

The value of museum communication: the cases of the Paper and Watermark Museum in Fabriano and the Ascoli Piceno Papal Paper Mill Museum in Ascoli Piceno

Patrizia Dragoni

*Department of Education, Cultural Heritage and Tourism, University of Macerata, Italy,
email: patrizia.dragoni@unimc.it*

Abstract: Guaranteeing the survival of cultural heritage, increasing its accessibility, both physical and intellectual, and the creation of countless benefits for different categories of stakeholders depends both on a perfect comprehension of the interests and abilities of users to take advantage of what is offered and, above all, on identifying and analysing the various types of value that can be attributed to it. According to Montella, there are three types of value that may be analysed for this purpose: a *presentation value*, informative in nature and inherent in the historical, cultural and possibly artistic value implicit in the heritage; a *landscape value*, extended to the context, inherent in the factual information services aimed at supporting policies of preventive and programmed conservation; and a *production value*, commercial in nature, which concerns the external effects generated by cultural heritage management to qualify the products and the images themselves of the businesses in order to make them stand out from the competition. The aim of this article is to inquire into whether, in what way and to what extent the communication of the Paper and Watermark Museum in Fabriano and the Ascoli Piceno Papal Paper Mill Museum in Ascoli Piceno creates presentation value and therefore leads the public to understand how far paper production has influenced the economic and socio-cultural history of the area in which they are located.

Keywords: Museum, Cultural Heritage, Accessibility, Education.

1. The notion of value in the light of European political orientations

If we wished to carry out an exhaustive analysis in order to measure heritage value we would have to refer to all the direct and indirect tangible and intangible benefits that might derive from the possibility of accessing the view of the cultural heritage and the understanding of its cultural value. Very briefly, these comprise:

- an increase in intellectual capital of users and the various benefits this brings at an individual and social level according to the knowledge economy;
- intangible and tangible benefits, both private and collective, linked to tourism not only in relation to production sectors such as handicrafts, wine and food and locally-produced “made in” goods in general, but also in relation to territorial marketing, reinforcing EU identities, the care for the places and, therefore, the economic and urban use of the places¹;
- reinforcement of European Union feeling.

¹ Montella 2009; Cerquetti, Capriotti 2016.

The greater the uses perceived by citizens, the greater their willingness to support, first of all through the taxation system, the costs of safeguarding and promoting cultural heritage, which would thus be seen no longer as an expense but as an investment.

This view permeates European political orientations, as shown especially (but not only) at the 2005 Faro Convention². The focus is therefore on involving different actors in promoting heritage through new models of participatory governance and a lot of attention is paid to audience development. Faced with these objectives, the current reality shows that a considerable number of European citizens remain excluded from basic cultural consumption and that people in disadvantaged socio-economic conditions are particularly penalized. In Italy, too, as was observed at the last G7 meeting on Culture in Florence, only 30% of the population visited a museum or an exhibition last year. In this way, a progressive loss occurs in the identity link between citizens and their own living environment and its history, of which the cultural assets are visible signs.

To avoid or at least combat this lack of connection, museums must first of all modernize their presentation value so as to identify and satisfy the interests of different audiences.

The problem to be dealt with therefore concerns the supply:

- its contents, or the reference cultural values starting with the distinction between the anthropological notion of culture and that of classical-humanist-idealist heritage;
- the delivery methods (tools and languages), which should be differentiated according to the mixed social, economic and cultural conditions and the non-uniform facilities available to the various user groups.

This implies from the outset paying attention both to the existing and the potential demand.

2. Intellectual accessibility and its emergence over a century

The theme of the intellectual accessibility of the value of cultural heritage, corresponding to Sandel's definition of the present-day museum understood as a tool of social utility, is not new.

It was at the end of the 18th century, or even earlier, in fact, that the importance of the social function of museums was established in the United States, and the perfect tool for this function was to be found in the George Brown Goode educational museum³. Particular attention was paid to this theme after the First World War by international organizations such as the OIM, which was re-founded at the end of the Second World War as the ICOM and which immediately took up social themes again, such as the museum as a school; this also reflected the provisions of Articles 26 and 27 of the Declaration of Human Rights signed by the UN on 10th December 1948. In 1949 the ICOM review, "Museum", began launching a real "museums crusade" in favour of developing their role in social and educational promotion⁴ and Georges Henri Rivière reiterated the same concept, moving on from the motto "accessible à tous" to "au service de tous" and pointing out the importance of popular participation in museum activities⁵.

² Council of Europe 2005.

³ In particular see Goode 1986. On the history of museum accessibility see also Dragoni 2010, 2014, 2016.

⁴ Lèveillé1949.

⁵ Rivière1949.

Of special importance is the *Recommandation concernant les moyens les plus efficaces de rendre les musées accessibles à tous*⁶ formulated by UNESCO in 1960, which supported, with concrete recommendations, petitions for the spread of culture and social justice – petitions which were by now widespread, but still too abstract. It said that the member nations should adopt laws or regulations to make museums comprehensible to all, favouring the development of their educational functions. But a more interesting aspect is that precise operational instructions are supplied for this purpose: systematic use of posters or captions with which brief information could be supplied, publication of guides and leaflets, regular guided tours catering for the different categories of visitors and prepared by qualified personnel, the discreet use of mechanical audio apparatus, daily opening at times convenient for everyone, an improvement in the welcome given to visitors, free entry at least one day per week, customer loyalty program through easy payment plans such as subscriptions for individual museums or groups of museums, preferential relationships with schools at all levels.

Even in the 1970s, in spite of the protests they attracted as being a vehicles for bourgeois values, the educational role of museums was never called into question; on the contrary, requests were made that it be performed in more effective, innovative ways, moving from one-way teaching to exchanging ideas, replacing traditional guides with entertainers and leading visitors to develop an ability for critical awareness through maieutics, and reaffirming the need to guarantee accessibility for all thanks to opening times compatible with working hours. These same directions are found again in the *Resolution of the Round Table on the development and the role of museums in the contemporary world*, issued by the ICOM at Santiago, Chile, in 1972⁷.

These two documents are referenced today in the *Recommandation concernant la protection et la promotion des musées et des collections, leur diversité et leur rôle dans la société*⁸, adopted by UNESCO on 17th November 2015, which updates the 1960 document in the light of subsequent socio-economic and political changes. The recommendation deals with communication, among other things, saying that states must encourage museums to adopt any initiative and to use all channels to play an active role in society even in favour of those who do not habitually attend them, for the purposes of integration, social inclusion and lifelong learning to be pursued in collaboration with other educational institutions and especially with schools. Therefore it returns to encouraging states to support the social role of museums, as essential factors also for constructing collective identities, and to act so that the use of technologies does not increase inequalities by falling foul of the digital divide.

The 2015 *Recommandation* shifts the accent from museum services to the users. This approach, although it could be observed right back in the 1930s, generated growing interest especially in the 1960s, starting with the fundamental text by Pierre Bourdieu and Alain Darbel⁹, and it became widely popular from the 1980s onwards.

In this same period, a group of academics from La Sapienza university, led by Tullio de Mauro and Maria Corda Costa, founded the “Gruppo universitario linguistico pedagogico” (Pedagogical and linguistic university group), whose most noteworthy product is the readability index known by the acronym “Gulpease”. It comprises an adaptation into Italian

⁶ http://portal.unesco.org/fr/ev.phpURL_ID=13063&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html<7.6.2017>

⁷ On the Santiago declaration, see the issue of “Museum” dedicated entirely to it, No. 3, 1973.

⁸ http://portal.unesco.org/fr/ev.phpURL_ID=49357&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html<7.6.2017>.

⁹ Bourdieu, Darbel 1966.

of another equally famous index, devised by Rudolph Flesh in 1948. Together with other readability indices, it is today present in the main IT packages (such as Office), alongside the “Gunning Fog” index, reflecting the minimum number of years of education needed to read a given text easily.

In line with these studies, from the early 1990s to 2005 recommendations were made for simplifying administrative language in Italy.

Museums, even though they are public institutions, have not usually complied with these decrees. However there are no museums without written or verbal communications to direct visitors, identify and interpret objects and so on. These are messages that, being received simultaneously while viewing the objects and their supports and while walking around, cannot be conceived like pages in a book. Academics from various disciplines have dealt with this subject especially in the francophone context, where it has been given a more theoretical slant, and the anglophone one, where more attention has been paid to the practical side. From *Writing on the Wall* to the AAM Standards Manual for Signs and Labels and to Beverly Serrell’s *Exhibit Labels*, there are countless practical guides to drawing up and preparing texts in museums¹⁰. The advice and the basic rules are those typical of “plain language”: clarity, conciseness, logical relevance, elimination of ambiguity, capacity for persuasion, and to these are added typographical rules and those for textual composition, positioning and lighting. Serrell’s manual also deals with the logical structure of a text¹¹, as does Bradburne’s book dedicated to interaction in museums¹².

3. MIBACT (Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities and Tourism) guidelines for communication in museums: internal signage, captions and panels

In Italy, in order to bridge the gap with overseas countries and update the instructions already partially supplied by the Legislative Decree of 10th May 2001, the MIBACT last year published *Guidelines for communication in museums: internal signage, captions and panels*¹³. This document starts from the assumption that the data on cultural participation show that both in Europe and in Italy a sizeable share of the population is still excluded from it because of cultural barriers. It urges a work of promotion aimed at the different bands of potential users, to recognize exactly the characteristics and needs of each of them; this task should be based on constructive theories of learning as an individual process

¹⁰ Sultema, see: Bitgood 1991; Bitgood1996; Ferguson, MacLulich&Ravelli 1995; Hein1998; Hood 1995; Kelly 1996; Kelly 1999a; Kelly 1999b; Litwak 1996; Longhenry 1998; McLean 1993; MacLulich 1995; McManus1989; Samson1995; Serrell1996; Serrell 1997; Weil 1994.

¹¹ Serrell identified a number of steps in writing visitor friendly labels: start with information directly related to what visitors can see, feel, do, smell, or experience from where they are standing; vary the length of the sentences; use short paragraphs and small chunks, not large blocks of information; metaphors are better for other forms of narrative, not labels; alliteration is an easy device to overuse; exclamation marks in labels shout at readers and force emphasis on them; humour should be used sparingly; use quotations when they advance the narrative and are necessary; expect visitors to want to read; use informative paragraph titles and subtitles; have a snappy ending; newspaper journalism is not a good model as articles are written with the assumption that readers; will not read everything; stay flexible within the label system – labels that all look the same become boring to read; interrelate labels and their settings; include visitors in the conversation: encourage their participation. Serrell 1996, p. 84-91.

¹² Bradburne 2000.

¹³ <http://musei.beniculturali.it/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Linee-guida-per-la-comunicazione-nei-musei-segnalica-interna-didascalie-e-pannelli.-Quaderni-della-valorizzazione-NS1.pdf<7.6.2017>>.

carried out through restructuring and extending the conceptual network and dependant on social and personal factors, or on interests and motivations as well as emotions and commitment.

But of even greater importance is the fact that, for the museum to be configured as a context in which visitors can independently “construct” the meaning of what they see and experience what Anglo-Saxons call *the flow experience*, the document does not limit itself to recommending multidisciplinary readings of the objects and the relative physical and historical contexts in order to make even obscure meanings comprehensible to everyone: it specifies in minute detail where and how we should communicate in order to capture the attention and facilitate understanding¹⁴.

Thus, to put it in a nutshell, it deals with the positioning of messages, so that they are immediately identifiable and recognizable, with the right dosage of information, even limiting the number of captions and panels in each room, and with the simplification of the languages¹⁵, shunning highbrow, academic formulae in favour of everyday expressions, avoiding digressions and notions that are too abstract, explaining technical terms when essential, minimizing factors for distraction, moderating the amount of words, and associating images and graphics to writing. It also focuses on the organization of displays, suggesting that the arrangement and presentation of objects and texts should be varied, that monotonous repetitions and long serial rows be avoided, and pauses along the trail be provided for, such as with seats and waiting and refreshment areas.

It then deals with the goals and, for this purpose, with the construction of the message, both written and audiovisual, with its delivery and its very material composition. It suggests, for example, starting from the most important information, expressing one concept per sentence and one theme per paragraph, heightening the attention of users by asking questions about the subject shown or a related subject, proposing comparisons, inviting solutions to problems, creating opportunities for all-round experiences and for free and creative interpretation, stimulating all the sensory capacities and even suggesting the right position in which to look at the work.

The tools for written and audiovisual communication/interface that are available, dividing the levels of information from lowest to highest, range from the caption to the catalogue and involve the use of different tools at different points in the visitor trail, each of which is created and proposed with precise criteria¹⁶.

Panels, which are the subject of my inquiry, must, for example, supply:

- information on the design/curatorial choices: Why are some works placed in the same room? What are the relationships between the architectural side and the decoration?
- information generating a greater awareness of the value of the asset for the community, explaining why the museum takes on the duty of conserving it to hand down to future generations.
- information on the relation between heritage and territory.
- diagrams that make clear the relationships of the objects with their original context.
- clues revealing the intercultural nature of the heritage.
- Is the object I see an original or a copy? The question of authenticity is often raised by visitors, and concerns not only the works but also the rooms and furnishings in historic buildings.

¹⁴ Hooper Greenhill 1994; Bollo 2008.

¹⁵ Fortis 2003 <http://mestiere.ehclients.com/uploads/files/PlainLanguage.pdf<7.6.2017>>.

¹⁶ The document refers, in this respect, to Regione Toscana 2008.

In relation to the structure of the contents, these should be structured in “information packages” that can be rapidly understood:

- use titles, sub-titles and key words to allow the reader to understand rapidly the theme dealt with and decide whether to continue reading, depending on their own interests;
- start with the most important concepts, and do not put them at the end;
- divide up the information into short paragraphs of 4-5 lines maximum, with around 45 characters per line;
- highlight in bold type the key words and the basic concepts.

If mixed information (for example, about the architecture of the room and about the works displayed) is supplied on one single panel, distance it visually on the panel itself.

4. The presentation value of the study cases

4.1. Fabriano Paper and Watermark Museum

Starting from the above presuppositions, a desk and field-type analysis was put in place regarding written communication tools in the museums under examination.

The Fabriano Paper and Watermark Museum was established in 1984 by the municipal council, to illustrate the importance of the town in the history of paper production in the western world. The displays have been recently enlarged and are divided into sections showing the various paper processing phases. The faithful reconstruction of a medieval fulling mill is of particular interest in this respect: here, you can watch the manual processing of watermarked paper. The upper floor, with a more traditional layout, houses a section devoted to printing and displays ancient watermarked sheets, which can be dated to 1293 and later. Visits are available daily and are generally carried out by the museum guides, who explain clearly and competently the materials kept in the museum. At the end of the visit, inspired by the Chinese saying “if I listen, I forget, if I study, I remember, if I do, I understand”, taken on the basis of the “Munari method” for museum teaching, with the help of master paper-makers the visitor is given the chance to create a sheet of paper by hand, and they can keep this as a souvenir of the museum. The museum also promotes courses lasting several days.

There are numerous panels giving in-depth information on all aspects regarding the world of paper, from its Chinese origins to its arrival in Fabriano, and from the use of Fabriano paper over the centuries, to the development of the industry and the businessmen who mainly promoted it such as Miliani; some of the objects on display belong to his paper mills.

From an analysis of the panels, carried out in the light of the above-quoted ministerial guidelines, the communication created by the museum may be considered as a best practice as far as the content is concerned (they are written by university teachers of economic history); they are brief, bilingual and document the whole paper production process from its origins to industrialization, with excursions into its uses and into local businesses). Slightly less satisfying is the aspect regarding their structure, inasmuch as they are accompanied by illustrations and photographs that facilitate comprehension, but they do not have graphic signs or other appropriate solutions for highlighting basic concepts. A further point is that the number of them is perhaps excessive to allow the viewer to read them all while standing up during a visit.

From an analysis using the Gulpease index, the text of the panel shown is seen to be of average difficulty¹⁷. The technical terms are, in fact, hard to understand.

Apart from giving the normal information on opening times and how to get to the museum, the website¹⁸, also bilingual, informs visitors about the museum activities, the history and processing of paper and the fulling mill, with longer texts compared with the panels that offer further pre- and post-visit explanations. A link to the “tripadvisor” website enables one to read the museum reviews – 753 of them (505 excellent, 181 very good, 41 average, 9 poor and 4 very bad) – and lets readers leave their own review.

The activity the museum performs with schools is particularly intense, with the exception of this year, when attendance felt the negative effects of the earthquake. Since the schools that visit the museum come from all over Italy, we might suspect that the museum lacks one of the activities that the document on the guidelines requires last of all: an evaluation of the teaching activities.

4.2. The Ascoli Piceno Papal Paper Mill Museum

The Ascoli Piceno Papal Paper Mill Museum was inaugurated only in 2006, after restoration of the building. Open to the public only at weekends, it houses a section devoted to “Bambagina” paper and the Orsini Natural History Museum. Since 2013, it has also housed the “Tutta l’acqua del mondo” (“All the water in the world”) Water Museum, a multimedia exhibition that, by means of touchscreens, videos, three-dimensional maps and interactive installations enable an in-depth examination of the importance of water for transforming landscapes and for economic as well as industrial activities. The part relating to paper production, which occupies the ground floor, contains some machinery that replicates a working environment such as that of Fabriano. The information panels, created by the Provincial authority, contain brief information of a mainly educational nature on paper manufacture, in Italian and English. Although they are brief and clear in terms of content and readability, they are nevertheless short on multi-disciplinary-type information. The structure, with brief information blocks and certain key terms highlighted, make them compliant with ministerial instructions.

From an analysis using the Gulpease index, the text of the panel considered by the museum to be a good example was, however, difficult to read. In this museum, too, workshops are set up by the company managing the facilities, offering visitors, especially school students, the chance to create a sheet of paper.

The museum does not have a dedicated website, but is linked to the Ascoli Borough website¹⁹, which is exclusively in Italian. There is therefore no way to leave a review of the museum via the website, but reviews found on “tripadvisor” are nevertheless excellent for the most part (out of 47: 29 excellent, 10 very good, 2 average, 3 poor, 1 very bad). The negative comments are mostly due to the limited opening hours.

The short guide²⁰ recently produced by the cooperative that manages the facilities, although it can be appreciated for the information it supplies, is not written according to the instructions contained in the Guidelines.

¹⁷ For a linguistic analysis of the texts, readability analyzers available on line were used, in particular Translated.net <http://labs.translated.net/leggibilita-testo/<12.6.2017>>.

¹⁸ <http://www.museodellacarta.com<12.6.2017>>.

¹⁹ <http://visitascoli.it/punti-interesse/i-musei-di-ascoli-piceno-i-musei-della-cartiera-papale<12.6.2017>>.

²⁰ Guide to the Papal Paper Mill Museums 2017.

5. Conclusions

An analysis of the presentation value of the two museums examined did not highlight particular critical points, except in respect of the use of technical terminology relating to the description of production machinery, which it is difficult to replace using synonyms and can anyway be explained through the guided tours that the museums organize regularly.

In addition, since they document traditional production activities and do not therefore display objects attributable to what we might call high art, these museums avoid the danger of cryptic communication with specialist languages, cloaked in absolute aesthetic values as generally happens with historical-artistic and archaeological museums especially in Italy. In fact, since idealistic tradition is stronger and unchanging here, compared with countries where an anthropological notion of culture and a lively interest in material culture have been prominent for a long time and in a very determined way, attention in Italy is centred and, in fact, completely focused on masterpieces and in any case on arts rightly considered as superior. Little care is taken, therefore, over small local museums and the assets conserved in them especially when, as in the cases examined here, they deal with objects of common use. The very notion of museum, which is still dominant in spite of some recent efforts to update the thinking, is that of a temple of the muses, of the treasure-chest.

Among the various tools museums have available to them to create a dialogue between the collection and the visitor, written communication is therefore of great importance and involves many complex issues; it needs specific professional skills to resolve these issues, at least in part, and critically work out the right choices. For this particular task they use evaluation processes that should take place in several stages: *ex ante*, to identify the museum's reference audience and hypothesize texts suitable for their interests and the interpretative tools available: *in itinere*, with experimental checks on an audience sample²¹; *ex post*, at the end of the visit, through feedback activities.

Often in Italy it is not only the small and medium-sized museums that lack the necessary professional skills to design, create and manage communication methods that are really suitable for presenting the whole cultural value implicit in the objects they put on display and in the surrounding town and area. This means that the costs incurred for their installation and ongoing management, although limited but nevertheless onerous for the modest funds available to the great majority of Italian boroughs, are not compensated for by the creation of a significant presentation value either from the point of view of human capital in visitors, or of the development of tourism and community feeling. The risk deriving from this is that the public and –very rarely – private resources destined for these museums, which anyway comprise potentially important services to society, decrease progressively until their very existence is in put in doubt.

The Ministry's stated aim is to supply useful instructions for implementing effective communication in all museums, and they can therefore – we hope – give rise to a set of consistent, inescapable rules, not limited to minute instructions concerning the writing and positioning of captions and other information panels, but comprehensive of all equipment and performance standards to be complied with. This will ensure, as laid down in the prevailing Code, minimum quality levels to promote what are, in fact, public assets: these standards should also provide for the employment of necessary staff who have specific and

²¹ This type of evaluation can be carried out through focus groups, interviews, questionnaires, analyses of visitor registers and eyewitness surveys. Of the many publications on the subject, that of Hooper Greenhill, 1994, is fundamental.

basically adequate professional skills, acquired following appropriate, monitored training programs.

References

1. Bitgood S., *The ABCs of Label Design. Visitor Studies: Theory, Research and Practice*, 8 (1991) 115-129.
2. Bitgood S., *Practical Guidelines for Developing Interpretive Labels. Visitor Behaviour, Fall*, 4-15, (1996). Ferguson L., MacLulich C., Ravelli L. *Meanings and messages: language guidelines for museum exhibitions. Sydney: Australian Museum*, (1995); Hein G. *Learning in the Museum*. London: Routledge, (1998).
3. Bollo A. (ed. by), *I pubblici dei musei*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 2008.
4. Bourdieu P., Darbel A., *L'amour de l'art*, Paris 1966.
5. Bradburne J.M., *Interaction in the museum – Observing Supporting Learning*, Libri Books on Demand, March 2000.
6. Cerquetti M., Capriotti G., *La valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale nei territori periferici. Un possibile approccio interdisciplinare applicato al caso di Mevale di Visso (MC)*, Il Capitale Culturale XIII (2016) 421-465.
7. Council of Europe 2005, Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, Faro, 27th October 2005, http://www.ecco-eu.org/fileadmin/user_upload/CETS_199.docxFARO_CONVENTION.pdf
8. Fortis D., *Il plain language. Quando le istituzioni si fanno capire*, in Quadreni del MdS, 2003.
9. Dragoni P., *Processo al museo. Sessant'anni di dibattito sulla valorizzazione museale in Italia*, Firenze: Edifir, 2010.
10. Dragoni P., *Accessible à tous. La rivista «Mouseion» per la promozione del ruolo sociale del museo*, Il Capitale Culturale XI (2014) 149-221.
11. Dragoni P., *La concezione moderna del museo (1930). All'origine di un sistema di regole comuni per i musei*, Il Capitale Culturale XIV (2016) 25-51.
12. Goode G.B., *A memorial of George Brown Goode*, Annual report of the U.S. National Museum, Washington: Smithsonian Institution 1986.
13. Hood M., *Audience Research Tell Us Why Visitors Come to Museums – and why they don't*. in Scott C. (ed.) *Evaluation and Visitor Research in Museums: Towards 2000*. Sydney, Powerhouse Publishing, 3-10, (1995).
14. Hooper-Greenhill E. (ed.), *The educational Role of the Museum*, Londra: Routledge 1994.
15. Kelly L., *Jumping in Head First! – Implementing a New Approach to Public Program Evaluation*. in Scott C. (ed.), *Evaluation and Visitor Research in Museums: Towards 2000*. Sydney Powerhouse Publishing, 161-168, (1996).
16. Kelly L., *Developing access to collections: assessing user needs*. museums Australia Conference, Albury, 1999a. Available online at <http://www.amonline.net.au/amarc>.
17. Kelly L., *Finding Evidence of Visitor Learning*. Musing on Learning seminar, Australian Museum, April, (1999b). Available online at <http://www.amonline.net.au/amarc>.
18. La guida dei musei della cartiera papale 2017.
19. Lévillé A., *La croisade des musées*, Museum 1949 II(4), Les Musées au service de tous II, 197-198.
20. Litwak J.M., *Using Questions as Titles on Museum Exhibit Labels to Direct Visitor Attention and Increase Learning*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, (1996).
21. Longhenry S., *Labels for Contemporary Art. Museum Practice*, 18-21 (1998).
22. MacLulich C., *Off the wall: new perspectives on the language of exhibition texts*. in Scott C. (ed.) *Evaluation and Visitor Research in Museums: Towards 2000*. Sydney, Powerhouse Publishing 105-115, (1995).

23. McLean K., *Planning For People in Exhibitions*. Washington, Association of Science Centres-Technology Centres, 1993.
24. McManus P., *Oh, Yes, They Do: How Museum Visitors Read Labels and Interact with Exhibit Texts*. *Curator* 32(3) (1989) 174-189; Samson D., *Reading Strategies Used by Exhibition Visitors*. in Blais A. (ed.), *Text in the Exhibition Medium*. Quebec City: Musee de la civilisation, (1995).
25. Montella M., *Valore e valorizzazione del patrimonio culturale storico*, Milano: Electa, 2009.
26. Regione Toscana, *La parola scritta nel museo. Lingua, accesso, democrazia*, Atti del convegno (Arezzo 17 ottobre 2008) 2008.
27. Rivière G.H., *The organisation and functions of the Museums*, *Museum* 1949 II(4), Les Musées au service de tous II, 206-214.
28. Serrell B., *Exhibit Labels: An Interpretive Approach*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 1996.
29. Serrell B., *Paying Attention: The Duration and Allocation of Visitors' Time in Museum Exhibitions*. *Curator* 40(2) (1997) 108-125, Weil S., *Creampuffs and Hardball: Are You Really Worth What You Cost?* *Museum News* 73(5) (1994) 42-44, 62.
30. *The role of museums in today's Latin America*, *Museum* XXV(3) (1973).