

Co-creating, co-producing and connecting: Museum practice today.

Introduction

Museums of the twenty-first century no longer rely on an taxonomic array of artefacts in glass cases for comparative learning. Contemporary museological practice tends toward spaces where “audiences encounter and engage with [...] objects [...] sounds, moving images, multimedia installations, performers, and so on” (Allain and Harvie 2013, 175). The complexity of these spaces is attributed with attracting new audiences by offering a variety of ways of engaging with museum content. Changing the “taste” of a culture by upending social positioning (Bourdieu 1996; Daenekindt and Roose 2017). This new musology creates learning visits that are focused on visitor experience than the object on display (Solis 2012): an encounter with a past that is ‘brought to life’ through ‘events,’ advertising and performance, simultaneously eliciting criticisms that museums suffer from ‘Disneyfication’ or are reduced to ‘edutainment’. An epithet suggesting that loss of deeper learning potential inherent in more traditional tactics (McPherson 2006; Jackson and Kidd 2011; Komarac et al 2017; Balanzategui et al 2018; Dewhurst 2018).

Museums are a “focal point for communities” and “inclusive spaces where people from different backgrounds can come together” (The National Strategy for Scotland’s Museums, Galleries and Heritage Sites 2012, 22). Factually these museums are still businesses, whether public cultural institution, non-profit endeavour or part of the commercial sector. Few museums would survive if not subsidized based on an expectation that they will use these funds to provide welfarist benefits through an expanded visitor base and evidence of service to the broad general public. In providing these services their exhibitions

allow people to explore identity and an increased understanding of heritage. One can interpret this educational remit as service to a neo-liberal agenda of performance and performativity within a commercial market for leisure activity choices.

Policy makers are caught between broad educational remits and the marketplace. Cultural policy in the UK is squarely based in a neo-liberal plural approach to engagement. Firmly tied to the Treasury Green Book agenda, the policy recognises that government funding is not the only source of support. It now considers the entertainment world as a useful model for delivery beyond the aging middle class consumer.

The Museums Association (MA) and The International Council of Museums (ICOM) are aware that the twenty-first century museum is required to be more than a collection to be viewed and contemplated. In the past, museum policy advocates like MA and ICOM prompted museums to step up their focus on audience engagement. In the UK through the implementation of The National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries and the Code of Ethics for Museums, UK policy leaders created a shared framework under which museums and galleries would have "the opportunity to revisit, rethink and refresh the museum offer within the wider landscape of social and cultural capital" (The national strategy for Scotland's Museums, Galleries and Heritage Sites 2012, 10). We have entered an age where digital technology has changed the rules of engagement. Consumers no-longer visit museums as passive spectators but look to engage with collections directly through their portable devices; the experience is digital, participatory and informed (Gillispie 2010; van Dijck 2013; Sanz 2017). Visitors have discovered a different cultural capital from traditional

museum offerings and inclusion is being thought of in different terms (Sanz 2017). Increasingly, museums are also offering virtual experiences of the museums and the collections. We argue that museums have become hybrid spaces, where consumers look and challenge what they see; form part of what they see; or participate as co-creators formulating an idea or co-producing an exhibition or performance with the museum staff (Solis 2012). We define the idea of the hybrid museum as an organisation consisting of both a physical and online space where discipline and medium boundaries are entwined, creating a multidisciplinary space engaging to visitors of all forms (Chung 2003; Dewdney et al 2013)

Co-creation in the museum setting can be defined as the active institutional commitment and engagement with visitors in an “ongoing, give-and-take process of participatory conversation, dialogue, and idea sharing” (Moyer 2007; Simon 2010). Co-production, on the other hand, is defined by Brandsen & Honingh (2016) as “services [that] are not only delivered by professional and managerial staff in public agencies but also co-produced by citizens and communities” (427). Kershaw and colleagues (2017) suggest that the application of co-production to the museum sector will strengthen user outcomes and increase connections to their surrounding communities. Co-production should also “improve the outcome of consumption to create value for both suppliers and for consumers” (Thyne and Hede 2016).

To examine these questions, we draw on results of our year-long research using performance as the tool to engage groups categorized as ‘hard to reach’ or ‘socially excluded.’

Museum Performance and Performativity

“Museums are becoming dynamic environments in the service of the society aiming at reconnecting with the public and demonstrating their value and relevance in contemporary life” (Tsiropoulou et al 2017). In the UK where our study was conducted, there is a move towards engaging a more multicultural audience (Black 2005, 2). To meet this objective, many museums have focused on building collections and exhibition programs that are more representative of the people in their surrounding communities not just the “tourists, middle class and highly educated” (Booth et al 2017; Falk and Dierking 2018). A contemporary museum visitor expects a museum to perform the role of a complete leisure experience (Germak and Khan 2017).

The only way for museums and galleries to continue to attract a visitor base and expand on that base is to provide a leisure experience that has an all round twenty-first century interactive experience. Sometimes that leaves museums and the entertainment industry uneasy. Experimenting with this multi-dimensional remit has led some museums to question what they are, what their role in society is, and the challenge of trying to satisfy too many competing goals affecting their relationship with visitors (Black 2005, 4). To quote Black (2005, 267), the “change or die” phenomenon sets educational goals in conflict with leisure pursuits and being a venue where ideas and cultures collide to produce positive cultural discourse (Germak and Khan 2017; Lavanga 2006). Diversifying service is not meant as an abandonment of prior practices, but rather, a ‘business like’ expansion of service.

Digital Age

Museums irrespective of subject and focus, tend to provide a learning experience that emerges from the dialogue between visitor and site (Falco and Vassos 2017). Jaén and colleagues (2005) suggest that creating social interaction among museum visitors is effortful to create dynamic customizable visits and simple mechanisms to explore large collections. For more than a decade museums have explored this tension through production of hybrid conditions, augmenting museum collections with digital media that encourages active inquiry (Koleva, 2009). Koleva et al (2009) notes that “the technical expertise required by programming-based approaches means that the vast majority of domain professionals [do not have the training and therefore] are not able to directly experiment” with the affordances of digital media without the aid of computer programmers.

Although it is recognized that some museums require specialist expertise to develop digital enhancement, those with the expertise are showing vast development of their visitor experience. For example, Jaén (2005) reports the MoMo project created by a Social Interaction subsystem allowed visitors to message other visitors, create affinity groups, or see those who saw an artwork before them. While capacity varies across the field, the political push toward these hybrid experiences is changing how museums look to engage with their visitor base.

Negotiating Space: the challenge of cultural barriers

Museums and galleries are looking to raise awareness of their existence to those who would not normally visit their establishments and seek to develop new partnership approaches to delivering the service (Simon

2010). Deconstructing and understanding the barriers that create the gap is the key to developing an audience base (Black 2005, 61). Soon after it was published, Bourdieu's (1996) theory of cultural taste afforded an important lens for examining the choice to spend time at cultural sites (Bennett, 2005), Boyne (2002) and Prior (2005) both suggested that his theories are outdated and unable to keep up with the continuous tangibility of society in the modern world. DiMaggio and Mukhtar (2004) further highlight that the evolution of popular culture led universities and "non-profit cultural institutions" to more populist arts and media forms (171) that quickly supplanted Bourdieu's work. Despite the criticism, Bourdieu's theories continue to provide insight into the museum culture and the visitors they attracted in the past. It also provides insight into why they may be in crisis with the type of visitors they attract today and the continued lack of full representation of from their surrounding communities.

Bourdieu (1996) discussed the nature of social and cultural capital and the impact of social class on the diversity of visitors to museums and galleries. He theorized that only members of a higher socio-economic status held the social and cultural capital to engage with the higher arts such as museums, galleries and theatre. The push towards museums engaging with members of the lower socio-economic classes have driven cultural institution policy makers to focus on new services to classes of people traditionally not present in the visitor base. While seemingly paternalistic, the data we present in this study suggests that a two way process creates enriched cultural capital.

Consumption/Production

Changing how a museum interacts with its visitors both inside and outside the museum can affect its popularity. Kelly (2011) states that museum success is dependent on three intersecting activity domains, the physical, online, and mobile. The exhibitions, the staff, what facilities it has, the external benefits to its surrounding communities and visitors it wishes to inspire (Watson 2007; Weil 2003).

With emerging new media being so accessible to a large majority of the population, it is no surprise that museums are trying to catch up with these tools as a means of engagement and social inclusion. Although there is a growing trend in museums to provide entertainment as part of exhibitions, these changes are also subject to criticism as these new tools reshape museum identity, and role in a commercial world (Black 2005; 2012; Gray 2016; Kershaw et al 2018).

The attitude that visitors have towards museums are different from even a decade ago; visitors demand more from museum sites including access to the collection through technological devices (Ambrose and Paine 2018, 18). Events such as community engagement projects, workshops, activities, lectures, talks, tours and performances are all different types of interactive engagement activities that are employed to attempt to attract a diverse audience to the site. These events offer visitors an opportunity to experience not only the performativity of the exhibit but also the performativity of the site. Providing this range of activities and services in turn heightens the visitor's expectations for museums. Although the benefit of an events program is acknowledged, some staff describe this work negatively or time consuming (Ambrose and Paine 2006, 62). Despite this resistance the museums that commit the resources to creating larger scale engagement

programs report that the effort does attract a wider and more diverse audience base.

Users Co-creating the Experience.

Interactive modes of delivery have created a new form of attraction and interest in these sites generating a wide range of visitors from young children to the elderly of all classes. To sustain engagement by audiences traditionally missing at the museum Loureiro and colleagues (2017) suggest that engagement should be conceived as an opportunity to “embrace a proactive visitor relationship” (826). Obviously, this pedagogical change has led to some displacement as resources are directed toward the social role of co-creating mutually beneficial exhibition content or programmes with local communities towards a shared goal (Davis 2007; Simon 2010; Thyne and Hede 2016).

Allowing participants to be equal creators of the final product empowers both the co-creators and other visitors, fostering a sense of belonging to the site and the exhibit. (Black 2005; Knudsen 2016). These results are well documented in the evaluation of *Duet for Four Chambers* developed by University of Manchester students. Co-creation of the performance encouraged participants and visitors to become an “active agent” throughout the whole engagement process and to take away “their own emotional, physiological or conceptual response to the encounter” (Niblett and Allison 2016). Project *RETHNK* at the National Maritime Museum demonstrated that developing co-produced projects requires trust from both sides of the relationship, engaged listening and participatory activities that are meaningful to the surrounding community. This creates a

cultural change in the institution and is attributed with increased democratisation of the museums content and programming (Salter 2018).

The Present Study

Based on the emerging research on socially engaged museum experiences, our museum team undertook a collaborative research project with a ‘socially excluded’ or ‘hard to reach’ community group in South Ayrshire. The investigation looked at how performance can assist a local authority museum to develop a relationship with its surrounding community and widen its visitor group. The investigation used a practice-as-research methodology (Freeman 2010; Kershaw and Nicholson 2011) applying artistic and creative strategies of performance. The project developed four different creative and performance outputs over the course of one year.

The Creative Practice

The performance projects were all developed from communal themes but they could also either enhance the site’s community engagement and/or enhance exhibitions (Prendergast and Saxton 2009). They were created with a co-creation style of working (Simon 2010) which provided the opportunity for the participants to work together with the museum to develop each project.

Although each project had a performative element, they were all different media, which were attractive to participants for a range of reasons. Some preferred to work on the film, others on the theatrical performance or exhibition and others preferred to focus on the storytelling, which was the backbone to each project. Working with different media allowed the participants to feel confident

about their ideas and take leadership with a medium that they felt comfortable with (Simon 2010). In turn, they felt empowered by this opportunity to have their voices heard.

Developing a Relationship

To enable continuous engagement with groups, a relationship needs to be built and then maintained. The confidence of the individuals who participated in numerous projects seemed to make it easier and possibly a more comfortable atmosphere for those who were new to participating. This falls in line with what Bourdieu (2010) discusses in reference to social capital being gained by individuals through networks (27). It seemed that one of their peers having confidence in the project and the facilitator providing comfort to new participants meant that they developed confidence at a faster pace than those who participated in the very first project. Once a relationship is formed with a group, focus can be moved to developing more relationships with other groups and so the community engagement for the site is in turn developed. This practice methodology brought attention to the effect of the participants' process and place-based experiences, which in turn could be linked to the outcomes that flowed from the final performance.

Most notably, participants reported that the interactive co-creation process developed a sense of trust between the "hard to reach" group and the museum staff. Thyne and Hede (2016) attribute the effectiveness of this type of work to the focus on efforts to explore symbolic (social, confidence skills) and productive (creative, technical skills) efforts in the creation process. Furthermore, flexibility in the creation allowed all participants on their own terms. The

research has also demonstrated that this type of program development helped sustain relationships with the surrounding community over a longer period. The research provided insight from the community group participants and the local authority staff, including management and policymakers over the year long period. This data offered a new understanding of how all participants perceived the spaces prior to creating the performance projects and monitored the changes that were achieved.

The research was based on concepts of cultural engagement Bourdieu's theories to analyse the museum and to develop knowledge about the site and its relationship with the surrounding community. The work of other theorists such as Putnam (2001) and Coleman (1988); who were heavily influenced by Bourdieu, was also used to look at the concepts of social and cultural capital and how these concepts worked in connection with the barriers that may stop visitors from engaging with the site. We used the notion of Putman's (2001) bonding capital (making connections with the social group) and bridging capital (building bridges across the social group to the museum). Putman suggested that the bonding capital would help the group 'get by' but that bridging capital was crucial to 'getting ahead'. Added to this Solis' (2012) work on Generation C stated that the connected consumer was used to examine how young people today are connected digitally 24/7; the digital disruption or revolution that we are witnessing, is hitting producers and services head on and how bridging capital could help the other way. In other words, the development of social capital was a two way process; the museum staff could learn from the group and the group learn to participate and consume the museum. The reality is that not only do you need the cultural capital to participate in a museum experience; you need the

digital capital to consume the experience and tell everyone about it simultaneously. The worrying trend here was that not only were museums at risk of not keeping up with engagement strategies through digital inclusion, but consumers were in danger of being excluded further, through the digital divide, of not understanding or being able to afford the technology.

A framework was created from the findings which can be applied in other museum establishments to build on community engagement and to create original practice-based performances. This form of bridging capital brings in community groups and can slowly introduce them to the museum using performance, exhibition and then digital tools can help those in positions of power in the museum to understand how to engage with different user groups. As part of this process, the community group participants were brought into the site to enable them to engage with the buildings and surrounding grounds from the beginning of the research to build their confidence in being there and engaging with the staff, other visitors and the exhibitions. As Black (2009) states “Co-creative projects progress very similarly to collaborative projects, but they confer more power to participants” (264). Each project was developed through a series of workshops where the participants were encouraged to develop a creative product that would be exhibited within the museum.

There were many issues that have been highlighted throughout the research at the museum and the findings highlight that the operational aspects of the museum are at odds with local authorities policies. There are many aspects of the museum that worked well on a daily basis but other areas that require attention. If the museum wishes to expand their visitor base from their regular visitors, they

need to develop their community engagement to be more inclusive and with that means the opening of resources for community use and participation; rather than the 'do not touch' approach that was applied in this particular museum.

Even though they have numerous, changing exhibitions, they still seem to attract the same visitor base. They recognised this and the need to develop better digital marketing and advertising to inform their surrounding community of their exhibitions and programme of events, also to develop exhibitions that are more inclusive, in coordination with schools and young people through a medium that they engage with. Development of activities, tours, talks, performances, etc., in line with the "Curriculum for Excellence" and in conjunction with their surrounding community, they may find that they attract a more diverse visitor base. Taking exhibitions or using performance out in the community to give community groups, schools and individuals a taste of what they would encounter if they visited the site would assist in breaking down barriers the bridging capital that Putman and others refer to.

The research highlighted that the use of performance workshops and practices enhanced the participants' confidence and that social-economy skills were developed within the group. This was were an unintended but very positive result. This transformation of power therefore led to significant engagement with participants, which in turn then developed changes within their lives, e.g. one was accepted to study fine art, one went to college, another built bridges with their family and others volunteered locally. Having the freedom to co-create all of the projects was key to making the group feel that they were part of the site and the development of each project. In turn this made them feel more comfortable and accepted in the site and made them proud of their final projects.

The development of such social economy skills was not an objective of the research project, but an unplanned benefit to those people involved in the project and a benefit that has longer term, wider social health benefits for the community and their families.

The performance projects also developed a new visitor base from the participants and their families and friends who came to see the completed projects; therefore, a new and more diverse visitor base was generated. The research has informed us that if people are made aware of the exhibitions and activities that are going on within the site, even through word of mouth, they will come if they feel that it will be of interest to them. The museum also needs to embrace developing their use of multimedia both within their exhibitions to enhance their visitor experience. To develop interactive learning through different media both on and off the site, through different digital media such as social media. This will assist in the engagement with Generation C and help them connect to site's exhibitions and programme of events.

The research found that individuals who had not previously engaged with the site can come to feel part of its social community when there are opportunities for them to engage on different participatory levels. Therefore, the development and continuity of the community engagement of the site will without a doubt attract a continuous, diverse audience base.

Recommendations

Community engagement should be part of the planning for all events and exhibitions at Museums and should be just as important as the development of the exhibitions themselves. Allowing different members of the community to

engage with the development of the museum planning will allow the site to move away from being represented by a small section of the community who are often older, wealthier and who hold higher formal education levels. It can be argued that this creates a barrier keeping those who are not represented from engaging with the museum. It can also be argued that this site appeared to only have relationships with schools, groups and its surrounding community from one side of the surrounding area, reinforcing the stereotypes about those attending the museum and failing to satisfy the social-inclusion agenda of Council policy.

Museum sites need to generate direct participation with communities and groups to build on its engagement, develop the interactive activities that complement its exhibitions and focus on better advertising to inform the surrounding community of its exhibitions and activities. This will develop relationships with community groups, which are important especially when working with groups who do not generally engage with the site.

Relationships are key to engagement. Developing relationships with schools and groups will allow the gallery to engage with different community groups, and will provide them with an opportunity to meet groups and develop a relationship with them. In turn, this will provide opportunity for communication and consultation on what future exhibitions and activities they should seek to develop. By building these relationships the site and staff will have the ability to further develop their exhibition programme with and around the interests of the surrounding community. Furthermore, this will allow the site to develop an exhibition calendar that can involve and be open to workshops, group activities and many more aspects of engagement that can be linked into the site and its exhibitions.

The implementation of media and interactive means into the site would make the exhibitions more accessible to a larger majority of the surrounding community. Therefore, further implementation of multimedia and performance within the site is advisable although this must be planned in conjunction with the planning of the exhibition to ensure that there is a high level of expectation about all aspects of the exhibition/event and activities. This would also assist in sending out the message that museums and galleries are no longer elitist and that they belong to the community and should be enjoyed by all.

Without the continued development of community engagement, Local Authority cultural sites are in danger of remaining unknown, unvisited and underused by its surrounding community. This research has provided insight and knowledge into the development of co-created community-performance projects, in the hope that Local Authorities may learn from the findings to further develop community engagement in their cultural heritage sites.

Conclusion

The hybrid museum offers the possibility to attract new audiences by assessing the performance and performativity of the site and looking at both the business and the educational targets. By drawing on Bourdieu's theories of social and cultural capital, as a lens with which to look at the changes. Over time we can witness the changes through the development of museums as object focussed to that, that has led them as modern day entertainment and education spaces that are socially inclusive. It can be seen that museums have learned from other popular culture and leading leisure establishments to break down preconceived barriers. Through the use of workshops with non-users, museums can broaden

their visitor experience. This can be done through assessment of visitor consumption and development of exhibitions that are made accessible to all, with different levels of social capital through the use of modern digital methods; connecting with young people in forms that they understand and feel comfortable. The cultural divide will only serve to get wider; if we do not embrace other participatory techniques as a way of connecting, co-creating and co-producing museums. The visitors are there, we just need the museums to catch up and learn from each other. That the bridging capital that Bourdieu and Putman refer to, is a two-way process and can help transform both the experience and learning of the visitor and the museum educator.

References

Allain, P. and Harvie, J. 2006. *The routledge companion to theatre and performance*. Oxon: Routledge.

Ambrose, T. and Paine, C. 2006. *Museum Basics*. 2nd ed Oxon: Routledge.

Ambrose, T. and Paine, C. 2018. *Museum Basics*. 4th ed Oxon: Routledge.

Balanzategui, J. and Ndalians, A., 2018. Hybrid spaces: Melbourne Museum's Jurassic World: The Exhibition. *Australasian Journal of Popular Culture*, 7(1), pp.59-74.

Bandelli, A. and Konijn, E.A. 2015. Museums as brokers of participation: how visitors view the emerging role of European science centres and museums in policy. *Science Museum Group Journal*. 3(3).

Bennett, T. 2005. The historical universal: The role of cultural value in the historical sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 56(1), 141–164.

Black, G. 2005. *The Engaging Museum: Developing museums for visitor involvement*. Oxon: Routledge.

Black, G. 2012. *Transforming Museums in the Twenty-First Century*. Oxon: Routledge.

Booth, K., O'Connor, J., Franklin, A. and Papastergiadis, N., 2017. It's a Museum, But Not as We Know It: Issues for Local Residents Accessing the Museum of Old and New Art. *Visitor Studies*, 20(1), pp.10-32.

Bourdieu, P. 1996. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Routledge: London.

Boyne, R. 2002. Bourdieu: From class to culture: In memoriam Pierre Bourdieu 1930–2002. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 19(3), 117–128.

Brandsen, T. and Honingh, M., 2016. Distinguishing different types of coproduction: A conceptual analysis based on the classical definitions. *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), pp.427-435.

Chung, C.W., 2003. *Web Communication Technologies and Internet-Related Social Issues-HSI 2003: Second International Conference on Human Society@ Internet, Seoul, Korea, June 18-20, 2003, Proceedings* (Vol. 2). Springer Science & Business Media.

Coleman, J. 1988. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*. 94, 95-120.

Daenekindt, S. and Roose, H., 2017. Ways of preferring: Distinction through the 'what' and the 'how' of cultural consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 17(1), pp.25-45.

Davis, P. 2007. Place exploration: Museums, identity, community. In Watson, S. 2007. *Museums and their Communities*. Oxon: Routledge.

Dewdney, A., Dibosa, D., and Walsh, V. (2013) *Post Critical Museology: Theory and Practice in the Art Museum*. Oxon: Routledge.

Dewhurst, C.K., 2018. Time Travel: Tourism and the Rise of the Living History Museum in Mid-Twentieth Century Canada by Alan Gordon. *Great Plains Quarterly*, 38(4), pp.435-436.

DiMaggio, P. and Mukhtar, T. 2004. Arts participation as cultural capital in the United States, 1982–2002: Signs of decline? *Poetics*. 32(2), 169–194.

- Falco, F.D. and Vassos, S. (2017). Museum Experience Design: A Modern Storytelling Methodology. In *The Design Journal*. 20(1).
- Falk, J.H. and Dierking, L.D., 2018. *Learning from museums*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Freeman, J. 2010. *Blood, sweat and theory: Research through practice in performance*. United Kingdom: Libri Publishing.
- Germak, C. and Khan, S. (2017). Interaction design applications for museum spaces. New exhibit paths driven by a Bluetooth sensor system. In *The Design Journal*. 20(1).
- Gillespie, T. 2010. The politics of 'platforms'. *New Media & Society*. 12, 347–364.
- Gray, C., 2016. Structure, Agency and Museum Policies. *Museum and Society*, 14(1), pp.116-130.
- Jaén, Javier, et al. 2005 "MoMo: Enabling social multimedia experiences in hybrid museums." *Proceedings of International Workshop of Re-Thinking Technology in Museums: Towards a New Understanding of People's Experience in Museums*.
- Jackson, A., and Kidd, J. 2011. *Performing Heritage: research, Practice and Innovation in Museum Theatre and Live Interpretation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kelly, L. 2011. *Audience research in the museum without walls*. Museum Next Conference, Edinburgh, 26-27. 2011(May).

Kershaw, A., Bridson, K. and Parris, M.A., 2018. Encouraging Writing on the White Walls: Co- production in Museums and the Influence of Professional Bodies. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 77(1), pp.19-34.

Kershaw, A., Bridson, K. and Parris, M.A., 2018. The muse with a wandering eye: the influence of public value on coproduction in museums. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, pp.1-21.

Kershaw, B. and Nicholson, H. 2011. *Research methods in theatre and performance*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. 2000. *The museum as catalyst. Museums 2000: Confirmation or Challenge*. London:Routledge.

Knudsen, L.V. 2016. Participation at work in the museum. In *Museum Management and Curatorship*. 31(2), 193-211.

Koleva, B., Egglestone, S.R., Schnädelbach, H., Glover, K., Greenhalgh, C., Rodden, T. and Robertson, M.D. 2009. "Supporting the creation of hybrid museum experiences." *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM.

Komarac, T., Ozretic-Dosen, D. and Skare, V., 2017. Understanding competition and service offer in museum marketing. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración*, 30(2), pp.215-230.

Lavanga, M. 2006. *Artistic Explorations in Cultural Memory: Research Workshop*. University of Leiden: Faculty of Creative and Performing Arts, 3-4 November
<http://www.culturalfoundation.eu/library/artisticexplorationsinculturalmemory?q=artistic%20explorations> Accessed 14 June 2018.

Loach, K., Rowley, J. and Griffiths, J. 2016. Cultural sustainability as a strategy for the survival of museums and libraries. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*. 23, 186–198.

Loureiro, S. and Sarmiento, E. 2017. Making museums attractions to tourists: serious leisure, meaningfulness and emotions the drivers to engagement. *Journal of Tourism and Development*. 1, no, 27/28, 825-835.

McCall, V. and Gray, C. 2014. Museums and the ‘new museology’: theory, practice and organisational change. *Museum Management and Curatorship*. 29, no 1, 19-35.

McPherson, G. 2006. Public memories and private tastes: The shifting definitions of museums and their visitors in the UK. *Museum and Management Curatorship*. 21, 44-57.

Moyer, T. 2007. Learning through Visitors: Exhibits as a Tool for Encouraging Civic Engagement through Archaeology. In *Archaeology as a Tool of Civic Engagement*, edited by Barbara J. Little and Paul Shackel. AltaMira Press: Lanham, Maryland.

Museums and Galleries Scotland 2012. *The National Strategy for Scotland's Museums and Galleries*.

Niblett, H. and Allison, J. (2016). Performance as interpretation: a museum studies perspective. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*. (21)4. 574 - 580.

Prior, N. 2005. A question of perception: Bourdieu, art and the postmodern. *The*

British Journal of Sociology. 56(1), 123–139.

Putnam, R. 2001. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. London: Simon & Schuster.

Salter, J. (2018). The Blood, Sweat and Papercuts of a Participatory Space. Retrieved from <http://museum-id.com/blood-sweat-paper-cuts-participatory-space/> Accessed 16th November, 2018

Sanz, A. (2017). Digital Literatures circulation: testing post Bourdieu theories. *Neohelicon*, 44(1), pp.15-25.

Simon, N. 2010. *The Participatory Museum*. California: Museum 2.0

Solis, B. 2012. Meet Generation C: The Connected Customer, Retrieved from <http://pan-dodaily.com/2012/03/06/meet-generation-c-the-connected-customer/> Accessed 5th April, 2018

Thyne, M. and Hede, A.M. 2016. Approaches to managing co-production for the co-creation of value in a museum setting: when authenticity matters. In *Journal of Marketing Management*. 32(15-16), 1478 - 1493.

Tsiropoulou, E.E., Thanou, A., Paruchuri, S.T. and Papavassiliou, S. 2017. Self-organizing museum visitor communities: A participatory action research based

approach. In *Semantic and Social Media Adaptation and Personalization (SMAP)*, 2017 12th International Workshop on IEEE. 101-105

van Dijck, J. 2013. *The culture of connectivity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Watson, S. 2007. *Museums and their communities*. Oxon:Routledge

Weil, S.E. 2007. Beyond Big and Awesome. *Museum Management and Marketing*. 6(3), 195.