University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

1-1-2019

Museum to Museum Collaboration: Exploring the Relationships Between Museums and Cultural Organizations in Denver, Colorado

Leah Zavaleta
University of Denver

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd

Part of the Anthropology Commons, and the Museum Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

Museum to Museum Collaboration: Exploring the Relationships between Museums and

Cultural Organizations in Denver, Colorado

_____

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of Social Sciences

University of Denver

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

_____

by

Leah Zavaleta

June 2019

Advisor: Dr. Christina Kreps

ABSTRACT

Collaboration has become a cornerstone of contemporary museum practice. In the
United States, the anthropological literature on collaboration and museums has tended to
be dominated by discussions on collaboration between museums and Indigenous
communities in the course of implementing the Native American Graves Protection and
Repatriation Act of 1990. To date, little has been written on how collaboration is enacted
among museums. This thesis explores the relationships among four museums in Denver,
Colorado. By exploring how collaboration is defined, what a collaboration between
museums looks like, and identifying the benefits and challenges of inter-museum
collaboration, this study attempts to provide another valuable perspective on
collaboration. This research found that inter-museum collaboration benefits the museums
involved by enhancing institutional visibility and access to resources in the form of
financial support, cultural knowledge and larger social networks. It also helps enrich the
social and cultural wellbeing of targeted communities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Museums are an important source of contemporary educational and cultural

enrichment (Shannon 2014, 9). Children go to museums as part of field trips and

museums are the main attraction listed on nearly every tourist site when visiting a new

city or country. Most major museums are considered to be nationalizing institutions; they

are meant to reflect a harmonious and uniform national identity (Simpson 1996, 1-2).

What happens, though, when these museums do not adequately reflect the cultures they

are representing? The often-promoted national identity does not always include the

minority, immigrant, and Indigenous cultures within the country (Simpson 1996, 2, 4-5).

A failure in adequate multicultural representation has led to the growth of community-

based or community-oriented museums. Some museums, though, are realizing their

potential to act as social agents by becoming more inclusive in both their practices and

their representations (Sandell 2012, 1). Part of this new inclusivity requires engagement

with the communities whose material culture reside in collections—whom Peers and

Brown (2003, 1) identify as source communities— and the audience that the museum

serves, working with them to discover what the community wants from a museum and

amending their practices accordingly (Peers and Brown 2003; Ames 1992; Kurin 1997).

The "new museum" is increasingly focused on being more democratic and providing

educational opportunities in the service of social development (Kreps 2003b, 9; Ames 1992; Grincheva 2015, 137). The inclusion of community voice in the planning and development of an exhibit, as well as in the exhibit itself, is one of the many ways a museum can be more inclusive.

Within the past thirty years, social scientists, museum scholars, and other researchers have been observing and discussing the collaborative strategies employed by community museums (Simpson 1996; Message 2014; Isaac 2007). Some community museums have limited resources; they work with members of the community, various organizations, and sometimes other museums to build their collections and perform the basic functions of a museum (Kurin 1997, 96, 103). Postcolonial critiques of mainstream museums and their outdated modernist practices have spurred a growing interest in collaboration and how to incorporate this method into contemporary museum practice (Simpson 1996). Collaboration is understood as "people working jointly on a given project, particularly those outside academia" (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008, 7). It is not to be mistaken or used conversely with consultation, which usually has informal or legal connotations within the United States and the United Kingdom (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008, 7). Collaboration more often implies a partnership between the museum and the community. This partnership entails a shared willingness to work together, to respect one another, and to learn (Silverman 2015, 12).

This project sought to expand anthropological inquiry on contemporary museum practices, specifically regarding how community-museums engage in collaboration with other museums, by defining the collaborative efforts that Museo de las Americas engages in with other museums and organizations in Denver, Colorado. There are a several case

studies on collaboration between museums and source communities, a few case studies on inter-institutional collaboration between museums, archives and libraries, and relatively little on museums collaborating with other museums (Phillips and Anderson 2011; Simpson 1996; Shannon 2014; Peers and Brown 2003; Tanackovic and Badurina 2009; Shannon 2015; Keith 2012; Cai 2013; Hoogwaerts 2016; Grincheva 2015). Throughout the course of my research I recorded the motivations of why museums choose to collaborate, how the staff at Museo, and other institutions in Denver, placed meaning on and defined collaboration, and explored the implications and outcomes of inter-museum collaborations.

My access to the field derived from my internship in the education department at Museo de las Americas (Museo) from April to August of 2018. During this time I was able to develop a number of relationships with staff at the museum, participate in and observe museum functions, and learn about the efforts the museum makes to collaborate and partner with other institutions as a crucial part of their operations. At the end of my internship in August I was brought on as a Maestra (teacher), facilitating the arts and culture workshops as part of the Museo's educational programming. Continuing as a Maestra helped me to maintain those relationships and keep in touch with the museum. I was aware of Museo's meetings with contacts from Denver museums including the Denver Botanic Gardens (DBG), Denver Museum of Nature and Science (DMNS), the Denver Art Museum (DAM), Denver Broncos, Redline, and the Museum of Contemporary Art (MCA). These meetings were frequently mentioned and referred to, and personal communications with staff members alerted me to the frequent occurrence of working with other museums and organizations in the area. This research explored

these relationships to illuminate how these relationships functioned, what became of them, and how they influenced museum operations such as programs, events and exhibits.

I used two methods of qualitative research, namely participant observation and semi-structured interviews. Most of my research was conducted in the final month of my internship, August, and into the first two weeks of September. Reflections on my time as an intern, specifically the meetings and events I was part of and privy to, are combined with insights gained from my interviews with contributors from Museo, Denver Museum of Nature and Science, Denver Botanic Gardens, and the Museum of Contemporary Art.

This chapter provides an overview of my research project and includes background information on museums and their role in society on a global, national and local scale. It also unpacks the concepts of "community" and "Latino" and addresses how they will be used in the context of this project. Since this research project involves a Latino museum, current immigration and integration policies in the United States and Denver are discussed to provide context for the work done by Museo and other museums in the Denver area. This chapter ends on a discussion of the Scientific and Cultural Facilities District that partially funds the museums involved in this study, as well as an introduction of the field site, Museo de las Americas.

Chapter Two covers the literature review and theoretical framework that informs this research project. The literature review examines a history of collaboration and critiques of the practice. It also addresses case studies of collaboration concerning Latino communities and museum to museum interaction. The section on theoretical frameworks

introduces critical museology, or the new museology, and the concepts of the contact zone and the engagement zone.

Chapter Three addresses the design of this research project: the guiding research questions, rationale for site selection and the population involved. It further discusses the methodologies informing my research methods, and defines semi-structured interviews and participant observation. The chapter closes on the process of data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations for the project.

Chapter Four presents the major findings and breaks them down into categories and themes. This chapter concludes on an analysis of those findings informed by the literature and theory presented in Chapter Two.

Chapter Five is the conclusion of my research. This chapter will summarize the objectives of my research project, the theoretical framework and methods used, and the major findings and subsequent interpretations from the research. It also addresses the limitations of the project and mentions thoughts for future research.

Background

This section aims to briefly discuss museum ethnography and the return of anthropology to the museum as a site of study (Bouquet 2012; Ames 1992). It will also provide a brief overview of the social and political role of museums in constructing and constituting society. On the national scale, museums play a role in creating national and civic identity (Levitt 2015). National museums are generally located within capital cities and present a narrative of the nation to visiting domestic and international tourists and diplomats. On a smaller scale, museums also play a role in their local communities. Small museums such as tribal and community museums are generally place-based and oriented

towards their respective communities (Isaac 2007; Simpson 1996). The use of "community" to describe a museum type or group of people is complicated, however, because there are different associations of meanings and contexts that should be considered. Community is a complex term that has been widely contested and deconstructed (Crooke 2009; Isaac 2007; Golding and Modest 2013). Today it is generally agreed upon as being unbounded, ever-changing and diverse (Golding and Modest 2013; Crooke 2009). In this chapter, I investigate the Latino community and the larger public of Denver, Colorado. The last section of this chapter provides background on the local components of this research. The main field site, Museo de las Americas, has a history spanning three decades, several outreach and education programs that promote cultural diversity and "competency," and is part of a tax district in Denver—the Scientific and Cultural Facilities District (SCFD). Overall, this chapter starts with a wide scope and narrows down to the communities that are central to this project.

Museum Ethnography

The museum first began as princely private collections housed in storerooms and cabinets of curiosities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Bouquet 2012; Shelton 2011; Ames 1992). These "expressions of Renaissance erudition" grew in "fits and starts" from collections encompassing diverse cultural traditions and objects from around the world, which contributed to research about non-European cultures (Thomas 2016, 7). Thomas writes that museums have been regarded as "temples of elite culture, warehouses of colonial loot and hegemonic institutions" (2016, 22). This conception, upheld by popular accounts in museum studies, relegate to the background the fact that many of the objects in

anthropological collections [were] obtained through purchase or exchange. Most field collectors were, like other travelers, comparatively vulnerable, reliant on host communities' help and hospitality; they did not have the capacity to steal artifacts, had they even wished to do so. (Thomas 2016, 85-86)

Labelled ethnographic collections for the relationships they embody and their connection to social and cultural meanings these items were used primarily for scientific and cultural studies, thus giving rise to anthropology (Thomas 2016, 82; Bouquet 2012, 95-96). For a while, anthropology studied the material culture of the diverse peoples of the world, until ethnography within the academy and the university turned towards ethnographic fieldwork (Bouquet 2012, 96). This new form of ethnographic research, which was less dependent on material culture, involved complete immersion into the culture as subject, often for long periods of time, and directed anthropology's attention away from the museum until the mid-twentieth century (Bouquet 2012. 94, 96; Ames 1992).

The museum's role as a national and civic institution came about during the 19th century as the institution supported the ideologies and values of a nation or state through exhibitions and cultural production that marginalized alternative perspectives and knowledges (Bennett, 2011; Macdonald 2011). Tony Bennett discusses this instilling of a civic identity in the art museum through specific ways of seeing (Bennett 2011, 263). Western museum practices typically valued "forms of vision" over the other senses, thereby excluding other ways of embodied practices that inform the creation of a civic identity (Bennett 2011, 264, 275). Since the Enlightenment, attempts to move away from this prestige of sight towards a dialogic practice of seeing, which enabled a range of different perspectives to be negotiated, was deemed conducive to an increasingly diverse society (Bennett 2011, 264). However, the differences in ways of seeing practiced within

the museum and by curators was not easily extended to the incoming "masses," thus creating a hierarchy of seeing and understanding the organization and display of objects (Bennett 2011, 268). Bennett draws a connection between seeing and conversation, how the collections spark exchange thus presumably equalizing the members of society engaged and encouraging informed and educational conversations (2011, 268).

As museums changed from private spaces to public educational institutions, tensions were introduced into this dialogue as one side of the public was unaware of the ways of seeing upheld in the museum, creating a hierarchy between curator and visitor, educated and uneducated (Bennett 2011, 268). The "new museum," that which no longer is seen as "temples of dead gods, or copies of palaces of an extinct nobility," worked to pluralize the optical vantage points that encourages visitor's construction of individual forms of engagement rather than curatorial authority and dictation (Bennett 2011, 276). Educating the public and changing the way museums displayed their collections to account for different ways of looking and perceiving the world are two components of museum praxis that began to shift during the advent of critical museology.

Other changes in the museum during the 19th and 20th centuries brought significant change to the museum and its relationship to the public. Educational reforms, the first movement of which was encouraged by Enlightenment ideals of public access to knowledge institutions and later reinvigorated by the welfare state, brought about a democratization of the museum (Ames 1992, 20-21). This aimed to open the museum to the public and influenced a shift in the museum profession to a greater consideration of the public and their access to collections and information (Ames 1992, 20-21). The advent of "blockbuster" exhibitions to bring in mass amounts of visitors also began with

the decline of outside funding and an increased reliance on visitor income for future

museum operations (Ames 1992; Macdonald 2011).

A renewed interest in material and visual culture and its interconnections within

social systems, influenced by theories about the social life of things and entanglement,

returned anthropology to the museum (Bouquet 2012, 95-96). This time, however, there

was a different focus: while object study was still significant, the museum—its practices

and position as a cultural producer—and its role within society became the subject of

anthropological study (Bouquet 2012, 96, 98). As one of the main approaches to research,

ethnography is a method for explaining the complexities and contingencies of museum

work (Bouquet 2012, 98). Ethnographic research about the museum has yielded studies

that have changed the way museums are perceived: for example, studies concerning the

ways in which museums collect, how museums put objects on display, and how museums

interact with the public through tours and other educational programs (Bouquet 2012, 98-

99). In a similar fashion, this study employs ethnographic methods and anthropological

theories to explore engagement between museums in the hope of understanding museum

engagement in a new context.

The Museum as National

Several scholars have discussed the nationalizing role museums play (Ames 1992;

Bennett 2011; Macdonald 2011). Peggy Levitt discussed the topic in depth in her book

Artifacts and Allegiances: How Museums Put the Nation and the World on Display

(2015). She shows how museums at certain historical moments have cast an image of

shared identity through strategies of displaying objects and histories that link people

together and have simultaneously justified a country's colonial ventures (Levitt 2015, 2,

7). The objects stored in museum collections not only construct an image of a national citizen, but also a citizen of the world (Levitt 2015, 2). The strategies of display employed in some museums center on the displacement and recontextualization of material culture (Kreps 2003a, 314; Thomas 2016, 91). This recontextualization of material culture can construct an idea of belonging to a complex whole while feebly representing another culture and subsequently appropriating it for the purpose of enforcing national pride (Clifford 1988, 22). Levitt builds upon this notion and suggests a reframing of identity. She calls for "new ways of conceptualizing identity that take into account that many people belong to several groups at once and that these multiple allegiances can coexist, if not complement each other" (2015, 5). This new conceptualization considers the cultural, social and political influences that underlie the institution of the museum. Such a reconceptualization would involve a re-examination of society as heterogeneous yet intricately connected, and accounts for the way museums address cultural diversity in the world, as well as within the city in which it is located (Levitt 2015).

How a nation presents itself is seen by the world and can influence international relations. Understanding the nationalizing intentions of museums can help to illuminate their role as cultural diplomats in an increasingly inter-connected world. Some countries are more recently using their museums and other cultural institutions as forces of "soft power," a term coined by Joseph Nye in 2008 referring to a form of cultural diplomacy using the nation's cultural heritage and expression of cultural wealth to create long-lasting amicable relationships with other nations (Cai 2013, 128; Hoogwaerts 2016, 314-315). This means that countries can express their wealth and power, not only through

their militaries, but through arts and cultural institutions. The images and narratives on display attract attention from other people and spark a friendlier encounter oriented towards exchange and other amicable interactions. Museums are ideal institutions to be used in this form of diplomacy because they "have the capacity to become symbols of entire cities and nations, embodying a society's culture, values, and aspirations in a physical, tangible way" (Hoogwaerts 2016, 315). The use of museums as agents of cultural diplomacy creates an avenue for cross-cultural dialogue, the sharing of knowledges, and opens the museum as a space for dialogue and contestation on a broader, more global scale (Hoogwaerts 2016; Cai 2013). This notion of cultural diplomacy and "soft power" are further discussed in the Literature Review because of its potential to initiate museum-museum collaboration across international borders.

Tribal Museums and Community Museums

On the local level, museums similarly construct and reinforce a community identity. In recent years, scholars have shown how museums in general can be used to perpetuate a single truth promulgated through dominant discourse that undermines any alternative perspective (Bennett 2011; Macdonald 2011; Levitt 2015). This practice has consequently marginalized Indigenous and minority communities by misrepresenting or ignoring their existence, beliefs, and stories (Macdonald 2011; Ames 1992). It has been repeatedly mentioned that museums have a long history tied to colonial oppression and paternalistic exclusion that ignored the voices of minority and immigrant populations (Ames 1992; Bouquet 2012; Macdonald 2011; Silverman 2015). These common features of the "old museum" (Macdonald 2011; Kreps 2003b, 315) were precursors that inspired the development of a new museum movement: the community and tribal museum or

11

cultural center. Community and tribal museums emerged simultaneously with the civil

rights movement of the 1960s and 1970s (Simpson 1996). Influenced by the feminist and

postcolonial critiques of the inequalities perpetuated by various institutions, these

museums were created when minority and underrepresented communities decided to take

control and develop their own institutions focusing on their lives and experiences

(Simpson 1996; Lonetree 2012). This period coincided with efforts to create tribal and

community museums within an economic purview—for example tourism, cultural

preservation and local economic growth (Lonetree 2012, 19). The community museum is

the primary focus of this research, and its interactions with larger museums, but

consideration of tribal museums and cultural centers adds to the discussion of how these

marginalized communities have sought to address their own needs in their own ways in

an act of self-determination and community empowerment (Simpson 1996, 10-11;

Lonetree 2012; Fuller 1992).

In *Museums and Communities: the Politics of Public Culture*, Ivan Karp reflects

on the creation of "publics" because of "the political contests over who has the right to

speak for whom" transpiring from claims that communities make on museums (1992,

14). Museums are increasingly called upon to recognize and acknowledge

underrepresented communities, asking for their opinions and (ideally) responding in kind.

Furthermore, the notion of power held by and within cultural institutions, like museums,

has been questioned since the civil rights era—museums are no longer conceived as

"neutral ground" (Lavine 1992, 138). The ethnic and community-based museums that

arose with the civil rights movement conceive of their primary obligation as serving their

respective community (Lavine 1992, 139). These museums, according to Lavine,

epitomize some of the more promising innovative relationships between museums and communities.

Moira Simpson cites an Aboriginal Australian woman who said at a conference, "we are tired of being researched; we want to be in the research ourselves, to have a say in what needs to be studied" (1996, 12). The rising popularity of tribal and community museums sought to empower these communities to represent their own culture—to preserve it. Simpson further states that these museums and cultural centers provide an avenue for members of different ethnic groups to be partners in the planning process, often as advisors or staff members in mainstream museums (1996, 12). This inclusion of Indigenous and minority communities will be addressed in this section through a brief discussion of the creation of two tribal museums and cultural centers: the Makah Cultural and Research Center (Ericksen 2002) and the A:shiwi A:wan Museum (Isaac 2007). Though these studies address how Indigenous communities negotiated different perspectives and blended Western museum practices with their own traditional practices, they also describe a model of museum that was often adopted as a foundation for tribal and community museums.

Patricia Ericksen (2002) illustrates the creation of the Makah Cultural and Research Center from its initiation to full realization. The cultural and research center was created to be "a new place on the landscape for being Makah and remembering that experience" (Ericksen 2002, 25). Outside advice was sought from museum professionals, though they encouraged the Makah community to let their own worldviews shape the museum (Ericksen 2002, 173-174). The support of the public was emphasized through the process of creating the center, for without public support there would be no

understanding of what the center was to become and the project would have fallen apart from the beginning (Ericksen 2002, 174). The significance of this center is that it was created with the Makah community, with external facilitators checking in along the way to ensure that Makah words and knowledges fully informed the process since it was to be a place of Makah memory and experience (Ericksen 2002). Ericksen's discussion on the indigenization of the museum includes the incorporation of Makah worldviews, Makah conceptual categories for the classification and organization of collections, and most importantly, the active use of the space and its materials for community gatherings and ceremonies. For the Makah, the creation of a center promoted their culture and empowered their experiences throughout its creation and continued operation. The constant assurances that the Makah had a voice in the process was key to understanding the significance of a tribal museum in empowering and ensuring the continued survival of an Indigenous community.

Isaac (2007) emphasizes the negotiation of knowledge as a central component in creating the A:shiwi A:wan museum at Zuni, New Mexico. However, instead of negotiation she calls it "mediating knowledges" (Isaac 2007). Her approach to mediation is informed by "methodologies based on the political, social, and ideological interactions between different cultures" (Isaac 2007, 15). "Mediating knowledge" aims to understand local history and the transmission of knowledge as it constructs a community so that local and cultural knowledge can be maintained and passed on through generations in a museum framework (Isaac 2007, 6, 10, 14-15). The focus here is on the local and internal knowledges, which account for knowledge that is privileged and knowledge gaps that exist between generations (Peers and Brown 2003, 5). In meetings over the creation of

the museum, Isaac noted that the traditional Anglo-American values in the museum did not reflect the Zuni values due to a difference in cultural practices (2007, 97). Isaac writes about how the tribal museum has come to be recognized as a forum[1] for affirming tribal identity and as a place to reestablish traditional practices. She calls for museum scholars to move beyond the negotiation and politics of representation towards a deeper understanding of the control of knowledge (2007, 15). In this framework, the museum seeks to identify the differences between cultures to "mediate between external and internal perspectives" thereby establishing greater control over the presentation, transmission and narration of history (2007, 15). In other words, mediating knowledges is a chance to understand the context of these conflicting perspectives and identify the underlying assumptions perpetuating them to better reconcile differences and find compromise. This way, control over the production and transmission of knowledges no longer lies with one voice but is shared with and informed by multiple voices to construct a more holistic and coherent history that includes different perspectives within the common narrative.

According to Lonetree (2012), the museum is associated with ingrained historical trauma for the United States' American Indian communities, and they are regarded as a place for dead objects and quiet solitude (Isaac 2007, 97). This sentiment inspired some

---

[1] The use of temple versus forum to describe a museum originally comes from Duncan Cameron's "The Museum, A Temple or the Forum," first published in 1971. It has been used in a number of works since its publication because of the foundational premise that museums must revoke the "temple/shrine" of the past and work towards creating a democratic museum by reestablishing the museum as a forum—the social function of a museum as a place of discussion and debate. The museum as temple perpetuates the enshrining of significant and valuable things meant for the elite classes who had the respectability and education to appreciate them (2004, 66). As a forum, the museum admits there are things unknown and not understood, that it needs to open itself to the public for discussion and debate (2004, 67). Any iteration of temple, shrine or forum relating to the museum extends from this work, though it is often unacknowledged.

tribal communities to model their museum after George-Henri Rivière's ecomuseum model from the 1980s (Rivard 1999, 40; Isaac 2007, 97). According to Isaac, Rivière thought that the museum should approach culture more holistically so that it included an ongoing practice of tradition rather than interpretations of these traditions as they are manifested through objects (2007, 97). Ecomuseums initially began as a rural movement in France, though it moved to the urban sphere in the 1970s and 1980s (Rivard 1999). They began as neighborhood museums in poorer areas of the city, in former but abandoned public spaces, that illustrated the "local everyday cultures, from an ethnic, working-class or crafts standpoint" (Rivard 1999, 41). René Rivard, a Quebequois museum scholar, notes that in the 1980s these museums experienced a militant trend in which the museum became an "instrument of community development by spreading and sharing its resources" (1999, 41). Peers and Brown (2003) and Phillips and Anderson (2011) have likewise observed that Western museological models are often appropriated and adapted to suit the goals of the community. The draw of the ecomuseum for an Indigenous community is that it allows for creation of a space for self-exploration, incorporating the community's knowledge and providing an avenue for the exchange of expertise between communities and the international museum community (Isaac 2007, 98). In the case of the Zunis working with ecomuseum advocates, Isaac states the collaboration might be viewed as Anglo-Americans encouraging Zunis to separate from Western ideals and practices (2007, 99). A grant application for the Pueblo of Zuni mentioned that the beauty and appeal of an ecomuseum lies in the ability for the Zunis to turn to a form of museum practice that encourages a narrative of continuity and the development of a community (Isaac 2007, 99).

Nancy Fuller elaborates on how the ecomuseum model can be used to facilitate community empowerment. In her case study of the creation of the Ak-Chin Indian Community Museum, Fuller positions the museum as a facilitator for community empowerment. In this case, the Ak-Chin worked with museum advisors to create their community museum but the primary focus was on garnering support from the community by teaching and training community members about how to operate a museum and care for their cultural heritage (Fuller 1992, 348-349). The focus was on community support and inclusion in every step of the process, and ultimately the community members working in the museum gained power as knowledgeable advisors and representatives for the community (Fuller 1992, 359).

The community museum also draws from the goals of the ecomuseum, such as local control, a greater focus on locality (as a place-based institution), interdisciplinary and non-disciplinary approaches to practice, encouraged community participation, preservation of collective memory and knowledge sharing, and local socioeconomic development (Rivard 2001, 21-22). In the same manner as the tribal museum, the community museum is made by and for the community, and is ideally located within the community. The community represented is usually a minority community, one that has been under- or mis-represented in a larger, so-called mainstream museum (Kurin 1997). For this reason the community museum is sometimes referred to as an ethnically- or culturally-specific museum (Kurin 1997). One of the first and more well-known community museums is the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum in Washington DC (Simpson 1996, 72; Message 2014, 6; Kurin 1997, 94). The museum is located in a historically predominantly black neighborhood in the DC area, and was established by

the Smithsonian Institution in 1967 (Message 2014, 7). Moira Simpson quotes John

Kinard, the former director of the museum, who said "the destiny of the museum is the

destiny of the community; their relationship is both symbiotic and catalytic" (1996, 11).

Kinard succinctly ties the museum and its current operations—as well as its

continuation—to the inclusion and consideration of the local community in which it

resides. From the beginning, the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum focused on the

"interactions between the museum and both its local (community) as well as national

(Smithsonian) contexts" (Message 2014, 7). In this case, the local community

relationship refers to the Black community and their role within the museum, either as

staff or through their inclusion in and use of the museum. This community museum has,

along with some tribal museums, set the standard for community museum practices and

its successes have influenced the growth of community museums in the 1970s (Simpson

1996, 73). Since its establishment, the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum has turned its

attention to community collaboration and addressing the social and political issues

relevant to community life, which has become a central focus of much museum practice

and transformations of the past four decades (Message 2014, 7; Simpson 1996, 73, 92-

93).

Community museums give decision-making power and control to ethnic minority

groups, but they also provide a space for artists of minority groups to display their work

(Simpson 1996, 9). These institutions help to reinforce a sense of cultural pride for the

community as well (Fuller 1992, 61; Kreps 2003b; Kurin 1997, 105). Simpson briefly

discusses the formation of El Movimiento during the civil rights era to reclaim the

Mexican American identity and regain a sense of pride in their culture (1996, 8). This

included reclaiming "Chicano," a derogatory term, as an identity that became an outstanding historical movement in the civil rights of Mexican American culture (Simpson 1996, 8). Juxtaposed against the nationalizing potential of large museums, the "constituency museum[s] showcase the experiences of particular groups but also reveal something about where they stand in relation to the nation as a whole" (Levitt 2015, 3). This type of museum not only provides a space for minority communities to determine and present their own culture, but it also helps construct an image of that community as it stands within the complex social fabric of a city and a nation.

Though the significance of community museums is evident in the literature and their widespread presence in the world, there are debates concerning the necessity of a separate ethnically/racially specific museum. These debates do not suggest that these museums are unnecessary per se, though they do delve into the role these museums play. Mainstream museums have been criticized for not attending to the material culture of a group of people, nor have they been known to include minority groups as staff members within the museum (Kurin 1997, 104). Those who argue for the community museum note their importance in providing an autonomous space for the community to preserve and present their heritage, thus emphasizing cultural diversity (Kurin 1997, 102, 105-107; Kreps 2003b, 10). They also aid in fostering a strong sense of communal cultural identity while simultaneously serving as an educational device for younger generations (Kurin 1997, 105-107; Simpson 1996, 73; Kreps 2003b, 10). This often comes in the form of community volunteers and community support for the museum and its operations (Kurin 1997, 104). There is also an argument that these specialized museums can contribute to public knowledge by bridging differences and providing a space for people to address

and negotiate their differences (Kurin 1997, 108). Finally, to borrow Gayatri Spivak's term, "strategic essentialism," community museums can provide an opportunity for specific groups to "act temporarily as if their identities are stable in an effort to create solidarity, a sense of belonging and identity to a group, race, or ethnicity, for the purposes of social or political action" (Reilly 2018, 29). While this may have the negative effect of homogenizing diversity within a group of people, it offers an avenue for people to unite under a single banner to gain social and political recognition of issues of adversity facing these people (Reilly 2018, 29). This creates the community museum as an advocacy institution for that group of people and can ultimately benefit the community (Reilly 2018, 29).

On the other hand, those who argue against ethnically/culturally-specific museums highlight the inequalities when it comes to finances, small staff sizes and their lack of access to power positions to receive funding (Kurin 1997, 96, 103). The arguments against suggest that energies should be focused on changing the mainstream and "reconceptualizing ideas of American identity and culture" (Kurin 1997, 97). With the increasing globalization of society it is understood that "American" culture is inexorably connected to that of others (Kurin 1997, 97). It is also argued that culturally specific museums will detract from broader sociocultural discourse and will focus solely on their respective culture, thus contributing to further segregation in museums and society (Kurin 1997, 98). Learning from comparisons between cultures is crucial in understanding the interconnectedness of our world and how much each culture influences, and has influenced, one another (Kurin 1997, 97-98). In addition, there are many cultures in this world, thus solely focusing on one would seem to continue to ignore

the existence of others (Kurin 1997, 98). The complexities and diversity of culture seem to be lost within the culturally specific museum, though those arguing against it realize the need for these cultures to be addressed more profoundly in the mainstream museum (Kurin 1997, 99). This research expands upon this debate by considering how community museums and smaller cultural organizations work with larger museums. Such partnerships and collaborations have the potential to influence change in mainstream museums by providing a culturally-relevant perspective while simultaneously empowering the community museum and their respective communities.

Defining Community

Unpacking the concept of community is crucial to understanding just who is being represented. The term is not definitive and changes meaning depending on the context in which it is applied. Many other scholars have riddled "community," each providing their own understanding of the term in the context of their research. Gwyneira Isaac (2007) specifically emphasized the cultural implications of the term's use. She highlights the lack of discussion in other studies about the politics of difference internal to Indigenous communities, remarking that "the majority of studies make the assertion that a *local* museum is *representative* of the community" (emphasis in original, Isaac 2007, 11, 14). This would imply that the community is homogenous and unchanging when, in fact, it is diverse. Her unpacking of community in the context of her research with the Zunis relied on a deeper understanding of the religious hierarchy of social roles that determine the status of a Zuni member (Isaac 2007).

Elizabeth Crooke similarly states that community is a politically charged, multi-layered concept, changing meaning when considered in different contexts (2009, 1). A

community can contest the museum's representation of it as somehow unified when there

are different political, social or cultural perspectives held by members of the community

that would speak to multiple identities (Crooke 2009, 1). Golding and Modest recognize

the problematic nature of using the term community, calling it in generalizing terms a

"warmly persuasive word" that "is most often used to describe positive aspects of a

group," but can also be "exclusive, serving to divide and marginalize" (2013, 20).

Raymond Silverman also addresses this complexity, stating that communities "are social

and political spaces in which local and global identities are forged and sustained" (2015,

8). Further, he summarizes that

> foregrounding the social and political tensions that often abound within and
> between communities, both local and global, much of this critical discourse has
> been framed in terms of the politics of representation, a means for establishing,
> sustaining, and asserting presence. (Silverman 2015, 9)

Benedict Anderson (1983) notably deliberated on the term "community" as an

imaginary construct within the context of nationalism. For Anderson, the "imagined

community" stems from the fact that not everyone will know one another and yet feel

camaraderie with one another because of a unifying image or idea (1983, 6).

Communities are distinguished by the "style in which they are imagined" (Anderson

1983, 6). When a nation is imagined as a community, Anderson states that "regardless of

the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always

conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship" (1983, 7). In other words, despite any

inequalities that exist on a social and/or political level, everyone is inadequately

equalized under the unifying banner of "community."

Another term that is used in this research paper, for lack of a better one that has yet to be developed, is "Latino" and the "Latino community." Juan Flores deconstructed this term and contextualized it within three approaches: demographic, analytical and imagined (2000, 194). He argues that, in distinguishing between these three approaches "to Latino unity and diversity it is possible effectively to complicate and deepen understanding of cultural expression, identity, and politics" (Flores 2000, 194). The demographic approach is the most basic and reduces a people to a quantifiable presence, more appropriately regarded as a population that is targeted for economic and political purposes (Flores 2000, 194). This way of collectively conceptualizing a people has the adverse effect of limiting potential for intersectionality as it throws minority populations against each other in a numbers game in which different groups are racing to be the largest population to overthrow the majority (Flores 2000, 195). The analytical approach

> presumes to move closer to Latino reality by recognizing evident diversity of Latino groups and experiences such as country of origin, time in the United States (generation), region or place of settlement, occupation and socioeconomic status, and educational background,

but is limited by its inability to "differentiate among the differences and among kinds and levels of difference" (Flores 2000, 195-196). The final category, that of the "Latino imaginary," draws on Anderson's "imagined communities" to further break down the construct of a Latino identity. Flores presents this as a critical, historically based approach that does not mean to signify a community that is "not real" but a projection beyond the "real;" the "Latino imaginary" is something that is not immediately present but is informed by a "shared memory and desire, congruent histories of misery and struggle, and intertwining utopias" (2000, 198). In this sense, it is more adequate to call

23

this the "Latino historical imaginary" that recalls the home country, landscapes, life-ways and social struggles to unite a group of people who may differ in various ways within those elements (Flores 2000, 198). He argues that the "Latino identity is imagined not as the negation of the non-Latino, but as the affirmation of cultural and social realities, myths and possibilities, as they are inscribed in their own human trajectory" (Flores 2000, 200). Each context of "Latino" is complex and therefore inadequate to refer to such a diverse range of people whose experiences are informed by a variety of factors distinct from each other. Though, there is no alternate name that can supplant it. Flores suggests that a search for a new name would require a reconceptualization of the global map, of America, and would include "a process of historical imagination and struggle over social meaning at diverse levels of interpretation" (2000, 203).

These discussions and contestations of "community" and "Latino" show that these words should not be used lightly. The history of these terms and the varying contexts in which they are used suggest that they cannot be universally applied to any group of people. However, I retain "Latino" because the museums involved in this study similarly use it to refer to this group of people. I cannot speak to individual conceptions of identity because I did not include constituent communities in this research project.

In addition, community can span across continents, for example the LGBTQ+ community includes people who identify along the spectrum all over the world. National and global associations of different professions unite people all over the country and the world under the same banner, even though they may differ in interests, professional specialization, gender/sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, the list goes on.

24

From the few scholars mentioned here, it can be ascertained that the parameters of "community" are distinctly tied to the context in which one is reading the group of people—even then it can be fluid and complex. Although I recognize the difficulty of using "community," it does provide an avenue for discussing how a museum engages with specific audiences. I do acknowledge, however, that the communities referenced and alluded to in this research are greatly varied due to the diversity of people living in an urban area.

Immigration and Integration Policies

Today, immigration policies are highlighted on the news at least once a week, and racial tensions in the United States are increasing as violence and prejudice runs rampant. These tensions surrounding immigration are not new; they are deeply embedded in historical relations with many people migrating from foreign countries, not just Latin America. The United States was built on immigration and the promises of a second chance, yet it makes immigration and naturalization more and more difficult with each new amendment to immigration laws. According to Sierra, Carillo, DeSipio and Jones-Correa, the tide of immigrants shifted from mainly Northern and Western European countries to people primarily migrating from Latin America after the passage of the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act (2000, 535). The more recent concern over Latino immigration "is rooted in the history of conquest and settlement in the Americas" (Sierra et. al. 2000, 535), a history that some have chosen to ignore or forget (Sanchez 1999, 72).

George Sanchez (1999) urges scholars of immigration to remember the colonial context of the United States and the politics of manifest destiny. He calls for renewed

awareness of the impacts of colonialism on migration patterns and how neo-colonial

policies influence immigration and relations with people from other countries (1999, 75,

78). Sanchez writes,

> rather than experiencing "foreignness" through immigrant exclusion and
> consistent international conflict, the imperial war with Mexico in 1846 and the
> fact that United States land in the Southwest was formerly part of a Mexican
> nation is consistently forgotten in narratives of United States history and culture.
> More similar to the racialization of Native Americans, which presumes the
> "naturalness" of their condition under the inevitability of their conquest by the
> United States, westering Anglo-Americans very actively have to "forget" this
> history as they assume the position of the "native" in the American Southwest by
> ascribing "alien" status to Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans.
> (Sanchez 1999, 72-73)

It was not until the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe, at the end of the Mexican American War

that the United States essentially acquired the rest of the Western frontier (Flores 2000,

200). This land included the territories that are now the states of Texas, Colorado, New

Mexico, Arizona, and California (Schulten 2013). Forgetting that this Western land used

to be part of Mexico, some groups in the United States have laid claim to being the

rightful owners of the land and exhibit xenophobic hostilities to anyone else who comes

to live there.

Today, Latinos are the largest and fastest growing ethnic minority in the United

States (Sandoval and Maldonado 2012, 193). According to Jesús Lara (2012), large urban

areas are becoming increasingly ethnically diverse, with a 37% rate of population growth

between 2000 and 2009. Indeed, there are well-known neighborhoods that are majority

Latino—for example, the Broadway District in Los Angeles, the McDowell and Van

Buren Corridors in Phoenix, Washington Heights and El Barrio of East Harlem in New

York, and Little Havana in Miami (Lara 2012, 144). Citing the 2010 Census, Lara states

there are 50.5 million Hispanics in the United States, roughly 16.3% of the entire

population in the country, and the Latino population grew roughly 43% in a decade

(2012, 143). Some estimates claim that by 2050 the Latino population will increase to

nearly 133 million people (Lara 2012, 95). The 2010 US Census Bureau for Denver

estimates that 30.5% of the population identifies as Hispanic or Latino

(www.census.gov/quickfacts/denvercitycolorado, accessed 12/7/2018). This number is

increasing with each year as more and more people enter this country.

Museums are aptly situated to educate people about the culture and history of a

nation, but also a group about their own culture. This educational resource is particularly

useful for migrant communities in a new country as they promote cross-culture dialogue,

integration and social interaction between migrant communities and other citizens of the

country (Iervolino 2013). Serena Iervolino posits that opening the museum to migrant

communities can lead to a reinterpretation of museum collections that can spark dialogue

between people and turn exhibits into a "sharing space" thereby enabling the

"renegotiation and reconstruction, not only of the meaning of the collection but, more

broadly, of national and cultural identities" (2013, 114). The "new museum"—with its

focus on inclusivity, public service and negotiating knowledges of historically

marginalized communities—is learning to engage in this form of cross-cultural dialogue

to promote public education on cultural diversity (Ames 1992; Kreps 2003a, 315;

Grincheva 2015, 137). When museums engage in bringing different people together

through new collaborations and programs, they "create opportunities for more democratic

forms of communication and for fighting against the socio-spatial segregation of ethnic

minorities that characterizes cities in the "western" world and reinforces societal divisions under racial and ethnic lines" (Iervolino 2013, 115).

Moira Simpson states that as communities create their own museums, they enable "historical and contemporary issues to be examined, discussed and interpreted for the benefit of the community and its visitors" (1996, 4). Through these community museums, culture is more accurately reflected and relevant to the interests of the community (Simpson 1996, 11). As social and political tensions rise with the growing number of Latinos in the country, the need for cultural institutions reflecting the Latino experience becomes more important. Misrepresentation in the media, much like misrepresentation in the museum, necessitates the creation of a place for the people to take control of their own image. Cultural centers, community-run and community-based museums are ideal places for education and cultural representation, for providing a safe space for the community to gather and find solidarity with others.

Denver seeks to embrace and celebrate the contributions that immigrants and refugees make to the social, cultural and economic fabric of the Denver community (City of Denver press release 2017). As of 2014, the foreign-born population in Denver was 16%, with roughly 64 percent from Latin America (Office of Community Support Denver Human Rights and Community Partnerships 2014). Efforts to listen to the concerns of immigrants and refugees, such as the Listening Session in 2015, have highlighted areas where Denver needs to improve and provided recommendations for such improvements (Rogers 2015). The first Listening Session, which took place on September 16, 2015, emphasized the lack of translations and available translators, issues with education gaps resulting from differences in recognition of degrees and English

28

being a second language for most, legal scams and lack of access to legal assistance, inability to navigate the system that leads to more confusion and trauma, and lack of understanding about employee rights (Rogers 2015). Many argue that integration efforts must ensure that newcomers are fully woven into the social, economic, cultural and political fabric of their new communities. This process requires easier access to educational and legal resources, the enforcement of integration policies that currently exist, and the ability to speak out about the policies that may benefit or negatively affect immigrants and refugees (Rogers 2015; Office of Community Support Denver Human Rights and Community Partnerships 2014). There are efforts to increase awareness of immigrant and refugee contributions to Denver, highlighting the stories and successes of people who have made Denver their home, and the creation of a Denver Immigrant Day of Action on March 21 following the example of other cities with large immigrant and refugee population (City of Denver press release 2017, accessed 3/6/2019). One of these integration initiatives is the Denver Immigrant Integration Mini Grant, established in 2013 with the aim to bring diverse communities together. These grants, which provide up to $1,000 in financial aid, are available for small, community-driven projects that are focused on bridging immigrant and receiving communities, creating stronger and more connected neighborhoods, addressing community needs, and fostering community (City of Denver press release 2017, accessed 3/6/2019).

Scientific and Cultural Facilities District

Denver institutions receive a great deal of support for collaborating with one another thanks to a partnership between science and cultural facilities in the area. Established in 1989, the Scientific and Cultural Facilities District (SCFD) has

"distributed funds from a 1/10 of 1% sales and use tax to cultural facilities" in the Denver

metro area. This money goes towards those facilities whose primary goal is to enlighten

and entertain the public "through the production, presentation, exhibition, advancement,

or preservation of visual arts, performing arts, cultural history, natural history or natural

sciences" (scfd.org, accessed 3/18/2019). This organization supports, in varying

capacities, all the institutions included in this study. As part of the SCFD, organizations

qualify as a "tier", each tier has a certain amount of money that goes towards the

organization and has different requirements of each institution (scfd.org, accessed

3/18/2019). Tier 1, which includes the Denver Art Museum, Denver Museum of Nature

and Science, the Denver Botanic Gardens, the Denver Zoo and the Denver Center for

Performing Arts, receives 65% of SCFD funds (scfd.org, accessed 3/18/2019). These

higher-level organizations have significant reputations of regional and national

excellence, they draw in a large audience that is both in-state and out-of-state (scfd.org,

accessed 3/18/2019). The next level, Tier 2, are regional organizations that receive 21%

of SCFD funds based on two factors: qualifying annual income and the organization's

paid attendance (scfd.org, accessed 3/18/2019). The final Tier, Tier 3, includes smaller

organizations with science and culture at the heart of their operations (scfd.org, accessed

3/18/2019). They benefit Denver's neighborhoods and act as an avenue of engaging in

cultural interests (scfd.org). Many provide opportunities for the community to become

involved in a variety of ways, and these institutions receive 13.5% of SCFD funds

(scfd.org, accessed 3/18/2019). This final tier is where Museo de las Americas falls. It is

a smaller organization focusing on the Latino community of Denver. It provides

opportunities for the community to be involved in Latino cultural experiences ranging from dances, festivals, to food and artistic styles (museo.org).

The SCFD also funds a Scientific and Cultural Collaborative (SCC), a nonprofit organization comprised of Tier 2 and Tier 1 member organizations (scfd.org, accessed 3/18/2019). Tier 3 organizations can choose to opt in by paying a fee (scfd.org, accessed 3/18/2019). The overall mission of the Collaborative "is to enhance scientific and cultural opportunities for the public through collaboration and synergy" (scfd.org, accessed 3/18/2019). From its beginnings in 1994 to now, SCC members have invested some of their awards from the SCFD towards joint education and public awareness ventures, their overarching motto to "do things together that we could not do alone" through collaboration, regional service and increased accessibility (scfd.org, accessed 3/18/2019). This kind of encouragement to engage in collaboration with one another and with different communities in Denver is a larger system of support than what most museums discussed in the literature have backing their projects.

Museo de las Americas

Museo de las Americas is part of the Art District on Santa Fe (ADSF) and is located within the La Alma- Lincoln Park Neighborhood, sharing in a rich history of cultural and social diversity (Denver's Art District on Santa Fe 2018, accessed 3/6/2019). The goal of the ADSF is to reflect the heritage of the neighborhood, which has historically been home to a Latino working-class population (Denver's Art District on Santa Fe 2018, accessed 3/6/2019; La Alma- Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association 2014, accessed 3/15/2019). The land upon which Denver was built originally was inhabited by the Cheyenne and Arapahoe peoples, though over time the land was claimed

by gold prospectors, railroad barons and workers, and eventually immigrants from the world over (La Alma- Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association 2014, accessed 3/15/2019). The name of La Alma-Lincoln Park is tied to U.S history and the Latino connection to the neighborhood. Originally, in 1885, it was named Lincoln Park after President Abraham Lincoln (La Alma- Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association 2014, accessed 3/15/2019). La Alma means "spirit" or "soul," referencing the "spirit of the worker" that has resided there for generations; this part of the name was added in the 1970s when the neighborhood boundaries were redrawn (La Alma- Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association 2014, accessed 3/15/2019). After gaining a negative stigma from constant threats of flooding, the neighborhood has been inhabited by working class families since the late 1800s (La Alma- Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association 2014, accessed 3/15/2019). Mexican immigrants first arrived to the area fleeing the revolution of 1910, bringing with them their visual and performing arts traditions, literature, architecture, education and entrepreneurship that bolstered the cultural and social economy of the area (La Alma- Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association 2014, accessed 3/15/2019). In 1966 the neighborhood to the north (now Auraria) was slated for redevelopment after being deemed "blighted," thus forcing the Latino community to relocate to La Alma-Lincoln Park, leaving behind a fear of gentrification and displacement (La Alma- Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association 2014, accessed 3/15/2019).

Museo de las Americas was founded in 1991 by Jose Aguayo, Magdalena Aguayo, Ramon Kelley, Ramona Kelley, Emanuel Martinez, Maria Lupita Martinez and Rebecca Arellano (Museo de las Americas, accessed 3/8/2018). It began as a small office

space at its current location, slowly accumulating a neighboring space and growing to be the museum it is today. Since its incorporation, Museo de las Americas has received a number of awards for excellence in community engagement, education and the arts and is recognized as the premier Latino museum in the Rocky Mountain region. Museo de las Americas' mission, as stated on the landing page of Museo de las Americas' website (accessed 12/16/2018), "is dedicated to educating our community through collecting, preserving, interpreting and exhibiting the diverse arts and cultures of the Americas from ancient to contemporary, through innovative exhibitions and programs." Not only does Museo serve as a place of Latino culture, where Latino immigrants to Denver can see themselves represented in the artwork, but it also has a strong focus on education and outreach within the Denver community. The education department works with Denver Public Schools, Charter schools, and others to serve a wide variety of children and families, introducing them to the artwork of prominent Mexican cultural icons. There are also a variety of events the museum hosts, both on site and in other locations, that encourage participation of Latino cultural festivities through the incorporation of food, sights, smells and performance that engulfs the visitor in a totally immersive experience.

Additionally, Museo is instrumental in implementing a curriculum on cultural competency that focuses on the following five principles: valuing diversity, self-assessing one's cultural behavior, assessing cultural knowledge, understanding the dynamics of difference, and adapting to diversity (personal communication, 4/5/2019). They see this as an important part of their work because they recognize that as diversity increases, so does the need for culturally competent people (personal communication, 4/5/2019). The education department is involved in many initiatives to encourage cultural competency

and diversity such as Arts Education for All, A+ Colorado, and the Education Director is

working to implement a new curriculum in the public school system entitled HeART and

Culture, which she was working on during my time as an intern in the department.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL

FRAMEWORK

The previous chapter examined some of the literature on the role museums play in

society and the construction of identity. This chapter expands on these topics and

addresses critiques on the construction of identity and the politics of representation in

museums by discussing how these two fundamental components of museums have been

critiqued and the larger changes in museum practice these critiques inspired. It also

introduces the theoretical frameworks informing this research: critical museology (Ames

1992; Bennett 2011; Macdonald 2011; Peers and Brown 2003; Marstine 2008), the

contact zone (Clifford 1997) and the engagement zone (Onciul 2015). Collaboration has

come to be a cornerstone of contemporary museum practice and is discussed in many

studies (Boast 2011; Simpson 1996). This chapter seeks to provide a history of

collaborative practice in the museum and summarizes the critiques of collaborative

practice that call for greater recognition of the power asymmetries that are still often

perpetuated in practice. This historical perspective aids in understanding why

collaboration is still used, its significance in museum work, and how it could be adapted

to migrant populations—specifically the Latino population that is the predominant group

considered in this study. This chapter then examines the literature on Latino

representation in the museum and inter-museum collaborations. However, the literature

on these two topics is scarce. On the other hand, much has been written on collaboration

between mainstream museums and Native American communities.

History of Collaboration in Museums

Tensions had been rising between American Indian activists and museums, which

Lonetree noted became more vocal during the 1960s and 1970s (Lonetree 2012, 17-19).

Though greater public attention and large-scale efforts to change museum practices

followed Indigenous boycotts and protests of museums for the "perpetuation of colonial

ideologies and oppressive policies" after experiencing years of animosity regarding their

treatment, the theft and destruction of their culture and their peoples, and negative

relations with museums in the 1980s (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 9). In Canada, these

protests compelled the government to develop multicultural policies urging museums to

"play more proactive roles and advocate for more radical forms of social intervention and

reform" (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 9). Achieving these policies required new ways of

thinking about key issues central to museum work. This includes, but is not limited to,

incorporating aboriginal modes of decision making that is more respectful of listening to

all interested parties. By bringing around a hybridization of practice this would promote a

more dialogical way of determining how to enact public representation of distinctive

cultural traditions (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 10).

Indigenous boycotts and protests over *The Spirit Sings* exhibit created for the 1988

Winter Olympics in Canada influenced revisions within museum practice, including the

formation of a National Task Force on Museums and First Peoples and the inclusion of

collaboration as a fundamental practice in what Phillips calls "the second museum age" (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 12, 14, 229). This exhibit was one of several during this time that instilled great critique and reflection on museum practices (Phillips and Anderson 2011; Lonetree 2012). The exhibit contained over 650 examples of Aboriginal art, mostly collected during the early years of contact (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 48). Outrage was mostly directed at the corporate sponsor of the exhibit, the Shell Oil Company, which had initially overlooked and then forced the Lubicon Lake Cree off their lands for oil drilling in the 1970s (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 49). The large outcry over this exhibit, initiated by the Lubicon, influenced debates within parts of the museum world contesting the role of museums as spaces of representation and their potential to be political advocates for underrepresented or marginalized communities (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 49). This exhibit is considered to be a watershed event in North American museum history because of the response it aroused in the form of a conference, the formation of a Task Force, and recommendations for changing museum practice and protocols (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 51). The Task Force's 1992 report recommended changes to protocols, practice and power structures within the museum informed by a new model of partnership. This partnership model has led to sweeping change in museum work in Canada, similar to those in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 14; Simpson 1996).

Collaboration seeks to destabilize museum authority in favor of inclusive practices that allow other stories to be told. Controversies sparked by the exhibit and other expositions at the Canadian Winter Olympics highlighted the political narratives of exclusion and ignorance told through technologies of display and interpretation (Phillips

and Anderson 2011, 67). It is not enough to merely include Indigenous and minority communities as collaborators or advisors, engagement and collaboration must go further. James Clifford, quoted in Peers and Brown's *Museums and Source Communities*, warns that "unless museums do more than consult, they will continue to be perceived as merely paternalistic by people whose contact history with them has been one of exclusion and condescension" (2003, 2). Raymond Silverman mentions that no relationship between a museum and community is the same (2015, 11). Collaborative relationships between museums and source communities differs by degree of involvement and commitment, the goals and objectives sought at the outset of the relationship, and the length of time the relationship spans (Peers and Brown 2003, 3). Laura Peers and Alison Brown identify that "some of the most successful solutions have emerged from projects involving the hiring of source community members to assist in house and to act as liaisons between their communities and heritage institutions" (2003, 7). These kinds of relationships bring the community into the museum and includes them in the process of knowledge and cultural production. By including community members in the process, museums have the opportunity to reflect on their actions and their role within the problematic history of museum-community relations, allowing for changes to be made and changing dynamics for future relationships (Peers and Brown 2003, 10).

Collaboration in the United States is typically conducted in relation to Native Americans, mostly focusing on the requirements set by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990. This human rights law was a turning point in museum and Indigenous relations as it required museums to "return Native American cultural items—human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and

objects of cultural patrimony—to lineal descendants, and affiliated Indian tribes and

Native Hawaiian organizations" (Nash and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2010, 99-100).

NAGPRA opened new possibilities for cross-cultural collaboration within the museum.

Indigenous peoples have their own epistemologies and conceptions of the connection

between humans and objects (Kreps 2003a, 316; Colwell 2014, 11-12). These objects are

often associated with family, religious practices and collective heritage and are living

beings (Kreps 2003a, 316). NAGPRA encourages museum engagement with Indigenous

communities, in the form of consultation, to build relationships and establish a basis of

practice that is better informed by Indigenous practices and to repatriate human remains

and other objects of cultural patrimony back to their communities (Kreps 2003a, 316;

Nash and Colwell-Chanthaphonh 2010).

Critique of Collaboration

While there have been those who praise collaboration within the museum as a

hallmark process of inclusivity and change, there are some who have critiqued the

practice. Robin Boast examines James Clifford's use of the "contact zone" in the

museum, claiming that its implementation is only a "partial portrait" and re-situates the

museum as a "neocolonial" institution (2011, 56). He claims "the neocolonial nature of

these contact zones could destroy the very empowerment that it is meant to engender"

(Boast 2011, 57). Returning to Pratt's original definition of the contact zone, Boast

highlights the "deeply asymmetrical spaces where a dominant culture would provide for a

'negotiated' space for certain kinds of cultural exchange, negotiations, and transactions

necessary to the maintenance of the imperialistic program" (2011, 57). In these

statements, Boast remarks that the provisions for negotiation in contact zones do not

empower marginalized cultures but end up perpetuating the colonial or imperialist

agenda. The contact zone is a space of tension and unequal power based on the history of

colonial relations between the museum and the community (Clifford 1997). This inherent

inequality does not go away under the guise of collaboration, and if the museum does not

try hard enough to facilitate open negotiation and dialogue, it inevitably maintains its

power status and erases any hopes at empowering the marginalized and underserved

community (Boast 2011). He draws from Peers and Brown's argument that artifacts can

function as contact zones, they are sources of knowledge and can spark new relationships

both within and between communities; however, he suggests that in using these objects to

facilitate consultation and collaboration, "the role of the museum, or archive, is obscured

as it does not make clear how these objects of the contact zone are being used in

postcolonial contexts" (Boast 2011, 59, 61).

Janet Marstine, author of *New Museum Theory and Practice: An Introduction*,

identifies "radical transparency" as "a liberatory antidote to the assumed alignments and

readability of knowledge," it is a foundational "mode of communication that admits

accountability—an acknowledgement and assumption of responsibility for actions"

(2008, 14). Boast (2011) notes that the museum is often not transparent about its position

within the process of collaboration and this lack of accountability further contributes to

the positioning of the museum as neocolonial. It can be understood, from this example,

that the process of collaboration has multiple complicated levels that are not always made

clear to participants or the public and must be illuminated if it is to be effective.

Along with lack of transparency and accountability of the museum for engaging

in such postcolonial practices, collaboration has also been critiqued for its tendency to be

manipulative or create a false consensus (Lynch 2012, 146). When the museum becomes

what Nancy Fraser termed an "invited space," there is no guarantee of participation;

Lynch additionally cites Andrea Cornwall's argument that mere presence in a situation

does not mean participation nor a willingness to listen and respond (Lynch 2012, 147).

Lynch also highlights the difference in cultural conceptions of power that can further

hinder the process (Lynch 2012; 148). For example, in the Western ideal, the museum

has been an educator, and a scientific and cultural authority (Ames 1992; Macdonald

2011). While change has been slow to come, postmodern critiques of the museum

conceives of power as co-constructed rather than individualistic, thus sole authority of

production no longer rests within one entity (the museum) but is created from a dialogue

among participants (Ames 1992; Phillips and Anderson 2011, 92-93). The ideal is that

this dialogically constructed knowledge is balanced. However Lynch suggests that within

diverse conceptualizations of power, epistemological differences become centralized in a

collaborative relationship and obscure issues of the ethics of the relationship that is

created (2012, 148). Her argument is that, as long as the museum remains an "invited

space," these power dynamics remain a main component of the failure of collaboration

and the relationships generated through the process (Lynch 2012). She critiques

Clifford's hopes for the agency brought about by collaboration, stating that such hopes

underestimate the museum's need to control and that the idealized hopes can be easily

undermined if the museum withholds the promise of collaboration and mutual respect

(Lynch 2012, 150). To remedy such a situation, she borrows from the French philosopher

Emmanuel Levinas, stating that "humans can only successfully learn about themselves

through engagement with another" (Lynch 2012, 151). She emphasizes collaboration as

an ethical practice of continued engagement and reciprocity among parties or stakeholders, bringing about an awareness of dependence upon one another for the creation of knowledge (Lynch 2012, 151).

Nancy Mithlo points out that collaboration can place an excess burden and responsibility on the Native American community involved to "'bridge' the broad conceptual gap" between museum and Native epistemologies (2004, 746). She states that "both Indigenous knowledge and Western knowledge systems can be interpreted as subjective enterprises with restricted codes" (Mithlo 2004, 746). Furthermore, "adoption of an oppositional credo, while serving to maintain boundaries and differentiate values, ultimately oversimplifies and mischaracterizes the aims of both parties" (Mithlo 2004, 746). Turning Vine Deloria's "white man's burden" on its head, her use of the "red man's burden" is a critique of Western values and the placement of the responsibility to examine and undo the consequences of colonial legacies on Native Americans as a "narcissistic assumption" (Mithlo 2004, 748). The attempts to destabilize museum narratives through collaboration is, in this case, not so much a reciprocal practice involving dialogue and negotiation but asking someone else to do your own work. This "handing off" of accountability suggests a desire to be trained, giving Natives the responsibility to educate others and assumes that Natives possess this innate knowledge of interpreting any Native culture, despite their own personal backgrounds (Mithlo 2004, 757). Ultimately, Mithlo states,

> [the] incorporation of Native perspectives, the collaborative approach between Native consultants and museum curators, and inclusion in training and hiring all serve to increase the participation in the museum enterprise but fail to connect real research needs of tribes with the activities of the museum. (2004, 759)

The museum thus uses collaboration and consultation with Native tribes for their own ends rather than considering the tribes' needs, therefore showing a lack of understanding, respect and reciprocity for what the tribe may have set out to achieve.

All three critiques touch upon various aspects of how collaboration in practice is not always achieving desirable outcomes. There can be a lack of transparency about the complicated inner workings of the process, thus potentially positioning the museum as neocolonial and still dominant (Boast 2011). Or underestimating the need for museums to control, creating an atmosphere of continued unethical relations (Lynch 2012). It can also be that the institution places the responsibility of fixing the issue of colonialism within the museum and its collections on the Native community, thereby neglecting to consider what the Native community may need from the museum (Mithlo 2004). These critiques are important to consider in any future collaborative project between a museum and community to ensure that the goals of the project are clearly outlined, that an ethical and reciprocal relationship is established from the beginning. Museums need to come to the project prepared with ideas, possible solutions and a willingness to reciprocate expertise for expertise so that no burden is unduly placed upon one party.

Museums and Latino Communities

The history of collaboration is long and contains a great deal of mistakes, lessons learned, changes, adaptations, and alterations depending on the museum and the community involved. There are many cases where anthropologists have studied the relationship between museums and Native American communities, but little on the

relationships between museums and Latinx[2] communities. My field site for this research, Museo de las Americas, is the premiere museum in the Rocky Mountain Region (museo.org). Other, perhaps more widely known Latino museums include El Museo del Barrio in New York (Moreno 2004, 512) and the Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum in Chicago (Simpson 1996, 83). Additionally, there is growing support for a National Latino museum, though it is present mostly in social media (on a website and Twitter) and in propositional legislation introduced to the House of Representatives in 2005.

Some of the well-known Latino museums in the U.S. began as country-specific community museums, but then grew to be larger institutions and expanded their attention to represent Latin America as a whole. For example, El Museo del Barrio began as a Puerto Rican community-based space in the late 1960s, following the rising trend in community museums during the civil rights movement (Moreno 2004, 506, 507). Since its first days as a museum, it has become institutionalized within the museum sector, broadening its representational horizons to include the rest of Latin America. As it became more institutionalized in the mid 1970s, El Museo's focus on art shifted from the individual artist to art of a specific "culture group" and its social and historical ties within Latin America and the United States (Moreno 2004, 512, 514). The Mexican Fine Arts Center Museum in Chicago, founded in 1982 by the Mexican American community, is another well-known art museum that aims to "demonstrate the richness of art in Mexican culture" (Simpson 1996, 83). The museum has always had a strong emphasis on

---

[2] The Spanish language genders nouns, when a noun ends in an "a" that connotes a feminine possessor; likewise when a noun ends in an "o" the noun is masculine. The "-x" replaces the standard o/a ending in Spanish forming nouns of the masculine and feminine genders. The "-x" is a contemporary effort to be more conscious of racial and gender identity politics.

education and informing the public about Mexican historical and contemporary arts while encouraging the development of Mexican artists in the Chicago area (Simpson 1996, 83).

Magdalena Mieri, Judith Freidenberg, Kathleen Tracey and Yixin Qiu conducted a study in Langley Park, Maryland determining the need for a Latinx community museum. Their Community Museum Project team proposed to establish an institution that further develops the cultural identity of the area's Latinx and Latin American populations (Mieri, et. al. 2006, 62). Their approach was informed by three developments of the new museology, including the rise of neighborhood museums in the United States, for example the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum in D.C, the rise of integral museums in Latin America and the ecomuseum, which has been popular in France and Quebec (2006, 62). Their project involved approximately thirty immigrants that were recruited from CASA de Maryland, a program aiding new immigrant communities (Mieri et. al. 2006). These thirty people were brought together with the goal of identifying their opinions for a museum about immigration (Mieri et. al. 2006). They also participated in a series of workshops where they engaged in deep discussion and created stories about objects significant to their journeys and experiences (Mieri et. al. 2006). The main themes that arose from their discussions concerned the preservation of language, maintenance of daily activities, participating in and understanding the background of Latino traditions and customs and their cultural significance; educating others about Latino culture, including their work ethic, customs, common goals in life, similarities in worries and concerns for family and children that are similar to anyone's experiences; Latino cultural expression through Christianity, food, music, dance and history that is central to a Latino identity (Mieri et. al. 2006). Overall, educating the public about the variety of Latino and

Latin American culture with the goal of exhibiting similarities and making Latinos and Latin Americans seem not as "alien" was the main concern of the participants in the study (Mieri et. al. 2006). In discussing objects provided in the second workshop, participants expressed a "desire to pass on traditions to future generations so the children are not cut off from their cultural roots" and to emphasize the importance of certain cultural traditions (Mieri et. al. 2006, 62). The goal of their future museum was to "facilitate a forum where community and identity could take place" and to maintain and encourage a greater understanding of the daily activities, customs and traditions that provide the foundation of Latino and Latin American culture (Mieri et. al. 2006, 62).

There is currently a bill in the U.S. House of Representatives "to study the potential creation of a national museum of the American Latino Community Act of 2005," also known as HR 2134. The bill was introduced in 2005 by Congressman Xavier Becerra (D-CA) on the basis that the Latino population has been a part of American history since before the founding of the United States and it is time for a national museum representing the community (Pombo 2006). This commission of 23 members planned to study the potential creation and develop a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a National Museum of the American Latino Community, which would be located on the Mall as part of the Smithsonian Institution (Pombo 2006). Though there has not been much published on this other than commissions and bills, there is an online presence to garner support through a website (https://americanlatinomuseum.org/) and on Twitter, @latinomuseum, which often posts about new Congressmen supporting the potential creation of the institution, articles about

Latino history within the United States and articles demanding the creation of the

institution itself (Pombo 2006).

Museum to Museum Collaboration

Though there is an abundance of scholarly work on collaboration between

museums and source or marginalized communities (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson

2006; Shannon 2014; Simpson 1996), there is a dearth of research on inter-museum

collaboration. One case of inter-museum collaboration is Jennifer Shannon's (2015)

Projectishare, a collaborative online project with the Dené, the University of Colorado

Museum of Natural History, the National Taiwan Museum and the Indigenous peoples of

Taiwan, the Paiwan. The project aimed to use technology to create an online

collaboration of the museums and the communities to build partnerships and bring the

knowledge generated from such a relationship to a broader audience that the physical

museum cannot reach (Shannon 2015, 67). The process was documented by a graduate

student to facilitate ongoing critique and discussion (Shannon 2015, 67). Reflecting on

the project, Shannon notes that there were initial issues with translation between the

different traditions of museum anthropology and Indigenous communities separated by

half the world (2015, 68). Shannon and her counterparts at the National Taiwan Museum

operated primarily as liaisons and project managers while the Paiwan and Dené partners

were the primary actors and decision-makers of the project (Shannon 2015, 70, 72-73).

Collaborative projects, such as this one, inevitably encounter internal conflicts and

obstacles that affect the process and the outcome. In this case, language was a barrier

(Shannon 2015, 68). Another was the realization that decolonization within the museum

can only be partial as there is always more to do, and finally that power sharing is never

completely equal (Shannon 67, 69). The issue of funding was another source of this power inequality, largely because the National Taiwan Museum is a larger institution with more resources than the University of Colorado Museum of Natural History (Shannon 2015, 80). The grant that funded the project, the Museum & Community Collaboration Abroad (later renamed the Museums Connect Grant through the American Alliance of Museums), required that all funds were to be managed by the U.S institution, CU Museum of Natural History (Shannon 2015, 80). These kinds of tensions have also been recognized by other researchers studying inter-institutional collaboration.

Sanjica Tanackovic and Boris Badurina, who studied the collaboration between cultural heritage institutions in Croatia, described similar obstacles to the collaborative process. The heritage institutions considered in the study were libraries, archives and museums, all of which shared similar focuses and missions to serve the public (2009, 301). Tanackovic and Badurina also observe that there is little research, aside from a study by the Institution of Museum and Library Sciences (IMLS), on the dynamics of an inter-institutional relationship (2009, 301). IMLS partnered with the National Leadership Grants (NLG) program in 1998 to promote collaboration between museums and libraries, and "enhance education, training, research, demonstration, preservation and digitization in museums and libraries" (Aeffect 2000). IMLS encourages collaboration among "community learning resources," and the final report of their research (completed by Aeffect, Inc.) into such collaborations showed that, by working together, libraries and museums can "increase access to information in their communities, enhance education, attract new audiences, and expand the reach of their programs" (Aeffect 2000). Some of the motivations for collaboration listed include a desire to improve current services, an

opportunity to create new services that include all institutions, and a desire to meet visitor needs (Tanackovic and Badurina 2009, 309). Obstacles in the collaboration between the Croatian libraries, archives and museums included a lack of staff, increased workload, financial difficulties, different organizational structures, lack of detail about collaborations that went well and a general lack of guidelines for engaging in such projects, lack of support from the institution, infrequent or poor communication, and different terminology used (Tanackovic and Badurina 2009, 310). Without institutional support, it can be difficult to maintain a good relationship that is necessary in collaboration. Different terminology was listed as an obstacle in Shannon's (2015) project as well, not only in institutional language, but also between the people engaged in the project.

More recently, with political and social tensions increasing around the world because of wars and political disputes, cultural diplomacy and the concept of "soft power" have influenced the cross-cultural collaboration of international museums and communities (Cai 2013; Grincheva 2015; Hoogwaerts 2016). Natalia Grincheva cites Kylie Message's argument equating "the co-opting of cultural institutions with international aid and development programs 'so that cultural outcomes are celebrated as if they were concrete socio-economic or political outputs,'" remarking how this form of cultural diplomacy turns museums into economic and political strongholds of a sort (2015, 137-138). Museums are being used in this manner to attract others and to sustain relationships between peoples of different cultures. Grincheva (2015) specifically ties one program to cultural diplomacy, the American Alliance of Museums (AAM) Museums Connect grant launched in 2007. The AAM grant aims to pair museums and local

communities in the United States and institutions abroad for cross-cultural exchanges (AAM 2016). Grincheva remarks that AAM "advocates for developing and sustaining museums as neutral zones in which to talk about issues of concern to communities and different segments of society and to aid understanding of current events in historical and cultural contexts" (2015, 140).

Within the framework of the new museology, museums are directing their focus towards inclusivity, participation and creating partnerships to facilitate community development (Grincheva 2015, 137). This goal of inclusion, participation and collaboration has been extrapolated within cultural diplomacy and the AAM Museums Connect grant to facilitate relationships between museums and governments around the world. According to Grincheva, the goal of the AAM Museums Connect is to develop and facilitate knowledge and understanding about culture by creating models of international collaboration that can be recreated and extended beyond the museum walls to benefit and invite the community (2015, 140-141). The grant is aimed towards developing relations not only between governments by making one's culture more attractive and sharing certain cultural values, but also between communities and encouraging greater respect of different cultures (Grincheva 2015, 141). The fault in focusing primarily on community development, Grincheva notes, detracts from international exposure to American culture and values through the grants program (2015, 141).

Despite the Museums Connect grants program not taking a direct enough approach to American cultural diplomacy, and the fact that the program ended in 2016 after nine years of funding numerous international museum collaborations, museum

diplomacy has gained some recognition. One example of museum diplomacy is Yunci

Cai's (2013) study of the Singapore-France Cultural Collaboration. Cai cites successful

cross-cultural museum exchanges between the British Museum, China, and Iran as

influencing this diplomatic relationship (2013, 128). These interactions centered around

artifact exchanges that occurred at a time when China and Iran had difficult political

relations with the United Kingdom; the blockbuster exhibits that resulted as part of this

exchange opened new avenues of dialogue for these nations, yielding a success for the

collaborations (Cai 2013, 128). In this case, the "soft power" the British Museum wielded

sparked international attraction and intrigue, and it facilitated the governments of each

nation's relationships with one another that ultimately benefited all parties (Cai 2013).

These relationships often begin as apolitical situations, but they typically escalate to

become more political because of the unequal power relations between participating

nations (Cai 2013, 129). This kind of cultural diplomacy through museum relationships

bears similarity to the unequal power relations exhibited through colonial relations within

the contact zone. In fact, Cai remarks on the unequal power relations by equating cultural

exchanges to a form of government propaganda and a new form of cultural imperialism

(2013, 128).

Cai's study critiques the Singapore-France cultural collaboration as a form of neo-

imperialism, largely due to the history of Great Britain's colonization of Singapore and

France's stance as a major imperial power prior to the mid-twentieth century (2013, 128).

Though France did not colonize the island nation, the strong imperial history of France

assumes the country more power over Singapore in the collaborative relationship (Cai

2013). Cai found in the Singapore-France collaboration that the museums did not

consider cultural diplomacy to be a major motivating factor for exhibition exchanges, though they found that such a framework provided sufficient funding opportunities to "support their programming or as political gateways to gain access to the renowned museums overseas," thus benefiting each museum's own mission and objectives (2013, 134). The exchanges offered an avenue for Singapore's collections to be seen on an international stage through France's museums and facilitated an exchange of institutional and museum knowledge and expertise between all participants (Cai 2013, 139). Outside the museums and their benefits from this collaboration, each government found the exchange to be significant because it opened opportunities for political networking (Cai 2013, 138).

Theoretical Framework

This section concerns the theories that informed my research. Critical museology and the new museology influence a more critical and reflexive approach to museum practice (Ames 1992; Macdonald 2011; Peers and Brown 2003). This is sometimes enacted through more inclusive exhibits and programming, often produced through collaboration with those communities that are represented so that their voices and perspectives are given priority within the museum (Onciul 2013, 2015; Clifford 1997; Ames 1992). Furthermore, the contact zone as it is applied to museums (Clifford 1997), and a more recent expansion upon this model, the engagement zone (Onciul 2013, 2015), are discussed in relation to their implications within changing museum practices and collaboration.

Critical Museology (New Museology)

The cultural analysis of historical, social and political contexts of the museum and its role within society as an authority and cultural producer influenced current changes in museum practice and ethos that have contributed to the "new museum" and a critical museology (Ames 1992). The inherent political and colonial context of collecting and representation, both of which are fundamental components of the museum, generally came into question during the 1960s and 1970s as a result of feminist, postcolonial, racial critiques, and Native activism (Lonetree 2012, 17-19; Simpson 1996). These critiques occurred alongside a larger critique of anthropology in general concerning a "crisis of representation" as well as a "reflexive turn" in anthropology—and, by extension, museums (Silverman 2015, 10; Thomas 2016, 31). This new wave of thinking encouraged museums to reconsider their history as a hegemonic institution promoting ideologies and images that marginalized a range of people who were speaking out to reclaim their stories that were misrepresented or ignored (Kreps 2003b, 5; Simpson 1996).

Critical museology, also known as new museology, is "a critical anthropology of museums" charged with "pay[ing] more attention to the social and political systems in which they themselves are embedded" (Ames 1992, 10). Some scholars note that the museum has historically been regarded as a temple or a shrine to an idea, a place of reverence and quiet meditation (Ames 1992; Macdonald 2011; Lonetree 2012; Cameron 2004). Within critical museology, the aim is to open the museum to dialogue and contestation, making it more of a forum (Ames 1992; Cameron 2004). Sharon Macdonald describes the new museology as "expanding methodological approaches," "deepening the

empirical base" and recognizing the "supremacy of the visitor," ultimately becoming "more theoretical and humanistic" (2011, 1-2). She also notes that the "new museology" is seen by some as a "first wave" of changes in museological practice, a forerunner of critical museology (Macdonald 2011, 1). Prior to the "new museology," the "old museology" was generally focused on museum methods rather than understanding the factors that influence museum work and their social role (Macdonald 2011, 2). These changing methods are directed towards a better understanding of the ownership of knowledge, how knowledge is produced and the inherent political nature of knowledge, the representation of cultures through exhibits and display, and the shifting meaning of museums in an increasingly commercial and consumer-oriented economy (Macdonald 2011, 2-3).

The heightened awareness and critique of museum practices that arose from critical thinking and reflection on museum practices urged museums to include Indigenous, marginalized and source communities in the museum. This practice of collaboration and consultation can produce collaboratively designed exhibits, changes in collections management practices, introducing a new language of classification, and other alterations to museum methods (Onciul 2013, 79; Phillips 2003, 158). Peers and Brown claim that such collaborative practices and shifting contexts of museum work can help the museum learn and grow by: "realizing the political nature of museums, their histories, and their functions, as well as the need to acknowledge and address these dynamics when creating new relationships" (2003, 9-10). Learning and growth within the museum comes after listening to these diverse perspectives (Ames 1992, 55). Change also occurs when museum professionals start to rethink preconceived notions of materiality and recognize

the connections between the material and the social (Peers and Brown 2003, 7-11; Kreps 2003a; Marstine 2008, 18). This constitutes a realization that artifacts can embody the cultural and historical memory of Indigenous and other marginalized communities as well as the artifact's ability to transmit such memory through generations (Peers and Brown 2003, 5-6).

Ruth Phillips suggests that this work can empower Indigenous communities and provide a platform to fight larger battles for identity recognition and representation outside the museum (2011, 157). She argues that, within the realm of critical museology and reflexive practices that include these communities in the museum, the museum has become something akin to an experimental laboratory for new cultural and knowledge production that focuses more on the process of working together than the outcome (Phillips and Anderson 2011, 192). These new forms of knowledge production shift the locus of power from the museum to the communities, using their language, their categories, and their stories to rewrite the wrongs that have been done in the past (Silverman 2015, 3; Onciul 2013, 2015; Ericksen 2002).

Within institutions, the definition of a museum has also shifted in the past few decades. The International Council of Museums (ICOM) definition for museums has influenced the role of museums since the council's creation in 1946 (Kreps, forthcoming). According to the 22nd General Assembly in 2017, the current museum definition states

> A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment. (ICOM, accessed 5/6/2019)

The definition is constantly changing, however, and the definition "no longer seems to reflect the challenges and manifold visions and responsibilities" as museum policies and practices are critically examined and adapted (ICOM 2019). The changing economy and increased commercialization of society has also changed the perception of the public from passive reader to active consumers.

Increased attention to the obligation of providing a public service have led to the development of visitor studies and making the museum accessible to the public (Macdonald 2011; Hein 1998). Museums have introduced new technologies such as interactives and participatory activities as a new way to engage the visitor in active learning rather than simply passively reading labels (Macdonald 2011; Bennett 2011). This shift in thinking of the visitor as active consumer places greater responsibility on the public for their own learning and opens the museum to visitor input using surveys and other approaches to visitor studies (Hein 1998). Some museums are working towards being more democratic by opening themselves up to dialogue and conversational exchange, though this process is uneven and not widespread. Nicholas Thomas writes that "new museums, grand developments and more visitors are not aspects of a single trend, but of related trends, manifested differently and unevenly in different countries and in different museum environments" (2016, 28). Drawing upon this, not every museum enacts these changes on the same level. Indeed some are slower to come to change and others have been making great strides since before the movements of inclusion, engagement and democracy became key phrases in museum practice (Thomas 2016).

Since the emergence of critical museology, several scholars have discussed this critical approach to the study of the museum. Janet Marstine has written extensively on the new cultural theory of museum ethics, heavily influenced by feminist critical inquiry (2008, 3). This "contingency of ethics" refers to the new dependence of the museum upon "social, political, technological and economic factors and to acknowledge its changeability," noting how the "new museum," is informed by critical museology and dependent upon subsequent changes in the world around it (Marstine 2008, 8). Marstine describes museum ethics as a social practice, one that works to destabilize the traditional authoritative voice of the museum and provide an alternative discourse that is more inclusive, transparent, and overall understanding of the multitude of museum practices exhibited in different cultural institutions across the world (2008, 4). Borrowing Foucault's premise that discourse can function as a mode of power and can destabilize social relations, the new museum discourse seeks to include the voices of those who have historically been marginalized and misrepresented (Marstine 2008, 4-5). Marstine urges a "radical transparency" that makes the museum accountable for its actions, encouraging critical reflection on its practices and emphasizing the importance of collaborating with those who have been marginalized by museums in the past (2008, 14-15). The new museum ethics is also focused on an ethical shared guardianship of cultural objects, meaning a change in perspective, no longer seeing objects as passive bearers of culture but as stories and people, thus privileging the experience and social character of objects (Marstine 2008, 18).

The Contact Zone and the Engagement Zone

The relationships between museums and communities usually occur within the context of the contact zone. Mary Pratt initially proposed this theory of unequal social interaction in colonial encounters, which James Clifford applied to the museum. It is defined as "the space of colonial encounters, the space in which people geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict" (1997, 192). The relationship described in the contact zone typically lies in museum collections due to the traumatic histories and colonial circumstances, in some cases, in which these objects were collected, sometimes through conquest, violence, and excessive force (Clifford 1997; Peers and Brown 2003, 20). Within the contact relationship, hierarchies of power can be perpetuated through dynamics of invited space (Lynch 2012) and years of racial assumptions that were constructed through material culture studies in the museum (Peers and Brown 2003). This inequality is acknowledged and problematized within the contact zone. Clifford depicts the contact zone as a social relationship illustrated through the sociocultural contexts of collections and the form of exchange that is created under the guise of contact work (1997, 192). Peers and Brown write that contact work, such as collaboration and consultation, forms a two-way process in which communities are reunited with their cultural belongings and, in working with these communities, museums can record Indigenous perspectives and learn new ways of looking at and conceptualizing the connections between humans and materiality (2003, 1-2, 9-10). Fundamental to contact work is negotiation and debate in which new perspectives and worldviews are considered and ideally held as equally valid forms of

knowledge (Peers and Brown 2003, 85; Phillips 2003, 160). The most common outcomes of the collaborative process are "museum programming, coproduced exhibits, community employment, collection loans, repatriations, community participation on museum panels, and changes to museum practice and ethos" (Onciul 2013, 79). Clifford argues that "approaching museum work as contact work provides the understanding and context necessary to begin to grapple with the real difficulties of dialogue, alliance, inequality and translation which will be part of any change" (Nicks 2003, 20).

Several scholars have identified that, in working to share authority with communities, museums can democratize and pluralize the histories represented within their walls (Onciul 2015, 72; Peers and Brown 2003; Simpson 1996). This work can "decentralize the traditional voice of museum expertise and enable counternarratives to be heard through the representation of community voices in the museum" (Onciul 2015, 72). Issues of asymmetries of power, which Clifford (1997) acknowledged within museums as contact zones, are further perpetuated through the "invited space" (Fraser in Lynch 2012, 147) of the museum that can reinforce the 'us/them' dichotomy, ultimately oversimplifying the process of engagement (Onciul 2015, 76). There have been a few critiques of the contact zone, specifically how it has been shaped to fit into the goals of the postmodern new museology (Onciul 2015, 78; Boast 2011). Onciul refers to Boast's (2011) critique of the contact zone as an instrument of neo-colonialism, drawing from his arguments and recommendations for future practice to inform her own conceptualization of the engagement zone (2015, 80-81). The underlying issues of asymmetrical relations, appropriation of culture and biases inherent in the museum continue to be unaddressed and concealed under the guise of contact work (Onciul 2015, 81). This concealment

creates the contact zone as a site for the center, for those with authority and power, rather than destabilizing the center's power and allowing those in the periphery to speak (Onciul 2015, 81). Onciul ties this ability to speak to Gayatri Spivak's proposition that the subaltern can only speak within the terms of the dominant discourse because of their position in society (2015, 80). One of the significant resulting components of the contact zone, autoethnography, is often forgotten in the application of the contact zone despite its importance (Onciul 2015, 81). Onciul highlights Boast's emphasis on the autoethnography as a point of entry into dominant discourse as it "raises key issues for collaborative engagement based on contact zone models and ties into the debate on the limits of self-representation within a dominant cultural forms such as the museum" (2015, 81). Her proposed "engagement zone" seeks to address the internal dynamics and negotiations over the performance of culture that could eventually lead to a deeper understanding of engagement.

Bryony Onciul's (2015) engagement zone builds upon Clifford's contact zone but explores "the inter-community work that occurs within cross-cultural engagement and is prominent in community controlled grass-root community developments" (Onciul 2015, 82). This concept includes a spectrum of engagement from tokenism to community control and accounts for the agency of participants and inevitable power fluctuations within the conceptual, physical and temporal space created within the engagement zone (Onciul 2015, 82). Inter-community work acknowledges the fluidity and dynamism of communities as indiscrete objects to be collected for insight, recognizing how everyone comes into an engagement zone with their own expectations and requirements (Onciul 2015, 87). Onciul's concept realizes that, while museums remain cultural authorities, the

Indigenous communities involved retain some level of agency and power because of the value placed on their knowledge and perspectives (Onciul 2015, 86). The location of power is constantly shifting as it is claimed, negotiated and exchanged during the process; and notions of power and authority are also questioned, thus changing the roles and status of people within the zone (Onciul 2015, 85). The engagement zone acknowledges the unmapped and unpredictable nature of engagement that constantly changes with the movement of individuals in and out of the zone (Onciul 2015, 83, 85). It also is a space in which "knowledge can be temporarily and/or permanently interpreted and translated," meaning that the translation occurs to ease understanding for those without the cultural capital necessary to grasp these alternative perspectives and can be returned to and renegotiated as needed (Onciul 2015, 83, 85). The performance of "on" and "off stage" culture can be shared and discussed to facilitate better understanding of cultural values, but these off stage cultural expressions can also be addressed as sensitive information that is not meant for public reproduction (Onciul 2015, 83). Finally, she notes the potential influence that actor-network theory can have on Western academia and museum work by providing a deeper understanding of Indigenous epistemology and the interconnectedness of agency in human and non-human actors thereby developing the necessary concepts to understand the connections between representation and cross-cultural competency and the lived experience of people (2015, 86).

Onciul refers to Shyrock's definition of "off-stage" in her writing on the engagement zone and the disclosing of cultural information. According to Andrew Shryock,

61

the production of identities meant to be public, that have publicity as part of their function, will create, of necessity, a special terrain of things, relations, and activities that cannot themselves be public but are essential aspects of whatever reality and value public things might possess. This terrain is the 'off stage' area in which the explicitly public is made, even staged, before it is shown. Though not universally 'private'—it can include entire national communities, ethnoracial minorities, socioeconomic classes, religious movements, and global diasporas of almost any kind—this terrain can never be fully transparent, and it is often a site of social intimacy (2004, 3).

The "off stage" performance of culture that occurs in the backstage areas of collaboration with communities is often sensitive and not meant for mass consumption, but it also aids in understanding the culture when necessary. The engagement zone allows for these performances to occur in a safe space, and for qualities of such performances to be negotiated before being made public.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

This research project began with a desire to understand collaboration as it is enacted between museums. A great deal of research and scholarly writing has been produced about collaboration, especially as it is used to describe the interactions between a museum and a source community, which Peers and Brown (2003, 1) define as the peoples to whom objects in collections belong. These past case studies review and refine how collaboration should be done. It is a complex process that has come to be a cornerstone of contemporary museum practice (Phillips and Anderson 2011; Kreps 2003a). Museum and community collaborations are the typical form of museum engagement and have been frequently discussed in the literature (Peers and Brown 2003; Simpson 1996; Shannon 2014; Phillips and Anderson 2011). What is not largely available, however, are studies concerning collaborations between museums. This research, therefore, is concerned with these inter-museum collaborations.

Denver, Colorado is home to several well-known museums and cultural organizations. These institutions have received many awards for their work and they are pillars of the Denver community. They also are member organizations of a tax district and partnership called the Scientific and Cultural Facilities District (see Background). Under the SCFD, museums and cultural organizations are encouraged to work with one

another and participate in city-wide Free Days and other events. Free Days are when the member organizations of SCFD provide free/discounted admission, these days are funded by the tax district (scfd.org, accessed 4/14/2019).

To better understand how museums and other cultural organizations collaborated with one another, I sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What is collaboration and how do museum professionals define it on their own terms?

2. What are the benefits to creating a network of inter-museum collaboration, both for the institutions involved and for the communities affected?

3. What would this network of collaboration between museums look like?

These questions were answered through a literature review of case studies concerning collaboration, semi-structured interviews and participant observation.

Site Selection

Museo de las Americas (Museo) was selected as the main site of study based on various factors. The first factor was my internship at Museo, which began in April and ended in August of 2018. During that period, I worked in the education department preparing for and running the ninth annual summer Arts + Culture Camp, organizing supplies for and attending many events, and researching topics related to educational workshops and current and upcoming exhibits. As an intern, I developed relationships with my coworkers and learned a great deal about how the museum operated. These relationships helped me in my research because my coworkers became interested in what I was doing and were more than willing to help. Even after my internship finished, I was brought on as a Maestra (teacher) and continued to work with Museo and interact with

the people who had been kind enough to include me. The museum's proximity to the

University of Denver made it easily accessible, and its location in downtown Denver

meant that it was nearby the Golden Triangle where several other museums are located.

Museo de las Americas is a small museum, with one main gallery and two

adjoining smaller rooms, located within the Santa Fe Arts District. This district is located

on Santa Fe drive and is lined with art galleries, artist studios, craft stores, coffee shops,

Latino and other ethnic restaurants. It is an eclectic space with a wide variety of

entertainment possibilities. There is a large Latino population in the surrounding

neighborhood. Museo de las Americas is located within the community and permanently

staffed by people identifying as Latina and Chicana, though there is a rotating spectrum

of volunteers and interns, as well as donors and board members who may identify

differently. The museum is dedicated "to educating our community through collecting,

preserving, interpreting and exhibiting the diverse arts and cultures of the Americas from

ancient to contemporary, through innovative exhibits and programs" (museo.org,

accessed 12/20/2019). The mission of Museo reflects the rationale of community

museums to represent those who have not historically been represented in mainstream

museums, to educate about a culture that has been either mis-or underrepresented, and to

better serve the community in question by providing a safe space for members of the

community (Simpson 1996; Isaac 2007; Kurin 1997; Kreps 2003b).

Research Population

The participants in this study were staff at Museo de las Americas, Denver

Museum of Nature and Science, Denver Botanic Gardens, and the Museum of

Contemporary Art. I had initially identified the staff at Museo de las Americas from the

museum's website. The ones who agreed to participate in my research included the Education Director, Education Coordinator, Collections Manager and Registrar and the Development Coordinator. From the Education Director I learned of other people whom she has worked with at other institutions. She put me in touch with each one, via an email introduction before I reached out with my letter of intent. Through this snowball sampling, I interviewed the Manager of Programs at the Museum of Contemporary Art, the Partnership Programs Coordinator at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science, and both the Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility and the Community Relations Manager at the Denver Botanic Gardens.

Though the roles of each person are similar in that they are either part of education, engagement or programming, the direction and focus that is undertaken in this work differs from museum to museum depending on the mission statement and goals of each institution. Throughout the course of conducting research, I learned that the title of the position and the description on the museum website did not necessarily depict what is entailed in each role; each person does more than what is described and changes course throughout their time at the museum.

At Museo de las Americas, the Education Director and Education Coordinator work closely together to develop educational workshops and art activities. The Education Director establishes relationships with donors and other people in similar positions at different museums. She also works on creating curricula for area schools within the Denver metro area. The Education Coordinator organizes the Maestrxs, the teachers who facilitate the arts and culture workshops, coordinates with teachers and schools on scheduling workshops, and keeps track of the education department expenses. The

Development Coordinator is responsible for fundraising, sponsorships, donors and members at Museo de las Americas. She organizes fundraising events, sends out email questionnaires about how Museo can improve their donor base, and gathers general feedback on its impact, she also solicits advice on what the museum can do better or how it can be improved.

In the other institutions, I did not have a first-hand experience of what each person did and relied upon their own descriptions of what they are responsible for in their respective roles. The Manager of Programs at the Museum of Contemporary Art is responsible for the adolescent youth and adult programming at the MCA. The Partnerships Programs Coordinator at Denver Museum of Nature and Science considers himself to be the "programs specialist to external partnerships programs coordinator." He oversees two grant funded programs, ensures the smooth operation of the SCFD Free Days and Night at the Museum, and the museum's community fair and festival presence. The Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility at Denver Botanic Gardens oversees the marketing and communications relationships, promotes the gardens, builds relationships and partnerships and generally expands the social reach of the gardens in the Denver area. The Community Relations Manager at Denver Botanic Gardens works in the same department as the Director of Marking and Social Responsibility, but she handles community relationships and partnerships with external community organizations.

Methodology

Zina O'Leary defines methodology as the "overarching macro-level frameworks that offer principles of reasoning associated with particular paradigmatic assumptions that legitimate various schools of research" (2010, 88). In other words, methodology is the rationale informing research. Informed by Laura Nader's "Studying Up" (1972) and Jennifer Shannon's ethnography with experts (2014), this research project sought to understand how museums work with one another by studying the museum as an institution rather than the people as has been the convention within anthropology.

Studying Up

Laura Nader's influential article, *Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained from Studying Up* (1972), concerns the anthropologist studying up in their own society—a stark contrast from the tradition in anthropology of studying the marginalized "Other" belonging to a different culture. She notes there is an urgency to the kind of anthropological study concerning power and power structures within our own society, which is reflected in a turn to studying the professional organization or institutional sphere of our society beginning in the 1970s, though the field of researching expertise gained its "distinctive shape" in the 1990s (Nader 1972; Boyer 2015, 588). This turn to our own society inverts the traditional structure of the anthropologist embedded within a power structure that is typical of fieldwork with other cultures. She poses the question: "what if, in reinventing anthropology, anthropologists were to study the colonizers rather than the colonized, the culture of power rather than the culture of the powerless, the culture of affluence rather than the culture of poverty?" (Nader 1972, 5). This field of study opened a new set of questions and perspectives that asks one to consider, are the

problems we see at the bottom level of society a direct effect of the decisions made at the top? By studying up, the anthropologist makes the complexities of social hierarchies accessible to the public, a "democratic framework" that creates a more informed citizen within society (Nader 1972, 11).

The museum's long history of being an authoritative and educational institution places the institution in a position of power. Powerful because it controls knowledge production and cultural discourse through the creation of meaning enacted in the recontextualization of objects in exhibits (Hall 2013, xxi, 3-4). This connection thereby makes the museum a suitable site for studying up in my own society; additionally, as a student of museum anthropology who works in museums, the museum community is my community.

Ethnography with Experts

The people who were involved in this study are museum professionals, and some are members of the Latino community they aim to serve, therefore they were considered as professional and cultural experts for the purposes of my research. Inspired by Jennifer Shannon's discussion regarding the ethnography of experts in her own research at the National Museum of the American Indian (NMAI), as well as Dominic Boyer's article *Anthropological Approaches to Expertise*, the framework concerning research with experts informed my social interactions in interviews and observations, as well as my analysis of the resulting data.

Expertise was not, and still is not, easily defined within anthropology (Boyer 2015, 588). Though notions of cultural expertise are evident in the works of E. Evans-Pritchard and Clifford Geertz, cultural expertise is not commonly acknowledged as being

on the same level of professional expertise in the Western cannon of anthropological research (Boyer 2015, 589). Dominic Boyer suggests that the heightened urgency and motivation to do research regarding experts and expertise arose after Laura Nader's urging to "study up" during the 1970s and the "reflexive turn" inspired by seminal works like James Clifford and George Marcus' 1986 *Writing Culture*, resulting in an explosion of anthropological interest in expertise in the 1990s and 2000s (2015, 589). As noted earlier, Nader urged the study of one's own society, and the reflexive turn brought awareness to the colonial history of anthropology and one's own effects on research (Silverman 2015, 2; Nicks 2003, 20; Kreps 2003a, 314). Holmes and Marcus, quoted in Boyer, note that the turn towards studying experts "inevitably bring[s] anthropological knowledge into disquieting but generative juxtaposition with other modes of expert knowledge, which exist outside the wetworks [*sic*] and institutions of academic anthropology" (2015, 590). In other words, research regarding experts is a kind of collaboration, a new way of producing knowledge that includes other perspectives that may not have been considered within the tradition of anthropology. This kind of research disrupts the traditional "we/they" dichotomy of anthropological fieldwork and rethinks participants and contributors in research as counterparts and equals (Boyer 2015, 590).

Shannon mentions this disrupted dichotomy while working with cultural experts and museum professionals during the creation of the *Our Lives* exhibit at the NMAI. Past anthropological analysis has been dependent upon a distance between the researcher and the subject of study, a distance that disappears when conducting research with experts (Shannon 2014, 15). My research was conducted within the boundaries of my own society and mostly over the course of a year, inherently lacking the typical analytical and

epistemological distance of anthropological research. Shannon recognized that the community curators and museum professionals involved in the creation of the exhibit were "treated equally: they have all been engaged and invited to interpret the exhibition and its process and impact," also recognizing her own involvement in the same way within the curation of *Our Lives* (2014, 16). She notes that she would share her analyses with her coworkers and they would puzzle over notions of collaboration and community curating (2014, 16). In my own research, I found myself talking through ideas with my coworkers who were also contributors in my research as well as with the other contributors I had learned of through the Education Director at Museo de las Americas. During our conversations, I found that my contributors were sharing their own insights and reflections on past experiences, thinking through them and analyzing them with me.

Collaboration Continuum

My understanding of collaboration derives primarily from Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson's (2008) continuum of collaboration. Insight gained from the literature confirmed that collaboration is complex and constantly changing (Silverman 2015; Onciul 2015). Instead of a clearly defined road map with progressive steps to follow, collaboration is more like a winding road that doubles back and forth. Therefore, Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008) created a continuum that allows for this constant change that is characteristic of the practice.

Table 4.1: Continuum of Collaboration (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008, 11)

Resistance	Participation	Collaboration
Goals develop in opposition	Goals develop independently	Goals develop jointly
Information is secreted	Information is disclosed	Information flows freely
No stakeholder involvement	Limited stakeholder involvement	Full stakeholder involvement
No voice for stakeholders	Some voice for stakeholders	Full voice for stakeholders
No support is given/obtained	Support is solicited	Support is tacit
Needs of others unconsidered	Needs of most parties mostly met	Needs of all parties realized

The features on the side address the questions of the process such as: how do the goals develop, how does information flow among stakeholders, how are stakeholders involved, how is support gained among stakeholders and what needs are considered (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008, 10). The authors emphasize that relations of community and power are formed at each level, though in different ways and for different needs (2008, 12). Within the category of resistance (to collaboration), community identity and power relations arise out of opposition; in collaboration they arise out of synergy because power is shared and mutual trust informs the relationship between participants and creates a community of practice (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008, 12). This continuum was used to help analyze the collaborative process as laid out by my contributors to determine the level of engagement that typically occurs.

Participant Observation and Semi-Structured Interviews

The two main methods used for the purposes of this research were participant observation and semi-structured interviews. Both methods were selected as the most

appropriate options to collect information because it would otherwise be difficult to reduce the complexities of collaboration and human interaction down to variables and numbers. Participant observation and semi-structured interviews require accessibility to the field and have the potential to provide a first-hand account of the subject of study.

Participant observation is the foundation of cultural anthropology fieldwork (Bernard 2011, 275). It involves immersing oneself completely in the culture being studied, learning to critically analyze what is seen and heard and gaining the rapport and trust of the community (Bernard 2011, 275, 277). This method of research "produces the kind of experiential knowledge that lets you talk convincingly" about the subject of your research (Bernard 2011, 275).

Semi-structured interviews are typically used when there is no likely chance for another interview (Bernard 2011, 172). Interview guides are created for these kinds of interviews that specify an order to asking questions and can provide reliable qualitative data (Bernard 2011, 173). I created a set of interview questions (Appendix A) for contributors from Museo de las Americas and a separate set of questions (Appendix B) for contributors from other Denver institutions. Each guide had eight questions, with pre-set probe suggestions for a question that would likely have a follow-up. These probing questions were usually along the lines of "can you elaborate on that?" or "what would that look like?" Though the guide was there to provide a direction to the interview, conversation would sometimes take a turn and the question guide would become irrelevant. In this case, the interviews became a slightly more unstructured and informal as I explored different areas of the tangent that had been initiated.

I kept a field notebook to record all my observation and interview notes. Field notes would be entered with the date and time. Interviews were notated with the person's name, their position at the museum, and the date and time of the interview. Field notes are a researcher's main database as they contain the thoughts, questions, comments and other concerns that arise during fieldwork (Bernard 2011, 312). Interviews were recorded using both the field book for notes and questions that popped up during conversation, as well as a digital recorder. The recorder provides a verbatim account of the interview that is more difficult to attain with mere pen and paper. These interviews were then transcribed over a period of two months.

Data Collection

As with all students conducting research involving human subjects at the University of Denver, I completed an application to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval of my research. The IRB is primarily an ethics committee, which is detailed below in the Ethical Considerations section. The application is meant to ensure that the research idea has been thought out, ethics have been considered and to make sure that recruitment material is clear, concise, and presents the research topic in a way that is not confusing to the potential contributor. Objectives for the research are carefully examined, the population must be identified, the site listed, length of research and methods of collection explained. Once this application is approved, research can begin.

My primary role when I started as an intern in the education department at Museo de las Americas was to assist with the promotion and organization of their Summer Arts + Culture Camp. The camp was set to begin the last week of June and go through to the second week of July, five weeks in total. During these five weeks, there were nearly one

hundred children, the oldest of whom was fourteen, in the museum every day from nine o'clock in the morning to noon. Though these children were not in any way be a part of my study, I was wary of conducting research during this time. I decided to conduct my research during the month of August (though some interviews spilled over into September due to scheduling conflicts), when camp-related activities died down. August was also the last month of my internship. By this time, I had stable connections to the museum and had gotten to know the staff members well. As an intern my duties ranged from researching recycling options to assisting with research for educational materials. I often helped prepare for events such as Noche de Museo, Museo de las Americas' annual fundraising event, and volunteered my time as a representative of Museo de las Americas at Mother's Day activities at the Re:Vision Co-Op and Golden History Museum's Golden City Trading Post field day. Being a small community museum with a small number of staff, days at Museo were often chaotic and busy. Finding time to sit and write down observations as part of my "fieldwork" was nearly impossible to do while at work, so most of my observation and field notes were recorded at the end of the day.

Interviews were similarly difficult to organize due to the hectic nature of scheduling for museum professionals. Emails were scripted beforehand and sent in to IRB as part of the application. These emails stated the objectives of my research, emphasizing that participation was voluntary and one could choose not to be included. The emails also explained that, since I was not being funded, there was to be no incentive for participating—though I was offering to buy them coffee. Additionally, I specified that the location of the interview could happen wherever the potential contributor wished. It did not have to be in their office at their respective museum. When someone responded

that they were willing to participate, a date and time for the interview was coordinated. Often, I got a list of dates and times they were free and attempted to fit my own schedule around this. From the people I knew at Museo de las Americas, I learned the names of other people at local museums I could talk to for my research. This is known as snowball sampling and can greatly increase the number of contributors in a research project.

Of the nine permanent staff I approached at Museo de las Americas, four responded that they would be willing to participate. Three had decided to do the interview at the institution itself, only one opted for meeting elsewhere. Before the interview I had my contributors sign a consent form (Appendix C), further agreeing to their voluntary participation, once again detailing the objectives of the research, who to contact if there were any concerns or questions, how data was to be recorded, and how they would be identified in my research analysis. They could agree to this or decline, sign their name, and I would send them a copy for their own records. A consent form is used to protect both the researcher and the contributor from any issues or concerns that arise during the period of research (Fluehr-Lobban 2003). Once the form was signed, I would ask if it was okay to start recording and begin. I started each interview asking the person to state their position, then I followed my interview guide. Due to the unpredictable nature of conversation, I had to adjust some questions and skip around so as not to be repetitive or ask something that had already been addressed. One interview was interrupted twice, the time and extent of which were noted in the interview transcripts. The one member of Museo who decided to meet elsewhere suggested we meet at a Starbucks near where she was working that day, far on the North end of Denver. There was no room at the Starbucks so we went next door to a fast food restaurant. The

restaurant was playing loud music, which was initially a concern, so I placed the recorder as close to my contributor and took more detailed notes during the interview. During transcription, however, I noticed the music did not affect the voices coming through the recording.

Contacts made through the staff at Museo all decided to meet at their own institutions, aside from one. The Manager of Programs at the Museum of Contemporary Art suggested a phone interview would be easier, so we set a date and time and I called her from my apartment. The Community Relations Manager at Denver Botanic Gardens suggested sitting at the outdoor café in the gardens since it was a nice day. We were interrupted once by a server, which was also noted in the interview transcript. I met with the Partnership Programs Coordinator at Denver Museum of Nature and Science in a large atrium off the Planetarium. This room has high ceilings and was a little loud due to the screaming kids and families in the museum that day. This wound up to not be a problem for the recording.

Data Analysis

Interviews were transcribed over the course of two months. After transcribing, I printed out each interview and began coding them. I used colored highlighters and pens to code the main categories I had identified within my interview questions. There were six initial categories: definition of collaboration, benefits, challenges, past collaborations, process and key points/advice. These categories corresponded to the kinds of questions that were asked. After coding with the different colors, I went back to the digital documents and reprinted each interview on single-sided paper. I had taped together three sheets of paper (8.5"x14") lengthwise, folding them at approximate widths of letter paper

(8.5"x11"). At the top of each section I wrote the six categories identified above. Using the color coded interviews, I identified the quotes on the second set of printed interviews, cutting out the necessary quotes and taping them within their corresponding section on the longer sheet of paper. I printed the interviews twice to keep the original quote within its conversational context should I need it, and to manipulate the quotes on a wider scale so I could make connections and identify themes more easily.

Once the quotes were placed in their spots, I then read through the quotes again. This second time I identified key points that were frequently mentioned. I identified themes based on key words or concepts that were mentioned most frequently within the quotes. These themes correlate to broad, overarching ideas of the benefits or challenges of collaboration. Some of the information obtained in my interviews, such as detailing the process of collaboration and past collaborators, were not coded in this way. The processes were compiled and compared to illustrate similarities and differences in the process on a case-by-case basis. As for the past collaborations, these were used to provide examples that helped to illustrate ideas identified in the process or certain benefits and challenges. Finally, I created a wordcloud to gain a better understanding of my contributor's definition of collaboration. A wordcloud is a visual representation of text that identifies the most frequently used words. The more frequently a word is used, the larger it appears within the representation. The less frequently a word is used, it appears smaller in the image. This was done to identify the key components of collaboration according to my contributor's definitions, which would provide insight into their worldview and conceptualization of the term. From this definition, as well as descriptions of the collaborative process, I attempted to identify what mode of engagement was most

frequently used according to Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson's (2008) continuum of collaboration.

Ethical Considerations

Throughout the course of my research I followed the Principles of Professional Responsibility of the American Anthropological Association. There are seven main criteria,

> (1) Do No Harm, (2) be open and honest regarding your work, (3) obtain informed consent and necessary permissions, (4) weigh competing ethical obligations due collaborators and affected parties, (5) make your results accessible, (6) protect and preserve your records, and (7) maintain respectful and ethical professional relationships. (American Anthropological Association, website 2018, accessed 2/23/2019)

At the outset of my research I aimed to help Museo de las Americas and any other contributors in any way possible. The goals of this research were to explore museum-museum collaboration and showcase the people and museums involved as knowledgeable resources and advisors. This study is a critical look at how museums collaborate with one another, not a critique of the people involved, nor on the institutions. It offers a chance for reflection.

I informed everyone at Museo de las Americas of my intentions during the final month of my internship, sought and received approval from the Executive Director before my research began, and informed my other contributors what I was doing before interviews were conducted. I shared my chapters on the findings and analysis, as well as the conclusion, with my contributors for their input. Their advice and feedback is important because this is about their own work, their institutions and I value their opinions. A few of my contributors expressed interest in hearing more about what I was

doing as I progressed and I kept in touch, primarily with Museo, throughout the course of writing this thesis.

All my data was made secure during my research. Recordings were transferred to a thumb drive and deleted from the device after each interview. The thumb drive was kept on my person at all times. Transcripts were saved directly to the thumb drive as well. My field book never left my possession and was read by no one but myself. Once my research was completed, as stated in my application to the IRB, these files were destroyed.

My relationships with the people at Museo de las Americas began as professional relationships, and they remained as such throughout the course of my research. Though my time as an intern at the museum had ended, I stayed on as a Maestra (teacher) and continued to interact with everyone at Museo. I did not breach their trust or go against my word in any way. Though I would occasionally hear gossip during my time at Museo, and sometimes this would work its way into my interviews, I did not include this in my results. These are personal opinions that were expressed between coworkers and I did not want to include anything that could potentially cause harm to any person or institution involved.

Positionality

I am the youngest of two children to a middle class family in the South. My sister is two years older than me and works as a nurse. My mother is a life-long government employee and my father took care of my sister and I until my last year of high school. He has since gone back to teaching and has been working in the Maker community for the past few years. My family has moved across the country twice for my mother's job. I

have lived in and grown up on both coasts of the United States. My life has been marked by road trips up and down the East Coast and across the country, I have visited nearly every state and seen the diverse landscapes of this country. Through these road trips I learned to occupy myself with books, which have been a passion of mine since I learned to read. Books have been my refuge and my escape, they have inspired me to learn about the peoples and cultures of this world and the stories they tell, particularly Latin America, Ireland, Scotland, Spain, France and other Francophone countries.

Our last name derives from the Basque language, roughly translating to "abundance of small courtyards/squares" and variations of it is surprisingly shared among many families of Hispanic descent. My mother's maiden name has roots in the French, Welsh and Celtic languages with different meanings in each language—either elm, oak or snake. My father's family more recently originates from Peru. My mother's side of the family is Scandinavian, Welsh, Scottish, Irish, English—predominantly Northwestern European, which dominates my genetics. I do not identify as Latina. I took French for six years instead of Spanish. However, I am slowly teaching myself Spanish and being immersed in the language the way I am at Museo has helped me pick up the language a little easier.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This research sought to explore how museums collaborate with one another. The initial research objectives sought to address this by asking: what is collaboration? How do my contributors define collaboration? If collaboration, as a model described by Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008), is what occurs in these inter-museum partnerships? What does an inter-museum collaboration look like? What are the benefits and challenges of such a practice? The observational knowledge I developed while interning within the education department at Museo de las Americas during the summer of 2018 revealed how inter-museum partnerships are being created and maintained. This research explored these relationships more in depth to understand how these relationships functioned, what became of them, and how they influenced museum operations such as programs, events and exhibits. The four people from Museo who agreed to participate in my research worked in collections, development, and education departments. The other people with whom I met outside of Museo at DMNS, MCA and the Gardens were part of a similar network of museum educators, programs and community engagement coordinators. This characteristic subsequently directed my attention towards

programming, education and engagement as the primary sources or motivators of inter-museum partnerships and collaborations.

Programming and engagement departments within museums are geared towards the public and enriching museum experiences by providing additional opportunities to learn about and engage with the subjects displayed in the museum (Hein 1998). Service to the public and opening the museum to the public are integral parts of the "new museum" and critical museum practice (Ames 1992; Macdonald 2011; Hein 1998). This is done by providing additional educational resources, inspiring individual interest, being more transparent about museum practice, opening up the museum's collections and resources to the visitor, and including community voice within the museum (Ames 1992; Macdonald 2011; Marstine 2008). My research discovered, through the collaboration of different museums' education and engagement departments, that museums are not only "doing diversity" by incorporating different perspectives from minority groups, but they are also addressing the community's cultural, social, and educational enrichment. I propose that this collaborative work, while intrinsically democratic and inclusive, is a form of "curating community." I borrow this term from Stacy Douglas (2017) and Kelley Hays-Gilpin and Ramson Lomatewama (2013) to refer to how the inter-museum collaborations presented in my research ultimately contribute to the social and cultural wellbeing of a community, that the programs and events that are often the outcome help to build and grow community. This idea is further discussed later in the chapter. "Curating community" is achieved through actively seeking out organizations that do specific cultural work related to a theme to provide more appropriate and relevant

perspectives, and by asking and listening to various communities about what the museum can do to fulfill their specific community needs.

The organization of this chapter follows the order of my research questions. I explored how my contributors defined collaboration and what it means within their specific contexts. Their role as community engagement and education staff within their respective museums caused their definitions to slightly differ from those provided in the literature. The next section summarizes the process of inter-museum collaboration. I did not observe the process first-hand, therefore I am relying on my contributors' reflections on their experiences and what they generally go through when engaging with another museum or cultural organization. My description of the process is by default slightly vague and provides a general overview. Finally, I discuss the benefits and challenges of inter-museum collaboration. The overarching benefit is how these relationships continue to democratize the museum. Themes of inclusivity and diversity, sharing knowledge and reflexivity also emerged as benefits of inter-museum collaboration. The challenges that were identified are essentially the downside of each benefit, for example miscommunications, institutional differences and personality clashes. The remainder of this chapter constitutes my analysis of what I discovered by tying back to critical museology, the model of a constructivist museum, and further exploring how inter-museum collaborative work contributes to the social and cultural wellbeing of community.

Findings

This section presents the overarching categories and themes that emerged from the eight interviews I conducted. A definition of collaboration was asked for in each

interview from the perspective of each contributor informed by their own experiences. These definitions were collated into a single document and were used to create a wordcloud. The wordcloud was generated online through a freely available generator (https://www.wordclouds.com/). Wordclouds are useful when trying to understand the significance of certain words or ideas within a complex concept—to gain insight into the worldview of a group of people. The larger the word appears in the cloud, the more frequently it is used and the more significance is placed upon it. One of the main problems with generating a wordcloud is that it focuses on the frequency of word use. This means that filler words and modifiers, which were used often, appeared larger in the cloud and skewed the ideas represented. My contributors also often rephrased my question and used collaboration multiple times during their discussion. This meant that initial attempts to create a wordcloud showed collaboration as the most frequent word, therefore larger and more significant. The wordcloud that was finally produced was the eighth attempt.

Figure 5.1 Wordcloud showing frequency of times a word was mentioned In my contributors' definitions of collaboration.

To better organize and understand the definition of collaboration per my contributors, I created a table identifying different levels of significance for each word.

Table 5.1: Significant words in definition of collaboration separated by level of frequency

Motivating factors	Help, audience(s), together
Objectives	Reach, building, common, ideas, support
How is it achieved?	Programs, resources, projects, event, sharing, partnerships, organization, staff, hear, time, contributions, network
Who is it directed at? What is involved?	Community, group, voice(s), stakeholders, teamwork, relationship, conversations, investing, grow, transformed, translated, workshops, stronger, authentic

Put together, these words all speak to the intricacies of collaboration. All the definitions included the motivations for collaborating with another institution, the goals for collaboration, briefly mentioned parts of the process and desired outcomes, what is involved, and those that would be affected by the outcomes of a collaboration between museums.

My contributors all hold positions where the public is at the front of their attention for any aspect of their work. Whether it is the public as consumer, as student, or as contributor, public service and growth are evidently key considerations in these museums' collaborative projects. Additionally, helping one another by working together was reiterated by many of my contributors; as the Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility at the Botanic Gardens noted "joining forces, I mean the whole cliché that you're stronger together than you are separately, is just true" (Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility, DBG 2018). The Education Director at Museo identifies one of the major motivating factors as "you get to learn from others and you see things that maybe you didn't see…when I sit down on collaboration projects I think just hearing ideas—

other ideas that you've never thought of from other people is always exciting" (Education

Director, Museo 2018).

These institutions are all united by the Scientific and Cultural Facilities District

(SCFD), a partnership that encourages and supports collaboration between its member

organizations. The Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS and the Director of

Marketing and Social Responsibility at DBG state that, since there is a network of

museums already in existence, "why not help each other out?" Though the institutions

involved could be said to be competing for similar audiences, they decided to work

together to expand and enrich their audiences rather than continuing to uphold the

capitalist, consumerist ideal that a larger audience for one museum means losing numbers

at another. The Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS elaborated on this supposed

competition, noting that he

> genuinely feel[s] like Denver and Colorado is a bit more collaborative and a bit
> more…like if we work together, even though we're going for the same thing, we
> could be stronger. It's a bit more "social insect" and…that's a genuinely unique
> thing about here and Colorado…[is] a bit more collaboration and partnership than
> most other places. Most other places—they don't work together. (Partnership
> Programs Coordinator, DMNS 2018)

Indeed "reach" and "growth" are mentioned several times in the definitions provided. It

is evident that such work is genuinely oriented towards the betterment of audience

experience and opportunity.

"Authenticity," and variations thereupon, was mentioned a few times by the

Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility and the Community Relations Manager

at the Gardens, the Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS and the Manager of

Programs at MCA. This term has been problematized in the field of anthropology, art

88

history, and culture studies for its typical association with "real" as compared to "not real." Mari Carmen Ramirez writes from the standpoint that the transculturation of Mexican society renders "authenticity" invalid (1992, 64). She traces the history of "authenticity" to its roots as a "Romantic construct with no basis in the culture in which it is supposed to reside" (1992, 64). Guillermo Gomez Peña writes that the Western understanding of identity and culture as a closed system perpetuates this idea of authenticity as being something that corresponds to stability in culture (1996, 185). This kind of perspective ignores historical influences on a society and culture thereby rendering anything produced from historical change inauthentic. In relation to the trade system on African art, Steiner (1994) deliberates on three modes of art manipulation that twist the definition of authenticity. If the object is "uncovered" within what is thought to be the original context or natural setting of the object (say, in its home country), the object is thought to be more authentic, therefore real (Steiner 1994, 154). In this case, authenticity refers to the original, real, culturally specific placement of the object within time and space. If an object is "marked,"—meaning an artist has signed their product— it is understood as more authentic than an unmarked piece (Steiner 1994, 159). On the other hand, the marking of said object spoils it and renders it inauthentic (Steiner 1994, 159). These contestations of authenticity illustrate that the term is a construct referring to an ideal that does not exist. Authenticity is not universally applicable, either, because culture is not static—it is constructed and influenced by historical, social and political pressures.

While "authentic" has been used to judge "originality" or "realness" and associate material with a certain value over another, the way my contributors used the term has a

different implication. The Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility at the Gardens

defines authenticity as showing the public that

> you've done your homework, you've engaged the people who have something
> meaningful and current to contribute...making sure that we're presenting
> information from the source, I guess…it's important for us to be true to the
> traditions of Dia de los Muertos and to educate a wider population that may not be
> familiar with the traditions, and then to resonate with people who are familiar and
> honor whatever their experience has been. (Director of Marketing and Social
> Responsibility, DBG 2018)

Similarly, the Community Relations Manager at the Gardens recognized her own

capacity to spearhead an event as the sole person in charge and how collaboration helps

to implement a program or event by "building relationships with outside partners,

individuals, or museums to help grow the event and to help keep it truly

authentic…because different voices help continue making it successful" (Community

Relations Manager, DBG 2018). The Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS defines

authenticity as

> listening to community, listening to Community with a capital 'C' and listening to
> communities and hearing what do they want? What do they need? And how the
> museum can, through its mission, address and work with them. There's the
> concept of inclusion, this idea that we're not doing something for you without
> you, and for community groups we are going and listening… (Partnership
> Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018)

At the MCA, the Manager of Programs used "authentic" to emphasize collaboration as an

inclusive practice that actively engages with the communities in question to do right by

them—a genuine consideration of inclusivity. She commented that

> when you collaborate, it gives you a chance to kind of check yourself and say…
> what voices are represented and what voices are not represented and how do we
> do that within our program, not just to kind of do it to hit numbers or like, check a
> box, but how do we do that in an authentic way? (Manager of Programs, MCA
> 2018)

The way my contributors used "authentic" mostly correlates to maintaining a sense of dignity or integrity in the programming by ensuring that those who live those experiences and have a stake in the subject in question have been included. By dignity and integrity I mean that, instead of appropriating a tradition and presenting the popular culture conceptions of its practices, the museum tries to provide a substantial interpretation. This would include seeking different perspectives and ensuring that as many voices as possible are included so that what is represented reflects actual experience, not just what outsiders to that culture think. It is a way of maintaining agency of a community over the representation of a tradition or experience.

The definitions of collaboration my contributors provided me illustrated their position on the practice and identifies their main goals. My questions were initially structured to identify six main categories of information: definition of collaboration, benefits, challenges, process, past collaborations, and key points or words of advice. Not every question was asked in the same order, nor was every question explicitly asked. These categories were then broken down into themes that emerged from our conversations. Within benefits were: leveraging strengths, democratization and inclusion, reflexivity, growth (of the community), institutional visibility, and the sharing of resources such as space, knowledge and funding. Some of the challenges include institutional differences in structure, size and policy, managing expectations, difficulty communicating, and personality clashes and questionable intent. The remainder of this section will address the process of collaboration as depicted in my interviews and will provide evidence for the themes mentioned above.

What a collaboration between museums and cultural organizations looks like

Within Museo are different structures of the collaborative process, depending on the departments involved and the identified goal or outcome of the collaboration. The general process involves creating or developing an idea, identifying the decision-maker in the stakeholder institution, scheduling meetings and working towards implementing the idea (usually considering the cost of implementation, planning how it will play out and the capacity in which each institution works within that idea), one or two departments are usually involved (Department Coordinator, Museo 2018; Education Director, Museo 2018; Collections Manager and Registrar, Museo 2018). Regarding exhibits and collections, the Collections Manager and Registrar at Museo adds: an idea is formed (usually in a discussion between herself and the Executive Director of the museum, though sometimes it is created individually), a place is chosen for the new exhibit and the cultural liaison is identified and contacted, she puts together an exhibit of six to fourteen pieces, and creates interpretive labels to go with them (Collections Manager and Registrar, Museo 2018). The education department is usually brought in to create or identify workshops that complement the exhibit, then the Collections Manager and Registrar brings the materials over to the receiving institution, she then installs the exhibit and it is up for ten to fourteen weeks (Collections Manager and Registrar, Museo 2018). This was the process in creating exhibits for *Museo Sin Fronteras*, (Museums without Borders) a travelling exhibit program that gets the collection into the public: "Because it's about not only just getting the collection out there but just allowing people to know about us" (Collections Manager and Registrar, Museo 2018). These exhibits are seen as an extension of Museo de las Americas within a different space or institution.

The education department is partially dependent on partnerships and collaborations with outside institutions and organizations. These relationships are not necessarily always with other museums or cultural organizations, but with school districts and other non-profit groups that provide resources and other forms of aid for schools and minority populations. This network of people is important for the continued success of educational and outreach programming because of the resources they provide. It helps provide contacts for schools, sponsors and donors that provide additional funding for Museo's program offerings that directly benefit the community. Contacts with schools in the area create a large network of places where Maestrxs (teachers) can facilitate arts and culture workshops, thereby increasing Museo's visibility and reach in the Denver area.

Another example, which the Community Relations Manager at the Botanic Gardens described, illustrated the specifics of coordinating the annual SCFD Showcase and partnering with SCFD member organizations. The event started about five years ago on a small square of garden space downtown called the Garden Block. The Gardens partnered with the Downtown Denver Partnership to bring awareness to this space, to make it more visible to the public, and that the Gardens' horticulture staff were down there planting a variety of plants and flowers from different seasons. This block acted as an extension of the Gardens that was more directly in the public eye and the Gardens decided to increase the utility of this space and add programming. The Gardens partnered with SCFD to invite member organizations to the block so they could "highlight the breadth and diversity of SCFD organizations" (Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018). The showcase grew in popularity over the next few years until it became a safety concern to continue hosting the event in the block downtown—which was on 16th street

mall in downtown Denver—so after two years a decision was made to move the showcase to the Gardens.

Through this Showcase—and the subsequent partnerships created with other SCFD member organizations—the Gardens has learned about the needs and requirements of different organizations and how to accommodate those within their own space, for example obtaining Marley flooring for the dance performances by the Colorado Ballet (Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018). The Botanic Gardens handles promotional material for the showcase and provides each participating organization with twenty free passes for their members. The Gardens also offers half price admission for both days of the Showcase to increase accessibility to the event (Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility, DBG 2018). The process is always being fine-tuned with each year as lessons are learned.

Benefits of Inter-Museum Collaboration

As mentioned previously, the benefits of museums collaborating with one another fall under the following themes: leveraging strengths, democratization and inclusion, reflexivity, growth (of the community), institutional visibility, and the sharing of resources such as space, knowledge and funding. These themes are not necessarily bounded and distinct from one another, and they often overlap. The examples that follow demonstrate the connections between them as one informs and enables the other.

Inclusivity and democratization of the museum are alluded to in the definitions my contributors provided, but this theme is further illustrated in the Denver Museum of Nature and Science's mobile museum project. This project actively seeks out the community and asks them what could be done better, what would they like to see done at

94

the museum, and what do they specifically need from the museum (Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018). The mobile museum project goes into Carbondale, Pueblo, Ray and several Denver neighborhoods to ask people what they would be interested in seeing at DMNS and what should be addressed (Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018). The Partnership Program Coordinator describes this as "co-visioning" or "co-creating" directly with the community and giving power to their voices by following through on their opinions and feedback. He defines "co-visioning" and "co-creating" as "we're thinking about what we want together and co-creation is like, we're executing it together," referencing an egalitarian form of collaborative work (Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018).

On the continuum provided by Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2008), this level of work would be equated with "collaboration." The Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS has his own continuum of engaged work that is similar to Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson's, except it begins with "participation" at the lowest level and "collaboration" at the middle level. He sees "participation" as "we're having an event, do you want to come" whereas "collaboration" is "we're going to do our thing, you're going to do your thing, but we're going to do it together over a long period of time" (Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018).

Shared or extended space is gained from leveraging institutional strengths and resources in collaboration. Sharing resources such as space increases the capacity of a program and institutional visibility. Especially for the Free Days at DMNS, which is the only institution that does additional programming, according to the Partnership Programs Coordinator, the museum becomes an extension of the other museum's and cultural

organization's space. This space is seen as a "satellite space" of the participating institution, they have control over their activity and how they showcase their institution during the event. The Partnership Programs Coordinator expressed his hope that the participating institutions can reach new audiences and gain better visibility within the greater community of Denver. These partnerships provide the opportunity for other institutions to say "we exist, this is what we do," which provides a greater service to the community as well.

Sometimes an institution's space is too small to handle the growing popularity of an event so they hand it off to another institution. This was the case with the MCA and the program Mixed Taste. This event is a "weird summer lecture series that will keep you on your toes" (MCA website, accessed 4/14/2019; Manager of Programs, MCA 2018). Comprised of mismatched topics that find common ground in the lecture series, Mixed Taste aims to "bring different audiences together [to] meet other creative people and kind of just expand the concepts of art" (MCA website, accessed 4/14/2019; Manager of Programs, MCA 2018). When the program grew in popularity to the point where MCA no longer had the spatial capacity to host, they handed it off to the Denver Center for Performing Arts Off-Center (DCPA) as it was more equipped to handle the event. The DCPA now control the programming, but the event is still under MCA's name and they continue to assist with promoting the event and sustaining the social network by bringing in artists and creatives.

The Collections Manager and Registrar at Museo notes that *Sin Fronteras* brings pieces of the museum's collection into the public in public institutions like libraries or city halls. Museo benefits from this visibility outside their walls, and the space benefits

because of the number of visitors to that space (Collections Manager and Registrar, Museo 2018). This increased number of visitors establishes a new audience for both institutions, which is a point that the Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS re-iterates. The Collections Manager and Registrar adds

> it's really important to get the Latin voice out into the community there. I mean percentage-wise I'm not really sure how many people in Denver have Latin descent, but it's a lot. But when you look at that percentage compared to the percentage of artwork that they're being represented in or by, it's very—the ratio is like, way off…so there's no reason it shouldn't be out there showing its face. (Collections Manager and Registrar, Museo 2018)

Not only does this extend the space of the museum, it also benefits the Latino community by showing them art where they can see themselves represented. Furthermore, she remarks how this extension of space outside the museum breaks out of the regulations and elitist tendencies of the museum, thereby disrupting the gaze traditionally imposed upon museum objects (Collections Manager and Registrar, Museo 2018). Inclusivity exercised as integration of these voices into the public as facilitated by the museum and civic institutions is something that Serena Iervolino (2013) discusses in her work on migrant communities in Italian museums. Though this is not happening within the museum itself, the museum is facilitating intercultural dialogue within another institution that incorporates the Latino voice and perspective into other communities.

Institutional visibility because of shared space is further illustrated in interviews with the Community Relations Manager at the Gardens and the Partnership Programs Coordinator at DMNS. Considering the SCFD showcase at the Gardens, the Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility identified a major benefit of the Showcase is that "not all of them have a permanent venue, some of them could use more exposure," so the

Showcase is an opportunity for them to gain some visibility and benefit from the Gardens' promotional efforts. The Gardens gives these organizations a space to demonstrate what they do for the community.

The Gardens are also supporting the Denver Art Museum (DAM) on their upcoming exhibition on Monet, which will run from October 2019 to February 2020 (Denver Art Museum website, accessed 4/14/2019). Each institution's PR and Marketing teams are working together on cross-promoting these exhibits. In 1999, the Gardens built a Monet Garden inspired by an exhibit at the DAM in the same year (Krishnan 2009, accessed 4/27/2019). The Gardens' horticultural team has worked with DMNS in the past on a mushroom exhibit as well (Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018). In each of these situations, the Gardens are joining together with the DAM and DMNS to enhance public visibility of specific exhibits and extend learning across institutions as well.

Nearly every contributor identified the process of collaboration as a reflexive practice. It gives the museum a chance to identify what has been done, what was done well, what can be improved and who is doing the work that needs doing that can be approached for advice (Community Relations Manager 2018; Manager of Programs 2018). The Manager of Programs at the MCA noted in discussing the museum's FemFest event, "We had drag queens and we had a LGBTQ collective called Secret Love Collective do photo booths and we had…just like making sure we were being inclusive of different experiences" (Manager of Programs, MCA 2018). In this manner, collaboration is a way for an institution to make sure that they are inclusive of a variety of perspectives by including them in an event for a community of people identifying along a spectrum with a range of experiences. This includes reflecting and ensuring that those voices are

included in a way that is not tokenistic or perpetuating a homogenous perception of the

group, so that an event truly inclusive and respectful. The collaboration may not be

perfect and work every time, but maintaining old practices that were exclusionary

"because we've done this program for five years this way" (Manager of Programs, MCA

2018) no longer works. Looking within a specific community for people and

organizations who are doing the kind of work that museums are trying to do, then asking

for advice and guidance, seems to be the goal of these reflexive practices when it comes

to inter-museum collaboration. At the end stage of collaboration, reflexivity is continued

through debriefing sessions that identify strengths and weaknesses, usually highlighting

what could be improved for next year (Education Director, Museo 2018).

Some institutions are well-known for their work on inclusivity, such as Museo

and their work in the Latino community, and are sought out for their culturally specific

input (Education Coordinator, Museo 2018). For example, the Botanic Gardens and

Museo de las Americas collaboratively run a bilingual yoga program. Museo hosts the

yoga class in their art galleries, the Gardens provide free admission tickets and a shuttle

that takes participants to the Gardens at the end of class (Community Relations Manager,

DBG 2018). The program has had a rocky start, however, because, while the idea was

good, it was not as popular when it was first hosted at the Gardens. The Community

Relations Manager reflects,

> I thought first it might be a challenge to bring people to the Gardens to do yoga,
> especially underserved audiences who maybe have never tried yoga before who
> might feel intimidated by doing yoga in the Gardens. So we thought, okay
> where's a safe space that they feel comfortable going and who—you know Museo
> already has a member base that the community feels safe going and they know
> Museo so why don't we bring the bilingual yoga to Museo? We will pay for the
> instructor and we will pay for…provide you with the information about the shuttle

program and you will promote it to your member base, manage the sign ups and then we'll bring [everyone] after—you know, you manage all of that—and we'll bring the people who did the yoga that day…to the Gardens after to enjoy the Gardens for a day…and it seems to have worked well. (Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018)

The two institutions are still working to grow the program and work with it for the future. I have personally attended a class and it only had a few people, maybe nine total, including myself. I mentioned as much in our interview and she responded

partnerships and collaborations take years to truly develop and…you have to come at it every single year, you can't just 'one and done…that was great what's next?' It's continuing to build that relationship and that trust with the museum but also with the community you know and so you don't just say that was great and then move on to the next thing it's…you continue to build that because it takes several years before it kicks off, before people really say start hearing about it, start talking about it, start promoting it. (Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018)

This example shows that, in its early stages a program can have a rocky start. These programs take time and constantly returning to the table and figuring out how to improve and make it better. The successes that are mentioned in this section, the ones that draw thousands of visitors each time, are likely the result of a lot of time invested and constantly returning to and updating ideas. This program also shows, however, that Museo de las Americas is regarded as a safe space for the Latino community and a place where they are comfortable. A reputation like this has helped them build partnerships with organizations that want to be more inclusive of the Latino community, which reinforces Museo's Education Coordinator's comment that they are sought out for advice on Latino-centered programming.

These community relationships and outreach efforts are only as effective as the work the people in the department put forth. The Director of Marketing and Social

Responsibility describes her department's work in the community as the most significant

instigator of future collaborations because, without the input and feedback from the

community, the programs that are currently running would cease to exist (Director of

Marketing and Social Responsibility, DBG 2018). For example, their programs on

xeriscape gardens have grown thanks to input from ranchers and farmers in Colorado

(Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility, DBG 2018). The Dia de los Muertos

celebrations in October and November continue to grow with each year (Director of

Marketing and Social Responsibility, DBG 2018; Community Relations Manager, DBG

2018). Another example is the shuttle program, which was created to overcome a

transportation barrier that some communities may have that keeps them from visiting the

Gardens (Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018).

Another benefit of inter-museum collaboration is the sharing of knowledge. This

tends to occur in two contexts: ideas or cultural knowledge specific to a certain

community and the sharing of social networks. The Manager of Programs at MCA

referred to this sharing of knowledges as "sharing ideas, whether or not they pertain

directly to your programs—so sharing ideas and creating a support system and

camaraderie because then that information gets transformed and translated in specific

ways to everybody else's programs…" Even though an idea may not be related to the

program in question, it is the coming together and contributing to a conversation that

helps to build and sustain relationships. In sharing ideas and knowledges a support

system can be put in place that can potentially lead to the mediation of those ideas and

the creation of something that benefits everyone.

In her discussion of a Philadelphia initiative between the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Taller Puertorriquieno and the Congreso de Latinos Unidos, Moira Simpson remarked that the project "intended to provide a model for other communities to establish networks of contacts between community organizations and cultural institutions, and thus enable greater community involvement and power in the cultural affairs of their towns and cities" (1996, 63). This empowerment of the community through these social networks is similarly reflected in the work the museums involved in this research aim to accomplish. Though the Philadelphia initiative began in the early 1990s and involved a different scope and framework of relationships, the goals and intended outcomes are similar.

One of my contributors mentioned cultural capital when calling upon the culturally specific knowledge of smaller cultural organizations. This recalls Pierre Bourdieu's (1985) deliberations on the forms of capital—a discussion that can be applied to the collaborative process. He defines capital as "accumulated labor (in its materialized form or its 'incorporated', embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, i.e. exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living behavior" (1985, 83). Bourdieu uses "appropriate" in the sense of acquiring or legally obtaining a specific resource. The term as it is used today is highly contested and refers to the stealing and inappropriate consumption of another culture in a way that does not acknowledge the rightful ownership of that culture and, in relation to Indigenous peoples and their culture, the historical traumas they have endured at the hands of the appropriators (Lukavic, John et al. 2019; Lonetree 2012, 5). Bourdieu builds on the notion of economic capital and ties it into the exchange of cultural and

social capital. Economic capital is intricately connected, though often subverted or concealed as being the root of other forms of capital, to cultural and social capital (Bourdieu 1985, 91). These two forms, cultural and social, are enacted and exchanged within the collaborative process and within the network of museum professionals. The overall outcome of this exchange of capital has an economic effect that could be equated with the outcomes of collaboration either through tangible products like exhibits or through the restructuring of museum practice and museological thinking. Cultural capital, according to Bourdieu, has three forms: embodied, objectified and institutionalized (Bourdieu 1985, 84). Embodied cultural capital is learned and developed over time, it is not naturally given from biological inheritance, and functions primarily as symbolic capital (Bourdieu 1985, 85-86). In other words, this form of cultural capital is the individual's *habitus* (Bourdieu 1980), the slow accumulation of specific knowledge and practices that comes from growing up with ways of knowing, seeing, and being. The appropriation of this form of culture, through the sharing of intellectual property or cultural knowledges seen as resources, depends on the relationship between the resources and their potential products that is mediated by the relationship between the person in question and others with similar capital who are competing for the same goals (1985, 86). In the context of the engagement zone (Onciul 2013, 2015), within which collaboration often operates, this situation would be the negotiation and mediation of different knowledges to reach some conclusion of a product in the form of changing practices, collaboratively created exhibitions, or repatriation of objects.

An example of sharing cultural capital is when Museo was brought in to do Professional Development workshops for Denver Public School (DPS) elementary

teachers. Several museums in the area were taking part in this Professional Development

program, for example the Museum of Contemporary Art did workshops for high school

art teachers (Manager of Programs, MCA 2018). The museums involved in this

professional development day coordinated with one another, and with representatives

from DPS, to discuss initial goals and how they could work together to help the teachers

in the district (personal communication 2018). I was a part of a couple of meetings to

plan for and coordinate the professional development day: one was with the elementary

school art teacher organizers and a second with the Education Director, Education

Coordinator and another intern in the education department. In the first meeting we

discussed the teachers' goals and what they wanted to learn from us, specifically

regarding cultural appropriation, diversity and how to approach diversity in the

classroom. The second meeting was with those of us in the department. We talked about

what we would do and how we could address the concerns raised in the first meeting. We

spent a week researching cultural appropriation and teaching diversity in the classroom,

then considered how we could present this information to the teachers and how they

could then adapt this information to younger children. We created a document with

information and a list of other resources, presented a couple of Museo's workshops to

show how we teach culturally specific artistic traditions in a way that does not

appropriate these traditions, and answered any additional questions the teachers had

during the workshop.

The sharing of social networks, as an example of Bourdieu's social capital, can

also help to build collaborative projects. This is seen in some partnerships at the Denver

Museum of Nature and Science. One organization is contacted and asked to participate,

then they are asked if they know of anyone else doing similar activities who could be

asked to participate. Usually the Free Day events at DMNS are centered around a theme,

such as birds for the National Year of the Bird or Black History Month (Partnership

Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018). Organizations doing work in those areas would be

contacted to come and participate or do an activity, then DMNS would ask them if there

is another group they know of or work with that can be brought in (Partnership Program

Coordinator, DMNS 2018). This kind of snowball effect builds the network of

institutions that can be called upon for specific knowledge for future collaborations. It

also expands the network of professionals and enhances the social capital of museums.

Relationships and connections are essential to any collaboration because they help to

establish a baseline of trust (Shannon 2014, 4). Without that trust built out of

relationships, information can be withheld and people may not want to collaborate

because they are unsure of an institution's intentions (Onciul 2015; Education Director,

Museo 2018). Building this network and sharing contacts in such a way helps forge these

relationships and makes them stronger. An important part of building these relationships

is not only calling them to help with something for your institution, but checking in to see

what they are doing, inviting each other to events and not being one-sided in the

relationship. The Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS stressed this importance in

his reflection on the subject:

> you have to have relationships with folks…you can't co-create and co-vision
> without some established relationship and getting to know the people there…that
> means I go to their events…and to be in that relationships means, you invite me to
> your events and I invite you to our events, we have this opening to work together.
> (Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018)

Challenges of Inter-Museum Collaboration

Collaboration is not easy, my contributors specified as much in our interviews. Some of the challenges my contributors encountered include institutional differences in structure and policy, managing expectations, difficulty communicating, and personality clashes and questionable intentions. The four institutions involved in this study are extremely different from one another and have different missions.

The Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS and the Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility at the Gardens both noted that there is also a discrepancy in staff sizes that can create barriers of inequality from the start. These staff size differences can make inter-museum collaborations more difficult because the sharing of responsibility is not equal and can interfere with the amount of time and ability one can commit. While the ambition or concept for a new project is present, the difference in manpower has often stalled some collaborations (Manager of Programs, MCA). At DMNS, for example, the Partnership Program Coordinator stated

> the hard thing about a larger organization is that sometimes you don't really know what everyone else is doing, especially because your responsibilities live with different people, different folks…I could have a colleague working on something that I don't know about and, when you're working with a smaller cultural they have the one person who's working on this. Sometimes like left hand doesn't know what the right is doing kind of thing. (Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018)

Though he noted that his coworkers now meet regularly to talk about everything that they are doing, this is only within one department. This size relationship was also noted in my interview with the Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility at the Gardens,

> we are still learning how to "right" size relationships between ourselves as a large institution and a smaller more niche organization…I think we need to realize that there should be a financial compensation for their time and their expertise. Just to

couch everything under "oh it's audience building for both of us" or "it's exposure for both of us" probably isn't always fair because the smaller organization, it's harder for them to set a meeting every month because they are probably wearing ten different hats whereas here we're wearing three different hats. (Director of Marketing and Social Media, DBG 2018)

Not only does she consider the difference in responsibilities and projects that people are working on, but she also notes the financial barrier inherent in working with different sized institutions.

Financial resources are often a motivation for collaborating with other institutions. Managing expectations regarding financial support, on the other hand, is a delicate task and requires respect and consideration of another institution's needs. Just as an institution pays for someone to do an activity at their event or an agency pays for contract work, so should a museum when seeking specific perspectives. The Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS further explained that when coordinating the museum's Free Day events, expectations of payment are often unattainable because he still has a budget to consider.

The expectation that a larger organization can pay a certain amount based on the sole fact that they are larger and thereby have greater funding sources often forgets the fact that the departments within those institutions have their own budgets to work with and cannot always pay the expected amount. For example, the following conversation has come up a couple times for the Partnership Program Coordinator: "sometimes overcoming the 'but you're a big organization, you have all these resources you should be able to do this…you should be able to pay us this' and I'm like 'but I still have to work within this budget'" (Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018). One of the biggest challenges for him is managing these expectations while supporting the

organizations invited to participate in events and understanding their needs. This ties back in to staff size and the capacity an organization must commit a certain number of people to an event, especially if that event tends to draw more people that, perhaps, they are not used to.

Not expecting people to do more work than they should have to is another expectation to manage when working with different size organizations. If an event is expected to draw, for example 8,000 people, and the smaller organization can expect to interact with 800 but can only send a few volunteers, the larger institution (in this case DMNS) must understand the differences in capacity and attempt to reconcile this difference by offering to do more to help, usually by giving advice on how to modify activities so they can be accomplished in a short time frame (Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018). The Partnership Program Coordinator genuinely wants to make sure everyone is successful, but managing these differences and expectations is a lot of work and it is a challenge that takes time to make sure the participating organization is well-informed about expectations for the event.

Communication filters into every challenge described here because, without clear communication, intentions are not expressed, expectations and understanding of different institutional capacities cannot be managed, and lack of communication means that information is not being shared and concerns are not addressed. Sometimes bad experiences and slights from the past can affect relationships and future collaborations. The Community Relations Manager at the Gardens noticed that the Latino community was "not a fan of the Botanic Gardens." When she asked around the community no one would tell her the exact reason why other than "we partnered one time and it didn't go

right or it went awry" (Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018). It took her some

time to rebuild that trust with the slighted groups and communities. She told me

> I wanted to work harder than ever…I wasn't a part of that right, that wasn't my doing…[and] apologizing, 'I'm sorry that even happened, that sucks that would ever happen, you know there's new leadership here, that there is a different mindset with the institution'…we want to and will work hard at it. (Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018)

Her efforts to rebuild those relationships started out small as the other institutions were

still hesitant, but they are growing because of a renewed effort and changed mindset in

the staff at the Gardens to genuinely work together with these other institutions.

Museums have a long history of slights and traumas to minority communities (Lonetree

2012; Simpson 1996). Part of the collaborative process is acknowledging these injustices

and working to improve relationships (Silverman 2015). This requires active listening

and understanding that there are problems that need to be addressed before improvements

can be made (Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018; Chapoose, Goff, and Voirol,

2017). Listening, acknowledging and respecting these opinions are key to building a good

relationship with these communities. Being clear about intentions and goals is made more

important in a collaboration because of these past experiences (Director of Marketing and

Social Responsibility, DBG 2018; Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018). There

are also hurdles to consider regarding the collaboration between the PR and Marketing

departments of each institution. If one museum is going to help another on a program or

event but their institutional logo is not represented in promotional materials or on the day

of the event, then the museum may feel offended and may not be interested in

collaborating again (Education Coordinator, Museo 2018).

Differences in institutional policies or goals can also negatively affect a collaboration between museums. For example, the MCA does teen and adult programming whereas Museo does primarily youth and family programs. For this reason these two museums do not often collaborate on programs relating to education, though this does not necessarily hinder their relationship with one another (Manager of Programs, MCA 2018). Despite these differences, and because of their similarities in size and resources, the two museums still align themselves with one another and reach out if there is something they can work on together. The Collections Manager and Registrar at Museo also noted that everyone comes to the table with different goals and communicating that is sometimes difficult to do or it is ignored. These goals may be informed by different institutional policies that can sometimes be hard to mediate. Further, communication was generally noted in nearly every interview as a key concern when it comes to collaboration. Miscommunications can hinder a relationship and interfere with a collaboration, as seen with the Community Relations Manager mentioned above. Face to face meetings and phone calls were noted to be better than emails because information and language can get lost in translation (Manager of Programs, MCA 2018).

Along the lines of communication, most often contacts are made with a specific individual at an institution rather than with the institution. This can be positive or negative, but if that individual were to leave the institution, the contacts would leave with them. Sharing the network of contacts within the institution and among coworkers—by communicating often and sharing that information—could ensure the continuation of these relationships. The Education Director at Museo remarked that collaborations often

depend on the person, that some people are better than others at networking and collaborating with other people and institutions.

Personality clashes and questionable intent were explicitly brought up in one interview and alluded to in a couple others. Being active in the community that an institution aims to represent ensures the creation of contacts and the building of trust between the community and the institution. The Education Director remarked that the staff at Museo are constantly involved in the Latino community, that she and the Education Coordinator are always mindful— "we have to like, live and breathe it, and so because of that I think the education department right now has tons of collaborations" (Education Director, Museo 2018). Inviting someone to the table in a respectful manner, following up with them and maintaining those contacts are a social skill that are hard to learn but are key to collaborating. Similarly, the Collections Manager and Registrar at Museo advises that how you present yourself matters when collaborating with another person and/or institution. Ensuring that each group is coming to the table organized and prepared is one step to overcoming this challenge. Questionable intent is also a challenge, especially if one institution is seeking to be more inclusive of a population but has made no previous efforts to be inclusive, either in staff membership or museum content (Education Director, Museo 2018).

Analysis

Inter-museum collaboration reflects several tenets of critical museology, namely inclusivity and diversity, reflexivity and democracy (Ames 1992). Richard Sandell (2012), Christina Kreps (2003b) and Ivan Karp and Steven Lavine (1992) have equated critical museology and the changes it inspires in contemporary museum practice as a

matter of human rights. Some critics see current efforts at engagement as relatively new, though it has been a goal of most museums since they grew to become public institutions during the Enlightenment (Sandell 2012, 134). Likewise, education and public service have typically been at the heart of museum work since the 19th century, but these goals have gained considerable traction since the inclusion of public service in ICOM's museum definition in 1974 (Hein 1998; Fuller 1992, 329). Furthermore, efforts to be more inclusive of minority populations, especially migrant populations, has opened museums up as places of intercultural dialogue and cultural exchange (Iervolino 2013). This opportunity offers a chance for cross-cultural engagement and can mitigate migrant communities' integration into their new homes (Iervolino 2013). Being more inclusive and presenting a diverse range of cultures and perspectives, by collaborating with and including community voices in museum work, also orients the museum as a facilitator for community empowerment and enrichment (Fuller 1992). These larger trends in museums are reflected in my research findings and will be discussed through the remainder of this chapter.

"Inclusivity and diversity" was a theme that emerged as one of the main benefits of inter-museum collaboration, evidenced in my findings above. This notion of inclusivity was equated with "authenticity" as my contributors sought to include those relevant voices and experiences in programs and events. "Voice(s)" was also mentioned frequently in the definition of collaboration my contributors provided. Concerns over being authentic, by representing those voices that have culturally-specific knowledges and experiences the chance to be heard, are at the center of collaborative work of the institutions involved in my research.

Raymond Silverman mentions a key motivation for community-engaged collaboration, often involving the translation of knowledge, involves "redressing the legacies of colonialism" (2015, 7). The people commonly grouped in the "Latino community," extending from the United States to Central and South America, were colonized by the Spanish and further marginalized by settler-colonial actions of the U.S when it grew to include the West in 1848 (Sanchez 1999; Flores 2000). In this respect, the Latino community in the U.S. have a legacy of colonialism that needs to be addressed. Collaborative projects "often have at their center strategies for creating spaces in which local knowledges are reclaimed, resuscitated, transformed and produced, spaces in which local narratives are articulated primarily for local communities, but at times also for global audiences" (Silverman 2015, 7). He adds that the "movement of objects of knowledge between a community of origin and a museum…is a multivalent political, economic, social and cultural process" (Silverman 2015, 3). Citing postmodern theorists Walter Benjamin and James Clifford, Silverman reminds us that translations are never complete: there is always information lost in the process; but, while this can be a deconstructive process that alters the original text or meaning, something is gained and given new meaning (2015, 4). The act of translating knowledges is about the process and negotiation of meanings, understanding that the outcome can always be returned to and revised (citing Phillips 2013, Silverman 2015, 4).

The definition of collaboration provided by my contributors included the words "transformed" and "translated." Additionally, the Manager of Programs at MCA noted that ideas are often translated through the collaborative process into a visible outcome, such as a program or event. These knowledges and ideas shared during collaboration

allow for a mediation between local (community) and global (or public) knowledge. Outside perceptions of a local tradition may differ from the meanings that the local group attribute to it, a concern iterated in Gwyneira Isaac's (2007) work with the Zuni Tribal Museum and mediating knowledges. Specifically for Dia de los Muertos, a typically Mexican tradition that has been appropriated in American culture, bringing in Museo to collaborate on projects at the Gardens or DMNS helps to bring a culturally-specific knowledge and experience that retains the meaning associated with the tradition so that celebrations at other museums can be "culturally appropriate without culturally appropriating" (Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018; Community Relations Manager, DBG, 2018).

Serena Iervolino (2013) highlighted the museum's ability to function as facilitator of intercultural dialogue that can help integrate new migrant communities into their new homes in other countries. This not only occurs by opening cross-cultural dialogue with migrant and "native" communities but also by educating migrant communities about the histories and values of their new country that is often presented within museum walls (Iervolino 2013; Levitt 2015). In a similar sense, the programs and events my contributors discussed facilitate cross-cultural dialogue through the inclusion of culturally-specific museums and organizations. These groups can provide a specific perspective to an audience they do not typically engage with, thereby opening new lines of conversation that encourages discussion and learning. This kind of visibility and power given to their institutions and voices introduce new or alternative perspectives that empowers the communities represented.

On a similar note, Nancy Fuller discusses the museum as facilitating community empowerment. She specifically highlighted and discussed three of the main objectives that were to be accomplished during the process of creating the Ak-Chin Indian Community Museum. These objectives primarily involved bringing an awareness within the community to the role and function of museums and archives, establishing a management capability within the community and designing a culturally appropriate facility (1992, 348-349). Fuller writes that "in subtle ways, the museum staff had become a new power in tribal decisions. They were recognized as representatives of the community, willing to be spokespersons for them, and knowledgeable about the means needed to carry out their goals" (1992, 359). While the situations presented in my research are different from the Ak-Chin museum, there are similarities that can be drawn between the two.

The museum, in this case a larger museum such as DMNS or the Gardens, acts a facilitator for community empowerment and development by inviting representatives of different communities into their space for programs and events. Community members who fulfill the role of "representatives" are staff at smaller cultural organizations and community museums. Their presence in these programs and events hosted by larger museums has the potential to empower and promote community development of their respective communities they represent. This potential was noted a few times by the Education Director at Museo, specifically in relation to the Denver Broncos and Broncos en Español. The program with the Broncos celebrates the Latino fans of the football team (Education Director, Museo 2018). Programs like this, and like the Free Days at DMNS or the Showcase and other programs at the Botanic Gardens, bring diversity into the

115

museum (and other organizations) and is regarded as a form of community building or growing the community (Education Director, Museo 2018; Partnership Program Coordinator, DMNS 2018; Community Relations Manager, DBG 2018).

In democratizing the museum, especially in the cases presented here, the public voice is considered and actively sought out to influence changes in programming. Community voice informs the creation of new events that reflect what they specified as their needs. This perception of the community as active—as having the power to seek information based on their own interests, as having a voice within museum practice—is one of the key transformations in museological thinking. Democratizing the museum, opening itself up to community input and feedback, as well as being more transparent about its strategies of display, interpretation and classification, are important components of the "new museum" as it works to better serve the public (Ames 1992). The perception of the audience as active learners is central to the constructivist educational approach, which has been employed in some museums to increase interactive engagement within the museum (Hein 1998). This approach recognizes that every visitor has their own set of knowledges (Jeffery-Clay 1998; Hein 1998). They build upon this knowledge using the materials and resources provided by educational institutions, including museums. The process of meaning making in the museum is, according to Jeffery-Clay, "an active process in which the learning consciously links new knowledge to old…Museums may also help in knowledge construction by providing opportunities for visitors to build links to their pre-existing knowledge" (1998, 4).

George Hein, a prominent scholar of museum education, imagines what a constructivist museum would look like. The elements he identifies as crucial for creating

a constructivist museum are similar to what the museums involved in this study are trying to do with their programs and events. Hein suggests that the constructivist museum recognizes multiple learning styles and accommodates these different styles within exhibits and programs, creates collaborations with other museums and organizations, and encourages social learning spaces (1998, 165, 174). This collaboration with other museums and educational institutions allows for more appropriate learning situations that welcomes a wider range of visitors (Hein 1998, 171). He notes that,

> [the] constructivist museum will make available to the visitor a much larger array of materials and objects than would be possible using only the objects of a single exhibition. And it will do so without returning to the overwhelming and alienating array of objects that characterized older museum exhibitions. (Hein 1998, 171)

The programs and events that are the result of the museums in this study collaborating with other museums or organizations exemplify these components of the constructivist museum that Hein imagined. The different activities that these various organizations provide accommodate different learning styles, usually providing a hands-on experience. These programs and events, such as Museo's celebration of Frida Kahlo for the Santa Fe Arts District's First Friday in July of 2018 and DMNS' Free Days, draw in more visitors that do not attend the museum on a regular basis. With the added programming and activities for each of these events the museums can provide a wide array of resources and materials for active engagement so that visitors can create their own experience. Additionally, the very nature of programs and events is social and they often occur in open spaces where social interaction is inevitable and encouraged.

Finally, the general consideration of audience, community building and growth frequently mentioned throughout my interviews leads me to consider inter-museum

117

collaboration as a form of ensuring the social and cultural wellbeing of the communities these museums serve. Returning to the original connotation of "curate," I suggest this practice can be equated with an idea of "curating community." Stacy Douglas's book, *Curating Community: Museums, Constitutionalism, and the Taming of the Political* equates the museum with the Constitution in its ability to construct a citizen. She suggests the constitution produces an idea of community, producing a political community through a similar representational framework employed in the museum that valorizes sovereignty (2017, 8-9). Hays-Gilpin and Lomatewama (2013) use "curating community" in relation to the re-orientation of artifacts as beings, representatives or embodiments of living ancestors. The artifacts become "Thous" and are the communities they derive from, thus the curatorial responsibility necessitates respecting those beings and working with source communities through collaboration and consultation (2013, 263-265, 281).

The word "curate" has been used in popular media to suggest curated music and playlists (Spotify), wardrobes (Stitch Fix) or personal libraries (Goodreads). Additionally, the professional role and responsibility of a curator has shifted multiple times in the history of museums (Ames 1992; Kreps 2003a). Philip Cash Cash, cited in Christina Kreps' *Curatorship as Social Practice*, recalls that "curator" in the original Latin means "to take care of" (Kreps 2003a, 315). She expands upon this original meaning of curator as caretaker and considers how those "individuals or classes of people—such as priests, shamans, spiritual leaders, royal functionaries—are also curators" with a specialized knowledge about objects and their care (Kreps 2003a, 315). Further exploring this relationship, I see the contributors to my study as having a specialized knowledge about

communities—either because they are members of those communities or have worked closely with them—and they are constantly seeking to learn what these communities need to better serve, or take care of, them. The programs and events these museum provide showcase a wide range of resources and organizations in the Denver area that are available to the public. These programs and events contribute to the social and cultural wellbeing of these visitors because they are given extra opportunities to learn. They inspire visitors to seek out these organizations for further exploration. My contributors equated these programs and events with community building and growth, though I see it as the museum trying to take care of their communities by giving them what they need to go into the world with a little more information than they may have had before.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

This research began with the objective to explore collaboration as it is enacted among museums, if it was at all. I then explored how museums engaged with one another and what were the perceived benefits and challenges of such interactions. Collaboration has become a "hot topic" in the museum world within the parameters of the new museology and the efforts being made to be more inclusive concerning Indigenous and other minority communities (Boast 2011; Simpson 1995, 56; Onciul 2015, 72). Since the 1980s and 1990s, especially after the passage of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) in 1990, museums have engaged with these communities to critically evaluate and change museum practices of collections care, conservation, and representation with the goal of devising new methods and practices of museum work that considers the communities' traditions and desires (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2008; Kreps 2003, 315-316). Many studies from Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand (Phillips and Anderson 2011; Simpson 1996) that focus on this topic consider museum relationships with Indigenous communities, though studies involving other minority and migrant populations are on the rise, especially in the United Kingdom and Europe (Iervolino 2013; Keith 2012).

The main field site of this research was Museo de las Americas, whose mission is directed towards the Latinidad community and educating the public about Latin arts and culture. For this reason, background information covered immigration policy, Denver's stance on immigration and integration, Denver's current integration initiatives, and the work that Museo de las Americas does to better include and represent the diverse Latino identity within the city of Denver. Iervolino (2013) suggests that the museum can facilitate cross-cultural dialogue between different groups of people, mediating cultural negotiations and encouraging the integration of minority communities into the majority group. Current political and social tensions concerning "Latino aliens" are rising with the discussion of migrant caravans and building a border wall (*The Economist* 2018a, 2018b).

Denver recognizes the significant contributions that Latino groups make to the social, economic and political fabric of everyday reality (City of Denver press release 2017). The staff at Museo de las Americas who agreed to participate were the Development Coordinator, Collections Manager and Registrar, Education Director and Education Coordinator. Other participants included in this research were the Community Relations Manager and Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility at the Denver Botanic Gardens, the Partnership Program Coordinator at the Denver Museum of Nature and Science, and the Manager of Programs at the Museum of Contemporary Art.

The practice of collaboration falls within the framework of critical museology (Ames 1992; Macdonald 2011), the contact zone (Clifford 1997) and the engagement zone (Onciul 2015). Critical museology entails a more critically and reflexively informed museum practice that reassesses its history and the social, cultural and political contexts in which it operates (Ames 1992). Though there are several features of critical

museology, the components most significantly reflected are the reconceptualization of knowledge as collectively produced, leading to greater inclusivity and the recognition of different perspectives; and the democratization of museums, which aims to destabilize the elitist characteristic of museums and open museum practices to the public (Ames 1992; Macdonald 2011). Contact work precludes a colonial relationship in which asymmetrical power relations are created within the museum (Clifford 1997). These relationships are formed through a long history of "extracting" objects and marginalizing "Others" for the sake of scientific study (Kurin 1994, 19; Peers and Brown 2003). Collections in museums constitute these relationships because of the social interactions they embody (Peers and Brown 2003; Clifford 1997). Collaborations and consultations typify the methods of contact work that seek to open museum practices concerning care, conservation and collections management to critical reflection and radical change (Peers and Brown 2003, 1-2, 9-10). These practices seek to include Indigenous and other marginalized communities to negotiate different practices and perspectives—thereby gaining a better understanding of the complexities of reality and cultural context necessary to work towards changing museum practice (Clifford 1997, 192; Nicks 2003, 20). The engagement zone differs from the contact zone in that it acknowledges "the inter-community work that occurs within cross-cultural engagement" and recognizes the fluidity of engagement as individuals move in and out of the zone and power is shifted through negotiation and exchange (Onciul 2015, 82). This framework considers engagement as a spectrum that ranges from tokenism to community control, acknowledging the constant changing of roles and positions of power within engagement and how individuals change the nature of engagement through their own expectations and

requirements (Onciul 2015). The translation of cultural knowledge for those who do not have the capital to understand it, the recognition of engagement as a semi-private interaction where expressions of culture are negotiated and disclosed, and acknowledging the agency of individuals are significant components of the engagement zone and how it can work to increase community control (Onciul 2015).

The contact and engagement zones apply to my own research because of the colonial ties to Westward expansion and the accumulation of territory that used to be Mexico in 1848 and the internal complexities of a Latino community identity that require negotiation (Sanchez 1999; Flores 2000). While there are some Latino populations in the United States because of immigration, some are here because the border simply moved over their homes (Sanchez 1999). There is a historically embedded colonial context for the relationship between Mexico and the United States, but there is also a neo-colonial relationship with the rest of Latin America because of U.S. foreign policies and interventions in the politics of Latin American countries (Sanchez 1999). Furthermore, the Latino population in the U.S is complex and encompasses many peoples and cultures who have been grouped together under one homogenizing term for the sake of demographics and quantification of data (Flores 2000).

This research also presents an effort to "study up" by doing an anthropology of museums, as per Laura Nader's and Michael Ames' urgings to turn to our own society and "study ourselves like we study others; view ourselves as 'the Natives'" (Ames 1992, 10). Implicit in this work is doing an ethnography with experts, which is borrowed from Jennifer Shannon's (2014) work with the community curators at the National Museum of the American Indian's *Our Lives* exhibit. Though my research project was not an

ethnography, it is ethnographic by nature of conducting interviews and engaging in participant observation. The permanent staff at Museo de las Americas hail from different countries in Latin America, they are members of the cultures they aim to represent and thus cultural experts. Additionally, everyone I interviewed were museum professionals at varying levels of position in their respective departments. I treated all my contributors as experts in their field because they simply are. Experts and expertise, as noted earlier in this paper, "was a relatively transparent social designation, not one that seemed to admit or reward further anthropological theorization" (Boyer 2015, 589). It is generally understood that an expert is "an actor who has developed skills in, semiotic-epistemic competence for, and attentional concern with, some sphere of practical activity or 'enactment'" (Boyer 2015, 589). In other words, an expert is well attuned to and possessing the capacity to understand the symbols and meanings associated with an activity. All the people involved in this study fit into this rough definition of expert.

I learned that the key drivers for museum to museum collaboration are directed towards the audience and helping one another by working together. These were emphasized in the definition of collaboration each of my contributors provided in our interviews. Audiences are characteristically at the forefront of any program, event or educational workshop. My own experiences working in the education department at Museo taught me that the audience is diverse, everyone has different base knowledges and learning to adapt for different groups of people is crucial. Ensuring that your audience is accounted for in all its complexities, that they are both entertained and inspired to learn, that they grow as a person from their experiences is what drives these inter-museum collaborations.

The Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility specifically remarks that, in these collaborations "we are stronger together," and leveraging the strengths of each institutions serves both the museum and the community. The sense of togetherness is further supported through the Scientific and Cultural Facilities District (SCFD) and its encouragements for member organizations to collaborate and expand their reach. Part of leveraging of institutional strength is gaining access to resources such as increased visibility, space and niche knowledge. Visibility is especially important for smaller organizations to get their voice into the public and show them they exist as resources (Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS 2018; Community Relations Manager DBG 2018). Space is another benefit: organizations gain a "satellite space" when they are invited to participate in a larger museum's event (Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS 2018). The sharing of knowledge in the form of culturally specific knowledge— and in the form of social networks—is also shared within collaborations. Some smaller organizations, like Museo de las Americas, have specific knowledge that would provide a culturally appropriate perspective to an event, which enriches both the event and the audience (Community Relations Manager DBG 2018; Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS 2018). Social networks are shared in a snowball effect, through conversations with one organization another one will be identified and connections are made in this manner (Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS 2018).

On the other hand, there are challenges that are contingent upon some of the benefits. Visibility only occurs if PR teams work together and promote one another, which does not always happen (Education Coordinator Museo 2018). Managing expectations is another challenge that arises from these institutional differences. Smaller

organizations have fewer people than larger organizations, therefore each person at the

smaller organization has more responsibilities and projects they are trying to accomplish

and the capacity to engage in a collaborative project differs (Director of Marketing and

Social Responsibility DBG 2018; Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS 2018).

Different policies and goals will also hinder a collaborative relationship if these goals are

not identified and reconciled in some way at the beginning of a project (Director of

Marketing and Social Responsibility DBG 2018; Collections Manager and Registrar

Museo 2018). Finally, negative experiences in the past can affect the amount of trust and

openness in a future relationship (Community Relations Manager DBG 2018).

Though these museums in Denver may compete for the same or similar audiences

they ultimately are stronger together by building on each other's resources and skills.

They can leverage each other's strengths to better serve their communities and learn from

one another (Director of Marketing and Social Responsibility DBG 2018; Partnership

Program Coordinator DMNS 2018). Smaller community museums and cultural

organizations already do work on inclusivity, diversity and outreach in their respective

communities (Education Coordinator Museo 2018). These museums, as Richard Kurin

(1997) noted, tend to have very few resources in terms of staff, capacity and finances. By

collaborating with larger museums, they can gain access to the resources that these

museums have, which my contributors identified as institutional visibility, satellite

spaces, and financial support. However, Kurin (1997) also notes that larger, mainstream

museums need to learn from community museums regarding inclusivity and the

culturally specific knowledge they represent. This can be remedied by collaborating with

community museums whose contributions would provide an avenue for the negotiation

and collective production of knowledges. My contributors did not express concerns over competition in our interviews, only how they could build on each other's strengths to work towards changing their practices to better serve and enrich the larger Denver community.

Efforts to engage with critical museology and informed, reflexive practice were exemplified throughout the course of my research. Inclusivity, democracy and sharing knowledges are mentioned above as inherent in collaborating with culturally-specific museums and listening to feedback from communities. However, collaboration between museums and organizations also provides an opportunity for greater reflexivity of museum practice. My contributors illustrated this through their emphasis on the importance of collaboration with other museums as it allows you to gauge where you are, what is good, what could be better and how to work with those doing the work that needs improvement in your institution (Manager of Programs MCA 2018; Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS 2018; Education Coordinator Museo 2018). Including culturally specific organizations in programs centered around those cultures is a way for museums to engage in cross-cultural dialogue and encourage cultural diversity. The Scientific and Cultural Facilities District (SCFD) serves many member organizations in the Denver area, creating an established network of connected institutions that are encouraged to collaborate and expand upon each other's resources. Building upon and taking advantage of such a network of museums through collaboration—whether on programs, events or exhibits—benefits all museums involved.

After our interview, the Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS asked me why I was looking in to inter-museum collaboration and what I hoped to be my "end

goal." He reflected on the museums he has worked in before, specifically in San Francisco, where museum partnerships and working with one another was not as common as it is in Denver. These museums were competing for the same audiences because they were both science museums. Additionally, the institutional operations were different since one museum was an exploratory science museum and the other was more regimented (Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS 2018). He suggested that Denver is unique when it comes to partnerships and collaboration among organizations because there is a stronger environment and support network for these kinds of engagement practices (Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS 2018). Though the organizations that do collaborate "could be deemed [to be] competing for the same audience," the goal of supporting schools and local communities is stronger (Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS 2018).

Evidence from my interviews shows that the museums involved in this study are working to incorporate many minority and marginalized communities into their programming and events to spark inspiration to learn, to encourage negotiation of beliefs and preconceived ideas, and to act as mediator or facilitator for this intercultural dialogue. These programs and events not only celebrate, preserve and promote cultural diversity but they also educate the public about social diversity that exists within their own communities. This kind of cultural and social caretaking can be equated with the role of a curator, in the sense of the original Latin meaning "to take care of" (Kreps 2003a; 315). Ames compares the work of the curator, who not only cares for but also interprets heritage, to the way teachers consider their curriculum pertinent to learning (1992, 96). There are concerns over the "de-schooling" of museums, in their efforts to

democratize, as patronizing the visitor and lessening interactions between them and the object (1992, 96). The act of democratizing ensures increasing access to objects and different aspects of the museum so that visitors have the necessary resources for independent learning (Ames 1992, 96-97). This goal of democratization and taking care of the visitor was reflected in my research. My contributors, and their respective museums, are rather taking care of the cultural and social wellbeing of their communities by providing them with resources for further independent education and encouraging dialogue with one another to build, grow and enrich the community.

Limitations

There are some limitations that affected this research. Due to the connections my contributors had with one another, the focus of collaborations between museums is on how this occurred with respect to programming, events and education departments. While the insights gained from these perspectives illuminate how inter-museum collaborations have the potential to deepen community engagement and expand the potential for democratization in the museum, there is little to remark on relating to collaborations on exhibits, collections management or any other aspect of museum practice. Additionally, because of time constraints and people's availability, the parameters of this research were relatively small. There are some other large museums, like the Denver Art Museum, Denver Zoo, and History Colorado, as well as smaller cultural organizations that were not involved in this study. This is mostly due to scheduling complications, unanswered emails, and the fact that there may have been no personal contact within those institutions.

Future Research

The skills necessary to interview take a long time to acquire the experience necessary to know how to navigate such a situation. Given time to conduct more interviews I would address the questions that arose during my analysis regarding the specific people involved in inter-museum partnerships, exploring how my contributors understood the difference between collaboration and other forms of engagement (aside from the Partnership Program Coordinator DMNS), and who the target communities for these programs were. Additionally, my initial focus was on the Latino community and how these inter-museum relationships worked towards including them in museums where they are not normally represented (either in visitor numbers or cultural materials). Throughout the course of my research I learned how Denver museums collaborate with several local organizations that target a variety of communities. Given more time I would like to explore the broader applications of inter-museum collaborations for these other communities. I would also like to talk with more people in each institution to gather a broader perspective of inter-museum collaboration—not only more staff within the education, programming and events departments but also within other levels of the museum. This would illuminate a bigger picture of collaboration between museums that might yield interesting conversations. If I had more time I would go into the various communities in Denver and conduct a survey to see who goes to museums regularly, who attends Free Days and other programs or events at these museums? How has their perception of the role of museums in their lives changed because of this? what do they like about these programs? What do they not like and how could the museum improve?

There are many questions but, ideally, I would like to explore inter-museum collaboration and its effects from a community point of view.

This research project has given me a sense that inter-museum collaboration happens on multiple levels and is constant—at a local, state, national and global level. For those cities that do not currently have a network of museums that strive to work together, a situation alluded to in my interview with the Partnership Program Coordinator at DMNS, I suggest a support network should be created. It is evident that this collaborative work benefits the museums and organizations involved, as well as the larger public who patronize those museums and organizations. Such a network of partnerships and collaborations would unify and create a cohesive arts and culture sector that could bolster those organizations needing help, include a wider range of community voices, expand museum and organizational reach into the public, and it ultimately helps museums work towards being democratic and reflexive in their practices.

REFERENCES CITED

"2018 Mini-Grant Awardee Program Summaries. Pdf." n.d. Accessed March 6, 2019. https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/643/documents/Office%20of%20Immigrant%20and%20Refugee%20Affairs/2019/2018%20Mini-Grant%20Awardee%20Program%20Summaries.pdf.

"ABOUT THE DISTRICT." n.d. Denver's Art District on Santa Fe. Accessed March 6, 2019. https://denversartdistrict.org/about.

"American Alliance Of Museums Announces 2016 Museums Connect Grants." 2016. *American Alliance of Museums* (blog). August 16, 2016. https://www.aam-us.org/2016/08/16/american-alliance-of-museums-announces-2016-museums-connect-grants/.

Aeffect. 2000. "Institute of Museum and Library Sciences: Identification and Analysis of Library and Museum Partnerships Executive Summary."

Ames, Michael M. 1992. *Cannibal Tours and Glass Boxes: The Anthropology of Museums*. Vancouver, Toronto: UBC Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London, New York: Verso.

Bennett, Tony. 2011. "Civic Seeing: Museums and the Organization of Vision." In *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Sharon Macdonald, 263–81. USA, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bernard, H. Russell. 2011. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. California, United States: AltaMira Press.

Boast, Robin. 2011. "Neocolonial Collaboration: Museum as Contact Zone Revisited." *Museum Anthropology* 34 (1): 56–70.

Bouquet, Mary. 2012. "The Ethnography of Museums." In *Museums: A Visual Anthropology*, 93–118. A&C Black.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1985. "The Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by Richardson, John G., 83–94. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Boyer, Dominic. 2015. "Expertise, Anthropological Approaches To." *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* 8 (2): 588–92.

Brown, Alison K., and Peers, Laura, eds. 2003. "Introduction." In *Museums and Source Communities*. Taylor and Francis.

Cai, Yunci. 2013. "The Art of Museum Diplomacy: The Singapore-France Cultural Collaboration in Perspective." *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society* 26 (2): 127–44.

Cameron, Duncan. 2004. "The Museum, a Temple or the Forum." In *Reinventing the Museum*, 61–73. Altamira Press.

Clifford, James. 1988. "On Collecting Art and Culture." In *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*, 215–51. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.

Chapoose, Betsy, Goff, Sheila, and Voirol, Shannon. 2017. "Seven Steps for Building a Museum Tribal Collaboration." In . Denver, CO.

City of Denver. n.d. "Immigrant Integration Mini-Grants." Accessed March 6, 2019. https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/human-rights-and-community-partnerships/our-offices/immigrant-and-refugee-affairs/immigrant-integration-mini-grants.html.

Colwell, Chip. 2014. "The Sacred and the Museum: Repatriation and the Trajectories of Inalienable Possessions." *Museum Worlds: Advances in Research* 2: 10–24.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip, and Ferguson, T.J. 2008. *Collaboration in Archaeological Practice : Engaging Descendant Communities*. Archaeology in Society. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Crooke, Elizabeth. 2009. "The Politics of Community Heritage: Motivations, Authority and Control." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (1–2): 16–29.

Douglas, Stacy. 2017. *Curating Community: Museums, Constitutionalism, and the Taming of the Political*. University of Michigan.

Ericksen, Patricia. 2002. *Voices of a Thousand People: The Makah Cultural and Research Center*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

"Featured Garden of the Week: Monet Garden." 2009. Denver Botanic Gardens. September 1, 2009. https://www.botanicgardens.org/blog/featured-garden-week-monet-garden.

Flores, Juan. 2000. "The Latino Imaginary: Meanings of Community and Identity." In *From Bomba to Hip-Hop: Puerto Rican Culture and Latino Identity*, 191–203. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn. 2003. "Informed Consent in Anthropological Research: We Are Not Exempt." In *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology: Dialogue for Ethically Conscious Practice*, edited by Fluehr-Lobban, Carolyn, 2nd ed., 159–78. California: AltaMira Press.

Fuller, Nancy. 1992. "The Museum as a Vehicle for Community Empowerment: The Ak-Chin Indian Community Ecomuseum Project." In *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*, edited by Karp, Ivan, Lavine, Steven D., and Kreamer, Christine, 327–65. Washington, London: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Golding, Viv, and Modest, Wayne. 2013. "Introduction." In *Museums and Communities: Curators, Collections and Collaboration*, edited by Viv Golding and Modest, Wayne, 1–12. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Gomez-Peña, Guillermo. 1996. "The Multicultural Paradigm: An Open Letter to the National Arts Community." In *Beyond the Fantastic: Contemporary Art Criticism from Latin America*, by Gerardo Mosquera, 183–93. London, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Grincheva, Natalia. 2015. "Democracy for Export: Museums Connect Program as a Vehicle of American Cultural Diplomacy." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 58 (2): 137–49.

"History | Museo De Las Americas." n.d. Accessed March 8, 2018. http://museo.org/about-us/history/.

Hall, Stuart, Evans, Jessica, and Nixon, Sean, eds. 2013. *Representation*. London: SAGE Publications.

Hays-Gilpin, Kelley, and Lomatewama, Ramson. 2013. "Curating Communities at the Museum of Northern Arizona." In *Reassembling the Museum Collection*, edited by Byrne, Sarah and Harrison, Rodney, 259–83. School of Advanced Research Press.

Hein, George E. 1998. *Learning in the Museum*. London, New York: Routledge.

Hoogwaerts, Leanne. 2016. "Museums, Exchanges and Their Contribution to Joseph Nye's Concept of 'Soft Power.'" *Museum and Society* 14 (2): 313–22.

Iervolino, Serena. 2013. "Museums, Migrant Communities, and Intercultural Dialogue in Italy." In *Museums and Communities: Curators, Collections and Collaboration*, edited by Golding, Viv and Modest, Wayne, 113–29. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Isaac, Gwyneira. 2007. *Mediating Knowledges: Origins of a Zuni Tribal Museum*. Arizona: University of Arizona Press.

Jeffry-Clay, Kodi R. 1998. "Constructivism in Museums: How Museums Create Meaningful Learning Environments." *Journal of Museum Education* 23 (1): 3–7.

Karp, Ivan. 1992. "Introduction: Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture." In *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*, edited by Karp, Ivan, Lavine, Steven D., and Kreamer, Christine, 1–18. Washington, London: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Keith, Kimberly F. 2012. "Moving Beyond the Mainstream: Insight into the Relationship between Community-Based Heritage Organizations and the Museum." In *Museums, Equality and Social Justice*, edited by Sandell, Richard and Nightingale, Eithne, 45–58. Routledge.

Kreps, Christina. 2003a. "Curatorship as Social Practice." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 46 (3): 311–23.

———. 2003b. *Liberating Culture: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Museums, Curation and Heritage Preservation*. London, New York: Routledge.

Krishnan. n.d. "Claude Monet: The Truth of Nature." Denver Art Museum. Accessed April 14, 2019. https://denverartmuseum.org/exhibitions/claude-monet.

Kurin, Richard. 1997. *Reflections of a Culture Broker: A View from the Smithsonian*. Washington, London: Smithsonian Institution.

"La Alma-Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association » History." n.d. Accessed March 15, 2019. http://www.lincolnparkneighborhood.org/history/.

Lara, Jesus. 2012. "Patterns and Forms of Latino Cultural Landscapes: Southwest Detroit, a Case of Incremental Re-Adaptive Use." *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability* 5 (2–3): 139–56.

Lavine, Steven D. 1992. "Audience, Ownership, and Authority: Designing Relations between Museums and Communities." In *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*, edited by Karp, Ivan, Lavine, Steven D., and Kreamer, Christine, 137–57. Washington, London: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Levitt, Peggy. 2015. "Introduction." In *Artifacts and Allegiances: How Museums Put the Nation and the World on Display*, 1–13. California: University of California Press.

Lonetree, Amy. 2012. *Decolonizing Museums: Representing Native American in National and Tribal Museums*. University of North Carolina Press.

Lukavic, John, Beltrán, Ramona, Deal, Gregg, and Okuma, Jamie. 2019. "Who Does This Honor?: Appropriation and Historical Trauma." presented at the Who Owns Culture? Appropriation and Appreciation in the Global Art World, Denver Art Museum, February 23.

Lynch, Bernadette T. 2012. "Collaboration, Contestation, and Creative Conflict: On the Efficacy of Museum/Community Partnerships." In *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics*, edited by Marstine, Janet. Routledge.

Macdonald, Sharon. 2011. "Expanding Museum Studies: An Introduction." In *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Sharon Macdonald, 1–12. USA, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Marstine, Janet. 2008. *New Museum Theory and Practice: An Introduction*. Chichester, UNITED KINGDOM: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

Message, Kylie. 2014. *Museums and Social Activism*. Routledge.

"Methods and Ethics - Learn and Teach." n.d. Accessed February 25, 2019. https://www.americananthro.org/LearnAndTeach/Content.aspx?ItemNumber=2645&navItemNumber=652.

Mieri, Magdalena, Judith Freidenberg, Kathleen Tracey, and Yixin Qiu. 2006. "Latino Community Identity and Development: The Case of a Community Museum in Langley Park, Maryland*." *The Journal of Latino - Latin American Studies; Omaha* 2 (2): 62–III.

Mithlo, Nancy Marie. 2004. "'Red Man's Burden': The Politics of Inclusion in Museum Settings." *American Indian Quarterly* 28 (3/4): 743–63.

Moreno, María-José. 2004. "Art Museums and Socioeconomic Forces: The Case of a Community Museum." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 36 (4): 506–27.

"Museum Definition- ICOM." n.d. Accessed May 6, 2018. http://icom.museum/the-vision/museum-definition/.

Nader, Laura. 1972. "Up the Anthropologist: Perspectives Gained From Studying Up."

Nash, Steven E, and Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip. 2010. "NAGPRA after Two Decades." *Museum Anthropology* 33 (2): 99–104.

Nicks, Trudy. 2003. "Introduction." In *Museums and Source Communities: A Routledge Reader*, edited by Peers, Laura and Brown, Alison K., 19–27. London, New York: Routledge.

O'Leary, Zina. 2010. *The Essential Guide to Doing Your Research Project*. London: SAGE Publications.

Office of Community Support: Denver Human Rights & Community Partnerships. 2014. "Denver Immigrant Community & Neighborhood Assessment." https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/643/documents/Offices/Office%20of%20Immigrant%20and%20Refugee%20Affairs/ImmRef_Assessment.pdf.

Onciul, Bryony. 2013. "Community Engagement, Curatorial Practice, and Museum Ethos in Alberta, Canada." In *Museums and Communities: Curators, Collections and Collaboration*, edited by Golding, Viv and Modest, Wayne, 79–98. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

———. 2015. "Engagement Zones." In *Museums, Heritage and Indigenous Voice: Decolonizing Engagement*, 71–89. London, New York: Routledge.

Phillips, Ruth B. 2003. "Introduction." In *Museums and Source Communities: A Routledge Reader*, 155–70. London, New York: Routledge.

Phillips, Ruth B., and Janice Anderson. 2011. *Museum Pieces: Toward the Indigenization of Canadian Museums*. Montreal, CANADA: MQUP.

Pombo. 2006. *Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of the American Latino Community Act of 2005*.

Ramirez, Mari Carmen. 1992. "Beyond 'the Fantastic': Framing Identity in U.S. Exhibitions of Latin American Art." *Art Journal* 51 (4): 60–68.

Reilly, Maura. 2018. "What Is Curatorial Activism?" In *Curatorial Activism: Towards an Ethics of Curating*, 17–33. Thames & Hudson.

Rivard, Rene. 1999. "Museums Hoist Their New Colours." *The UNESCO Courier* 52 (1): 40–42.

———. 2001. "Ecomuseums in Quebec." *Museum International* 53 (4): 212.

Rogers, LaTausha. n.d. "Denver Immigrant and Refugee Commission," 13.

Sanchez, George J. 1999. "Race, Nation, and Culture in Recent Immigration Studies." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 18 (4): 66–84.

Sandell, Richard. 2012. "On Ethics, Activism and Human Rights." In *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics: Redefining Ethics For the Twenty-First Century Museum*, edited by Marstine, Janet, 129–45. London, New York: Routledge.

Sandoval, Gerardo Francisco, and Maldonado, Marta Maria. 2012. "Latino Urbanism Revisited: Placemaking in New Gateways and the Urban-Rural Interface." *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability* 5 (2–3): 193–218.

"Scientific and Cultural Facilities District." n.d. Accessed March 18, 2019. http://scfd.org/.

Schulten, Susan. 2013. "The Civil War and the Origins of the Colorado Territory." *The Western Historical Quarterly* 44 (1): 21–46.

Shannon, Jennifer. 2014. *Our Lives: Collaboration, Native Voice, and the Making of the National Museum of the American Indian*. Santa Fe, NM, US: SAR Press.

———. 2015. "Projectishare.Com: Sharing Our Past, Collecting for the Future." In *Museum as Process: Translating Local and Global Knowledges*, edited by Silverman, Raymond A. London, New York: Routledge.

Shelton, Anthony Alan. 2011. "Museums and Anthropologies: Practices and Narratives." In *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Macdonald, Sharon, 64–80. Wiley-Blackwell.

Shyrock, Andrew. 2004. "Other Conscious/Self Aware: First Thoughts on Cultural Intimacy and Mass Mediation." In *Off Stage On Display: Intimacy and Ethnography in the Age of Public Culture*, edited by Shyrock, Andrew, 3–30. California: Stanford University Press.

Sierra, Christine Marie, Carillo, Teresa, DeSipio, Louis, and Jones-Correa, Michael. 2000. "Latino Immigration and Citizenship." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 33 (3): 535–40.

Silverman, Raymond A. 2015. *Museum as Process*. London, New York: Routledge.

Simpson, Moira G. 1996. *Making Representations: Museums in the Post-Colonial Era*. London, New York: Routledge.

Steiner, Christopher. 1994. "The Quest for Authenticity and the Invention of African Art." In *African Art in Transit*, 100–129. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Tanackovic, Sanjica Faletar, and Boris Badurina. 2009. "Collaboration of Croatian Cultural Heritage Institutions: Experiences from Museums." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 24 (4): 299–321.

The Economist. 2018a. "Donald Trump Makes Migration Mexico's Problem," August 18, 2018. https://www.economist.com/the-americas/2018/08/18/donald-trump-makes-migration-mexicos-problem.

The Economist. ———. 2018b. "Donald Trump and the 'Onslaught' from Central America," October 27, 2018. https://www.economist.com/the-americas/2018/10/27/donald-trump-and-the-onslaught-from-central-america.

Thomas, Nicholas. 2016. *The Return of Curiosity: What Museums Are Good for in the 21st Century*. London, UNITED KINGDOM: Reaktion Books, Limited.

"U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: Denver City, Colorado." n.d. Accessed December 7, 2018. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/denvercitycolorado.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS FROM MUSEO DE LAS AMERICAS

1. Please state your position/role at Museo de las Americas

2. How would you define collaboration?

    a. What does collaboration look like to you?

3. Do you think Museo de las Americas has engaged in collaboration?

    a. If so, what did it look like? Describe the process from start to finish.

        i. Who decides?

        ii. Who is in charge?

        iii. Is it one department or the museum as a whole?

4. What other Denver museums and institutions has Museo de las Americas worked with?

    a. Would you mind telling me who you worked with and may I contact them?

5. Do you think that collaborating has helped Museo de las Americas fulfill its mission to serve the Latinx community of Denver?

    a. How does collaboration potentially help Museo's educational programming?

6. Do you think collaboration helped the other Denver museum you worked with? How so?

7. What were the main obstacles you encountered in this process?

8. Do you think your work with other Denver institutions has helped Museo de las Americas represent the Latino identity and culture to a wider audience?

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS OUTSIDE MUSEO DE LAS AMERICAS

1. Please state your position/role at your institution.

2. How would you define collaboration?

    a. What does collaboration look like to you?

3. How do you think working with Museo de las Americas has helped your own institution?

4. What do you see as a benefit of working with a community based, community run museum?

5. Has working with Museo de las Americas helped expand upon your institution's mission?

    a. Has this work expanded your institution's audience?

6. In what capacity do you and your institution collaborate with other organizations in the area?

    a. What other institutions in the Denver area have you worked with?

7. What are the benefits of collaborating with other museums and cultural organizations?

    a. What challenges have you encountered?

APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORM
University of Denver
Consent Form for Participation in Research

Title of Research Study: Collaboration between Museums: A Case Study of Museo de las Americas

Researcher(s): Leah Zavaleta, MA student in Anthropology. Advised by Christina Kreps, PhD in Anthropology.

Study Site: Museo de las Americas

Purpose
You are being asked to participate in a research study. This study aims to expand anthropological knowledge of collaborative partnerships, specifically between small to medium-sized community-based, ethnic museums and mainstream museums. The focus of this research is on the collaborative efforts of the Museo de las Americas in Denver and its partnerships with larger museums such as the Denver Art Museum and Denver Museum of Nature and Science.

Procedures
If you agree to take part in this research study, you will be invited to participate in an open-ended, semi-structured in person interview. This interview will be held at a time and place of your choosing and will last up to an hour and a half. Depending on the information provided, it may be necessary to go further in depth. In such a case, a second interview may be requested. Interviews will be recorded using an audio-recording device. The researcher will conduct observations of daily activities at Museo de las Americas to better understand the daily functions of the museum. Observations will not be video recorded but recorded in field notes.

Voluntary Participation
Participating in this research study is completely voluntary. You are under no obligation to participate and may withdraw from participation at any time. You have the option for full or partial participation. Full participation includes being observed and being interviewed. Partial participation involves one aspect and not the other. Partial participation will not have any impact on other benefits to which you are entitled.

Risks or Discomforts
Potential risks and/or discomforts of participation may include discomfort with being observed or discomfort with specific questions. There will be no risks to your physical being or health.

Benefits
Possible benefits of participation include your being regarded as an advisor for other museums seeking to collaborate with another museum. This may result in being called in to assist on a project or give advice. The museum itself may be seen as a leader in cross-museum collaboration as well and may serve as an example of how to conduct such a collaborative project.

Incentives to participate
Compensation is not being offered for participation in this research project.

Confidentiality
Your privacy will be respected. You have the option to have the researcher use a different name or identifier in the analysis of the project to keep your information safe throughout this study.

Your individual identity will be kept private when information is presented or published about this study. If you agree, it would benefit the study's analysis if your role or title/position within the museum could be used to assess how collaboration works at Museo de las Americas. There is a possibility that you may be recognized by your role within the museum as this information is freely given on the museum's website. Should you wish to be completely anonymous, the request will be honored. Data pertaining to this project will be kept on a flash drive that only I have access to, and notes will be kept in a notebook, which will be on my person at all times or in a locked office. Interviews will be recorded on a digital recording device and the audio files kept on the flash drive. After the completion of the research project, all notes, transcriptions and audio files will be destroyed. Consent forms and email conversations relating to the project will be kept for up to three years and then destroyed.

Questions
If you have any questions about this project or your participation, please contact Leah Zavaleta at 919.265.7753 or leah.zavaleta@du.edu at any time. You can reach the faculty advisor for this project, Christina Kreps, at christina.kreps@du.edu.
If you have any questions or concerns about your research participation or rights as a participant, you may contact the DU Human Research Protections Program by emailing IRBAdmin@du.edu or calling (303) 871-2121 to speak to someone other than the researchers.

Options for Participation
Please initial your choice for the options below:
___The researchers may audio/video record or photograph me during this study.
___The researchers may NOT audio/video record or photograph me during this study.

Please take all the time you need to read through this document and decide whether you would like to participate in this research study.

If you agree to participate in this research study, please sign below. You will be given a copy of this form for your records.
_____   _____
Participant Signature   **Date**

Please take all the time you need to read through this document and decide whether you would like to participate in this research study.
If you decide to participate, your completion of the research procedures indicates your consent. Please keep this form for your records.