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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the value of museums in the early part of the 21st century with a particular emphasis on Australian museums.

The study takes as its starting point the alignment of museum value with their capacity to achieve economic and social policy objectives set by government. This instrumental paradigm has been criticized by the museum community as narrow, unbalanced and incapable of capturing the full value and impact of museums to individuals and communities.

Relevant policies, reports, studies and articles have been reviewed and analyzed to establish the context in which the value of museums is currently being debated. Much of this literature has emanated from Britain where the government agenda has had particular implications for the museum sector since New Labour took office in 1997. The literature review identifies a fundamental problem with substantiating the instrumental contribution of museums using an impact evaluation model. It examines the emergence of a values paradigm and explores what values are attributed to museums through primary research with a professional cohort and with a cohort of the visiting and non-visiting public.

It finds that both public and professional respondents attribute value to museums across four dimensions (intrinsic, instrumental, institutional and non-use value). Further, the research finds that sufficient evidence exists to substantiate value claims to support a values-based paradigm for assessing the worth of museums.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The context for this thesis is one of change and challenge. It has its origins in the demise of the concept of public good, the application of a utilitarian framework to funding public culture and a growing frustration with the inadequacy and imbalance of this approach. It finds that this situation has stimulated a vigorous debate amongst cultural professionals about the value of museums at the beginning of the 21st century and how best to articulate and measure that value.

In response, this thesis uses primary research with professionals and the public to identify what values are attributed to museums. The research outcomes are compared with findings from emerging literature to develop a values typology. Further primary research examines whether the values in this typology can be substantiated. Finally a set of defensible, values-based indicators is proposed for the purpose of establishing a new evaluation paradigm for museums.

Museums that are the subject of this study are predominantly publicly funded museums in Britain and Australia. In Britain, this includes museums funded by national and local governments. Public museums in Australia are funded by one of the three tiers of government- Commonwealth, state/territory or local. The Commonwealth (also known as the federal) Government oversees 'national' institutions such the National Museum of Australia, the National Maritime Museum and the Australian War Memorial. State governments fund major state museums which often combine natural history, social history and anthropological collections. Examples include the Museum of Victoria, the Queensland Museum, the South Australian and Western Australian Museums and the Australian Museum in New South Wales.
There are three institutions where art, social history and natural history collections are subsumed under one institutional title (the Museum and Art Gallery of the Northern Territory, the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery in Hobart and the Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery in Launceston, Tasmania). In New South Wales, a second large institution, the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences, is also state funded. Commonly referred to as the Powerhouse Museum, the collection of The Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences includes decorative arts, design, social history, industry, physical science and technology. Local councils in both urban and regional areas fund local history museums and often contribute funding to museums with special collections.

This chapter is organized into three sections. First, it provides a brief overview of the context from which the thesis questions have evolved. Secondly, it establishes some parameters in terms of the choice of secondary literature for this study and the way that concepts and terms are applied in this developing field. Finally, it outlines the structure of the thesis.

**Background and Focus of This Study**

Significant changes have impacted on the museum sector both locally and globally over the last three decades. Faced with the economic downturn of the 1970's, Western governments within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)\(^2\) reversed the expansionism that had characterised post-war spending and introduced sweeping economic and structural reforms under the broad policy of 'modernising government'\(^3\).

---

\(^2\) The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) formed in 1961 comprises 30 countries including Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. One of its prominent roles is fostering good governance in the public service of OECD countries.

\(^3\) A programme to modernise the public sector with the common objectives of making the public sector more responsive, transparent, and efficient in meeting the needs of citizens.
Economic reform was a series of measures to reduce public expenditure and improve the quality of public services (NAO, 1999; OECD, 2005a). These reforms altered both the basis for public funding and the relationship between governments and their service providers.

Under the structural reforms of the modernising agenda, public sector agencies, once funded as public goods, were required to justify the receipt of public monies. Results-based accountability was introduced to ensure that public investment in services could be justified by demonstrable outcomes. Agencies were expected to provide evidence that they were using public funds efficiently, effectively and economically.

While the efficient and effective use of resources remains an essential cornerstone of public funding agreements, recent years have witnessed a shift from the dominance of the economic paradigm. Two drivers for this change are mentioned briefly here. One has been a wider international debate criticising models for measuring the health of communities based solely on economic determinants such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Gross National Product (GNP). Accordingly, there has been a shift in emphasis towards a more balanced approach embracing wider social outcomes and quality of life issues when measuring the health of communities.

Another factor has been the growing pressure on governments to deal with the impact of rapid social change. The development of knowledge economies, globalisation and culturally diverse populations, growing inequality, declining social trust and rising civil disobedience are perceived to have impacted negatively on traditional notions of connectedness, citizenship and social cohesion (Beauvais and Jensen, 2002). AEGIS (2003), Jenson (2002) and Baeker (2002) find that accelerated social change presents a challenge to governments to envisage a new civic realm that promotes social trust, co-operation and community well-being.
Fundamental to this new civic realm is the development of positive social capital, defined as the networks, norms and trust that enable co-operation for mutual benefit (Putnam, 2000; Fukuyama, 2002).

A new civic realm is at the heart of policy in the United Kingdom where the present government has had a specific interest in the reduction of what it describes as ‘social exclusion’ through a whole-of-government approach that includes arts and culture. The Department of Culture, Media and Sport policy, *Centres for Social Change: Museums, Libraries and Archives for all*, identified combating social exclusion as ‘one of the Government’s highest priorities’ and outlined a role for museums as ‘agents’ and ‘vehicles for positive social change’ to achieve this end (DCMS, 2000a). To ensure compliance with this role, funding agreements with DCMS sponsored museums and galleries are structured to reflect social inclusion objectives (DCMS, 2000a: 26)

In Australia, the role of arts and culture (including museums) in achieving wider social development goals is recognised in state policies where governments have strong commitments to reducing exclusion, improving individual self esteem, providing opportunities for life-long learning and contributing to community health (AEGIS, 2003; 2004). Examples are to be found in state policies such as *Creative Queensland* (2002), *Growing Victoria Together* (Victoria, 2001; 2005), *Tasmania Together* (2001) and *A New Direction for New South Wales: State Plan* (2006). Like their British counterparts, the Australian public sector is now required to ‘justify their spending in broader social and economic terms, rather than the simple development of their portfolio activity’ (AEGIS: 2004: 44).

In addition to contributing to general social objectives and using public funds efficiently, museums are under other pressures. In an environment where there are an increasing number of calls on the public purse, the issue of opportunity costs underlies demands on museums to demonstrate that the service they provide is a valued and unique one. Failure to do so opens the door to considerations of whether the same outcomes could be achieved in other ways at less cost.
Without disputing the museum’s claim to worthiness, what these questions will address instead is its relative worthiness. Is what the museum contributes to society commensurate with the annual cost of its operation? Could some other organisation (not necessarily a museum) make a similar or greater contribution at greater cost?" (Weil, 1994: 42)

Pressured into delivering against social and economic policy objectives and required to justify their existence in terms specified by funding bodies, museum leadership has found itself in a reactive position struggling to articulate the unique value of the sector in terms that enable it to argue from a position of strength (Ellis, 2002).

Increasingly frustrated, the UK cultural sector in general and museum leadership in particular have claimed that government is reducing cultural value to its utilitarian and instrumental impact at the expense of other dimensions of worth (Matarasso, 1996; Ellis, 2003; Holden, 2006), with constructing a role for museums that fails to adequately take account of its core purposes (Appleton, 2002; Ellis, 2003), of fostering a prescriptive and directive funding culture (Selwood, 2002b, 2004c) and of allowing ‘the institutional and measurement properties of the administrative system [to] exercise far too much influence over the nature of the cultural activity itself’ (Holden, 2004: 20).

Within the last three years, these debates have gained momentum. At the time of writing this thesis, the debate is in the midst of a significant paradigm shift from an instrumental to a more comprehensive and nuanced ‘value’ base for determining the public worth of museums.

There are two major reasons for this. On the one hand, there has been a direct challenge to the dominance of the utilitarian/instrumental paradigm amid calls for a more holistic approach to assessing culture. The debates have coalesced around the ‘value’ of culture as opposed to its instrumental ‘impact’ with much of the discourse emphasising the significance of intrinsic, as well as instrumental values (de la Torre and Mason, 2002; Holden, 2004, 2006; McCarthy et al, 2004) and ‘use’ values other than direct use (The Outspan Group, 1999; Throsby, 2002; Holden, 2004).
The values debates have unlocked a range of issues and widened discourse. Under current consideration are overarching frameworks for assessing culture based on concepts such as 'public value' (Holden, 2004; 2006), cultural capital (Throsby, 2002) and long-term sustainability (Matarasso, 2001; Hawkes, 2001). Critics call for 'a wholesale reshaping of the way in which public funding of culture is undertaken' (Holden, 2004: 10).

The paradigm shift is also reflective of a trend to increased democratisation and public involvement in cultural decision-making. In the last half of the 20th century, challenges to established authority have questioned the hegemony of the expert (Weil, 1997) amid calls that public opinion should be sought in the evaluation of public services (Matarasso, 1996; Wavell et al, 2002). de la Torre and Mason (2002) and Holden (2004) argue that, while values identification should include the perspectives of professional experts, the process also needs to involve the public as both recipients and creators of value.

At the core of these debates, then, is the question of 'whose values' and which values are being used to provide the benchmarks against which the worth of culture in general and museums in particular are being assessed and how those values are measured (Matarasso,1996; Mason, 2002; Owen, 2006). In response to this context, my research addresses the following questions:

1. Based on an analysis of emerging literature and primary research with museum professionals and the general public, is it possible to develop a typology that describes the value of museums?

2. Is it further possible to use this typology to develop a model for values-based assessment supported by a set of defensible indicators?

In answering these questions, the research examines the context in which contemporary museums operate in Australia and Britain. I interrogate the current utilitarian/ instrumental paradigm adopted by governments in Britain and Australia for evaluating the performance of museums and the response of the professional cultural sector to this paradigm.
A further part of the thesis tests a preliminary values-based typology, based on an analysis of existing literature, with professional and public cohorts. This typology is then examined to determine whether it can be supported by evidence.

The next two sections of this chapter explain the inclusion of British literature in this research and define primary terms used frequently in this thesis.

**Establishing parameters**

**Rationale for including the British perspective**

In Australia, the subject of the social value and impact of arts and culture has emerged relatively recently. At a Commonwealth level, there is an increased emphasis on the well-being of communities and the development of indices to measure the impact of economic, social, environmental and human factors on community health. The Commonwealth project, *Measures of Australia’s Progress* (cat. 1370.0, 2002; cat. 1370.0, 2004; 2006) outlines a social capital statistical framework for organizing, collecting and reporting data about social capital at a federal level. It recognizes three main domains (social, environmental and economic) against which the health and ‘well-being’ of a nation can be measured. At both federal and state levels, the contribution of the creative industries to economic growth and contributions to social capital and community capacity building have emerged in the last decade.

The three-tiered system of Australian government, with residual powers assumed by the states, makes a ‘whole of government approach’ to policy development and implementation a complicated undertaking. The strength of state powers can serve to mitigate federal initiatives, particularly within areas where states ‘rights’ affect control.
Negotiated positions have become the norm with the establishment of Ministers' Councils which are chaired by the federal Minister with portfolio and which include the states Ministers holding the same portfolio.

The Cultural Ministers Council (CMC), established in 1984, is one of these bodies. It is comprised of the Australian Commonwealth, State and Territory Ministers for the Arts and the New Zealand Ministers with responsibility for the arts. It provides a forum for cooperation and coordination on matters relating to the development of the arts and culture in Australia and through joint projects with New Zealand where feasible and appropriate. In 2003, the CMC commissioned a study to examine international literature and case studies on the subject of *The Social Impacts of Participating in the Arts and Cultural Activities*. The author was an industry advisor for this study. In 2006, the CMC, through its Statistical Working Group, initiated a major program to explore the public value resulting from investment in arts and culture (ABS, 2006)

The situation is different in Britain where the two-tiered system of government has more easily accommodated 'whole of government' initiatives. Since the election of New Labour in 1997, a 'whole of government' approach to implementing the social impact agenda has been pursued with energy and forcefulness from Westminster. Its implementation has been facilitated by the structural reforms of the modernizing government program and the two-tiered system of national and local governments. In addition, the British Government and the Department of Culture, Media and Sport have used the internet to widely publish their considerable output in terms of discussion papers, reports, white papers and policies and make them available within the public domain.
The vigour and conviction with which the government embarked on the social reform agenda has generated a correspondingly energetic and, often critical, response from the cultural sector, most notably from the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA), Arts Council England (ACE), the National Museum Directors Conference (NMDC) and DEMOS⁴, the British cultural think tank and forum. The combination of British government policy and sectoral response has generated a burgeoning literature which has provided the theoretical context for the primary research undertaken in Australia as part of this thesis.

In using the lessons of the British situation as the theoretical framework to interpret the outcomes of primary research conducted in Australia, the author hopes to provide guidelines to inform decision making at a time when policy is in a formative stage and there remains some opportunity to influence events in this country.

The review of literature for this research reveals a developing terminology. This section attempts to clarify some of the generic, overarching terms as they are currently used. Other terms and concepts are defined and discussed within subsequent chapters.

Notes on language and terms used in this study

Museum

Three definitions of a 'museum' were sourced for this study. The first one is used by the International Council of Museums (ICOM).

⁴ Based in Britain, Demos, describes itself as a 'greenhouse for new ideas' and 'an independent think-tank' http://www.demos.co.uk/aboutus/default.aspx (Accessed on 26/09/04).
A museum is a non-profit making, permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for purposes of study, education and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment. (ICOM Statutes art.2 para.1)

The second definition is the one adopted by Museums Australia in 2001-2.

A museum helps people understand the world by using objects and ideas to interpret the past and present and explore the future. A museum preserves and researches collections, and makes objects and information accessible in actual and virtual environments. Museums are established in the public interest as permanent, not-for-profit organisations that contribute long-term value to communities.

The third definition was agreed upon by the Museums Association (England) in 1998.

Museums enable people to explore collections for inspiration, learning and enjoyment. They are institutions that collect, safeguard and make accessible artefacts and specimens, which they hold in trust for society. This definition includes art galleries with collections of works of art, as well as museums with historical collections of objects. http://www.museumsassociation.org/faq&_XPOS_=mahead7 viewed 24th February 2002.

Common to all three definitions is the presence of collections as a constituent element, the emphasis on a public interface and the interpretation of collections for a range of outcomes.

Specific to both the ICOM and the Museums Australia definition is the emphasis on the public, not-for-profit dimension while the Museums Association (England) does not confine their definition to the funded, not-for-profit sector.
The primary research for this thesis (outlined in Chapter 5) uses two cohorts. The professional cohort was sourced primarily (but not exclusively) from public, not-for-profit museums funded by Commonwealth, state and local governments. Of the 34 participants in this cohort, there were two who represented museums funded in alternative ways. One was a culturally specific museum which generated its own income and the second was a university museum supported by the academic community.

The current policy environment in which museums operate has been a developing one, resulting in the introduction of structures and processes to support it and requiring the adaptation of terms to describe it. Many concepts (values, benefits, impact, evaluation, assessment and measurement) have been adapted to reflect the requirements of these policy objectives and structural processes.

The next section seeks to clarify some of the language within which this thesis is set. Many of these terms are generic and will be the subject of further elaboration throughout this thesis. Other terms describing specific policies such as social cohesion, inclusion and social capital will be defined within an appropriate context in later chapters.

Culture

Since the late 19th century and throughout the 20th century, cultural theory and definitions of culture have been strongly influenced by social anthropology, notably the work of Edward Tylor (1871) and theorists such as Raymond Williams (1983). Both Tylor and Williams promulgated a view of culture as a 'whole way of life' expressed through symbolic systems such as language and expressive arts, knowledge, belief, morals, law and custom.
This is the definition adopted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics which defines culture as ‘the shared sense of meaning that determines a group’s way of life. Following from this, activities that focus on defining, interpreting or expressing this meaning can be seen as cultural activities’ (ABS, 2001, cat. 4160.0: 270).

For the purposes of this thesis, it is also necessary to take account of other factors that affect the way in which the term ‘culture’ is interpreted.

In practice, policy-makers often define culture based on administrative convenience rather than cultural theory (Belfiore and Bennett, 2006; Holden, 2006). An interrogation of Arts and Cultural Ministry websites reveals that the parameters of the term ‘culture’ are delineated by government structures and refer to the publicly funded activities that are encompassed within a specific portfolio.

For example, under the English Department of Culture, Media and Sport the term ‘culture’ encompasses museums, galleries, the built and the historic environment, libraries, archives and the arts (viewed 15th October 2006 from http://www.culture.gov.uk/about_us/culture/). The Australian Commonwealth Department of Communication, Information Technology and the Arts encompasses arts and culture under one program of activity including artists, actors, filmmakers, musicians and performers and ‘collections of cultural significance’ in galleries, libraries, archives and museums (viewed 14th October 2006 from http://www.dcita.gov.au/arts). Arts New South Wales, a state-based Ministry for the Arts, oversees museums, galleries, visual arts and crafts, performing arts, literature, community arts and other access programs and indigenous arts (viewed 14th October 2006 from http://www.arts.nsw.gov.au/annrep_).
For administrative convenience, policies and organizational systems are applied generically across the public sector and multiple areas of a portfolio. Particularly with regard to evidence-based policy, results-based accountability and impact evaluation, the literature used in this thesis will often refer to their broad application across 'arts and culture' or the 'cultural sector', rather than to museums specifically. In the cases where policies and systems have been developed specifically to address the collections sector (museums, galleries, archives and libraries) or focus solely on museums, these instances will be identified.

A similar situation exists with literature generated by cultural critics and commentators who often apply the term 'culture' to embrace a range of activities including the arts, collection agencies (such as museums) and heritage when they describe concepts such as 'Cultural Value' (Holden, 2004; 2006). Much of the literature sourced for this thesis considers the role of culture in relation to structural reform and developments in public policy. The literature used in this thesis is current as of March 2007.

Policy

The National Audit Office (UK) defines policy as 'the translation of government's political priorities and principles into programmes and courses of action to deliver desired changes' (NAO, 2001, 1).

Owen (2006: 23) finds that policy is the 'the most pervasive form of social intervention'. Through policy, a government outlines the intents and goals by which it regulates, controls and promotes services, sanctions actions and establishes a consistent approach across some area (Owen, 2006: 25). Owen distinguishes between legislative policy (a government bill or parliamentary act), large scale policy which 'provides direction for interventions that are implemented across a system of providers under the same organisational umbrella' and local policy which is confined to a single organisation (2006: 24).
This thesis focuses on the second form of policy (large scale) and the 'impact of the policy-making and the policy-implementing system as it is experienced by the client' (Owen, 2006:25).

Public good and public services

Structural reform within governments that have adopted the modernizing agenda has had a significant impact on the notion of 'public good' as a basis for funding. 'Public goods' are goods or services that can be consumed by several individuals simultaneously without diminishing the value of consumption to any one of the individuals.

The capacity of multiple individuals to consume the same good without diminishing its value is a key characteristic of public goods and is termed non-rivalry. Non-rivalry is what most strongly distinguishes public goods from private goods. A pure public good also has the characteristic of non-excludability where an individual cannot be prevented from consuming the good whether or not the individual pays for it (Samuelson, 1954).

The term 'public services' refers to services provided by governments to their citizens and financed directly through the public sector, negotiated as public/private partnerships or authorised through a private provider. The notion of public services reflects a social consensus that certain services should be available to all, regardless of income. Examples of public services range across social security, schools, health care, urban planning, national defense and cultural institutions and organisations.

Public funding is based on the assumption that these public services are valued and provide identifiable benefits. Within the modernising context, they are also subject to on-going monitoring, continuous assessment and required to demonstrate that they are achieving results. These results are variously defined as 'values', 'benefits', 'outcomes' and 'impacts' and require some consideration and clarification within this context.
Impacts and outcomes, values and benefits

Within a modernising framework, public agencies such as museums have had to demonstrate their contribution to wider economic and social objectives. The Green Book, published by HM Treasury (2003: v) signals ‘a stronger emphasis on the identification, management and realisation of benefits – in short, focusing on the end in sight, right from the beginning’. Planning, with intended benefits in mind, is now required of public sector agencies. Proving that activity has produced an intended result is demonstrated through evidence of outcomes, impacts, value and benefits.

‘Outcomes’ tend to be associated with direct and immediate effects (Cultural Heritage Consortium, 2002: 13). ‘Impacts’, on the other hand, refer to longer term results and address the question, ‘did it make a difference?’ (Wavell et al. 2002: 7). Poll and Payne (2006:2) suggest that ‘outcomes’ may be considered to be the eventual result of using services, ‘the consequence, visible or practical result or effect of an event or activity’ (number of books read as the result of regularly using a library), while ‘impacts’ are ‘the effect or influence of one person, thing, or action, on another’ (developing a love of literature as the result of regular reading).

‘Value’ is a broad, overarching term which can refer to both the moral principles and ideas that serve to guide individual and collective action and the qualities and characteristics attributed to things (Mason, 2002; Rescher, 2004). This thesis is concerned with the second definition.

Something ‘valued’ is important or precious and involves the perception of actual or potential benefit (Poll and Payne, 2006: 2). When an outcome results in a beneficial impact it tends to produce ‘value’ (Mason, 2002; CHASS, 2005).

To prove that activity has resulted in achieving the planned intent requires the use of evaluation to collect the evidence.
Evaluation, impact evaluation and measurement

Evaluation is the process of judging the worth or merit of something. Often, evaluation is undertaken using set of standards or criteria for which data is collected and against which assessments are made to provide evaluative determinations (Scriven, 1991; Matarasso, 1996; Owen, 2006).

Evaluation of public sector performance has been progressively formalised through the introduction of evidence-based policy, results-based accountability and performance management. Evidence-based policy uses a range of methods ‘to systematically investigate the effectiveness of policy interventions, implementation and processes, and to determine their merit, worth, or value in terms of improving the social and economic conditions of different stakeholders (Davies, 2003:3).

Impact evaluation is linked to accountability as it ‘rests partly on the not-unreasonable assumption that citizens at large should know whether programs funded by government...are making a difference’ (Owen, 2006:252). Impact evaluation is a logical evaluation choice for governments as it mainly concerns itself with the outcomes of applying policy to a target population with the aim of determining whether the intended objective was achieved (Davies, 2003; Owen, 2006).

'It seeks to provide estimates of the effects of a policy either in terms of what was expected of it at the outset, or compared with some other intervention, or with doing nothing at all i.e. the counterfactual (Cabinet Office, 2003:4).

Though several types of impact evaluation exist, governments have tended to favour an objectives-based model though Owen (2006) demonstrates that impact evaluation is not confined to the objectives-based model. Other models of impact evaluation include needs based, goal-free, process-outcome and realistic evaluation.
Though the term *measurement* has become synonymous with quantitative data and numerics, it also admits qualitative information (Sarantakos, 1998: 72). This wider definition of measurement is adopted throughout this study as is the generic term ‘assessment’ which encompasses both evaluation and measurement.

**Community**

A major recipient of social policy is the ‘community’. However, in spite of the fact that the term *community* appears with almost ubiquitous frequency within the literature on cultural impact and social policy, it is often used without sufficient clarity to what it is referring (Jermyn, 2001).

Guetzkow (2002: 14) suggests that community can be defined on the basis of propinquity, legality or group membership. Propinquity refers to residential proximity such as found in neighbourhoods. When designated boundaries apply (towns, cities or states), the definitions include a legal dimension. Group membership includes forms of self-identification with a community of interest based on any number of associations (age, sub-culture or sexual preference) or group identification focusing on ethnic diversity or class. Social policy tends to be directed towards definitions of community-as-propinquity (urban regeneration and renewal) and community-as-membership (social cohesion, social inclusion, cultural diversity).

**Structure of the Thesis**

The literature base for this study is an evolving one. When the primary research was conducted in 2002-3, a limited literature on the subject of impact was emerging. Specifically, the literature emerging at that time dealt with what impact museums had in relation to economic and social policy objectives (Coalter, 2001), whether there was evidence to support impact claims (CHC, 2002; Wavell et al, 2002) and how to collect the evidence to measure the impact (Reeves, 2002).
This situation has evolved rapidly within the last three years. Particular mention should be made of the June 2003 Demos Forum, *Valuing Culture*. An initiative of Demos and aea consulting, the forum directly challenged the British government's linking of cultural worth to utilitarian policy agenda. The *Valuing Culture* forum had an important role in reframing discussions in Britain on the basis of 'value', as opposed to 'use'. An outcome was the response from the Secretary for State and Minister for Culture, Media and Sport, the Hon. Tessa Jowell.

Her personal monograph, *Government and the Value of Culture* (DCMS, 2004), opened the door to a new dialogue about the 'intrinsic' value of culture in addition to its instrumental impact. Other publications such as John Holden's monographs *Capturing cultural value: how culture has become a tool of government policy* (2004) and *Cultural value and the crisis of legitimacy: why culture needs a democratic mandate* (2006) have further widened the debates to reflect on the contribution that cultural institutions make to overall public value.

The debates and discussions on the 'value' issue have accelerated the publication of new literature. Some of the most significant literature has become available in the last 18 months with several reports of particular relevance to this thesis published during the writing phase in late 2006 from the Council of Australasian Museum Directors and the Museum, Libraries and Archives Council and the National Museum Directors Conference in Britain.

---

*Valuing Culture* attracted presentations by Adrian Ellis/ Director of aea Consulting, Charles Saumarez Smith/ Director of the National Gallery, the Rt. Hon. Chris Smith/ former Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport and currently Director of the Clore Program for Cultural Leadership, Deborah Bestwick/ Director of Oval House Theatre, Nicholas Hytner/ Director of the National Theatre, Professor Robert Hewison/ Cultural Commentator and Art Historian, Sara Selwood/ Editor of Cultural Trends, the current Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, Tessa Jowell, and Lord Stevenson, Chairman of Pearson and HBOS and Former Chair of the Tate. Estelle Morris, then newly appointed Minister for the Arts, also made a brief contribution.
Given the evolving nature of this subject, it has seemed appropriate to distribute the literature throughout the body of this thesis. Material relevant to the background and context which gave rise to the study is presented in the first four chapters. As the implications of the primary research for an evidence base and a generic indicator set are discussed, the literature directly associated with these topics is included in those chapters.

A further note is made at this point regarding the inclusion of literature not specifically related to museums and from further afield than the two main countries of comparison, Britain and Australia. By way of explanation for the first point, reference is made to the definitions of 'culture' on pages 10-12 of this chapter and the use of this generic term (particularly by government) to encompass a range of activities including, but not confined to, museums. Given that government policy and procedures have been formulated to apply across this generic field, selective use is made of literature within this overall cultural remit (community arts, broadcasting (BBC), libraries, heritage and other related activities and organisations) where it is relevant. Given the relative paucity of literature specifically related to museums (particularly at the commencement of this study) these inclusions were deemed necessary. Similarly, though the bulk of the literature referred to in this study was sourced from Britain and Australia, the literature on modernising government contains material from the OECD and examples of evaluation methodology have been sought across sectors and countries. An example is the inclusion of the very recent study of contingent valuation of libraries in Norway by Aabo with its particularly useful and explicit description of the methodology for conducting these studies.

The present chapter introduces the thesis. It outlines the context which has generated the research questions, discusses issues associated with the literature base and clarifies the use of terms within the framework of this study.
Chapter 2 explores the context and significance of the modernising government agenda in Britain and Australia and the impact of its structural and policy reforms for assessing the value of museums. It examines the notion of value from the perspective of governments undertaking structural and social policy reform, from the position of the professional museum and cultural sector responding to these reforms and from the general public faced with work, leisure and demographic changes.

Chapter 3 examines the literature on impact evaluation, the approach adopted by the British and Australian governments to embed results-based accountability. It finds that implementing impact evaluation poses many challenges. Among these challenges are an evolving conceptual base, uncertain terminology, assumptions regarding causality, the choice of appropriate models and methods, an inconclusive evidence base and a sector generally unfamiliar with the discipline of evaluation.

Chapter 4 introduces the emerging literature on an alternative to impact evaluation through the notion of a values-based paradigm. Upon analysing the literature, it proposes a values typology for museums.

Chapter 5 describes the approach to the primary research component of this study.

Chapter 6 tests the proposed values typology against findings from primary research with professional and public cohorts and further examines whether the museum experience which generates value attribution is unique. The typology is subsequently revised on the basis of primary findings. Chapter 7 uses findings from the primary research and reports published in late 2006 to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to support these value dimensions. Chapter 8 situates a proposal for a values-based assessment paradigm for museums within the developing field of cultural indicators and the literature on this subject. Chapter 9 concludes the thesis.
CHAPTER TWO: THE CONTEXT FOR THE RESEARCH

This chapter explores perceptions of value from three perspectives-government, the professional museum sector and the general public.

The first section examines the government perspective. The proposition advanced in this thesis is that the modernising government agenda adopted progressively over the last three decades by countries comprising the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) of which both Australia and Britain are members, has altered funding based on the notion of 'public good' and changed the relationship which government has with the public sector. It observes that through formal systems of accountability and contractual funding agreements, governments have been able to set the terms to which public sector institutions must comply in order to receive on-going funding. These terms have been closely aligned to achieving government economic and social policy objectives and reflect a trend to valuing the sector for its contribution to these goals. Government control of policy, public management and evaluation criteria over much of the last decade has placed the cultural sector in a position of responsiveness and reaction. For this reason, the ensuing discussion is primarily devoted to an analysis of the structural and policy context in which museums have been operating since the early 1980's.

The second frame of reference examines value through the lens of professionals working in the cultural sector, including museum professionals and their advocates. It finds that, over the last decade, the sector has been largely limited to a reactive position, responsive to the increasing demands for evidence to support the economic and social impact agenda and challenged to cogently articulate the value of museums beyond this instrumental paradigm (Matarasso, 2001; Ellis, 2002).
More recently, it observes the emergence amongst the sector of a more proactive position that argues for a different paradigm to evaluate museums and re-shape the criteria upon which funding decisions are based.

The final frame of reference explores the value of museums through direct public engagement. It finds that social, technological and economic changes over the last two decades are challenging the maintenance of museums audiences. It questions whether declining audience attendances are an indication that museums are valued less by the public.

**Governments and the question of value**

* Museums and galleries contribute to the delivery of a number of policy objectives determined by government. It is reasonable that central and local government expect the achievement of such objectives because a significant proportion of most institutions' income comes from the State. It is also possible, of course, that short-term changes in policy may detract from the longer term purposes of cultural institutions (Travers, 2006: 12).

In the last two decades, questions of value in relation to all forms of public sector activity have been influenced by both structural reform and social and philosophical trends. This first section explores these structural reforms in OECD countries over the last two decades. It finds that these reforms have had a profound impact on the notion of 'public good', have transformed the public sector and have altered the terms of public service provision with significant implications for all public sector services, including museums. With specific reference to museums, it finds that the reform agenda has promoted greater control of museum activity through the combination of accountability, the budget process and funding tied to the achievement of government policy. The resulting situation is a value paradigm constructed around instrumentalism defined by demonstration of contribution to social and economic policy objectives. The following section examines these structural and social reforms and their impact on cultural accountability, management and activity.
Structural reform: modernising government

Since the late 1970's, OECD countries have grappled with complex pressures for social and economic change (OECD, 2003; 2005a). Following World War II, governments of Western industrialized countries embarked upon a period of economic expansion that was to last for a quarter of a century. Characterized by large investment in public spending, governments expanded their responsibility into increased welfare and social services and provided subsidies for arts, culture, consumer and environmental protection. During this period, governments were near-monopoly providers of utilities such as power and water, services such as healthcare, social welfare, education and transport infrastructure (OECD, 2005a:2).

Though this level of expenditure was sustained during the post war period of rapid economic growth, with the economic downturn of the 1970's, governments were faced with the necessity of reducing spending. It became evident that some of the open-ended, demand-driven commitments (such as healthcare) were leading countries into financial crisis and that it was unsustainable to use an ever-increasing share of the national economy to fund these expanding public responsibilities. Governments were compelled to seek reductions in public spending while continuing to provide high quality services in response to public demand. To resolve these issues, OECD governments embarked on a major program of reform which reversed the expansionist trend through policies which sought 'economies', 'efficiency' and 'effectiveness' in spending.

The quest for economic reform raised questions about the role and size of governments (OECD, 1997:8). As the role of government was re-cast to focus on establishing and monitoring policy, governments were able to divest themselves of many aspects of direct asset control and service delivery with a corresponding reduction in spending.
Freed of the role of monopoly service provider, governments reduced the size of their public sectors, required public agencies to assume more responsibility for service provision and sought alternative methods to deliver traditional services through private/public partnerships and outsourcing (OECD, 2005a).

Reforms, however, created other challenges. Among them was ensuring that policy was delivered through services to a high standard. Providing evidence of good performance became a complicated matter amidst an overall trend to greater transparency (OECD, 2003:7), a growing focus on the performance of public services rather than simple conformity with law and the use of entities outside direct government control to deliver services (OECD, 2005b:3).

*The governability of complex, dynamic and diverse processes requires new capacities which cannot be offered by traditionally administrative and bureaucratic government structures and methods of operating.* (OECD, 1997:8)

Implementing these reforms required a shift from a traditional bureaucratic model, which operated the public service on a monopoly-provider basis through compliance with pre-set rules and regulations to a management model whereby departmental and agency managers were given performance contracts in which responsibility and accountability requirements were a condition of employment. The model for what came to be known as the ‘New Public Management’ originated in the private and commercial sector and was adapted for use in the public service (Kelly et al, 2002: 10; Blaug et al, 2006: 10)

Underpinning the new public management were new uses of the terms ‘control’ and ‘accountability’, constructed to reflect the premises of the modernising agenda.
The OECD definition of ‘control’ is a process designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of operations, reliability of reporting and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. ‘Accountability’ means the obligation of those entrusted with particular responsibilities to present an account of, and answer for, their execution (OECD, 2005b:2).

In other words, governments established strategic mechanisms by which to exert control over a devolved network of service providers operating within the parameters of government policy. Central to these mechanisms were control of expenditure through monitoring the use of public monies and the collection of performance information (OECD, 2004: 2).

Fiscal leverage

One of the key mechanisms to effect control, and a fundamental tenet of the ‘modernising’ agenda, links policy and fiscal accountability with public administration and governance. Governments’ regular budget cycles have assumed a central role in the process of reviewing financial probity, efficiency and performance.

The budget and accounting process has become the operational planning tool of government and provides the architecture for accountability. The current vogue for including performance targets and measures has further strengthened the role of the budget (and finance ministries) as a lever for change (OECD, 2003:7)

Under performance management, input-oriented budgets have become performance budgets, cash-based accounting systems have changed into accrual-based cost accounting or performance reporting systems, and compliance and financial audits are complemented by performance audits and evaluations.
Rather than a spending tool, budgeting has become a management tool integrated with systems, such as evaluation. The result is the centrality of budgets as a key element of management linked to the financial cycle of budgeting, accounting, and auditing (OECD, 1997: 21).

With increasing devolution, much greater responsibility has come to rest on the shoulders of particular ministries, departments or agencies to show that managers have used public money and other resources in a way that accomplishes their set functions efficiently. Audit scrutiny has increased and audit offices with mandates to provide regular, independent review of financial management, performance and compliance are now a feature within most OECD governments (OECD, 2005b:2).

In addition to these measures, a range of other mechanisms have been progressively implemented to enforce accountability and ensure government control. Of significance to this study are performance management and evaluation.

**Performance management**

Ultimately citizens judge government not by intentions but by results. Much of the focus of modernising government has been aimed at making governments appear more efficient, transparent, customer-aware, and responsive to demands for public accountability. Public sector performance, therefore, has taken on special urgency within this reform context (OECD, 2004: 2).

Governments introduced performance-based management and budgeting to improve efficiency, assist financial decision making, ensure transparency, guarantee accountability and achieve savings.
In reality, this has involved writing goals, targets, indicators and measures into the formal management and incentive systems of government organisations and public employees, relating, less to how the service is provided and more to the results that are achieved (OECD, 2004:1).

Australia and New Zealand were among the first to begin performance management and budgeting in the late 1980s, followed in the early to mid 1990s by Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States. Importantly, Australia was one of a handful of OECD countries (including the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom) that adopted a top-down and total system approach, mandating change across government (OECD, 2004: 4).

**Performance evaluation**

Integrated with performance management, performance evaluation enabled governments to assess progress against policy objectives, targets and benchmarks (OECD, 1997: 10). Provision of performance information has assumed a central role in managing and controlling public services, monitoring value for money and meeting public pressures for accountability.

As the importance of performance data has increased over time, issues such as the choice of performance measures (appropriateness and validity), the collection and the processing of data (reliability), the quality of information (accuracy and completeness), the standards and criteria for judgement, the interpretation and explanation of results and the relevance and adequacy of performance data for decision-making have been the subject of discussion and debate both within governments and within the public sector.

The OECD was aware as early as ten years ago that improvement was required in many of these areas.
Concerns include the focus on setting targets around numerically measurable fields of activity to the exclusion of qualitative data, the emphasis on economic targets at the expense of effectiveness and quality, the difficulties in converting general policy objectives into clear indicators, an overemphasis on achieving targets with possible displacement effects, the absence of time series data and a lack of clarity in the linkages between inputs-activities-outputs-outcomes-targets. (OECD, 1997: 20)

Evidence-based policy

With the introduction of 'evidence based policy' the need for performance data or 'evidence' to demonstrate achievement of policy objectives has become formalized.

*Policy evaluation and analysis requires a structured and organised approach to defining an answerable question, summoning appropriate and relevant evidence, critically appraising and analysing that evidence, identifying the risks and opportunities of a policy, programme or project, and determining the likely effects (positive and negative) of the project at hand. Project and programme management has emerged in recent years as a structured and organised ways of planning, implementing and concluding projects and programmes. The congruity of interest between policy evaluation and project management is clear.* (Davies, 2003: 11)

Evidence based policy seeks proofs of impact from a wide field (Davies, 2003: 3). Experimental evidence, social surveys, administrative data, results from qualitative research, economic impact studies, systematic reviews, philosophical and ethical evidence and performance data gathered from agencies entrusted with service delivery all claim to be used to determine whether a policy has achieved its intended outcomes. In the UK policy achievement is linked to targets set by Public Service Agreements and Service Delivery Agreements negotiated with service providers.

In spite of the emphasis on the role of evidence within this framework, critics question whether performance information is used *at all* to determine budget allocation and policy development (Selwood, 2004c; OECD, 2005).
The OECD admits that 'many governments are still struggling to ensure that information about results, once gathered, is actually used admitting that 'in only 19% of countries do politicians in the legislature use this information in decision making (OECD, 2005a:4).

The next two sections of this chapter briefly describe the implementation of modernising reforms in Britain and Australia. They illustrate the development of a context characterised by the diminution of the 'arms length' principle, increasing contractualisation of relationships and the use of accountability systems and funding to ensure compliance with government policy.

The British experience

In Britain, modernising reforms were implemented from the early 1980's. The passing of the National Audit Act of 1983 'enshrined the principle of Value for Money, judged by the three E's: economy, efficiency and effectiveness' (Hewison, 2003: 3-4) and was quickly followed by the establishment of a National Audit Office.

Further reforms included the establishment of the 'watchdog' body, the Quality, Efficiency and Standards Team (QUEST), to ensure the overall fiscal accountability of the public service with a wide brief to develop standards, set performance objectives in consultation with sector agencies and devise performance measures to be used in funding agreements (QUEST, 2002:3). At an operational level, the new reform agenda was enforced through the introduction of 'management by results' which established objectives within broad policy guidelines, enshrined them in corporate plans and monitored progress through on-going review and performance indicators.

Performance indicators, as an accountability measure, have been quite prescriptive in Britain with the government establishing indicator frameworks within which the sector has limited scope to respond.
In the early 1990's, the Office of Arts and Libraries (OAL) commissioned Coopers & Lybrand to develop a range of performance indicators including measures of access and use, income generation and financial management for application across the national museums and galleries. These indicators were intended to provide objective benchmarks against which to measure progress in achieving the aims and objectives identified in corporate plans, to identify areas of relative strength and weakness, inform decision-making on the allocation of resources and motivate staff (OAL, 1991).

Demands for increased compliance with government policy progressively paved the way for the decline of the 'arms length' principle and greater intervention by government in the work of sponsored agencies (Selwood, 2002). This was helped, when, following the British Conservatives re-election in 1992, the Department of National Heritage (DNH) was formed and accorded status as a Department of State with representation in the Cabinet.

_The implications of this marked the growth of political interest in the cultural sector........While the Secretary of State for the National Heritage was still publicly committed to the so-called 'arms length' principle in the early 1990's, by 1996 the proceedings of a parliamentary committee revealed that the principle had actually come to be regarded as 'stunting' the growth of the Department, and that as a Cabinet Minister, the Secretary of State expected to be able to have a view about how money was spent and what decisions should be taken about the future direction in the country (Selwood, 2002b: 2)._  

The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) succeeded the Department of National Heritage and, in 1998, established three-year funding agreements tied to the achievement of government objectives, particularly with regard to a key Labour policy of social inclusion. The Rt. Hon Chris Smith, then Secretary of State and Minister for Culture, Media and Sport described the 'new relationship' between government and the recipients of public funding as part of the modernisation and reform agenda which sought returns on public investment in line with government policy.
Three year funding will be accompanied by three year funding agreements and all recipients of funding from DCMS will have a clear responsibility to deliver against demanding output and outcome based targets. The advent of resource accounting across Government will ensure that DCMS ties its expenditure to its objectives, and we will need to be assured that public money is being used appropriately to meet public objectives (DCMS, 1998:3).

In 1999, DCMS published *Museums for the many: standards for museums and galleries to use when developing access policies*. The standards included engaging diverse audiences through increased and innovative access to collections, addressing physical barriers such as opening hours, admission and pricing policies, setting targets to increase the proportion of visitors from under-represented groups and extending facilities to provide disability access, availability of information in languages other than English, electronic access to collections, etc.

The standards were aimed at museums and galleries directly funded by DCMS. Using the standards as a benchmark, museums were then asked to set access targets for inclusion in their 3-year funding agreements with the Department. It was the expressed intention that the standards would ‘become a requirement of Registration as part of their reformulation of the scheme over the next few years’ (DCMS, 1999c:5). That compliance was assured is illustrated by the triennial funding agreement between DCMS and the National Science and Industry Museum in London.

_A key aim of this Funding Agreement is to demonstrate the key connections between the NMSI’s core business and DCMS’s objectives and its four key strategic priorities....There will be increased emphasis on the audience, and on building social capital through delivering access and social inclusion agendas_ (DCMS, 2003a:2).

Many of the initiatives that have characterised public sector reform in Britain are echoed by those undertaken in Australia during the same period and which focused on stronger financial controls and greater accountability.
The Australian experience

Since the 1970s, modernising reforms in the Australian Public Service have been influenced by several government reviews. The first of these reviews, *The Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration* (1976) established the general parameters within which successive reforms have been implemented within the last 25 years. The main themes of the 1974 review were responsiveness, improved efficiency and effectiveness, results-based management and community participation (Australian Public Service Commission, 2003: 45).

Further Commonwealth white papers (*Reforming the Australian Public Service*, 1983), reviews (*Public Service Act Review, 1994*), discussion papers (*Towards a Best Practice Australian Public Service, 1996*) and the revised *Public Service Act 1999* gave effect to a broad range of reforms. These have been paralleled in all Australian states and territories since the 1970s where reforms have focused on the functions and responsibilities of public service agencies, the efficiency and effectiveness of their operation, and their responsiveness, both to the governments they serve and to the wider community.

Similar to its British counterpart, The Australian National Audit Office was established in 1997 to oversee performance and accountability for the expenditure of public funds within the Commonwealth public sector. States have similar structures. In New South Wales, the Council on the Cost and Quality of Government (COCQG) reported annually across government, providing a summary of expenditure, service efforts and achievements, together with a description of the community context within which these achievements occur.

‘Management by results’ was subsequently introduced into the public sector to be achieved through establishing objectives within broad policy guidelines, progressively monitoring progress towards these objectives and evaluating them through the use of corporate plans, systems of on-going review and the use of performance indicators.

In the state of New South Wales, performance monitoring was introduced by the state government through ‘management audits’ in the 1970’s, followed by ‘efficiency audits’ in the 1980’s. In 1986, the Program Evaluation Unit was established to co-ordinate monitoring activity across the public sector and, in 1987, program evaluation became an official requirement for public sector managers. In 1988, the Office of Public Management was created to further consolidate the work of auditors and program evaluators and in 1990 the Public Finance and Audit Act was passed which made program evaluation a legal obligation for managers of public sector institutions (Douglas, 1991).

Service and resource allocation agreements have evolved progressively from ‘compliance’ to a ‘greater degree of performance control’ (Australian Public Service Commission, 2003: 95). Since 1999, as the Commonwealth has progressively implemented the recommendations of the White paper, it has moved from direct performance reporting (what an agency has done and what services it has delivered) to an outputs and outcomes framework that focuses on what results have been achieved by delivering services. Importantly, governments see agency ‘outcomes’ as a direct reflection of government policy and decide appropriations based on the achievement of prescribed outcomes.

_The framework focuses on the outputs the public sector is producing and their contribution to the outcomes set by government, and is aimed at assisting the tracking of results and progress towards targets.....Importantly, appropriations are now made at the outcomes level. Outcomes, and the supporting administered and departmental outputs, therefore form the basis of an agency’s operating budget and external reporting framework_ (Australian Public Service Commission 2003: 95)
In Australian states and territories, Treasuries link agency operations with strategic policy through 'results and services' reports. Results and Services Plans (RSP's) describe services provided, the cost of those services and how the services contribute to overall results for the community. Results and services provide a 'performance story' about the agency to Treasury based on the information provided. A recent audit of the use of performance information to manage services in New South Wales, noted that

Many of the public sector reforms that governments have introduced have focussed on maximising results through the better use of performance information. Sound information is essential in determining the extent of community need, how those needs can be most effectively met and how the taxpayer's dollar can be most efficiently used. The monitoring and regular review of existing services also require sound information (Audit Office of New South Wales, 2006b:1)

Greater public accountability through agency responsiveness to citizens was furthered through initiatives such as service charters and 'guarantees of service' first implemented in some states in the early 1990's and followed by the Commonwealth in 1997. These service charters inform customers and clients about the agency's services, avenues of communication, service standards, client rights and responsibilities and available feedback and complaint mechanisms. An extremely important dimension of the shift to a customer focus on the part of Australian and British governments, and an important trend in terms of the primary research component of this thesis, is an increasing expectation that members of the public, clients, and industry members will be consulted in terms of both policy development and service delivery. This trend is resulting in agencies not only informing citizens about policy initiatives and programs, but also involving them in helping to develop policy and programs (Australian Public Service Commission, 2003: 154).

In summary, the modernising program has created a structural framework that fosters a closer alignment between service delivery, funding, performance information and policy objectives.
But, in the last decade, public policy in both Britain and Australia has witnessed a shift from the predominance of an economic paradigm to a greater focus on 'social outcomes'. The next section examines this shift and finds that there is a trend to justify public investment in these broader social terms.

**Social reform**

Social cohesion, the capacity to cooperate and the willingness to trust, is seen as essential to economic and social well-being. But the growth of knowledge-based economies, industrial and economic changes directly connected to globalisation, the emergence of more mobile and culturally diverse populations, increasing trends to individuality at the expense of communal norms, growing inequality, declining social trust and rising civil disobedience have tested social cohesion in Western countries and challenged governments to develop 'a new form of civics' (Baeker, 2002; Jenson, 2002; AEGIS, 2004).

Beauvais and Jenson (2002: vi) see this as an opportunity for governments. They suggest that social cohesion serves as a useful concept for framing a range of complex policy issues and providing an umbrella concept within which to subsume single policy issues such as anti-poverty, employment and community development. Their principal idea is that social policy is a productive factor and that social expenditure is an investment with positive results for both human resources and economic productivity (Beauvais and Jenson 2002: 21).

They note that many OECD governments increasingly present social expenditure in terms of investment in fostering social cohesion.

*The European Union’s Social Policy Agenda (European Commission, 2000a) is part of the integrated approach towards achieving economic and social renewal. The guiding principle of this new agenda is to strengthen the role of social policy as a productive factor. This means viewing social expenditures on health and education as an investment in human resources, with positive economic effects (Beauvais and Jenson, 2002: 9).*
In their review of recent literature, Beauvais and Jenson (2002: 2) note that the concept of social cohesion encompasses 5 constituent elements including common values and a civic culture, social order and social control, social solidarity and reductions in wealth disparities, social networks and social capital, and territorial belonging and identity and that

*By far the most important definition of social cohesion used in these studies is one that treats social capital and social networks as the constitutive element* (Beauvais and Jenson, 2002: v)

Social capital shares some of the features of social cohesion. It is described as the shared norms and values that promote trust and cooperation realised through social networks, relationships and transactions (ABS, 4160.0, 2001; Putnam, 2000; Fukuyama, 1999).

*While definitions of social capital vary, the main aspects are citizenship, neighbourliness, trust and shared values, community involvement, volunteering, social networks and civic participation (UK Statistics Online, 2005, accessed 12th November 2006 from http://www.statistics.gov.uk/socialcapital/)*

Strategies to building social networks and, thus, reduce social exclusion and its consequences are at the core of social policies in many OECD countries, particularly those of Britain.

*There is widespread recognition of the consequences of social exclusion including the direct effect on the numbers of individuals and families living on extremely low incomes, the indirect effects on the productive capacity of societies as a whole; and the links to increased conflict and insecurity. In this context, increasing attention is being paid to the need for policy initiatives that support greater engagement with excluded groups and communities, building social capital and social networks and contributing to democratic renewal (Popay et al, 2006: 9)*

Putnam (2000) and Jenson (2002) believe that institutions and organizations are crucial for reducing social exclusion, building inclusion and fostering social cohesion because of their capacity to engage people and build social networks. Public institutions have a special role to play because of the principle of non-excludability.
A role for public institutions (including museums) in reducing social exclusion has been integral to the formulation of social policy in Britain and Australia. In both countries, investment in arts and culture in return for service delivery that addresses social exclusion is seen as a form of public expenditure that can ease divisions by enabling socially disempowered groups to participate in society on a more equal basis through engaging in cultural activities. Underlying this premise are two assumptions.

On the one hand, there is a belief that 'participation is good' (Burns Owen Partnership, 2005: 24) and that cultural participation, like other forms of participation, is a form of civic engagement that builds active citizenship and social capital (Beauvais and Jensen, 2002; ACE, 2004).

Regular involvement in these activities can produce social solidarity and social cohesion through the creation of community symbols and community identity (McCarthy et al, 2004: 29)

The other assumption is a belief in the transformative effect of participation in arts and culture. A survey of literature notes that participation in cultural activities is credited with positive impacts on individual development through the acquisition of skills, exposure to new experiences, building self esteem and confidence, learning and improved mental health (Williams, 1997; Matarasso, 1997; Guetzkow 2002; ACE, 2004; McCarthy et al, 2004; Ruiz, 2004).

Further, cultural participation is credited with addressing neighbourhood renewal by improving communities' performance' on the four key indicators of health, crime, employment and education (ACE, 2004: 5). Precipitated by these twin beliefs- 'good' comes from participation and culture has transformative power- British social policy, in particular, has constructed a role for museums in contributing to neighbourhood renewal and regeneration, social inclusion and civic renewal (Burns Owen Partnership, 2005: 17).

With the election of New Labour in Britain in 1997, the government saw opportunities for cultural solutions to resolve societies' socio-economic problems (Selwood, 2004).
Within months of the 1997 election, the Cabinet Office had established a Social Exclusion Unit, which reported to the Prime Minister on ways in which government departments could work together to create a more equitable and inclusive society predicated on reducing the incidence of social exclusion. The Social Exclusion Unit produced the document 'Bringing Britain Together: a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal' for presentation to Parliament by the Prime Minister in 1998 as part of its remit to "develop integrated and sustainable approaches to the problems of the worst housing estates, including crime, drugs, employment, community breakdown, and bad schools etc" (Prime Minister, 1998, n.p.). The report recommended the formation of a number of Policy Action Teams (PAT) to examine ways in which social exclusion might be tackled.

One of the ways in which public culture was cast in the role of positive change agent was through its relationship to civil renewal. Civil renewal assumes an 'active citizenship' which encompasses cultural entitlement (Burns Owen Partnership, 2005: 15). It is argued that equitable access to and participation in public culture is fundamental to a sense of belonging to the mores, traditions, customs and ethos of a nation. By encouraging engagement and participation, especially amongst marginalised groups, museums can contribute to the achievement of this social objective.

Another set of policies described a role for arts and culture in building social capital in communities through 'neighbourhood renewal', an overarching approach designed to narrow the gap between deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country, through empowering communities, improving key public services, promoting local leadership and encouraging collective action (DCMS, 1999a). Much 'renewal' work was proposed through programs of 'regeneration', a place-based term referring to a specific area, neighbourhood or town.

7 The Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) defined social exclusion as a complex and multi-dimensional phenomenon which occurs 'when various linked problems are experienced in combination' to prevent people from being full members of society' and which is 'more than a material condition' of poverty: exclusion prevents people from participating fully in public culture' Social Exclusion website viewed 19th February 2001 http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/seu/pageac0b.html?id=96&vId=27&url=page.asp?id=213
While 'renewal' focuses on the development of strong local community networks, structures and facilities, the term 'regeneration' carries a more 'transformative' quality encompassing environmental, social and economic aspects (sometimes associated with major capital investment) applied specifically to areas which are suffering from physical, social or economic decline (ACE, 2004: 19).

The role of culture in regeneration can be as primary 'driver' or 'catalyst' for change, as an integral part of an overall regeneration strategy and as an enhancement to a separate regeneration plan. Evans and Shaw (2004: 5), distinguish between culture-led regeneration where cultural investment of some kind is the catalyst for regeneration, cultural regeneration, where cultural activity is fully integrated alongside other activities and culture and regeneration, in which some sort of cultural spend, either a public art program or specific exhibition, takes place alongside a regeneration strategy but is not integral to it.

Implications for museums in Britain and Australia

In May 2000, the then Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport in the British Government, the Rt. Hon. Chris Smith, applied the policy of combating social exclusion to museums, libraries and archives. In his forward to the document, Centres for Social Change: Museums, Libraries and Archives for all, he stated that museums, libraries and archives are

........often the focal point for cultural activity in the community, interpreting its history and heritage. This gives people a sense of their own identity, and that of their community. But the evidence is that museums, galleries and archives can do more than this, and act as agents of social change in the community, improving the quality of people's lives through their outreach activities. This policy aims to stimulate and direct that role. ........ to encourage museums, galleries and archives to adopt a strategic approach to social inclusion (DCMS, 2000a:3)
British museums were to achieve these outcomes through mainstreaming social inclusion as a policy priority, providing the widest possible access to collections and knowledge (particularly through the use of IT), consulting with the local community, mounting exhibitions that reflected cultural and social diversity, embarking on a range of partnerships and using their existing resources in order to support new strategies (DCMS, 2000a). Future funding agreements with DCMS sponsored museums and galleries would be structured to reflect social inclusion objectives (DCMS, 2000a: 25).

Corresponding developments have emerged in Australia. A review of policy and interviews with policy makers in each state and territory conducted for the Statistical Working Group of the Cultural Ministers Council (CMC) by the Australian Expert Group in Industry Studies (AEGIS) in 2004 found that

"...........in Australia, as in the UK and elsewhere, there is very great interest among policymakers in considering social as well as economic impacts when developing policies and programs for arts and cultural activities and in encouraging collaboration between arts fields and other social and economic initiatives in the pursuit of social objectives. (AEGIS, 2004: 4-5)"

Australian policymakers are interested in positive social impact which they see in terms of both individual well-being and increased community trust and the development of social networks (AEGIS, 2004).

State policies such as Creative Queensland, Growing Victoria Together and Tasmania Together describe a role for arts and culture in reducing social exclusion, improving individual self-esteem and contributing to educational attainment and health. Other initiatives are particularly focused on sustainability or regional development (AEGIS, 2004: 5). In New South Wales, public sector agencies have been directed by Treasury to identify how their agency contributes to priorities outlined in the State Plan, including improving services, building harmonious communities, encouraging greater use of cultural facilities and strengthening rural and regional economies (New South Wales, 2006).
Culture related policy objectives in Australia at Commonwealth level have tended to focus on increasing participation, supporting equitable access, ensuring freedom of cultural expression for all Australians, encouraging multiculturalism, developing and improving the viability of Australian cultural businesses, preserving Australia's cultural heritage and maximising funding by the private sector of culture organisations (ABS, 4160.0, 2001: 276).

More recently, 'the public value delivered in return for arts and cultural heritage investment by government' (ABS, 4915.0.55.001, 2006: 29) is the subject of a major study initiated by the Cultural Minister's Council via its Statistical Working Group.

The project is being co-ordinated by The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) through the National Centre for Culture and Recreation Statistics (NCCRS) and is a first attempt to articulate a shared position on the areas of concern to arts and culture through drawing together 'arts and cultural heritage policies across all levels of government' (ABS, 4915.0.55.001, 2006: 8).

Key issues, drawn from existing policies, have been used 'to determine the underlying questions that would inform, or have already informed, decision making in this area' (ABS, 4915.0.55.001, 2006: 8). The issues are presented in five categories: cultural, social, quality of life for persons involved in the arts', quality of life for consumers and the economic viability of arts and cultural heritage services.

---

* The Cultural Ministers Council (CMC) formed in 1984 is a 'whole of government' initiative that involves the Commonwealth and State and Territory government Ministers for the Arts in Australia and New Zealand Ministers with responsibility for the arts. The Cultural Ministers' Council provides a forum for cooperation and coordination on matters relating to the development of the arts and culture in Australia.

The Commonwealth, through the federal Department for the Arts, provides secretariat services to the council and its Statistics Working Group (SWG). The Department also manages a number of key council initiatives including the Collections Australia Network website, the Collections Council of Australia, and the Return of Indigenous Cultural Property Program. The Council is supported by the Cultural Ministers' Council Standing Committee which provides advice and administrative support to the Ministerial Council. The CMC comprises representatives of the relevant Ministers' departments, the Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts and the Australia Council.

Within these categories, sub sections clarify the current terms for public investment in culture. There are familiar public policy outcomes including learning, well being and personal achievement, identity, cultural diversity, civic participation and tolerance, the development of social capital and social responsibility and contributions to economic growth through cultural tourism, innovation and creativity and international trade in arts and cultural heritage products. The second stage (now underway) requires industry feedback on key issues with the aim of determining priorities for research and statistical collection (Personal communication with Lisa Connolly, Director National Centre for Culture and Recreation Statistics, Australian Bureau of Statistics, 20th April 2006).

In summary, museums have been among the recipients of an agenda to modernise government and reform the public sector – a reform agenda indicative

... of a commitment to a less ideological age – one more based on 'what works'? In addition, the need to prove value for money to a sometimes sceptical public, the diminution in the public's desire to simply take professionals at their word, and the greater amount of policy-relevant research that is being undertaken worldwide, have all contributed to the pressure of public agencies to produce evidence for their actions and investments. (Burns Owen Partnership, 2005: 2)

This reform agenda has altered funding based on the concept of 'public good' in favour of funding based on values of 'economy, efficiency and effectiveness' and the achievement of social outcomes. However, a growing body of criticism emanating from the cultural and heritage sectors argues that the resulting emphasis on instrumental outcomes and an increasingly output-oriented, quantitative approach to public sector management downplays and obscures other, intrinsic benefits of arts and culture (Holden, 2004; McCarthy et al, 2004).
An alternative position is emerging that argues for consideration of the 'full range of effects' that participation in arts and culture can afford individuals and communities (McCarthy et al, 2004: xi) and that takes 'a broader and more holistic view of the processes whereby cultural investments in general, and the museums, libraries and archives domains in particular, contribute to human well-being' as part of the wider cultural eco-system' (Burns Owen Partnership, 2005: 68).

The professional sector and the question of value

This section examines the question of value from the perspective of cultural professionals. The secondary research which underlies this section is exclusively British. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, as discussed in Chapter One, the government under New Labour has been articulate, focused and ambitious in its pursuit of reforms aimed at implementing social inclusion through cultural activities and organisations. Clear objectives and the availability of policies, reports and working documents in the public domain through use of the internet has enabled these reforms to become widely available for comment and public debate. In addition, the two-tiered system of government in Britain facilitates national policy penetration.

The situation is different in Australia. In spite of the presence of the Cultural Ministers’ Council and its mandate to cooperate on specific projects of common interest and concern, a three-tiered system of government means that there are many areas in which there is no 'national' policy per se but, rather, three different levels (Commonwealth, state and local) of policy operating across the same sector. The resulting diffusion and difference works against a common set of policy objectives to which the sector can respond. Importantly, for this study, though various levels of government have cultural policies, the question of 'value' has yet to be articulated by any of them.
The cultural sector, including professional working in museums, have had three main responses to government policy and its increasingly instrumental approach to assessing the value of culture—compliance, criticism and, more recently, challenge.

**Compliance**

Pressed to demonstrate achievement of policy objectives in order to secure on-going funding, the cultural sector has been quick to claim a range of positive impacts reflective of government policies and to seek supporting evidence. By way of example, policy based in economic rationalism has been supported by evidence provided by the cultural sector itself, that investment in arts and culture has a high ‘multiplier effect’ generating direct and indirect expenditure, attracting inward investment and tourism, and creating jobs (Myerscough 1988).

The National Museum Director’s Council report on the economic and cultural value generated by UK museums prepared by Travers and Glaister (2004) revealed that spending generated by visitors to NMDC institutions was estimated to be £565 million (2004:18) and that the annual turnover was £715 million, resulting in an overall expenditure generated within the economy of some £1,220.

With the addition of a conservative ‘multiplier’ (1.5-1.7) the economic impact of the NMDC sector claims to be within the range of £ 1.83 billion- £ 2.07 billion (Travers and Glaister, 2004: 19).

The same report found that the overseas “export” of NMDC institutions was valued at £320 million a year (Travers and Glaister, 2004: 19). In addition, six out of the top ten UK visitor attractions in 2002 were NMDC members (Travers and Glaister, 2004: 5).
There is an increasing literature on direct contributions to the economy through employment, tax revenue and visitor spending and indirect contributions through the attraction of investment. Public-good benefits include the availability of a public culture for the next generation, and contributions to the local community's quality of life (ETFCD, 1997; McCarthy et al, 2004:8). There have been similar attempts to substantiate the social impact agenda where

....the recent literature of the cultural sector is replete with publications asserting the vital contribution of the arts and museums to various aspects of the government's social agenda (Selwood 2004c: 38)

The arguments in support of these claims are various. It is generally believed that many of the impacts of cultural engagement are learning effects that contribute to increased human capital (Bryson et al., 2002; AEGIS, 2004; Burns Owen Partnership, 2005). Arts Council England (2004: 7) reports the outcomes of a study by the National Advisory Council on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCCE) which suggests that there is a growing demand in businesses worldwide for forms of education and training which develop human communication, innovation and creativity.

Creative human capital, goes the argument, is needed for competitive edge in the new knowledge and creative economies and the presence of cultural resources in a community contributes to a vibrant environment in which ideas can flourish (Florida, 2003; Holden, 2004; Burns Owen Partnership, 2005).

*Museums and galleries are generally thought of as repositories of exhibits, or as attractions, or as centres of study. But their holdings and activities also have another impact: they encourage people to think differently, to take and transmit ideas, and to generate new things based on the creativity of the past (Travers and Glaister, 2004: 29).*
Cultural activities, it is asserted, can have other positive impacts on individual development through the acquisition of skills, exposure to new experiences, increased confidence, changed attitudes, learning and improved mental health (Williams, 1997; Matarasso, 1997; Guetzkow 2002; Wavell et al, 2002; ACE, 2004; McCarthy et al, 2004; Ruiz, 2004; Burns Owen Partnership, 2005).

Communities, too, are beneficiaries. Gould (2001 in ACE, 2004: 26) argues that cultural activity ‘builds and holds the human resources of communities’; driving transformation through education, skill building, connecting people and consolidating new partnerships.

Gould is of the opinion that the cultural capital of communities is built by a combination of the presence of cultural resources in the community and the use that residents make of those resources. Museums are specifically attributed with ‘keeping the collective memory alive’ (Burns Owen Partnership, 2005:6), facilitating intercultural understanding, acting as safe places for meetings and contributing to neighbourhood regeneration, civil renewal and active citizenship (ACE, 2004; NMDC, 2004a; Burns Owen Partnership, 2005).

Importantly, driven by governments’ reform and policy agendas, pressed into delivering a number of government objectives and forced to justify their existence in terms specified by funding bodies, the sector has tended to articulate its purpose around these new instrumental roles. Critics observe that this preoccupation with implementing the utilitarian agenda has deflected the attention of museum leadership away from developing a strong and articulate position with which to defend the sector arising from its heart and purpose (Matarasso, 2001; Ellis, 2002; Saumarez Smith 2003). Compelled to demonstrate their worth in terms of instrumental outcomes, museum leadership experiences

......difficulty in advocating or indeed in some cases articulating certain core functions and responsibilities in a way that is sufficiently compelling to secure the funds to resource them (Ellis, 2002:8)
In fact, the sector’s apparent inability to articulate its worth and value from a position of strength has been a recurring subject (Matarasso, 1996; The Outspan Group, 1999; Holden 2004; McCarthy et al, 2004). There are compelling reasons to rectify this situation, as the late Stephen Weil warned that

As crunch time approaches, ..... and as the demands that are made on the public and private resources available to the non-profit sector continue to grow at a faster rate than those resources themselves, virtually every museum may find itself faced with several much tougher questions-....without disputing the museum’s claim to worthiness, what these questions will address instead is its relative worthiness. Is what the museum contributes to society commensurate with the annual cost of its operation? Could some other organisation (not necessarily a museum) make a similar or greater contribution at lesser cost? (Weil, 1994: 42)

Criticism

Though required to comply and work within an instrumental agenda, the sector has maintained a (somewhat muted) critical position which has challenged many of the assumptions on which policy and structural reform have been based. Commentators find fault with an economic bottom line that has enforced a reductionist view of culture, failed to take account of the much wider range of outcomes that occur as the result of cultural participation and which is based on questionable assumptions.

Matarasso (1997), Hawkes (2001), Throsby (2002) and Holden (2004) observe that governments have adopted a narrow interpretation of economics focused on financial bottom lines and market forces which obscures the deeper meaning of economics as the management of a society’s resources.

Within this wider concept of economics as sustainable resource management, they argue that the purpose of culture is not to create wealth but to contribute to a stable, confident and creative society through public planning that integrates cultural, social, economic and environmental factors to create a quadruple bottom line (Hawkes, 2001).
The argument is taken further with the suggestion that the adoption of sustainability as an overarching principle to guide cultural funding for museums is more appropriate given the long-term nature of decisions relating to significant items which are being preserved for future generations and the consequent need to provide permanent and lasting funding solutions (Holden, 2004; Throsby, 2002).

Philosophically, Bennett (1989b) and Holden (2006) question other assumptions fundamental to the utilitarian agenda. Both dispute the claim that museums can compensate for structural inequalities in society, which delivers an already differentiated population to the museum’s door. This view is reinforced by Appleton (2002) and AEGIS (2004) who question the suitability of museums as agents of social change, and their capacity to assume responsibility for solving deep-seated socio-economic problems.

Matarasso queries the feasibility of measuring the impact of museums in terms of their capacity to be socially inclusive on the basis that social benefits tend to occur as by-products of cultural programs rather than being the primary reason for them. He argues that a

"...serious, sustainable response by museums to the challenge of social exclusion must be a cultural one arising from the heart of their values and purpose, rather than an additional, project-based approach which can only address symptoms (Matarasso, 2000b: 5)."

The belief in the ‘transforming’ power of culture that underpins much cultural policy is challenged by Ellis (2003) and Belfiore and Bennett (2006). Ellis quotes the social historian, Joli Jensen, who questions the ‘unfounded belief in the transformational power of investment in culture on social ills’ and sees this form of investment as a form of ‘displacement activity’ enabling governments ‘not to have to address social problems more directly’ (Jensen, 2002 in Ellis, 2003: 8).
Other sector criticism has focused on the models chosen by governments to assess the performance of the sector. In the early 1990's, the introduction of performance measurement based in the positivist paradigm (discussed further in the next chapter) generated considerable discussion and debate. Critics questioned the appropriateness of applying a system that originated in the profit-making, commercial sector where a bottom line lends itself to quantitative measurement to the more complex environment of the public sector where multidimensional briefs and a wide range of stakeholders make meaningful performance assessment a much more complex issue (Ames, 1991; Bud, Cave and Haney, 1991; Walden, 1991). Funding decisions based on instrumental criteria that reduce value to material terms, may compromise the very heritage values upon which programs are based.

Challenge

In the last four years, the climate of criticism has gained momentum and has culminated in direct challenge to the dominance of the utilitarian paradigm. It may be observed that the vigour with which governments have pursued an instrumental agenda has served to focus attention on the significance of museums at the beginning of a new century and their value within a post modern world.

_We can say, therefore, that it is the existence of cultural policy ...that is to a large extent responsible for public discussion of their value_ (Belfiore and Bennett. 2006: 2)

Out of this dialectic, a more assertive position has emerged which owes some debt to an event titled, _Valuing Culture_ \(^9\).

---

\(^9\) _Valuing Culture_ attracted presentations by Adrian Ellis/ Director of aea Consulting, Charles Saumarez Smith/ Director of the National Gallery, the Rt. Hon. Chris Smith/ former Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport and currently Director of the Clore Program for Cultural Leadership, Deborah Bestwick/ Director of Oval House Theatre, Nicholas Hytner/ Director of the National Theatre, Professor Robert Hewison/ Cultural Commentator and Art Historian, Sara Selwood/ Editor of Cultural Trends, the current Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, Tessa Jowell, and Lord Stevenson, Chairman of Pearson and HBOS and Former Chair of the Tate. Estelle Morris, then newly appointed Minister for the Arts, also made a brief contribution.
In June 2003, Demos\textsuperscript{10} (a think tank for the arts and cultural industries) in partnership with the National Gallery, the National Theatre and aea Consulting brought sector frustrations to the fore, directly confronting British policy makers and starting a debate about the way in which public funding of culture in Britain is undertaken.

The \textit{Valuing Culture} forum focused on the limitations of the instrumental paradigm. Speakers criticised the 'lopsided attempt' of the British government to define cultural in terms of wider social and economic goals' leaving 'underarticulated and, given an environment where there is a strong bias towards the quantifiable, undervalued, the intrinsic worth of these organisations and their activities' (Ellis, 2003: 3), a position supported by the findings of the report for the American Wallace Foundation and published by the Rand Corporation, \textit{Measuring the Muse} (McCarthy et al, 2004).

The Rt Hon. Chris Smith, former Secretary of State and Minister for Culture, Media and Sport acknowledged that

\textit{Cultural leaders have begun to state openly that they no longer believe that artistic activity and value should cower behind labels other than the cultural. Have begun to assert that there will be fine educational and social and outreach work done by arts organisations, that they come as a natural development of the work that is being done, that they are of course important and need to be supported, but that they are not the heart of the matter. There is a new self-confidence about this abroad in the cultural world, born partly from strength and partly from frustration.} (Smith, 2003: 2)

The forum generated some important outcomes. On the one hand, it stimulated the current British Secretary for State and Minister for Culture, Media and Sport, Tessa Jowell, to reflect on 'intrinsic value' and to open the door for a more holistic approach to measuring the worth of culture.

\textsuperscript{10} Based in Britain, Demos, describes itself as a 'greenhouse for new ideas' and 'an independent think-tank' \url{http://www.demos.co.uk/aboutus/default.aspx} (Accessed on 26/09/04). aea Consulting has offices in London and New York where it specializes in strategic planning for the cultural sector with a special focus on boards and senior management \url{http://www.aeaconsulting.com/site/home.html} (Accessed on 1/09/03).
In her personal essay, *Government and the Value of Culture* (DCMS, 2004), the Minister states that culture is 'satisfying of the deepest of human needs', 'is at the heart of what it means to be a fully developed human being' and 'has an important part to play in defining and preserving cultural identity-of the individual, of communities'.

Jowell's essay, while not eschewing the instrumental agenda, extends the frame of reference within which the role of culture is defined and measured and admits both instrumental and intrinsic dimensions.

...we still have to deliver the utilitarian agenda, and the measures of instrumentality that this implies, but we must acknowledge that in supporting culture we are doing more than that, and in doing more than that must find ways of expressing it (DCMS, 2004: 10)

The 'value' of museums- how to argue for their important contribution to society and how to measure them effectively - is now open for discussion and 'debate' (DCMS, 2004: 5). Jowell calls for a 'consensus' across government and the sector to develop 'a more strategic overall vision' (DCMS, 2004: 31) supported 'through the development of a wider and more consistent evidence base' (DCMS, 2004: 29) to measure the value of museums.

Further, and important for the primary research of this thesis, the more inclusive tone recognised that 'Whatever method is used, Government recognises that it must be sensitive to the needs of the sector and users' (DCMS, 2004: 33).

The role of government, said Jowell, is 'not as a piece of top down social engineering, but a bottom up realisation of possibility and potential' (DCMS, 2004: 10).
Too often politicians have been forced to debate culture in terms only of its instrumental benefits to other agendas—education, the reduction of crime, improvements in wellbeing—explaining, or in some instances almost apologising for our investment in culture only in terms of something else. In political and public discourse in this country we have avoided the more difficult approach of investigating, questioning and celebrating what culture actually does in and of itself. There is another story to tell on culture and it is up to politicians in my position to give a lead in changing the atmosphere, and changing the terms of debate (DCMS, 2004: 9)

These issues are further elaborated in the ensuing ‘consultation’ paper, Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life—The Value of Museums (DCMS, 2005) with a forward by Tessa Jowell and a personal introduction by the Minister for the Arts, Estelle Morris. The consultation paper implies a paradigm shift away from the dominance of the instrumental agenda:

Government needs to look beyond an instrumental framework. Government and museums need to articulate better the sector’s worth, in response to a clearer understanding of the benefits for users and non-users, as well as their own needs (DCMS, 2005: 32-33)

This more consensual approach is evident in Understanding the Future: Priorities for England’s Museums published by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport in October 2006. The report is ‘the result of collaboration between DCMS officials and a group of informed advocates for museums, conscious of and committed to the need for further change for the benefit of museum audiences’ (DCMS, 2006: 4).

The inclusion of major advocacy and professional bodies from the museum and cultural sectors (The Museums, Libraries and Archives Council, The Museums Association, the National Museum Directors Conference, The Association of Independent Museums, the University Museums Group, Arts Council England) in the formation of priorities to guide museums over the next decade and develop an action plan for museums that will include an overall assessment framework is an important step towards a new relationship.
In addition, DCMS has requested the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) to prepare an initial action for delivering the priorities.

*The action plan will be a dynamic and living document. It will respond to developments inside and outside the sector and will be shared between Government, the MLA, the sector and its partners and users* (DCMS, 2006: 5)

This has not come a moment too soon for a sector which has argued that policymakers need to take a more holistic approach to measuring the 'processes whereby cultural investments in general, and the museums, libraries and archives domains in particular, contribute to human well-being' (Burns Owen Partnership, 2005: 68).

The action plan is scheduled for presentation at the 2007 Museums Association conference in October in Glasgow and may be step towards the development of a common framework within which value can be assessed and which will develop a new language

....capable of reflecting, recognising and capturing the full range of values expressed through culture make explicit the range of values addressed in the funding process to encompass a much broader range of cultural, non-monetised values, view the whole cultural system and all its sub-systems, and understand how systemic health and resilience are maintained, recognise that professional judgement must extend beyond evidence-based decision-making, see the source of legitimacy for public funding as being the public itself, overturn the concept of centrally driven, top-down delivery and replace it with systemic, grass roots value creation (Holden, 2004:10)

Running parallel to government initiatives is a more strategic and proactive position emerging from the cultural sector itself, led by the National Museum Directors Conference, Arts Council England, the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council, The Association of Independent Museums, The Group for Large Local Authority Museums, The Museums Association and The University Museums Group and articulated in their joint document *Value and Vision: the contribution of culture* launched on 8th June 2006.
The document calls for a 'new settlement' between the government and the cultural sector that will see government 'place the cultural sector closer to the heart of public policy making' and invest sustainable funding for the next 10 years (NMDC, 2006: 2). Importantly, the sector articulates its position as a value-based one, citing the power of culture to enrich people's lives, position Britain as a world player, encourage creativity, maintain standards of excellence and quality, engage young people, extend learning opportunities, celebrate diversity, connect communities and forge partnerships.

Another area in which change is evident is related to the role of the public in determining value. Insufficient focus on citizens and their requirements has been a criticism of traditional performance-based approaches to assessing the impact of museums.

\textit{Targets and measures do not always tell a comprehensive story of the citizen's experience of receiving public services. They can fail to measure aspects of performance that would provide a better insight into the citizen's perspective. As such simply measuring increasing numbers of new visitors to heritage sites fails to capture other aspects of the visit such as visitor satisfaction or success in learning about the past} (NT and Accenture, 2006: 10).


Kelly et al (2002: 10) suggest that public value (refer Figure 1) provides an alternative third paradigm to both the traditional model of public management and the 'new' public management that has characterised the modernising reforms of the last two decades.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public interest</th>
<th>Traditional public management</th>
<th>'New public management'</th>
<th>Public value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defined by politicians/experts</td>
<td>Aggregation of individual preferences, demonstrated by customer choice</td>
<td>Individual and public preferences (resulting from public deliberation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance objective</td>
<td>Managing inputs</td>
<td>Managing inputs and Outputs</td>
<td>Multiple objectives - Service outputs - Satisfaction - Outcomes - Maintaining trust/legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant model of accountability</td>
<td>Upwards through departments to politicians and through them to Parliament</td>
<td>Upwards through performance contracts; sometimes outwards to customers through market mechanisms</td>
<td>Multiple - citizens as overseers of govt - customers as users - taxpayers as funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred system for delivery</td>
<td>Hierarchical department or self-regulating profession</td>
<td>Private sector or tightly defined arms-length public agency</td>
<td>Menu of alternatives selected pragmatically (public sector agencies, private companies, JVCs, Community Interest Companies, community groups as well as increasing role for user choice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to public service ethos</td>
<td>Public sector has monopoly on service ethos, and all public bodies have it.</td>
<td>Sceptical of public sector ethos (leads to inefficiency and empire building) – favours customer service</td>
<td>No one sector has a monopoly on ethos, and no one ethos always appropriate. As a valuable resource it needs to be carefully managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role for public participation</td>
<td>Limited to voting in elections and pressure on elected representatives</td>
<td>Limited – apart from use of customer satisfaction surveys</td>
<td>Crucial – multi-faceted (customers, citizens, key stakeholders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal of managers</td>
<td>Respond to political direction</td>
<td>Meet agreed performance targets</td>
<td>Respond to citizen/user preferences, renew mandate and trust through guaranteeing quality services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1 - Approaches to public management (Kelly et al, 2002: 10)*
Originating in the new public service theory of which Mark Moore is the main proponent (1995), public value argues for 'a renewed emphasis on the important role public managers can play in maintaining an organisation's legitimacy in the eyes of the public' (Blaug et al, 2006: 6) by recognising the public as the authorising agent. Understanding citizens' preferences is key. Failure to engage with the public about what they want and need may result in services not providing public value. In short,

*If organisations are to create public value in their practices and use evaluative standards to measure their performance, then those values and evaluative standards must be authorised by the public* (Blaug et al, 2006: 7)

It is still early days, but the concept of public value seems to be shifting government focus from an emphasis on driving policy from the top down to negotiating with sector and public end-users. DCMS now states that the guiding principle in developing priorities for England's museums over the next decade should be 'what the public genuinely values' (DCMS, 2006: 2). Evidence of whether the public values museums is the subject of the next section of this chapter.

**The public and the question of value**

This section examines one indicator of evidence for the public value of museums- willingness to commit time and effort to make a museum visit. It situates this discussion within a context of social change. It concludes that there is scope to consider other factors besides 'direct use' in the consideration of whether, and how, the public values museums.
Museums and the public: shifting ground

The public museum, as we know it today, began in the 18th century with the opening of private collections to public view. It is interesting to note that social impact was an expectation of early museums which were expected to civilize and refine the masses, raise the level of public understanding regarding the place of Western civilization in the evolution of mankind and celebrate heroes and major civic events (Bennett, 1989; Weil, 1997).

Bennett (1989a; 61) notes that, to this end, museums in the latter part of the 19th century were differentiated from places of popular assembly (the inn, the tavern, the fair, the circus) and used to socialize the working classes into new forms of civic behaviour. It was assumed that considerable cultural benefit would accrue to the state via the exposure of the general population to the improving (and civilizing) influence of the museum and through the development of the ‘new’ knowledge and learning that could be acquired there.

As the Enlightenment progressed into the Industrial Revolution, knowledge was increasingly understood and encouraged as an economic resource. The libraries and museums founded in the 19th Century were to be sources of useful knowledge – the Victoria and Albert Museum for instance was intended to improve industrial design – and their philanthropy was combined with social regulation. Free museums and libraries would keep the working classes out of the pub (Hewison, 2003: 2-3)

In their presentation, museums of the time were influenced by the new fields of geology, biology, archaeology, anthropology, social and art history and evolutionary theory but which narrowly defined the concept of humanity.

The arrangement of these ‘knowledges’ into a totalising order of things and peoples that was historicized - the history of the earth, the history of life, the history of human evolution and western civilisation - formed an uninterrupted chain of development from the amoeba to the industrial revolution and the industrial and artistic triumphs of capitalism. The result was a representation which addressed the museum visitor as both the culmination of the evolutionary series and as the apex of development. A representative generality and universality, which under represents non-Western cultures, women, etc. (Bennett, 1989: 61).
The under-representation of minority groups, different ethnicities and women within this 'representative generality' subjected the late twentieth century museum to many criticisms. The role of museums in legitimating particular power structures, serving the colonial aims of imperial nation-states and acting as the vehicles of particular hegemonic ideologies and sectional interests characterised museological discourse in the latter half of the 20th century with direct challenges from unrepresented minorities, feminist, labour and indigenous studies and the 'new' social history. These combined impacts have witnessed a shift in exhibition presentation replacing the didactic narrative with acknowledgement of ambivalence, uncertainty and 'unfinished social business' (McDonald and Fyfe, 1996).

Notwithstanding these initiatives, visitor attendances to museums in English-speaking countries have fluctuated over the last decade. In Australia, museum attendances decreased 27.8% in 1991 to a current level of 25% (ABS, 2007, cat no 1301.0). A 2001 survey for Museums, Libraries and Archives Council in the UK undertaken by Market Opinion Research International (MORI) found that attendances to museums were declining.

North American figures demonstrate stability rather than growth. According to 2002-03 Statistics Canada data (the most recent available) museum attendance grew from 25.4 million visitors in 1993-94 to 27.8 million visitors in 2002-03. However, because the number of Canadian museums had also increased, average attendance actually declined, from 20,586 visits per museum in 1993-04 to 18,862 visits per museum in 2002-03. In the United States, the National Endowment for the Arts' 2002 Survey of Public Participation in the Arts found that attendances to museums and art galleries had remained stable between 1992 and 2002 at 27% of the population.

The reasons for audience participation patterns are not solely a factor of relevance and relationship. Other factors are found in demography, the impact of changing leisure patterns and new competitors.

---
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Changing demography

The evidence that a limited sector of the population regularly choose to visit museums is cited by Hood (1995), and MLA (2004). Visitors to museums are mainly a well educated, affluent, professional middle-class sub-set of the overall population.

This demographic profile is largely maintained even when physical barriers are addressed. In 2001, the Department for Media, Culture and Sport in Britain removed admission charges to the country's national museums. Visitor attendances soared. However, though the number of visits to UK national museums has increased, surveys reveal that the demographic profile of visitors has not altered substantially (Martin, 2003; MLA, 2004).

Significantly, however, the number of new museums and their high public profile in the latter part of the twentieth century coincided with the maturation of the post-war baby boomers.

The baby-boomers represent an unprecedented population phenomenon characterised by large numbers of people with unparalleled levels of tertiary education and affluence who made demands for cultural resources.

Part of the middle class, the part created as a consequence of the post-war baby boom, is the real player in this phenomenon. It is this social group, increasingly numerous, affluent, educated and urbanised, that expresses strong cultural demand (Maggi, 1998: 4-5).

The sheer size of this generation accompanied by its 'cultural capital' is attributed with creating a demand for cultural services not experienced before. The question remains whether the impact of this generation may be a short-lived phenomenon. Changing leisure patterns related to ageing are already having an effect on museum attendances.
An American National Endowment for the Arts report published a decade ago (1998) revealed declining arts participation and museum attendance then amongst the baby boomer generation, partly attributable to the use of more home based leisure facilitated by broadcast technology such as television, video, cassettes, compact discs and computers. Museum attendances are facing the combined challenges of the ageing of the generation that has supported their growth, a declining birth-rate amongst Western industrialised nations, significant changes to work and leisure and more entrants in the leisure attractions market.

**Work and leisure**

Changing patterns of work and leisure have seen a shift away from the standard working week to a greater variety of working hours through growth in part-time employment and 'casualisation'. Amongst full-time workers, there is a significant trend towards longer working hours. Over the last twenty years, the proportion of full-time workers working 50-59 hours per week has increased from 10% to 16%. In August 2002, around 1.7 million Australians worked 50 hours or more per week—twice as many as in 1982 (Burton and Scott, 2003).

Lynch et al (2000) researched changing leisure patterns in Australia and their impact on museums. They found that, amongst respondents between the ages of 18 and 60 years of age, 51% felt they had less leisure time than five years ago, with most participants indicating that they were working longer hours.

In the limited time available for leisure, people find that they are faced with more choice. These choices are not confined to external leisure attractions. There has been surge in domestically-based leisure fuelled by the ubiquitousness of personal computers and home based entertainment systems.
In Canada, watching television accounts for 36% of total leisure time amongst adult Canadians (Canada Council for the Arts, 2002: 30). In Australia, the National Recreation Participation Survey data for the period between 1986 and 1991 (the last time recorded), suggests that visits to museums and galleries were beginning to decrease, while ‘socialising at home, engaging in computer activities and, in particular, shopping were all on the increase (Burton and Scott, 2003: 61). Similar findings have been noted in the UK (MLA, 2001:4)

The growth of computer ownership has accelerated, with access to the internet growing exponentially in the last six years. In Australia, a 2004 report from the Commonwealth Department of Communication, Information Technology and the Arts found that the level of Internet access and online activities undertaken by Australians has grown rapidly since 2000:

- At June 2004, 84 per cent of persons aged 16 years and over had Internet ...compared with 64 per cent at June 2000.
- 61% of persons aged two years and over had Internet access via a home PC (up from 38 per cent in the 2nd Qtr 2000).
- 59 per cent of households had Internet access compared to 16 per cent in 1998.
- 10.4 million persons 14 years and over used the Internet during June 2004 compared to 7.6 million in June 2001, an increase of 37 per cent. (DCITA, 2004: 5)

The capacity of domestically-based leisure to discourage ‘going out’ and subsequent impacts for the cultural attractions industry, as well as for the social isolation of the individual have been raised repeatedly within the last decade (Pronovost, 1998; Canada Council for the Arts, 2002).

*Technological change is seen to offer both opportunities and risks for the culture and leisure sector. For example, new media technology introduces new forms of cultural expression, but may threaten the sustainability of traditional forms of expression (ABS, 2001, 4160.0: 277)*

Oliver (2001) finds that the contemporary ‘time-squeeze trend’ where people try to fit in a larger number of activities in the same, or decreasing amounts of free time has challenging consequences for museums.
This leads to a situation where there is a loss of depth of involvement in activities as people engage in more activities at a lower level of intensity and commitment. It also leads to a situation where entertainment, amusement and stimulation become the dominant modes of activity as people simply don’t have time or don’t make time to amuse themselves. If this is the case, then museum visitation which takes on average between 1-2.5 hours, suffers because of the time commitment and the level of intellectual attention involved (Oliver, 2001: 4-5).

When people do venture out, there is an increasing array of attractions from which to choose. Among the most significant competitors is cinema. The Canada Council for the Arts (2002: 34) found that cinema attendances had increased 10.5% amongst adult Canadians between 1992 and 1998 while museum attendances had dropped by 2.6%. 59% of Canadians go to movies compared to 30% that attend museums. 37% of adults in the UK visit museums compared to 59% who go to the movies (MLA, 2004: 4). In Australia, a 2002 study of cultural attendances by the Australian Bureau of Statistics found that 69% of Australians attend cinemas compared to the 25% of the population that visits museums (ABS, 2002, cat. 4114.0).

Outcomes

Within this changing environment, the final quarter of the 20th century witnessed a dramatic alteration in the relationship of the museum with its public. From a position of unquestioned subject authority and moral superiority, the museum of the late 20th century began to redefine its relationship with its publics within principles of increasing equality and democratisation.

Moreover, direct use as a key criterion for demonstrating value presents a challenge in a competitive and increasingly time-poor world. Are declines in direct participation an indication of declining value? An exploration of use values other than those of direct use allows for the exploration of this question.
Conclusion

What do these three perspectives tell us about the value of museums?

From the government perspective, we find that economic and social policy combined with the modernizing agenda has resulted in an instrumental and utilitarian value perspective. The worth of public investment in museums is judged by achievement of policy objectives. The cultural sector challenges assumptions on which the instrumental position is based including economic interpretation based in the monetised systems of markets, the belief in the transforming power of culture, the expectation that museums can and will resolve a society's social issues and the failure to take account of intangible outcomes, less susceptible to quantification.

On the one hand, these debates have generated new questions about the value of culture in general, what types of value are experienced as the result of cultural participation and how these types of value can be meaningfully assessed. However, there is, as yet, no clear typology of what values we are attributed to museums and indicators to measure their worth. How then do we assess the value of museums? The next chapter examines current assessment models through an analysis of the critical literature and explores alternative models which are emerging from the debates about valuing culture.
CHAPTER THREE: EVALUATING IMPACT

The previous chapter examined the context in which current debates about the value of culture in general and museums in particular are being discussed with specific reference to the impact of a modernising agenda and policies of structural and social reform.

This chapter examines the implementation of that modernising agenda through the use of evaluation as a compliance system. It interrogates impact evaluation and finds that, although impact evaluation is a logical choice for monitoring the outcomes of policies within a results-based accountability framework, the objectives-based method preferred by governments is problematic. Vague terminology, lack of clear objectives, industry unfamiliarity with the discipline of evaluation, methodological challenges and difficulties with producing evidence and proving causality are examined.

Introduction

It is perhaps not surprising that the modernising agenda with its focus on justifying public investment through demonstrable results found alignment in a positivist paradigm.

Positivism originated in France with the social philosopher, Auguste Comte who championed the application of ‘scientific method’ to study phenomena that can be perceived through the senses (Crotty, 1998). Comte questioned the basis on which 19th century society was studied. He eschewed the metaphysical and theological paradigms of the day, arguing that the methods used were neither rational nor empirically based.
He argued that society is based on universal laws and that the goal of research is to discover these laws, form theories about them and test the theories. Understanding these laws allows a logical course of events to be predicted and enables cause and effect linkages to be identified.

The positivist belief in an objective, external reality which can be identified and validated through tangible evidence is served by methodologies that emphasize numerical measurements and the study of observable behaviour (Sarandakos, 1998; Davies, 2003).

In the initial years of the reform agenda with its focus on deficit reduction and economic management, performance evaluation was applied to the public service to determine what the things an organisation produced (outputs) as the result of receiving resources (inputs) (CHC, 2002: 12; Wavell et al, 2002:7).

Performance evaluation, combined with performance management, served to focus attention on the efficient and economical use of resources but provided little information about whether programs were effective and what outcomes they had achieved. When the 1990s brought further changes to the reform agenda through the inclusion of social, as well as economic, goals, results-based accountability and evidence-based policy were introduced to monitor public sector progress towards these new directions. Two major conceptual shifts accompanied results-based accountability and evidence-based policy. The first was a shift from a focus on outputs to one of outcomes. The second was the introduction of impact.

Outcomes are the short to medium term results of individuals engaging with outputs ‘for example: books read, visitor interaction with a website, user satisfaction with answer to enquiry, recollection of a memorable event (Wavell et al, 2002:7). With evidence-based policy has come the recognition that achieving social outcomes requires sufficient time for results to be realised. This has shifted the focus to consideration of longer term impacts that result ‘in a change in state, attitude or behaviour of an individual or group after engagement with the output’, ‘expressed as ‘Did it make a difference?’ (Wavell et al 2002: 7).
Results-based accountability requires public sector agencies to take responsibility for both initiating action and the results of that action. Public agencies are obliged to articulate how public monies will be spent on services and products that have an impact on people’s lives, monitor how effectively and efficiently these programs work, and take action to improve program results. The dimensions of these new accountability systems are (a) outcomes that clearly articulate what programs are to achieve (b) indicators to measure whether or not outcomes have been achieved (c) performance standards or benchmarks to assess how programs are progressing (d) instruments to regularly obtain indicator data and (e) periodic collection and analysis of data for internal decision making and public reporting (Horsch, 1996).

*Progress on outcomes is demonstrated through measuring data against indicators, 'an instrument or tool for evaluation, a yardstick to measure results and to assess realization of desired levels of performance in a sustained and objective way' (Chapman 2000: 2 in IFACCA, 2004: 10).*

Though the alignment of policy, funding and monitoring has provided governments with an integrated compliance system, implementing results-based accountability through impact evaluation has proved difficult. There are several reasons for this. Vague policy, uncertain terminology and questions about proving causality make impact evaluation uncertain terrain. The evidence base has been inconclusive and patchy. Lack of familiarity with the tools of evaluation within the cultural sector compounds the difficulties. The next section examines these issues.

**Defining terms and concepts**

This section begins with an analysis of the terminology surrounding the field of evidence-based policy and impact evaluation and finds that at both policy and implementation levels, the terminology is still evolving.
Defining outcomes

The instrumental outcomes expected of cultural agencies are couched in government policy and include such objectives as contributing to social cohesion, building social capital, reducing social exclusion and playing a role in urban regeneration and renewal. Policies, however, tend to be general (Owen, 2006) and can be frustratingly vague (Guetszkow, 2002). Nowhere is this more evident than in the inconclusiveness of the terminology surrounding the objectives of social policy.

Social exclusion

For example, although it is the most widely used term in the field of cultural impact, the term social exclusion is far from settled, often applied inconsistently and subject to various interpretations (Jermyn 2001; Burns Owen Partnership, 2005). The British Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) has used ‘exclusion’ as an ‘umbrella’ term to encompass a range of conditions which are often interrelated: ‘what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, bad health and family breakdown’ (Cabinet Office, 2000). Dodd and Sandell (2001) find that the museum sector has tended to associate social exclusion with long standing principles to democratise culture, widen access to services and embrace cultural diversity.

Cultural diversity

Cultural diversity is most widely understood to refer to diversity based around ethnicity and race.

*The argument takes off from the notion that integration of immigrants and national minorities is one of the pillars of social cohesion. It identifies policies that will promote inclusion. Diversity in this context refers to a pluralism of values, life styles, cultures, relations and languages across and within European societies.* (Beauvais C, and Jenson J 2002: 11)

A specific role is identified for cultural institutions such as museums, libraries and archives
... in promoting knowledge, understanding and value of diverse cultures, faiths and histories. Evidence shows that through their engagement with communities they can foster a sense of identity and racial harmony (Burns Owen Partnership, 2005: 26)

Tolerance for diversity is perceived as fundamental to the ‘more inclusive’ contemporary civil societies in which we live (DCMS, 2005:6) and contributes to social cohesion by promoting ‘strong and positive relationships’ between people from different backgrounds to create ‘a common vision and a sense of belonging for all communities’ (Burns Owen Partnership, 2005: 19-20)

Social cohesion

. Matarasso's 1997 study revealed that participation in cultural activity positively affected social cohesion through reducing social isolation, improving community networks and providing forums for cross cultural and intergenerational contact that resulted in greater tolerance. Beauvais and Jensen find that there are two ways to define and measure social cohesion:

Those who define social cohesion in terms of social solidarity and patterns of distribution turn to measures of inclusion-exclusion, as well as to individual measures of income distribution, poverty, and a range of inequalities. Those who define social cohesion in terms of social bonds and capital measure rates of participation, membership and trust, as well as trying to characterize the network form (Beauvais and Jensen 2002: vi)

Though social capital is linked with social cohesion, its parameters are still evolving. Kelly and Kelly (2000) and Williams (1997) equate social capital with the contribution that museums (and other cultural institutions) can make to the communication of ideas, information and values, improved planning and organising skills within communities, understanding different cultures and lifestyles, partnership building, active membership of organisations and collaboration with others. Beauvais and Jensen (2002:15) suggest that the end result of these enhanced civic skills, efficacy, and recruitment is increased political participation. Putnam (2000) finds social capital within the formal and informal networks that enable people to work together and Fukuyama (1999, 2002) associates social capital with the norms of reciprocity that develop within societies where there is a level of trust.
Defining impact

The qualifying adjectives ‘direct’ or ‘indirect’ are frequently applied to impact but mean different things depending on whether they refer to economic or social impact, direct or indirect engagement. When referring to economic impact, The European Task Force on Culture and Development (ETFCDC, 1997) and McCarthy et al (2004) apply the term ‘direct’ to describe ‘tangible’ impacts such as jobs creation, contribution to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and the ability of cultural institutions to create locally significant economic effects. ‘Indirect’ impact refers to ‘intangibles’ such as the ‘cultural credit’ which attracts sponsors, collectors or connoisseurs and the capacity of cultural products to create national and international stocks of ideas or brands.

When referring to social impacts, the EFTCD (1997) uses the terms ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ to differentiate between individual and social recipients. Direct social impacts refer to the capacity of culture to provide individuals with ‘socially valuable’ leisure activities, ‘elevate’ their thinking, contribute positively to their psychological and social well-being, enhance their sensitivity, improve their personal communication skills, develop confidence and provide opportunities for extending personal knowledge.

Indirect social impacts describe the impact of culture on communities and include the provision of public amenities, preservation of a community’s collective ‘memory’, the collection of a reservoir of creative and intellectual ideas for current and future generations and a civilising impact that improves quality of life in urban areas with the result that there may be reduced incidence of street crime and hooliganism and an increased sense of personal security (ETFCDC, 1997).

There may be references here to the possibility of an ‘aggregation effect’ where cumulative effects on individuals accrue to the community. Guetzkow (2002:16) finds that ‘the question of how to link micro-level effects on individuals to the more macro level of the community’ is unresolved.
Most obviously, one could simply talk in terms of the percentage of individuals/organizations in a population that are affected. Social capital is typically conceived of in such a manner, where a community with a higher percentage of individuals participating in civic groups and/or a greater density of such groups is considered to have greater social capital. Hence, if arts programs get more individuals involved in community groups, then they increase the community’s social capital (Guetzkow, 2002: 16)

Aabø (2005: 488), however, took a different approach when assessing the value of public libraries to Norwegian society, assuming that the sum of the parts (individuals) was equal to the whole (society).

By surveying a representative sample of the citizens, including both library users and non-users, and aggregating the individual preferences to a social preference, an estimate was reached. This aggregated estimate was defined as the social value of public libraries, expressed in monetary terms in accordance with use of the term in welfare economics.

‘Direct’ and ‘indirect’ are also applied when describing levels of engagement with cultural products. ‘Direct and indirect’ can denote active or passive engagement and will affect the nature and degree of impact (The Outspan Group, 1999: 1). The duration of involvement with cultural product is recognized as another important factor. Sustained engagement over a period of time is likely to have a more significant impact (AEGIS 2004; McCarthy et al, 2004).

Those individuals who are most engaged by their arts experience are the ones who are the most attuned to the intrinsic benefits, and those benefits create not only positive attitudes toward the arts, but also the motivation to return (McCarthy et al, 2004: 56)

The time dimension also has implications for impact assessments. Reeves’ (2002) and CHASS (2005) distinguish between immediate, intermediate and longer term impacts finding that the effects at each stage are likely to be qualitatively different.
This research finds that evaluating impact is challenged by the uncertainty surrounding the language of policy objectives. Methodological problems further complicate the situation.

Evaluating impact

Impact evaluation has a 'strong summative emphasis' (Owen, 2006: 252). It takes a retrospective look at the achievements of a policy or program after sufficient time has elapsed to generate effects. Owen (2006: 252) finds that accountability and impact evaluation are related because

''a key element of the accountability thrust is that the public has the right to expect that funds spent in the public arena have been translated into effective social and educational interventions.''

Impact evaluation has proved particularly attractive to policy makers with an instrumental agenda as it focuses on many of the issues which directly concern them. Impact evaluation provides evidence to policy makers, funding bodies and managers about the extent to which resources have been wisely spent. It addresses itself to the range and extent of a program or policy's outcomes, whether a program or policy has been implemented as planned and the degree to which implementation is a factor in subsequent outcomes. It can inform decisions about the continuance, modification or termination of a program (Owen, 2006: 253).

Given the energy with which governments have pursued an instrumental agenda to achieve economic and social policy objectives within the last two decades, it comes as no surprise that the type of impact evaluation favoured by governments in Britain and Australia is an objectives-based approach which focuses on assessing the achievement of pre-determined goals. Importantly, the notion of 'causality' is implicit in objectives-based evaluation as the approach is based on an assumption that the program or policy is an intervention which effects change.
However, Sarantakos (1998) notes that establishing a causal relationship between two variables is a difficult task and 'even when it is established, it is not a guarantee of certain, scientific knowledge'.

Proving causality requires a clear relationship between two variables, the ability of one variable (the cause) to consistently explain the other variable (the effect) and an appropriate time-order sequence (that is the causal variable precedes the effect). A further important condition is that 'cause and effect must be contiguous, that is, close together in time and space' (Sarantakos, 1998:11). Establishing contiguous situations to prove causality within the cultural sector has proven problematic given that there is often an interval of time between the event and the result allowing for the intervention of other factors which may have contributory effects (Jermyn, 2001; Wavell et al, 2002; CHC, 2002).

Studies in which direct causality can be proved are noticeably absent in the cultural sector. AEGIS (2004: 32) reports a Rapid Ethnographic Assessment Procedure (REAP)\(^\text{12}\) study which conducted a 'comprehensive search of all studies from 1950-1999 (published and unpublished in English) that tested the claim that studying the arts leads to some form of academic improvement'. Of the 11,267 studies investigated, 188 were considered robust enough to be retained for further analysis. Out of these, there were only three

... where reliable causal links were found were: listening to music and spatial-temporal reasoning, learning to play music and spatial reasoning and classroom drama and verbal skills (AEGIS: 2004:32).

Sarantakos (1998: 12) notes that even when an association exists between two variables, it does not necessarily indicate a causal relationship.

\(^{12}\) REAP conducted a comprehensive search for all studies from 1950-1999 that tested the claim that studying the arts leads to some form of academic improvement. Searches turned up 11,267 such studies of which 188 were retained for the study proper as these considered robust and relevant enough. Effect sizes were calculated for each of the relationships claimed. The results of each stage were startlingly different and reveal the difficulties of establishing causal relationships rather than associations (correlations) between the variables of interest. Three areas were found in which a substantial number of studies have demonstrated a clear causal link between education in an art form and achievement in a non-arts, academic area. In contrast, in seven areas studied no reliable causal link was found. The authors say that the lack of findings in these seven areas is attributable to one or more of three factors: in some cases the failure to find a causal link probably reflects the fact that there is no causal link; in some cases a causal link was found but it was not strong enough to be reliably generalized to other studies; and in other cases, the lack of findings may have been due to the small number of studies carried out on a given research question (Winner and Hetland 2000 in AEGIS, 2004: 32)
In fact, within the arts and cultural sector, many impact studies are found to be methodologically limited, achieving little more than establishing correlations between arts involvement and the presence of certain effects (Beauvais and Jensen, 2002; McCarthy et al, 2004).

A growing body of opinion within the cultural sector points to cumulative, rather than direct impact (AEGIS, 2004; McCarthy et al, 2004; Ruiz, 2004), resulting in a package of experiences that, together, combine to effect an impact.

*It will seldom be possible, for example, to track impact back to specific events. A startlingly good experience may stay in an individual’s consciousness for some time but, for the majority, the impact of archives, libraries and museums, is likely to be cumulative* (CHC, 2002: 21).

A precondition of evaluating impact, suggested by Ruiz (2004: 29), involves a degree of planning with specific intent to effect change with regard to social objectives ‘Evaluation, particularly of social inclusion initiatives, requires clear formulation of project aims and should look for sustained changes in the community’.

However, the absence of clear social objectives in relation to museum programs has been noted by Allison and Coalter (2001), Wavell et al (2002) and Bryson et al (2002). Museums, institutions that collect, preserve and interpret material cultural heritage do not plan activities with the intention of achieving social change. The result is that a fundamental premise on which impact evaluation is based is underdeveloped. Allison and Coalter find that,

*There is a lack of clearly stated [social] purposes and objectives for museums, accompanied by a failure to monitor the extent to which objectives are being met* (Allison and Coalter, 2001: 8).

The complications associated with evaluating impact are not confined to the issues of direct causality. Proving impact depends on evidence and the question of evidence raises another set of dilemmas.
Questions of evidence

The question of evidence to prove impact is a vexed one. In pursuit of evidence, data collection methods have been proposed, existing data sources have been interrogated and new data frameworks have been developed. But in spite of the energy with which data has been pursued, this remains an area characterized by both an abundance of claims and some significant gaps in the evidence base to substantiate them.

Evidence sources

_Evidence_ is commonly used to refer to ‘facts or testimony in support of a conclusion statement of belief’ and, according to the rhetoric, constitutes the foundation upon which ‘decisions, policies and actions are based’ viewed at http://www.resource.gov.uk/information/evidence/00ev.asp (link no longer available)

The collection of evidence has assumed a central role in the new age of accountability and impact evaluation (Selwood, 2002c). Evidence is needed to prove impact and there are an increasing range of data sources available. These include data from national bureaux of statistics, national tourism boards, social surveys, performance measurement of publicly funded bodies and the reports from agency research and evaluation departments.

British data sources include the British Market Research Bureau (BMRB), Market and Opinion Research International (Ipsos-MORI), the Office for National Statistics, Visit Britain, Best Value reviews, DCMS data from government audits and data from within the sector such as the Group for Large Local Authority Museums (GLLAM).

Similar data sources are available in Australia. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) collects, analyses and reports data from a national census conducted every four years.
The type of evidence available from these sources is predominantly quantitative, with an emphasis on participation data, inputs, and outputs. Both the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Office for National Statistics in England collect data for cultural activities and museum attendance by demographic group – categorising the percentage of attendees according to gender, age and residential location. Time use surveys in both countries monitor trends in the availability of discretionary (leisure) time compared to work time.

Large scale population surveys specifically examine attendance, participation and attitudes to the arts and cultural organizations. In England, the British Market Research Bureau (BMRB) and Ipsos MORI are two of the providers. In Australia, similar studies are conducted by the National Centre for Culture and Recreation Statistics (NCCRS), a branch of the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS).

Sources of benchmarking data in England are found in data produced by the Group for Large Local Authority Museums (GLLAM), the Association of Independent Museums' and the Benchmarking Group of the Group of Smaller Local Authority Museums (GoSLAM) (Selwood, 2004c). In Australia, benchmarking data is collected annually by the Council of Australasian Museum Directors (CAMD) and includes information on the number of physical visits to sites, virtual visits, participation in outreach programs, school and tourist attendances, publications, repatriation of indigenous cultural material, revenue, expenditure, employment, volunteerism, etc.

In 1985, the Cultural Ministers Council (CMC), in response to concerns about a lack of reliable data for the cultural industries which was seen as an impediment to policy development and effective planning, established the Statistical Advisory Group (SAG) now known as the Cultural Ministers Council Statistics Working Group (CMCSWG). In 1991, a partnership between the ABS and the CMC resulted in the establishment of the National Centre for Culture and Recreational Statistics (NCCRS), a branch of ABS with the result that
The partnership between the CMC and the ABS has been instrumental in encouraging standardisation and coordination of data collection and analysis, and improving the range, quality and accessibility of data (ABS, 2006: 34).

During the last decade, specific ABS surveys have been developed to address the needs for statistics in arts and cultural heritage. These include 'Work in Selected Culture and Leisure Activities', 'Attendance at Selected Cultural Venues and Events', 'Children's Participation in Cultural and Leisure Activities', the Time Use Survey and the Household Expenditure Survey.

State and territory arts departments also commission surveys and maintain data collections. In its 'Key Issues for an Information Development Plan' paper for Arts and Cultural Heritage in Australia (ABS, 4915.0.55.001, 2006: 35-36), the ABS notes 50 non-ABS commissioned surveys, 30 non-ABS data collections and a further 10 databases providing data relevant to impact issues.

National omnibus surveys are regularly conducted by a range of commercial market research organizations including Environmetrics and Roy Morgan Research. The Bureau of Tourism Research conducts international and domestic visitor surveys.

However, although a wider variety of data sources now exists and an increasing amount of data is being collected, questions of evidence in support of impact remain. There are several reasons for this.
Evidence issues

Time series data sets are recognized as necessary to make comparisons, identify trends and track developments. However, a major gap relating to time series data which can be used for baseline purposes has been identified (CHC, 2002; AEGIS: 2004; Burns Owen Partnership, 2005).

In 2002, Resource (now the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council in England) commissioned the Cultural Heritage Consortium (CHC) to ascertain whether existing time series data provided evidence of impact for museums, libraries and archives. The Consortium concluded that 'The data tell us something about use and satisfaction but little about the actual outcome of the visit' (2002: 13) and 'None of the time series data that we studied comes close to measuring impact' (2002: 14).

The inevitable conclusion is not only that the existing system for collecting quantitative data ......is patchy, inconsistent and incomplete but also that it is failing to generate any useful information on the outcome of the services or the on the impact they make (Cultural Heritage Consortium, 2002: 19)

Selwood (2004c) notes that the absence of a defensible evidence base can also be attributed to data sets which have originated for purposes other than those required by current policy needs, have variable reliability due to changes in methodology and, therefore, may not provide meaningful and valid comparisons. Similarly, Ferguson (2003:1) in her review of CAMD surveys for the Council of Australasian Museum Directors, prior to the most recent revision, noted the problems with changes in the survey over time: 'The 2002-03 survey had been substantially modified from that of 2001-02. Where possible, comparisons are made with previous results'.
A further impediment to assessing impact is the relative absence of evidence from longitudinal studies. Even where longitudinal studies do exist, the results can be equivocal. An example of this is found in the area of cultural regeneration which is heralded by some as an important example of positive social and economic impact. The case study of Barcelona is an interesting example of potentially negative impact over time.

As Beatriz Garcia (Garcia, 2003) points out, the legacy of the Barcelona Olympics and the Seville Expo meant that Spain in the early 1990s saw urban regeneration very much as an outcome of flagship, high profile capital projects. The Guggenheim – a cultural icon in a depressed, post-industrial northern Spanish city – fitted this picture exactly and was joined by other major infrastructure projects, notably a high quality underground rail system, designed by Norman Foster. Garcia acknowledges that the short-term benefits were impressive; a worldwide transformation of the city’s image, substantiated by a large rise in tourism. Overseas tourism increased by 43% between 1994 and 2000, while domestic tourism rose by even more (58%) over the period.

But, in recent years, questions have been asked about the sustainability of such high-profile initiatives. In particular, whether the tourism impact lasts beyond first time visits, whether the regeneration project has provided jobs for locals and whether the project has provided a platform for local artists or simply acted as a franchise of the US parent institution. Baniotopoulou (2001) is very clear on these points, arguing that, in the case of Bilbao, the presence of the Guggenheim has done relatively little for the local arts scene, features relatively few Basque or Spanish artists among its acquisitions and, instead, reflects the desire of the Guggenheim Foundation itself, to be at the forefront of the international art world. Evans (2003) argues that this lack of a link between ‘flagship’ cultural projects and local creative businesses is not confined to Bilbao, but is a weakness of grand cultural projects everywhere. Indeed, he argues that such flagship projects are often undertaken at the expense of local and regional cultural development and that the benefits do not necessarily go to residents as the result of culture led regeneration (Baniotopoulou, 2001).
The absence of robust studies to prove cultural impact is also affected by a sector inexperienced, and in some cases unwilling, to undertake evaluation. Matarasso (1996: 1) has criticised the cultural sector for showing 'little interest in developing evaluative systems through which to prove its value internally or externally, preferring, it seems, to state simply that 'seeing is believing'. In the instances where sector evaluation does occur, other problems are evident:

.....systematic and rigorous reporting of the data collection methods used and the results obtained are often absent; therefore the quality and validity of the evidence is difficult to establish. (Wavell et al, 2002: 84)

These problems are discussed by AEGIS (2004) and Selwood (2004c) who cite the absence of information on sample sizes and composition, timing, theoretical and methodological framework and the mechanisms by which a desired impact or effect may be achieved. Critically, most studies lack control or treatment groups, critical to demonstrating comparative advantage over other means of achieving the same effects (Matarasso, 1996; DCMS, 2003b; AEGIS, 2004; McCarthy et al, 2004).

In general, studies generated by the cultural sector are criticised, on the one hand, for a lack of specificity in relation to the experiences that produce claimed benefits, under what circumstances and for which populations. 'Without these specifics, it is difficult to judge how much confidence to place in the findings and how to generalize from the empirical results' (McCarthy et al, 2004, xvi). By contrast, too much specificity utilizing 'case' studies', 'best practice' examples and focusing on immediate outcomes rather than longitudinal analyses limits the potential for the generalization and extrapolation needed to make an overall case for impact across the cultural sector (Allison and Coalter, 2001; Jermyn, 2001; Selwood, 2002; AEGIS, 2004).
With limited experience in evaluation, there is criticism that sector practitioners fail in two major areas. On the one hand, there is tendency to measure commitment and effort, rather than effectiveness. This leads to a focus on outputs (effects) rather than outcomes (AEGIS, 2004; Burns Owen Partnership, 2005). Secondly, the absence of clear intentional objectives against which to measure impact combined with poor methodological practice results in a situation where 'extensive hard evidence of impact, gathered systematically, is often lacking' (Wavell et al, 2002: i). In summarising their interrogation of qualitative studies undertaken for Resource (Museums, Libraries and Archives Council), Wavell et al concluded that

_In general, then, while most of the literature reviewed here conveys the opinion that the sector does have a positive social impact, particularly in relation to aspects of personal development, extensive hard evidence of this impact, gathered systematically, is often lacking, particularly in the museums and archives domains (Wavell et al, 2002: 79)_

However, there is some indication that the sector itself is beginning to recognise the need for, in the words of Wavell et al (2002) 'extensive hard evidence of impact, gathered systematically'. Two recent reports, one originating in Australia and the other in England, and both commissioned by the national body of museum directors in each country, have recently been released. They demonstrate an advance towards addressing outcomes as well as inputs and outputs. They are discussed in detail in a subsequent chapter of this thesis 13(Chapter 7) where they are analysed as part of the body of evidence to determine whether a values paradigm can be substantiated.

Another area that has bearing on the validity and reliability of evidence is the selection of methods to acquire data and their appropriateness to the purposes of the research.

---

The Australian Bureau of Statistics recognises that developing policy to promote, decrease or support participation in different areas of culture and leisure activity must take account of the ‘beliefs and values’ and leisure ‘wants and needs’ that motivate people to participate in cultural and leisure events (ABS, 2001, cat. 4160. 0: 282). Assessing ‘beliefs and values’ presupposes the adoption of a suitable suite of methodological options appropriate to the questions being explored. Quantitative methodologies provide important data in relation to trends, patterns and relationships but are insufficient to describe the impact of cultural activity, especially with regard to intrinsic values.

*In terms of understanding how our social institutions influence us, quantitative knowledge alone is insufficient. The story is richer and often less clear than the apparent precision of statistical data* (Bryson et al, 2002:9)

The next section explores some of the issues and options associated with determining methodological approaches to measure impact and assess value.

**Questions of methodology**

This section examines a broad literature on methodological options for data-gathering to prove impact. The methodological question is considered a generic one and the methodological analysis is not confined to those options which are currently used by museums.

**Planning for impact**

The adoption of an objectives-based impact evaluation model assumes that results can be traced directly to a planned intervention. Problems with this position have been discussed, especially with regard to the ‘contributory’ influence of intervening events and subsequent suggestions that causality is cumulative rather than direct. Though evaluating direct causality may be problematic, assessing impact is possible within certain considerations.
Creigh-Tyte and Mundy (DCMS, 2003b) and AEGIS (2004) both suggest that evaluating impact is dependent on pre-conditions. These pre-conditions can be either a plausible theory describing the reasons that intended effects can be expected as the result of planned interventions or a set of specific objectives against which assessments are to be made. A time dimension differentiating long-term from short and medium term impacts, identifiable assessment measures, a framework by which these measures can be applied in a consistent manner across the different types of impacts and the use of either relevant baseline data or control groups against which comparisons can be made are all considered necessary.

A method which addresses many of these preconditions is Everitt and Hamilton’s (2003) log frame model. Log frame planning is a program model based on intentional planning to effect change. The narrative column establishes the overall goal, the objectives towards which the project should be working to achieve the goal, the activities to meet the objectives and the inputs or resources required to undertake the activities. An ‘if-then’ logic works from the bottom upwards: if these inputs are secured, then these activities can be undertaken, then these objectives can be met and then this goal becomes achievable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Effectiveness indicators</th>
<th>Methods of verification</th>
<th>Assumptions/risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Log Frame Planning for Results (Everitt and Hamilton 2003)*

The second column develops success indicators for (a) goal realisation (b) objectives achievement (c) activities, and (d) securing resources. The third column (methods of verification) identifies the evidence required to acquit the indicators and the fourth column addresses risks, constraints and other that may affect the project pursing the programme as identified in the other three columns.
A similar approach has been adopted by the Library and Information Resource Group/ Society of College, National and University Libraries Impact Initiative (LIRG/ SCONUL) in the UK which has developed a framework for impact assessment that involves (a) articulating objectives (b) developing success criteria that reflect the objectives (c) creating impact measures (d) identifying evidence in respect of these impact measures and (e) selecting appropriate research methods to collect the evidence (Poll and Payne, 2006: 12-13).

Surveys of randomly or purposively selected samples of museum visitors compared with non visiting control groups can be used for short or long term studies with a series of data points linked to the life of a study (before, at start, during, after) which track the impact of an intervention or the emergence of a phenomenon (AEGIS, 2004 :54). Other methodological options include ex-post facto research which examines the causes of a phenomenon retrospectively and correlational or associational studies which provide information about the degree of relationship between two or more variables but do not necessarily provide causal evidence, unless the mechanisms connecting actions and impacts are proven to be consistent over time or across a range of similar projects (Cohen and Manion, 1980).

Evaluating causality

Moren and Blom (2003) and van der Knaap (2004) question objectives-based impact models aimed at verifying casual relationships independent of the intervening process of change.

Proponents of realistic evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997) eschew objectives-based impact models and argue for analysing the underlying causes for change especially with regard to the role played by the process of intervention and the specific context within which the intervention occurred.
Change, they argue, can only be understood through an analysis of components including program goals, the assumptions underlying those goals and the intervention process, especially with regard to the type, nature, and intensity of services delivered, how these services are experienced by program participants, and how services are expected to lead to outcomes (Green and McAllister, 2002: 4).

Pawson and Tilley (1997) identify three basic components that underpin realist evaluations—context, mechanism and outcome. The 'contingent' foundation of this model allows for different situational factors to be taken into account in an evaluation—'in relation to different cases, interventions and contextual contingencies might vary, likewise mechanisms at work might differ, which in turn might lead to different outcome patterns' (Moren and Blom, 2003: 48). This model of impact evaluation resonates with Mason (2002) who argue that cultural values are 'contingent' because

*Values are produced out of the interaction of an artifact and its contexts...Values can thus only be understood with reference to social, historical, and even spatial contexts—through the lens of who is defining and articulating the value, why now, and why here? (Mason, 2002: 8)*

**Qualitative evaluation**

Satterfield’s position is that

*...some values cannot be expressed as numbers or declarative statements but are, instead, embedded in the contextually, emotively, and morally rich stories and conversations through which we define ourselves and our actions in relation to natural systems. With this in mind, one set of studies speculated that more inclusive portraits of value could be found in value-rich narratives if only one could elicit such narratives from lay stakeholders in a defensible manner. These studies assumed that morally resonant, image-based, and narrative-style elicitations would help respondents articulate a broader range of non-cost and non-utilitarian environmental values (Satterfield, 2002: 88).*
Considerable discussion and debate within the cultural sector has focused on the limitations of quantitative methods when attempting to capture subjective meanings and values.

There is now recognition within government of the need to use qualitative methods. The chapter on Qualitative Research and Evaluation in the UK government's Magenta Book (Cabinet Office, 2004) finds the roots of qualitative research in the reaction against positivism.

Rather than examine relationships in quantitative terms, or test hypotheses using statistical techniques, the interpretivist tradition argues that social research should provide in-depth, qualitative understanding of the subjective meanings of social life. In other words, it grew out of a concern to understand social life as it is experienced by people and as they make sense of it, rather than to derive laws or theories about it (Cabinet Office, 2004: 2).

Qualitative research within the interpretivist paradigm involves understanding, interpreting and explaining events, contexts and people in terms of personal and shared meanings (Sarantakos, 1998; Cabinet Office, 2004).

It encompasses a range of methods including focus groups, depth interviews, Delphi panels, Nominal Group Technique, Citizens' juries and panels, participant observation, documentary analysis, ethnosemantics, discourse analysis, Critical Incident Technique and personal narratives (Crotty, 1998; Sarantakos, 1998, Low, 2002; Cabinet Office 2004; Owen, 2006). Qualitative research can also be used with quantitative methods (Cabinet Office, 2004:3). An example of a blending of both qualitative and quantitative approaches within one method can be found in Personal Meaning Mapping.

Personal meaning mapping\(^4\), is a method that assesses impacts through a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. It has been used in North America and Australia studies.

\(^4\) Personal meaning mapping was developed by John Falk from the Institute of Learning Innovation in Annapolis, Maryland, USA.
Through interview, it collects a rich field of narrative data from respondents prior to a museum experience and compares this with further responses collected immediately after an intervention (or experience). The comparative data can measure changes in extent, breadth, depth and mastery of a topic or subject. It has been used to conduct two studies at the Powerhouse Museum in Sydney. In the first instance, it was used to determine whether museum experiences could have a positive effect on developing creative awareness amongst first year students when designing for an end-user (Caban et al, 2002). The results from museum visitor respondents were compared with control groups who did not have the museum-visiting experience. A second study sought to determine what (if any) learning occurred as the result of engagement with interactives in a science museum compared to a science centre. Following a pre-interview, museum visitors were directed to an exhibition experience with a strong interactive component and then interviewed both immediately afterwards and several months later to determine the type of learning that had occurred as the result of the experience. Results were compared with a control group in a science centre (Falk et al, 2004).

User-focused evaluation methods

A further set of methodological options is found in consumer-focused approaches including *hedonic pricing*, a method that measures the increments in financial value gained from the proximity of a real estate parcel to a particular heritage resource and *contingent valuation methods* that measure total value according to individual’s expressed willingness to pay for a service. Contingent valuation has been applied most recently to assess the value of Norway’s public libraries (Aabo, 2005).

Contingent valuation and time cost valuation are emerging as two methods of assessing the financial value of non-profit organizations and services that have no equivalent on the common market and therefore no "market prices" that can be determined.
Using the contingent valuation method, people directly or potentially interested in a service are asked to rate the value in financial terms, expressed by their willingness-to-pay. E.g. What would you pay for maintaining this museum? (Aabo, 2005). The time costs method is based on the assumption that users invest time and effort in order to use services. The value that they place on that use must be at least as high as their "sacrifice" of time. Time costs are calculated by multiplying users' time spent with museum services with the average salary costs of the population served by that museum. The method has been used in library value assessments (Poll and Payne, 2006).

Other methods allow the attribution of degrees of value to an attraction or an experience. Choice modelling breaks down the specific attributes of an experience and assigns a value to each aspect. Users are subjected to forced-choice scenarios where they must select between two aspects of an experience and progressively ascribe value to a few features over many possible aspects. This method is currently being used to identify the factors that most affect repeat visitation to museums in Australia.\(^\text{15}\)

Other user-based approaches evaluate quality and impact through selecting a few key dimensions and ascribing levels of value to each. The Council for the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS) in their November 2005 report recommended this approach for measuring the quality and impact of publicly funded research in Australia. Quality (the capacity of research to influence best practice), impact (longer term influence on society) and capability (the power to simulate new thinking and innovation) are proposed as the three dimensions for evaluation. CHASS recognises that ‘disciplinary differences suggest that research units should choose from a generic menu of options when assessing quality, impact and capability’ (2005: 11), a situational approach not unlike that proposed by Pawson and Tilley (1997) in relation to realistic evaluation.

\(^{15}\text{Increasing visitor frequency is a partnership between University Technology Sydney, The Powerhouse Museum, the National Maritime Museum, The National Museum of Australia, the Australian War Memorial and Museum Victoria funded through an Australian Research Council Grant and industry support.}\)
To address these issues of disciplinary diversity (research in the social sciences may apply a higher % in the social impact category than research in the creative arts where quality may be the most important criterion), ranges of 40%-70%, 20-50% and 10-30% are set for each dimension with the freedom to adjust within these ranges to achieve a total potential score of 100%.

A similar model was developed by the National Trust in Britain in association with the management consultants, Accenture. This version utilises Shareholder Value Analysis (SVA) to quantitatively measure and track the levels of public value generated by public sector heritage organisations. The Accenture model has been applied to several National Trust properties in England to determine how well they are achieving public value through optimising user experience and providing benefits to both the local community and the national interest.

Each one of these three categories (user experience, local community and national benefits) is defined, accorded a % value out of 100% within the Trust’s overall aims for that particular property and provided with a set of indicators for assessment purposes.

For example, ‘user experience’ is separated into ‘encouraging the use of heritage; being a source of inspiration with customers; providing excellence in visitor experience reconciled with conservation; ensuring access for all sectors of the public’ (NT and Accenture, 2006: 15) and accorded a ranking of 40% importance of total public service value (with 30% allocated to each of ‘impact on the local community’ and ‘contribution to national interest’). User experience is assessed on the basis of 5 indicators which are themselves assigned % ratings put of 100 (total visitor numbers= 25%; adult enjoyment rated very good-excellent= 20%; child enjoyment rated very good-excellent= 20%; value for money= 20% and overall service= 15%).
Accenture argues that this model (The Public Service Value Model) offers a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures and enables the heritage sector 'to identify the priority outcomes citizens require from their services and to ensure that these outcomes are pursued cost effectively’ (NT and Accenture, 2006: 22). However, they also identify some important limitations. The first is that the Public Service Value Model does not assess intrinsic value.

Intrinsic value incorporates some of the intangible values of heritage such as the principles of stewardship and conservation as well as concepts of the historical and cultural significance of heritage, its aesthetic qualities and its option value (the value of the availability of the option of using an environmental or other asset at some future date). Traditionally heritage experts have been the sole arbiters of intrinsic value and as such have been the primary advisers on policy and the allocation of resources. That view is now changing within the sector as mechanisms are sought which enable greater consultation and engagement with the citizen. (NT and Accenture, 2006: 23).

Importantly, the sector is accountable for conducting the evaluation which will demonstrate that its activities have results. There are professional challenges in this domain as the sector faces up to its responsibilities in this area.

Conclusion

In summary, impact evaluation is occurring within an evolving theoretical and methodological context. Agreement on terminology remains unresolved. The objectives-based model of impact evaluation preferred by governments is problematic, especially with regard to proving direct causality when intervening factors may have a significant effect. The evidence base for substantiating cultural impact is weak, not helped by a sector unfamiliar, inexperienced, and sometimes unwilling, to undertake evaluation. Times series data are generally absent and sector studies are often too specific to enable meaningful comparisons and generalisations.
Where evidence does exist, it is often inconclusive. Based in a positivist paradigm, the prevailing model also favours tangible and numerical data at the expense of qualitative information that could better describe the effect of the sector on individuals and communities (Wavell et al, 2002; CHASS, 2005). Though an evidence base is emerging for economic impacts (Travers, 2006), substantiation of social and individual impacts tends to default to effort rather than results.

The literature reveals a growing consensus that there is a need for an overall model to assess the impact of the cultural sector generally and, within that, for the museum industry specifically (The Outspan Group, 1999; AEGIS, 2004; Ruiz, 2004; Burns Owen Partnership, 2005) for

...although there is a wealth of research evidence available in each of the respective areas that demonstrates social and/or economic impact, there is no common or systematic approach to evaluation of initiatives or programmes, rendering it impossible to compare and contrast findings (Ruiz, 2004:1)

But, there are also fundamental questions about the paradigm within which objectives impact evaluation is based. Museum professionals and their advocates question the current evaluation paradigm, arguing that the utilitarian/ instrumental platform on which it is based is inherently flawed.

It is challenges to the instrumental paradigm and questions about what values, whose values and what other types of values should be constitute a theoretical framework for evaluating museums which is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE VALUES ARGUMENT

It is obvious, though not always remembered, that evaluation is fundamentally about values. It is not an abstract, quasi-scientific process through which objective truths can be identified. It is necessarily relative. The important, and essentially political, question about evaluation is which value system is used to provide benchmarks against which work will be measured—in other words, who defines value. The way in which we define value is part of how we create reality (Matarasso, 1996: 1)

Arguments for a values-based paradigm have been gaining momentum as the result of three factors which have, to some extent, converged. These three factors are the concept of Public Value, the role of the public in identifying value and dissatisfaction with the current instrumental paradigm for determining worth.

The first of these, the concept of Public Value, potentially provides an overarching framework within which to develop a sustainable future for the sector. Public Value supports the second factor, the involvement of the public in the role of value creation and identification. The necessity of involving the public was first raised by Matarasso (1996) and now finds a theoretical place within the Public Value paradigm (Holden, 2004 and 2006; Blaug et al, 2006). Finally, increasingly vigorous discussions argue that the current emphasis on the instrumental benefits of culture is reductionist, resulting in an unbalanced and incomplete picture of the value of the sector that fails to capture its real worth.

The combination of these three factors underpins calls for a new paradigm that admits the full range of benefits accruing to individuals and society through participation in cultural activities (Ellis, 2003; Hewison, 2003; Saumarez Smith, 2003; Selwood, 2003; McCarthy et al, 2004; Holden 2004 and 2006).
Unlike the tangible objectives that dominate the instrumental paradigm, many of these benefits are ‘intangibles’ such as the captivation and pleasure experienced, the expanded capacity for empathy felt, the expression of communal meanings shared and the creation of social bonds (McCarthy et al, 2004: 38).

The values discourse is stimulating the development of a new language which reflects public perceptions and provides professionals with cogent argument for culture’s worth (Matarasso, 2000b; McCarthy et al, 2004; Holden, 2004, 2006).

Value dimensions

From an analysis of the literature, the research finds value described across a several dimensions, through a variety of aspects and experienced by a range of beneficiary groups. Dimensions include instrumental, intrinsic, sociocultural, institutional and use values. Beneficiary categories encompass individuals, community/society and the economy. This section of the thesis examines each of these value dimensions through an examination of literature emanating from a range of sources across the arts, heritage and collections fields. Values and benefits typologies are reviewed. The chapter concludes with an attempt to synthesise the results into a preliminary ‘values’ typology.

Instrumental value

‘Instrumental value’ describes the utilitarian and instrumental benefits that culture can provide for individuals, the economy and for society.

‘Such benefits are instrumental in that the arts [and culture] are viewed as a means of achieving broad social and economic goals that have nothing to do with art [and culture] per se’ (McCarthy et al, 2004: xi).
Instrumental value emerged as part of the modernising reforms of the 1980's and 1990's as governments sought tangible evidence to demonstrate a return for their investment in culture. Instrumental value is found in contributions to the economy through attracting tourism, providing employment, supporting urban regeneration and producing a multiplier effect on local economies, in benefits to communities such as increasing social capital, encouraging inclusion, contributing to social cohesion, facilitating tolerance for cultural diversity, and through benefits to individual by fostering learning, personal well-being and health.

Early studies conducted by Matarasso (1997) and Williams (1997) in the community arts field produced typologies which identified a range of instrumental outcomes (social, educational and economic) but which were the first to recognise intrinsic values such as ‘imagination and vision’, ‘pride’ and ‘enjoyment’ as well (Matarasso, 1997). These typologies are reproduced here (Figures 3) and on the next page (Figure 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Artistic</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established networks of on-going value</td>
<td>Communicating ideas and information</td>
<td>Further work of artistic merit</td>
<td>Developed local enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed community identity</td>
<td>Planning and organizing activities</td>
<td>Further training or education in the arts</td>
<td>Led to employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised public awareness of an issue</td>
<td>Collecting, analyzing and organizing information</td>
<td>Developed groups or arts activities</td>
<td>Improved productivity in business/ public/ community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessened social isolation</td>
<td>Solving problems</td>
<td>Developed creative talents</td>
<td>Enhanced or developed tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved understanding of different cultures and lifestyles</td>
<td>Using technology</td>
<td>Improved access to arts education or training</td>
<td>Attracted new resources to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved recreational options</td>
<td>Using mathematical ideas and techniques</td>
<td>Increased sales for artworks or developed audiences</td>
<td>Improved or developed public facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired action on a social justice issue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved planning and design of public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased appreciation of the value of community arts projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved consultation between government and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Created cost savings in public expenditure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crime prevention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3. Benefits of community arts participation (Williams, 1997)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal development</th>
<th>Social Cohesion</th>
<th>Community empowerment</th>
<th>Local image and identity</th>
<th>Imagination and vision</th>
<th>Health well being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased personal confidence and self worth</td>
<td>Reduced social isolation</td>
<td>Built community organizational capacity</td>
<td>Developed pride in local traditions and cultures</td>
<td>Helped people develop creativity</td>
<td>Had a positive impact on how people feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended involvement in social activity</td>
<td>Developed community networks</td>
<td>Encouraged local self reliance</td>
<td>Contributed to a sense of belonging and involvement</td>
<td>Eroded the distinction between creator and consumer</td>
<td>Provided an effective means of health education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave people an active voice to express themselves</td>
<td>Promoted tolerance and conflict resolution</td>
<td>Helped people extend control over their lives</td>
<td>Created community traditions</td>
<td>Allowed exploration of values, meanings and dreams</td>
<td>Contributed to a more relaxed atmosphere in health centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated interest and confidence in the arts</td>
<td>Provided a forum for multi-cultural understanding</td>
<td>Provided insight into political and social ideas</td>
<td>Involved residents in environmental improvement</td>
<td>Enriched the practice of professionals</td>
<td>Provided enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided forums to explore personal rights</td>
<td>Helped validate the contribution of a whole community</td>
<td>Facilitated effective public consultation</td>
<td>Provided a basis for developing community activities</td>
<td>Encouraged risk taking</td>
<td>Improved quality of life of people with poor health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to educational development of children</td>
<td>Promoted cross cultural contact and co-operation</td>
<td>Involved local people in community regeneration</td>
<td>Improved perceptions of marginalised groups</td>
<td>Helped communities vision beyond the immediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged adults to take up education and training opportunities</td>
<td>Promoted contact across generations</td>
<td>Facilitated the development of partnerships</td>
<td>Helped transform the image of public bodies</td>
<td>Challenged conventional service delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped build new skills and provided work experience</td>
<td>Helped address issues of crime</td>
<td>Built support for community projects</td>
<td>Made people feel better about where they live.</td>
<td>Raised expectations about what is possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to people's employability</td>
<td>Provides ways for offender rehabilitation</td>
<td>Strengthened community co-operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Value of participation in community arts projects (adapted from Matarasso, 1997)

With the emphasis on social policy objectives, contributing to outcomes such as social capital and social cohesion are paramount within the instrumental paradigm. However, as discussed in Chapter Three, their meanings remain somewhat inconclusive.
Matarasso (1997) found the value of participation in community arts in increased social cohesion, community empowerment and, what he termed, local image and identity which encompassed pride, belonging and active citizenship in support of community issues.

There are echoes of Matarasso in Kelly and Kelly (2000). They distinguish between social capital outcomes (contribution to the communication of ideas, information and values, helping improve participant's skills in planning and organising, improving understanding of different cultures and lifestyles, improving the understanding of the role of arts and culture in the community, partnership building, active membership of staff/board in other organisations and artistic collaboration with others), social change and public awareness outcomes (contribution made to stimulating and developing public awareness of important issues and changing people's attitudes on political, ethical, religious or moral issues) and building and developing communities outcomes which includes developing community identity and social cohesion, providing recreational opportunities and public amenities that help to convey the history and heritage of an area and developing local enterprise. Beauvais and Jensen (2002) advance the discussion by suggesting that social cohesion is the overarching concept which subsumes social capital and social inclusion. The social outcomes hierarchy Figure 5 reflects the Beauvais and Jensen position.

![Figure 5: Proposed hierarchy of the social outcomes of culture (Scott, 2007)](image-url)
From a combination of government policy and sector generated studies, we find that the instrumental value of culture is diverse, encompassing benefits that develop individual human capital (learning, skill building, increased self confidence, improved health), economic benefits (employment, local enterprise, increased tourism and attraction of investment), creative benefits (new artistic work, vision and imagination) and social benefits (improved social capital, social cohesion and increased social awareness).

The Outspan Group (1999) suggest that the instrumental benefits of culture can be described in terms of benefits that accrue to individuals (personal benefits), the economy (business benefits) and to communities.

Personal benefits can be experienced through direct, indirect and non-use.

*Non-use benefits are derived by individuals who gain satisfaction from the knowledge that the arts and culture products/services are available for possible future use (option benefits), that they exist for others to enjoy (existence benefits), and that they will continue to exist for future generations to enjoy (bequest benefits) (The Outspan Group, 1999, iii)*

Benefits for the economy (business) are derived from the redistribution of spending by stakeholders and by producers of cultural services and products (The Outspan Group, 1999: 8-9). In this typology, individual benefits (e.g. mental, physical and spiritual health) aggregate and accrue to the community. Cultural benefits experienced by communities & society are contributions to education and learning, the social capital generated from international partnerships and agreements, the generation of scientific knowledge, the development of national, local, personal identity, community cohesion and improved ‘quality of life’ (The Outspan Group, 1999: 9-10). Figure 6 reproduces this typology.
### Generalized Framework of the Total Benefits of the Arts and Culture Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit Category</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Societal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Benefits accruing to stakeholders (users and non-users)</td>
<td>Benefits derived from the net redistribution of commercial activity from one area to another</td>
<td>Unallocatable benefits to either individuals and/or businesses yet indivisible and tending to be societal in scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefit Components</strong></td>
<td>Use Values: - direct use - indirect use - future use Non-Use Values: - option value - existence value - bequest value</td>
<td>GDP, labour income and employment impacts associated with attributable spending by stakeholders and by producers on management and development</td>
<td>Health effects - mental, physical, spiritual Education benefits International responsibilities and agreements Contributions from outside Business location decisions Scientific benefits Identity - national, local, personal Community cohesion “Quality of life” Regional economic development Creative production Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6: Generalized Framework of the Total Benefits of the Arts and Culture Sector (Reproduced from The Outspan Group, 1999: 6)*

### Intrinsic value

Belfiore and Bennett (2006) find that many of those outcomes of cultural participation and engagement now described as ‘intrinsic’ value have their source in a Western intellectual tradition beginning with Aristotle and described variously as the cathartic, psychological, cognitive, aesthetic and ethical impacts of the arts. Contemporary positions focus on the impact of arts and culture on ‘meaning’, ‘a distinctive type of pleasure and emotional stimulation’ (McCarthy et al, 2004: xv) and the effects ‘that add value to people’s lives’ (McCarthy et al, 2004: 37).
For individuals, intrinsic values are experienced as a 'state of absorption', or 'focused attention' that comes with 'captivation', (McCarthy et al, 2004: 45), as the 'deep satisfaction' that the 'pleasure' of seeing an art work or having a cultural experience that is moving and meaningful, can engender (McCarthy et al, 2004: 46), as the capacity to explore 'personal meaning' (Silverman, 1993; 1995), and the discovery of 'personal beliefs in amongst universal truths' (DCMS, 2005: 6), as the provision of a 'new perspective on the world' (McCarthy et al, 2004: 48) and the uplifting spiritual experiences that address our needs to experience 'the religious, the numinous and the sublime' (Holden, 2004: 34).

McCarthy et al's report for the RAND Corporation and the Wallace Foundation (2004), also takes the position that these individual benefits states can aggregate and accrue to the public realm, connecting people 'more deeply to the world', extending their 'capacity for empathy' through drawing them into the experiences of people and cultures 'vastly different from their own' (McCarthy et al, 2004: 47).

Other intrinsic benefits are experienced collectively. Holden finds that symbolic value is generated through culture's 'expression of communal meanings' (Holden, 2004: 34). The 'creation of social bonds' (McCarthy et al, 2004: 50) that 'make connections between people' and 'reinforce a sense of unity and identity' (Holden, 2004: 34) can be formed through cultural experiences.

Providing 'a voice to communities the culture at large has largely ignored' (McCarthy et al, 2004:51), commemorating events that shaped a nation's history and sharing the development of a community's identity (Scott, 2005), provide

a way for us all to see our place in the world. This is all the more important as society changes, and new values of nationality and community emerge. The fixed points of history and heritage have an even greater meaning as our world becomes smaller, and our values develop. (DCMS, 2005:3)
McCarthey et al proposes a typology (Figure 7) that acknowledges both instrumental and intrinsic dimensions, which distinguishes between private and public benefits and which acknowledges that there is an area of overlap. The typology assumes that individual benefits accrue to the public domain through a process of 'aggregation'.

We contend not only that these intrinsic effects are satisfying in themselves, but that many of them can lead to the development of individual capacities and community cohesiveness that are of benefit to the public sphere. (McCarthey et al, 2004: 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instrumental benefits</th>
<th>Intrinsic benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private (Individual)</td>
<td>Improved test scores</td>
<td>Captivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private benefits with public</td>
<td>Improved self-efficacy, learning</td>
<td>Expanded capacity for empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spillover</td>
<td>skills, health</td>
<td>Cognitive growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public benefits</td>
<td>Development of social capital</td>
<td>Creation of social bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic growth</td>
<td>Expression of communal meaning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7: Instrumental and intrinsic benefits across private, private/public and public domains (Reproduced from McCarthey et al, 2004: 4)*

The inclusion of both instrumental and intrinsic dimensions is a position which finds support at government level from the English British Secretary for State, Tessa Jowell.

...we still have to deliver the utilitarian agenda, and the measures of instrumentality that this implies, but we must acknowledge that in supporting culture we are doing more than that, and in doing more than that must find ways of expressing it (DCMS, 2004: 10)

Jowell argues for the inclusion of intrinsic values on the basis that they are 'satisfying of the deepest of human needs', are 'at the heart of what it means to be a fully developed human being' and have 'an important part to play in defining and preserving cultural identity-of the individual, of communities' (DCMS, 2004: 15).
Socio-cultural value

The advantage of examining the heritage framework is in the clarification, extension and delineation that it offers to the intrinsic and instrumental value dimensions, particularly with regard to intangible benefits for communities.

Attribution of value is at the heart significance assessment for heritage sites. Mason (2002: 10) interrogates heritage value typologies (Reigl 1982; Lipe 1984; Frey, 1997; English Heritage, 1997; Burra Charter, Australia ICOMOS, 1999) and proposes a new typology (Figure 8) comprising two dimensions (sociocultural and economic). Within these two dimensions, Mason identifies several separate aspects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociocultural Values</th>
<th>Economic Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Use (market) value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/symbolic</td>
<td>Non-use (nonmarket) values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual/religious</td>
<td>Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Bequest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8: Provisional typology of heritage values (Reproduced from Mason, 2002: 10)*

Cultural and symbolic value

Mason (2002: 11-12) describes cultural or symbolic value as that value that comes from building cultural affiliation and shared meanings in the present through a common response to an object, place or exhibition.

A further form of cultural or symbolic value is political value which Mason describes as ‘the use of heritage to build or sustain civil relations, governmental legitimacy, protest, or ideological causes’ (2002: 11). Examples of sites with political value that are experienced in the present include Old Parliament House in Canberra (and the Aboriginal Tent Embassy in front of it) and the Houses of Parliament at Westminster in London.
Spiritual value

Mason finds that heritage sites can be imbued with religious or other sacred meaning. These spiritual values can ‘embrace secular experiences of wonder, awe’ (2002: 12).

Historical value

Historical value, the capacity of an object, site, exhibition or experience to ‘embody, convey or stimulate a relationship with or reaction to the past’ is ‘at the root of the very notion of heritage’ (Mason, 2002: 11).

*Historical value can accrue in several ways: from the heritage material’s age, from its association with people or events, from its rarity and/or uniqueness, from its technological qualities, or from its archival/documentary potential* (Mason, 2002: 11)

The primary conduit of historical value is authenticity. Authenticity is often experienced through material which is ‘truly old’ and which, as a result of its age was a ‘witness to history and carries the authority of this witness’. Thus, if one can prove authenticity of material, historical value is indelibly established. (Mason (2002: 13)

Within Mason’s typology, scholarly value is a sub-sets of historical value. Scholarly value or academic value describes the ability to gain knowledge from the past for use in the present and the future (Mason, 2002: 11-12).

Social value

The social values of heritage are not specifically related to the specific historical values of heritage. They have more in common with building social capital and facilitating social connections and networks.

*The social values of a heritage site might include the use of a site for social gatherings such as celebrations, markets, picnics, or ball games—activities that do not necessarily capitalize directly on the historical values of the site but, rather, on the public-space, shared-space qualities* (Mason, 2002: 12).
Social value also includes the notion of 'place attachment' experienced as community feelings of affiliation that social groups derive from the specific characteristics of their 'home' territory and the sense of social cohesion that this attachment can engender.

Aesthetic value

Aesthetic values are the visual qualities of heritage ascribed through their beauty, formal relationships, sensory experiences and the feelings of well being that they invoke. Mason's proposed values typology, however, keeps aesthetic value separate. It can also be argued that the scholarly work arising from research on collections and places is a form of instrumental value in which heritage institutions produce new knowledge for the benefit of society.

The many interpretations of beauty, of the sublime, of ruins, and of the quality of formal relationships considered more broadly have long been among the most important criteria for labelling things and places as heritage (Mason 2002: 12).

Many of the aspects encompassed within the socio-cultural dimension of Mason's typology resonate with the intrinsic values typology developed by McCarthy et al (2004) specifically where the values are experienced collectively.

Use and non-use value

Direct use

Direct use of cultural services is a key indicator in determining public value. Willingness to give something up, to spend money, to commit energy and to spend time visiting, using, enjoying and travelling to and from cultural activities are tangible demonstrations that the public values culture (Holden, 2004: 42).

The very fact that people go to theatres and galleries, visit country houses and museums, make music and write poetry is proof enough that they value culture. In this sense culture does not simply produce value; it embodies value (Holden, 2004:49)
Cultural participation also offers opportunities for deeper engagement through friends and members groups and through volunteering. Holden (2004: 41) contends that participation and engagement that require regular commitments of time and energy create Public Value through the development of social relationships and affective attachments to culture. These forms of direct use are captured through visitor attendance figures, numbers of volunteers and friends and hours of volunteering work. However, a growing body of literature suggests that the absence of direct use does not preclude attribution of value.

Data from an Omnibus Survey (Skelton et al, 2002 in ACE, 2004: 29), carried out by the Office for National Statistics for Arts Council England, show widespread support for the funding and role of the arts among the population including participants and non-participants:

- 74% of adults aged 16 and over believed that arts and cultural projects should receive public funding
- 73% said that the arts played a valuable role in the life of the country
- 72% said that arts from different cultures contribute a lot to this country
- 37% said the arts play a valuable role in their lives

A 2002 study on participation in and attitudes towards the arts in Scotland, found that it was not only users of arts and cultural activities who valued them.

*Nine out of ten people agreed that arts and cultural activities give a lot of pleasure, the success of Scottish artists, performers and writers give people a sense of pride, that artists, performers and writers are important people who contribute to society, and the arts and cultural activities help bring communities together and help enrich the quality of people's lives* (Ruiz, 2004:18).

A 2004 study conducted by Market Opinion Research International (Ipsos-MORI) for the MLA found that the majority of the British population think it is important for their local town or city to have its own museum or art gallery. This includes a substantial proportion (76%) of those who had not visited during the past 12 months (MLA, 2004: 3).
Burns Owen Partnership reports a study for the British Library where non-users were willing to pay in tax more than twice what the Library currently receives in public investment (Pung et al, 2004 in Burns Owen Partnership 2005: 7). Similar studies for the BBC (Davies, 2004) and Norwegian libraries (Aabo, 2005) revealed similar findings in terms of willingness to pay irrespective of direct use.

Non-use values

A second application of the term 'use' applies when considering both the financial and the non-financial benefits of culture (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002; McCarthy et al, 2004). 'Use' in the economic context is important for both cultural policy development and future funding decisions. In economic terms, use values as are market values and can be assigned a price.

*Use values of material heritage refer to the goods and services that flow from it that are tradable and priceable in existing markets. For instance, admission fees for a historic site, the cost of land, and the wages of workers are values. Because they are exchanged in markets, these values can be easily expressed in terms of price, and they are susceptible to economists' many analytical tools based on neoclassical theory (Mason, 2002: 13).*

Non-use values on the other hand, are economic values that are not traded in or captured by markets and are therefore difficult to express in terms of price. For instance, many of the qualities described as socio-cultural values are also non-use values. They can be classed as economic values because individuals would be willing to allocate resources (spend money) to acquire them and/or protect them.

*The economics field describes non-use values as emanating from the public-good qualities of heritage—those qualities that are "nonrival" (consumption by one person does not preclude consumption by someone else) and "nonexcludable" (once the good/service is provided to anyone, others are not excluded from consuming it) (Mason, 2002: 13).*
Mourato and Mazzanti (2002: 51) argue that, this 'non market' dimension of cultural heritage can work against it when it comes to making decisions for sustainable funding. Though the non-financial benefits of culture are valued by society, they remain outside markets and are not valued against any market price. This form of 'market failure' can result in under-funding, leaving the conservation of many important cultural assets at the mercy of political whims and overstretched government budgets.

Matarasso (1997), Throsby (2002) and Holden (2004) argue for a more holistic interpretation of economics. They define economic value as investment in a society's resources for long term sustainability, rather than a narrow focus on commercially monetized values held against markets.

Economic value is determined by the extent to which something enhances or detracts from our well-being. Something has economic value if its benefits to the well-being of society (including future generations) are greater than or outweigh its costs. Though it encompasses commercial value – as expressed through monetary exchange within markets – economic value is not restricted to values that are revealed through markets. The full schema of economic value incorporates commercial (or market) value; use values not captured within markets; and non-use values (Holden, 2004: 31).

Throsby (2002:101) suggests that an approach to viewing the economic value of culture which takes account of non-use values is through the notion of cultural capital. Heritage, Throsby argues, brings with it 'stores of cultural value—that is, things that have been inherited from the past which are valuable in themselves and which yield value to those who enjoy them, both now and in the future' (2002: 101). These accumulated stores of cultural value can generate a flow of services that provide continuing benefits for individuals, communities and the economy and which, combined, constitute the cultural capital of a heritage asset.

In Throsby's view, the economic value of a heritage asset or of the goods and services to which it gives rise, is reflected in both use and non-use values. He provides the example of Venice.
The different types of economic values identified above can be illustrated with reference to Venice...... A significant proportion of these direct use values is generated by tourism, which provides the tangible revenue base upon which the local economy is sustained. In addition, Venice gives rise to all three of the nonmarket benefits noted above: people all over the world care deeply about the continued existence of Venice, even if they have never been there; many would be willing to pay something simply to preserve the option of visiting it at some time; and the city is surely regarded as part of Italy’s and the world’s cultural patrimony, which must be passed on intact to future generations (Throsby, 2002: 104).

Institutional value

To instrumental, intrinsic and use value we add the role of public institutions in the creation and maintenance of Public Value. Initially introduced by Mark Moore (1995), Public Value refers to both the value created by government through services, laws regulation and public institutions (Kelly et al, 2002) and the role that public sector managers can play in maintaining an organisation’s legitimacy through actively seeking public input into program development and service delivery (Blaug et al, 2006).

Public value thus turns on public authorisation for an organisation’s activities. If organisations are to create public value in their practices and use evaluative standards to measure their performance, then those values and evaluative standards must be authorised by the public (Blaug et al, 2006: 7)

Holden advocates adopting the concept of Public Value and adapting it to the cultural sector where, he argues, cultural institutions have a significant role to play as active agents in the creation or destruction of Public Value.

Holden’s thesis is that public institutions are integral to building public confidence. He argues that well-run public agencies that are ethical, fair and equitable in their dealings with the public and transparent in their practice generate trust in the public realm (2004: 44).
The role of public institutions in creating Public Value is the framework adopted by the British Broadcasting Corporation's (BBC, 2004) in its 2004 application to renew its licence. The BBC maintains that it creates value across several dimensions which, together, create Public Value. These value dimensions include contributing to democratic value through encouraging national debate and providing trusted and impartial news coverage through which the public can engage with current issues; developing cultural and creative value through fostering talent, encouraging new programming and celebrating heritage; promoting educational value through knowledge and skills building; fostering social and community value by showcasing difference and encouraging understanding of difference; generating economic value through investment in creativity; and building global value 'by being the world's most trusted provider of international news and information, and by showcasing the best of British culture to a global audience' (BBC, 2004: 8).

---

16 Building public value: Renewing the BBC for a digital world, 2004
A preliminary values typology for museums

This research finds that each of the values typologies outlined in this chapter enriches the discussion and the conceptualization of what constitutes cultural value. Distilled from the literature analysis, this research proposes a typology of four value dimensions and three beneficiary groups for museums (Table 1). It adopts:

1. the dimension of instrumental value which is the expected end-result of much cultural policy in the UK and Australia;
2. the dimension of intrinsic value raised in the writings of McCarthy et al (2004), Ellis (2003), Jowell (2003) and Holden (2004, 2006);
3. the ‘institutional’ dimension introduced by Holden (2006: 15);
4. the additional dimension of ‘use’ (The Outspan Group 1999; Mason, 2002; Holden 2004; Ruiz 2004; MLA 2004); and
5. the three beneficiary groups: individuals, the community and the economy outlined in various typologies (The Outspan Group 1999; Geutzkow, 2002; McCarthy et al, 2004;);

Under each dimension of value, it ascribes aspects associated with beneficiary groups according to an analysis of the literature. It subsumes many of the intangible outcomes of heritage value within the dimension of intrinsic value accruing to the benefit of communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value dimensions</th>
<th>Intrinsic values</th>
<th>Instrumental values</th>
<th>Institutional values</th>
<th>Use values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>- Captivation</td>
<td>- Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Direct use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pleasure</td>
<td>- Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Existence use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Empathy</td>
<td>- Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Option use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Perspective</td>
<td>- Health and well</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bequest use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Uplifting</td>
<td>being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>- Opportunities to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>develop creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/</td>
<td>- Spiritual and</td>
<td>Increased social</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Trust in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>society</td>
<td>religious value</td>
<td>cohesion through:</td>
<td></td>
<td>public realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(enlightenment,</td>
<td>a) Greater social</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Support for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>insight wonder)</td>
<td>capital (reducing</td>
<td></td>
<td>democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>social exclusion,</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Equity and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tolerance for</td>
<td></td>
<td>fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cultural diversity,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>active citizenship)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(social awareness,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>renewal, recreation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>new knowledge,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>- Civic branding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Multiplier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effect on local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regeneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This preliminary values typology arises from an analysis of a literature generated by government and cultural sectors. However, the concept of Public Value is based on the principle that it is the public themselves the ultimately define and authorize value who, therefore, need to be involved in values identification and attribution (Kelly et al, 2002; Mason, 2002; Holden, 2004, 2006; Blaug et al, 2006).

Increased public involvement in values identification is supported elsewhere. One factor is the trend towards demand-led approaches in cultural planning, illustrated by justifying the spending of limited public money on cultural heritage, basing resource allocation on consumer benefits and an increasing

...consumer orientation in cultural institutions including investigating and reaching new markets, encouraging repeat visits by change and renewal, providing integrated experiences, and striving to surpass expectations (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002: 63).

A second factor is the increasing democratization within the cultural sector witnessed in the shift to recognizing the role of the public in values' discussions.

This democratization is a positive development in our field and bears witness to the importance of heritage in today's society....Today the opinions of experts are often a few among many, in an arena where it is recognized that heritage is multivalent and that values are not immutable (de la Torre and Mason, 2002: 3)

Thirdly, there is a philosophical shift from a positivist position where the focus is on justifying social policy and through quantifiable data to an interpretivist paradigm in which the goal is to develop an empathetic understanding of what the public values.

The question posed by our public value approach is whether the views of those who receive services and those who deliver them are adequately taken into account in the construction and conception of public value (Blaug et al, 2006: 7)
Conclusion

The literature notes a growing trend towards a value-based framework for articulating and assessing cultural worth. A preliminary typology has been proposed based on literature analysis. To ascertain its relevance, this typology requires testing with professionals associated with the museum sector and the general public.

Should there be sufficient data to support the typology, then it may provide a framework for developing a set of generic indicators supported with evidence by which value can be assessed. Together these aspects may form the basis of a new paradigm for assessing the value of museums.

Testing this typology and determining whether there is evidence to support these value claims is the subject of the primary research, the design of which is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE: THE RESEARCH DESIGN

From the literature review, three major issues emerge. One is philosophical, one is methodological and one is political. The philosophical dimension relates to 'what' kind of a paradigm should form the basis for determining the worth and significance of culture in general and museums in particular. Critics find the positivist paradigm focused on instrumental impact limited. A growing number of commentators argue for a paradigm that will express the full range of values that accrue to individuals and communities from the presence and experience of culture/museums (The Outspan Group, 1999; Mason, 2002; McCarthy et al, 2004; Holden 2004 and 2006).

The second aspect is methodological. There are calls for an overarching framework to assess value (The Outspan Group 1999; AEGIS, 2004; Ruiz, 2004; Burns Owen Partnership, 2005). This framework requires the production of a generic set of defensible indicators (Matarasso, 1996; Jermyn, 2001; Cultural Heritage Consortium, 2002, Selwood, 2002; Wavell et al, 2002; IFACCA, 2004) that reflect both quantitative and qualitative outcomes.

The third dimension is political and relates to 'whose values' determine the criteria on which the worth of museums is assessed. The development of a new paradigm needs to include the perspectives of both professionals and the public to balance the government position (Blaug et al, 2006). Professionals have knowledge of the intent of museums and their institutional value but in a democracy only the public can determine what is truly of value to them (Kelly et al, 2002; CHASS, 2006; Holden 2004 and 2006). There are already precedents for public involvement in cultural values identification:

*The Heritage Lottery Fund has convened citizens' juries to articulate what it is about heritage that the public values. Although the sample sizes are small, results show an unprompted high level of sophistication on the part of the public, and an appreciation of what culture can and does achieve, once they are made aware of the provision (Holden, 2004: 39)*
In response to these issues, the primary research focused on two questions. The first question examines the types of value that the public and professionals attribute to museums. The second question explores whether there is evidence to support these values.

The rest of this chapter describes the research design that was employed to obtain the primary data.

Choosing a research framework

A paradigm is a set of propositions that explain how the world is perceived; it contains a world view, a way of breaking down the complexity of the real world, telling us ‘what is important, what is reasonable’ (Patton, 1990: 37).

In commencing the primary research, three research paradigms were examined. These three paradigms are positivism, critical perspective and interpretivism (Crotty, 1998; Sarantakos, 1998).

In positivism, reality is external to the individual and governed by universal laws. The aim of positivist research is to discover and explain these laws and to use this knowledge to predict the course of events through direct cause and effect linkages. The assumption of universality predisposes positivist research towards large representative samples, indicative of the population as a whole. Research within the positivist paradigm is deductive, seeking to prove hypotheses using methods adapted from scientific research and applied according to strict rules and procedures. Positivism focuses on apprehending and studying reality through the senses and favours methods that produce tangible results. Quantitative methods, which produce observable, quantifiable data are used predominantly.
A second research paradigm, critical perspective, has evolved from Marxist theory and feminist studies. It is based on a world view of tension, conflict and confrontation arising from perceived exploitation and oppression. Within the critical paradigm, reality is both objective and subjective, both external and internal to the individual. Through oppression by external forces, individuals are considered to be conditioned and hindered from realizing their potential. Social research can be an instrument for liberation and emancipation by explaining and elucidating repressive social systems.

A third paradigm, interpretivism, seeks to understand and interpret social reality through discovering the meanings that people attach to things, relationships and events. Interpretivism views human beings as creators, who can generate systems of meaning and make sense of their world unrestricted by external laws. Unlike positivism which seeks to test and prove existing theory, interpretivism builds theory, allowing it to evolve inductively as the research progresses. Because it is non-deterministic, cause/effect linkages are not sought. Reality in this paradigm is a subjective creation of people's minds and may, therefore, be interpreted differently by different people.

Sampling in the interpretivist paradigm tends towards typical cases rather than towards large numbers, is purposive in its choice of respondents rather than random and employs suitability as a criterion for selection more than representativeness (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Interpretivist data gathering methods try to capture reality as it is experienced by the respondents, present information gathered verbally in descriptive form and use the respondents' own words to describe their views and experiences. To achieve these aims, qualitative methods are predominantly used and a flexible approach with regard to the choice of instruments and procedures and the use of methods is allowed (Sarantakos, 1998: 55).
In the interpretivist paradigm, the development of hypotheses evolves through a process of communication between researcher and respondent working together for a common goal. Statements collected in the course of the research illuminate patterns of meaning and interaction and are considered parts of the process of creation, reproduction and explanation of social reality.

The philosophical assumptions and principles of interpretivism were considered to provide the most appropriate framework within which to conduct the primary research for this study.

Selecting the samples

In line with the interpretivist paradigm, the samples for this study were selected purposively. In the case of the professional cohort, suitability was a key criterion in selection while the public cohort was constructed with a focus on including typical cases.

This study applied Sarantakos' (1998: 448) guidelines for sample selection through addressing a series of questions: (a) What were the procedures used to select the sample? (b) What measures are employed to avoid errors? (c) How were ethical issues addressed? (d) Who are the respondents? (e) What was the size and composition of the sample? (f) What are the characteristics of the population? These issues are discussed with relation to each of the two cohorts in the next sections of this chapter.

Procedures used to select the professional sample

The professional museum community in Australia is a relatively small one. ‘At the end of June 2004 there were 7,624 persons employed in museums, comprising 4,291 (56.3%) full-time employees and 3,252 (42.7%) part-time employees’ (ABS, 8560.0. 2004).
The research sought respondents for the professional cohort from people directly employed by Commonwealth, state and local museums at senior executive and senior staff level who brought to the study both a comprehensive overview of the complex range of issues facing contemporary museums and considerable personal experience within the field.

A number of these respondents were members of Museums Australia, the national professional organisation representing museums and galleries and the people who work in them and those Directors who participated in the study were also members of the Council of Australasian Museum Directors (CAMD).

Potential respondents were initially contacted by email and invited to participate in the study. The following invitation was issued:

*Since 1991, museum attendances in Australia have declined. There is evidence that this pattern is not confined to Australia. This phenomenon occurs at a time when there are more museums in Australia than ever before and when, globally, there is evidence that there is more literature on museums, more news about museums, new and diverse ways to access museums and a greater profile of museums as centres of cultural tourism and urban renewal. What explanations can we offer, then, for the phenomenon of simultaneous growth and decline? Do declining attendances indicate that there is declining value for museums and what they offer?*

*This PhD study will explore these questions through researching the value of museums to communities from the perspectives of both those whose work is associated with the museum industry and the end users - the general public.*

*This study will explore the contribution that museums make to the community and the value attributed to that contribution from the perspectives of museum professionals and the public. A second stage will use the data from the two cohorts to explore ways in which the value of museums to the community can be measured appropriately.*

*Each of these cohorts (museum professionals and end-users) will comprise separate samples for the research. You are invited to be a participant in cohort (1) - professionals associated with the museum sector. Participation in the project is voluntary, but if you agree to participate, your commitment will be required for the duration of the study which will take place over a period from July-November 2002*
Measures used to avoid errors

The most critical issue that the author faced in undertaking this research was the potential for respondent bias. Selwood (2002b), IFACCA (2004) and Belfiore and Bennett (2006) note differences between the aims of advocacy and research. They caution against the potential for bias amongst professionals working in the sector, particularly at senior executive level, charged with advocating on behalf of the sector to secure funding.

To address these issues, the author established a set of checks and balances within the professional cohort by including non-executive museum employees as well as other professionals associated with the museum field but not directly employed within it. The latter were academics, service providers, a cultural planner working in local government where a museum was a significant part of a regeneration scheme and a senior official in a state government tourism office with a special interest in cultural tourism. The inclusion of these respondents also extended the range of perspectives brought to bear on the study questions.

The establishment of a second cohort of public user and non-users of museums provided another mechanism for checks, balances and comparisons. A third mechanism was applied through the processes of the primary research. The professional respondents were required to substantiate value claims with evidence. This mechanism encouraged a self reflective scrutiny.

Ethical considerations

Permission from the University of Sydney Ethics Committee was sought in May 2002 to contact and invite participation from the professional sector. This was subsequently granted and a subject information statement and consent and confidentiality form was sent to each respondent who had indicated initial willingness to participate. The research involving the professional cohort commenced in July 2002. Throughout the reporting of the findings in this thesis, care has been taken to reference comments indirectly.
Composition, characteristics and size of the professional sample

To achieve an overarching evaluation framework which would have generic applicability (Wavell et al, 2002) required the purposive selection of respondents (Miles and Huberman, 1994) representative of a range of museums. Respondents to the professional cohort (see Figure 7) were sought from across the country, from Commonwealth, state and local museums, located in both urban and regional centres and from institutions that collectively represent a cross section of major collection fields.

The participants represented the three main Commonwealth museums, five out of the seven state/territory museums and a variety of regional, local and specialist museums including a children's museum, a migration museum, a community museum, local historical museums and house museums. Three of the state museums (Western Australia, Queensland and Victoria) comprise multiple sites and the respondents from these three institutions were bringing perspectives from across a range of different collections and museum types. Museum Victoria, for example, comprises the Immigration Museum, Science Works (an interactive science discovery centre) and Melbourne Museum, a large urban campus with natural history, social history and ethnographic collections. Queensland Museum includes six sites: the main campus in Brisbane with natural history, social history and ethnographic collections as well as a science centre, The Museum of Lands, the Cobb and Co Museum in Toowoomba, the Museum of Tropical Queensland in Townsville, The Workshops Rail Museum in Ipswich and The Woodworks Museum in Gympie. The Western Australian Museum consists of the main campus in Perth, the West Australian Maritime Museum and other sites in Geraldton, Albany, Fremantle and Kalgoorlie-Boulder. Another sampling issue was to ensure that the cohort reflected the population base that museums serve. The majority of museums are located in the three most populous states, New South Wales (31.1%), Victoria (21.5%) and Queensland (17.5%) (ABS, 8560.0, 2003-4) and the cohort was structured to reflect this population concentration. The total sample selected for the professional cohort is outlined in Figure 9 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Type of museum</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>SH/AE</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SH/AE/NH</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SH/AE/NH</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 6</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SH/AE/NH/A</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 7</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 8</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SH/AE/NH</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 9</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 10</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Community museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 11</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Specialist museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 12</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Special museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 13</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>SH/AE/NH</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 14</td>
<td>Senior Exec</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 15</td>
<td>Senior Curator</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>SH/AE/NH</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 16</td>
<td>IT Specialist</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SH/ID/SC</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 17</td>
<td>Curatorial Division Head</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>SH/AE/NH</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 18</td>
<td>Curator</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Support services for regional museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 19</td>
<td>Prof Dev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Support services for regional museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 20</td>
<td>Prof Dev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Support services for regional museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 21</td>
<td>Prof Dev</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Support services for regional museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History Academic/Museum Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure Studies Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design Studies Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Studies Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Studies Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government Cultural Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Australia Cultural Tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Participants Professional Cohort**

**KEY:** SH (Social History) AE (Anthropology/Ethnography) NH (Natural History) TD Technology/Design) A (Art) SC (Physical Science)
Procedures used to select the public cohort

The author applied to the Ethics Committee separately to conduct research with a second cohort of public respondents and to use a professional recruitment agency to establish this cohort. The use of a recruitment agency enabled identification of a public cohort unknown to the author and dispersed across three locations.

The specifications for this study and the sample design were developed by the author and send to three companies. The company selected was able to comply with the specifications and the timeframe for recruitment.

Ethical considerations


Composition, characteristics and size of the public sample

The recruiting agency was asked to find respondents according to the specifications outlined in Figure 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adelaide</th>
<th>Regional centres</th>
<th>Sydney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young adults 18-24 years</strong></td>
<td>Young adults 18-24 years</td>
<td>Young adults 18-24 years</td>
<td>Young adults 18-24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (15)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (15)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents with children under 12 years</strong></td>
<td>Parents with children under 12 years</td>
<td>Parents with children under 12 years</td>
<td>Parents with children under 12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (15)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (15)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adults without children 35-50 years</strong></td>
<td>Adults without children 35-50 years</td>
<td>Adults without children 35-50 years</td>
<td>Adults without children 35-50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (15)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (15)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seniors 55+</strong></td>
<td>Seniors 55+</td>
<td>Seniors 55+</td>
<td>Seniors 55+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (15)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 1- museum visitors (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (15)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
<td>Group 2- non museum visitors (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10: Recruiting specifications - public cohort*

**Specifications for recruiters**

The agency was provided with the following guidelines to follow in the recruitment of participants.

A. **Background Information for recruiters**
1. You are being asked to recruit participants for a study that will be conducted via email from February 2003 until June 2003.
2. The subject of the study is the value of museums to communities.
3. The study will take the form of a series of questions forwarded and returned by email.
4. Please ensure that potential respondents are aware of the nature and length of the study and respectfully request a commitment for the duration of the study.
5. Once a respondent satisfies the recruiting criteria, please forward the attached consent form by email, ask them to read it, sign it and mail it back to Carol Scott/149 Bland Street/Haberfield/NSW 2045/phone 02-9799 8969 by 31st January.
B. Criteria for recruitment
a) Each respondent must be contactable by email
b) Museum visitors must have made four visits to a museum over the last three years.
c) For the purposes of this study, the term museums refers to science museums and social history museums (Adelaide: South Australian Maritime Museum/ South Australian Museum/Migration Museum/National Motor Museum; Sydney: Australian Museum, Powerhouse Museum, National Maritime Museum; Longreach: Australian Stockman’s Hall of Fame/ Longreach Powerhouse Museum/ Longreach Cultural Association). It does not include science centres or art galleries.
d) Non-museum visitors are those who have made no visits to museums, science centres or art galleries over the last four years.

C. Recruiting Questions
Question 1: Within the last two years have you been to an exhibition at any of the following?
c) Longreach: Australian Stockman’s Hall of Fame, Longreach Powerhouse Museum, Longreach Cultural Association
Question 2: How many times would you have been to any or all of these museums in the last three years?
Question 3: Do you have a personal email address that you access on a daily basis?

D. Respondent Information (for recruiters to provide to respondents)
(Explanation of study) This PhD study is researching the value of museums to the community. This is an important study which enables the general public to voice their opinions about the role that museums play in their lives and in the lives of their community. Problems with museums will also be canvassed.
1. You are being asked to participate in a national study that will be conducted via email from February 2003 until June 2003.
2. The subject of the study is the value of museums to communities.
3. The study will take the form of a series of questions forwarded and returned by email.
4. The study will take place from early February until June 2003.

If you agree to participate, you must sign a consent and confidentiality form and forward it to Carol Scott/ 149 Bland Street/ Haberfield/ NSW 2045/ phone 02-9799 8969 by 31st January, 2003. The consent form is a necessary requirement by the university where the researcher is undertaking her PhD. I will send you the consent form now by email.
Response rate

120 visitors and non-visitors to museums were recruited. Of these, 40 people lived in a major city (Sydney) and 40 lived in a smaller city (Adelaide). Though the author originally asked for respondents from a regional centre in Queensland (Longreach) to be part of the sample, recruiting in this area proved difficult. The recruiters suggested regional Victoria as an alternative. This proved to be a better solution as the respondents were sourced from more than one regional center (Ballarat, Shepperton, Geelong, Apollo Bay) providing greater diversity across the regional component.

Of the 120 people recruited, 70 formally agreed to participate in the study which lasted from early February to late July 2003. They covered four life stages (18-24 years, parents with dependent children, adults 35-50 without dependent children and seniors 55-70) and included both visitors and non-visitors to museums. As can be seen from Figure 11, the final sample comprised 70 respondents who covered a range of occupations and included both employed and unemployed people (students, retirees, people seeking paid work).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-24 years</th>
<th>Parents with children under 12 years</th>
<th>Adults 35-50 years without children</th>
<th>Seniors 55-70 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Visitors n=4</td>
<td>Visitors n=7</td>
<td>Visitors n=6</td>
<td>Visitors n=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-visitors n=4</td>
<td>Non-visitors n=4</td>
<td>Non-visitors n=5</td>
<td>Non-visitors n=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional areas</td>
<td>Visitors n=4</td>
<td>Visitors n=3</td>
<td>Visitors n=2</td>
<td>Visitors n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-visitors n=2</td>
<td>Non-visitors n=4</td>
<td>Non-visitors n=3</td>
<td>Non-visitors n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>- student x 5</td>
<td>- health worker x 2</td>
<td>- teacher x 2</td>
<td>- self employed x2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IT support worker</td>
<td>- company worker</td>
<td>- student</td>
<td>- visiting research fellow/university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- customer service worker</td>
<td>- manager</td>
<td>- self employed x2</td>
<td>- clerical worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- university lecturer</td>
<td>- home duties x 4</td>
<td>- unemployed</td>
<td>- sporting coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- real estate workers x 2</td>
<td>- clerical officer</td>
<td>- insurance</td>
<td>- retired x 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- insurance consultant</td>
<td>- unemployed x 2</td>
<td>- manager</td>
<td>- bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- exhibition</td>
<td>- company</td>
<td>- film animator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- company</td>
<td>- manager</td>
<td>- teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- librarian x 2</td>
<td>- film director</td>
<td>- security guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- sales rep</td>
<td>- service manager</td>
<td>- home carer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- prison officer</td>
<td>- production manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- retailer</td>
<td>- works programmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- clerical worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Final list of participants- public cohort
Approach to the study

Miles and Huberman (1994: 17-18) believe that most qualitative studies commence with a general conceptual framework that explains the main issues to be studied- the key factors, constructs or variables and the relationships among them. Qualitative research may range from tight, pre-structured studies to loose, emergent ones. In Sarantakos' view (1998: 106) frameworks in qualitative research emerge from experience, are revised and corrected through research and refocused to serve the needs of the study.

*In most cases the investigator knows enough about the setting but not enough about the research question; at least not enough to support a conclusion or a theory. The investigator usually knows, before the fieldwork begins, what questions require an answer, what setting to investigate, which actors to approach, which processes to consider, what types of events to register and what instruments to employ* (Sarantakos, 1998: 106)

This quotation describes the course of this study. When the study commenced in 2002, there was an emerging, but limited, theoretical literature available. The 1997 election of New Labour to power in Britain commenced the cycle of policy development to tackle social exclusion through a whole- of-government approach. The Department of Culture, Media and Sport responded to the government initiative with a flurry of reports, discussion papers and publications including Efficiency and Effectiveness of Government Sponsored Museums and Galleries (1999), Museums for the many: Standards for Museums and Galleries to use when developing access policies (1999), Centers for Social Change: Museums, Galleries and Libraries for All: Policy Guidance on Social Inclusion for DCMS funded and local authority museums, galleries and archives in England (2000) and 'Evidence Based Policy Making: Identifying 'What Works’” (2002). This suite of publications located the role of museums firmly within the social policy agenda, structurally enforced by evidence-based policy, results-based accountability and impact evaluation.
The primary research for this study commenced in 2002 within an emerging theoretical framework. Initially, the research sought to explore the contribution of museums to long term impacts for individuals, communities and the economy from the perspective of two cohorts that had previously been largely excluded from the construction of impact indicators.

Within three years of the publication of Centers for Social Change: Museums, Galleries and Libraries for All, aea consulting and Demos, the British think tank, had joined forces to stage the Valuing Culture forum (2003) which challenged the British government's instrumental approach to assessing cultural value. This forum was the catalyst for a new wave of critical commentary. As discussed in Chapter 1, recent literature on value has provided the author with a wider analytical framework within which to explore the findings from the primary research.

Choosing a methodology

A methodology is a model which entails theoretical principles as well as a framework that provides guidelines about how research is done in the context of a particular paradigm (Sarantakos, 1998: 32). As discussed in previous sections of this chapter, the author selected an interpretivist paradigm within which to locate this study. Interpretivist social research uses qualitative methodology to uncover subjective realities, explore meanings and interpret social life through capturing reality as it is experienced by respondents (Sarantakos, 1998: 46).

Qualitative methodology aims to understand people rather than to measure them. It favours descriptive data presented verbally and uses the respondents' own words to illustrate their views and experiences. Among the features of qualitative methodology, Patton (1990: 40-41) cites:
1. Naturalistic inquiry which studies real-world situations as they unfold and which allows for both exploration of new areas and detailed inspection and of some aspects;
2. Inductive analysis in which the evaluator is immersed in the details and the specifics of data to discover important questions;
3. Holistic inquiry in that the whole phenomenon under study is understood as a complex system that is more than the sum of its parts;
4. Qualitative data, thick description;
5. Personal contact and insight with the researcher getting close to the people, situation and phenomenon under study;
6. Dynamic systems, with attention to process and change;
7. Context sensitivity, placing findings in a social, historical and temporal context;
8. Design flexibility as understanding deepens.

Qualitative methodology is particularly appropriate to this study given the dynamic nature of the subject, the specific context within which it is evolving and the research objective to seek the views of the respondents to be expressed in their own words.

This view is supported by Mason (2002: 15) who believes that qualitative research methods including narratives, analyses written by experts and interviews of ordinary citizens, elicit cultural values more effectively than quantitative methods. Moreover, he suggests that some kinds of values in particular (such as spiritual values) resist being compared or scaled and thus are more susceptible to elucidation through qualitative methods. Satterfield (2002: 88) concurs with this view.

...some values cannot be expressed as numbers or declarative statements but are, instead, embedded in the contextually, emotively, and morally rich stories and conversations through which we define ourselves and our actions in relation to natural systems. With this in mind, one set of studies speculated that more inclusive portraits of value could be found in value-rich narratives if only one could elicit such narratives from lay stakeholders in a defensible manner.
Methods of data collection

Methods refer to the tools or instruments employed to gather empirical evidence or to analyse data (Sarantakos, 1998: 32). In the case of this study, the author sought methods that would provide the ‘thick description’ (Patton, 1990: 40) that is necessary to qualitative analysis.

Open-ended questions were developed for distribution to each of the cohorts. In addition, the methods chosen needed to engage dispersed respondent groups, representative, on the one hand, of professionals working in Commonwealth, state and local museums across the country and, on the other, of a geographically-scattered public cohort.

The author capitalised on the prevalence of internet use in Australia where 84% of persons aged 16 years and over have internet access, 59 per cent of households have the internet at home, and where sending and receiving electronic mail is the most common use of the internet at 82% (DCITA, 2004:5). Questions and responses were sent and received by email. Throughout the study, the responses of both cohorts were kept distinct with neither cohort having access to the responses of the other.

The increasing use of the internet in social research is cited by Desai (2002) and Silverman (2004). Online survey software such as surveycraft and surveymonkey are now part of the tool-box of contemporary market research. The advantages of online surveying include access to a geographically dispersed public and less time spent in data analysis (with online surveying tools, analysed data is available in real-time rather than having to input data collected through hard copy questionnaires into a statistical software package such as SPSS before analysis can occur). Email interviews are also increasingly in journalism, where the provision of a written record has advantages in terms of more precise reporting (Hart, 2006).
The primary research which formed part of this thesis falls between the structured questionnaire available through online software survey packages and the more interactive format of the email interview used in journalism. Each respondent in this study was sent a set of specific, open-ended questions to which open ended answers were allowed. However, there was no discussion of the responses with the interviewee once the replies were received.

**Developing the questions**

Open-ended were developed to enable the respondents to describe the value of museums from multiple perspectives in their own words without reference to the preliminary values typology generated by an analysis of the literature and described in the previous chapter. These perspectives included impact, loss, uniqueness, evidence of value and meaning.

**Questions for the professional cohort**

From the expertise, professional knowledge and experience of this cohort, the research sought responses on the significance of museums from three perspectives- impact, evidence of value and difference.

From an analysis of the literature, some issues emerged which effected the construction of the questions, particularly those associated with impact. Firstly, in definitional terms, positive impacts accruing to a beneficiary are a form of value (see Chapter 1). Secondly, public funding is based on the assumption that there is some positive value in having and supporting museums. Thirdly, the necessity of articulating impact within existing funding structures and policy constraints is a political reality for museum professionals. Finally, there is a gap in what is constitutes impact due to the absence of professional and public perspectives in the construction of indicators.
For these reasons, this study took the view that the primary research offered an opportunity to explore what impacts the professional and public cohorts perceived resulted from the museum experience. Therefore, the questions for the professional cohort began with a general definition of impact and provided some structure to responses by asking for examples associated with social, personal and economic impacts of museums.

_Landry et al (1993) describe the 'impact' of cultural activity as 'those effects that go beyond the artefacts and the enactment of the event...and have a continuing influence upon, and directly touch, people's lives.' In considering the impact of museums, we are thinking beyond the immediacy of the museum visit to the long-term effects of museums on communities. These effects may be related to social development, personal development and economic development._

1. In your opinion, what are the long-term impacts of museums on communities?
   Give concrete examples where museums effect social development, personal development and economic development and provide evidence to support your claims.

2. What makes the impact of museums different to other institutions and services? Thinking of examples of the human, social and economic impact of museums, how is the contribution of museums different from that provided by other services and institutions?

3. What evidence do we have that the community values museums?

_**Questions for the public cohort**_

The inclusion of a public cohort addressed Holden's view that (2004: 10) cultural value is to be found 'in the subjective experience of participants'.

Adopting Low's view (2002: 33) that direct elicitation techniques in values identification are not always successful, the author approached the question of value from a variety of perspectives including meaning, contribution and loss.

'Loss' as a benchmark against which to gauge responses has proved effective in other studies. Wavell et al (2002) cites two studies, both conducted at the University of Sheffield, that examined the value of public libraries to their users in the context of library closures and/or the reduction of opening hours.
The authors of the studies (Proctor, Usherwood and Sobczyk, 1996) concluded that for the vast majority of library users the public library is a service of great value, enhancing quality of life, and, for many people, fulfilling an essential need. In three of the four community libraries surveyed, over half of the respondents who had missed the library said they had missed it for a reason related to their well-being or life style (i.e. studying, job seeking, social activity) rather than a more specific book/information related reason.

Bryson et al (2002) used questions of loss in their social impact audit for museums, libraries and archives in south west England and the researcher for this thesis applied them in work conducted for the Australian Heritage Commission in 1991. The questions for the Public cohort were:

1. What does having museums in your city/town mean to you?
2. In your opinion, how do museums contribute to the social development of a community? (b) In your opinion, how do museums contribute to the personal development of the individuals who visit them? (c) In your opinion, how do museums contribute to the economy of communities?
3. If museums no longer existed, what would you, as an individual, lose? If museums no longer existed, what would the community lose?

The research process

The first stage of the study commenced with the distribution of questions to the cohorts.

Upon receipt of responses, all comments were collated and analyzed using content analysis. Content analysis is one of the simplest kind of descriptive statistics (Mason, 2002: 21). It applies a systematic approach to counting the frequency, prominence, direction and intensity of the subject research units. As a qualitative technique, content analysis may be directed towards subjective information such as motives, attitudes and values. Sarantakos (1998: 281) expects that content analysis will address:
1. Whether or not the chosen units appear in the text;
2. The frequency of the appearance of the units;
3. The significance or prominence of the units e.g. which comes first;
4. The evaluation of the units (positive, negative, neutral);
5. The intensity of the statements.

Low (2002: 35) describes ethnosemantic methodologies as ones based on an assumption that culture is encoded in language that can be elicited through a linguistic, taxonomic analysis. Structured questions organize responses into taxonomic categories to create cultural domains of meanings.

After the units of analysis have been ascertained, the researcher identifies and evaluates the items that appear to be theoretically important and meaningful and relates them to the central question of the study (Sarantakos, 1998: 284). In this first stage, the value typology proposed in Chapter 4 was used as a starting point to categorise the data from both cohorts. This study availed itself of the flexibility of qualitative research to be able to be both exploratory while at the same time undertaking detailed inspection of specific aspects. This was applied in a further stage of this study examined the question of evidence.

The study also explored the question of evidence in two ways. In the first set of questions, the professional cohort was asked to provide evidence that the public values museums. In addition to the data provided through this question, the author distilled statements from the professional cohort's responses to the question about the impact of museums on individuals, communities and the economy. These questions were then re-submitted to the professional cohort for rating on a five-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Those statements which received an agreement rating from 65% of the cohort were then asked for substantiation through examples of evidence. Examples of some of the ratings and responses about supporting evidence can be seen in Figure 12. The figures are the percentage of the sample that either disagreed or strongly disagreed, neither agreed or disagreed or, agreed or strongly disagreed with each statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly agree</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum collections provide a unique source of creative inspiration for artists and designers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>- Artists and designers testimonials; - Examples of exhibitions where this is highlighted; - Analysis of relevant audience studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums provide the focus for forging new community networks.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>70.89</td>
<td>Wishful thinking. Museums are well positioned to do so especially in smaller communities. But Museums could also exclude groups and eschew networks. So don't know about evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums reflect cultural shifts in a nation's relationships with indigenous communities</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>90.31</td>
<td>- Number of new Indigenous galleries and special temporary exhibitions in museums in the last 20 years - The number of Indigenous curators employed by museums compared with 10 years ago - Number of Indigenous objects acquired for collections - Number of publications about Indigenous representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums provide a focus for communities to celebrate significant cultural events and rituals.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>86.66</td>
<td>- Number of events - Number of participants - Breadth of events e.g. Special event programs linked to community significant cultural events and rituals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions of validity

The author employed three of the mechanisms described by Miles and Huberman (1994) and Sarantakos (1998: 81-82) to achieve validity in terms of the study. One of these mechanisms is the use of triangulation, or applying multiple methods to obtain a variety of information on the same issues to achieve a higher degree of validity and reliability. In the case of this study, two methods - open ended questions and ratings - were used to refine the number of value statements and drill down for data about supporting evidence. A second method to ensure validity was through the composition of the professional cohort to include both people directly employed in the sector as well as those indirectly associated with the sector through outreach support work, professional development and academic discipline. The second mechanism to achieve validity was the establishment of a second cohort of public respondents which allowed comparisons between responses across the two main cohorts against the matrix of value dimensions and in terms of the responses to the questions on impact and contribution.

Finally, the process corrected a tendency amongst professionals identified by Jermyn (2001), Reeves (2002), Selwood (2002) an IFACCA (2004) to bias impact in favour of the positive to the exclusion of negative effects. The questions allowed for open responses. Dissenting comments as well as positive ones were forthcoming; 'The presence of museums has not eliminated genocide, made the community more tolerant of boat people or encouraged people to drive fuel efficient cars' said one professional respondent. More critical comments are included in the next chapter.

In addition, the requirement of the professional cohort to substantiate their claims with evidence encouraged a self-reflective scrutiny which is apparent in Chapter Seven: The Evidence Base for Value.
CHAPTER SIX: THE VALUE OF MUSEUMS

This chapter reports the combined responses to open-ended questions posed in the first round of the study for both the professional and public cohorts.

The professional cohort comprised 28 people selected from a range of Commonwealth, state and local museums throughout the country. The findings reported in this chapter are responses to two questions

_In your opinion, what are the long-term impacts of museums on communities? Give concrete examples where museums effect social development, personal development and economic development and provide evidence to support your claims._

_What makes the impact of museums different to other institutions and services?_

In addition, 70 people recruited from the general public participated in this round of the study. They covered four life stages (18-24 years, parents with dependent children, adults 35-50 without dependent children and seniors 55-70), lived in both urban and regional centres and included visitors and non-visitors to museums. The public responses are aggregated answers to questions about personal meaning associated with the presence of museums, the perceived contribution that museums make to individuals, the community and the economy and what would be lost to individuals and the community if museums no longer existed. Specifically, the findings reported in this chapter are responses to the questions

1. _What does having museums in your city/town mean to you?_
2. _In your opinion, how do museums contribute to the social development of a community? (b) In your opinion, how do museums contribute to the personal development of the individuals who visit them? (c) In your opinion, how do museums contribute to the economy of communities?_
3. _If museums no longer existed, what would you, as an individual, lose? If museums no longer existed, what would the community lose?_
Firstly, the research finds considerable confirmation for the proposed values typology. Although neither cohort knew of the existence of the typology, both cohorts generated responses that can be categorised according to the four dimensions of intrinsic, instrumental, institutional and use value. Further, it finds that there is considerable commonality between the cohorts. Where differences exist, these are often attributable to differences in perspective with the professional cohort speaking from the perspective of intention and expertise while the public cohort expresses their opinions on the basis of their experience as end-users. Finally, the range of aspects within each category of value is considerably expanded.

Findings: Intrinsic Value

Holden describes intrinsic value as

...all those wonderful, beautiful, uplifting, challenging, stimulating, thought-provoking, terrifying, disturbing, spiritual, witty, transcendental experiences that shape and reflect their sense of self and their place in the world [and] the rootedness that culture provides. This can play out in two ways – in a sense of place and geographical location, where cultural infrastructure can anchor local identities, and in a sense of belonging to a community, either a geographical community, or a cultural community of interest (Holden, 2006: 22-23)

The literature suggests that intrinsic value can be experienced by both individuals and the community. For an individual, the experience of intrinsic value can be as a ‘state of absorption’, or ‘focused attention’ that comes with ‘captivation’, (McCarthy et al, 2004:45), as the ‘deep satisfaction’ that the ‘pleasure’ of seeing an art work or having a cultural experience that is moving and meaningful can engender (McCarthy et al, 2004: 46), as the capacity to explore personal meaning, and personal beliefs in amongst universal truths (Silverman, 1993, 1995; DCMS, 2005: 6), as the provision of a ‘new perspective on the world’ (McCarthy et al, 2004: 48) and as the uplifting spiritual experiences that address our needs to experience ‘the religious, the numinous and the sublime’ (Holden, 2004: 34).
This study finds that all of these aspects are identified by the respondents to this study. Further, it reveals an even greater array of experiences emerging from the responses of the public cohort. The following findings report responses from both cohorts with comments attributed to each.

**Intrinsic values experienced by individuals**

The literature suggests that many of the outcomes claimed within the domain of intrinsic value (perspective, reflection, enrichment, discovery, enlightenment, inspiration) have a cognitive dimension. McCarthy et al. (2004) express this as a capacity to encourage rapt absorption and captivation, inviting visitors to make sense of what they are seeing through focusing their attention on an object or an exhibit.

'Because meanings are embedded in the experience rather than explicitly stated, the individual can gain an entirely new perspective on the world and how he or she perceives it' (McCarthy et al., 2004: 48).

Both cohorts offered comments about the outcomes and impacts on individuals that result from the museum experience.

**Perspective**

The public respondents in this study suggested that one of the outcomes of visiting museums is the development of perspective, experienced through encountering dimensions of time and space beyond the immediate and the personal.

*museums* give a perspective of how insignificant the human race really is. Sometimes that is really good when you feel like things happening in your life are overwhelming (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, urban resident)

*museums* give a chance to view oneself within the fabric of time and space; a perspective of history and where you fit within the frame (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 55-70 years old, urban resident)
People plot their own courses but sometimes museums can help them get a lift up to see destinations beyond their local horizons (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 21)

Reflection

The atmosphere of museums is also found to be conducive to personal reflection.

[a museum] generally is a quiet place (not as quiet as a library) but somewhere you can wander perusing interesting exhibits which are not accessible in my everyday life (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70 years, urban resident)

A quite place to go and have a look and browse; A tranquil place to wander when quiet time is needed (Public cohort: female, visitor, 18-24 years, urban resident)

[a museum is] a quiet place to look back over time and reflect on things that have happened over time (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, urban resident)

Enrichment

Museums supplement, deepen and enhance existing knowledge on a subject. But they also open new possibilities through presenting the unknown.

[A museum] enriches my life by providing me with an opportunity to see/experience/learn about things that I would normally never get the chance to see/experience/learn about (Public cohort: male, visitor, parent, urban resident)

Museums enrich our lives by extending our knowledge of the world around us, both the natural environment and the social and cultural environment. (Professional cohort: Senior Curator State Museum resp 15)

People reminiscing about museum visits when they were children report how the visit opened up a world of possibilities, or introduced the other (the natural world, the past, other cultures) (Professional cohort: Curatorial Division Head- State Museum resp 17)

Provides access to information of, and enrich my knowledge of historical developments of people, art, nature, industry etc; It is good having a museum as there are always new things to have a look at (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 55-70 years, urban resident)
Discovery

Encountering new worlds can be both an exciting and an unsettling experience. Many of the public respondents found that museums provide a safe environment in which to discover the unknown, the unfamiliar and the 'other'.

[Museums offer] possibilities to look at both the familiar and the unexpected. New discoveries among the old friends at every visit (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70 years, urban resident)

Museums are valuable educational sources to teach the public about things that are outside the square in which they live (Public cohort: female, non visitor, 18-24 years, urban resident)

[A museum is] somewhere to visit to search for clues on other life; Individuals would lose or at least have a diminished ability to understand the world generally (Public cohort: female, visitor, 35-50 years, no children)

[Museums] allow us to be armchair travelers (raises questions about why, how and where without having to travel all around the world!) (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, urban resident)

A museum visit can be a voyage of discovery (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 8)

A Museum provides a safe, non-threatening environment where a visitor can at her/his own leisure and in an unstructured way explore experiences and ideas that might otherwise be alien, confronting or provocative (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Community Museum resp 11)

Museums once provided information on things for which many people had no alternative source. Museums were a gateway to an unknown and often threatening world (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

In museums you can find out a great deal about other civilisations, about evolution, about life in general around the world (Public cohort: female, visitor, 35-50, urban resident)
Enlightenment

One respondent to this study felt that museums offer

...information to enlighten those who visit (Public cohort: male, visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

Inspiration

This study finds that the objects and stories presented in museums have the capacity to ‘embody’ or ‘stimulate’ a significant reaction in the beholder (Mason, 2002: 11) which prove inspirational in a variety of ways.

Actually ‘seeing’ an original or authentic object can be personal inspiring and bring home to us the size and appearance of many animals (some extinct) that we will probably never see in the flesh (Public cohort: female, non visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

The example of this beautiful work has inspired some exhibition visitors to take up embroidery, enriching their lives with a creative pastime (Professional cohort: Senior Curator State Museum resp 15)

‘Museums can be a source of inspiration to individuals in their accounts of personal lives, their triumphs and disappointments, their achievements and failures (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 1)

Museums link the individual to the cosmos as a whole; we want to feel the vastness of things, to encounter the transcendent and the awesome; -We want to connect to the highest aspirations of the human species (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28)

The capacity for a visitor to “drill down” for more information can inspire visitors to pursue a topic at depth. This has the potential for life-changing experiences (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 8)

Insight

The Council for the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences suggests that the humanities ‘ask [us] to account for ourselves, our history, our stories, and our human values ...the arts ask the same questions in different ways providing not scientific knowledge but insight...the flashes of inspiration that illuminate and encapsulate our place in the world’ (CHASS, 2005: 13).
Meetings between visitors, objects and stories can have the same effect, resulting in recognition, understanding, awareness and insight.

_The immersive environment and rich media choices of museum galleries encourage those moments of insight which become touchstones for later understanding and recall_ (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 2)

'A valuable insight into unknown subject matter' (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

Respondents describe feelings of well-being (refreshment, excitement, awe, affirmation and joy). McCarthy et al (2004: 46) proposes that the experience of 'pleasure' through cultural encounters provide is 'the primary intrinsic value' exceeding all other outcomes in terms of its importance. Pleasure in object or an exhibit can captivate and absorb the visitor, taking her/him into an imagined realm, 'a departure from one's everyday self that enables one to imaginatively inhabit the created reality being presented'. The respondents to this study express these feelings of well-being in terms of refreshment, the experience of excitement and awe, the comfort of personal affirmation and the sheer joy of seeing and sharing something of value. A professional respondent described 'refreshment' as

_Enhanced feeling of well being after experiences of beautiful things, new ideas, oddities, heritage ... A feeling of refreshment after 'time out' from other pressures of life._ (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

Another professional respondent expressed the capacity of museums to develop sensitivities and values

_[Museums] influence the development of sensitivities and values_ (Professional cohort: Academic- Design Studies resp 24)
Excitement and awe

For some public respondents, ‘Museums can be places of excitement and awe. They can provide windows to art, history and worlds that individuals have no other way of experiencing (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, regional resident).

Having a museum in my city means that I don’t have to go far to learn and see and touch the history and life style of my culture and many others, past and present. This to me is an amazing experience. To be able to walk through and see inventions and designs of the world and how much time has changed peoples perceptions and sense of design. How much technology has expanded with the human mind and how primitive life was in centuries before. I can appreciate life in so many more ways. To me, a museum in my city is a privilege (Public cohort: female, visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

Affirmation

Museums can make individuals feel proud of their own histories (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 2)

Joy

Finally, some of the public respondents in this study referred to the contribution that museums make to ‘sharing’ something of value, particularly with children and significant others, and the joy that this can provide.

Visits to museums have always been a part of my life. If they no longer existed they would leave a gap. My latest visit to the South Australian Museum was with my grandson, and it was a joy to see things there again through his eyes and enthusiasm. The museums are a source of knowledge and pleasure (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident);

I would lose the opportunity to spend time with children who are just awakening to an interest in their communities past and importance. I regularly visit with children through my work within school; to share past experiences with family and friends (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, regional resident)
This study finds that individual experience of museums is more complex than what is described in the proposed typology. The experiential aspects can be categorized into (a) cognitive (b) empathetic and (c) well-being domains outlined in Table 2.

Table 2: Intrinsic values experienced by individuals (Scott 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value category</th>
<th>Cognitive domain</th>
<th>Empathetic domain</th>
<th>Well-being domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value aspect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Refreshment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>Sensitivities and values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excitement and awe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affirmation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlightenment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McCarthy et al (2004: 47) claim that these intrinsic experiences ‘can connect people more deeply to the world’, extending their ‘capacity for empathy’ and compassion through ‘drawing them into the experiences of people vastly different from them and cultures vastly different from their own’ giving individuals new references that can make them more receptive ‘to unfamiliar people, attitudes, and cultures’. This suggests that the positive outcomes experienced by individuals accrue to the common good through ‘aggregation’.

The concept of ‘aggregation’ is unresolved in the literature. McCarthy et al’s typology (2004: 44) proposes that ‘private’ (individual) benefits have some public ‘spillover’. This is especially the case in the category of expanded empathy (an individual benefit) which accrues to the common good resulting in collective tolerance.

However, Guetzkow (2002: 15), questions whether there is sufficient evidence to substantiate claims that cumulative individual impacts result in collective outcomes. He refers to the predominance of individual impact studies and the paucity of community impact studies in this regard. He recommends further research (2002: 16-17) into participation levels, tipping points within a community and the presence of individual cultural catalysts to prove aggregation from micro (individual) impacts to produce macro (community) outcomes.
This study found perceptions among some respondents that aggregation occurs although the degree to which these outcomes can be directly attributed to museums remains open to question. A more probable scenario is one in which museums are a contributing factor amongst many (AEGIS, 2004; McCarthy et al, 2004; Ruiz, 2004).

A public respondents to this study suggested that museums provide 'insight into other's lives (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, regional resident) and another felt that an

_Awareness of local cultural mix can lead to greater acceptance and understanding_ (Public cohort: female, visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

Understanding and tolerance is a theme reiterated among by another public respondent who felt that a museum ‘...helps people understand difference and approach difference with more respect and interest' (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

Importantly, heightened awareness of global issues and the place of one's own community within a global setting is perceived to be a positive outcome of museums.

_Better awareness of themselves within the community; Better awareness of themselves or their community within the broader world; Better awareness of key issues impacting upon alternative futures._ (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

_Being exposed to a greater range of global issues makes individuals more conscious of global events. It [makes] people more understanding and open_ (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 18-24 years, urban resident)

The perspective of one professional who responded to this study was that museums could have an impact on developing tolerance and acceptance among visitors.
Tolerance

Most of our visitors are not [name of cultural group] and by visiting our Museum they can learn about being [name of cultural group] and thereby hopefully learning greater tolerance and also an appreciation of the value of difference (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Community Museum resp 11)

Acceptance

The museum has come to play a role for some communities of a place of acceptance by the official or mainstream community. It’s enabled them to bury some of their old griefs and to thereby move on and to accept that Australia is indeed their new home (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28)

Has [indigenous exhibition] been more important for indigenous or non-indigenous Australians? In some respects I think the Aboriginal communities have seen it as particularly important for the way it enables them to claim a symbolically important part of the non-indigenous cultural terrain and institutions. (Professional cohort: Curatorial Division Head-State Museum resp 17)

The content of an exhibition on immigration may be significant at the time, but in many ways the fact that there is an Immigration Museum, in which the lives of an ethnically diverse community is celebrated, probably has the greater long-term impact (Professional cohort: Curatorial Division Head-State Museum resp 17)

Intrinsic values experienced collectively

An analysis of the literature suggests that intrinsic values can also be experienced collectively. Many of the intrinsic values that communities experience are expressed in the heritage values typology proposed by Mason (2002) and outlined in Chapter 3. These include historical, social, symbolic and spiritual value experiences. Intrinsic values experienced collectively are described in other parts of the literature as the ‘creation of social bonds’ and the ‘expression of communal meanings’ (McCarthy et al, 2004: 50), as the ‘rootedness’ that culture engenders through belonging and as the ‘sense of place’ where ‘cultural infrastructure can anchor local identities’ (Holden, 2006: 24).
This study finds that the intrinsic value of museums is experienced collectively particularly through historical and social value. Lesser emphasis is placed on symbolic and spiritual value.

**Historical value**

This study finds that, of all the intrinsic values experienced at a collective level, historical value is of *most* importance to the public cohort. 54 of the 70 of the public respondents (including many non-visitors) referred to the role of museums in providing access to history.

Mason (2002: 11) defines historical value as the capacity of an object, exhibition or site to embody, convey or stimulate a relationship with or reaction to the past. DCMS acknowledges that historical places or things ‘can show how events and beliefs from the past shape people’s experience of the present’ (DCMS, 2005:6) and provide

*a way for us all to see our place in the world. This is all the more important as society changes, and new values of nationality and community emerge. The fixed points of history and heritage have an even greater meaning as our world becomes smaller, and our values develop.* (DCMS, 2005:3)

The respondents to this study have multiple reasons for valuing the historical experience that museums provide. These include access to the communal archive, experience of the past, learning the lessons of history, experiencing a sense of belonging and identity and the opportunities they provide for cultural transmission and cultural continuity. Examples of each of these aspects follow.

**The communal archive**

The public recognizes the role of museums in providing ‘a repository for items which are too significant to discard, a sort of communal ‘attic’ where items of interest can be deposited’ (Public cohort: male, non-visitors, 55-70, urban resident).
Objects are one of the ways we communicate meaning and they become imbued with meanings through experience with them. [Museums] are guardians of the local collective memory (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3)

Museums work with communities to preserve ... ‘part of their history and memories that have been collected and stored over long periods of time’ (female, visitor, 18-24, urban resident). Museums reassure the public ‘that we are keeping items / information of the past & present to show for the future’ (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 35-50, urban resident). Access to this shared past provides

...a chance for society to gain an understanding of past life culture of local and wider community (Public cohort: male, visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

If museums no longer existed ‘the community would lose many valuable items that would be thrown out or given to persons, organizations that would allow them to fall into disrepair or even be lost for good’ (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident). ‘They [communities] would lose a communal collective of almost everything imaginable (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, urban resident), with the result that

So many good things are lost or forgotten without museums (Public cohort female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

A respondent from the professional cohort summed it up by saying

I find it easiest to think of the long-term impacts of museums on communities by considering what life would be like without them. We would be denied a corporate memory or identity, a serious loss for how can we understand the present without some reference to the past? We depend on museums to maintain our cultural treasures and to reflect upon what is significant, or distinctive, about our community and the environment in which we live (Professional cohort: Senior Curator State Museum resp 15)
Experience of the past

Public respondents in this study identified the unique way in which museums provide 'access to history'. Museums offer

a graphic and physical way of educating and reminding people of their heritage and history and also of other societies history and heritage, in a manner that is or should be easily accessible to all (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 35-50, regional resident)

Historical reconstructions, such as those at the Maritime Museum and Migration Museum offer insights into significant aspects of ways of life that have now past (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

The lessons of history

People believe that it is important to learn the lessons of history because history's lessons can 'show the way'. It is important to remember history to help guide us into the future (female, non-visitor, 18-24, urban resident). What is the quote – “a people that knows no past has no future “ (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident). Museums are

....a reference point to what may have existed before my time and no longer exists or may have evolved into something different (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

The long term impact of a museum should be in its chronicling of past experiences and their effect on the evolution of society, as a reminder of what has gone before, an acknowledgement of achievements and failures, and in sign posting unfinished issues and challenges yet to be faced (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 1)

Cultural continuity

History is important because it is a factor in establishing a sense of cultural continuity. Museums provide 'past history to the present, giving a sense of continuity and belonging; reminder of the communities roots and bind the people together with a common trunk to branch off from (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, regional resident).

If we didn't have museums, 'the history of the community would be lost (Public cohort: male, visitor, 35-50, urban resident)
With the subsequent result that we would lose knowledge of where we fit in (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident) and there would be a 'loss of continuity, where has it been – where is it going (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Communities would lose a very large chunk of their history and path of how they came to be as they are; valuing what communities did in the past – cultural heritage (Public cohort: male, visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

**Belonging and identity**

A connection with history is also the prism through which other intrinsic values, such as belonging, can be realised.

_They [museums] can make people feel like they have something to belong to, a type of heritage (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, regional visitor);

[museums provide] A sense of where we came from. Which in turn develops a sense of pride and belonging (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Museums mean a "Living" link to my History, where I came from, how I developed and how my City was formed (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident).

Of course they are important. They tell us where we have come from. They illustrate the advancement of knowledge, in short, what makes us tick as a human race (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Local Museum resp 10)

This link to the past is important. If museums no longer existed

_Perhaps we as a community would lose our sense of where we came from. Our triumphs and mistakes, as a community would no longer be on display (Public cohort: female, parent, non-visitor, regional resident)

_The community would lose its past - I realise that we must progress into the future but we must also value and appreciate what has gone before and follow our story from its inception (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, regional resident);_
‘I think it is important to be able to see how things used to be’ (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, parent, urban resident).

I think the community would lose its sense of history; or its records of history, which would be of particular loss to children in the community (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 35-50, regional resident)

Cultural transmission

Opportunities to transmit our culture to the next generation through sharing the experience of history is one of the things that people value most about museums. It is perceived to be particularly important that children are introduced to the past. Museums offer parents an opportunity for ‘...showing children what has gone on before them. (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident). This is a form of social bonding across and between generations that offers opportunities for

A father or mother to show the child their experiences of our life and others. To teach them of other civilisations. children will grow up never knowing and that would be a tragedy (Public cohort: female, visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

If museums did not exist, there would be

....no where to take the grand-children to help teach them and show them how it was and what it is (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Where would we be able to take our younger generation, so as they too could see our History (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

This is the domain of collective intrinsic value considered most significant to the public, whether they are visitors and non-visitors. Museums, institutions which provide access to the past, are valued because of they do this.
Social value

Another intrinsic value experienced by communities is social value. Social value is experienced collectively through the use of museums as public-spaces and the social connections and networks that arise from coming together in public spaces. Social value also encompasses place attachment and other forms of community identity that can flow from sense of place (Mason, 2002). All of these aspects of social value were described by respondents to this study.

Civic places and spaces

*Museums have come with opera houses, libraries and universities to occupy the important civic spaces once reserved for churches* (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28)

Sense of place

*Museums give a sense of place. It is the place for a community to say to itself and visitors “This is who we are and why we are here. This is what we have and this is what you can learn from us”* (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

*Museums that interpret the historic use of places (buildings & sites) contribute to understanding of social, political, legal, administrative (etc) history. The museum’s authority assures the visitor that they are “standing on the very spot” where a significant event occurred. The community’s cumulative sense of that significance can influence decision-making for the future* (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

*One of the museum’s objectives was to generate and make available knowledge of other aspects of the region’s heritage. After 10 years the sense of place for many in the community had changed* (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 21)

Community identity

Through researching the history of a local area, a museum can find new knowledge, engender understanding and develop pride about the place where it is located.

*A museum can also have long term impact on its own community by confirming its sense of identity; A Museum can also enable a community to learn more about itself* (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Community Museum resp 11)
Museums in regional communities can be very potent places that help define the character of an area. The new Shear Outback in Hay is a major new architectural icon in the town that is helping to define a more outward looking and contemporary image of the town, whilst at the same time helping the local economy and preserving the history of the region (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 9)

The long-term value of museums lies in their ability to validate individual community cultures, histories and aspirations, and interpret different communities to each other. (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3) Strengthen regional identity versus globalisation; antidote to mass media images, stories increasingly providing a globalised perspective minus what is unique to the local community or regional community identities; Opportunities to see artefacts and stories of local identity and to keep these in a publicly accessible place rather than relying on private memory; Cultural mapping of a community frequently identifies availability of cultural institutions, such as museums, in a community as an indicator of a place’s ‘livability’ (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 19)

In terms of smaller regional communities and the smaller State Capitals, museums seem to play a proportionally larger role in the life of their communities than in the larger cities. The smaller scale of the local museums and the often direct relevance to local people and places enables a much stronger bond to be formed between individuals and the institution (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 6)

Symbolic value

The symbolic value of museums was noted in relation to the shared meanings associated with collectively marking the events of history.

Commemoration

The Australian War Memorial’s dual role as museum and memorial. Yet it draws enormous audiences and its power, lies precisely in being more accepting of its role as shrine than are most museums (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28)

Spiritual value

Finally, spiritual values are attributed through religious meanings attached to a place or through the wonder and awe that a place can inspire.
Museums are as near as we get in a largely secular society to the churches and cathedrals of earlier eras in Western society. Any discussion of them needs to keep in mind that they are a manifestation of “split religion”, to use the sociological phrase. They are shaped by concepts of the sacred and the profane and infused with notions of canonical authority .......... So the first set of long-term impacts is similar to that for religion. Museums link the individual to the cosmos as a whole.... We want to feel the vastness of things, to encounter the transcendent and the awesome, and exhibitions on evolution, for instance, meet that need. We want to connect to the highest aspirations of the human species, to encounter that sense of reaching for the stars, and art museums at their best do that wonderfully as we see the brilliance of our fellow human creators.

(Note that museums often encourage us to think of the great artists as divinely inspired -- like the saints and prophets and writers of sacred scripture.) Museums connect us too to the sense of the immanent godhead. History museums in Australia do this particularly, dealing as they often do with the local and the everyday. In lifting up our things, places and stories they tell us that we are near to the heart of meaning (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28)

In summary intrinsic values experienced communally is described across historical, social, symbolic and spiritual value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value category</th>
<th>Historical value</th>
<th>Social value</th>
<th>Symbolic value</th>
<th>Spiritual value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value aspect</td>
<td>The communal archive</td>
<td>Civic places and spaces</td>
<td>Commemorative events</td>
<td>Wonder and awe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience of the past</td>
<td>Sense of place</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The lessons of history</td>
<td>Community identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td>Cultural transmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intrinsic value accruing to the economy

An interesting and unexpected finding emerging from this study was the perception that the economic contribution that museums make is both indirect and of intrinsic, rather than instrumental value, to communities.
Public respondents to this study offered their opinion that the economic value of museums lies in public access to the ideas archive, in the inspiration that the archive provides and in the potential for new products, processes and solutions which can result. This is a view elaborated more recently by Travers (2006: 80 and 81) in his report for the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council and the National Museum Directors Conference in the UK in which he explores the role of museums in contributing to the growing creative economy and in inspiring a new wave of designers. Public respondents to this study noted that museums have a role:

..providing a knowledge archive for the community - something which is unique and valued by others by providing a research venue for individuals, organizations and businesses (Public cohort: male, visitor, 35-50, regional resident)

..providing stimulus to the creative process, by exposing original ideas and experiments they lead to future developments (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Museums also display ‘new’ ideas, a role celebrated in the 2004 report from the UK National Museum Directors Conference, Creative Engagement.

Museums provide a show space for artists and craftsmen to exhibit their work to the marketplace (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Museums are places where one can be inspired by ‘ideas’. This can have powerful economic effects in the long term.

To have museums helps us to foster our creative imagination in a multitude of ways. Passionate people are productive people (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

Things people see could give them the inspiration to go and build something, or invent something and could make our society millions as a result! (Public cohort: female, visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

They stimulate awareness of the exhibits shown there and so may encourage other activities which could contribute to the economy (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)
This is a view shared by the Independent Working Group for the Prime Minister's Science, Engineering and Innovation Council (PMSEIC). Reporting on the contribution of arts and culture to the creative economy in Australia, the group recommended that

...the role of the cultural sector should also be taken into account alongside the creative industries. The Working Group considers that this inquiry necessitates inclusion of the public access role undertaken by these sectors such as libraries, archives, galleries, museums and arts organisations (PMEISC, 2005: 13)

The PMEISC report argues that, not only do cultural institutions hold the communal archive of ideas which they can display through exhibitions to a diverse and intergenerational audience, but that they have a wide network for the distribution of ideas through outreach programs, links with industry, academic partnerships and international links (PMEISC, 2005: 19).

Findings: Instrumental values

Instrumental value describes the return on an investment in culture with regard to economic benefits such as civic branding, tourism, employment, the multiplier effect on local economies and creative capital, social benefits including increased social capital, social cohesion, tolerance for cultural diversity, urban regeneration and civic participation and individual benefits such as learning, personal well-being and health.

Instrumental benefits experienced by individuals

Learning

Second only to historical value, the opportunities for individual and community learning provided by museums were valued most by the public respondents to this study. Museums provide an engaging, informal and entertaining way for people to self-select their learning. Certainly, the experience of visiting museums is an opportunity for visitors to
...broaden knowledge [and] see things of historical and natural value that I would otherwise have no opportunity to see (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident).

Museums offer the visitor opportunities to engage with the unique, the unusual, the exotic and the extinct. If museums no longer existed, we would have

Nowhere to actually see stuffed animals and different cultures – we would need to do a lot of traveling to see the real thing. Although it is available on TV and Internet is does not provide the same visualization effects (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, urban resident)

The experience of learning in museums is not age-specific. Museums provide learning for all ages at all life stages.

I remember being taken by my folks as a child, visiting as a teenager and now regular visits for fun and as part of uni studies. Each time the experience has been a little different as my view of the world changes (Public cohort: male, visitor, 35-50, urban resident).

But the real contribution of museums is the type of learning experience provided.

By providing information for all five senses! Reading interesting facts, seeing displays, feeling samples and hearing, smelling and sometimes tasting new experiences or environments greater understanding of the impact of environmental changes through actually seeing extinct species (Public cohort: male, visitor, parent, urban resident)

Learning in museums stimulated by objects. Mediated through objects, the learning that occurs in museums is a visual and sensual experience. Objects are windows onto a wealth of information about the time, place, people, stories and connections associated with them (Corum, 2002). Museums provide

A particular way of learning through objects- for children museums are a great visual and interactive reminder of history and can be a better tool for teaching (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, regional resident)
Most importantly they [ideas] can be represented visually rather than simply facts in a journal. This makes museums far more accessible and interesting to visit for many more people (Public cohort: male, visitor, 35-70, urban resident)

We have a visual history of the city (and other things) available to access and learn from without having to read rather textbooks (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

Shows a hands-on and viewing experience of learning (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

Museums provide a visual library of historical information (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

I think museums are an important teaching tool especially for the young, it is far easier to learn about something if you can visualize it that if you just hear about (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 55-70, regional resident)

In museums, learning can be fun and entertaining.

The opportunity to learn in a relaxed non-structured environment whilst socializing at the same time (Public cohort: female, visitor, 35-50, urban resident).

To me personally museums are like ancient wonderlands which tell me about facts, yet at the same time entertaining to learn about (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

Museums offer information and history in an entertaining and uncommercial way (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 35-50, urban resident);

Leisurely entertainment and information sources (Public cohort: male, visitor, parent, urban resident)

They are a marvellous source of information and pleasure (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

...a source of entertainment and knowledge (Public cohort: male, visitor, parent, urban resident)
The professional cohort also recognises the learning outcomes that museums provide.

[Museums] encourage and stimulate intellectual engagement; (Professional cohort: Academic- Design Studies resp 24)

Educational theorists have demonstrated that new learning proceeds from what is already known. In the museum context, new insights are gained when fresh information or perspectives are connected to pre-existing knowledge, changing the whole (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 2)

Skill building

Museums develop the skills of their committee members by giving them the tools to develop insights and understanding into their own community, and how to preserve key aspects of these. (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20)

Instrumental values experienced collectively

While learning benefits can be enjoyed by individual museum visitors, other instrumental benefits accrue to the community as a whole. Learning is an outcome at the collective level where museums provide educational resources for schools and communities. Museums’ contribution to the growth of social capital, social cohesion and social inclusion are important to both communities and governments. Key to these outcomes is the opportunities that museums provide for engagement, participation and community capacity building.

An educational resource for schools

I often visit museums with a class relating to a particular topic or theme currently being studied with my class (Public cohort: female, visitor, 35-70, urban resident)

[museums are an] educational resource without the formality of a classroom where they can see rather than have to read about the items (Public cohort: male, visitor, 35-50, urban resident);
If we didn’t have museums

...schools would lose educational based outings which make the students think/learn, sometimes without realising (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 18-24, regional resident).

A learning resource for the whole community

Museums increase a community’s stock of general and local knowledge.

Museums are somewhere to go, if knowledge or information is required on a certain subject – especially ‘local’ subjects (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 35-50, urban resident); and

...provide an opportunity for communities to learn and ‘see’ outside their own environment (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

If we didn’t have museums

The community would lose a place of learning, a place to explore, a place to take time out and observe quietly things that have shaped their community (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Museums are also places where

....specialists can get together and share knowledge and research (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3)

Knowledge building

Research on collections produces new knowledge. This outcome was particularly acknowledged by the professional cohort.

(1) Archaeological collections contribute to understanding of patterns of prehistoric and historic human occupation, land-use and settlement, and this understanding may inform or enrich decision-making for present and future land-use and/or settlement in the same area.
(2) Economic development effects of this can be illustrated by examples such as taxonomic and type collections in natural science collections (museums, herbaria) contribute to understanding of the economic potential of botanical and zoological resources
(3) Fossil record based on museum collections contributes to understanding of geological environment and thus can help indicate the potential of certain regions to yield certain sorts of mineral resources

(4) Community archives (including business and political records) are made available for historical analysis and can thus contribute to economic decision-making

(5) Museum personnel, drawing on knowledge of museum collections, can provide consultancy services to communities through "impact studies" and can thus contribute to contemporary decision-making about environmental and economic matters

(Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Similarly, museum collections are a constant source of reference for scientists, historians and other scholars, as well as a source of inspiration for artists, designers, etc (Professional cohort: Senior Curator State Museum resp 8)

Research undertaken on museums, their collections ...can contribute to developed understanding of issues that affect the community (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Museum collections and exhibitions provide a context for understanding the history of communities such that individuals can more confidently understand their own experiences, behaviours and needs (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Cultural capital

Many of the public respondents in this study felt that the presence of a museum is an indicator that the community is 'cultured'.

[a museum] creates culture (Public cohort: male, visitor, parent, urban resident)

[a museum] adds to the culture of the city (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

They increase cultural awareness (Public cohort: female, 18-24, visitor, regional resident)

They are a vital and valuable asset to the life of the City (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, regional resident)
If we didn’t have museums

*I feel the community would lose "sophistication and inspiration". Losing our museums would be a "dumbing down" of the community* (Public cohort: male, visitor, parent, urban resident)

**Leisure facilities**

For all their educational, learning and cultural benefits, one of the perceived benefits of museums is that they add to the number of leisure options in a community. In this regard, they offer a particular form of leisure for people of all ages- educational, while at the same time, entertaining.

*Having museums in our city means that we have places of interest for people to visit "a place to go", somewhere to go on a rainy day* (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, regional resident)

*...most are reasonably priced it allows families to visit them. It can also mean a day out for the family* (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

*Museums provide another branch to the community, much like sporting clubs, galleries etc. A community needs wide ranging recreational and educational facilities* (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, regional resident);

*...a place where one can visit when they are four years of age or ninety four* (Public cohort: female, visitor, 18-24, regional resident);

If we didn’t have museums, we would lose

*..the opportunity for a family outing, a haven for grandparents to take help educate their grandchildren* (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

*...the opportunity to have a day out either on a hot or wet day* (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

*....the loss of a social outing; a place to take my children to have fun as well as being educational* (Public cohort: female, visitor, 18-24, regional resident)

*Something in a pleasant environment is the primary benefit* (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Local Museum resp 10)
Civic pride

Museums are a vehicle for describing 'who we are and what we have' to ourselves and others.

*Pride, to know that we are in possession of such a gem* (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

*A good museum can engender pride in a community* (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

*...a feeling of pride and ownership in the community* (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, regional resident)

*An intangible impact is that of contributing to a sense of pride in communities' history and cultural identity* (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20)

*An opportunity to share our local history with visitors* (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, regional resident)

*...visitors can be taken, to show the history of the area, with a certain sense of pride* (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

*A place to visit with tourists to 'show off' an otherwise unknown part of our local history* (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

Almost equal numbers of respondents (11 from the public cohort and 9 from the professional cohort) felt that museums contribute to building social capital. As discussed in earlier sections of this thesis, social capital refers to the norms of trust and reciprocity that are fundamental to healthy, functioning communities. Social capital relates to the capacity of museums to facilitate social connections, networks, and other relations through meaningful participation in public programs, commemorative events, volunteer activity and special interest groups. In addition, the engagement of marginalised social groups and the celebration of cultural diversity in museum programs contribute to social inclusion. All of these aspects were recognised by the respondents.
Providing opportunities for engagement

The public cohort recognised that museums provide opportunities for engagement with public culture by the local community.

...particularly living history museums like Sovereign Hill provide real opportunities for community involvement (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, regional resident)

...gives the volunteers or helpers (paid or unpaid) a sense of belonging (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident);

They are encouraged, not only to visit, but to become active participants in "living history (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, regional resident)

Individuals with the interests in the museum can join groups and clubs and be part of the museums activities (Public cohort: female, visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

...a volunteer element which allows people of common interest to make or share a topic of interest (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Encouraging social interaction

Museums are also credited with providing opportunities for local residents to meet, interact and socialise with visitors.

They attract many people from many different cultures to our community (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 35-50, regional resident).

Museum visiting is a social experience with 85% of people visiting in the company of others (MLA, 2004). Many types of social interaction result from shared museum visiting.

Museums promote social development through providing interesting activities and places to visit for family and friends (Public cohort: male, visitor, parent, urban resident)
After wandering around the museum in Sydney it is impossible not to then wander around Hyde Park and soak up some of the sunshine. Each time we have been it has resulted in a conversation of what we saw and how staggered we are by something or other we have seen (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

For families and friendship groups who want to spend time together, the museum offers an attractive setting for their personal social interaction (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Local Museum resp 10)

Museums as "safe places for unsafe ideas" encourage social interaction between visitors (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Community involvement in sourcing a collection or developing a museum offers long term opportunities for engagement.

The development of a Museum can spark community spirit and awaken civic consciousness and co-operation. When the Museum of Tropical Queensland was proposed for Townsville one of the anticipated attractions was based around the story of the "Pandora" and the "Bounty" mutineers.

The Museum provided a focus for community input and engagement that has resulted in a high level of community ownership of the Museum. Robert Putnam in his book "Bowling Alone" suggests that the establishment of museums (along with kindergartens and public parks) "strengthens habits of co-operation while not stifling individualism". Putnam supports the notion that museums are avenues for social capital creation. The study undertaken by Price, Waterhouse, Coopers found that the exhibition injected almost $1M into the Geelong economy. region (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 8)

Museums provide new community networks e.g. a museum at Melrose set up a committee to accession its collections. The meetings, the social interchange, the local history research, the gossip – what more could you ask? It was a completely new social group, and the project became a highlight of their week. Museums also bring like-minded members of local communities together to work on a common cause, with all the roles and responsibilities involved in running an association (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20)

The development of new community relationships through dialogue, involvement with indigenous peoples and repatriation of collections (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16)
Fostering social inclusion

Museums contribute to the social inclusion agenda in a number of different ways. In the first instance,

*Museums allow different backgrounds of people with common interests a place to learn more about the experiences that matter to them* (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 18-24, regional visitor)

*Engaging the participation of under represented and minority groups contribute enormously to the vision of a learning society.* (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16)

A professional respondent related how a cooperative venture between a local council museum and the local indigenous community had positive long term impacts.

*This exhibition sought to give an indigenous interpretation of ...... local history. The impact of this exhibition on the local community was huge. After people visited the exhibition a local community campaign developed to add a plaque to the blank side of the monument to recognise the [local indigenous] people as the original owners of the land around ...... The relations built up over those years also led to the local council signing a declaration on indigenous issues and the partnerships have continued* (Professional cohort: Local government cultural planner resp 27)

The study generated several examples where museums had worked closely with marginalised groups from both migrant and indigenous communities with important results in terms of belonging and affirmation, both within the communities themselves and amongst the wider population. The first respondent is referring to the impact on migrant communities encouraged to develop exhibitions and programs about their migration experiences with a state museum.

*Through the process (of developing a new exhibition) new alliances are made and the group can come together in a more cohesive way. Many groups feel more confident after they have worked on a program with us. Does the Museum contribute to a sense of community identity? Yes no doubt about it. Finally I do think that we can claim that many groups do feel more integrated into the ......Community after involvement in the Museum; has the Museum contributed to a sense of belonging? Yes I think so.* (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 7)
Another potent reference is one made to the impact on indigenous communities through the development of new galleries in most major museums throughout Australia and the inclusion of their objects, stories and perspectives on history.

*Through access to artefacts and information collected by museums in past decades, Aboriginal people have been able to reclaim a lost heritage, in some cases traditional language and skills, and to develop pride in their cultural identity.* (Professional cohort: Senior Curator State Museum resp 8)

The role of national museums representing the multiple voices of a nation was recognised.

*...recently-established museums (such as the National Museum of Australia) seek to explore identity rather than define national values* (Professional cohort: Senior Curator State Museum resp 15)

Inclusion can also result in different aspects of affirmation.

*They [visitors from this cultural group] find in the museum a positive environment in which to affirm their [name of cultural group] identity - not religious, not political, but cultural* (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Community Museum resp 11)

Notwithstanding these comments, there were those amongst the professional cohort who questioned whether museums could effect social change. In the first two examples, there is a perception that there are natural limits to what museums can reasonably achieve in the social change arena. In the third example, limitations are ascribed to the willingness of the public to receive messages. In the fourth case, museums' general unwillingness to plan with intent is seen to be limitation

*I am not convinced museums can do much more than signpost or point the way to the future ... I feel the social development role can be overstated. Tertiary institutions, unions, the media and lobby groups have much more influence, and probably always will. I cannot think of one institution in Australia that has a continuing influence on people's lives* (Prof cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 1)
Even where it is possible to argue that the museum has helped redefine a social issue, it is difficult to ascribe the impact of the museum against other social and political forums. In the words of Stephen Weil (1999) 'Museum workers need to remind themselves more forcefully than they generally do that museums can wonderfully enhance and enrich individual lives, even change them, and make communities better places in which to live. Only rarely, however – and, even then, more often that not in synergy with other institutions – do they truly dent the universe.' (Prof cohort: Division Head, State Museum, resp 17)

Museums are an important part of the cultural development of a community. They were products of an age of inquiry in the 19th century and of a desire to bring enlightenment to the masses. Governments continue to invest in them these days with similar motivation. The truth is that the masses remained obdurate. The masses don't want to be enlightened. They want to stay cocooned in their regime of entertainment, sport, and social intercourse through the workplace, the pub, the club or the BBQ. The statistics for television watching attest to what the unenquiring minds absorb.

Do museums effect social change? Have holocaust museums eliminated genocide? Has the fact that Australia has four immigration museums made the community more tolerant of boat people? Has the National Motor Museum caused people to decide to drive a fuel-efficient electric car or Hyundai Excel rather than a gas guzzling 4WD or a purple convertible like Elvis? Not likely (Prof cohort: Senior Exec Local Museum resp 10)

Museums are capable of having a range of impacts on communities, although not all choose to do so. At no stage of their development have museums been entirely divorced from the communities in which they are located but the degree of engagement has varied enormously (Prof cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 4)

Other respondents reflected that the degree of impact is affected as much by factors beyond the museum's control (the attitudes, knowledge and life history of visitors) as it is by what the museums does and how it presents a subject.

I think the more tolerant attitudes are generated amongst those who visit the Museum but do not have a vested interest in a particular cultural identity (Prof cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 7)

[Museums] inform and educate in an accessible and interesting manner. This may present problems as popular views and stereotypes are often firmly held. Therefore, there is not really a community response as it is mitigated through class, region, age, gender and ethnicity (Prof cohort: Academic History/CMW ith Museum Board Member resp 22)
Instrumental values related to the economy

The literature describes direct and indirect impacts in relation to the economy. Direct impacts include the multiplier effect on local economies, employment and the purchase of services. Indirect impacts encompass the contribution to tourism, civic branding and fiscal leverage to attract bequests, sponsorship and donations. Both cohorts in this research perceived that museums have an economic impact. This research found, however, that the emphasis was on a greater range of indirect economic impacts than found in the literature. Moreover, respondents were critical of the underlying assumption that museums should be involved in profit-making activities. Many public respondents questioned this premise.

General comments

Some respondents answered the question with an array of ways in which museums make direct and indirect contributions to the economy. These include their role in urban renewal schemes, tourism and their own commercial operations.

They [museums] generate urban renewal, significant employment opportunities, the development of a culture around monumental architecture, which can have 'branding' effects on whole cities, cultural tourists (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16)

Cultural Tourism, reduces declining population in regional communities, job creation, attracts visitors to communities, attract spending to community service industries (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 19)

[Museums] contribute to economics as a tourist destination, develops skills within the community, use a very wide range of contractors and services, runs commercial operations (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3)
Employment

Many museums are employers, and contribute to the social fabric of a community through remuneration, personnel management and development. Volunteer programs in museums can assist individuals to gain (a) life skills and work experience (b) training and experience that contributes directly or indirectly to career development, and (c) fulfillment through involvement with meaningful tasks (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Museums contribute to the economy of a community by providing employment, use of buildings and facilities and stimulating interest in formal learning to acquire skills in specific areas (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Local multiplier effect

The professional respondents were particularly aware of the ways in which museums can contribute to local economies.

Evidence suggests that expenditure on new museum venues or major exhibitions impacts on businesses in the surrounding area (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 2)

Accommodation houses, cafes and garages all benefit through a multiplier effect resulting from a museum attracting visitors to stop in a community for an hour or two, stretching into an overnight stay resulting in local spending at a variety of businesses. (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 21)

There are spin-offs from community museums not so much in creating new jobs – although that does happen with some of the larger ones – as in extending visitors' stay in a town (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20)

Indirect economic impact - people indirectly benefiting financially are builders, trustees of the premises and other local business e.g. Restaurants, parking, retail shops etc (Public cohort: male, visitor, 18-24, regional resident)

Most museums are voluntarily run. Although their budgets are relatively small, they don't cost the community anything, or very little. Any money coming into them, therefore, or to their community indirectly, is a net gain. (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20)
Purchasers and vendors of services

In addition to the local multiplier effect, museums purchase local services.

*Museums become purchasers of local community services e.g. electrical, lighting, carpentry, plumbing, photography.* (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20)

Producing new commercial products

In some cases, museum collections have inspired new products. The most significant of these are the Museum Shops outlets throughout North America and the catalogues of the Smithsonian Institution and The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. Closer to home, one respondent related that

*The product lines originally only available in the Geraldton Museum shop and from the potter’s studio went on to be distributed through other WA Museum outlets.* (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 21)

Contribution to regeneration

Specific comments about the impact of museums in terms of cultural regeneration and renewal schemes came from the professional cohort.

*Manchester Science and Technology Museum which contributed so much to the urban renewal of a run down area of Manchester* (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 8)

...*a positive impact on the economic welfare of the city as a whole, i.e. Melbourne and Bilbao* (Professional cohort: Academic- Leisure studies resp 23)

*Greater Manchester Council, established The Museum of Science and Industry to effect a physical improvement to a depressed area of the city centre; to attract visitors thereby encouraging other investment; to provide a centre for education (using an educational charitable company as the vehicle); to give Manchester’s industrial and scientific pedigree a high profile. -Flagship projects are in spectacular buildings that are part of an international fashion for landmark museums housed in signature architecture* (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 4)
Te Papa, Museum of NZ, and the Guggenheim Bilbao. These museums have reinvented their towns as destinations. They have changed the way local residents think of their communities – creating a feeling of esteem – and they have resulted in strong economic benefits for their towns and broader communities. (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

I believe the presence of the Maritime Museum in this location has ensured that Lipson Street over the years has developed the reputation as the 'heritage precinct' (Professional cohort: Local Government Cultural Planner resp 27)

The undertaking of capital development contributes to community employment and to economic multipliers through expenditure within and by the community (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

The well-being of a community is enhanced by the presence of a viable and credible museum, particularly in terms of employment and tourism. But the establishment of a museum does not necessarily mean that great economic benefits will automatically follow. The great success everyone mentions is the Guggenheim Bilbao, but its success opens up a much broader discussion: the cultural institution as a major architectural statement in itself and a symbol of urban renewal and branding, irrespective of collection and programs (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 1)

Creative communities

Richard Florida's (2003) concept of the 'new creative class' suggests that a concentration of creative people working in an area can have substantial impact on urban economic growth. The presence of a museum can contribute to a creative community.

The emergence of cultural community around the new institutions An appreciation of the museum as a cultural vortex (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16)
Cultural tourism

Travers (2006:36) finds that British museums and galleries attracted between 10-11 million international visitors between 2002-2006. He notes that the revenue flowing into the economy from cultural tourism is considerable (2006:80).

The Australian respondents to this study acknowledge the role of museums in attracting tourists but are somewhat cynical about the efficacy of the argument for increased funding.

The museums in Adelaide are generally located in high traffic areas, and generally high tourist areas, therefore a visit to a museum isn’t usually just that. There is morning and afternoon tea, lunch, incidental purchases and the purchase of souvenirs at least, that contribute to the economy. Also, people visiting museums out of the city, tourists and residents of Adelaide, may not have been to that spot before, and due to visiting the museum have discovered other interests, places to stay etc. that bring them back and therefore bring more money into the community economy (Public cohort: female, 18-24, visitor, urban resident)

A good local museum can be a draw card for tourists and in that way money comes in to the community and thus provides employment (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Flow on effects of visitors using facilities around the museums benefit communities. The Birdwood Hotel is probably greatly benefited by visitors using its facilities after visiting the motor museum. Business opportunities may be viable given the attraction of a nearby museum. An example of this would be the café included in the redevelopment of the museum in Adelaide, the place is always busy (Public cohort: male, visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

The growth of cultural tourism (with a middle-class that increasingly visits museums when overseas or interstate rather than in their home city) has certainly been important for the economics of many institutions. But it is doubtful if even the most economically rational politician or bureaucrat has approved increased funding for museums because they believe the rhetoric proffered by those institutions (Professional cohort: Curatorial Division Head- State Museum resp 17)
Civic branding

The power of museums to contribute to civic branding is acknowledged.

....good for the prestige of the city (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, urban resident)

Expertise

Important to the professional cohort is the contribution that museum expertise can make to economic planning and decision making.

Curatorial expertise in terms of understanding the ecology and monitoring the conditions of, the unique local natural environment is very under-rated by both government and business. This specialist expertise is vital in terms of identifying invasive terrestrial and marine pests and weeds which can devastate natural environments, animal communities, agricultural crops and other primary industries (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 6)

Economic development is invariably affected by the application of research findings to wider community interests. Examples include: longitudinal studies of biological populations that contribute to decisions about (say) farming methods, fishery locations, aquaculture methods. Biodiversity studies that affect decisions about preservation of endangered species (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Though government policy has emphasized economic impact as one of the instrumental impacts that museums must demonstrate, the public respondents were equivocal about this premise, with some rejecting it outright.

I don’t see how museums contribute to the economy of a community – they are not profit making businesses (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, regional resident)

I do not believe museums contribute to the economy of communities (Public cohort: male, parent, non-visitor, urban resident)

Do museums contribute to the economy of a community? I must admit that this has never occurred to me (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)
Probably not significantly. Hopefully they are still valued enough to keep them even if they do not contribute much to the economy of communities (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

I am really not certain how they contribute. I believe that they would likely being a government organisation, or a place of education etc, have little or no taxes, and all entry fees would probably be eaten up by the expensive cost of security etc. I believe volunteers staff a lot of the administration positions, and this is likely the case because they don't make a lot of money? I have never heard any reports in the media of how valuable they have been from this perspective (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, parent, urban resident).

I doubt if any museum can generate enough income to be self sufficient. Always a museum will require community funding to be viable (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Whether museums contribute anything at all to the economy is immaterial for some. In answer to this question, they stated that they value museums for other reasons.

Contribute to the economy of communities? Socially and historically – valuing what we had in the past (Public cohort: female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

If you mean monetary value- who knows. The value for me and for the communities is to look into the past and maybe see where our future lies (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

Museums on their own do not, I feel, contribute to the general economy of a City, they so however greatly contribute to the education of the Visitor and this cannot be gauged in Dollars and Cents (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Though this study finds that people perceive that museums do make direct and indirect contributions to the economy (employment, tourism, local economy multipliers), it also finds that the economic value of museums is perceived to be as much a factor of the benefits and services which flow from the cultural asset. Though often intangible, these values are embodied in the cultural asset and are an important indicator of its economic value. Instrumental value is summarised in the following table.
Table 4: Instrumental value of museums experienced by individuals, communities and the economy (Scott, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Value</th>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>Economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>Direct:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Self directed through visual objects, in a free choice environment with an entertaining dimension</td>
<td>(a) Providing opportunities for engagement</td>
<td>(a) Provision of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Volunteer programs assist individuals to gain life skills, work experience, training that contributes directly or indirectly to career development</td>
<td>(b) Encouraging social interaction</td>
<td>(b) Producing new commercial products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Fostering social inclusion</td>
<td>(c) Purchasers of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community capacity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) An educational resource for schools</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) A learning resource for the whole community</td>
<td>(a) Contribution to cultural Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Knowledge building</td>
<td>(b) Local multiplier effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Cultural capital</td>
<td>(c) Contribution to regeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Leisure facilities</td>
<td>(d) Attracting creative communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Developing civic community pride</td>
<td>(e) Contribution to civic branding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings: Institutional value

Holden suggests that museums contribute to public value and as such should be integrated with the rest of public policy and ‘seen as an integral and essential part of civil society’ (Holden, 2004: 11).

This approach places public agencies such as museums firmly in the role of active agents ‘in the creation or destruction of what the public values. Trust in the public realm, transparency and fairness are all values that can be generated by the institution in its dealings with the public (Holden, 2006:17).

An aspect of the institutional value associated with museums is the perception that the information provided is honest, balanced, fair and meaningful.
Honesty

Museums are seen to have a moral and ethical dimension that the community expects, respects and appreciates. Museums can be ‘honest brokers’ by presenting facts without necessarily giving opinions. They are places which are effectively neutral territory; museums in Australia have played an important part in the many faceted debate and discussion over indigenous issues region (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 9)

Objectivity

They are not seen as politically or socially partisan; -People generally trust them and trust the information/stories they tell (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 2)

Museums (via their exhibitions) can present objects that offer (apparently) conflicting evidence about history. Museums can involve the visitor in developing an understanding of ‘points of view’, investigative methods and problem solving. This can also encourage individuals to develop awareness and tolerance of ‘the other’ (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Loss of the museums would be a deprivation to the community. They can offer information about our own and other cultures which is not available in the mass media, with the advantage of allowing individual appreciation at an individual pace rather than in a way controlled by the medium. They can present more than one interpretation of an event, and more than one point of view (female, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

Meaning

Today there is no shortage of information/we survive in an environment of information overload. What is in short supply are conduits of effective translation of information and modes to select what we want to know and in what form. Museums offer intersection and translation points (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

Information brokers- museums distil a lot of information about our community/society (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 35-50, urban resident)

Trusted expertise

The fact that the information provided by museums is considered reliable is recognised through the range and number of public enquiries that museums are expected to answer.
Museums provide a source of authoritative information (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

The general public trusts museums to provide authoritative answers; particularly in terms of identifying unusual natural phenomenon, works of art, craft and items of heritage significance. Curatorial expertise that can ensure accuracy of identification in terms poisonous animals, insects or plants is vital when such animals, insects or plant material might be implicated in a medical emergency (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 8)

**Modeling democracy**

The balanced approach to information is also recognized in the non-polemical way that issues are presented and discussed in museums.

*Museums (via their public programs) can model the practices of debate and discussion, and thus encourage individuals to develop awareness and tolerance of 'the other' (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)*

*Museums can serve as cornerstones in the community upholding, strengthening, and realizing some of the most fundamental democratic ideals of our society. They can encourage and support the pursuit of independent thought, critical attitudes, and a deeper understanding of the world. They can serve as places for community forums, providing information and opportunities for dialogue where the public can make decisions about common concerns (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 19)*

**Civil behaviour**

Like libraries, museums require a behavioural code in a public space which is acknowledged.

*The traditional museum 'code' of behaviour models some aspects of socialization that are still valued by some communities (e.g. conformity to rules, participation in learning through reading and looking, showing respect for older people/things, showing respect for the learning needs of others) (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)*

**Representing stability and permanence**

Museums represent continuity and, by their presence, suggest that some things endure even in an era characterized by change.
Individuals recognize the museum as a landmark in the street-scape and
the "social-scape" and value its apparent stability. The museum can
become part of the personal backdrop that each individual constructs for
their own life drama. This can contribute to personal confidence
(Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Museums are relatively permanent. It allows them to be a repository of
information; that can be consulted and reinterpreted over generations and
to be immensely important as record keepers of human experience. The
tangible quality of collections gives them a claim to "reality" that is denied
to many other forms of information or testimony. This imbues them with a
power to which people respond because of the temporal nature of human
existence (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Specialist Museum resp 12)

Fostering relationships

Australian museums ‘develop relationships with other governments and
countries in terms of good will (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth
Museum resp 3). Speaking of the British situation, Travers (2006: 50) notes that
these types of partnerships accrue to local and national governments in terms of
better political and diplomatic relations while others support long term
scholarship and research.

Upholding public standards

Best practice in processes, procedures and customer relations can
contribute to public value.

A general sense of social cohesion within the community from pride in and
respect for a well-run and conducted institution (Professional cohort:
Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 1)

Public access to collections

Kelly et al (2002: 29) find that the public's view of value 'often rests on the
availability of a service to all on equal terms'. For the public cohort in this study,
and important service provided by museums is equitable access to collections that
are important societal archives. The public cohort recognizes the value of public
access collections. If we did not have museums
Exhibits would be lost to private collections, beyond the sight of the majority of people (male, visitor, 35-50, urban resident) enables ordinary people to see artifacts they might never have the opportunity to experience (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 35-70, urban resident)

[Museums are] essential institutions in societies that consider themselves to be enlightened and progressive; important societal archives, because their major objectives are to procure, conserve and display objects of lasting interest and value to a community (Professional cohort: Academic- Design Studies resp 24)

For the public cohort, the presence of museums is an indicator that cities value preserving heritage and educating their citizens.

It means that the city recognises the importance of educating and entertaining the people of the city (and visitors to the city!) (Public cohort: male, visitor, parent, urban resident)

It means that the city is concerned to educate its public of history, that it is proud to be part of the heritage, community minded (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, parent, urban resident)

Findings: Use values

Many of the intrinsic and instrumental values are experienced through direct use of museums. However, this study has found that non-users value museums and describe the worth of museums in terms of existence, option and bequest value.

The inclusion of non-visitors as well as visitors in the primary research captured all three dimensions of non-use value emerged from the public responses to round 1 of this study. The responses reveal that all three aspects of non-use value are present and that there are clear indications that many respondents value museums irrespective of whether they are direct users.
The presence of non-use values arising from the public cohort has considerable significance for museums. Firstly, the confirmation of non-use/ non-financial values suggests that museums (like other forms of heritage) are imbued with a form of cultural value. This cultural value is the inherent or stored assets such as ideas, traditions, beliefs, and customs which can give rise to a flow of goods and services over time Throsby (2002: 103).

Secondly, the flow of cultural value emanating from the asset is perceived and attributed worth in a variety of ways of which direct consumption is only one. Irrespective of direct consumption, the public values what museums stand for (existence value), they value the potential for future use (option value) and they value the opportunity that, through them, we will leave something of our culture to future generations.

Thirdly, the confirmation of non-use value demonstrates that the constituency with an interest in museums is much wider than that defined by direct usage and potentially more politically powerful should it be called upon for purposes of advocacy.

Fourthly, Mourato and Mazzanti (2002: 51) find that people attach a value to the conservation of cultural resources for a number of reasons without ever using or visiting them. They suggest that investing in the conservation and maintenance of cultural assets is akin to an insurance premium- even if one does not use the cultural asset at present, one retains the possibility of being able to use it at some point in the future.

Combined with the concept of intergenerational equity, ‘acknowledging the role of heritage as an inheritance to be stewarded and passed on to future generations’ inherent in bequest value (Mason 2002: 26), this is an argument for funding based on principles of sustainability of cultural assets for enjoyment and benefit into the future.
And finally, though non-use values are non-financial and external to markets, within the wider definition of economics as the use of a community's resources for long term sustainability, they represent a significant proportion of the total economic value of cultural heritage and need to be taken into account in determining asset worth (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002: 51).

**Existence value**

Existence value is attributed to museums regardless of direct personal use (The Outspan Group, 1999; Holden, 2004). In describing existence value, respondents stated that:

*Good to know that they are there for other people and children to visit but don't mean much to me* (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, urban resident)

*Personally it doesn't mean a lot as I don't visit them, but I can see the benefit of them being here. I would recommend them to visitors if asked* (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, regional resident)

*I rarely visit museums, but I recognize their importance as a visual record of the past* (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

*I do like to know that the museum is there and would be upset if it ceased to exist* (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident);

When asked about what they, personally or the community would lose if museums no longer existed, other views of existence value emerged:

*If museums no longer existed I would not lose anything as an individual but I think the community may miss out as there are bound to be some people who enjoy the past history that museums offer* (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)

*I wouldn't lose much because I don't really visit them anymore. I think that the community would lose a means of education and discovery of the past. Also it is nice to know that they are there* (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 55-70, urban resident)
If museums no longer existed, I probably wouldn't lose much. I would find other things to do with my time e.g. read. The community would lose a great deal – there would be no ongoing preservation of our history and culture (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, regional resident)

I do like the idea of museums and think we would lose a great reference place if we lost them (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, urban resident)

The community as a whole would lose, as there would be nowhere to access the past and I feel that would be a great shame (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, parent, urban visitor)

Option value

Option value refers to the possibility of future use even though museums are not being directly used in the present.

I don't tend to visit them at all, I suppose it's nice to know they are there if I ever felt like going (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 18-24, regional resident)

When asked what having a museum in the community meant to them, some respondents cited possible future use dependent on changes in life-stage:

[What does having a museum in your city/town mean to you?] at the moment - not a lot - being 21 my social life is very full and museums do not come into the picture. when I was younger I visited museums through school excursions and my parents and enjoyed them, and when I get a family will revisit and probably appreciate them more (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

Museums don't hold a great attraction to me so having them doesn't have great importance to me but this may change as my child grows older (Public cohort: female, visitor, parent, regional resident)

The question about personal and community 'loss' if museums no longer existed elicited some other dimensions of option value.
Even though I do not visit often, I would still feel the loss personally if museums no longer existed. I anticipate that in retirement I may have the time and be more inclined to visit (Public cohort: male, visitor, 55-70, urban resident);

Personally probably not a lot, however if/when I have children it would be one of the places I would really like to take them to - and not being able to do that would be disappointing (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 18-24, urban resident)

Bequest value

Bequest value is associated with the importance attached with leaving something for future generations even though direct personal use is absent. This study revealed evidence of bequest value.

I don't think I would lose much sleep if museums ceased to exist; However, it would be sad for future generations not to have the opportunity to see our history other than in photos, books etc. (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, parent, urban resident)

Perhaps a sense of loss for the next generation, as they would never be able to see these things up close (Public cohort: female, non-visitor, 55-70, regional resident)

I think the community would lose its sense of history; or its records of history, which would be of particular loss to children in the community; future generations will not obtain the visual side of what each museum holds (Public cohort: male, non-visitor, 35-50, regional resident).

Summary

An analysis of the combined comments of the professional and public cohorts confirms the preliminary typology and finds that, within each of the four dimensions, the range of value aspects is considerably more complex and diverse than generated by the literature. The unique features of museums which generate these value perceptions is the subject of the next section.
Is the museum experience unique?

It is useful to complete the picture of the perceived value of museums with consideration of the context in which these value experiences occur. Within an environment where opportunity costs are part of the economic determinations for funding the sector (Could the same effects be achieved by some other institution at perhaps less cost?) a further part of the primary research asked the professional cohort to consider what, in their opinion, made the experience in museums different to other cultural institutions.

Respondents in the professional cohort acknowledged that museums have parallels with libraries in terms of the provision of information. However, distinctions between museums and libraries were described in terms of the visual and 3 dimensional presentation of information.

A museum has some things in common with a library in that it gives public access to knowledge. A museum however organises material into set themes in a way that a library does not. It is far more visual rather than wordy (Professional cohort: Academic- History resp 22)

The archival role of museums gives them a link with libraries, though museums focus largely on visual exhibits in 3D and 2D form (Professional cohort: Academic- Design studies resp 24)

Another respondent saw the differences between museums and other social and cultural institutions related to core purposes and the services.

Museums have a different function to, say, a church or a sporting club. They offer specific heritage-related services – where to donate historic items, object identification, historic sites, object-based education.

No other organisation offers a similar service although there are some cross-overs between, say, museums, libraries and schools (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20)

Several of the respondents cited the complexity of the museum offering as a major differentiating feature. The museum offer ranges across multiple services and programs and it is the combination of these that make the museum different.
The differences (and advantages) that museums have compared to other institutions and services are:
-the possession of the real things- something increasingly valued by the public;
-accessibility- with a wider social reach than any other cultural institution except libraries
-the combination of enjoyment and learning that are so often seen as opposites but which are in reality essential partners (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 4)

The synergistic results of what museums do and are:
-Scholarship
-Integrity
-Designed learning experiences
-Real objects
Make for a 'factor x' that sets museums rather apart from the rest. (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

So the impact of museums should be different from that of other institutions in that they can provide a unique combination of visual and textual archive, intellectually-engaging leisure experience, distinctive architectural and exhibition environment, and research resource (Professional cohort: Academic- Design Studies resp 24)

No other institutions have such a complex set of purposes. To educate, to entertain, to shock, to preserve, to create meaning etc. I believe it is the complexity of purposes which set museums apart (Professional cohort: Academic- Leisure studies resp 23)

The defining element, however, is that museums have collections of objects which they preserve on behalf of the community.

They are amongst the few places that preserve our material culture and also record our memories (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 9)

[Museums] preserve objects of memory in perpetuity that gives a sense of focus and longevity in an environment of constant shift and emergence and attrition of other organisations/ entertainment (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16)

I consider that the custodial role of museums is crucial (Professional cohort: Senior Curator State Museum resp 8)
Museums hold local, state and national historical collections in trust for the community (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3)

The fact that we have "stuff" sets us apart from other cultural institutions and all the theoretical and practical possibilities and constraints that material culture brings means that we are unique amongst institutions (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Specialist Museum resp 12).

The collection, preservation and interpretation of material cultural heritage segues into a further defining and distinguishing feature. Objects are the 'real thing' which enable museums to offer visitors and authentic experience.

Objects

The presence of objects is defining. The presence of objects sets museums 'apart from other options for education, entertainment or infotainment' (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5). The study of objects is both the business of museums and its main communication format (Professional cohort: Senior Curator State Museum resp 15).

The museum's distinct advantage is that it has the object as its prism through which the story of the town, area of theme can be viewed. For good and ill visitors have certain expectations about a museum visit which at best mean they're in there to quietly venerate the objects, pay homage to the ancestors and sense the spirit of the place (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28).

The possession of the real things [is] something increasingly valued by the public (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 4). The power of objects is unique (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 9).

This 'power' has several components. Snow (2002:3) believes that

'objects are good to think with - they help us think about relationships and issues which we might not otherwise think of. They do not need just to be 'illustrations', but can contribute to analysis by themselves.......Taking an object as the centre of an analysis and building outwards can make a world of difference.'
Corum (2002:1-2) sees the role of museums in helping to unlock information ‘held internally by the objects themselves’ that is ‘part of a highly coded social language’. Museums allow ‘personal communion with an object; increasingly rare in a world of new media representation and facsimile’
(Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16)

[A museum] relies on the object and the experience being taken out of its rightful environment - ....and placed into a new context. Further it becomes in essence a subject which the visitor is to view or interpret or understand. Thus objects, events and ideas can be presented from varying perspectives simultaneously enabling the visitor to comprehend multitudinous meanings (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Specialist Museum resp 11)

For individuals, objects can trigger powerful memories which have a role in confirming personal identity. The ‘recognition of artifacts including photographs seems to be an important trigger for self identity/nostalgia factor’
(Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 19)

At a community level, Corum (2002: 1) sees the ‘immediacy and physicality’ of objects providing a reminder ‘that history actually happened’ and that there is ‘a physical link with those other worlds’. Mason (2002: 13) views this as an intrinsic value inherent in objects which are a ‘witness to history’ and carry ‘the authority of this witness’. This was supported by the experience of another respondent to this study:

Recently in Cairns, several hundred objects taken from a Chinese temple some years previously were “rediscovered” in the Cairns Historical Museum. Working with the local Queensland Museum Development Officer, members of the Cairns Chinese community are interpreting and recording these objects. The power of the artifacts has been surprising. The Chinese community seems to have been galvanized through their involvement with these objects, greater cohesion within the community is evident and it is likely that a Chinese Cultural Centre will result
(Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 8)
In this respect, museums are linked more directly to the search for identity in a community (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28). They help to engender a sense of pride and identity in local communities – especially in regional communities (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 9). They contribute in a unique way by illuminating what went before to make the people and place the way they are today (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20). As one respondent summarised it, I struggle to find an example of another structured service that like a museum can succeed with time in developing a better sense of place (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 21).

But there is also a view that the objects held in museum collections have power because they represent the community's sacred relics and are imbued with spiritual power. Museums are places where one can 'quietly venerate the objects, pay homage to the ancestors and sense the spirit of the place (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28). One respondent spoke of 'the distinctiveness of the museum' and its 'quasi-religious role' 

With the growth of secular culture, museums have increasingly become the moral equivalent of the church (How often we describe artifacts as a "piece of the true cross"). Events at museums often take on an almost sacrosanct character, whether deservedly or not (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28)

Unlike other public secular institutions, museums 'stimulate reflection on the quest for meaning' (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16) and are used by some for 'restorative reasons' and in the quest for 'something sacred, higher order, out of ordinary' (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 19). Certainly, the combination of inspiration, heightened perspective and awe can create a reverential experience.
I was 17 years old the first time I entered the American Museum of Natural History in New York. I knew nothing about its layout or holdings at the time, so it was pure serendipity that led me to one of the lower levels on Central Park West. There I drifted into a small, quiet gallery and stood in front of a display of microscopic invertebrates, the creatures that inhabit the minute wetlands of our lives. I felt so startled by joy that my eyes teared. It was a spiritual experience of power and clarity; limning the wonder and sacredness of life, life at any level, even the most remote...I was...feeling saturated by wonder. Only praise leapt to mind, praise that knows no half-truths and pardons all. I felt what Walt Whitman may have felt when he wrote of the starry night, 'The bright suns I see and the dark suns I cannot see are in their place.' His intuition bespeaks the cryptic faith in the unknown and the extrapolation of belief that organized religions require. The part stands for the whole, as it does in natural history museums that say, in effect, 'Here is one wildebeest on the savannah, but there are many more of them, it's part of a species. Trust in it.' (Ackerman, 1993: 102-3 in Carliner, 2002:1)

Relationships

Respondents to this study also felt that museums are distinguished by the importance they place on humanity and human relationships.

I think that museums are different in that they are institutions that put a high value on human experiences. Museums give value to the people whose stories are told and to the people who respond as visitors to those stories (Professional cohort: Local government cultural planner resp 27)

This feature permeates every aspect of the museum experience from the position of the visitor, to relationships with communities and opportunities for sharing with others.

At the level of the individual, 'the visitor's own viewpoint is respected and placed in context' (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 2), personal communion with objects is allowed (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16), a person's own direct experience... enables them to engage in a way that relates to their own interests and is more immediate, personal and intimate (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 21) with the result that
We are institutions that engage in a dialogue with our audience. (This is increasingly being recognised). Although linear and didactic communication can have a valid place, museums allow much free choice as to what and in what order will be encountered by the visitor (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Specialist Museum resp 12)

Several of the respondents commented on the essential relationship that museums have with the community. One respondent sees this as based in the concept of 'public ownership' (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16). Museums 'are usually seen as belonging to the community not separate to it (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3) allowing for a level of active engagement.

Museums also have the potential for community involvement and engagement that is typically hard to achieve in other institutions. By involving communities in the preparation of exhibitions or research projects, then making these available to the general public, museums can create a broader audience for community groups and help them articulate their ideas, history and identity – all in a culturally and symbolically powerful space (Professional cohort: Curatorial Division Head- State Museum resp 17)

The opportunity to share the event with others is an important dimension of the museum experience (Falk and Dierking, 1992) People visit museums in social groups. People sharing the experience of encountering collections can create a group gestalt with positive outcomes for learning.

I think that museums have the ability to provide group education and enjoyment in a way a library cannot. You cannot talk and discuss items in a library as this would disrupt other visitors. A gallery can be both a private experience or something to be viewed and savoured with others (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16)
Freedom

*Interaction with museums is by choice and not imposed* (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3).

Museums provide a free or low cost community resource for recreation, education, entertainment and enjoyment in a physically safe and undemanding space. Importantly, people freely choose to visit museums and this freedom of choice means that people have already expressed a degree of commitment.

*The idea of the visit already means there is a level of commitment to the activity, that it is non-formal implies the idea of active choice on the day – visitors are motivated for the most part, in the spirit of self-improvement that was such a powerful force in the 19th century, and coincided with the rise of modern museums. This may seem an odd way to start a discussion of the contribution of museums. But the fact that visitors are motivated is probably critical to the distinctive role of museums* (Professional cohort: Curatorial Division Head- State Museum resp 17)

This freedom characterises the nature of museum visiting during which people self-select from the array of possibilities within the museum environment. It is this exercise of choice in the course of the visit that defines the type of learning that occurs in museums. 'Museums allow much free choice as to what and in what order will be encountered by the visitor. An exhibition is a unique form of engaging an audience and allows for multiple readings' (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Specialist Museum resp 12). *Museums provide generous scope for personal learning...They open windows on a world little understood or appreciated before. The only limit on people enlarging their horizons is really the amount of time and energy they are prepared to put into it* (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20)

Freedom of choice has other implications. It defines permissions and constraints within which museums must operate, particularly in terms of presenting information. In a free-choice environment, visitors expect to make up their own minds about subjects and the museum is expected to be an 'honest information broker', presenting multiple perspectives on an argument.
Importantly, museums can provide different perspectives simultaneously on an issue, an event. They are not prescriptive in any way. A Museum provides an opportunity to learn analytically and at a somewhat disinterested distance from the event, issue or story it represents (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Community Museum resp 11).

In [a] front-end evaluation of a new exhibition on immigration policy, it was clear that members of focus groups distrusted the information and perspectives they were receiving from the media – they felt manipulated. They overwhelmingly say that they want the Museum to provide balanced information about immigration policy and history so that they can make up their own minds on current issues. (This perception matches the survey on history in the US by Rosenzweig and Thelen, which found that museums and historic sites were considered the most reliable sources of historical information, far ahead of universities, schools, books or TV.) (Professional cohort: Curatorial Division Head- State Museum resp 17)

The capacity of museums to present varying views on a particular subject simultaneously in a non threatening environment ‘allows a museum to become a subtle but potent social commentator – providing views in contradistinction to traditionally or politically current thinking, challenging the visitor to think more broadly and analytically’ (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Specialist Museum resp 12).

Museums can often do this successfully because ‘In museums, issues of concern or interest to communities can be explored within historic, contemporary or future contexts. In this way Museums can create a forum for debate where even very controversial topics can be addressed’ (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 8)

With the result that ‘Museums carry a perception of integrity and credibility in the community’ (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5). This role as the ‘honest information broker’ is seen to be an increasingly distinguishing feature of museums.

According to one respondent (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 2), ‘Museums are respected as truthful and trustworthy, able to provide an objective overview (unlike the media, or individual commentators and authors) and in the face of change, they continue to promote a sense of ‘trust’ (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16).
Trust gains importance as museums tackle contemporary social issues. Their perceived objectivity and a preparedness to present varying views on a particular subject simultaneously in a non-threatening environment (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Community Museum resp 11) enables them to be 'seen as neutral places for debate about important community issues' (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 9).

Public value

In their practice and ethos, museums are credited with making a contribution to public value. Museums are mostly accessible, safe, non-threatening and intellectually stimulating public spaces open to everyone, whatever their age, physical, educational or economic status (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 6). Museums are concerned to reflect and celebrate diversity (Professional cohort: IT Specialist State Museum resp 16), are committed to providing public access to their collections and their information and, in cases where they are free, provide a unique service in that they offer an equitable access to information and knowledge (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25). Museums have a wider social reach than any other cultural institution except libraries (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 4).

Learning

Museums are not the only institutions which offer learning experiences, but they provide for a special type of learning. While 'educational institutions expect some levels of previous learning, demand commitment and cost substantial amounts of money, museums only require the visitor to pay whatever level of attention they wish to give (self directed learning) (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 6).
We are educational institutions, but operate in the area more of informal and life-long learning (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Specialist Museum resp 12) offering a rare possibility for non-formal education in an increasingly credentialed society (Professional cohort: Curatorial Division Head- State Museum resp 17).

Respondents to this study also felt that one of the unique aspects of museum learning was, the combination of enjoyment and learning that are so often seen as opposites but which are in reality essential partners (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 4). Museums differ from other educational institutions because they provide learning environments that are enjoyable and allow visitors the opportunity to choose to learn independently at their own pace or in concert with peers of their choosing (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Community Museum resp 11).

This is at the core of the museum offer: a leisure activity that stimulates intellectual engagement (Professional cohort: Academic- Design Studies resp 24) and few other recreational/discretionary venues will regard visitor education and long-term impact as highly as museums do (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5).

The experience of museums, freely chosen and mediated visually through 'real' objects is a unique one. But it is what happens as a result of that experience that sets them apart from other educational, cultural and leisure experiences. Museums are about relationships. The museum experience can be shared in the company of others. But museums encourage our relationship with ourselves. Through the stimulation and reflection that objects can provide, visitors can relate to their personal past, enjoy individual interests and become inspired.

Museums enable communities to relate to their 'place', their history, 'who they are and why they came here', grounding their sense of identity. Museums enable people to relate to the wider world, to other phenomena and to the cosmos. Museums help people find their place in relation to the past, in relation to the world at large, in relation to what it means to be human.
The impact of museums is powerful, affecting individuals and communities alike. A combination of elements makes for a unique experience not found elsewhere. How do we capture and describe the value of this experience?

A values typology for museums

The findings from this study confirm the preliminary values typology and highlight the extent and range by which these value dimensions are experienced by individuals and communities. The outcomes of the primary research are summarized in Table 5. Each dimension encompasses one or more categories and under each category there may be several aspects. Categories are highlighted in bold type and numbered within each dimension. Aspects of each category are indicated by letter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value dimensions</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Enrichment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Enlightenment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Inspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Well being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Refreshment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Affirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Joy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Excitement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Insight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Communal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Experience of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Lessons of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Belonging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Transmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Social Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Sense of place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Use of civic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Symbolic Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Commemoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Spiritual Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Wonder and awe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) An educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civic/ community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Providing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Encouraging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Fostering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Public access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Fostering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Modeling civil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Trusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Honest/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Maintaining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Stability and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Local,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: A Values Typology for Museums continued (Scott 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value dimensions</th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value beneficiary</td>
<td>1) Inspiration for</td>
<td>1) Direct impacts</td>
<td>2) Indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>a) New ideas</td>
<td>a) Employment</td>
<td>(a) Contribution to cultural Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) New products</td>
<td>b) Purchase of services</td>
<td>(b) Local multiplier effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) New products</td>
<td>(c) Contribution to regeneration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Attracting creative communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Contribution to civic branding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Provision of expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

The primary research confirmed the typology, but the respondents generated an extended range of aspects within several value categories. One of the outstanding examples is within the category of historical value. The public values the role of museums in preserving the communal archive, providing opportunities to experience the past, presenting the lessons of history, fostering belonging and identity and ensuring cultural continuity and cultural transmission. From the perspective of public respondents to this study, it emerges as the single most important value attributed to museums.
The research also reveals the questioning of utilitarian outcomes in relation to museums' impact on the economy and the attribution of a more nuanced contribution related to inspiring creative and innovative ideas through access to the communal archive. This is a position argued forcibly by Travers (2006) in recent research conducted for the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council and the National Museum Directors Conference in the UK.

Institutional value emerges as a significant dimension in its own right. Museums are perceived as the 'honest information broker' presenting information in a disinterested and balanced way that enables the visitor to freely choose his or position on a subject. Museums are contributors to civil renewal through providing public access to cultural heritage, identified as an important aspect of citizenship. Providing safe forums in which current social questions can be debated fosters democracy. High standards of customer satisfaction add to the public confidence necessary for building public value. Relationship building through developing international partnerships increases the intellectual trade in ideas. The category of non-use was spontaneously confirmed through the responses of public non-users who generated numerous examples of option, existence and bequest value.

Comment is also made in relation to the category of social cohesion expressed in this research through museums' capacity to encourage engagement, participation and social interaction, include marginalized groups and foster belonging. Reference is made to the hierarchy of outcomes proposed in Chapter 3 as a way of understanding the relationship between these outcomes. Museums provide opportunities for people to come together in a public space and negotiate culture. This offers opportunities for social inclusion, particularly when marginalised groups have a chance to tell their stories. Participation also provides opportunities for people to engage with the subject of cultural diversity which may lead to greater understanding and tolerance.

Whether evidence exists to substantiate these value claims is the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER SEVEN: THE EVIDENCE BASE FOR VALUE

This study has used primary research to test a preliminary values typology with public and professional cohorts. The findings from the primary research have confirmed the typology and elaborated it to some degree.

The purpose of this chapter is to revisit the question of evidence in the light of both the primary research and new literature to update the state of the evidence question and to determine whether the values typology can be defended.

Accordingly, the following sections examine substantiating evidence for each dimension of the values typology. Two sources for evidence are used. The first source is from the primary research for this thesis. These are responses from the professional cohort in answer to questions of evidence. These responses are divided into 'comments' and 'evidence' where provided, under the heading Comments from the primary research. In addition, evidence is sourced from an analysis of two reports which became available in late 2006, one from Australia and the other from Britain. These two reports contain some significant differences from previous studies and other sources of evidence surveyed in Chapter Three. Both reports are rare examples of outcomes-based evidence that begins to describe the effect that the museums’ sector has as a whole. Both are effectively establishing benchmark data for the sector which can be used in future comparative, longitudinal studies.

The first of these is from the Council of Australasian Museum Directors (CAMD) and reports the findings from their annual survey 2005-6. CAMD has conducted a yearly survey of major Australian and New Zealand museums since 1990 to obtain a range of data based on its own performance indicators. In 2005 and 2006, the author worked with CAMD to review and refine its survey incorporating the findings from the research for this thesis.
The result is a greater focus on outcomes and the inclusion of use, institutional and instrumental value indicators. It is providing data in a useful format for positioning the value of museums in an Australian context.

The survey now collects evidence under categories such as Fostering Learning and Building Knowledge (educational use of museums through school and other educational group visits; partnerships with other educational bodies; number of research projects that are collection based; Australian Research Grants received; number and type of publications), Promoting Access to Institutional Knowledge, Exhibitions and Collections (number of public enquiries answered; attendances to new exhibitions; collection loans to other institutions, visitors to travelling exhibitions), Building Cultural Capacity in Communities (repatriation of indigenous artefacts, participation in outreach activities), Building Social Capital (evidence of engagement opportunities through volunteering, membership, affiliated societies; programs about cultural diversity) and Contributions to the Economy (employment; capacity to attract investment through sponsorship, bequests and donations; self generated revenue; tourism).

The second report was written by Tony Travers for the Museum, Libraries and Archives Council and the National Museum Directors Conference in Britain and published in October 2006.

*Museums and Galleries in Britain: economic, social and creative impacts* (Travers, 2006) reports the findings from a survey of England’s national and regional museums in response to questions regarding the sector’s overall social and economic impact. Its focus is the provision of evidence to demonstrate the depth and breadth of activity which has been generated in response to an increasingly complex and dynamic social agenda but which faces future slower or no-growth due to a funding base which is not keeping pace with developments.
Many of the questions in the survey were focused on income (public funding, capital grants, national lottery funding, donations and sponsorship, trading income, admissions income) and expenditure (operating expenditure, capital expenditure, collections purchase, staff). Other questions focused on forms of engagement (visitor numbers, website visits, numbers of volunteers and friends) and outputs (numbers of loans and publications).

The strongest part of the Travers' report is its well substantiated arguments for the economic impact of the English museum and galleries sector both in contributing to the local economy and as a 'tradeable' export. However, as with previous reports (NMDC, 2004a and Travers and Glaister, 2004), the arguments for the social and individual impacts of museum and gallery activity are focused on efforts rather than outcomes. The report describes many examples of activity directed towards creative, cultural, social and educational objectives but the evidence to substantiate the impacts of these activities in relation to user experience is lacking. One of the few exceptions is noted in the report and concerns a project conducted by Tyne & Wear Museums (TWM) in association with Bristol's Museums Galleries & Archives (BMGA) and the North East Museums Libraries and Archives Council (now MLA North East) to investigate demonstrable social impacts of museums.

This study purportedly included a literature review of recent material relating to impact measurement and evaluation, an analysis of audience data collected between 1998 – 2003 and a post-evaluation using focus groups of seven projects that took place between 1999 and 2004. The findings are not included in the Travers report.

The next sections of this chapter explore the question of whether sufficient evidence exists to support the values typology. It starts with the dimension of 'use value' and analyses the most recent literature in Australia and Britain combined with responses from the professional cohort to questions of evidence. Specific commentary has been cited to the respondent while examples of evidence from a range of respondents have been reported as a compilation.
Evidence of use value

Direct use

Comments from the primary research

*People still want to come to museums, in the face of an ever-increasing range of alternative options* (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

Evidence from the literature

Evidence of direct use is possibly the most available piece of data, although the figures vary according to the sample involved. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS, cat. 8560.0, 2003/4) sampling all adults over 18 years of age and all of the country’s museums (Commonwealth, state, local) reports that 25% of the country’s adult population over 18 years of age visits a museum. The Council of Australasian Museum Directors (CAMD) on the other hand, sampling only its membership of 21 of the largest institutions finds that there were 12 million visits in the year 2005-6, that this number represents a 5.5% increase on visits in 2004/05 and that visits to CAMD museums have risen steadily, with a 14.2% rise since 2001/02 (CAMD, 2006: 2).

Similarly, the Digest of Statistics (2006) produced for the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) in the UK by LISU finds that museums funded by the British Department of Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) attracted 34 million visits in 2005-6, that 95% of visitors rated their visit as good-very good and 80% felt that they gained new knowledge from their visit (2006: 10).

Travers (2006:8) reporting those museums surveyed for the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council and the National Museum Directors’ Conference (NMDC) report finds that ‘there are over 42 million visits each year to major museums and galleries’ in the UK.

---

17 LISU Research & consultancy for performance management
Comments from the primary research

Commentary: the willingness of some sections of the community to devote both money and time to the maintenance of museums (friends, patrons etc) (Professional cohort: Academic- Leisure studies resp 23)

Evidence from the literature

Holden states that willingness to pay and to give time to visit a museum is an indication of value. Volunteer hours for CAMD museums (also reported elsewhere in this chapter), exceeded 400,000 hours during the period covered by the survey. Travers reports that UK museums in the MLA/NMDC study had 3,000 volunteers and over 140,000 friends (2006:38).

The 143,000 ‘friends’ or equivalent supporters are important for a different reason. These individuals represent a major voluntary input not just into a museum or gallery, but into civil society more generally. At a time when national politicians are concerned about the loss of trust in government and many State institutions, the willingness of such a relatively large number of people to become involved in a major museum or gallery is useful evidence of the capacity of public institutions to engage citizens in a positive way (Travers, 2006:42).

Indirect use

Evidence from the literature

Increasingly, indirect use of the intellectual capital of museums through website access is proving another form of engagement. British institutions responding to the MLA/ NMDC survey reported over 100 million website visits in 2005/6 (Travers, 2006:38). The CAMD survey for the same period recorded 37 million visits (CAMD, 2006: 1)
Non-use

Comments from the primary research

The importance of the idea of the museum emerges most clearly when the museum changes and people start to debate what a museum is or should be. Often those who debate the loudest are those who visit rarely (or at least mainly visit overseas museums, and expect that local museums should emulate their metropolitan counterparts). But what comes across forcefully is the sense of what museums should be doing, even if no-one would visit that kind of museum or use the information being gathered behind the scenes (Professional cohort: Curatorial Division Head, resp 17)

Evidence from the literature

In addition, to direct and indirect use of museums and cultural activities, non-use values are now recognized as essential to values arguments (The Outspan Group, 1999; Mason, 2002; Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002; Holden, 2004; DCMS, 2005).

Pung et al (2004) found that non-users of the British Library were willing to pay twice as much in tax than what the Library currently receives in public investment. A study for the BBC revealed similar findings in terms of willingness to pay for BBC services compared with what public monies the corporation currently receives (Davies, 2004)

A 2004 study conducted by Market Opinion Research International (MORI) for the MLA found that the majority of the British population think it is important for their local town or city to have its own museum or art gallery. This includes a substantial proportion (76%) of those who had not visited during the past 12 months (MLA, 2004: 3). As one professional respondent in this study stated
The importance of the idea of the museum emerges most clearly when the museum changes and people start to debate what a museum is or should be. Often those who debate the loudest are those who visit rarely (or at least mainly visit overseas museums, and expect that local museums should emulate their metropolitan counterparts). But what comes across forcefully is the sense of what museums should be doing, even if no-one would visit that kind of museum or use the information being gathered behind the scenes (Senior curator)

Willingness to pay, or contingent valuation studies, have not been undertaken for the general arts and cultural or museum specific sector in Australia.

Evidence of instrumental value

Individual impacts

Personal learning

Comments from the primary research

As a significant point of difference to formal learning situations, professional respondents to this study commented that personal learning in museums is facilitated by the voluntary, free choice environment in which personal interest guides selection.

Most visitors come by choice, and then determine their own visit. Facilities like discovery centres encourage interactive and self-guided learning and are very popular (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

However, there was also some reservation about the existence of evidence to support these claims.

Audience-impact studies tend to suggest that some learning occurs in some museum settings, but I suspect that much more rigorous research is required before we can generalise and claim that museums truly ‘build knowledge’ (Professional cohort: (Professional cohort: Academic/Museum Studies resp 25)
Evidence from the literature

This reservation is supported by the literature. Although a significant claim of museum impact is the personal learning experienced by visitors, the actual evidence is uneven.

Student learning as the result of museum visits was the subject of a recent British study commissioned by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport and the Department for Education and Skills which examined the outcomes of 12 projects established through the Strategic Commissioning Programme 2003-2004: National/Regional Museum Education Partnerships. These projects consisted of museum education partnerships between national and regional museums. The projects ran from August 2003 to March 2004 and were of varying size.

The study involved 29,701 primary and secondary school students of whom 30% completed questionnaires about what they had learned as a result of a museum visit. 89% of the students who responded to the questionnaire felt that they had discovered some interesting things from the visit, 86% felt that the museum was a good place to learn in a different way to school-based learning, 77% felt the experience had given them a better understanding of the subject and 64% agreed that a visit to a museum or gallery makes school work more inspiring (Hooper Greenhill et al, 2004).

However, the data is largely perceptual, highlighting a problem with many studies in this area. There is an absence of both pre and post evaluations that provide measurable results. An Australian study, however, demonstrates that robust evidence of learning impact in museums can be attained through applying appropriate methodology.

Learning in Museums was an Australian study conducted in 2001 by researchers at The Powerhouse Museum (Sydney), the Institute for Learning Innovation (Annapolis, USA), and Curtin University of Technology and Scitech Discovery Centre (both in Perth, Western Australia).
The study explored whether any immediate and/or long term learning occurred as the result of engaging with interactive displays in museums and science centres (Falk et al, 2004). Visitors were interviewed both pre and post their encounters with exhibitions during a museum visit and, then, four -eight months later.

There were several important findings. Two key findings were the development of a learning typology which demonstrated that more than one type of learning outcome occurs. Four major categories of learning outcomes resulted from visitor interaction with the various interactive exhibits (a) Perspective and Awareness (b) Social Learning (c) Knowledge and Skills and (d) Motivations and Interests. A second finding illustrated that learning outcomes are mediated over time.

When visitors were interviewed in the museum immediately following their visit, they overwhelmingly reported that knowledge and skills were the primary type of learning impacts they experienced. Four to eight months after their visit, a large majority (73%) of visitors could articulate outcomes for at least one of their experiences but perspective, awareness and social learning were the dominant outcomes described by visitors several months later.

Economic impacts

Tourism

Comments from the primary research

Respondents in the professional cohort for this study also focused on evidence that museums play an important part in regional tourism.

*Look at tourism literature. The museum always gets a guernsey. That's in no small measure because communities recognize that people traveling through are looking for something - anything - to do and the museum is often one of the few visitor attractions in town. Community respondents have stated that they viewed a museum as a community asset because it brought in tourists; even people who didn't attend the museum mostly thought it was an asset (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28).*
Evidence suggestions from the professional cohort: (a) Tourism statistics (b) Examples in tourism destination marketing, community branding and publications: e.g. The Gulgong museum is a good example for community pride and positive image for a local museum; Sovereign Hill in Ballarat has been used very positively in the image of the city and is strongly identified with the city. Shear Outback in Hay has helped to improve the image of that town because of its strong iconography e.g. London, New York, Paris etc owe their international reputations in part on the quality and quantity of their cultural institutions (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 9)

Evidence from the literature

Museums and galleries are a key element in Britain’s tourism offer. Six out of the top ten UK visitor attractions in 2002 were NMDC members (NMDC, 2004a:6) and 10 to 11 million overseas visitors per year visited museums and galleries (particularly the national institutions) between 2002 and 2006 (Travers, 2006: 38). The opening of Tate Modern in 2000 demonstrated the power that a cultural attraction can have to generate tourism.

In only one year Tate Modern had become the third most visited tourist attraction in Britain and the anchor attraction on the South Bank, drawing attention and people to a previously undiscovered and undeveloped area (Arts Council England, 2004: 24)

2.5 million overseas tourists made a visit to a major when they travelled in Australia and New Zealand during the 2005-6 financial year (CAMD, 2005/6: 3). The role of Australian museums as destination attractions is recognised through tourism awards every year. In 2006, the immigration Museum in Melbourne won the Heritage and Cultural Tourism Award at the 2006 Victorian Tourism Awards while the 2006 Western Australian Awards gave the first prize of major tourist attraction to the Fremantle Prison Museum. In 2005 and, again in 2006, The National Museum of Australia in Canberra was judged the nation's best Major Tourist Attraction.
Employment

Evidence from the literature

In terms of direct impact (employment, purchase of services), the most recent figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Museums Survey (8560.0, 2003/4) show that the museum industry in Australia provides direct employment for 7,624 people. UK museums and galleries employ approximately 9,500 people (Travers, 2006: 38). Purchase of contract services is not reported in either the UK or Australia studies.

Self generated income

Evidence from the literature

Data from the Council of Australasian Museum Directors survey finds that the 21 participating institutions generated nearly $30,000,000 in revenue in the 2005/6 financial year (CAMD, 2006: 22).

Travers reports that, across the 22 British museums and galleries representing 121 sites surveyed, self-generated income amounted to over £200 million a year, including over £100 million in donations and sponsorship, over £100 million in trading income and some £20 million in ticket sales (Travers, 2006:8).

Local multiplied effect

Evidence from the literature

In Britain, Travers and Glaister (2004) found that spending generated by visitors to NMDC institutions was estimated to be £565 million, that the overall impact of the NMDC sector, including indirect and indirect effects, was in the range £1.83 to £2.07 billion and that the overseas “export” of NMDC institutions was £320 million a year. Comparable evidence for the economic impact of the Australian museum sector as a whole is not available.
Regeneration

Comments from the primary research

A professional respondent expressed reservations about this claim:

I don’t think we’ve seen this proved in Australia, but not for want of trying... There is some re-analysis of the French industrial NE region eco-museums in a recent issue of International Journal of Heritage Studies, suggesting that they are not continuing to be self-sustaining working communities as envisaged by utopian founders (Professional cohort: Cultural Tourism Specialist, resp 28)

Evidence from the literature

A major focus of economic impact within current British social policy is related to the role that cultural agencies can play in urban regeneration. London’s Tate Modern gallery, built and opened in 2000 in an area suffering economic decline (Southwark) is an example of culture-led regeneration. McKinsey & Company’s economic impact study (Travers and Glaister, 2004) on the Tate Modern after one year of opening, revealed that the gallery had created 467 jobs, 30% of which employed people from the local area, that the number of hotel and catering businesses in the immediate vicinity had increased by 23% from 1997-2000 leading to an estimated 1,800 new hotel and catering jobs and that property prices and commercial investment levels were increasing faster in Southwark compared to London averages. Overall, the estimated economic benefit of Tate Modern was around £100 million, of which £50-£70 million was specific to Southwark.

.... Tate Modern has played an important role in forging partnerships for the future development of the wider urban area. A masterplan commissioned by Tate Modern, which establishes a vision for the entire neighbourhood surrounding the museum, has been adopted by Southwark Council in its Unitary Development Plan. Tate is also part of a partnership scheme with other local employers - Spacia, Financial Times and Price Waterhouse Coopers - to sponsor projects that enhance the local environment through greening, social and safety initiatives. It also plays an active role in one of five pilot areas for Business Improvement Districts (BIDS), a new urban management structure where businesses pay a local levy to the council to actively engage in improvements to the area. (Travers and Glaister, 2004: 11)
Creativity

Evidence from the literature

Although a growing body of evidence exists that museums contribute both directly and indirectly to the economy, public respondents to this study questioned whether it is the purpose of the museums to stimulate the economy and suggested that a more appropriate economic indicator may be found in the contribution that museums make to the creative economy through fostering creativity and providing access to the archive of ideas. This research found that the public attribute the ‘creative archive’ held by museums with being a source of inspiration for new ideas. Travers (2006: 11) concurs, stating that

‘The role of museums and galleries ....in promoting and encouraging creativity should not be overlooked’. Future, high value-added economic activity may be based on ideas stimulated by museums. ‘Thus, the sub-sector will help in the development of new services, products and even manufactured goods’.

Evidence of the potential of museums to foster creativity was reported in one Australian pilot study examining the impact of museum visits on first year design students (Caban et al, 2002) while the use of museum collections to inspire fashion design is documented in the Powerhouse Museum’s exhibition, Sourcing the Muse (2002)\(^\text{18}\) and the interest shown by Karl Lagerfield of Chanel\(^\text{19}\) in the photographic images of early 20\(^{th}\) century criminals featured in the Justice and Police Museum’s publication of a recent exhibition.

Recognition of the role museums play in the international trade of cultural exports is also growing. The Council of Australasian Museum Directors reports the number of exhibitions that it ‘exports’ overseas annually and the numbers of visitors that attend these exhibitions. Travers sees other advantages of these cultural exports in terms of ‘soft diplomacy’ and in the international trade in ideas (2006: 81).


Community impacts

Educational resources and knowledge building

Comments from the primary research

The professional respondents to this study noted that evidence that the community values museums lies partly in the use that is made of them by the educational sector.

*Schools consider museums important as part of a child's education experience* (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3)

*Evidence suggested by the professional cohort:* (a) Numbers of school visits (b) Examples of partnerships with education (c) Support from educational institutions e.g. Education Departments support field officers based in Museums in some states (d) Public programs provided for adult education including collaborative programs with University Continuing Education Programs, University of the Third Age and the Workers Educational Association. Number of these programs; Numbers of participants; Types of programs provided for adult education, community development including collaborative programs with University Continuing Education Programs, University of the Third Age, WEA.

Evidence from the literature

Use of museums as educational resources by the formal education system exists. The 2002/3 Council of Australasian Museum Directors’ (CAMD) survey revealed that, amongst the 21 participating museums, more than 1.2 million visits were made by educational groups and that the majority of museums reported a rise in student attendance compared with the previous year (Ferguson, 2003: 3). The 2005/6 CAMD survey reported that more than 1.4 million educational visitors came to CAMD museums on organized excursions. Of these, 1.3 million were school students and over 71,000 were enrolled in tertiary or adult education classes (CAMD, 2006: 3).
In 2002 National Museums in Britain received 6.1 million visits by children - equivalent to half of Britain’s entire population of children. A further 3 million people participated in formal learning activities onsite in 2002 and 5.6 million people participated in learning activities off site – equivalent to one tenth of the British population (Travers and Glaister, 2004: 5). The second study on Museum Learning conducted for the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council by the Research Centre for Museums and Galleries at the University of Leicester (2005) has begun to address the issue of learning impact. One of its important findings is the higher marks received for history assignments written by students following a museum visit compared with marks for a history assignment written without going on a museum visit (2005: 20).

In addition to education programmes with primary and secondary schools, there is some evidence of collaboration between museums and higher education providers.

In Australia, CAMD museums reported over 50 partnerships with education departments and over 50 with tertiary institutions (CAMD, 2006: 14). Travers (2006:8) reports that British ‘museums and galleries have expanded their activities as partners with universities and further education’.

In some cases, this has led to the creation of new joint courses which build on and exploit the research value of collections and staff expertise. For example, Tate has been working with the London Consortium and the Royal College of Art, and is devising a Masters Degree with Birkbeck College; the Natural History Museum and the Science Museum both work closely with neighbouring Imperial College; the V&A collaborates with the Royal College of Art and Central St Martins School of Art; and, in Edinburgh the National Galleries of Scotland are partners with the Visual Arts Research Institute at Edinburgh University. In all cases, these initiatives demonstrate the benefits of reengaging the museum collections with new and wider audiences, and involving the academic and creative skills of museum staff in activities outside the host institutions. (Travers and Glaister, 2004: 12)
There is also abundant evidence of knowledge output through publications and the utilization of museum expertise for other projects. In Australia and New Zealand, CAMD museums made a significant contribution to knowledge with a total of 427 scholarly publications produced. In addition, over 14,000 publications, reports and articles about CAMD member museums were produced by other organizations (CAMD, 2006: 15). Travers reports that 1,400 scholarly publications were produced during 2004-05 by staff working in Britain’s museums and galleries (2006: 46).

The contribution to knowledge through research on collections is not confined to publications. In Britain, the National Museum Directors Conference report that taxonomic work based on the collections of the Natural History Museum and the Liverpool Museum enabled links to be made with other museum collections, leading to the creation of the English Natural History Collections Network and the National Biodiversity Network.

*The increase in awareness and concern about the natural world and the environment has refocused attention on the research capacity of NMDC members. This has led to an increased level of partnerships and consultancy work supporting the activities of environmental agencies and commercial companies working in the natural environment, with a particular emphasis on applied research on biodiversity (NMDC, 2004a: 33)*

**Community capacity building with indigenous communities**

*Comments from the primary research*

The Australian professional respondents to this study cited these evidence sources:

*Evidence suggested by the professional cohort:* Existence of policies at both institutional, national level and international level for the repatriation of indigenous cultural material and human remains (b) Existence of programs: [Commonwealth] Return of Indigenous Cultural Property Program for the repatriation of secret and sacred material and the return of human remains (c) Number of returned artefacts/human remains.
Evidence from the literature

Recognising indigenous heritage is not confined to within the walls of museums. It also refers to respecting the autonomy of indigenous cultures to manage their own material culture heritage. Repatriation of cultural material is a significant development in building capacity among indigenous communities. The 2006 CAMD reported that Australasian museum had completed 102 requests from indigenous communities for the return of cultural property.

Opportunities for engagement

Comments from the primary research

Commentary: Volunteers at ..........House are required to plan their own tours, keeping in mind logical presentation of content, management of very varied group (tourists, locals, families, kids), emergency procedures etc and then presenting their tour in a meaningful and enjoyable way. (b) Many volunteers have developed personal friendships and some property groups have strong social network. Weekend excursions always attract same group who enjoy social interaction as well as the earning experience (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 9).

Evidence suggested by the professional cohort: (a) Numbers of volunteers (b) Retention of volunteers (c) Duty statements (d) Program evaluations and volunteer response (e) Employment: A significant number of volunteers have taken the skills they garnered at the Museum and acquired paid employment in curatorial work; administration; publicity; desk top publishing etc.

Evidence from the literature

Close to 4,000 volunteers contributed 433,317 hours to CAMD museums in 2005/6 (2006:4) and professional respondents to this study felt strongly that museum volunteer programs offer important opportunities for skill building and social networking.

Contributing to social inclusion

Comments from the primary research

A professional respondent to this study cited a tangible example of inclusion as the result of museum activity:
Formation of groups as the result of working on museum displays i.e. The Museum in Adelaide provides numerous examples - The best single example is the creation of the Italian Historical Society in South Australia. This came about as an outcome of a Migration Museum exhibition on the Italian community in South Australia (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 7)

Evidence of increased social inclusion of indigenous cultures was suggested by the professional cohort through:

(a) The number of new Indigenous galleries and special temporary exhibitions in museums in the last 20 years reflects this changing relationship
(b) The number of Indigenous curators employed by museums compared with 10 years ago
(c) Number of Indigenous objects acquired for collections
(d) Number of publications about Indigenous representation
(e) Examination of the changes in indigenous displays over time. Aboriginal interpretation is often now one of giving voice to the people whose culture is reflected, which may in fact be in advance of mainstream society.

Although these were positive examples, one respondent commented that though, there was Far more Indigenous involvement than in the past [I am] still dubious as to whether most Indigenous people feel that museums are working for them (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

Evidence from the literature

DCMS has identified museums, libraries and archives as ‘centres for social change’. There are different ways of measuring access and inclusion. One is to consider the extent to which the facilities and services provided are accessible to people in the communities served. The other is to look at the actual use made of the services. (CHC 2002: 17)

With the aim of facilitating social inclusion through improved access, the British government undertook to make national museums free of charge in 2001. The government’s target was to increase visits by ‘disadvantaged’ groups (C2, D and E)

---

20 The UK social grades are alphabetised as A (upper middle class status with higher managerial, administrative or professional occupations), B (middle class status with intermediate managerial, administrative or professional occupations), C1 (lower middle class status with supervisory or clerical, junior managerial, administrative or professional occupations), C2 (skilled working class, often manual workers), D (working class status comprising semi and unskilled manual workers) and E (those at lowest level of subsistence, casual or lowest grade workers).
However, three years after the removal of admission charges, both Selwood (2004b) and MLA (2004) noted that social class remains a significant determinant in museum visiting.

*The higher an individual's social class, household income and education, the more likely they are to visit museums, art galleries and other types of cultural attractions* (MLA, 2004: 3)

In fact, the predominance of AB visitors (upper middle class and middle class) visitors to Britain's national museums is increasing in spite of the British government's overt attempts to require museums to be more socially inclusive.

......trend data for both England and GB suggest that the percentages of C1s, C2s, Ds and Es, attending museums are lower than they were previously despite the government's efforts directed towards museums widening their audiences and working to combat social inclusion. Against this, the proportion of As and Bs has increased (Selwood, 2004b: 19)

There appear to be differences, however, between national and regional attendances in Britain.

Travers (2006: 35) reports that the Museums Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) evidence to the Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee in January 2006 revealed that another government policy, *Renaissance in the Regions*, which focused on increasing and developing wider audiences to regional museums has seen participation by socio-economic groups C2,D and E and by black and minority ethnic groups who have not been visitors to museums increase by 15.2 per cent and 60 per cent respectively between 2002-03 and 2003-04.
Recent evidence sources demonstrating inclusiveness reveal more about
efforts than evidence. For the first time in the 2005/6 survey, CAMD participant
reported programs focusing on cultural diversity. Over 130 exhibitions and
programs which explored Indigenous and other cultures were listed in the CAMD
describing efforts towards cultural inclusion through encouraging participating
and celebration of diversity. However, while evidence of effort directed towards
achieving social cohesion is growing, evidence of impact continues to prove
difficult to obtain (Wavell et al, 2002; Rand, 2004; Ruiz, 2004; Burns Owen
Partnership, 2005).

Evidence of institutional value

Trusted expertise

Comments from the primary research
The [Museum] answers over 33,000 public enquiries a year. Why? Because
people see the Museum as accessible, welcoming (more so than
universities and most government agencies), credible (Professional cohort:
Senior Exec State Museum resp 5)

Evidence from the literature
In support of this comment, the 2006-6 CAMD report finds that museums
in Australia and New Zealand answered 372,713 queries in the period covered by
the survey.

Providing valued services

Comments from the primary research
Comments: A museum is especially valued in regional areas for its series
of branches, which bring museum services to a much wider audience, and
for its outstanding school loans service (Professional cohort: Senior
Curator State Museum resp 15 )
Evidence from the literature

In 2005-6, CAMD institutions made 10,472 loans of museum interpretation kits which reached 198,453 people, provided 25 monetary grants and 207 internships to small museums and traveled exhibitions to over 60 regional centers (CAMD, 2006).

Building relationships

Comments from the primary research

The strength of the relationship between museums and governments of other countries is often revealed by the amount of contact between them and the number of projects they run together (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 1)

The existence of organizations such as Asialink (Melbourne University), the Australia Council, Ausheritage and the British Council suggest that governments and funding agencies have already accepted the validity of the proposition (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Evidence suggested by the professional cohort: (a) Number of international partnership projects (b) Examples of published evidence in Forwards from representatives from governments on other countries to reports on such projects (c) Significance of projects eg Sydney 2000 Olympics (d) Evidence of infrastructural support for projects given by diplomats, Department of Foreign Affairs and other relevant bodies

(e) number of shared projects (f) number of contracts and grants, (g) degree of museum participation on government working groups and committees, input into planning processes, provision of data etc

Evidence from the literature

The CAMD survey reports the number of exhibitions which are sent overseas (not including New Zealand) and the number of visitors that these exhibitions attract. It does not report the number of international collaborations between Australasian and overseas museums such as The Great Wall of China: dynasties, dragons and warriors, a significant partnership between the National Museum of China and the Powerhouse Museum which has forged important diplomatic and cultural ties that go beyond the two institutions.
Attracting investment

Comments from the primary research

(a) Museums attract funding, investment, bequests, donations and other forms of support from many sectors of the community. [People] bequeath part of their testamentary estate to a museum. Sponsorship is a tangible expression of endorsement of a museum's activities and/or potential activities, and thus of its longer-term impacts (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

(b) Local government is beginning to invest more resources as it sees the importance of local museums. Many now incorporate an operating grant to the museum in their budgets; several have combined their shopfronts with visitor centres (Professional cohort: Support Services for regional museums resp 20)

(c) Politicians – at every level – demonstrate awareness of the important role that museums have in peoples' lives. They provide funds for museum support (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3)

Evidence suggested by the professional cohort: (a) Analysis of annual reports: reveal sponsors and grant recipients; also analysis of reports from funding bodies. (b) Charts of accounts: demonstrable through charts of accounts of any large museums (c) Presence of tax breaks for sponsors (d) the amount of in-kind support is another form of evidence on museums' ability to attract investment

Evidence from the literature

Federal, state and local government grants continue to represent 68% of funding for the operation of museums in Australia (ABS, 8560.0, 2003-4). Australian museums attracted $325,238,000 in recurrent income during the 2005/6 financial year (CAMD, 2006).

In addition, CAMD institutions attracted $1,000,000 in sponsorships and the equivalent of $26,000 in bequests (CAMD, 2006: 22) while the museums and galleries in the MLA/NMDC study received over £100 million in donations and sponsorship (Travers, 2006:8).
Media response

Comments from the primary research

Media comment has also been substantial. The Museum gave rise to a total of 1,393 national and international media reports in its first year, an average of almost four stories per day. An independent survey noted that 80% of all coverage had been favourable (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 2)

Evidence from the literature

Neither CAMD nor the MLA/NMDC study in Britain reported against this indicator, although most large museums monitor media interest and keep records of press clippings.

Maintaining public standards

Comments from the primary research

Respondents cited visitor surveys that 'show that satisfaction levels are high (91% of visitors surveyed say they are 'Satisfied' or 'Very satisfied' with their experience)' and 'comments by individuals in letters, visitor feedback forms or in visitor surveys also articulate the value that they have found in the Museum in a variety of ways (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Commonwealth Museum resp 3)

Evidence of intrinsic value

Intrinsic value encompasses impacts for both individuals and communities. The primary research for this thesis found cognitive outcomes for individuals such as enrichment, discovery, enlightenment, inspiration and perspective; well-being impacts including refreshment, affirmation, joy, pleasure and excitement and empathy outcomes embracing awareness and insight. For communities, intrinsic value is experienced as various dimensions of historical, social, symbolic, spiritual and aesthetic value.
This dimension has a limited evidence base. Travers finds that ‘The capacity of cultural institutions to provide people with opportunities to develop in ways that enhance their happiness – a key government concern – is not yet researched’ (2006: 13). Evidence, therefore, to support the dimension of intrinsic value is largely limited to the comments and suggestions arising from the professional responses to the primary research for this study.

Individuals and intrinsic value

Inspiration

Comments from the primary research

The professional respondents to this study found evidence of the role of museums providing inspiration through examples of specific programs. For example,

‘The use of collections and programs for design inspiration. The exhibition Sourcing the Muse; Photographer Anne Ferran has used the children’s costume collection at Rouse Hill estate for inspiration for her astonishing ‘X Ray’ photographs which talk eloquently of lost childhood and past memories; The Craft Museum in New Delhi has a significant collection of textiles which are used as “source books” for contemporary textile designers and manufacturers. The curator claims that patterns and techniques that fell out of use have been reintroduced into modern currency thanks to the preservation of historic examples; Australian artist, Janet Laurence, creates her installations using museum collection objects’ (Professional cohort: Academic Design Studies, resp 24)

Personal testimonials were also suggested as evidence.

‘Tim Flannery pays tribute in ‘The Future Eaters’ to the inspiration he and cousin, John Long, gained as young teenagers from a jaw bone in the Museum Victoria collection. Both men have subsequently developed successful museum careers’ (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Other respondents cited the evidence of studies that have investigated museums as ‘free choice’ learning settings, with specific reference to the work of John Falk and Lynn Dierking (The Museum Experience and Learning from Museums: Visitor Experiences and the Making of Meaning) and Lois Silverman (Visitor Meaning Making in Museums).
Communities and intrinsic value

The communal archive

_Dehere the primary research_

Respondents noted that museums normally only collect items that are assessed as significant and, hence, valued. This underlies the public preference for museums as places for the donation of family items for safe keeping and preservation.

Direct and indirect evidence was suggested to support this claim. On the one hand, the number, value and breadth of donations and bequests are evidence of the value of museums as a holder of both personal items and the communal archive. On the other hand, 'the hue and cry that accompanies de-accessioning' is an indirect indicator of this role.

Lessons of history

_Dehere the primary research_

Though the 'lessons of history' are a strongly perceived value from the perspective of the public, professionals provided mixed views about this claim and questioned what evidence exists to support this belief.

_I think museum presentations of the past are often delimited by mission and thus offer only partial insight into the present/future_ (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 26)

_Probably the Australian War Memorial has been playing a big role in the quiet formulation of an Australian reflectiveness about our experience of war. ...The fights going on with the National Museum demonstrate how museums are — properly — battlegrounds for ideologically competing groups seeking to stamp their formulations of national identity on the Australian psyche_ (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28)

_I think museum presentations of the past are often delimited by mission and thus offer only partial insight into the present/future. Eg: Australian War Memorial mission is to commemorate Australian war efforts, and therefore it often minimises other elements of a war and gives a historically disproportionate stress to Australian presence/action_ (Professional cohort: Academic/Museum Studies resp 26)
Wishful thinking and something I believe we all aspire to. I believe that Museums provide the opportunity for visitors to do so – to learn from the lessons of the past; to understand their own origins etc. I don’t really know how one finds evidence to show that museums do achieve this, unless one follows a visitor’s intellectual journey before and after a visit (Professional cohort: Senior Exec Community Museum resp 11)

Sense of place
Comments from the primary research

Respondents felt that the fact of preserving an historic building presupposes that its history, architecture and the events associated with it are important in some way. International examples include Mt. Vernon (George Washington’s home) and Monticello, (Jefferson’s home) both museums that have had an impact on interpretations of those two figures. An Australian example is Sovereign Hill in Ballarat Victoria, the scene of the Eureka uprising by miners during the gold rush of the 1850’s.

Identity
Comments from the primary research

Respondents commented that ‘Whenever a community wants to make a statement about the value of an experience, or a place or an object, when they want to make a statement about themselves, about their identity – usually the demand is for the establishment of a museum’ (Professional cohort: Regional Services for regional museums resp 20)

People create museums to express identities; people visit them to experience this expression, looking for reinforcement of their sense of identity. They do an excellent job of picking up the symbols of a community which are not themselves in situ and public. The Moonta National Trust Museum, for instance, has huge collections of material which builds a vivid picture of the life of a largely Cornish and Methodist community. The buildings in the area convey some of the story but only the bare bones. The Museum captures the inner life of Moonta much better (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28)

Evidence suggested by the professional cohort: (a) Their very existence expresses this identity, and the level and range of usage by local people (and by tourists who want to savour that local identity) provides evidence for its effectiveness. (b) Media and publications (c) Visitor feedback
Use as civic spaces

Comments from the primary research

Like libraries, museums are increasingly becoming social spaces that people are beginning to accept as places of informal learning, as well as recreation.

Evidence suggested by the professional cohort: (a) Attendance: If one measures importance by public attendance, evidence exists in the number of museum visitors around the world. (b) Number of diplomatic/state/ceremonial occasions (c) Capital investment (new buildings) by governments provides part of the evidence here (d) Prominence architecturally (e) Published papers: by Eilean Heumann-Gurian most recently at American Association of Museums Conference Dallas 2002

Community pride

Comments from the primary research

Evidence lies in the survival of over 2000 museums in Australia. (Professional cohort: Academic Museums Studies resp 25)

Loss: Yes. In fact, I find this point made most powerfully when a community is about to lose its museum or museum-type operation (as with a number of heritage railways under threat because of huge insurance premiums.). The sustained anxiety and grief which the impending and actual loss of the museum causes is palpable and amply demonstrates their value. Museums are at the least symbols of prestige and a guarantee of continuity for a community. Lose the museum and the town’s foundations seem to rock and community optimism takes a battering (Professional cohort: State Tourism resp 28)

Evidence suggested by the professional cohort

(a) Media reports: e.g. An examination of how new museum projects are received – especially the National Museum of Australia and Melbourne Museum eg. Australian regional examples e.g. Cobb & Co Changing Station at Surat in Queensland, Bishops Lodge and also Shear Outback in Hay and the regional museum in Wagga Wagga; (b) Funding and visitation is also an expression of civic consciousness and co-operation. In other words well-visited museums represent communal effort to create safe public spaces where shared values can be celebrated.
Commemoration

Comments from the primary research

The one example I gave of communities returning to the Museum to lay wreaths on the Wall Plaques I think speaks for itself. The existence of the plaque and the Museum has made an ongoing and permanent bond with the community (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 7)

Immigration museums provide an outlet for minority groups to celebrate and share their cultural inheritance. e.g. Te Papa Tongarewa marae located in-house and operating as a valid community focus for cultural practise (Professional cohort: Senior Exec State Museum resp 9)

Museums often construct their public programs calendar around significant cultural events in the community’s calendar, and thus contribute directly to the celebration (Professional cohort: Academic/ Museum Studies resp 25)

If the museum hosts an exhibition on (or related to) the theme of a 'significant cultural event', then it can provide the setting or visual backdrop for many other community events (announcements, book-launches, lectures) associated with the theme. The clustering of NAIDOC-week activities in museums that present exhibitions of indigenous materials is a recurring example.... Unplanned events in the community provide stronger evidence, I suspect, that the museum serves as a focal point. For example, news reports in Australia after the recent space shuttle disaster suggested that, on the day of the tragedy, people in Washington were gathering at the Smithsonian’s Air & Space Museum to mourn the loss (Professional cohort: Academic- Design Studies resp 24)

Evidence suggested by the professional cohort: (a) Number of these events (b) Numbers of participants (c) Breadth of these events e.g. Special event programs linked to community significant cultural events and rituals eg at the Powerhouse Museum Chinese New Year, Tibetan Mandala, Samoan arm tattoo, Gay Mardi Gras

21 NAIDOC Week- National Aborigines and Islanders Day Observance Committee This committee was once responsible for organizing national activities during NAIDOC Week and its acronym has become the name of the week itself.
Conclusions

The responses of the professional cohort to this study combined with recent CAMD data and the Travers report suggest that, although there is a growing body of evidence to support many aspects within the values typology for museums, significant gaps in evidence still exist. There is no evidence in Australia to prove non-use value. Overall, there is little evidence to support intrinsic value claims, learning impact is a contested area, social inclusion remains inconclusive and regeneration is an area where robust longitudinal studies are needed. These are areas for further research.

The primary research component of this analysis also revealed three new defensible aspects, one in relation to direct and indirect use value and two in relation to institutional value. These are ‘willingness to give something up’ (use value) and ‘media response’ and ‘attracting investment’ (institutional value). These are included in the framework for assessing value which is the subject of the next chapter.

This survey of evidence from literature and primary research confirms the need for a generic set of indicators to form the basis of an on-going research strategy. Moreover, these indicators need to reflect both intermediate and long term impacts and apply a suite of appropriate methodologies to acquire the data required across these timeframes (Mason, 2002). These issues will be discussed in the next chapter as part of the development of an assessment framework.
CHAPTER EIGHT: A PARADIGM FOR VALUES ASSESSMENT

In these days when measures rather than faith have to be applied, the arts are in a precarious position simply because it is so difficult to find suitable measures that truly reflect the value that arts contribute to the quality of life in our communities. (Matarasso, 1999: 1)

It is important to acknowledge the intrinsic value of culture. But how do we measure and understand cultural value? There needs to be consensus on what constitutes quality, and what a future evidence base should consist of (DCMS, 2005:8-9)

This chapter proposes an approach to values assessment for museums. It does so aware of some limitations in relation to this approach.

From an analysis of the evidence to substantiate the values typology undertaken in the previous chapter is it apparent that the existing evidence base is weighted in favour of outcomes (immediate and intermediate results) rather than longer term impacts. The approach proposed recognises that values based on longer term impact will require further research.

Further, indicators against which to measure progress imply standards. The evolving state of benchmark data affects the capacity to set standards. The setting of standards has not been a dimension of this research and this study acknowledges that further consultation with the sector is required as this work progresses.

This chapter, therefore, will first situate an approach to values-based assessment within the wider context of indicator development in general and cultural indicators in particular.
Social change and the development of indicators

An indicator is an instrument or tool for evaluation, a yardstick to measure results and to assess realization of desired levels of performance in a sustained and objective way (Chapman 2000: 2 in IFACCA, 2004: 10)

Indicator development has acquired prominence in recent years due to two emerging trends. On the one hand, there is a growing prevalence of quality of life and community indicator projects. At the same time, performance indicators for the cultural sector that focus on program review, evaluation and efficiency measures have increased amid demands from governments to provide evidence of use of resources towards policy objectives (Matarasso; 2001; Duxbury 2003; IFACCA, 2005). These two trends are not unrelated.

Context is an increasingly important factor in understanding the evolution and significance of indicators (IFACCA, 2005). AEGIS (2004: 3-4) finds that societal changes over the past decade have led internationally to a reevaluation of how to measure human progress. Two main trends have directed these developments. Changes in society in recent decades have accompanied a perceived decline in social capital and conventional measures such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Gross National Product (GNP) based solely on economic measures have been criticised as inadequate and misleading. Economic development priorities for public planning have been superseded by the emergence of new approaches including ecologically sustainable development (ESD), triple bottom line reporting (3BL), quality of life, community wellbeing, community capacity building, social inclusion, social capital, whole of government planning, best practice and creative communities.

The development of social indicators is increasing in prominence as concepts such as community building and sustainable development gain currency at governmental levels and as governments attempt to develop better measures of progress to meet the demands for greater accountability in policies and programs (IFACCA, 2005: 4).
Duxbury (2003: 4) notes that, since the 1990's, three main interpretive frameworks (quality of life, sustainability, and healthy communities) have merged to become an integrated social indicator framework. At the same time, the scope of this framework has broadened creating more opportunities for the inclusion of arts and culture. AEGIS (2004) finds that emerging trends in cultural theory such as the role of cultural vitality in sustaining communities and the recognition that culture is relevant to building social capital and contributing to social development objectives have supported the inclusion of cultural indicators within wider social indicators frameworks. Hawkes (2001) and Holden (2004) support this, arguing that public planning should integrate cultural, social, economic and environmental aspects. Policy development increasingly focuses on the intersection of cultural participation and other social areas including education, crime prevention, health and community building. Within this larger world of indicators, the cultural and arts environment has gained increasing prominence.

It is within this wider framework that national indices related to well-being and quality-of-life have been developed with social cohesion and social capital indicators becoming a preoccupation of many OECD countries in the last decade. Jackson et al (2000:129) for the Canadian Social Cohesion Network, Department of Canadian Heritage and Department of Justice propose indicators to measure social cohesion under a general framework of ‘participation’. Their social cohesion indicators include trust in people, confidence in institutions, respect for diversity, understanding of reciprocity, sense of belonging, support for social networks through frequency of contact, level of engagement, voluntary participation in networks and groups, willingness to commit time to becoming a member of voluntary organizations and political groups and willingness to make philanthropic donations. These indices, applied to the cultural sector, demonstrate the degree to which cultural activity is contributing to a national agenda.
The UK report to the 2004 OECD World Forum on Key Indicators locates the development of indicators and the gathering of statistical information to measure social capital firmly within the needs of evidence-based policy, particularly in terms of policy initiatives redressing social inequality, neighbourhood renewal and community revival (Babb, 2004). Similarly, Hall (2004) reports that indicator development in Australia has been motivated by the need to evaluate government policies and programs and assess public satisfaction with the quality of government services. Social indicator data in Australia is seen as particularly relevant to the programs associated with the sustainability of regional communities, areas of concentrated disadvantage, health, education, employment, family functioning, sport and recreation, arts and culture, housing, crime and justice. Social indicators were included for the first time in the 2006 General Social Survey in Australia.

Cultural indicators

Indicator frameworks have also been produced specifically for the museums' sector on behalf of governments. In 1999, DCMS commissioned Deloitte & Touche and Lord Cultural Resources and Planning (LORD) to work with government-sponsored national museums and galleries to develop and pilot test a generic business model and performance indicators for their on-going performance management. The model was based on two key criteria-efficiency and effectiveness (DCMS, 1999b).

The model distinguished 'core' activities such as the stewardship of collections, public access and 'support activities' including corporate management, site management and administration. A list of 365 performance indicators was developed from which a short list of 37 was abstracted to be used by government as a tool to monitor the performance of the nationally funded museums and galleries and to assess their contribution to the achievement of DCMS objectives including access, education, excellence, inclusion and value for money.
In 1999, DCMS also published its *Standards for Museums and Galleries to use when developing access policies* (DCMS, 1999C). The standards were 'aimed primarily at all the museums and galleries directly funded by DCMS' which were asked 'to set targets for access in their new 3-year funding agreements with the Department' with the intention that the standards would 'become a requirement of Registration as part of their reformulation of the scheme over the next few years' (DCMS, 1999: 6). The standards included engaging diverse audiences through increased and innovative access to collections, addressing physical barriers such as opening hours and admission and pricing policies, setting targets to increase the proportion of visitors from under-represented groups and extending facilities to provide disability access, availability of information in languages other than English, electronic access to collections, etc. Selwood's (2002b:72) analysis of the development of DCMS indicators for the UK museum sector found that qualitative indicators were casualties of the refinement process with 'user satisfaction' and 'public image of institutions' abandoned from 2001.

The ABS project *Arts and cultural heritage in Australia: key issues for an information development plan* (2006) consulted collecting institutions (libraries, museums, galleries and archives) to identify the indicators against which they are currently reporting. An analysis of the combined list of current indicators provides interesting insights. The majority are indicative of effort and activity rather than outcomes or impact. There is a focus on economic efficiency in terms of income and expenditure and an emphasis on indicators of 'best practice' in terms of collection management. In many cases, indicators drill down into more specific aspects of one topic. For example, 'visitor' indicators include residence, sex, age, qualifications, labour force status, occupation, industry, highest educational qualification, purpose of visit, length of stay.

There are indicators that could be classified as 'instrumental' (use as education resources, opportunities for participation and engagement, community capacity through support for regional institutions, provision of touring exhibitions, building knowledge through the publication of scholarly research and economic revenue attraction and generation).
‘Use’ indicators are comprehensive, with the exception of a non-use dimension. ‘Institutional’ indicators include the capacity of cultural institutions to attract donations, bequests, sponsorships, research grants, build relationships and partnerships, attract highly credentialed staff, provide trusted expertise and offer valued services to customers. There is almost nothing related to intrinsic value.

The ABS project states that it seeks data to inform policy with the goals of delivering ‘cultural, social, quality of life and economic benefits’ (ABS, 4915.0.55.001, 2006: 8). Although ‘quality of life issues’ refer to ‘impacts of arts involvement on learning, sense of achievement and general wellbeing’ (ABS, 4915.0.55.001, 2006: 9), there are as yet no indicators to address this essential dimension.

Developing indicators

The current lack of generic indicators, appropriate to both the tangible and intangible outcomes of museums, developed in consultation with the sector is noted by Allison and Coalter (2001) the CHC (2002) and Wavell et al (2002). But developing indicators is difficult work. Fukuda-Parr (2001: 2-3) argues that the most important issue is defining what we are trying to capture.

‘What is precisely the reality that we want to measure?...What are the key dimensions? Most social and economic realities are complex and multi-dimensional. No single indicator can reflect such a reality. Culture is no exception. It is a complex reality that needs to be ‘unpacked’ into key dimensions’.

Lievesley (2001:377) suggests that indicators also need to be realistic, allow enough change over time to be valuable as yardsticks, have relevant benchmarks against which they can be compared, be generic enough for generalization and coherent with what has been used before.

Meaningful selectivity is crucial. An almost limitless variety of indicators can be applied to the cultural sphere. Matarasso (2001; 6) notes that, ‘one of the problems with asking questions about cultural activity...is that there is almost no end to the interesting things one would like to know’ and therefore ‘it is essential to decide what level of information about the cultural sector can usefully and sustainably be collected.’ The tendency is to develop unwieldy productions of ‘wish lists’ that attempt to cover as many policy foci and variables as possible (Matarasso 2001; 2).

*Indicators must be chosen with care; not too numerous, enough to represent the whole spectrum to be evaluated, sensitive to changes. It is also advantageous if they are relatively simple to register regularly, so that temporal series may be compiled. Choosing indicators entails compromising between the ideal and the possible (Nylöf 1997; 367 in IFACCA, 2004: 17)

**Quantitative and qualitative indicators**

In an era when a positivist approach to evaluation has dominated, the term *measurement* has been synonymous with *quantitative* data and quantitative data has been aligned with *statistical* information. The literature notes some confusion with definitions of indicators and the role of statistics in indicator reporting. Duxbury finds that ‘what is measurable becomes a defacto indicator’ and quotes Berry’s definition of indicators as

*...presentation of measurements. They are bits of information that summarize the characteristics of systems or highlight what is happening in a system. Indicators simplify complex phenomena, and make it possible to gauge the general status of a system to inform action* (Berry, 2002: 3 in Duxbury, 2003: 2)
But Fukuda-Parr (2001: 278) suggests that while both statistics and indicators are built on data and are expressed as numerical values, an indicator is a special kind of statistic. 'Whereas a statistic describes a phenomenon, an indicator implies something about that phenomenon: Indicators...must contain evaluative, and not only descriptive, information.

This trend to broadening the scope of indicators is reflected in a conceptual shift 'to complement quantitative, objective measure with subjective, opinion-based measures and indicators' within projects. Duxbury (2003: 4) finds evidence of 'greater balance between quantitative and qualitative research methods in newer generation measures and indicators. IFACCA (2004: 3) believes that there is a place for both 'hard' statistical evidence and the narrative descriptions of qualitative evidence that policymakers use to understand, evaluate and communicate the importance and effectiveness of their policies and programs.

The use of both quantitative and qualitative indicators is considered crucial to evaluating cultural policies and programs. Matarasso cautions that 'In a world of numbers and quantification, if there are no indicators to assess the value of activities, feelings or relationships these things—however real—have no legitimacy 1996:1).

Policy makers' preoccupation with economic measures, and their reluctance to include social costs and benefits in the balance sheet, is like trying to navigate by compass with a magnet in one's pocket—it draws us off course. We must supplement monetary indicators of value with other more subtle, creative and sensitive benchmarks by which we can measure our progress as a society (Matarasso, 1996:1)

This is particularly important in the current shift towards a values-based paradigm for cultural evaluation which must recognises 'the affective elements of cultural experience, practice and identity, as well as the full range of quantifiable economic and numerical data (Holden, 2004:10)
A values approach to museums' assessment

In developing a values-based approach to museums assessment, this research addresses the issues derived from the literature combined with outcomes of the primary research for this study.

The proposed assessment framework adopts the values typology outlined at the end of Chapter 5 (and the extra inclusions at the end of Chapter 6 eg.media awareness, capacity to attract investment) as the basis for a set of generic indicators. This indicator framework distinguishes between immediate, intermediate and longer term timeframes, noting Poll and Payne's comment that some outcomes often become visible only in long-term development (Poll and Payne, 2006: 3).

Moreover, the framework adopts the principles outlined in the W.K. Kellogg Logic Model Development Guide (2006:47) that viable indicators will:

1. Reflect the issues on the subject of a variety of audiences;
2. Have a known data source;
3. Have identified data collection and analysis strategies appropriate for each indicator;
4. Have identified technical assistance within budget.

In response to point 1, the issues have been derived from an analysis of existing literature and the responses of a representative sample of Australian professionals working in Commonwealth, state and local museums, across all states and territories and in a variety of roles within and without organisations. The public cohort represents both the visiting and non-visiting public sourced from four lifestyle groups and three community situations (a large capital city, a smaller city and several regional centres).
CHASS (2005: 19) suggests that the use of existing measures, indicators and processes to measure quality and impact guarantees acceptability and reduces the resource burden. This research adopts this principle and has, where possible, proposed indicators that have an existing and on-going evidence base and a framework for data collection. This is particularly true for the Stage 1 indicators for which existing annual data exists through the CAMD survey and ABS data.

The CAMD survey has been undertaken annually since 1990 and is funded by the annual subscription of the participating institutions. Recently, CAMD has instituted a research program to conduct meta-analyses of existing CAMD survey data to build an evidence base in many of these areas as well as institute new studies (Scott C, 2005b). This initiative is supported by a working party of Evaluation specialists working in Australian museums in association with the CAMD Executive Officer of the Council of Australasian Museum Directors.

One of these studies, currently underway, is examining users of museum websites in an effort to better understand the factors that affect use. This collective initiative is similar to the LIRG / SCONUL impact initiative undertaken in the UK discussed briefly in the preceding chapter where participating libraries identified an area where they wished to determine impact and then adopted a collective project-based approach to assessment (Poll and Payne, 2006: 9-10). Importantly, the Council of Australasian Museum Directors has a working relationship with members of the Evaluation and Visitor Research Special Interest Group of Museums Australia who comprise the Working Party to assist CAMD realise its research initiatives.
In addition, the recent initiative of the Statistical Working Group of the Cultural Ministers' Council to develop a set of core data indicators for Australian collecting institutions (museums, galleries, archives and libraries) through the Australian Bureau of Statistics offers another data set for evidence use. There are, however, areas where new studies will have to be initiated. This is especially true in relation to the non-use value, intrinsic value dimensions and some of the instrumental value aspects.

The assessment framework which follows is categorized according to immediate, intermediate and long term time periods. The rationale for this differentiation is both a reflection of the cumulative nature of value, the need for a program of manageable data collection and awareness that some of the qualitative studies require time to be developed and implemented. The first section suggests indicators for which data can be collected in the short term through evidence which is known to be available annually from the CAMD survey, ABS data and museum annual reports. Some evidence requires meta-analyses of data contained in Human Resource Departments of museums, internal museum audience surveys and studies and revenue generation from commercial activities such as function hire.

In the transition from a typology of values to their assessment, Mason provides the following guidance. Firstly, he states that there should be an appropriate alignment of assessment tools to values. 'The choice of tools affects values—some tools give a more accurate or detailed view of certain values than others' (Mason, 2002: 23). Mason recommends

... a suite of different methods in complementary ways...The underlying principle is that the layering of different, complementary pieces of information will produce a more accurate answer than would the pursuit of one or two pieces of information (Mason, 2002: 16).
This is especially true when it comes to the difference between immediate, intermediate the long term indicators. It is recognised that indicators which are indicative of immediate/annual outcomes such as the number of publications as evidence of knowledge building support the notion of 'effort' towards creating new knowledge but do not substantiate evidence of impact through use in the longer term.

Finally, the proposed assessment framework encompasses all the indicators which this research has generated. The need for meaningful selectivity (DCMS, 1999b) is recognised as a necessary second stage and is proposed for future discussions with CAMD.
Section 1: Assessing the value of museums-annual outcomes

Table 6a: The Value of Museums: annual outcomes (Scott 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE DIMENSION</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>1) Direct use (physical visits)</td>
<td>1a) Number of visitor attendances to museums annually</td>
<td>ABS census data and CAMD report (1a)</td>
<td>Analysis of ABS and CAMD data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b) Degree of repeat visitation annually</td>
<td>Institutional records and surveys (1b)</td>
<td>Meta analysis of internal research surveys conducted by CAMD participating institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Indirect use (use of outreach services)</td>
<td>2a) Number of users of outreach programs e.g. number of participants to travelling exhibitions, outreach programs including lectures and workshops</td>
<td>Annual CAMD survey (2a)</td>
<td>Analysis of CAMD data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2b) Number of unique visits to museum websites</td>
<td>Annual CAMD survey (2b)</td>
<td>Analysis of CAMD data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Willingness to engage (through extended time commitment)</td>
<td>3a) Number of volunteers</td>
<td>Annual CAMD survey (3a)</td>
<td>Analysis of CAMD data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3b) Number of volunteer hours per annum</td>
<td>Institutional records and surveys (3b, 3c, 3d, 3e)</td>
<td>Meta analysis of volunteer programs, and members programs from CAMD participating institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3c) Retention rate of volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of minutes Boards of Trustees and other groups minutes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6b: The Value of Museums: annual outcomes continued (Scott 2007)

THE VALUE OF MUSEUMS: ANNUAL OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE DIMENSION</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>1) Recognition of trusted expertise</td>
<td>1a) Number of public enquiries annually 1b) Number of external projects for which museum expertise has been requested.</td>
<td>CAMD annual reports (1a) and Museum annual reports (1b)</td>
<td>Analysis of data from annual CAMD reports and Museum annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Building relationships</td>
<td>2a) Number of local, national and international partnerships involving museums and other government agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2b) Significance of these projects in terms of $, number and type of major stakeholders</td>
<td>Museum annual reports (2b) and interviews with Museum Directors</td>
<td>Document analysis of Museum annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Attracting investment</td>
<td>3a) Value of government grants (capital and recurrent) 3b) Number and value of sponsorships (cash and in kind) 3c) Number and value of donations 3d) Number and value of bequests</td>
<td>Annual CAMD survey (3a, 3b, 3c, 3d)</td>
<td>Analysis of CAMD annual survey data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE DIMENSION</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>METHOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>4)</td>
<td>4a) Number of staff 4b) Number and types of professional qualifications</td>
<td>ABS census data (4a) Museum annual reports (4a) Human Resource Dept records (4b)</td>
<td>Analysis of ABS, CAMD and HR data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Growth of sector</td>
<td>5a) Number of museums 5b) Number of new museums 5c) Number of museum closures</td>
<td>ABS census data and other ABS reports (5a, 5b, 5c)</td>
<td>Document analysis of ABS reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6) Providing valued services to communities</td>
<td>6a) Number of object loans 6b) Number of requests for skills training 6c) Number of visitors to touring programs 6d) Number of outreach lectures and presentations by museum staff and number of attendees</td>
<td>Annual CAMD survey (6a, 6b, 6c, 6d)</td>
<td>Analysis of data from annual CAMD reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE DIMENSION</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>METHOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUMENTAL</td>
<td>1) Community capacity</td>
<td>1a) Number of school students</td>
<td>Annual CAMD survey (1a1, 1a2, 1a3, 1a4, 1b1, 1b2)</td>
<td>Analysis of data from annual CAMD reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) providing educational resources</td>
<td>1a2) Number of partnerships with school bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1a3) Number of adult education programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1a) Number of participants in these programs (1a3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Knowledge building</td>
<td>1b1) Number of research publications based on collections</td>
<td>Annual CAMD survey (1b1, 1b2)</td>
<td>Analysis of data from annual CAMD reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b2) Number and value of museum/university projects funded by Australian Research Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Social cohesion</td>
<td>2a1) Number of programs about indigenous issues</td>
<td>Museum annual reports and CAMD report (2a1, 2a3, 2a4, 2b1, 2c1, 2c2)</td>
<td>Meta analysis of Museum annual reports, annual CAMD report, HR Departments and internal Museum records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) including marginalised groups</td>
<td>2a2) Number of indigenous staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a3) Number of LOTE programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a4) Number of LOTE exhibitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a5) Number of LOTE staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a6) Number of LOTE volunteers involved in developing programs and exhibitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) social engagement</td>
<td>2b) Number of public programs</td>
<td>CAMD report</td>
<td>Meta analysis of Museum annual reports, annual CAMD report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) social awareness</td>
<td>2c1) Number of objects repatriated to indigenous communities</td>
<td>Museum annual reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2c2) Number of programs about current social issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE VALUE OF MUSEUMS: ANNUAL OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE DIMENSION</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUMENTAL</td>
<td>3) Contribution to tourism economy a) cultural tourism</td>
<td>3a1) Number of domestic tourists annually 3a2) Number of international tourists annually 3a3) Number of museum that win tourism awards annually</td>
<td>Annual CAMD survey (3a1, 3a2, 4a1)</td>
<td>Analysis of data from annual CAMD reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Contribution to local economy a) employment b) Purchase of services</td>
<td>4a1) Number of EFT employed staff 4a2) Value of services purchased</td>
<td>Museum annual reports (3a3, 4a2)</td>
<td>Document analysis of Museum annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRINSIC</td>
<td>1) Satisfaction</td>
<td>1a1) % ratings very satisfied to extremely satisfied in visitor surveys</td>
<td>Internal visitor research from Museums (1a1)</td>
<td>Meta analysis of internal research surveys conducted by CAMD participating institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Social value a) Recognition of museums as valued civic spaces</td>
<td>2a1) Number of museum events attended by politicians and other dignitaries</td>
<td>Museum annual reports (2a1, 3a1)</td>
<td>Document analysis of Museum annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Symbolic value a) commemoration</td>
<td>3a1) Number of commemorative events held at museums 3a2) Number of participants</td>
<td>Museum functions statistics (3a1)</td>
<td>Meta analysis of functions statistics from CAMD participating institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2: Assessing the value of museums-intermediate outcomes

This section recognises that the collection of evidence against certain indicators requires the development of new partnerships (CAMD and ABS/NCCRS) and the mining of existing data from a range of sources and institutions that will require time to fulfil. CAMD has recently appointed an Executive Officer who is undertaking meta-analyses to address some of these issues as part of her job description. This is an outcome of work that the author has conducted with CAMD to develop their strategic research framework within a short term, intermediate and long term framework (working paper prepared for CAMD meeting, May 2006).

Table 7a: The value of museums: intermediate outcomes (Scott 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE DIMENSION</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>1) Non use</td>
<td>1a) Public value identified in relation to questions of use and non use values</td>
<td>New partnership between CAMD and ABS/NCCRS (1a, 1b)</td>
<td>Liaison with ABS/NCCRS to develop a study as part of the 'core indicators' project that identifies types of non-use value and willingness to pay using contingent valuation methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) existence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) non use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) bequest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Willingness to pay</td>
<td>1b) Public value in response to willingness to pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUE DIMENSION</td>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>INDICATOR</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>METHOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUMENTAL</td>
<td>1) Social cohesion a) promoting cultural diversity</td>
<td>1a) Number of Museums which promote cultural diversity in their mission/vision statements, strategic plans and programs policies</td>
<td>Museum mission and vision statements, strategic plans and program policies (1a)</td>
<td>Document analysis of Museum annual reports, strategic plans and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Contribution to civic branding</td>
<td>2a) Number of mentions of museums as 'things to see' and number of images of museums used to promote destination</td>
<td>Analysis of tourism literature and promotions (2a)</td>
<td>Document analysis of tourism literature and promotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Contribution to local economy</td>
<td>3a) Economic impact of major temporary exhibitions on local economy</td>
<td>Economic impact studies.</td>
<td>Meta analysis of economic impact studies related to museum programs over the last 10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Learning skills</td>
<td>4a) Range of skills developed with Museum volunteers</td>
<td>Volunteer position descriptions and training programs</td>
<td>Audit of volunteer position descriptions and training programs from CAMD participating institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL</td>
<td>1) Media response</td>
<td>1a) Number of editorials and articles produced annually</td>
<td>Museum media statistics</td>
<td>Audit of museum media statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Assessing the value of museums- long term impacts.

This section addresses the need for studies that explore the longer term impact of museums, especially with regard to social contributions, individual learning and intrinsic values. It advocates the use of some of the methodological options discussed in Chapter Three: Questions of methodology.

Table 8a: Long term impact (Scott 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE VALUE OF MUSEUMS: LONG TERM IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VALUE DIMENSION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUMENTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8b: Long term impact (Scott 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUE DIMENSION</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>METHOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRINSIC</td>
<td>1) Economic value</td>
<td>1a) Number of design products inspired by museum collections</td>
<td>Museum annual reports and internal documents (1a)</td>
<td>Meta analysis of annual reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) contribution to creativity and innovation</td>
<td>1b) Designers identify value of collections in inspiring new products</td>
<td>Testimonials from designers (1b)</td>
<td>Depth interviews with designers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Personal meaning</td>
<td>2a) Description of personal outcomes as the result of museum experiences</td>
<td>Reports of studies using Personal Meaning Mapping (2a)</td>
<td>Personal Meaning Mapping: pre and post analysis of interviews with museum visitors and follow-up 4-6 months later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Social value</td>
<td>3a) Number of commemorative events using museums as the site for the ceremony and numbers of participants</td>
<td>Museum annual reports</td>
<td>Audit of museum annual reports and statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) commemoration</td>
<td>4a) Greater extent, breadth and depth of historical appreciation and value as the result of museum visiting compared with non-museum visitors</td>
<td>Measurable comparisons between visitors and non-visiters</td>
<td>Personal meaning mapping determines extent, breadth and depth of historical appreciation and value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Historical value</td>
<td>4b) Greater extent, breadth and depth of historical appreciation and value as the result of museum visiting compared with non-museum visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The assessment framework for Australian Museums proposed by this research is actionable. Many of the outcome indicators which require annual data are based on knowledge of the Australian situation and available data. It is hoped that the results of this thesis can inform the work in progress which is currently underway through CAMD and ABS/NCCRS in an effort to encompass some of the values, as well as, the utilitarian benefits, of culture.
CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that the value of museums can be described across four dimensions. An assessment framework encompassing a set of generic indicators is proposed which will require implementation over time. Within the context of this framework, methods are suggested to acquire data, particularly within the dimension of intrinsic value. This final chapter reviews the main findings and the context which generated the research.

The context of the research

This research has been situated within the context of policy requirements that require substantiation of worth as a condition for on-going funding.

As indicated in Chapter 1, Australia and Great Britain share similarities in relation to public sector reform and the modernising government agenda, particularly with regard to the implications of results-based accountability, the requirement for performance information, the alignment between funding and policy outcomes and an increasing awareness of the role of the public in terms of public accountability and values identification.

Britain's two tiered system of government (national and local) facilitates a whole-of-government approach to change. When New Labour took power in 1997, its focus on reducing social exclusion and making museums agents of social change impacted the museum sector profoundly. The conflict surrounding the utilitarian agenda eventually gave rise to a robust challenge which has forced a paradigm shift and which has received some degree of endorsement at government level (DCMS, 2005; DCMS, 2006). This situation of thesis/antithesis has provided a rich field of literature which has been used as the theoretical framework for this research.
Australia is different in terms of its three tiered government structure which affects its capacity to achieve a whole-of-government approach to policy and structural change. The considerable autonomy which the Australian states enjoy challenges the development of a coherent and comprehensive cultural agenda. One of the recent cooperative initiatives is the Cultural Ministers Council project in association with the Australian Bureau of Statistics to develop a research agenda that will inform data collection for future evidence-based cultural policy development (ABS, 2006).

**Major purposes of the research**

This research sought to explore whether it is possible to develop a defensible values-based typology to assess museums. The study has furthered the development of a values typology specific to the museum sector, informed by public input as well as expert opinion. It has interrogated the existing evidence base and discovered that there is sufficient evidence to support many of the values claimed on behalf of museums. Finally, it has synthesised all of this data to develop a set of generic indicators and suggested appropriate methodological options to acquire necessary data.

Ultimately, the goal of this research has been to test the theory that a values-based paradigm is a viable approach to museum assessment. It is different to the Travers’ research (2006) because it has actively sought the involvement of the public in values identification, adopted an extended frame of reference with relation to other value dimensions (non-use/ institutional/intrinsic) and explored the evidence base for those dimensions.
Limitations of the research

This research is limited in two significant ways. There is an absence of robust benchmark data with which to make meaningful comparisons over time. There is also outstanding work to be done in terms of setting standards with the industry. Benchmark data is evolving and there are indications that a combination of the ABS/NCCRS Key Issues Plan developed in consultation with the Cultural Ministers Council will address many of the concerns in this area and fill important gaps in the existing evidence base. From an industry point of view, the recent revision of the CAMD survey has provided a more comprehensive picture of the outcomes of museum activity in Australia and New Zealand than ever before. The author was a key driver for this project and maintains a role as the Chair of the CAMD Research Working Party. It is anticipated that these two data collecting initiatives- one government and one industry- will do much to consolidate an evidence base for assessing the worth of museums.

Standard setting, though used in accreditation programs for regional museums in Australia through the national professional body, Museums Australia, and other state based agencies with a service role, remains an area requiring further discussion for the major Commonwealth and state funding agencies and the museum sector.

Contribution of the research

This research breaks new ground in several ways. In terms of the approach taken for the primary research, though there is much discourse about the need to involve the public in determinations of public value (Kelly et al, 2002; BBC, 2004; Holden, 2004; 2006) there are relatively few examples of this being actively undertaken. Moreover, though value typologies have been proposed for the heritage sector (Mason, 2002), combined arts and culture (The Outspan Group, 1999) and the arts (McCarthy et al, 2004), there is an absence of similar work specific to the museum sector.
Thirdly, evidence to prove impact continues to an inconclusive issue for the cultural sector as a whole. This study has been able to identify existing evidence to substantiate many dimensions of a values-based paradigm and propose ways in which evidence gaps related to intrinsic value could be redressed. Though the National Trust and Accenture in Britain (2006) have published a values methodology measuring visitor experience, public value in relation to the National Estate and impact on the local community, by its own admission it does not address intrinsic individual and community outcomes.

Travers notes that ‘there is no, single, consistent data source for British museums and galleries, still less for the wider arts and cultural sector’ (Travers, 2006: 6). This thesis is a significant attempt to develop a set of ‘common standards for data collection and evidence-building across the sector’ (DCMS, 2006: 25) which may be applicable to the British as well as the Australian museum industry. The words of the National Trust and Accenture are applicable as it can be truly said of this research that it ‘draws on tools being used elsewhere and helps develop a common language within and between different sectors’ (NT and Accenture, 2006: 6).

Responding to notions of use

The findings yield important information about the value of museums irrespective of direct or indirect use. Though only 25% of the Australian adult population goes to museums, this research suggests that, amongst the Australian public, non-visitors value museums for their bequest, option and existence value. This is an area to which contingent valuation studies could be applied to develop a more refined measure of museum value not confined to measures of direct participation.
Responding to notions of institutional value

Public value is the trust generated by well-run, ethical, public agencies, upholding practices of transparency and fairness. This research indicates that museums contribute positively to public value through building relationships and partnerships locally, nationally and internationally, through maintaining high standards of professional practice, through ensuring public access to a shared culture and through providing trusted, meaningful, objective expertise and knowledge.

Responding to notions of instrumental value

This study finds that museums provide opportunities for individuals to acquire skills and build knowledge. It reveals that museums are educational resources for communities and that the considerable research conducted on collections adds to the public knowledge base. Museums contribute to social cohesion through engagement and participation, through including the voices of marginalised groups and celebrating cultural diversity.

Significantly, amongst the public respondents to this study especially, the notion of museums as profit-making organisations or direct contributors to the economy is questioned. However, the value of museums' contribution to new ideas, to creativity and to innovation through providing unfettered access to the communal ideas archive is highlighted. This perspective finds support in notions of the creative economy, cultural export and the international trade in ideas (NMDC, 2004a; Travers, 2006).

Importantly, this study has examined the area of social impacts specifically related to community outcomes and generated a hierarchy to better understand the relationship between different stages of social outcomes in achieving specific impacts.
Responding to notions of intrinsic value

The historical value of museums is held in high esteem by the public. Access to the communal archive, experiencing the past, discerning the lessons of history, developing a sense of one's place within an historical continuum, passing on the significant aspects of a culture and seeing a continual thread pass from one generation to the next are all considered vitally important.

So powerful is this aspect for the public that it implies the application of some system of weighting such as that used in the National Trust/ Accenture model of Shareholder Value (2006) or that proposed by CHASS (2005) for use in evaluating the quality, impact and capability of publicly funded research.

This thesis has not explored this area sufficiently to propose a model but does recommend this as an area for future research.

For individuals, museums are associated with much more than the learning of facts and skills. Enrichment, discovery, enlightenment, inspiration and perspective are cognitive outcomes of the museum experience. In addition, museums contribute to feeling of personal well-being through refreshment, affirmation, joy, pleasure and excitement. It may be that experiences such as expanded awareness, especially in relation to other cultures, and insight into other worlds contributes to tolerance and understanding. This is a value dimension which requires further research to clarify the aggregation effect over time.

Recommendations

In addition to comments already made about future areas of research, recommendations are made in three other areas- partnership building, further research and strategic selectivity of indicators.
Opportunities currently exist for partnership building between the Council of Australasian Museum Directors, the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Cultural Ministers Council to further issues raised by this research that intersect with the CMC/ABS/NCCRS Key Ideas Project.

For example, the ABS/NCCRS, working on behalf of the Statistical Working Group of the Cultural Ministers Council, has generated a series of questions for development into a priority list that will form a future research agenda for the arts and cultural industries (personal communication with Lisa Connolly, NCCRS/ABS, 5th March 2007). Input from the sector in relation to developing a generic data collection framework has already commenced (email from Jenny Dobak 11th April 2007 and personal communication with Jenny Dobak 11th April 2007).

Issues raised by the ABS include how involvement in cultural activities (including museums) contributes to the sharing of cultural identity and sense of belonging, the development of understanding and tolerance and the maintenance and formation of community networks. Other areas focus on willingness to pay for cultural services, the profitability of the arts and cultural sector and the role of museums in fostering creativity. It is recommended that CAMD liaise with ABS/NCCRS to develop joint research projects in these areas.

A second recommendation relates to the use of evaluation methods that will elicit a rich narrative field of qualitative data while also providing a quantitative dimension to measure change. It is recommended that Personal Meaning Mapping be applied to many of the intrinsic value dimensions to determine whether measurable evidence exists that museums do effect change in these areas. As discussed in the previous chapter, Personal Meaning Mapping operates using pre and post tests which can be conducted within the limited period of a museum visit as well as allowing for follow up interviews several months later. Importantly, a quantitative measure of change can be produced by comparing differences in qualitative data across depth, breadth, extent and mastery criteria and between control groups.
Implemented to measure the impact of museum visits on cognitive, well-being and empathetic outcomes, PMM could reveal the capacity of museums to effect personal change. Using control groups, it could compare historical, social and spiritual and symbolic value outcomes between museum visitors with those who have another type of experience such as bus or boat tours of historic places.

A further methodological recommendation is the urgent need for CAMD and ABS to undertake a contingent value study to discern the extent of non-use value across the Australian population and to determine willingness to pay as a measure of the value of museums. The outcomes of this study would strengthen advocacy for the value of museums beyond direct participation and support arguments that funding is required for more than the average cost per direct visitor.

Finally, the list of value-based indicators arising from this research needs to be subjected to a process of meaningful selectivity so the most useful and significant can form the basis for benchmark development, trend analysis and value based positioning.

In summary, the museum sector is highly valued by the public across four major dimensions but operational budgets are not keeping pace with increasing costs, expanding agendas and increasing demands from funding providers (Kotler and Kotler, 2001). Sector advocacy needs to demonstrate it is in the best interests of governments to invest in a sustainable future for institutions that generate high public value. It is hoped that this research will contribute to that process.

In conclusion

This thesis has examined the emerging literature on a values approach to assessing museums and has used primary research to demonstrate that a values-based paradigm can be substantiated with evidence.
In addition, the thesis has developed a hierarchy of value outcomes that clarifies many of the various claims made regarding impact. The findings from other aspects of the primary research demonstrate that the museum experience is a unique one not offered through other institutions or organisations.

More primary research is needed to explore both the intrinsic and non-use dimensions of museum value. A contingent valuation study is particularly recommended to investigate the extent of non-use value. This is particularly critical at the present time as the expectations of museums' services and programs grow while funding fails to keep pace. In addition, more needs to be known about the individual and community benefits arising from engagement with and the presence of museums. Personal meaning mapping and choice modelling studies could provide much needed data in these areas.

This research has been situated within the context of funding and policy pressures on public museums and the requirement for evidence to substantiate worth. Conditions for on-going funding within a context of economic reform force the question of opportunity costs to the fore—could some ‘other organisation (not necessarily a museum) make a similar or greater contribution at lesser cost?’ (Weil, 1994: 42). While the subject of this thesis does not directly address that question it can shed some light on the issue of whether the museum experience is unique. Could the same effects be achieved by some other type of institution? For a combination of reasons, it would appear to be unlikely.

Importantly, this research has demonstrated that museums mean more to the public and to the people who work in them than the narrow band of utilitarian and instrumental outcomes constructed by government policy. Museums are revealed to be a rich and layered experience offering different ways to interact and intersect with objects and the stories that lie buried within them. The many forms of learning that may result, the feelings of joy and well-being they engender and the empathy that they nurture are valued by those who directly partake of the experience. But value is not confined to direct experience.
This research revealed that non-users still value the fact that museums exist, that the option for visiting may lie in the future and that, as a society, we will have something to pass onto our children.

For communities, there is a whole range of intangible values associated with the role of museums in enabling us to see and touch our past, facilitating our conversations about who we are as a society, sharing a public culture and coming together for significant events. The significance, range and depth of this dimension of value, particularly with respect to the importance which history holds in the popular imagination are yet to be fully explored.

Museums offer a unique experience that cannot be reproduced by other services. This value of this experience is described across a variety of dimensions. For museum leadership, articulating the worth of museums in terms of their value may offer the 'new language' they have been seeking.
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