

The Viability of South African Museums in the Post-1994 Landscape

Nkosinathi G. Tomose

BSc (Hons.) Wits

0317486 H

**A research report submitted to the Faculty of Science, University of the
Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Science in Archaeology.**

2008

Declaration

I declare that this research report is my own, unaided work. It is been submitted for the degree of Master of Science at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other university.

Declared at the University of the Witwatersrand on the 7th October 2008.


.....
Signature

Abstract

Museum studies in South Africa have predominately focused on addressing issues of politics and practice of museum displays and exhibitions, particularly in the period following the 1994 South African elections. These studies have led to the transformation of many past museum displays and exhibits. They have also opened up new research opportunities within the field of museum studies, such as the current study on social viability and economic sustainability of South African museums. In this research report I assess a range of museum operational models in and around Johannesburg and make recommendations about the best current operational model and on the potential model for future developments of culture and heritage museums in Johannesburg. Recommendations on some of the strategies that museums in and around Johannesburg need to adopt in order to develop further their social responsibility projects are given, based on my experience of how museums in Washington, D.C raised alternative funds towards such projects. The Section 21 Company model is seen as the best current museum operational model and has potential for future museum developments in Johannesburg.

Keywords: South African museums, sustainability, Johannesburg, heritage presentation, operational models, heritage management.

Dedication

I dedicate this research to all those who have given me time and support during the period of my study. I dedicate especially to my mother, Thandeka, G. Tomose, who has been both the mother and father in my family, for her outstanding encouragements and support in my studies, an opportunity that she never had. I would like to extend my dedication to the rest of my family and friends who believed in me and kept on igniting back the spark even when I had lost faith.

Acknowledgments

I would like to sincerely thank all the following people for their never ending support, love and encouragements in the completion of this research report.

I thank my supervisor Dr Benjamin W. Smith for his support and enthusiasm in helping me complete this research report and for his support throughout my years at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. My family and friends, especially mother who has always been there for me throughout my studies. My friend Dr Luca Polarollo for his support and encouragements during the writing up of this report. Marilee Woods for commenting on chapter 1 of this research report. The National Research Foundation for their bursary which helped me complete my degree. To Susan Ward, David Lewis-Williams and Benjamin Smith who provided the opportunity for me to visit a range of Smithsonian Institution Museums in Washington, D.C, United States of America. I am very grateful to all those who took time out of their busy work schedules to allow me time for my interviews; Steven Sack, Belinda Hlaka, Zola Mtshiza, Geoffrey Blundell, Wady Davy, Jillian Carmen, Francis Thackeray, Cecilia Kruger, Lindsay Marshall and Baba Dlamini. Many thanks to the Rock Art Research Institute staff and students and to all the staff at the Faculty of Science for were always there for all my enquiries.

Contents

Declaration.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Acknowledgement.....	iv
Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	vii
1.0. South African Museums Studies Post-1990s Political Transition.....	1
1.1. Background.....	1
1.2. Current Study	1
2.0 South African Museum on the Move: History and Development.....	4
2.0.1. Introduction.....	4
2.1 Museum Ownership & Management in South Africa.....	4
2.1.1 The Colonial Era.....	4
2.1.2 Apartheid Era.....	11
2.1.3 Democratic Era	15
2.1.4. Discussion and Conclusion.....	18
3.0. Processes and Methods Used to Conduct Research for this Study.....	24
3.1. Research Design Used in the Study	24
3.2. Research Methods Used in the Study to Collect Data.....	24
3.2.1. Literature survey	24
3.2.2. Interviews	26
3.2.3. Developing a Questionnaire for this Study.....	30
3.3. Study Sample.....	33
3.4. Data Collection Experiences: Problems & Opportunities.....	34
4.0. Social Responsibility & Economic Sustainability Levels of Museums in and around Johannesburg.....	36
4.0.1 Introduction.....	36
4.1. Results from examining museum models.....	36
4.3. Results from interviews.....	37
4.3.1. Issues addressing questions asked during the interview.....	37

5.0. Viability of Johannesburg Museums: What’s the Way Forward?.....	52
5.0.1. Introduction.....	52
5.1. Discussion of the Results: Problems and Opportunities.....	52
5.1.1. Problems and Opportunities of the Models Currently in Operation in Johannesburg.....	52
5.1.2. The Importance of Policies and Museums Standards Used by Museum in Johannesburg.....	60
5.1.3. Museums social responsibility.....	63
5.1.4. Potential best operational model for museums in and around Johannesburg.....	70
Appendix.....	72
Reference List.....	75

List of tables

Table 1...1940 Funding Levels.....	10
Table 2...Entrance Fees Charged at Museum Studied.....	44
Table 3...Summary of 2007 museum budgets and revenue generated from projects run by the museum to cover their cost.....	7
Table 4...Estimated Museum Visitor Numbers Year 2007.....	50

1.0. South African Museums Studies Post-1990s Political Transition

1.1. Background

Cultural museum studies in South Africa have focused mainly on the politics and practice of museum displays and exhibitions (e.g. Davison 1991; Karp 1992; Rassol & Witz 1994; Bennett 1995; Levitz 1996; Alubafi 2002; Sharpe 2003; Dubin 2006). Among other issues addressed by these studies are power, voice, identity, gender, conflict, multivocality, pedagogy, issues of presentation, representation, as well as practical issues centred around construction and reconstruction of museums displays and exhibits to represent South Africa's collective memories (e.g. Alubafi 2002; Sharpe 2003; Dubin 2006). Prominent amongst these studies is Pippa Skotnes's (1996) book, *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*, which contains essays debating issues of Bushman display in South African museums (e.g. Buntman 1996; Glenn 1996; Gordon *et al* 1996; Morris 1996; Skotnes 1996; Wilmsen 1996), and Thomas Dowson & David Lewis-Williams' (1994) discourse on how and where Bushman material culture is displayed. These studies offer strong challenge to those studying museum displays in the post-Apartheid South Africa.

1.2. Current Study

Unlike those studies, this one is not concerned with museum display but with museum operation. I assess seven operational models under which the various museums in and around Johannesburg operate. Issues of museum ownership and management will be examined. I focus only on cultural heritage museums. I also address issues of public versus private ownership and management. The aim of the project is to assess the problems and opportunities presented by various potential models of cultural museum ownership and management.

The first model, the Government Funded model, includes those museums governed by the Johannesburg City Council and Northern Flagship Institutions. These are council and nationally funded museums. The second model is a range of museums under private

ownership and management. This model often involves different partners in its operations. For example, some follow the Public Private Partnership (PPP) type of operation, involving both the public and private sectors. This model is used by most of the newly established cultural and heritage museums in and around Johannesburg.

Other models within the private sector include Commercial Entities (CE), Trusts, and Section 21 Companies. The CE model is based on private ownership and operates as a profitable business, while the Trust model is donor funded and overseen by interested parties and not-profit. The Section 21 Company model is not for profit, but otherwise it runs like a commercial company.

The study therefore deals with some highly varied operational models that are currently being employed in and around Johannesburg. I will examine MuseumAfrica that uses the Council Museum model and the Transvaal Museum that uses the National Museum model. Museums that I will examine representing the Public Private Partnership model include the Origins Centre and the Maropeng Cultural and Heritage Centre in the Cradle of Humankind. Trust model museums that I consider are represented by the Voortrekker Monument north of Johannesburg, and the Section 21 Company model by the Apartheid Museum. Lastly the Commercial Entity model is represented by the Lesedi Cultural Village, an “open air museum” (Van Veuren 2001; Schutte 2003), located northwest of Johannesburg.

This study will assess these models, focusing particularly on the level of social responsibility and economic sustainability of the museums involved. By “social responsibility” I mean issues such as museum access by people of varied social and economic backgrounds, educational access, equity and redress considerations, ticket prices, social responsibility in display and so on. I will compare museum entrance fees to average earnings and assess the sectors of society that can afford entrance fees to the most vibrant museums in Johannesburg, like the Origins Centre and Maropeng. At the same time it must also be taken into account that most of Johannesburg’s most vibrant museums are having difficulty in striking a balance between their social obligations and

their economic viability owing to their being owned by the private sector and therefore not having access to state subsidies.

I will address the issue of museum sustainability by examining each museum's operational and functional costs and how sustainable their current operations are. I will then consider whether they are likely to be able to afford basic maintenance. This will take me to a discussion of their medium to long term sustainability. Having done this I will go on to assess which of the five mentioned museum operational models is currently working best for museums in the current social, political and economic climate and I make specific recommendations on how to further enhance existing models. This is particularly important to the study because it will help me to make recommendations on what model will work best for future cultural and heritage museums in and around Johannesburg.

2.0 South African Museum on the Move: History and Development

2.0.1. Introduction

In this chapter I examine the issue of museum ownership and management in three South African eras: the Colonial (1825-1947), the Apartheid (1947-1990) and the post-Apartheid (1990-2008). I assess the problems and opportunities presented by different forms of museum ownership and management, and how they affect levels of museum social responsibility and economic sustainability.

2.2 Museum Ownership & Management in South Africa

Three eras of museum development in South Africa: some justifications

My use of the three eras (colonial, apartheid and post-apartheid) is for analytical purposes only. I am fully aware that each of the three eras was characterized by varied and complex social, political and economic processes. My discussion of museums in the colonial era starts from 1825 because this is the year that the first South African museum was established. I end the colonial era in the late 1940s because the period after this and up until the late 1980s marks a different political geography in South Africa, the apartheid South Africa. I refer to the period starting from 1990 as post-apartheid simply because this was the time of the undoing of the apartheid system within the process that resulted in the 1994 democratic elections. I felt that it is important for me to divide the study into these eras because it allows me to talk about different forms of museum ownership and management in different time periods and to compare how these processes have evolved.

2.1.1 The Colonial Era

Museums developments

The early development of museum traditions in South Africa is associated with the colonization of South Africa by Europeans. I acknowledge that South Africa's colonial process is complex and extends back before the arrival of the Europeans. This study, however, focuses only on the European colonization of South Africa because it is this

context that saw the development of the museum as a culture and heritage institution in different colonial states.

The history of museum development in South Africa dates back to the first half of the 19th century. The first cultural heritage museum in the country was the South African Museum and this was established in Cape Town in 1825 (Brain & Erasmus 1986). In 1855, thirty years following this establishment, the museum became officially recognised as a public institution. In the same year (1855) a similar culture and heritage museum opened its doors to the public, the Albany Museum in Grahamstown, in the Eastern Cape Province.

In 1857 the Museum Incorporation Act (MIA) was passed by the Cape Colony government to guide the operations and functions of public museums. The Act mandated the appointment of boards of trustees and full-time curators to manage and develop Cape museums. This process also aimed at enhancing the status of the museum profession in the Cape (Brain & Erasmus 1986).

The 1857 Act set the framework for the establishment of those Colony museums that opened their doors to the public in other big cities, for example, the Port Elizabeth Museum in 1856; King Williams Town Museum in 1884 and the Durban Museum in 1887 (Chubb 1941).

During this time, in the late 1880s, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State were still independent republics. The 1857 MIA applied to the Durban City Museum because Natal had been assumed as a British Colony by the end of 1843. On the other hand the Transvaal was granted independence in 1852 and the Orange Free State in 1854. The Transvaal built its own museum in 1893, the Transvaal Museum in Pretoria, and the Orange Free State in 1887, the National Museum in Bloemfontein.

The 1857 MIA passed by the Cape government to regulate the functions and operations of Cape museums did not apply to the Boer Republic museums until the 1910 declaration

of the Union of South Africa. From 1893 to 1903 no new museums were built in the country due to the political upheavals between the British and the Boers. After the Anglo-Boer War new cultural and heritage museums were developed across the country. These museums developments included the Natal Museum in Pietermaritzburg in 1903 and the McGregor Museum in Kimberley which opened its doors to the public in 1908 (Power 1953).

The McGregor Museum presents a unique model in its early development because it was a private benefactor development. The idea of establishing the museum was that of Mrs Margaret McGregor, the widow of the former mayor of Kimberley Mr Alexander McGregor. She wanted to honour her late husband and proposed the idea to the Kimberley Municipal Council and Library Committee which accepted the offer at a special meeting held in 1905. She later purchased a site for the museum in Chapel Street, built a building which she formally handed over to the Civil Commission on behalf of the government and the mayor on half of the Borough Council (Power 1953). The government and the Borough Council became the owners and managers for the first South African museum to be built by a private donor and presented to the people of South Africa. In the establishment of other museums such as South African Museum, Transvaal Museum, Albany Museum, the money came from the public in the form of donations and grants from the government (ibid).

In Johannesburg, for example, museums that were established after 1902 included the establishment of the Johannesburg Art Gallery (JAG) in 1910 opening to the public in 1915 (Chubb 1941; South African Museum Association Bulletin 1987). Like the McGregor Museum, JAG presents another unique model of development. JAG was developed by Florence Phillips, a wife of Johannesburg mining magnate Sir Lionel Phillips, to house European Art, and she later handed it to the Johannesburg Council. In 1936 JAG was incorporated onto the Johannesburg Council cultural institutions list, adding to the number of governmental owned and managed cultural museums in Johannesburg (Chubb 1941). MuseumAfrica, then called the Africana Museum, was

established in 1930, as the second large cultural and heritage museum to be built in Johannesburg during this era.

Models of museum ownerships and management

All the public museums were developed using government funds. The first model used to establish and operate public museums in South Africa was therefore a governmental funded model, following comparable developments in Europe. Some of these museums were state funded, and others were city funded, setting up a two-tier public museum hierarchy.

This model, I think, resulted partly out of the four divisions that existed then in the country. For example, when some of the major museums were established in the country in the late 1800s South Africa was divided into two Boer Republics (the Transvaal and Orange Free State) and two British Colonies (the Cape and Natal). I thus suggest that the state and city funding of museums went beyond serving basic public interest and rather served to legitimise and boast of the status of the big cities in each of the two republics and colonies. This becomes evident when one considers their location within cities and the type of architecture they celebrated. Museums were built in the city centres and using grand architectural structures of high status, which today signify the most lavish and expensive architecture of their time, some in Victorian style while others in Cape Dutch style.

After the declaration of the Union in 1910 there was another significant growth in the number of South African museums. To ensure good management of these institutions, museums were classified into three classes according to their principal sources of income: national, provincial and municipal. They were also classed according to their principal nature, for example: museums of natural history, art galleries and historical museums (Chubb 1941). In the middle half of the twentieth century there was thus a change in South Africa's museum model from a two-tier into a three-tier government funded museum model (Chubb 1941; Lannin 1941; Hey 1969). Following these classifications was the establishment of the South African Museums Association (SAMA) in 1936.

Thus the change from a two-tier to a three-tier government funded museum structure not only represented a change in the way museums were funded, but also in the way that they were to be managed. For example, some of SAMA's objectives included working with museum managements and assisting in the development of the status of museums in the country (Hey 1969).

In 1941 there were eleven national museums, eight provincial and eight municipal museums, making up a total of twenty-seven officially registered public museums in the country (Chubb 1941). The national museum service had grown by seven from four in the early 1900s and provincial by five from the three that were established in terms of proclamation No 145 of the 1913 Financial Relations Act (FRA). The 1913 FRA is the Act by which the Cape Province assumed responsibility for the Albany Museum, McGregor Museum and Port Elizabeth Museum (Hey 1969; see also Lannin 1941). Therefore the functions and operations of provincial museums were regulated by two policy frameworks, the 1887 MIA (Brain & Erasmus 1986), and the 1913 FRA (Hey 1969). The remaining eight museums were municipally run and operated. Together with national and provincial museums they were to become regulated by the newly established South African Museums Association (SAMA established in 1936) and abide by its codes of ethics and museum standards in the way they operated.

Problems and opportunities face by the museum

One of the chief problems faced by South African museums during this era was the problem of finance. Another problem was the lack of education departments in some of these museums. Even though museums mostly experienced financial difficulties, their financial positions were not the same in all cases. These imbalances in museums financial status led to the commissioned study of 1940 by Professor Drennan of the Africana Museum to ascertain the financial positions of all museums in the Union at all level of government (Drennan in Chubb 1941). This study aimed at assessing the general state of development of each institution.

In summary the study revealed that most of the nationally funded museums were in the Cape Province and they included the South African Museum, the South African National Gallery and the Michaelis Collection. Considering the amount given per museum, the Transvaal Museum and Paul Kruger House came out on top. Other museums that followed were the Natal Museum and the National Museum of Bloemfontein. At the provincial level, the Cape Province museums were the best funded museums in the country. These museums included the Albany Museum, Port Elizabeth Museum, the Kaffrarian Museum in King Williamstown and the Alexandra McGregor Memorial Museum. The Transvaal and the Orange Free State do not appear on the list because at the time there were no museums in these provinces designated as having provincial status. On the municipal level the Transvaal, particularly in Johannesburg (Africana Museum & JAG) dominated the funding levels and was followed by the Natal (Durban Museum & Durban Art Gallery). Table. 1 (below) presents a summary of the most highly funded government museums in 1940, the table is derived from Professor Drennan's work published in the South African Museum Association Bulletin (Drennan in Chubb 1941).

Table.1. 1940 Funding Levels

Sources of Funding

Museums	Union	Provincial	Municipality	Public Subscriptions & Donations	Other	Total
National Level						
Transvaal Museum & Paul Kruger House	£ 8300		£ 250	-	-	£ 8550
SA national Gallery	£ 2850	-	£ 500	-	-	£ 3350
South African Museum	£ 7000	-	£ 200	-	£ 50	£ 7250
Natal Museum	£ 2650	-	£ 150	-	-	£ 2800
National Museum Bloemfontein	£ 2500	-	£ 150	-	-	£ 2650
Michaelis Collection	£ 1000	-	£ 5	-	-	£ 1005
Provincial Level						
Albany Museum		£ 2269	£ 15	£ 83	£ 35	£ 2402
P.E. Museum		£ 1800	£ 300	£ 100	£ 1197	£ 3397
Kaffrarian Museum		£ 1000	£ 100	£ 80	£ 50	£ 1230
McGregor Memorial Museum		£ 1000	£ 190	£ 39	£ 440	£ 1669
Municipal Level						
Africana Museum	-	-	£ 7195	-	£ 200	£ 7395
JAG	-	-	£ 4485	-	-	£ 4485
Geological Museum JHB	-	-	£ 2790	-	-	£ 2790
Durban Museum	-	-	£ 3858	-	-	£ 3858
Durban Art Gallery	-	-	£ 2703	-	£ 439	£ 3142

(NB! The units above were converted into rands in order to represent the difference presented below)

In terms of changing funding levels, the Albany Museum per annum subsidy had increased by R538 from its original 1913 R2000 subsidy. On the other hand the McGregor Museum had decreased by an amount of R2000 and Port Elizabeth Museum

by a total of R400 since 1913 (Drennan in Chubb 1941). Some of the museums tried to improve their financial position by commercial ventures, for example the inclusion of a Snake Park in the Port Elizabeth Museum as another source revenue generation (Drennan in Chubb 1941). But, these new ventures also brought an increase in maintenance costs. The Transvaal government is reported to have given less support in all areas other than money to its museums, such as in the field of education. This is of interest because some of the most expensive museums at the time were the Johannesburg museums.

In terms of institutional educational programmes and efforts the South African Museum in Cape Town and the Albany Museum in Grahamstown were considered amongst the best. This involved the distribution of museum boxes to schools that could not afford to visit the museums, both from the urban areas and rural areas (Oliver 1941). This is not to say that other museums were not vibrant. Museums such as the Transvaal Museum were more actively involved in research and publication, for example, their work at Sterkfontein Caves and Kromdraai (Voigt 1987).

2.1.2. Apartheid Era

Museums developments

In 1948 the National Party won the South African general elections. This victory brought about a change in the country's social, political and economic environment and a shift away from the colonial era way of doing things. Similar developments took place in the museum sector. These developments included the establishment of new museum types and the expansion of already existing museum models. One example is the expansion in the provincial museum service as set out in proclamation No R110 of 1966 which gave power to the provincial museum administration in terms of the 1913 FRA, as amended, to establish, control and manage museums (Hey 1969).

In terms of the 1966 proclamation the provinces had to pay the salaries of all museum staff as public servants. They were also to receive a grant of 75% towards their capital development and new museum buildings; an amount of R403, 500, twelve-times the 1940 grant (R31,766). Provincial museums also received an acquisition fund of R500 towards

the purchase of exhibits and an amount of R785 to their maintenance grant. Some of the provincial museums were given power over some of the municipal museums, for example, the Port Elizabeth museum extended its authority to municipal museums in 1965.

There was also an expansion in the provincial museum service in the country, from only eight institutions in 1940 to twenty-one institutions in 1959. In terms of social developments, these museums (provincial) were divided into two categories: natural and cultural history museums. For example, natural history museums were to educate the public about then current findings in the field of natural science while on the other hand cultural history museums focused more on the human historical events for each province.

Amongst the museums that developed themselves further were MuseumAfrica and JAG (SAMAB). During this time the Voortrekker Monument included other Trekker interpretation centres in its services. These expansion processes signify that there was an increase in the number of visitors at this time. But, during this era, cities like Johannesburg were reserved only for the white population of South Africa, and museums therefore did not serve the majority of South Africans. In other provinces, such as the Cape Provinces, museums had established museum school services to assist those urban and rural communities who could not afford to visit the museum. This included the preparation of exhibits which were sent to schools and with special notes to country schools. During 1965, the Albany Museum distributed more than 2430 cases/boxes. This was achieved through the generous assistance from the Cape Provincial Education Development which staffed and financed these courses (Chubb 1941; Oliver 1941).

This era also saw the establishment of a different museum type. The open air cultural and heritage museums (Van Veuren 2001; Schutte 2003), museums often referred to as cultural villages. This development first took place at McGregor Museum in an attempt by the museum to exhibit diverse South African cultures, a process which led to the creation of the first South African outdoor museum by building two different Bantu-speaker tribal huts. In other parts of the world, for instance the United States of America

(USA), a similar form of museum is referred to as an “ecomuseum” (e.g. Fuller 1992). The establishment of this museum type initially came as a state initiative to support infrastructure and employment in the impoverished South African homelands (Van Veuren 2001; Schutte 2003). These open air museums later developed into private culture and heritage institutions owned by independent entrepreneurs (Van Veuren 2001). The funders of many of these museums have always been major corporates; an example is the cooperative effort Lesedi Cultural Village by Protea Hotels (a South African hotel chain) in partnership with Tourvest (a tourism investment company) (Schutte 2003). This museum type thus presents a new phenomenon in cultural and heritage museum (CHM) ownership and management in the country -one totally based on market share. The open air museum is unlike other CHMs in that it portrays indigenous cultures as they are lived and experienced and has no formal displays and exhibits like other privately owned museums do.

Most of the privately owned museums as opposed to cultural villages in the country, are built out of a collection made by an individual who accumulated artefacts and objects of significance. These are mostly small private companies and the money paid at the door goes straight into the institutions development unlike the cultural villages where many parties often make a profit from the money made.

Models of museum ownerships and management

Two museum models existed during the apartheid era; they are the governmental funded model at all three levels (state, provincial and municipal) and the private museum ownership and management model in the form of commercial entities (CE).

The government funded model was built on the same principles as it was in the colonial era, but was expanded further during this era, for example, the expansion of the provincial museum service by the government. During this era government kept direct control over most culture and heritage museums in the country. Under the state control, some of South African museums, such as technology museums, were used to propagate

apartheid ideologies (Levitz 1996). These museums were funded by corporates such as Eskom which, according to Levitz (1996), were benefiting from the system.

The influence of the state was, however, not limited to the government funded model because the development of the cultural village in South Africa was directly entrenched in the apartheid system ideology. The aim was to create museums for non-Whites outside South African big cities, whereas city museums would serve the White minority. This explains why museums such as the Africana Museum mostly focused on displaying and exhibiting white cultures in the early face of apartheid (Alubafi 2001). The museum however, disbanded these ideas in the 1980s (towards the end of the apartheid era), with the inclusion of South African Museum of Rock Art and a series of African huts at the museum.

The private museum model presents a very different museum operational model in that its success depends on visitor numbers. It was also more dynamic; we see for example open air museums moved away from formal exhibitions and displays. Economically this museum model was the most viable one, attracting both local and international tourists. Developed in the late 1960s, this museum type continues in the democratic South African era.

The open air museum model not only presents a different model, but also the development of partnerships in South African museum ownership and management. Museum-partnership refers to the relationship or the contract signed by two or more organizations involved in either the establishment or management of the museum. Museum-partnerships often involve a contract between commercial investment and social investment companies and the public sector. There are also museum-partnerships between private individual donors and museums. Museums may also enter into partnership with other museums for the conservation and preservation of objects of importance or with universities for research (Museums & Galleries Commission 1988). In countries such the United Kingdom (UK) and the USA this phenomena became popular after World War II; there, many of the privately owned museums were involved

in partnerships (Kavanagh 1995). The notion of a public-private museum partnership in South Africa dates back to the early 1900s with establishment of the Alexander McGregor Memorial Museum.

Problems and opportunities face by the museum

During the apartheid era the chief problem that was experienced by many South African museums was the problem of a decline in visitor numbers. This is a problem which struck South African museums in the interior and on the coast. A study conducted by R. Liversidge in 1968 indicates an increase in the number of museum visitors in some South African museums up to 1956 followed by a steady decline in museum visitor attendance. The two factors thought to have caused this were high entrance fees and poor publicity. Different views were raised, some arguing that the rise in entry fees was the result of the decline, not the cause (e.g. Bokhost & Coetzee in Liversidge 1968). The nature of museum displays and exhibits was also seen as one of the contributing factors. For example, Liversidge argued that museums tended to be static and conservative in their displays (Liversidge 1968).

Other issues that affected the number of museum visitors during this era included the political situation. For example, it has been reported that in Johannesburg, after Sharpeville, there was a sudden drop in museum attendance (Liversidge 1968). This indicates that people ceased visiting government museums to make a social and political statement at this time.

2.1.3 Democratic Era

Museums developments

The early 1990s political transition in South Africa, with the eradication of apartheid, saw another upswing in the number of cultural and heritage museums established across the country. In Johannesburg alone we have seen an array of museums being established within the thirteen year period of democracy since the 1994 elections. Now even areas that initially had no museums, boast one or more; for example the Hector Peterson Memorial Museum in Orlando, Soweto and the Kliptown Museum. The Alexandra

Township, north of Johannesburg, is also now in the process of building its own museum. This museum is being built as part of the City of Johannesburg township urban renewal project, called the Alexandra Renewal Project (ARP). There is also Constitution Hill in Braamfontein, Johannesburg.

Cities other than Johannesburg have also experienced this upswing in the number of newly established cultural and heritage museums since 1994, for example the District Six and the Robben Island Museum in Cape Town (Rassool and Prosalendis 2001).

In this era some of South Africa's oldest museums have been restructured, their exhibits and displays reconfigured to suit the new South African social, political and economic norm. In cities other than Johannesburg, these museums include the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Art Museum in Nelson Mandela Bay; a museum previously known as the King George Gallery and the Kimberley Mine Museum.

In and around Johannesburg restructured museums include MuseumAfrica in the Newtown Cultural Precinct previously known as the Africana Museum. According to Alubafi a name "intended to signify a museum more closely aligned with African (as opposed to white minority) history and culture than had been the case in the institution's previous life" (Alubafi 2001: 1). The Transvaal Museum in Tswane and the Voortrekker Monument north of Johannesburg and south of Tswane which is currently undergoing a process of restructuring (Cecilia Kruger 2007 *pers.comm.*). All these museums are governmentally funded institutions.

There is also a series of new private cultural and heritage museums. Many of these are world class museums such as: the Apartheid Museum, Origins Centre, and Maropeng in the Cradle of Humankind. These museums represent a new phenomenon in the history of South African museums studies, the idea of outsourcing some museum responsibilities and operations to privately owned institutions, forming what I call fully-fledged museum partnerships. For example, Maropeng is a public funded museum by the Gauteng Provincial Government and is privately run by a company called Maropeng āAfrica

Leisure (Pty) Ltd. Another institutions that is responsible for some of Maropeng's operations and practice is the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits), which is actively involved in running the exhibits and some Wits University members also sit on the board of directors for the institution (Lindsay Marshall 2007 *pers.comm.*).

The Origins Centre was established by the Wits University Rock Art Research Institute in association with private companies such as *The Atlantic Philanthropies*, Murray & Roberts, Anglo American, Graham Beck Foundation, National Lottery, and African Rainbow minerals. But, for some of its operations a private company called Imperial Holdings was involved in bringing tourists buses to the museum and for overseeing some of the museum operations, such as ticket sales, guiding, the shop, tea room and special events bookings.

The Apartheid Museum was established by the Gold Reef Casino in association with a company called Unani Egoli (Pty) Ltd at a value of R100 million in obligations to its casino license; Unani Egoli is a Black Empowerment Consortium that was also involved in establishing other culture institutions such as the Sandton Convention Centre and Monte Casino (Wady Davy 2007 *pers.comm.*).

Models of museum ownerships and management

The Hector Peterson Memorial Museum, Kliptown Museum, Alexandra Museum, Constitution Hill and MuseumAfrica all represent the Council Government Funded model. This means that all these museums are funded by the Johannesburg City Council. The city funding included their establishment, operations and maintenance. The Greater Johannesburg Council extends up to Midrand and incorporates all the Johannesburg townships such as Alexandra to the north and Soweto in the south. These townships have their own local councils such the Soweto Council and the Alexandra Council. The money thus filters through from the Greater Johannesburg council into these councils. The Kliptown Community Museum and the Alexandra Museum fall under these local councils. There are thus two council models in Johannesburg: the Greater Johannesburg Municipal Council and the Local/Ward Councils.

The Transvaal Museum and the Voortrekker Monument are governmentally funded through different governmental models. For example, the Transvaal Museum is a flagship institution meaning that it is of national significance and is thus funded directly by government through the Department of Arts and Culture. The Voortrekker Monument presents a unique governmentally funded model; it is established as a Section 21 Company, solicits some of its funds privately for its operations and sustenance, but still gets substantial support from the government.

The Apartheid Museum, Origins Centre, Maropeng and Lesedi Cultural Village all present different models of museum ownership and management. For example, the Apartheid Museum is run by the Gold Reef City Casino as a Section 21 Company. This is a public company model established not to make profit, but to generate income for the sustainability of the museum. On the other hand the Origins Centre and Maropeng operate under the Public Private Partnership model as set up, and use Section 21 Companies for their day-to-day operations. This means that they have to generate their own income to cover their operational and maintenance costs. At the same time they have to carry out their social obligation, which requires them to benefit the public. Thus the social obligation is present in the public side of the partnership. These are some of most vibrant museums in Johannesburg. They are faced with the dilemma of striking a balance between social obligation (to be recognised as socially viable institutions) and economic health and sustainability.

2.1.4. Discussion and Conclusion

Three eras of museum development have been defined as the colonial, the apartheid and democratic era, a division based on three South African social and political eras. Each of the three eras presents a unique landscape for museums in the country. For example, the colonial era presents the first establishment of museums as official institutions through government funds, and this was the first museum model in the country: the government funded model. The apartheid era presents the first official establishment of commercial museum entities a model based on market share which also continues to exist in present

day South Africa. This is a model that was developed through the cultural villages in rural South Africa. The first fully-fledged partnership model developed within democratic South Africa is the Public Private Partnership museums, collaborations between the government and the private sector. Thus there has been long continuity in some of the models used by museums in South Africa and so some of the problems they face in their operations are well-known and understood.

The way each model has been used varies from era to era, for example, in the colonial era there was an emphasis on the national government funded model. This was relevant at the time because South Africa was not one country, it was divided into four separate states. I argue that the establishment of museums in these states was important to their status, showing the wealth and development of each state. This is based on the notion of cultural consumption, a concept which I explore further for museums in the democratic era. Beside national museums there were also provincial and municipal museums and all were developed using government funds. This formed a three-tier hierarchy of governmental funded museums. The development of this hierarchy came after the establishment of the Union of South Africa with the provincialization of services.

In 1936 the South African Museums Association (SAMA) was established to develop further the status of museums in the country. This development ensured aspects of continuity in the use of the government funded model since SAMA brought together different museums and the government. The existence of the government model then continued to be a dominant operational model into the apartheid era and is still strong today. During the apartheid era a range of other operational models developed, most notably private models. One example was the establishment of fully commercial museum entities such as the cultural villages that became popular during the late 1960s.

What is interesting about the government funded model is the emphasis placed upon different types of museum in each of the three eras: first there was an emphasis on funding national museums (colonial era), then in expanding the provincial museum service (apartheid era) and there is now an emphasis in establishing municipal or local

museums (democratic era). Municipal museums have developed across the country since 1994; in Johannesburg even townships now have their own museums and this is something new. There are two reasons for this evolution in museum service in the country; the first reason is to boost the status of the townships and secondly to bring tourists to townships to boost their economies ([Kirshenblatt-Gimblett](#) 1998; Delmont 2004; Benjamin Smith 2008 *pers.comm.*). The first (status) of the two reasons mentioned above has to do with the overall social discourse in the cultural and heritage sector and that of the country as a whole as influenced by social, political and economic conditions. The second (tourist for economic injection) has to do with the developments that are taking place within the museum sector. Like in any other sector, the museum sector is not static, it evolves with time and a new era presents new problems and opportunities which museums have to address.

The democratic era presents the emergence of a new form of social discourse particular to culture and heritage institutions such as museums. This social discourse is different from that of the apartheid era that was based on social exclusion in museum access, and more similar to the 1930s colonial era establishment of the museums to serve the wider South African public. At the forefront of this challenge is the framing of museums and other cultural heritage institutions within the newly established South African cultural and heritage framework, the White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage. This cultural and heritage framework was developed with the establishment of the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology in 1996 to oversee the protection and the development of South Africa's cultural and heritage affairs (Government Gazette 1996). The White Paper then set a framework for the protection, conservation and presentation of South African cultural and heritage resources to its diverse citizens and the people of the world.

Amongst other objectives set out by this policy was an intention to ensure that the newly elected government was actively involved in the field of arts, culture and heritage through "...optimum funding arrangements and an institutional framework for the creation, promotion and protection of South African arts, culture and heritage and the associated practitioners" (Government Gazette 1996:4). This was an issue also stressed by the

former South African President, Dr Rolihlahla Nelson Mandela, in his speech during the inauguration of Robben Island Museum, a site where he had been detained as a prisoner for 18 of his 27 years in captivity as a political prisoner (Dubin 2006). Mandela lamented the past use of museums in the country and proposed the design of a new project that would broaden museum "...representation by endowing new museums and establishing monuments and memorials using state funds" (Dubin 2006:3). A year later in 1998, the Cultural Institution Act No.119 was passed which made provision for the payment of subsidies by the government to cultural institutions such as museums.

In terms of regulating the functions and operations of museums listed under the Cultural Institutions Act (i.e. letting or exchanging species, collection or other movable objects) one had to then follow the guidelines as set out in National Monuments Act No.28 of 1969. In 1999 the National Monuments Commission was, however, replaced by the newly established South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) aimed at preserving, protecting and conserving all of South Africa's cultural and heritage resources. The development of this government statutory body required the development of a new Act, the South African Heritage Resources Act, No 25 of 1999.

Another aspect of change is the use of museums by cities such as Johannesburg in their urban rejuvenation projects in order to become rated as world metropolitan culture cities. This parallels the early development of museums in the country whereby museums were developed to boast state status and to ensure that each state was admired for its cultural achievements. Both these forms of social discourse present problems and opportunities for the museums in the country. One such problem is the issue of fictitious cultural commodification and a second is the issue of museum access which has direct implications for museum sustenance in a multicultural society. How does one strike the balance in terms of museum access in a multicultural society like South Africa? Whose needs do you include and whose needs do you exclude? These have been stumbling blocks for many museums in the country since the first development of museums. In an attempt to overcome this problem, museums are now used in multimillion rand city branding projects; for example the use of museums by the City of Johannesburg in its

processes of urban renovation of the inner city and satellite townships as it aims to become one of the world's new Metropolitan cities identified by its culture and heritage institutions (Bremner 2004).

Such uses of museums have both social and economic implications. First, new museums have mostly been established in association with multinational companies and are based on profit making mechanisms. This often leads to the commoditization of these culture and heritage institutions, another process which leads to social exclusion in terms of museum access, since not every South African can afford the entrance fee charged at some of the newly established South African museums. The problem of addressing past inequalities is then a priority that becomes subservient to economics.

The other problem has to do with the establishment of unsustainably huge monumental structures to present such heritage. Of course this is not a new phenomenon, it goes back to the old South African Afrikaner Nationalism days with the construction of big monumental structures to glorify what was then conceptualised as "South African Heritage", for example the construction of the Voortrekker Monument (e.g. Delmont 1993). Within both geographies there thus seem to be a common understanding of the presentation of heritage without much attention paid to the sustainability of these structures. I hope that the assessment of museum operational models will help to unpack this process.

In both these eras (democratic and apartheid) I see the rhetoric about the held notion of heritage as being the mode of cultural production in the present that has recourse to the past (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995). A process of "the transvaluation of the obsolete, the mistaken, the outmoded, the dead, and the defunct" (ibid 1995:369). Simply put, heritage is the re-evaluation by new standards of what is no longer current, the old fashioned and those things that are no longer in function. Hence we continue to see the formation of major heritage institutions, as was so in the past, even though they may serve similar objectives. Thus, "heritage is created through a process of exhibition (as knowledge, as performance, as museum display). Exhibition endows heritage thus conceived with a

second life” (idem). I see the establishment of these new major South African heritage institutions as an example of such a process of heritage reproduction. The problem is that this is done without taking into account the viability and the sustainability of these institutions in the long run. Thus the problem faced by some of the new museums becomes one of financial sustainability and social viability soon after they have been constructed and left to run for themselves.

I see these new heritage institutions as structures that boast heritage and become monuments of their own times. However, there remains a question as to their social and economic viability and sustainability. We also have to consider that heritage is a value added industry, producing the local for export (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1995). Within these huge structures are complex problems of functionality and disfunctionality which affect the viability and sustainability of museums. One such problem is the issue of their finances which affect their daily functions and operations. Second is the issue of the entrance fee at these culture and heritage institutions. This becomes pertinent with Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s argument that “a hallmark of heritage is the problematic relationship of its objects to its instruments and its virtuality in the presence or absence of actualities” (1995: 369). What are then the causes of such problems within the new South African culture and heritage dispensation?

In order to assess such causes for museums in the new South African dispensation I use seven museums situated in and around Johannesburg to assess models under which they are set to operate. Chapter three of this study covers the range of methods and techniques that I use in the study.

3.0. Processes and Methods Used to Conduct Research for this Study

3.1. Research Design Used in the Study

This study uses qualitative research methods. I chose to use qualitative research due to its flexibility. It is a multi-method approach that involves interpretation of the subject matter ([Bogdan](#) 1975). It also involves the use of people (informants) in order to obtain detailed information about the subject matter under study, building a complex and holistic picture based on the reporting and analysis of the informants' views of the subject under study (*ibid*). Traditionally this research method is used to study and understand social and human problems. I used this method to make sense of, and interpret, current perceptions of museum management models.

3.2. Research Methods Used in the Study to Collect Data

3.2.1 Literature survey

For this study I used literature concerned with the nature and development of South African museums (e.g. Brain & Erasmus 1986; SAMABs **State dates**) and policies influencing such developments (e.g. Government Gazette 1996; **state other dates**). I also used literature that informed me of the different ways of conducting research and ways of approaching my research using different types of research designs, interviews and developing a questionnaire (e.g. [Bogdan](#) 1975; Oppenheim 1992; Cresswell 1994). I then divided this literature into five categories to make it easier for me to select the relevant literature for my study. This included literature dealing with issues of museums classification (e.g. Goode 1986), museum ownership and management (e.g. Chubb 1941; Fuller 1992; Kavanagh 1995; McLean 1996; Van Veuren 2001; Schutte 2003), museums displays and exhibits (e.g. Karp 1992; Levitz 1996; Alubafi 2002; Sharpe 2003), and ways of presenting the “other” in museums displays and exhibits (e.g. Dowson & Lewis-Williams 1994).

This division proved to be important to this study because it not only helped me identify relevant literature for this study, but also assisted me having a much broader

understanding of the different processes and developments taking place in the field of museum studies in the country and abroad. Most importantly is how these different studies influence one another. For example, how the politics and practice of museum displays and exhibits can influence the type of audience that visits the museum (e.g. Davison 1991; Karp 1992; Rassol & Witz 1994; Bennett 1995; Alubafi 2002; Sharpe 2003; Dubin 2006), and the implications of this for the overall number of visitors (e.g. McLean 1996). There are obvious ramifications of this for museums that are dependent on visitor numbers and entrance fees for their economic health to cover their maintenance cost and operations. This can also influence the social viability of the museum in terms of who the museum serves and the implications of this to its social obligation processes.

Because there are many studies that address issues of museum displays and exhibits in the country in the post-1994 landscape; however, (I use the term landscape to refer to different context as understood by different race groups in terms of their social, cultural, political and economic beliefs (Bender 2001)). There is no doubt that South Africans interpret the period post-1994 in different ways; however, this is not the place to discuss such interpretations. It is, however, worth remembering this particularly when dealing with museums in a country where some citizens were mis-represented in some of the museums in the past (e.g. Dowson & Lewis-Williams 1994), and where a majority was denied access to museums for nearly fifty years. To address some of these issues, such as museum access, I use this study to contribute to studies of South African museums in a rather different way. That is, by assessing the range of museum models currently in operation in Johannesburg, so as to get a sense of their social viability, but also their economic sustainability. These two things are linked because in order for a museum to be able to run social responsibility projects they need to be economically viable institutions.

To do this I used literature concerned with the development of museum traditions in the country, looking at how they evolved over-time, reviewing the different types of museum ownership and management and the different policies involved. This involved understanding the different policies set by governments to regulate the operations of

museums in terms of museum access, culture and heritage presentation, lending and loaning of objects (e.g. the White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage) and understanding policies concerned with the provision of funds or subsidies for museums (e.g. Cultural Institutions Act No. 119 of 1998 and Act No 29 of 1969; Museums Ordinance Act No.6 of 1914). Important as well were policies dealing with the development of museum traditions in the country such as the Museums Incorporations Act of 1857, the 1969 National Monuments Act, No.28 and the South African Heritage Resources Act No 25 of 1999. The literature consulted also included museum budgets, processes that museums used to generate income for their sustenance, sources of funding such as government, public donations and museum friends (e.g. Oliver 1941). I also looked at literature dealing with museum social responsibility programs (e.g. Rothman 1949; Chubb 1929).

Reviewing literature from all the five fields mentioned above has helped me develop such a clear framework for this project and to also understand how these different studies influence one another. Most importantly, my literature review has helped me to identify an area of research that I think requires more research in South African museum studies: museum models. This is important if we are to address issues of museum access and the future of the museums in the country as socially viable and economically viable institutions.

3.2.2. Interviews

Interview type: advantages & disadvantages

I used direct interviews for this project. I chose to use this type of interview because it allowed me to adapt questions as necessary, clarify doubts during the interview and ensure that the responses were properly understood. This was done by either repeating or rephrasing the types of questions asked during the interview (Oppenheim 1992). This type of interview also allows the researcher to pick up nonverbal cues from the respondents, something that may help the interviewer assess whether the respondent had thought of the subject under study before. These are some of the things that one cannot detect when using indirect interviews such as an internet survey or telephone survey. Like any other type of interview, face-to-face interviews are not without their limitations.

According to Oppenheim (1994) one such limitation is the geographical location. That is the distance that the interviewer has to travel to meet his/her respondents (ibid). This was also a limiting factor to my interviews because some in my respondents were outside Johannesburg.

Choice of respondents: some justifications

Having decided on what type of interviews to use I then had to decide who I was going to interview. Initially in my proposal, I had thought of interviewing museum staff and museum visitors, but I later abandoned this thought, to only interviewing key stakeholders because I thought they would have more in-depth knowledge on the operations and practice of the museums involved and museums in general.

I conducted ten interviews with eight senior museum staff and two other respondents who were not working at a museum. One was working for the City of Johannesburg Department of Arts and Culture and the other was a consultant and senior researcher at the Wits University. All my respondents were people with a sound knowledge of the functions and operations of museums in Johannesburg and with vested interests in museums in general. My respondents consisted of the following people:

1. Steven Sack: Director, City of Johannesburg Department of Arts and Culture, Newtown Johannesburg.
2. Belinda Hlaka: Curator, MuseumAfrica, Newtown Johannesburg.
3. Zola Mtshiza: Chief Curator Exhibitions, MuseumAfrica, Newtown Johannesburg.
4. Geoffrey Blundell: Curator, Origins Centre, University of the Witwatersrand, Braamfontein Johannesburg.
5. Wady Davy: Curator, Apartheid Museum, Gold Reef City Theme Park, Johannesburg.
6. Jillian Carmen: Co-founder of Johannesburg Museums Tool Kit & Associate Researcher School of Arts and Culture, University of the Witwatersrand.
7. Francis Thackeray: Director, Transvaal Museum, Tswane.
8. Cecilia Kruger: Deputy Director, the Voortrekker Monument, Tswane.

9. Lindsay Marshall: Deputy Director, Maropeng, in the Cradle of Humankind.
10. Baba Dlamini: Manager, Lesedi Cultural Village, northwest of Johannesburg.

Choice of respondents: in terms demographics & gender representations

The demographics of my respondent were reflective of diverse South African citizens and equity, in terms of gender representations 50% male respondents and 50% female respondents. There were no gender biases over the types of responses I got from the interviews. My interviewees fell into two age groups; four of them were between ages 34-37 and six were between 46 and older as is expected in a study focusing on senior management (Age Groups see Appendix 1). Previously known as only white institutions, there is a balance in different races that manage museums in and around Johannesburg, 60% whites and 40 % blacks. These are significant numbers considering the legacy of museums in South Africa, but it also has to be taken into account that these numbers only reflect the total number of stake-holders interviewed. To gain confidence in the level of responses, all the respondents have a high level of education (tertiary) and this influenced the high response rate during the interviews.

Conducting my interviews: problems & opportunities

Having decided on the type of interview to use and the people to interview, I then fixed my interviews. I wrote an email to each of my respondents, telling them about myself and the project and asked them to propose a date for an interview. My respondents replied at different times, some proposed early dates, and others proposed later dates due to their busy schedules at work.

I then prepared for each interview by drawing up a set of questions that I would ask to open and guide the interviews. I also prepared a questionnaire which remained the same for all my interviewees to direct specific questions to the area of my interest. In many cases instead of probing the opening questions I just used questions that were in my questionnaire. At the given dates I then went for the interviews. To put my respondents at ease I started each interview by introducing myself, the project and asked them for the

permission to continue with the interview. I therefore used verbal rather than written consent for my interviews.

In cases where I had prepared a set of opening questions I then asked my respondent to fill out the questionnaire at the end of the interview, but before giving out the questionnaire I asked them for their permission, they were all willing to assist. In cases when I had only used the questions from the questionnaire, I just relied on my notes which I had taken during the interview.

People often complain of restrictions during the process of conducting interviews. I did not experience any extraordinary restrictions except with time and in the provision of some information about the museum. Time was the chief constraint in some of my interviews, which often meant that I had to leave behind my questionnaire and pick it up later. This is, however, understandable since all my respondents are busy people and had to attend to other responsibilities of their museums such as meetings.

In terms of providing information, all my respondents were free and willing to assist. In some cases photocopies of museum documents were made for me, but unfortunately some of this information was of no relevance to the project. The second problem for this project during my interviews concerned museum budgets and year spending. Some of my respondents were not willing to give out this information. Some argued that their spending year had not yet ended and for their previous years they had not compiled such data and would be more than willing to issue such information in the future. But, I also got the feeling that, in some museums, these data had not been given out before. I then had to compromise by taking estimates of their year spending and number of visitors per annum based on what the respondents told, word of mouth estimates. This disadvantaged the study since I had initially thought of examining each museum's spending and number of museum visitors per annum in order to assess their economic health and accessibility. However, museum viability could be done by accessing other things at the museum such as their social responsibility programs (questions included in the questionnaire) and also using such estimates.

A study over a period of five years (assessing year budgets and visitors using records extending over five years) could benefit other research, because one can pick up the trends in the money spent at each museum and the total number of visitors over a given period and draw conclusions on which of the museums are economically sustainable and much visited. I got a general sense that even if all the museums in the project had provided me with this information, I would still have experienced problems in making comparisons and assessing trends because some of the museums are less than a year old in their operations. Thus, there is a need for a project that can assess this over a period of more than five years. This, however, does not mean that we cannot talk of current museum sustainability and social viability, because I gained much relevant information concerning these two issues in my interviews.

In conclusion I think my presence in these interviews was of value to the project and did not bias the process. It was of value because I was able to develop and add on questions that I had not included in my questionnaire and ask for clarity on certain points.

Tools used to record data during the interviews: problems & opportunities

I recorded all my interviews using a Croxley JD 6255 Manuscript Book, pen and pencil. Some people use tape recorders when conducting interviews, a data collecting tool that I had initially thought of using. However, I did not use it in my interviews, because in my literature survey I had learnt that, as much as it can be of advantage to the interview, tape recorders can also be a limiting factor. It can intimidate the respondents and hence discourage candor as the respondents can feel that they have been personally probed. I did not want to take that chance even though they can also stimulate the interviewee to be actively involved in the interview.

3.2.3. Developing a Questionnaire for this Study

Processes leading to developing a questionnaire

I used a qualitative research method and treated the project as a 'case study'. I chose this type of research approach (qualitative case study) as my research method in order to

locate my study within a particular geography and assess a particular problem: the museum operational model that works best for cultural and heritage museum in and around Johannesburg. This was just a form of research approach that I used, but it also meant that I had to come up with a technique that I could use to collect data appropriate to this study. Thus I developed a questionnaire that would help me guide my interviews and ask questions that were relevant to this study.

Type of questionnaire used

A questionnaire is basically a paper and pencil instrument that a respondent completes. The type of a questionnaire that I used is a self-administered questionnaire, which I personally presented to my respondents. The advantage of using this type of questionnaire is that the purpose of the enquiry is explained at the top of the questionnaire. Then the respondent is given time to complete the questionnaire either in the presence or absence of the interviewer. In my case the questionnaire was completed by the respondent in my presence, I gave clarity where necessary and took the questionnaire after the respondents had completed filling it. There were a few exceptions where I conducted a general interview with the respondent and left the questionnaire with the respondent to pick it up later due to the issue of time. I also grounded my use of this technique in Oppenheim's (1992) description of its advantages: that it ensures a high response rate, accurate sampling and a minimum of interviewers' bias.

In deriving my questionnaire I probed questions that included a combination of both closed and open ended questions (Appendix 1). The advantage of closed questions is that they make it easy for the interviewer to make comparison between different groups, for example according to age, gender and profession. I used this type of question only for the demographic section on top of my questionnaire. For the rest of the questionnaire I used open ended questions. I did this to allow freedom and spontaneity of answers by my respondents. I made most of the questions in the questionnaire open ended also to allow myself the opportunity of later seeking clarity if I did not understand the answers when transcribing questionnaires. These questions are also useful in testing hypotheses about ideas or awareness about a particular subject matter (Oppenheim 1992).

Structuring the questionnaire (Appendix 1)

In deriving my questions I also ensured that all the questions were not personal to the interviewees, such as questions asking them about their daily jobs at the museum and the time they arrive and leave their work. All questions were directed to answering the questions about museums models, their operations cost and social responsibility programs. I asked such questions as not to probe the respondents, but to find out how the museum operated and what model it used in its operations. I further divided my questionnaire into five sections. I made this division to order my questions from questions asking about museums, to questions asking about their social responsibility programs as this would make it easier in evaluating my questionnaire.

The first section of the questionnaire explains who I am and the purpose of the study to the respondent. The second section recorded the date, venue and time of the interview. The third section was for demographic study. In this section I included questions that were directed to the interviewees in terms of their name, age group, sex for gender presentation, occupation to ascertain the position of my respondents at work, their levels of education and nationality. Section four is based on the types of museum models and sets of museum standards and policies. This section comprises of 10 sets of questions out of a total number of 25 questions. The first question asked in this section is on the type of model used by the museum, followed by questions asking the type of other partnerships the museum is involved in and their benefit to the museum. This is followed by two sets of questions asking about the advantages and disadvantage of the model the museum is operating under. Section five comprises the rest of the questions and is on museum operational costs and museums social responsibility programs. The first question in this section asks about the museum annual budget and moves on to question about what it covers in terms of percentages.

In summary the questionnaire makes up a total of three pages. The aim of this questionnaire was to assist me to get an inside perspective from people working in the museums about the types of models their museums were operating under and to ascertain problems and opportunities they were experiencing with each model. I also got a sense

of the social responsibility programs that museums are involved in. Most of all I used the questionnaire for clarity, because I first conducted an interview and then left my respondents to complete the questionnaire afterwards.

3.3. StudySample.

The study sample of this project includes seven South African cultural and heritage museums. I followed three factors in selecting these museums: their types of ownership; the operational models they are using and their location. Museums location was important because I had decided to treat the project as a case study, it was therefore important to confine my study within a particular locality, Johannesburg. Privately owned museums used in this study make up a total of 57%, while government owned museums 43%.

Museum operational models were very important in deciding which museums to use for the project since they form the focus of this study. I chose seven museums to get a better comparative analysis of the models which works best for museums located in Johannesburg and its surroundings areas. These models vary from commercial entities, Section 21 companies, Public Private Partnerships, to government funded models. In the study I chose to use two types of government museums: one Flagship (National) Museum, the Transvaal Museum and one Municipal (Council) Museum, MuseumAfrica. The objective of doing this was to assess which of the two hierarchies works best and what are the advantages of each level.

I chose a third government owned museum the Voortrekker Monument because I had initially thought it was operating under a Trust Model. I later ascertained that it was jointly run by Afrikaner Institutions such as “die Erfenisstigting” (ES) in association with the government under a Section 21, not for profit, company. This Afrikaner institution was formed in the light of a growing perception that Afrikaner’s heritage resources are threatened. The company was founded in 2002 (Cecilia Kruger 2008 *pers.comm.*).

3.4. Data Collection Experiences: Problems & Opportunities

During the process of collecting data for this project I encountered some problems with the relevant literature; there is not much previous research in South Africa on operational models. This posed a threat to the study; to overcome this problem I had to consider in depth how museums were developed and who contributed in their developments in all the three defined eras of museum development in South Africa. I then considered issues of management such as who managed these museums, how were they managed and who or what were their sources of funding. From this I was able to establish relevant models.

Museum operational model are often made to sound as if they are given. However, when assessing these models and the ways they operate they are often implicit rather than explicit. They change and adapt to opportunities so cannot be read as fixed when considering viability. To overcome this problem one therefore needs to consider all the other aspects of the museum; how it is funded, who funds its operations and how does it generate other sources of income? Understanding the type of museum ownership and management structures and how they are composed, results in an understanding of the model the museum under which operates.

Amongst the opportunities experienced during the data collection for this project was in the use of my research method, and its techniques, such as the use of questionnaires. I found that it was easy to collect data using a questionnaire. I was able to guide the direction of the interviews to addressing the specific issues required for the project. Using this technique I was able to ask clarity questions when I did not get an initially satisfying answer. Thus the process of continuous consultation with your informants becomes an advantage. This only becomes a problem when the researcher does not have enough time at hand to continue consultations.

According to Cresswell (1994), a qualitative research approach can be divided into five main research types or modes of inquiry, the Biography; Phenomenology; Grounded Theory; Ethnography and the Case Study.

In this study I used the Case Study research approach; meaning that I chose a series of practical working examples of museums to use as models for the purpose of analysis. Then I categorized them by type. Those owned and managed by private institutions and those owned and managed by the government. I then assessed them using interviews with key stakeholders and using ground observations.

Cresswell (1994) identifies problems with the use of this research type and suggests that it is often better to identify a single case than multiple cases. He further asserts that the study of more than one case can dilute the overall analysis of the study, and that the more cases an individual studies, the greater the lack of an in-depth analysis in any single case (ibid). Using many cases can result in a weak generalization of the results. In this study I used five museums operation models because I wanted to assess which one works best. This study would have not been viable if I had used one or two models because two models could not offer me the range of contrast between the models.

4.0. Social Responsibility & Economic Sustainability Levels of Museums in and around Johannesburg.

4.0.1 Introduction

This chapter presents results obtained from ten interviews and from observations. In presenting these results, I first give the models under which the museums studied operate. The objective of this is not to repeat what other chapters have already noted; during the interviews I established that there are other issues concerning these models that I had not initially thought of, issues that I think are critical to this project. This involves the different ways that each of the seven models operate. In summary, this chapter divides into three sections: the models, my interviews and a summary of the results.

4.1. Results from examining museum models

During the study I discovered that the models were not as clearly distinct as suggested in chapter one of this project. In examining these models in detail I found that I could categorize them into two divisions. I call my first division Umbrella models, the model that was used when the museum was set up, and the second division Operational models, models that museums use for day-to-day operations. Some of these are subdivisions of Umbrella models and are established to ensure that the Umbrella models achieve their goals and objectives for the benefit of the museum. For example, the Public Private Partnerships use Section 21 Companies to operate on the ground and the Government Funded model uses two hierarchical structures to operate on the ground: National and Council models. Below is the summary of each of these categories.

1. Umbrella models include:
 - Government Funded models (GFm)
 - Public Private Partnerships
 - Section 21 Companies
 - Commercial Entity
2. Operational models include:-two Section 21 companies that develop under PPP model for day-to-day museum operations:
 - two operational models that develop under GFm at two different levels: one National and one Council.

- Two pure Section 21 Companies that are used as both set up and day-to-day operational models.
- Commercial Entity, this is also a model used as both the set up model and for the day-to-day operations of the museum.

In total there are four operational models; four Section 21 companies (57%), two of which developed out of PPP model (28.5%) and two that form part of both Operational and Umbrella models (28.5%), one National (14%), one Council (14%) and one commercial entity (14%).

4.4. Results from interviews

4.3.1. Issues addressing questions asked during the interview

I now summarise the results of the interviews conducted during my field research. I present these as my results to address questions asked in the questionnaire that I administered to ten museum stakeholders. Where necessary I have also included some of the issues that developed out of the interviews that were not necessarily part of the questionnaire, but which proved to be important.

The first question asked about the type of model that each museum operated under. Most of these museums were using models that cross-cut between what I call “Umbrella models” and “Operational models.” For example, the Apartheid Museum uses a Section 21 Company as both its Umbrella and Operational model. The same applies to the Voortrekker Monument which I initially thought operated under a Trust model. The Voortrekker Monument Section 21 Company model, however, differs from that of the Apartheid Museum in how it operates; it is an arms length model. The Monument not only depends on the money acquired through its Section 21 Company model, but also receives an annual grant from the government through the Department of Arts and Culture. Lesedi Cultural Village presents another model; it uses a Commercial Entity for its operations and as its Umbrella model.

Museums such as Maropeng, the Origin Centre, MuseumAfrica and the Transvaal Museum, use Umbrella models that are different from operational models. They have models that they are set up under and models that they use for day-to-day operations. For example, Maropeng and the Origins Centre use a Public Private Partnership as their umbrella models, but for their operation on the ground they use Section 21 companies. These Section 21 companies have to still fulfill the objectives of the partnerships; they are therefore not independent models but operational facilitation models. The same applies to the government funded model for museums; the museums are governmental, but function at different levels, such as at the National level as part of Northern Flagship Institutions (NFI) in the case the Transvaal Museum, and at the Municipal/Council level under the City of Johannesburg Department of Arts, Culture and Heritage is MuseumAfrica.

Out of the seven museums studied only three (43%) were involved formally in other forms of partnerships or associations. These were the Transvaal Museum and the Voortrekker Monument that have an association with the Department of Arts and Culture. The Transvaal Museum was currently exploring ways to forge an association with the Department of Science and Technology. The reason for this was that NFI is currently under the Department of Arts and Culture which is anomalous, since the Transvaal Museum deals with science in the context of natural heritage resources. But, through talking to some of my other respondents I established that the Department of Arts and Culture does not provide enough funding for museums and many argue that Science and Technology gets more funding. This develops as another reason why the Transvaal Museum was exploring such an association with the Department of Science and Technology. MuseumAfrica had a partnership with the Vaal University of Technology, which hosts its fourth year student's annual exhibits at the museum. These annual exhibitions help market and advertise the museum, but also bring new exhibitions to the museum.

There were different views held on the advantages of the models that each of the seven museums were run or operate under (both operational and umbrella models). For MuseumAfrica the advantages of the government funded model included: easy access for

funding from the Johannesburg City Council and its Arts, Culture and Heritage Department under which the museum falls. Another issue that developed during the interviews is that the name of the museum is also highly significant. For MuseumAfrica, for example, the Council has done well in branding the name of the museum. This therefore presents the second advantage of the model. The advantage of the government funded model for the Transvaal Museum was that the model makes it easy for the museum to promote scientific research, conservation, curation and run education programs. On the other hand, amongst the disadvantages of the Council model is that there has been an amalgamation of many museums in Johannesburg to include smaller museums under the council. This has meant financial constraints for bigger museums such as MuseumAfrica. The same is true of the NFI. Museums of this stature now have to compete for funding with smaller museums. This includes sharing the same budget with smaller museum for their operational costs, an advantage for smaller museums operating under the Council model.

For the Origins Centre and Maropeng the advantage of the Section 21 model is that the museums can apply to donors for operational funding. The way the Section 21 companies of these museums are established also allows the museums to choose to operate as commercial entities if the need develops (Geoffrey Blundell 2008 *pers.comm.*). The advantage of a commercial entity is that it generates profits for the companies involved (Lesedi Cultural Village model). The same would apply to the Origins Centre and Maropeng if they were to turn to become commercial entities. On the other hand the advantage of the Voortrekker Monument model is that the museum can operate as an independent museum, but is still able to solicit funds from the government in the form of an annual grant.

To answer the question of the set of museum standards that the museums operate under: all seven museums were aware of the existence of the South African Museums Association (SAMA) and the International Council of Museums (ICOM) museum standards and code of ethics. However, being aware of the museum standards and code of ethics is different from using them. All seven museums claimed that they adhered to

SAMA and ICOM museum standards and codes of ethics. Out of the seven, the Apartheid Museum acknowledged that it does not necessarily have to adhere or use these museums standards or code of ethics since it is an independent museum. These are, however, not the only museum standards that influence the function of museums in South Africa. The Origins Centre and MuseumAfrica also used the Johannesburg Museum Standards Toolkit (JMSTK) to assess the levels of their achievement.

The JMSTK is a computer aided kit developed for use by the museums in Johannesburg to assess their achievements in terms of their functions and accessibility in things like wheel chair ramps for disabled people. It was developed by Jillian Carmen and Ann Wanless (Jillian Carmen 2007 *pers.comm.*). This further assists Johannesburg museums to grade themselves locally before they can be graded internationally (ibid).

MuseumAfrica also used and adhered to AFRICOM (African Council of Museums) museum standards. These museum standards present an opportunity for South African museums to measure themselves against other major African Museums as this could benefit them and their status in the world. This is important since not all museums involved in this study have formally graded themselves using any of the above sets of museum standards and codes of ethic. Only two of the seven museums have formally graded themselves, the Transvaal Museum uses NFI procedures in grading itself. This involves the museum in ranking itself with other flagship institutions in the country in terms of its operational standards and procedures, which in this case included the collection, conservation and curation of natural history specimens as part of South Africa's rich natural heritage; research, exhibitions and education. It had to do all these duties because it is a national museum, thus it operates on a different scale to MuseumAfrica, also a government funded model. MuseumAfrica presents a second museum that has formally graded itself using the JMSTK. Five of the seven museums have not formally graded themselves and, out of the five, one was in a process of grading itself using the JMSTK: the Origin Centre.

Museum grading is important because it tells us about which level or rank the museum belongs to, whether it should be a national or provincial museum. The level and rank that a museum occupies is particularly important in the case of government funded museums, because they get funding according to their rank or at least used to get funding according to their rank. The ranking for government funded museums is also important because one can be able to assess how museums are funded at different levels and whether this has any implications on their levels of sustainability. Grading a museum is also important for the museum because it helps the museum to compare itself to other museums that surround it, what they have achieved and what it can do in order for it to compete with such museums. For example, the JMSTK helps museums using it to assess what they have achieved and what they have not and what things they need to do in order to become viable institutions in their geography. Museum achievements and the rank that the museum belongs to, compared to other museums that surround it, also influences how much money donors give to the museum.

Other than these different sets of museum standards and code of ethics, the Origins Centre, MuseumAfrica and the Transvaal Museum used other sets of policies for their operations. The Origins Centre, because it has been established in association with Wits University and the University is the primary stakeholder in the museum and it is located on university premises, abides by university policies. Amongst such policies are Wits Financial Controls and Operational Procedures. It has to follow these policies when dealing with issues of finance and practice (Blundell 2008 *pers.comm.*).

MuseumAfrica is also influenced by the City of Johannesburg infrastructure development strategies such as the City of Johannesburg 2030 goal of identifying itself as one of the world's cultural metropolitan cities. The Transvaal Museum, on the other hand, is influenced by the NFI policy of collections management, discipline and performance management since it is a museum of national significance. These policies influence significantly the operations and functions of each of the three above mentioned museums, in that they formed part, or were at the centre, of the daily operations and functions.

The types of museum standards and codes of ethics become important for this project to address the issue of a museum's level of social responsibility, because some of the museum standards and codes of ethics stress the need for museums to reach out to diverse publics and communities (e.g. ICOM museums standards and code of ethics). This is particularly important in the context of South Africa where museums have been associated with the legacy of a racially divided past.

Grading museums also puts the museums within a particular context, a context which makes it easy to identify the goals and objective as well as measure their achievement in terms of meeting such goals and objectives. In some of my interviews I established that the government had abandoned provincial museum services, amalgamating them into Council museums (Steven Sack 2007 *pers.comm.*). I also established that these museums now serve the interests of the cities since they form part of new South African metropolitan cities, such as Johannesburg, Cape Town, and Durban. The levels of Council museum viability under such amalgamation processes become another important point to be assessed, because it means that now the Council government funded model is liable for both municipal and provincial funding.

To address the question of museum economic sustainability and social responsibility, questions on museum annual budgets and costs were asked. Museum budgets ranged between R 3.5 to 7 million: Origins Centre ($\pm$ R4 million); the Apartheid Museum (R 3.5 million, budget changes depending on casino returns), the Voortrekker Monument, MuseumAfrica and Maropeng ($\pm$ R 6 million), the Transvaal Museum (R 7 million), Lesedi Cultural Village (respondent not certain, "but should be around R5 and R 6 million since they spend a lot in renovating the infrastructure").

In most of the seven museums most money was spent on salaries: this varied between 75 and 95 % of the total budget. For example, the Transvaal Museum spends 95% of its annual budget towards the payment of staff salaries, only is leaving it with 5% percent to cover its operations. The rest of the museums spent between 75 and 80% of their budget on salaries, leaving them 25 and 20% towards their operations and maintenance costs.

These are some of the things that the remaining balances covered in terms of museum operations and maintenance costs:

The Apartheid Museum spent the rest of its budget on museum exhibitions, maintenance and replacement of audio visuals, service contracts, building and garden maintenance. The Origins Centre remaining budget covered: building maintenance, utilities, rentals and stock, marketing, and development programs. The same applied to the Voortrekker Monument and Maropeng and to Lesedi (but excluding development programs). The Voortrekker Monument goes beyond the scope of these museums as it has to manage other Trekker Monuments using its annual budget, such as the Mafikeng Museum which operates with support from the Monument. Both Lesedi and the Monument stressed marketing as the key areas of focus for the remaining budget. For example, the Voortrekker Monument spent between R56,000 to R60,000 last year to market itself in Asia. This included a translation of their brochure into Mandarin (Cecilia Kruger 2008 *pers.comm.*).

Most of MuseumAfrica's remaining budget covered things such as the building, air-conditioning systems (which will take R2million to repair, and is currently experiencing problems). With only 5% to spend towards its operational and maintenance costs, the Transvaal Museum had to cover things such as conservation, marketing, the building, water, lights, and so on.

Building maintenance presents itself as the most common thing that museum budgets cover. I established that even though there seem to be huge gaps in museum annual budgets, these budgets were given according to museum spending.

About 86% of the museums studied generated some of their income from entrance fees and the others run extra projects to cover their costs. These projects included internal as well as external fundraising processes. Six of the seven museum studied charge an entrance fees that range from as little as R8 to R140, to contribute to their budgets except for MuseumAfrica which has no fee. Of the six museum that charge an entrance fee,

three have guaranteed sources of funding (the Transvaal Museum and Voortrekker Monument from DAC and the Apartheid Museum from Gold Reef Casino). The Transvaal Museum is dependent on the guaranteed funding to cover most of its operations. On the other hand the remaining three museums are totally dependent on the money generated from entrance fees and other fund raising processes for their economic health. These are Maropeng, the Origins Centre and Lesedi. There are trade offs in the way museum budgets are constructed, from museums that have guaranteed sources of funding to museums that are totally or mostly dependent on entrance fees for their sustenance. Below is a list of entrance fees charged at the museums that charge an entrance fee.

Table.2. Entrance Fees Charged by Museum Studied

Museum Names	Type of Fee	Adults	Children	Pensioners	Other
Transvaal Museum	Normal fee	R10	R8	R8	Addition fee of R3 added if one requires a tour guide
	Tour of research departments	R5	R5	R5	
	Discovery centre	R20	R18	R18	R10 additional fee on the normal fee
	Night tours	R140	R120	-	R100 for learners
	Science magic show	R20	R20	R20	
MuseumAfrica		Free	Free	Free	
Apartheid Museum	Normal fee	R25	R12	R12	R6 per pupil school group tours
Origins Centre	Normal fee	R45	R22	-	R35 Wits staff and students
Voortrekker Monument	Normal fee	R65	Charged nominal fee	Charged nominal fee	
Lesedi	Normal fee	R60	R40	-	
Maropeng	Normal fee	R80	R45	R60	

The entrance fees charged at the different museums contributed different percentages towards museum budgets. For example, for the Transvaal Museum entrance fee contributed not more than 1% towards the total budget of the museum, for the Voortrekker Monument 65%, Origins Centre 14%, Apartheid Museum 75%, Lesedi about 30% and for Maropeng no estimates were obtained.

Museums further relied on their internal and external fundraising projects for alternative income. Internal fundraising processes included, amongst other things, hiring out museum facilities as venues such as conference auditoriums, events halls, and boardrooms, outsourcing either their restaurants or gift shops for monthly rentals, hosting paid public lectures, and producing publications (e.g. the Transvaal Museums, the Apartheid Museum, and the Voortrekker Monument & Origins Centre).

The Voortrekker Monument also included Cape horse riding, an ox wagon drive experience which is privatised like the restaurant and the book shop. All Voortrekker rentals contribute 1% to its budget. The Monument also runs mountain bike riding and allows joggers to use the Monument space. Both cyclists and joggers are charged a normal fee at the gate and therefore contribute to the 65% generated through the entrance fee. Projects and events contribute 5% and 3% comes from sales which includes post cards and guided tours. For the Origins Centre on the other hand 18% came from functions and events, 21% from training (STTI), 12% from the shop and 35% from the café. The Apartheid Museum made about 10% from its commercial operations, such as its shop, 75% entrance fees and 15% from its casino subsidy. On the other hand Lesedi covered 10% from its bar and restaurant, 6% from its gift shop and 54% of income came from overnight stays, conferences and venue hiring for weddings (popular at the village).

External funding processes included approaching public and private financial institutions for donations such as ABSA, Sanlam and Standard Bank (e.g. the Voortrekker Monument). Museums also approached government, research institutions such as the National Research Foundation (NRF) for funding and private financial institutions. The Voortrekker Monument received 25% of its budget from DAC and the Apartheid

Museum receives 15% from two commercial institutions, an estimate of 10% from the Casino (this fluctuates depending on Casino returns) and about 5% from a company called Unani Egoli (a Black Empowerment Consortium) who are involved in the establishing of culture and heritage institutions such as the Sandton Convention Centre and Monte Casino. This is the same company that built the museum for an amount valued at R100 million as its social obligation to gain a casino license.

An example of a museum that received money from the NRF is the Transvaal Museum. Funds obtained from the NRF mainly contributed towards museum research programs. Last year (2007) for example, the NRF together with other private institutions contributed towards museum research not less than R 200 000, while DAC contributed only R25 000 towards museum research.

Other external methods used by the Voortrekker Monument to bring income to the Monument include the development of a system of subscribing corporate and public museum members. These members are charged joining and membership fees depending on how big they are. Four categories of member have been established by the museum, these included A-1 who paid a membership fee of R50 000 and an annual fee of R 2000; A-2 charged R10 000 (membership fee) and R 2000 (annual fee); B R5000 and R1000 (annual fee); C R1000 and R200 annual fee. In total the membership programs contribute 1% to the Monument budget.

These processes were all effective in the museums that used them. The level to which they contribute towards museum operational and maintenance cost varied, but all fell within a range of 5% and 35%. There was no museum who claimed to have gone beyond these averages. For those museums that had other partners, some of these partners contributed significantly towards these costs, for example the Origin Centre commercial partnership covered 80% of museum operational and maintenance costs; meaning that the centre only had to generate 20% towards its operational and maintenance costs. But for others, such as MuseumAfrica, the partnership with Vaal University of Technology only benefited the museum with exhibitions and did not bring any form of revenue to cover

the operations and maintenance costs of the museum. Table.3. below summaries the results according to museum budgets, entrance fee, internal and external fundraising processes.

Table.3. Summary of 2007 museum budgets and revenue generated from projects run by the museum to cover their costs. It includes grants from external funders.

	Transvaal Museum	MuseumAfrica	Apartheid Museum	Origins Centre	Voortrekker Monument	Lesedi	Maropeng
Budget	R7 m	R4 m	R3.5 m	R4 m	R6 m	R5-6 m	R6 m
Salaries	- 95%	- 75-80%	- 75-80%	- 75-80%	- 75-80%	- 75-80%	- 75-80%
Entrance fee	+ >1 %	-	+ 75%	+ 14%	+ 65%	+ 30%	-
Shops	?	?	?	+ 12%	+ 3%	+ 6%	-
Restaurants	-	-	-	+ 35%	+ 0.5%	+ 10%	-
Others	+ Sales>1%	-	+ 10% (including revenue from the restaurant)		+ Cape Horse Riding 0.5%		-
Training	-	-	-	+ 21% STTI			
Functions & Events	-	-	+ 10%	+ 18%	+ 5%	+ 54%	-
Annual Grants	+ 99%	+ 100%	+ 15%	-	+ 25%	-	-

(NB! The + sign represent the money generated (income) by the museum and the – sign represent the money spent (expenditure) by the museum)

With regards to the question of museum social responsibility, all seven museums responded positively. They each run one or more such programs depending of their financial capacity. These programs included amongst other things: free days to the museum to accommodate different South African publics and organizations who cannot afford to pay the entrance fee charged at the door (e.g. the Apartheid Museum); public school groups' educational programs, all the seven museums at a different scale. In some

museums this included providing educational packs to teachers to use at their schools for groups that could not afford to travel to the museum. For the Transvaal Museum this included night tours and casts of the Mrs. Ples fossil that were being made available to schools (aided by sponsorship). Other social responsibilities include free public lectures and temporary exhibitions and workshops.

For those museums from which I got the breakdown in visitor numbers, most of the adult visitors were international visitors. For example, 30% of the Apartheid Museum adult visitors were international tourists. Lesedi, the Voortrekker Monument and MuseumAfrica also received high number of adult international tourists; for the Voortrekker Monument and MuseumAfrica the range was between 20% and 30%. For Maropeng and Lesedi there was no breakdown in visitor numbers, but considering the number of visitors visiting these museums, they seem to be very accessible culture and heritage institutions. For Lesedi, most of the visitors that visit the village appear to be international from my observations. This questions the value of this village for the people of South Africa. This number of visitors includes an annual tour by Sparrow School to the village at a reduced rate, contributing to the social responsibility profile of the village.

The Voortrekker Monument on the other hand expanded its social responsibility programs beyond its museum premises by offering assistance to community projects in Provinces such as Mpumalanga and North West Province aimed at rehabilitating and conserving the Great Trek history and heritage. I found that it was actively involved in assisting with the management and celebration of some of South Africa's battle sites such as: the Battle of Kraaipan, Siege of Mafikeng, Battle of Molopo River, Battle of Derdepoort, British Forces' abortive attack on Game Tree Fort, Mafikeng, Ambush at Kaya-se-put, Relief of Mafikeng, Battle at Elands River, De la Rey and Smuts attack on Clements at Nooitgedacht, the capture of Modderfontein by Smut, De la Rey attack at Litchetenburg and so forth. Some of these celebrations were under its operations and annual budget, even though they took not more than a small percentage of the total budget. Below is a table of estimated visitor numbers per museum in year 2007. The

table also indicates trends in museums visitor numbers as a result of some of the museum social responsibility programs, particularly the large number of children/school group's attendance at each of the seven museums.

All social responsibility programs run by the different museum were found to be effective and were run in association with public institutions such the Department of Education and institutions such as the Ford Foundation, MOTT Foundation and Standard Bank (e.g. the Apartheid Museum). This is particular to education programs, thus the high number of children/school groups visiting the museum (Table 4). Museums such as the Voortrekker Monument, Origins Centre, the Apartheid Museum, Maropeng level of social responsibility based on visitors is high considering that they charge more than R10 children per head. Some of these museums charged even less for school groups, for example a nominal fee of R6 per pupil school groups tours at the Apartheid Museum (Table 2).

The issue of finance, however, presented itself as the most salient and limiting factor to the running of these projects. A commonly held view was that if museums were sufficiently funded in the country they could do better in expanding their social obligation programs. I established that this resulted because there was not enough money spent on social capital in the country. This leads us to the assessment of the models under which each museum is involved to ascertain which models addresses some of the problems mentioned above best.

Table.4. Estimated Museum Visitor Numbers Year 2007.

Museum Names	Total Number of Visitors	Adults	Children /School Groups	% per museum based on the total number of visitors for all museums (column 1 row 10)
Transvaal Museum	40,000	30%	70%	13%
MuseumAfrica	35,000	35%	65%	12%
Apartheid Museum	24,000	50%	50%	8%
Origins Centre	21,106	35.5%	66.5%	7%
Voortrekker Monument	33,000	40%	60%	11%
Lesedi	60,000	-	-	20%
Maropeng	82,000	-	-	28%
Total Numbers	205,106			100

Visitor numbers were collected from each of the seven museums studied. These numbers varied with each museum depending on its capacity and they fell within a range of 21,106 and 82,000. Maropeng, Lesedi, the Transvaal Museum and the Voortrekker Monument received most visitors in 2007 compared to MuseumAfrica, the Apartheid Museum and Origins Centre which ranged between 21,106 and 35,000 (Table 4). In some of the museums visitor numbers were said to be decreasing from previous years (e.g. Maropeng) while in some they were said to be steadily increasing (e.g. the Voortrekker Monument). However, in considering the number of visitors per museum it is important to take into account the entrance fee charged at each museum. For example, considering that MuseumAfrica does not charge an entrance fee the number of children and school groups seems to be lower than those of other museums. On the other hand if the amount charged per museum is taken into account some museums get surprisingly high levels of museum visitors such as Maropeng and Lesedi. This shows instability and inconsistency in number of visitors visiting some of Johannesburg museums.

In conclusion, all the seven museum committed themselves to running one or more social responsibility programs. The way these programs were run differed with each museum, for example, in some museums most of the socially responsibility projects were run

through sponsorships and in other museums such as Lesedi, these projects were directly funded by the museum. Those museums that used sponsors' money to run such projects generated other funds from their fundraising programs to develop further their social responsibility projects. All these projects were found to be effective in all the museum; however, there remains a question about the viability of these museums.

5.0. Viability of Johannesburg Museums: What's the Way Forward?

5.0.1. Introduction

The results of this project identify some of the problems and opportunities of the museum operational models currently being used in and around Johannesburg. This chapter discusses these problems and opportunities and evaluates the range of potential practices that museums in Johannesburg should consider if they want to enhance their existing models. It also makes recommendations as to which model will work best for future cultural and heritage museums in and around Johannesburg.

5.1. Discussion of the Results: Problems and Opportunities

5.1.1. Problems and Opportunities of the Models Currently in Operation in Johannesburg.

The umbrella models assessed in this study presents both problems and opportunities for the museums that use them. One such problem is that umbrella funding (i.e. the setup funding) is once-off and so museums need to develop different models to support their annual operations. Three umbrella models were recognised in the study and they included the government funded model, the public-private partnership model and the commercial entities model. The PPP model is experiencing problems in its application within CHMs in Johannesburg and this has even threatened the stability of museums using this model. Two of the PPP museums studied in this project were experiencing problems. Maropeng is experiencing major sustainability problems. Its commercial operators declared bankruptcy in 2007 because of major operating losses. At the Origins Centre the commercial operator, Imperial Holdings (Pty) Ltd, while making a small profit, pulled out in 2007 due to restructuring within the company business profile. The company sold off all of its tourism operations. These are the kinds of problems that result when you have two or more partners with different interests who try to forge a relationship with different agendas. The whimsical nature of commercial investment can have a serious destabilising effect on the museum they are in partnership with to manage. A breakdown in the partnership often results from conflicting values between the two

parties involved. For example, in these cases one partner has a vested interest in culture and heritage while the other was interested in the profit that these could generate. In cases where the partner with an interest in making profits suspects that it will take a long time to recover its investment it can easily decide to leave the partnership resulting in confusion and instability in the institution involved. This is one of the pitfalls of the PPP model, which museums such as Origin Centre and Maropeng are using.

These are some of the problems that result when one assesses the umbrella models that these museum run under, but when one considers the operating models that these museums use, one gets a different understanding of their status. This results partly because both Maropeng and Origins Centre operate using Section 21 companies. Amongst the two museums, the Origins Centre was said to have been the only one that had broken even in 2007 in terms of meeting its requirements without running at a financial loss (Steven Sack 2007 *pers.comm.*). Other museums that were using Section 21 company model in their operations such as, the Apartheid Museum and the Voortrekker Monument also broke even in their operations without financial loss.

The PPP model problems that I identify above are, however, at an organizational level, on how the model has been employed to operate and the objectives that it is employed to serve. This view was also held by some of the museums stakeholder that I interviewed, but they had different reasons to those sketched above. For example, four of the interviewed stakeholders argued that the problem was not with the models that museums used, but with the dynamics of individuals employed to manage these models (Geoffrey Blundell 2007; Wady Davy 2007 *pers.comm.*). This raises an important issue that I think museums need to consider: the passion and drive of individuals running the museum. This is vital to the success or failure of the museum. For museums to become a success in this country there is a strong need for highly motivated and highly trained people, equipped with all the necessary skills for the operations of the museum, but also with vested interest in culture and heritage. But, it is also true that the formulation and adoption of some of the models used to run some of Johannesburg's museums, such as the PPP model, have been adopted and applied within the museum sector without really

considering in depth their relevance to the sector and the context under which they are used. In South Africa there is less money spent on social capital than in countries like the USA and UK, and for models such as PPP to work adequately the country needs to spend a lot on its social capital (Swilling & Russell 2002). The PPP model therefore works better in the USA and UK than in South Africa. When one transfers the model to South Africa one needs to consider that the tax incentives for individuals and companies to support museums are not as great as they are in the USA and UK. It is therefore the tax incentives that make this system viable in other places such as the UK.

To realise the potential of this model we therefore first need to clearly define its relevance to the cultural and heritage sector as whole and also clearly state what objectives is the model going to serve in the sector and the opportunities it brings. On the other hand, the government through its Minister of Finance, needs to reconsider the tax system (tax exemption) for the companies and people that contribute in cash or in kind (e.g. by donating property, art and book collections and assets such as jewellery, vehicles and so forth) to the establishment and development of culture and heritage in the country. This will result to an increase in money spent on social capital in the country especially towards culture and heritage. This is vital in a country that is in the process of redefining itself using these tools (arts, culture and heritage). Tax incentives will also encourage the private sector and private donors of art, culture and heritage to invest more in developing and sustaining culture and heritage institutions such as museums.

Currently, the tax exemption system for culture and heritage institutions includes museums, libraries and archives in certain ways. For example, the Income Tax Act. No. 58 of 1962 includes these institutions in Part I of Section 18A of the Act: meaning that these institutions are exempted from paying tax on the money they receive from external funders or the donors. However, Part II of Section 18A of the Act does not include or mention culture and heritage institutions: meaning that those who donate in cash or in kind (property, art collections, asserts etc) to culture and heritage institutions enjoy no tax benefits even if they act in kind. This discourages donors and private patrons of culture from donating and investing in culture and heritage institutions, hence the low levels of

money spent on social capital in the country. This further impedes the PPP model in its operations, since many of the private companies that invest in the model still have to pay more money towards tax even though they are sustaining institutions for the benefit of the public.

In chapter four the Section 21 Company model was defined as the best operational model. The reason for this is that the model is developed as an independent operation which means there is no interdependency between two or more parties as is the case with the PPP model and the government funded model. This avoids the problem where one partner relies heavily on the other to bring something to the table for the operation of the museum. This, however, does not mean that Section 21 Companies do not employ any form of partnership, because they can. What differs is the structuring of the partnership which avoids the interdependency between two or more parties as is the case with the other two models. With Section 21 Companies, the best is the arms length Section 21 Company. By arms length Section 21 Company, I mean a Section 21 Company that allows for coordination between two or more partners, but still retains its state of independence. The coordination is between different institutions in the management of the museums. One such example is the interaction between the Voortrekker Monument and the government through the Department of Arts and Culture and some of the government statutory bodies such as SAHRA to help realise the goals and objectives of the museum. The model remains an independent Section 21 Company and when it needs extra funding it simply has to develop a business plan stating what it wants to achieve and how it will spend the money (Cecilia Kruger 2008 *pers.comm.*). Therefore even though there is interaction between the company (Voortrekker Monument Section 21 Company) and government structures, the company remains independent only taking advantage of the available government resources and opportunities.

One might then argue that the PPP model is also established to explore opportunities between the public and private sector and also to ensure that there is a sharing of resources by the public and private sector. This statement is true, however, the nature of interaction differs because both parties have to take full responsibility for the museum

operations while with the Section 21 Company the two parties only coordinate cultural and heritage duties without settling for a formal partnership and remain independent from each other. There is thus not the interdependency in this model that exists in the PPP model setting this model apart from the rest.

Kavanagh (1995) speaks of museums as partnerships, a concept that I have also used in the study. The question that then arises with regards to the different types of models, their advantages and disadvantages is: does the PPP model not offer such a partnership? The PPP model does not offer the form of partnership that Kavanagh talks of. Firstly, the PPP model is based on the idea of **outsourcing** cultural and heritage sector responsibilities, such as managing and maintaining museums. An example of this is the establishment of Maropeng where a private sector consortium has been established as a "[special purpose vehicle](#)" (SPV) to build and maintain the institution, Maropeng āAfrica Leisure (Pty) Ltd. What then makes this partnership different from that discussed by Kavanagh is that it is not based on coordination but the outsourced company takes total control of the running of the institution.

Coordination partnerships like those developed by MuseumAfrica and the Vaal University of Technology, the Voortrekker Monument with SAHRA and the Department of Arts and Culture, leave the institutions involved operating as autonomous run and governed institutions. This is a type of partnership that would therefore benefit Johannesburg museums, in particularly a partnership forged between different types of museums. This would allow for the exchange of ideas and knowledge between two or more institutions who share similar interests.

The Section 21 Company model also has an advantage within the tax system, something that I think influences the level of investors or donors to the museum in one way or the other. Section 21 Companies are established as Public Benefit Organisations (PBO) under Section 30 (1) of Income Tax Act No 58 of 1962 and as stated by Section 35 (1) of the Taxation Law Amendment Act No 30 of 2000 which became effective on 15 July 2001. This allows them to apply for special tax reduction certificates for themselves and

those who contribute to their finances at a value of 10% of the total income donated to the company. For example, if a company decides to donate R1 million towards an establishment or development of an institution via a Section 21 Company, then that company will get 10% of the amount it donates to any culture and heritage institution exempted from its annual tax. This encourages donors or funders to fund Section 21 Companies more than they do with other models, because the tax reduction system which has been created for Section 21 Companies allows for mutual benefits, a system of reciprocity.

On the other hand, one advantage of the PPP model for museums in and around Johannesburg is that it ensures that there is money from both the public and private sector invested into the development of cultural institutions in this geography, since most museums are facing the problem of under funding. But, we also have to be careful, because this model does not offer the solutions to the problem of museum financial constraints that many seem to hope it will. Museums that are currently using the model are still facing financial problems, something which further weakens the potential of this model to be used as a viable operational model for CHMs in Johannesburg.

These two models operate differently from the Commercial Entities model or private companies, in that they are not solely based on profit mechanisms as is the case with private companies. The advantages and disadvantages of the commercial companies are thus different from those of the Section 21 Company, PPP and government model, but do share similarities in some areas. The advantage of the Commercial Entity model for museums in and around Johannesburg is the economic viability of these institutions. A Commercial Entity is set up as a profit making business and is established as an autonomous and independent institution from the start. This avoids the interdependency that results with the PPP and GF models. Because of profit making, which goes to the pockets of the investors, this attracts lots of investors to the establishment of culture and heritage institutions that operate as commercial entities. Often such establishments involve big and well established companies; take, for example, the establishment of Lesedi Cultural Village, an investment by Tourvest (a well established South African

(SA) Tourism Investment Company) and Protea Hotels (S.A. hotel chain). First, both these companies are business orientated and, secondly, they share the same interests in profit making. This again avoids the conflicts of values that result with the PPP model where two or more partners may share two totally different values. A similar problem is recognised with the GF model whereby the government may want a museum to serve its agendas while on the other hand museum practitioners may have his/her own agendas and objectives based on the ethics and standards set for museums.

The Commercial model is, however, not without its disadvantages for culture and heritage institutions in and around Johannesburg. One such disadvantage is that, because the model is based on profit making it is highly unlikely for culture and heritage institutions using this model to address issues of social responsibility since the money generated has to go towards paying off the investors, thus investors come first in the model. The employment of this model for museums in and around Johannesburg would thus paralyse their levels of social obligation even though it may lead to them becoming more financially viable institutions. Lesedi Cultural Village does have social obligation projects, such as with Sparrow Primary and Secondary School based in Melvin Johannesburg, but the level of social responsibility is far lower than in the other models. Also factual accuracy and the intellectual integrity of the Lesedi displays is significantly less than in other models.

With regards to the tax system, culture and heritage institutions developed as commercial entities are also at an advantageous position since they are charged tax based on the money left after their year spending. This is a standard tax system that applies to most Pty and Ltd companies and corporates in South Africa regardless of their nature. This tax system would work well also for PBOs that are currently charged tax for the money they receive from the donors before they can spend it. This would allow them to first spend the money and then only to get taxed on what is left.

This model is good for profit making institutions, but would not serve as the best model for museums in Johannesburg. The profits generated by this model are distributed

between share holders who want return every end of financial year. This would thus compromise levels of museums social responsibility since most of the money that could be ploughed back to the institution goes directly to the pockets of the shareholders.

The Government Model offers the find operational model for Johannesburg museums, but it has its weaknesses. One of the weaknesses of this model is the employment practice for staff, something which came up a number of times in my interviews. Many of my interviewees suggested that most of the staff members in some of the government museums were deployed due to their political connections rather than their zeal or passion for museums. This becomes one of the limiting factors of this model. The other limiting factor about this model is its dependency on the state; this does not encourage those working in the institutions that use this model to become as dynamic and vibrant as they should be because they know that they have guaranteed sources of funding. The other problem that museums using the government funded model at the Council level is that the museum has to serve the interests of the city and be in line with the city's development policies, policies that bare little relevance to what the museum aims to achieve. This then becomes a problem for the museum because it has to meet the goals and objectives of the city before it can achieve its own. It also has to strike a balance between the two, and this becomes a problem because it results in a conflict of values, a problem that I have identified with the PPP model. But, there is also an advantage for museums that use this model because they can run many social obligation programs without having to worry where to get finance nor to worry about the taxes that they have to pay like other museums do. This model operates as a PBO and thus it is liable for tax avoidance which is an opportunity for museums using the model.

All the four models, discussed above present both problems and opportunities for Johannesburg museums. In these is always the issue of finance regardless of the model that each museum uses. The issue of finance has presented itself as one of the chief problems facing South African museums regardless of the type of model; the reason for this is general under-funding. This raises a number of questions such as, who exactly is supposed to fund museums and to what extent? Assessing museum operational models

currently being used in Johannesburg, I was able to establish two forms of museum ownership in Johannesburg and these are the government and the private sector. Therefore to answer the question of who is supposed to fund museums, the government and civil society are supposed to fund them. The question that should then be asked is to what extent do museums need to be subsidized?

One salient issue that arises with this question, which has direct implications to those museums funded by the government is, in a context like South Africa, where there are issues of poverty, access to clean water and housing, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, crime and illiteracy, how does one then strike the balance between meeting basics human needs and offering what might be seen as “blue sky” institutions such as museums, galleries and heritage centres.

This may at first seem not to be relevant to the study of museum models but it does have direct implications. These are some of the issues that have caused disquiet in the cultural and heritage sector as many governmental organizations and even private institutions, as well as private patrons of culture and heritage, are re-examining the reasons why they should continue funding culture and heritage (Casale 2004). In all of this lie the reasons for the under-funding of museums in the country, but museums can turn this into an advantage by using models that will address some of these issues and fit them within their policies and operations.

5.1.2. The Importance of Policies and Museums Standards Used by Museums in Johannesburg.

Four policies that influence the operations of some of Johannesburg museums have been identified as ICOM, SAMA and AFRICOM code of ethics and museums standards. For museums in Johannesburg an achievement grading system has been developed and is called JMSTK. This standard toolkit is designed for museums in this geography to grade themselves before they can be graded nationally and internationally. These are important policies that museums should all abide by even though some do not, owing to the fact that they are independent. One of the reasons why museums in Johannesburg

should abide by these policies is that these policies set guidelines for these museums on how to achieve some of their social roles. Some of these policies are inline with the idea of transforming a museum in South Africa and Africa as a whole, policies such as SAMA, AFRICOM code of ethic and museums standards.

These four museums standards would also contribute significantly to Johannesburg museums in terms of grading themselves, comparing their operational standards to local and international levels. This will increase their levels of competency and viability since what they would be doing would reflect on other museums using similar code of ethics and standards. I therefore argue that these policies will increase museum performances levels rather than just act as guidelines of what museum should do.

One reason that some Johannesburg museums looked at in this study are not viable institutions, is because they operate as isolated institutions. This is something which Cecilia Kruger of the Voortrekker Monument emphasised, “that there is lack of coordination within the South African museum sector” (Cecilia Kruger 2008 *pers.comm.*). This affects their levels of viability since there is less room for peer review of what each museum is doing and how it fits with what other museums in the same geography are striving to achieve. The institutionalization of these policies within Johannesburg museums will thus increase their levels of coordination, because there would be something that links and binds them together and each would be ranked against the other. This would introduce healthy competition in all sectors of museum operations.

I think it is important to have museum policies that are in line with what museums are set up to achieve, particularly in this day and age in which different cities are using museums to boast their cultural achievement status to the world. These codes of ethics and museum standards would further protect museums from city cultural policies which are sometimes not in line with what the museum sets out to achieve. In Johannesburg, for example, there has been such a cultural surge in the last few years; the city wants to grade itself as a new metropolitan culture city through its 2030 development strategy which involved the use of cultural institutions. Economically, such developments might benefit

the museums, by bringing large numbers of tourists and resulting in the creation of job opportunities. But, this can also lead to the deviation of museums from their initial goals and objective following what the city wants to achieve, thus the need for museum policies and standards that would protect the museums in such cases.

There is another problem of using culture as a form of regeneration which has direct implications for the operations of some CHMs. This cultural interest is economically driven and tends to focus more on the development of 'hardware' such as cultural infrastructure, rather than on 'software'. The 'software' side is the 'people-based' strategy that will focus on developing cultural procedures, integrity and quality of products and responsibility to consumers of cultures. The 'software' includes spending more on sensitising the public about the importance of cultural institutions such as museums. There is a lack of basic cultural and heritage education in the country which includes educating people about the importance of museums as nation building tools and identity formation institutions, a view that Wady Davy of the Apartheid museum emphasised (Wady Davy 2007 *pers.comm.*). Unless this problem is addressed I think it is impossible to talk of museum social viability because the majority of local people know little about their importance or how to appreciate them. This is the reason why there is a large number of international tourists visiting these institutions and few local visitors. The issue of entrance fee is in this case secondary to that of knowledge about the museum and what people can learn and take out of these institutions. Museum entrance fees are irrelevant if people do not see any need to visit museums. But, once sensitised, the entrance then becomes significant in a society where about 40% of citizens live below the poverty line (i.e. on or below a dollar a day)

(<http://povertynewsblog.blogspot.com/2007/10/in-sa-40-living-below-poverty-line.html>).

But, from the results of this study I have learned that most Johannesburg museums do make provision for those people who cannot afford museum entrance fees, particularly those museums that charge an entrance fee. This is contrary to what I had initially thought was the reason for the low South African visitor numbers to the museum. I had thought the entrance fee was the primary reason.

In conclusion education about these institutions and their importance to society would play a fundamental role in their social viability and economic sustainability since they will not only have to rely on international tourists for income generation as more and more South Africans would start using them. Even though the Department of Education has introduced a curriculum on arts, culture and heritage at schools, I believe a lot more still needs to be done. The model under which museums are set to operate and run could certainly play a major role in this by ensuring that all the museums reach out to their diverse audiences regardless of social and economic backgrounds. This leads us to the issue of museum communication. How do museums communicate with their audiences and how do they define their audiences? This is something that the SAMA, AFRICOM and ICOM museum code of ethics and standards touch on, in that museums need to be welcoming and accessible institutions to all those who want to use them. We therefore need cultural policies that would increase public participation in cultural and heritage activities. In order to increase levels of cultural participation, culture and heritage education and private support for cultural institutions must ultimately promote the value of culture and heritage to Johannesburg citizens in all spheres of society regardless of social and economic backgrounds (Casale 2004). These are critical elements to a successful cultural policy or strategy of our country.

The way museums communicate with their diverse audiences must also be linked to the way they market themselves. Museums marketing strategies fall under the different models that museums are established to operate under. Thus to understand museum viability and social viability will also entail understanding the different ways that museums communicate with their audiences and their marketing strategies. Improvements in communication and marketing can thus radically improve museum viability in and around Johannesburg.

5.1.5. Museums social responsibility.

In order to access levels of museums social responsibility, I compared visitor numbers from the seven studied museums. I now consider the entrance fees charged by each of the six museums that charged the fee and how it may affect museum access, by various

South African citizens regardless of their social or economic background. I also discuss some of the problems that I experienced during my fieldwork to support the arguments that I raise about museums accessibility, which reflects their levels of social obligation.

All the seven museums studied run one or two social responsibility programs and six of them charged an entrance fee (Table 2). Judging from the entrance fees charged by some of these museums, I suggest that some of the museums, especially those that charged more than R50 per adults, are targeted at selling South Africa's cultural heritage to international tourists rather than serving the majority of South Africans. This has both negative and positive impacts for the country's museums and the country as whole. The positive side to this is that, it boosts the economies of the museums and cities they are located in and also contributes to GDP through revenue generated from such tourists attractions. On the other hand, this compromises museum social obligations. It also avoids and undermines the processes of addressing the social and economic problems faced by the majority of South African citizens in terms of museums access. This becomes a problem if we want to recognise museums as socially viable institutions for all South Africans regardless of their gender, age and economic backgrounds. This problem results, simply because the entrance fees that some of these museums charge are way above the means of many South Africans. This causes social exclusion for South Africans who cannot afford to pay these entrance fees.

The question that then arises is what strategies are put in place to ensure that museums become welcoming cultural and heritage institutions? Beside external fundraising processes such as approaching private donors and sponsors for educational programs; museums also carried out internal processes to pay for those who cannot afford the charged entrance fees. These processes varied from museum to museum and included amongst other things the outsourcing of some museum amenities such as renting out the book and gift shops, restaurants and carrying out public lectures both paid for and free to accommodate members of the public. Table 3 summaries the income that museums generated and some of the external funders for their social obligation projects and for their economic sustenance. All these processes are highly structured ones and were all

suggested to be highly effective by my interviewees. One, however, cannot solely talk about museum social responsibility without considering their visitor numbers, but I think it is first important to consider the fees that each museum charges before one can talk about their visitor numbers which reflects their social obligations and accessibility. Table 4 presents the list of museums studied and the number of visitors they received in year 2007. For five of the seven museums studied I was able to get the breakdown in visitor number according to age groups i.e. adults and children (Table 4). These six museums proved to be very effective in attracting children/school groups. For example, 70% at the Transvaal Museum and others varied between 50% and 65% which are all high numbers of youth attendance. This number I suggest also resulted because of the entrance fees charged at these museums for this age group. The Transvaal Museum, for example, is one of the cheapest museum charging only R8 per child. Museums such as the Apartheid Museum, the Origins Centre and the Voortrekker Monument get high school visitor numbers because of government subsidies for this purpose as well as the nominal fee that these museums charge for school groups (Table 2).

For Lesedi and Maropeng I did not get the breakdown in visitor number, but this does not mean that these two institutions did not run social obligation programs. For Maropeng, their program has been included in the Department of Education curriculum. Based on the visitor numbers these are the museums with the highest number of visitors in 2007 (Table 4). The question that then arises out of these numbers is, does this mean these two institutions are the most accessible museums in Johannesburg? Considering the entrance fees that these two institutions charge (Table 2), I suggest that they are not as accessible as they may seem to be from the number of visitors listed in Table 4. I make such a suggestion because not everyone can afford the price that these museum charge. These museums are also not accessible in terms of their location: they are outside city centres in remote areas only accessible to people with cars. The issue of the high entrance fee for Maropeng was also suggested as one of the limiting factors for the museum not getting higher numbers of local visitors and a similar problem was recognised about its location (Lindsay Marshall 2008 *pers.comm.*). This is a problem that I personally experienced during the process of conducting my interviews; for example, to get to Maropeng using

public transport was just not appealing; the taxi drops you off some kilometres away and I had to walk for about an hour and half to get to Maropeng. This confirmed to me that Maropeng is designed for international tourists and a minority of South African citizens.

The high visitor numbers that these museums get, I think, has to do with the fact that they are more than museums or permanent exhibitions as Lindsay Marshall refers to Maropeng; they are also amusement centres. “City-get-away” centres for those who can afford leisure at a high fee; for example, they include hotels or overnight stays as part of their packages which distinguishes them from the rest of the seven museums. Lesedi, for example, is also used as the most famous traditional wedding venue in Johannesburg; this thus contributes to its high number of visitors.

To conclude I suggest that most of the seven studied museums were broadly accessible in terms of their location and their entrance fee. This becomes evident when one accesses their visitor numbers and when considering the structuring of these museum entrance fees to accommodate adults, children and senior citizens (Table 2). However, not all these museums can be accessed by lower income Johannesburg citizens, because one requires ones own transport to get to them; they are not accessible by public transport.

The issue of finance again presents itself as the most salient issue to the access of these museums, with exception of MuseumAfrica, which does not charge an entrance fee and is located in the CBD. But, still its visitor numbers fall within the same range as museums that charged an entrance fee. One of the reasons that contribute to these poor visitor numbers is the lack of capital available to the museum to spend on developing its social obligation programs: a problem that was also experienced by those museums that charged an entrance fee. How can we then solve this problem faced by these museums, which are willing and attempting to meet their social obligation, as well as their economic sustainability?

During the course of my study I got an opportunity to visit the Smithsonian Institute Museum Complex in Washington, D.C, USA. During this visit I experienced how

museums run their social obligation projects and particularly how museums that charged an entrance fee try to accommodate those who cannot not afford to pay the fees charged by these museums. Some of their fundraising projects are similar to what museums in South Africa are doing. These includes highly structured projects aimed at particular events such as exhibitions and community outreach projects such as approaching donors and funders for museum educational programs. At the Smithsonian Institution, for example, they have a grant management office for sponsored projects. This is an office dedicated to museum sponsorship and funding. Its task is to ensure that all museums within the Smithsonian museum complex are funded annually for their operations by the Federal Government, the private sector and by private benefactors. This office also serves to facilitate relations with private museums and assist them by fundraising in some instances. Thus the Smithsonian grant management office functions as a fundraising office for museums in Washington D.C, and it also ensures that there is fair distribution of finances to all museums.

Museums in Washington, both those that charge and do not charge an entrance fee, also run what I call informal fundraising projects; informal simply because they were not targeted at raising particular amounts unlike when the museum apply for money from external donors or receive the fixed income from museum rentals such as the shop and restaurant and exhibitions. These informal fundraising projects include the establishment of donation boxes at the entrance of each and every museum regardless of whether it charged or did not charge an entrance fee. Some of these museums include ponds into which members of the public throw their change and made a wish, this money is later collected and used to pay for those who cannot afford to pay the entrance fee at the museum. For those museums not charging an entrance fee, this money contributes to sustaining and developing further the museum, its social obligation programs and its projects.

I am fully aware that South African museums operate on a different scale to USA museums, but these types of fundraising programs could be applied here both for formal and informal fundraising projects. The establishment of a grant management office for

sponsored projects is of particular interest in the context of Johannesburg. This office could assist museums to develop further their fundraising and marketing strategies, something that will increase their funding levels by the government and private sectors. Donation boxes as an informal way of raising funds to pay for those who cannot afford entrance fees to the museum could also assist Johannesburg museums, particularly those who charge an entrance fee.

Maropeng is one of the Johannesburg museums that has adopted such an informal fundraising strategy to pay for those who cannot afford the entrance. This, in Maropeng, is in the form of a pond into which visitors throw their change, which is later collected and used to pay for those that cannot afford to pay the entrance fee charged by the museum. Donation boxes are one of the strategies that other Johannesburg museums could use to supplement their income and to help their social obligation programs; this would increase levels of museum social obligation in this geography and help to sustain and develop further their existing programs. This is important because more than six of my interviewees stressed that their museums wanted to run more social obligation programs, but they experienced financial problems. This is one of the strategies that Johannesburg museums could use to generate alternative income without being caught up in policy issues. This is money that will come from members of the public who desire to give in kind to these museums.

The other strategy that these museums could use, that I found to have been useful during my visit to Washington, which the Voortrekker Monument is already using, includes establishing museum members. Museums could encourage corporates and members of the public to become their members. This would involve charging a subscription fee at different rates depending on the type of membership required. These members could involve for example students, ordinary Johannesburg citizen, national citizens (members of museum from other cities other than Johannesburg) and international members, and corporates such as banks, investment and leisure companies, mining firms and other private organizations. All members could be kept updated on museum news and events; for example, all members could receive the museum's quarterly bulletin; invitation to

selected exhibition openings; a 10% discount from museum shop and/or entrance fee, reduced rates for selected educational programs and special activities and be allowed the opportunity to participate in the museum's operated tours. The price of each membership would depend on what the museums feel is appropriate given its surroundings and activities and depending on what would be rates that people and corporates could afford. However, I think in the case of big corporates there should be a minimum fee of not less than R10 000 set by museums if the company is to use its membership as part of its social obligation program. The list of benefits above could be the basic package and anyone or any corporation wanting more benefits could then be charged an extra fee. This would help set different categories or levels of membership, such as supporters, sponsors, patrons and benefactors.

During my visit to the Smithsonian Institution and in my assessment of the Voortrekker Monument operational model I have found that this strategy not only ensures that museums generate income towards their operating and social responsibility programs, but it also ensures high levels of public involvement in the running of the museum, as they feel much more involved than just being mere visitors. Other programs that I think are lacking in the Johannesburg museum sector, and probably the rest of South Africa's museum sector, are the kinds of voluntary programs that allow children from high schools, universities and senior citizens to volunteer their weekends off to work in the museums. In the USA this is said to be one of the strategies that has contributed to the high rate of museum visitor numbers, through word of mouth. This also encourages people to become more involved in sharing their culture and heritage with the rest of the world without feeling excluded from the process.

In conclusion, museums are attempting and are willing to run social obligation programs and projects, but this is impossible without external support. Assistance from members of the public is required and this can result in high levels of education about the museum. In 1940 Chubb made a suggestion to the South African Museums Association that there was a need to include museum studies in the school education curriculum. This suggestion, I think, is still valid in 2008. Until such time that museums are included in

the schools' curriculum, and people get educated about their importance as nation building institutions, and reservoirs where they can always scoop their cups to gain knowledge about their past and where they are heading, we cannot expect an increase in number of visitors, regardless of what museums are doing in their own capacity to increase visitors.

But, also the way museums are set to run in South Africa needs to change. Like in other countries, such as China, museums in South Africa are still focused on a particular class of citizens. They lure more white-collared workers who have sophisticated entertainment and leisure tastes (Casale 2004). In China this class has become the first priority of many Chinese local governments. Also linked to this, is the tourism strategy aimed at bringing high spending tourists to Chinese major cities (Casale 2004). This is defined as the western style of cultural consumerism by critiques of the Chinese Cultural Revolution (ibid). These are some of the critiques that I would like to level against some of the models currently in operation in and around Johannesburg such as the commercial entity even though it has proven to be a model that is viable economically, it does little to address issue of social access to the museum by those who cannot afford its entertainment.

5.1.4. Potential best operational model for museums in and around Johannesburg

The best model for museums in and around Johannesburg is the model that can address these variables: a model that allows a museum to solicit operational funds and explore other opportunities when the need arises, and a model that allows for easy public access to the museums.

Out of the seven museum operational models the arms length Section 21 Company used by the Voortrekker Monument is one of the best models in that it has proved to be flexible. This Section 21 Company model is able to adjust itself to adapt to opportunities. For example, the model takes advantage of the available government resources (i.e. through its annual grant of R1.5 million from the Department of Arts and Culture) and it retains independence and dynamism in its management, for example, in its managing structures where you have the Chief Executive Officer at the top to execute the goals and

objectives of the museum. Directors and Deputy Directors as well as a series of professional marketing people. This model juggles between the commercial and public sector in that it allows for the commercialization of its facilities, but at the same time is pressured to run social responsibility programs even beyond the limits of the museum. The establishment of corporate and public membership to the museum proved to be the best strategy to strike the balance between the social obligation role of the museum and its economic sustainability, in that on the one hand you allow members of the public to belong to the museum, but at the same time you pull close your major corporates into feeling that they are members of the museum rather than mere donors.

In conclusion, the Section 21 Company model appears to be the best current operational model for museums in Johannesburg. In order to achieve, this model needs to have an arms length link to the government if it ought to be truly able to maintain the infrastructure, plan new developments, and lever funding from donors. Using the arms length Section 21 Company model you are ensured high levels coordination between all parties involved in ensuring that museums are well taken care of in terms of the maintenance and operations, and with different expertise. With some of museum operational models currently in operation in and around Johannesburg such as Public Private Partnership and Section 21 Company there is some level of coordination, but the extent differs from that of an “arms length Section 21 Company”, which ensures high levels of coordination between members of the public, the private sector and the government. Thus, this model appears to me as the model that would advantage museums in and around Johannesburg.

Appendix

Museum Staff Questionnaire

My name is Nkosinathi Tomose. I am doing my masters research report on the viability of museums in and around Johannesburg. The aim of this project is to assess the range of varied operational models by which museums are run in and around Johannesburg i.e. their advantages & disadvantages, and to make recommendations on the models that work better for Johannesburg museums.

Interview: Date.....16/01/2008.....
Venue.....
Time.....2:00 PM.....

Respondent Details

Name:.....
Age group: 18-21, 22-25, 26-29, 30-33, 34-37, 48-41, 42-45, 46 & older
Sex: (Male) Female
Occupation:.....CURATOR.....
Education: Primary; Secondary; Tertiary; None
Nationality: South African; Other, Specify.....PSIT.....

Museum Model, Sets of Museum Standards and Policies

Under what model is the museum operating?
.....PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP.....

What other partnerships is the museum involved in?
.....

How does the partnership benefit the museum?
.....CAN APPLY FOR DONOR FUNDS. BUT ALSO
RUN AS A COMMERCIAL ENTITY.....

What are the advantages of the model?
.....AS ABOVE.....

What are the disadvantages of the model?
.....PROFIT GOES TO PRIVATE COMPANY.....

What set of museum standards is the museum operating?
.....JOB CITYS TOOLKIT.....

What other policies influence the functions of the museum and how?
.....UNIVERSITY POLICIES - FINANCIAL
CONTROLS AND OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES.....

To what extent do the museum standards influence the functions of the museum?

...NOT A GREAT DEAL YET...

How is the museum graded i.e. the criteria followed in grading the museum?

...NOT YET GRADED...

What sets of museums standards are used to grade the museum?

...THE ICOM - INTERNATIONAL...

Museum Operational Cost and Social Responsible Programs

What is your annual budget for the museum?

...CURRENTLY £4 MILLION (total)...

What does the budget cover in terms of percentages?

...PRIVATE COVERS MAINTENANCE, UTILITIES,

SALARIES, RENT, STOCK, MARKETING,

PUBLIC COVERS DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAMMES, SALARIES

What other mechanisms are put in place to cover extra cost by the museum?

...MERCHANDISING, PUBLICATIONS, ETC...

How effective are they?

...CONTRIBUTE ONLY A SMALL PERCENTAGE

What percentage do these mechanisms contribute to the running cost of the museum?

...£ 8%...

Where do you get other sources of funding?

...NGOS, COMPANIES

If the partnership benefits the museum, how much does it cover towards the running cost of the museum and in what? ...PARTNERSHIP COVERS APPROX.

...40% OF TOTAL COST...

What social responsibility programs does the museum run?

...EDUCATION PROG., PUBLIC LECTURES, TEMP

EXHIBITIONS

How are they run? ...ALL RUN BY THE PUBLIC

...FUNDING

Who funds these programs or under what museum budget do they fall under?

THEY ARE FUNDED BY OUTSIDE DONORS

How effective would you say they are?

Very good A.T. C.E.T.I.C. M.A.H.K.E.T.I.N.G. C.A.M.E.L.A.T.E

What are some of the problems does the museum face in meeting its social responsible programs as well as its economic sustainability?

S.C.A.L. P.E.S.S.A.S.T.I.L.T.Y. I.S. NOT POSSIBLE WITHOUT DONOR money - I.T. C.A.N.A.S.T. B.A.Y. F.R.E.E. I.T. D.E.E.T.

What mechanism are put in place to ensure that the museum strike the balance between its social responsibility programs as well as its economic sustainability?

A.S. A.L. A.S.P.E.C.T.S. O.F. T.H.E. C.E.N.T.R.E. A.R.E. O.V.E.R.S.E.E.N. B.Y. A. B.O.A.R.D.

What other issues would you say affect the viability of the museum e.g. in terms of museums access:

1. A.P.A.T.H.Y. O.F. S.E.A.T.H. A.F.R.I.C.A.N. I.N.T.E.R.N.A.T.I.O.N.A.L. 2. L.I.M.I.T.E.D. O.N. D.I.F.F.I.C.U.L.T. A.C.C.E.S.S. 3. A.P.A.T.H.Y. O.F. Z.A. T.O.U.R.I.S.M. I.N.D.U.S.T.R.Y.

THANK YUOU

Signature of the interviewer in the presence of the respondent.

Reference List

Alubafi, M.F. 2002. Redefining the "African" in MuseumAfrica : MuseumAfrica and the African renaissance. Unpublished MA Thesis University of the Witwatersrand: Johannesburg.

Ardouin, C.D. 1994. What Models for African Museums? West African Prospects. *Culture and Development in Africa: Proceedings of an International Conference held at The World Bank Washington, D.C. Environmentally Sustainable Development Proceedings Series* (No 1): 29-239.

Bender, B. 1993. *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg.

Bender, B. 2001. "Landscapes on-the-move." *Journal of Social Archaeology* 1(1): 75-89.

Bennett, T. 1995. *The birth of the museum: history, theory, politics*. London: Rutledge.

Bogdan, R and Taylor, S. 1975. *Introduction to Qualitative Research methods*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Cresswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Brain, C.K and Erasmus, M.C. 1986. *The Making of the Museum Professions in Southern Africa*. Pretoria: Transvaal Museum and South African Museum Association.

Bremner, L. 2004. *Johannesburg: One City Colliding Worlds*. Johannesburg: STE.

Brown, M. 2005. Re-envisioning the Kimberley Mine Museum: De Beers' Big Hole project. Unpublished MA Thesis University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Bruner, E., and B. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett. 1994. "Maasai on the Lawn: Tourist Realism in East Africa." *Cultural Anthropology* 9:435-70.

Buntman, B. 1996. Bushmen Images in South African Tourist Advertising: the case of Kagga Kamma. In P. Skotnes (eds) *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*: 271-290. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Casale, E. 2004. China's New Cultural Revolution. *The Platform* 4 (1): 8-12.

Chubb, E.C. 1941. Report Upon a Statistical Enquiry Concerning the Museums and Art. *South African Museums Association Bulletin* 11 (10): 233-260.

Chubb, E.C. 1929. Museums and Art Galleries as Educational Agents: Report of a visit to the United States of America and Canada under the auspices of the visitors grant committee of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. *The Carnegie Corporation Visitors Grant Committee* 2: 1-48.

Davison, G. 1991. *The Meanings of Heritage*. North Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Deacon, H., S. Mngqolo, and S. Prosalendis. 2003. 'Protecting Our Cultural Capital: A Research Plan for the Heritage Sector.' Unpublished paper for the Social Cohesion and Integrated Research program HSRC.

Delmont, E. 1993. The Voortrekker monument: monolith to myth. *South African Historical Journal* 29:76-101.

Delmont, E. 2004. Re-envisioning Greater Johannesburg: South African heritage development in the first decade of democracy. *African Arts* 30 (4): 30-35.

Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology Pretoria, 4 June 1996. White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage. *Republic of South Africa Government Gazette* 406 (No 1997). Cape Town 28 April 1996.

Dowson, T.A. and J.D. Lewis-Williams. 1994. Myths, Museums and southern Africa. In T.A. Dowson and J.D. Lewis-Williams (Eds) *Contested Images: diversity in Southern African rock art*: 385-402. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Dubin, C.D. 2006. *Transforming Museums: Mounting Queen Victoria in a Democratic South Africa*. Palgrave: Macmillan.

Fuller, N.J. 1992. The Museum as a Vehicle for Community Empowerment: The Ak-Chin Indian Community Ecomuseum Project. In Karp, I., Kream, M. and S.D. Lavine (Eds) *Museums and communities: the politics of public culture*: 327-365. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Galleries of South Africa. *South African Museums Association Bulletin* 11 (10): 233-238.

Glenn, I. 1996. The Bushmen in Early South African Literature. In P. Skotnes (Ed.) *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*: 41-50. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Goode, G. B. 1896: On the Classification of Museums. *Science, New Series* 3 (57): 154-161.

Gordon, R., C. Rasool and L. Witz. 1996. Fashioning the Bushmen in the Van Riebeeck's Cape Town, 1952 and 1993. In P. Skotnes (Ed.) *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*: 257-280. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Goudie, S.C., Khan, F. and Kilian, D. 1999. Transforming tourism: Black empowerment, heritage and identity beyond apartheid. *South African Geographical Journal* 81:22-31.

Hall, J. 1995. Museums, myths and missionaries: redressing the past for a new South Africa. In E. Hooper-Greenhill (Ed.) *Museum, Media, Message*: 175-185. London and New York: Routledge.

Hamilton, C. 1998. *Terrific Majesty: The Power of Shaka Zulu and Limits of Historical Invention*. Cape Town: David Philip.

Hammond-Tooke, W.D. 1997. *Imperfect Interpreters: South Africa's Anthropologists, 1920-1990*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Hey, R. 1969. The Provincial Museum Service. *South African Museums Association Bulletin* 9 (8):231-244.

International Council of Museums. 1992. *Marketing the Arts: every vital aspect of museum management*. ICOM MPR. Paris: ICOM.

International Council of Museums. 1974, 1987. Definition of a 'Museum'. Incorporated in the Statutes of the International Council of Museums and adopted at the 11th General Assembly of ICOM in Copenhagen 1974.

International Council of Museums. 1975. *The Museum and the Modern World*, Paris: ICOM.

Karp, I. 1992. *Museums and communities: the politics of public culture*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Kavanagh, G. 1995. Museums in partnerships. In E. Hooper-Greenhill (Ed.) *Museum, Media, Message*: 124-134. London and New York: Routledge.

Kilian, D. 1999. "Transforming Tourism: Black Empowerment, Heritage, and Identity Beyond Apartheid." *South African Geographical Journal* 81:22-31.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 1995. Theorizing Heritage. *Ethnomusicology* 39 (3): 367-380.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 1998. *Destination culture: tourism, museums and heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Koch, E. 1999. *Culture, Tourism and the Spatial Development Initiatives: Opportunities to Promote Investment, Jobs and Peoples' Livelihoods*. Pretoria: Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology.

Lannin, E.W. 1941. A Butterfly Trap and Bait. *South African Museums Association Bulletin* 11 (8): 193-212.

Levitz, C. 1995. The politics, ideology and social practices of South African natural science and technology museums. Unpublished MA Thesis University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Lewis-Williams, J. D. 1997. Exhibiting and studying San Rock Art: Response to Nettleton. *African Arts* 30 (3): 12-96.

Le Roux, H. 2004. "Hell/whole." *Art South Africa* 2 (4): 38-45.

Leversidge, R. 1968. Diminishing Museum Attendance. *South African Museums Association Bulletin* 9 (6): 197-201.

Magubane, M. B. 1998. The African Renaissance in Historical Perspective. In M.W. Makgoba (Ed.) *African Renaissance: the new struggle*. Johannesburg: Mafube Publishing.

McLean, F. *Marketing the Museum*. London and New York: Routledge.

Morris, A.G. 1996. Trophy Skulls, Museums and the San. In P. Skotnes (Ed.) *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*: 67-80. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Munjeri, D. 1994. Towards an Integrated Approach: Southern African Museums Map Outs Strategies. *Culture and Development in Africa: Proceedings of an International Conference held at The World Bank Washington, D.C. Environmentally Sustainable Development Proceedings Series* (1): 327-365

Museums and Galleries Commission. 1988. Guidelines for a Registration Scheme for Museums in the United Kingdom. London: Museums and Galleries Commission.

Nuttal, S and Cheryl-Ann, M. 2000. *Sense of Culture: South African Cultural Studies*. London: Oxford University Press.

Oliver, H.G. 1941. Inter-Museum Co-Operation. *South African Museums Association Bulletin* 11 (5): 114-117.

Oppenheim, A.N. 1992. *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement*. London: Continuum.

Power, S. 1953. The McGregor Memorial Museum, Kimberley. *South African Museums Association Bulletin* 5(9): 308-328.

Rogerson, C. 2002. Tourism Planning and Economic Revitalization of Johannesburg. *Africa Insight* 33 (1/2): 130-35.

Rassool, C. and S. Prosalendis. 2001. *Recalling Community in Cape Town*. Cape Town: District Six Museum.

Rassool, C and Witz, L. 1994. South Africa: A World in One Country: Moments in international tourist encounter with wildlife, the primitive and the modern. Paper

presented-Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town, 12 September, Cape Town.

Rothman, A. 1940. Museum Schools Services in South Africa and in the U.S.A.: A Study of the Educational Work of a few American Museums. Being a report on a visit to some of Museums in the United States, under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. *The Carnegie Corporation Visitors Grant Committee* 37: 1-33.

Schutte, G. 2003. Tourists and Tribes in the “New” South Africa. *Ethnohistory* 50 (3): 473-481.

Sharpe, C. 2003. Coming Together: The Role of the Apartheid Museum in Helping Renegotiate Memory and Identity in Post-Apartheid South Africa. Unpublished MA (Heritage Studies) Research Report, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Hagg, G. 2006. Arts, Culture and Food Security in Southern Africa. Commissioned by the Department of Arts and culture: July. HSRC Library.

South African Museums Association. 2006. *Professional Standards and transformation indicators*. Port Alfred: South African Museums Association.

Skotnes, P. 1996. *Miscast: negotiating the presence of the Bushmen*. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Stark, P. 2001. South Africa's Constitution Hill and Johannesburg Fort: Notes Towards a Concept Outline. Unpublished paper produced for Johannesburg Development Agency under auspices of Centre for Cultural Policy and Management. Newcastle-upon Tyne: University of Northumbria.

Van Vuuren, E.J. 2001. Transforming Cultural Villages in the Spatial Development Initiatives of South Africa. *South African Geographical Journal* 83:137-48.

Voigt, E.A. 1987. Museum Education: A Fairy Godmother for Museum Research. *South African Museums Association Bulletin* 17(6): 249-258.

Wilmsen, E. 1996. Decolonising the Mind: Steps Towards Cleansing the Bushmen Stain from Southern African History. In P. Skotnes (Ed.) *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*: 185-190. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Internet

http://www.jozikids.co.za/johannesburg/to_go/museums/

<http://www.nt.armstrong.edu/effective-interviews.htm>

<http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~bioslabs/tools/report/reportform.html>

http://www.polity.org.za/polity/govdocs/commissions/1999/katz9_6.htm

<http://www.sars.gov.za/legislation/other/Section%2018A.pdf>

http://www.acts.co.za/Tax/determination_of_public_benefit_activities_for_purposes_of_section_18a_of_the_income_tax_act_1962.htm

http://www.acts.co.za/Tax/18a_deduction_of_donations_to_certain_public_benefit_organisations.htm

<http://www.info.gov.za/gazette/regulation/2002/23816.pdf>

http://www.acts.co.za/tax/30_public_benefit_organisations.h

<http://www.info.gov.za/gazette/acts/1997/a28-97.pdf>

[http:// www.pmg.org.za/docs/2004/appendices/040614flagship.htm](http://www.pmg.org.za/docs/2004/appendices/040614flagship.htm)

<http://www.info.gov.za/speeches/1999/990629939a1003.htm>

http://www.dac.gov.za/white_paper.htm<http://www.blurtit.com/q734868.html>

www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/mbeki/1998/tm0813.htm: page

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Johannesburg

<http://www.pmg.org.za/docs/2004/appendices/040614flagship.htm>

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0438/is_4_37/ai_n13775093.htm