

Spring 5-18-2019

Social Media and the Democratization of American Museums

Valerie Wainwright

University of San Francisco, valerie.archer.wainwright@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.usfca.edu/capstone>

Part of the [Museum Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wainwright, Valerie, "Social Media and the Democratization of American Museums" (2019). *Master's Projects and Capstones*. 898.
<https://repository.usfca.edu/capstone/898>

This Project/Capstone is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects at USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Projects and Capstones by an authorized administrator of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact repository@usfca.edu.

Social Media and the Democratization of American Museums

Keywords:

museum studies, democratization of American museums, Internet, social media, participation, paradigm shift, authority, authenticity, curator, crowd-sourced, crowd-curated, Instagram

by

Valerie Archer Wainwright

Capstone project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Museum Studies

Department of Art + Architecture
University of San Francisco

Faculty Advisor: Stephanie A. Brown

Academic Director: Paula Birnbaum

December 14, 2018

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my Faculty Advisor, Stephanie A. Brown, Ph.D., for her wisdom, patience and understanding. I enjoyed our discussions immensely. I would also like to thank Marjorie Schwarzer, Administrative Director, Museum Studies, for her enthusiasm and support, and Professor Kate Lusheck for her guidance and expertise. Thank you also to Thacher Gallery Director Glori Simmons, Gallery Manager Nell Herbert and all of my Curatorial Practicum student colleagues, especially Ana Pao Romero Latapi and Jessica Noyes. It was wonderful working with you on “Quiet Spaces.” Thank you for your friendship Museum Studies M.A. Class of '18. I look forward to staying in touch. Finally, thank you Sam and Marina. Hearing you say “you got this!” really helped.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|--------|
| Abstract | 1 |
| Introduction | 2-7 |
| Literature Review | 8-29 |
| Case Studies | 30-57 |
| Conclusion | 58-64 |
| Appendices: | 65-97 |
| Appendix A - Annotated Bibliography | 65-90 |
| Appendix B - Quiet Spaces PR campaign proposal | 91-94 |
| Appendix C - Quiet Spaces Social Media Plan | 95-96 |
| Appendix D- Museum Instagram Account Data | 97 |
| References | 98-101 |

Abstract

The **democratization of American museums** has been accelerated by societal changes caused by the development of new, multiway channels of communication created by the **Internet** and **social media**. Social media is prompting public **participation** which has led to a **paradigm shift** in museology towards public engagement. The rise of vernacular creativity, especially among the younger, digitally native generations who are “curating” their identities by replicating, manipulating and sharing culture online, challenges the **authority** of the museum and **curator** as arbiters of culture. This paradigm shift also broadens the definition of **authenticity** from the object to the authentic experience. This paper argues that museums have a responsibility to remain relevant and to model the use of new technologies in the service of public good and in the pursuit of democratic ideals. They can only do so through nimble experimentation with social media. An examination of the evolution of the museum’s role in American society is followed by an analysis of the impact of technology on museum practice and philosophy. The description of a number of case studies involving social media initiatives by museums suggests that engaging the public in the curatorial process through **crowd-sourced** and **crowd-curated** exhibitions may be the key to museum sustainability. Finally, an outline of a social media campaign designed for an exhibition at the University of San Francisco’s Thacher Gallery, co-curated by the M.A. in **Museum Studies** Curatorial Practicum serves as a lesson in the use of the new media platform, **Instagram**.

Introduction

“We must treasure the old and honor the elder while steadily integrating the new to make museums more central and more relevant to a society in which we want to live”
- Elaine Heumann Gurian (Gurian, 2006, p7).

The dawn of the digital age and the emergence of the Internet mark a new era for museology. Museums are redefining themselves as democratic institutions characterized by a commitment to community and equal access to information and cultural heritage. Social media, with its communicative and participatory attributes, is at the forefront of this revolution in museum philosophy. A paradigm shift towards participation fueled by social media means museums have the responsibility to pursue democratic ideals through the inclusion of multiple voices in the museum narrative, and the broadening of access to all aspects of museum governance, from collections, to curation, exhibition design and outreach. This paper begins with an examination of the philosophical evolution of the museum's role in American society and concludes with several case studies of recent social media initiatives by museums that point the way towards a design for continued relevance and the sustainability of museums.

American museums in the late 19th century were primarily bastions of the elite. They mimicked the architectural appearance of the European palace or Roman temple and housed the private collections of the wealthy. Those who collected as well as those who cared for the collections were well educated and the contents were organized according to prevailing academic theories. Concurrently, the goal of outreach and educa-

tion on a wider scale was developing along the philosophical tenets of museology pioneers such as John Cotton Dana. Dana espoused democratic idealism by “placing the emphasis on the user rather than the institution” (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p35). Thus on the one hand the museum was perceived as a dominant cultural authority based upon the curator’s expertise, and on the other hand as an institution dedicated to public service. These two philosophical strains have influenced the evolution of museum philosophy up until the present day.

Following a discussion of the emphasis on museum outreach and education fostered by government funding during the mid-twentieth century, I focus on the decades of the 1960’s and 70’s, which were characterized by civil unrest and social upheaval in America. It was during this time that art movements began to seriously challenge the authority of the museum as the arbiter of art, and curators began to consider the relevance of social, rather than purely aesthetic, goals for exhibitions (Guenther, 2014). It was also during this time that digital technology began its ascent. I summarize three publications by the American Alliance of Museums (AAM) that span twenty-five years of technology as it relates to museum practice and philosophy from the onset of the Internet to the birth of social networking sites. The first volume, *The Wired Museum* (Jones-Garnil, 1997), was a clarion call for museums to digitize their collections for greater public access. The final volume, *Mobile Apps for Museums* (Proctor, 2011) encouraged museum professionals to develop interactive apps to enhance user engagement and participation. Social media was making the museum a more inherently social space. This leads me to revisit the battle framed by Duncan Cameron, the author of the “The Museum, a

Temple or the Forum” (Anderson, 2012). Cameron defends the museum as temple while Stephen Weil, who wrote “From Being *About* Something to Being *For* Someone” (Anderson, 2012), believed the primary mission of the museum was to be a forum for social issues.

The impact of technology and new modes of communication on society at large and on museums in particular has also called for the redefinition of the role of the curator. This paper continues with a discussion of the shifting role of the curator in a new era of participatory engagement. The ability to replicate, manipulate and share images online has led to a rise in vernacular creativity. The exponential expansion of social media networking sites is indicative of “The Experience Economy” (Klindt, 2017) in which the public has become accustomed to sharing their opinions. Nancy Proctor suggests that the contemporary curator may now have greater impact “by becoming a curator of information in the public domain, and an expert communicator and interpreter, stimulating interest and helping audiences navigate to the information sources that satisfy their curiosity” (Proctor, 2010, p38).

I then turn to case studies, beginning with a definition of social media and a description of the culture that has grown up around it. Amelia Wong writes that the digitally native culture “celebrates openness, frequent communication, participation, customization, collaboration and the visible articulation of identity and networks” (Sandell & Nightingale, 2012, p282). This is also the culture which has given rise to pop-up museums such as the Museum of Ice Cream, and I take a closer look at this “Made-for-Instagram

Museum” phenomenon (Pardes, 2017). What makes museums different from these new “selfie” factories is the creation of context, one of the traditional responsibilities of the curator. Sarah Cook concludes that a curator today, specifically a curator of contemporary art, does not so much need years of specialized connoisseurship as a “cutting-edge knowledge of the problems at play in contemporary society” (Townsend, 2003, p174).

Following this discussion are case studies of several recent social media initiatives that demonstrate the need for experimentation in the use of social media in order for museums to remain relevant and fulfill their public service missions to increase access and encourage user participation. Engaging the public in the curatorial process through crowd-sourced and crowd-curated exhibitions, as well as in co-creation through social media, may be a way to engage new and younger audiences.

“Click! A Crowd-Curated Exhibition,” which opened in 2008 at the Brooklyn Museum, is a landmark of this “ground-breaking trend” (Guenther, 2014). Ken Johnson, the arts writer for *The New York Times*, wrote:

How people arrive at consensus in the art world is worth studying. So is the tension between experts and non-experts, which can reach to the highest reaches of the culture industry...But it will take a lot more persuasive reasoning to convince anyone with a serious interest in artistic quality that ‘crowd-curating’ is a good idea. The best you can say for ‘Click!’ is that it’s a good conversation starter (Johnson, 2008).

The conversation continues with a description of three exhibitions that demonstrate how social media can build interest and increase audience engagement for museums

willing to experiment with digital platforms. They are: “O Snap! Your take on our Photographs” from the Carnegie Museum of Art in Philadelphia, “Public Property,” at the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore, and “Photo Hunt” at the Columbus Museum of Art (Guenther, 2014).

“Photo Hunt,” initiated in 2012, was repeated numerous times. It was an Instagram-based campaign during which participants submitted a photo in response to a photograph from the Columbus Museum of Art’s collection that was posted on the social networking site. The best submissions were later mounted next to the original artwork in gallery space. The museum staff felt it was successful because it was about “... building a creative community and a deeper connection to art” (Guenther, 2014, p40). Other goals of these projects included demystifying the curatorial practice and breaking down perceived barriers that keep large segments of the population out of art museums (Guenther, 2014).

There has been backlash by those who consider “citizen curators” and “user-generated content” to constitute “dumbing down” and “false democratization.” However, the potential for forwarding social justice by including the public voice is undeniable (Salamon, Cunningham & Richards, 2017). These exhibitions also support a broadening definition of authenticity, as Ross Parry points out:

Contemporary Museology is providing us with new definitions of the ‘authentic’ that shift its definition away from an emphasis on the genuine and the original, and more towards terms such as honesty and humanity. In this frame of reference, authenticity becomes much more to do with intent and impact, and much less to do with provenance and authorship alone (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p25).

Social media is already an integral part of the communication channels that are maintaining and building relationships between museums and current and potential users. Can social media support a University Gallery's mission to "foster creativity, scholarship and community" as well? I continue with the description of a social media campaign for the University of San Francisco's Thacher Gallery with which I was involved. This exhibition was co-curated by the M.A. in Museum Studies Curatorial Practicum in the fall of 2018, and explored the theme of sanctuary as it related to image and text found in modern illustrated books in the permanent collection of the University's Donohue Rare Book Room. As a member of the PR team for "Quiet Spaces: Picturing Sanctuary in the Illustrated Book," I helped develop a promotional campaign that sought to connect USF students with the Gallery's "community of interest" both on campus and online. As the exhibition and the writing of this paper were concurrent, I was unable to assess the campaign, however, a new model for evaluation is introduced that is potentially more suitable for contemporary exhibitions. Outlined in Andrew Pekarik's essay, "From Knowing to Not Knowing" (Anderson, 2012), this evaluation model calls for iterative exhibition design based on visitor feedback.

Finally, I echo the experts and call for an openness to experimentation regarding Internet innovations so that museums can remain relevant and make valuable contributions to the evolution of democratic principles within the museum organizational infrastructure, and between museums and their communities, both onsite and online.

Literature Review

“Museums are the inventions of men, not inevitable, eternal, ideal nor divine. They exist for the things we put in them, and they change as each generation chooses how to see and use those things” - Stephen Weil (Anderson, 2012, p172).

The gallery on the top floor of the museum is dark, lit only by the glow from nine video screens. People of all ages fill the space, seen in silhouette, alone or in groups. Some are sitting in corners, others move about slowly. The space is crowded, yet no one seems to mind. A few people are crying, others seem bemused. The dirge-like multimedia artwork “The Visitors” is striking an emotional, even spiritual note in museum visitors, young and old. Created by Icelandic artist Ragnar Kjartansson in 2012, this piece is a contemporary work of art that is humanistic, meditative and both uplifting and somewhat melancholy. A different artist appears on each of the nine screens, each filmed in a different room of a decaying mansion, playing an instrument and singing a phrase over and over again from a poem penned by Kjartansson’s ex-wife; “Once again I fall into my feminine ways.” The piece is over an hour long, but many visitors stay for the entire performance, and some return with their family and friends. They ask for the artwork long after the exhibit has closed. “The Visitors” is not just popular, it embodies many of the sociological theories that museums must act upon in this digital age in order to remain relevant. It looks like entertainment, but invokes complex emotions. It allows for multiple interpretations. It is social, viewed in a public space where a broad range of reactions are valid. There are no didactic panels or audio guides. Visitors are free to roam, yet stay connected by the gallery’s inherent inclusion. This is art that people want to experience and share.

Today, we are firmly entrenched in the digital age, and museums are evolving to accommodate societal changes. They strive to mirror these changes in new mission statements, new methods of exhibition and curation, education and outreach. The societal changes brought about by the digital, information, or “Knowledge Age” (Falk & Sheppard, 2006) are extraordinary, and they are happening rapidly. Many experts agree that the digital age marks a paradigm shift for museology (Jones-Garmil, 1997; Manovich, 2002; Anderson, 2012; Sanchez-Laws, 2015). As researchers John Falk and Beverly Sheppard have observed, “The changes we are seeing today are not evolutionary in nature, they are revolutionary. Everyone seems to agree that we are living through one of the greatest periods of economic and social upheaval in recorded history” (Falk & Sheppard, 2006, p24). Some experts suggest that the emergence of the Internet signaled the creation of a new “cultural metalanguage” (Manovich, 2002) as pivotal to social evolution as the invention of the Guttenberg press (Drotner & Schroder, 2013). Elaine Heumann Gurian, a museum consultant with a long history of working in groundbreaking museums, mused, “the change when it comes, will not be merely technological, but at its core philosophical” (Gurian, 2006, p95). I would argue that this change has occurred.

Through an analysis of the writings of professionals from across a broad range of museum fields, this paper suggests that in order for museums to survive they must redefine themselves as democratic institutions whose primary mission is to serve their communities in a two-way conversation that acknowledges the public in an intercon-

nected, digital world. I also postulate that the inclusion of multiple voices in the museum narrative does not constitute a “dumbing down” of culture although it does indicate shared authority (Din & Hecht, 2007; Drotner & Schroder, 2013; Guenther, 2014; Salaman, Cunningham & Richards, 2017). Nor does the inclusion of the public voice signal the demise of the curator’s. Instead, it suggests a shift in curatorial practice towards collaboration and the modeling of expert thought (Din & Hecht, 2007). Nina Simon, director of the Museum of Art and History in Santa Cruz, CA, defines it this way: “Instead of being ‘about’ something or ‘for’ someone, participatory institutions are created and managed ‘with’ visitors” (Nina Simon, 2010, piii). Not all of the changes wrought by the Internet and social media are viewed in a positive light, and the outcome is far from resolved. However, “the presence of digital technology in museums is both pervasive and permanent. While the actual technologies continue to morph, museums will continue to adjust to both the promise and the challenge inherent in digital media” (Din & Hecht, 2007).

This paper begins with an historical overview of the philosophical evolution of the museum’s role in American society up to the dawn of the digital age. I then take a closer look at developments in computer technology that have impacted society, and museums in particular, from the 1990’s through the first decade of the 21st century, and how museums have responded. Finally, I focus on the traditional role of the curator and suggest that the responsibilities of this pivotal position have shifted due to new modes of communication and interaction between the institution and its visitors. This investigation into issues vital to the sustainability of the museum builds the foundation for a

description of case studies and a summary of suggestions designed to answer the question of how a University gallery can redefine itself to remain relevant and enhance its relationship with both current and potential stakeholders; college students who are digital natives, and community members from the University's urban environment.

We all collect things. Why? Why do we keep a shell, our mother's ring, or a dog's collar? Why do we keep photos and purchase paintings to decorate our homes? We collect things to remind us of a place or a loved one; perhaps a moment in time. As Duncan Cameron (1930-2006), a Canadian museologist and former director of the Brooklyn Museum observed, we collect objects that resonate personally, that remind us of who we are, and where we fit in the world (Anderson, 2012). John Cotton Dana (1856-1929), founding director of the Newark Museum in New Jersey and a pioneer of museum theory, opined in "The Gloom of the Museum," that wealthy people collect valuable things that others can't have (Anderson, 2012). When the first public museums opened in America in the late 19th century, they primarily housed the private collections of the American aristocracy in buildings that emulated European models of the palace or temple (Anderson, 2012). In essence, they showcased the memories and aspirations of the elite. Those who collected, as well as those who cared for the collections, were well educated, and the objects were organized, as Cameron explained in his essay "The Museum, a Temple or the Forum," according to "scientific systems of classification, to prevailing theories of history, or to the academic approach to art and art history" (Anderson, 2012, p53). The primary mission of the museum was to collect, preserve and interpret these unique and valuable objects in a scholarly manner (Conn, 2010). These

institutions were dependent upon private subsidies from wealthy patrons (Falk & Shepard, 2006) and were visited, not all that frequently, by academics and by members of the upper-middle-class elite, whose values they reflected (Anderson, 2012). The objects themselves gained a special aura and were imbued with significance due to their selection and interpretation by experts (Guenther, 2014).

Of course, there is a multiplicity of viewpoints in history. The goal of community outreach and education on a wider scale appears early on in museology theory. Peale's museum in Philadelphia attempted to attract a broad constituency through a mix of patriotism, civic engagement, entertainment and natural science. The science exhibits were carefully organized to reflect accepted theories of humankind's place in the universe in a manner meant to appeal to a general audience (Conn, 2010). Lynda Kelly, a museum scholar based in Sydney, Australia, mentions the writings of George Brown Goode (1851-1896), an ichthyologist, secretary of the Smithsonian, and museum thinker, who stated that "the museum must, in order to perform its proper functions, contribute to the advancement of learning through the increase as well as through the diffusion of knowledge" (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p54). John Cotton Dana, writing in 1917, was intent upon opening up the museum to the community, both for entertainment and instruction (Anderson, 2012). Dana's democratic idealism of the 1920's stated: "New audiences will use museums in ways which will dissolve traditional barriers between different organizations, placing the emphasis on the user rather than the institution" (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p35). Dana even coined the word "user" to describe museum visitors, a moniker that has only recently been widely (re)adopted. The histori-

an Steven Conn writes: “These twin drives toward increased public access and increased rationality culminated, certainly in the United States, in the creation of the great civic museums of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries” (Conn, 2010, p21). The evolution of the museum in American society has thus been driven both by the dominant cultural authority of the curator’s expertise, as well as by the democratic ideals of public service.

Due to technological and sociological developments in the Industrial age, a paradigm shift in the museum mission did occur mid-20th century. The average working class family gained discretionary income, and the time to spend it on something other than food, clothing and shelter (Falk & Sheppard, 2006). Lev Manovich, artist, computer programmer and professor of new media art, points out that these years also saw the rise of mass entertainment, including cinema, the lexicon of which the digital age would later embrace (Manovich, 2002). Museums began to respond with exhibitions interpreted for a wider audience with greater entertainment value. According to Falk & Sheppard, the model for managing these museums was based on Industrial Age protocols. Management was top down and paternalistic (Falk & Sheppard, 2006). Stephen Weil points out that although a “good” museum at the time might have meant one that was known for its excellent collection and knowledgeable staff, its generous benefactors, and peer approved programs, “not one of those approaches took into the slightest account the museum’s external impact on either its visitor or its community” (Anderson, 2012, p178).

The drive towards greater public inclusion was fueled after World War II when there was an enormous increase in the number of museums, many engaged in what Barbara Franco, former director of the Historical Society of Washington D.C., called the “salvage and warehouse business,” in an attempt to collect and preserve the record of human and natural history after the war (Anderson, 2012, p170). Museums became showcases not just for the memory of the elite, but for “the memory of all” (Gurian, 2006). Professional organizations such as AAM, founded in 1906, and ICOM, established in 1946, began to have an effect on museum ideology by setting standards for the museum mission to perform public service. Museums also began to receive federal funding, with the mandate of serving the public, not only as caretakers of cultural history, but also in outcome based community programming (Anderson, 2012). Museums began to pay more attention to public programming to attract new audiences and increase revenue. Exhibits featured enhanced entertainment values, and educational programs were expanded (Falk & Sheppard, 2006). The onset of civil unrest and social upheaval during the 1960’s and 70’s, as well as developments in analog and digital technology, would bring further changes to society. In response, museums would change their methods of museum preservation, curation and exhibition.

As early as the 1950’s, contemporary art movements began to challenge institutional authority, especially the role of art galleries as arbiters for definitions of art. Kate Fowle, in her essay “Who cares? Understanding the role of the Curator Today” (Rand & Kouris, 2007) describes the rise of artists’ collectives in New York City in the fifties where the curatorial role was taken on by the the artists themselves. At the same time in London,

the “Independent Group,” consisting of artists and critics, became a forum for discussions around art as part of a greater cultural network that included popular culture such as movies and fashion. Fowle singles out two particularly influential curators who emerged at this time: Harald Szeemann and Walter Hopps. Fowle writes: “While their characters and careers were markedly different, they shared a desire to challenge the bureaucracy of institutions, earning reputations for actively questioning the form of exhibitions as well as for their sustained engagement with artists and their work” (Rand & Kouris, 2007, p30). Szeemann is known for recognizing new forms of art such as installation and performance art where the exhibition was an experimental endeavor. Hopps expanded the parameters of solo shows by living artists, such as Marcel Duchamp’s first retrospective in 1963, including “Fountain,” a seminal work from 1917 that helped formulate the debate between content and context; an issue that is revisited in discussions about social media use by museums today (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013).

Amanda Guenther in an article entitled “Today’s Curation: News of the Art Museum and the Crowd” credits two movements in particular, “Institutional critique” and “Fluxus,” as being progenitors to current experiments in participatory and inclusive design such as crowd-curating (Guenther, 2014). Both movements challenged elite control of art institutions and sought to manipulate museum collections and spaces (Guenther, 2014). New York artist Dove Bradshaw, for example, who was involved in the “Institutional critique” movement “added her own label to a glass case for a fire hose mounted to a wall in the Metropolitan Museum of Art” (Guenther, 2014, p27). Dove made postcards featuring a photo of the case and placed them in the museum gift

store. Eventually the Met purchased the original photograph, and put institutionally sanctioned postcards on sale.

“Fluxus” was an art movement that questioned traditional interpretations of art objects. Mixed media projects incorporated found materials, mail art, scavenger hunts and even silent orchestras, all meant to demonstrate that everyone is an artist. The ultimate objective of the founder, George Maciunas, was the “gradual elimination of the fine arts” (Guenther, 2014, p29). Although this radical goal was not widely accepted, the democratization of the gallery space through the inclusion of multiple voices was being tested. “The acceptance by some curators of such ‘social (not aesthetic)’ goals for art exhibitions has continued to justify the socially constructive ends of crowd-sourced art” (Guenther, 2014, p29). During the sixties, communication theorist Marshall McLuhan called for a more participatory environment in cultural institutions as well (Klindt, 2017), describing the museum as a potential facilitator for the myriad viewpoints of differing stakeholders (Sanchez-Laws, 2015).

It was also during the sixties and seventies that digital technology began its ascent. Katherine Jones-Garmil, in AAM’s publication *The Wired Museum* (1997), outlined historical tech milestones that impacted the museum world starting with automation technology used to enter collection data into databases with a system known as SELGEM, standing for “Self Generating Master” (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p36). This work was done mostly by curators and registrars for the purpose of tracking and identifying objects in collections (Marty & Burton Jones, 2007). The Apple computer was invented in 1977,

and “the era of the personal computer began in earnest” (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p39). By the end of the seventies, museums such as the Boston Children’s Museum and the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University were creating basic computer inventories of their collections. In the eighties, developments including desktop computers, improved storage devices, software written especially for museum applications, and the development of controlled vocabularies for database developers made greater access to collection information a reality (Jones-Garmil, 1997). In the late eighties a network known as ARPA-NET, which began as an initiative of the U.S. Department of Defense in the sixties, split into two segments: “a private military-only network, and another to cover the rapidly expanding use for research, business, and personal traffic that was appearing on the ARPA-NET” (Marty & Burton Jones, 2007, p17). This marks the beginning of the Internet as we know it today. Originally under the auspices of the National Science Foundation, funding for the Internet shifted to the private sector in the early nineties and the gold rush for a piece of the “telecommunications pie” took off (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p89). By 1995, the Internet was flooded with websites.

The triumvirate of publications from AAM regarding the integration of technology in museums that begins with *The Wired Museum* (Jones-Garmil, 1997) and ends with *Mobile Apps for Museums* (Proctor, 2011), spans 25 years of digital development and is a fascinating overview of the industry’s evolution from the birth of the Internet to the flourishing of social media networks. In *The Wired Museum*, a collection of essays written by leaders in the field, the contributors strongly urged museums to begin digitizing

their collections and to consider a public access component by linking their collection information to the Internet. The main argument for digitization was to fulfill the museum mission, as seen by AAM, to provide access to shared cultural heritage to the broadest possible audience. Editor Katherine Jones-Garmil, then assistant director for information services and technology at Harvard's Peabody Museum, argued that digitizing collections would actually enhance physical attendance by creating an appetite for the original object. She also believed that increased digital access to collections would greatly benefit the scholar and student. Maxwell Anderson, director of the Art Gallery of Ontario when he was writing in 1997, urged scholars worldwide to help interpret these new, exponentially increasing digital public resources, calling for a decentralization of expertise. Ever the optimist, Anderson writes: "Since the provision of varying levels of interpretation is one of the benefits of digital technology - rather than the watered-down lowest common denominator known as the wall label - digital access will allow any user with any background to feel at ease with interpretive material" (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p17).

Other concerns addressed in this volume include funding for digitization projects, the integration of resources, intellectual property rights and the overall fast pace of change in the tech industry. Howard Besser, an associate professor at the University of California's School of Information Management & Systems, based his recommendations on an examination of the library, "a cultural institution that is approximately a decade ahead of museums in the transformation process" (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p154). He saw this transformation as a movement from "collecting material 'just in case' someone will

need it” to “delivering material ‘just in time’ to answer a user’s needs” (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p154). A decade later (ten years behind) Peter Samis, then an associate curator of interpretation at SFMOMA, acknowledged the importance of providing information “just in time” for the museum visitor. He also pointed to the need for “Visual Velcro” to hook visitors and capture their attention (Din & Hecht, 2007). Besser predicted a convergence between collection management systems and systems used for exhibitions, creating a paradigm shift in how the public views museums and the possible erosion of the authority of curators. Access to a plethora of information and digitized images on the Internet would allow the public to create their own connections and juxtapositions. There was a growing realization that the traditional role of the curator as the sole arbiter of cultural significance was changing. Besser postulated that: “A possible result may be an erosion of high culture in general, with the curator’s role becoming somewhat akin to that of a film critic” (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p121). James Blackaby, then senior systems developer in the Office of Technology Initiatives at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum added that “curators are search engines too since [integrated technology tools] are highly sophisticated filing systems” (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p13). This demonstrates that museum professionals were aware of the evolving concept of shared curatorial authority. Almost two decades later, with the advent of crowd-sourced and crowd-curated exhibits, the curator’s role continues to shift towards the inclusivity of multiple voices, however, Stanford professor emerita Wanda Corn, for example, still believes in the curator’s primary historical role: “Curators will always be keepers of collections.” (Guenther, 2014, p22). Besser continued by pondering the possible deterioration of the authenticity of cultural objects through digitization, but

concluded that the visual literacy of millions was a worthwhile goal. Diane Zorich, a museum information management consultant, exhorted museum professionals to think beyond using the internet as a marketing tool, and to move towards the inclusion of pedagogical material online, which remains a primary focus for museums today (Jones-Garmil, 1997). The contributors overwhelmingly encouraged collaboration between museums for format standardization, visitor research, and most of all, experimentation. George Macdonald and Stephen Alsford, Canadian museum professionals, concluded that “museums cannot remain aloof from technological trends if they wish to attract 21st century audiences” (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p267).

Fast-forward to 2007. Where does AAM stand on the adoption of digital technology? *The Digital Museum, A Think Guide* (2007) is the second volume in the AAM trilogy, a compilation of essays by leading practitioners in the field reflecting expert thought about the inclusion of digital technology in the museum world at that time. The editors, Herminia Din and Phyllis Hecht acknowledged the “inexorable presence of the Web” (Din and Hecht, 2007, p3), and the contributors weighed both analog and digital solutions to the issues of public participation and engagement. Matthew McArthur, then director of the new media program at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of American History, in his essay entitled “Can Museums Allow Online Users to Become Participants?” wrote:

In 1997, when AAM published the seminal *Wired Museum*, a debate was raging about the impact of public access to high-quality digital images of collection objects. Would visitors no longer feel the need to visit museums? Would original artifacts lose their ‘aura?’ Would the role of curators be usurped if visitors could closely examine objects and sort them in various ways? Today those concerns

seem quaint...*Wired Museum* contributor and informatics professor Howard Besser certainly hit the nail on the head when he predicted (with some regret) that the public would come to 'view culture less as something to consume and more as something to interact with' (Din & Hecht, 2007, p59).

Web 2.0 had arrived, and with it the challenges, conflicts and opportunities of two-way communication between museums and users.

By 2007, most major museums had completed the digitization of their collections, and made them available online. Computers had become essential to all aspects of museum operations, from conservation, to collection management, registration, curation, education, marketing, and finance. The most important difference between these two AAM volumes is a shift in mission focus from accessibility to interpretation. Deborah Said Howes, then in charge of educational media at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, called this a shift from the "Information Age to the Conceptual Age," and noted that museums, as trusted sources of knowledge, can create trustworthy and appealing Internet content (Din & Hecht, 2007, p69). What was important then was how to make sense of the vast digital storehouse of cultural information in a way that would engage visitors, and provide a meaningful public service. There was a greater emphasis on public programming and education, and the desire to connect with visitors in a more personalized way. The concept of "scaffolding," or "cognitive hooks" (Din & Hecht, 2007, p22) emerged as a way to help visitors make meaning out of exhibition content. Interactive elements such as kiosks and audio guides had made their way into the gallery space to supplement, but not supplant, "those time-honored staples of gallery interpretation: wall text, object labels and live tours" (Din & Hecht, 2007, p31).

These Interactive digital displays were making galleries into more inherently social spaces. Websites had likewise become less static. No longer the digital brochures of the past, they had evolved into robust interactive sites that encouraged two-way communication with users. Herminia Din and Phyllis Hecht stated that technology elements were being designed “not only as learning tools but also to promote social interaction among visitors” (Din & Hecht, 2007, p10). With this recognition of the social sphere came an increased interest in younger audiences. Nik Honeysett, then head of administration for the J. Paul Getty Museum in Los Angeles and chair of AAM’s Media and Technology Standing Professional Committee, wrote that “...the youth of today - our future - are digital natives. To either remain or become relevant, any mid- to long-term strategic planning must include the Web as a primary mechanism to fulfill your mission” (Din & Hecht, 2007, p147). All of the contributors agreed that tech training is vital for staff and should be an integral part of preparing individuals for a museum career. Visitor research, exhibit evaluation and iteration are encouraged in order to create exhibitions that resonate with the public. The importance of the object and its “aura” had receded in favor of a meaningful social experience (Din & Hecht, 2007).

The third volume in this trilogy on technology trends from AAM is *Mobile Apps for Museums, The AAM Guide to Planning and Strategy* (2011) edited by Nancy Proctor, then head of mobile strategy and initiatives for the Smithsonian Institution. The arrival of networked mobile devices, such as smartphones, tablets, and wi-fi media players meant that two-way communication had arrived, and *Mobile Apps for Museums* encouraged museum professionals to play with technology, literally. One-way delivery of

content from museum to consumer was a thing of the past. AAM now gave museums the green light to partner with commercial vendors and develop mobile apps to encourage participation and the opportunity to connect through mobile tour guides and games. Koven Smith, then Director of Technology for the Denver Art Museum, outlined three strategies for the mobile experience; “broad appeal, stealth, and third-party” (Proctor, 2011). “Broad appeal” pertained to apps intended for a mass audience, “stealth” was meant to target a niche group, while “third-party” was an application designed by a company outside of the museum’s purview by using the API (application programming interface) for museum collection content, if available. The focus was on encouraging user participation to broaden museum access. Proctor admitted that these apps were not money makers; in fact, they might have zero return on investment. She wrote: “The metrics of success for mobile, like its goals, are therefore not just the number of downloads and dollars received, but also the extent to which the mobile program is able to engage audiences and support other museum programs, activities and revenue streams” (Proctor, 2011, p21). Mobile apps connected “communities of interest” (Proctor, 2011, p11) and supported the museum’s core mission of public service by broadening the collection’s accessibility to new audiences, including social media users. According to Proctor they also had to maintain the museum’s reputation for quality content, but most importantly, they were vital to the museum’s sustainability by fulfilling the obligation to remain relevant (Proctor, 2011). As Peter Samis wrote, in a technological world, “the museum as a commodifying factor, a temple on high, is dethroned, and the visitor, with whom all experience must finally succeed or fail, thrive or

fall on barren ground, is deemed the final arbiter. The museum is the sum not of the objects it contains but rather of the experiences it triggers” (Anderson, 2012, p304).

There are those who have argued forcefully for the preservation of the temple, chief among them the framer of the debate, Duncan Cameron. Cameron, in his oft-cited essay “The Museum, a Temple or Forum,” argued that “the museum as temple is valid and furthermore that such museums are essential in the life of any society that pretends to civilization” (Anderson, 2012, p54). He thought that museums must insist on excellence and resist experimentation, while acknowledging the need for the creation of forums to display “radical innovations of art forms” and “the most controversial interpretations of history, of our own society, of the nature of man, or, for that matter, of the nature of our world” (Anderson, 2012, p55). Writing in 1971, Cameron was in the enviable position of reflecting at a time when museum attendance had been growing steadily for two decades. Still, he expressed concern over the public the museum didn’t reach. He proposed engaging this audience through mass media. What he didn’t foresee was the evolution of mass media into social media. He also could not have known that attendance at art museums, across all demographics would start to decline steadily during the first decade of the 21st century. Attendance dropped 8% from 2008 to 2012 - to 21% overall - according to a report by the National Endowment for the Arts (Guenther, 2014). “Visits by women and minority groups remained steady. Museum-going rates declined among millennials and generation X. Attendance at art museums and galleries increased only among adults age 75 and older” (Guenther, 2014, p6).

In contrast to Cameron, Stephen Weil, writing thirty years later, felt that the primary mission of museums was to be a forum for social issues important to the community. For example, he described the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum, sponsored by the Smithsonian in Washington D.C., as a model for a neighborhood museum because it was “for somebody rather than about something” (Anderson, 2012, p182). Weil felt that the Anacostia’s attention to present day community concerns resulting in exhibitions such as “The Rat: Man’s Invited Affliction” (Anderson, 2012, p184) represented a shift in American museums from the old knowledge rich, scavenger-warehouse model, to “breadth-based learning environments” responsive to the concerns of the community, and fueled by a rapidly evolving electronic information environment (Anderson, 2012, p185). Cameron, on the other hand, thought that the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum should be classified as a community center, rather than a museum. Cameron wrote: “Is it not a community center serving an important and very necessary function in interpreting the immediate environment and the cultural heritage of that community by means of exhibition techniques but without permanent collections and curatorial functions?” (Anderson, 2012, p50). Weil believed that serving the community was, in fact, the primary mission of a museum. He summed up three decades of museum evolution since Cameron’s day as: “mere refreshment (the museum as carbonated beverage) to education (the museum as a site for informal learning) to nothing short of communal empowerment (the museum as an instrument for social change)” (Anderson, 2012, p175). Likewise Falk & Sheppard state that museums have become gathering places, or “forums” for discussions and debates about local community concerns and ideas. (Falk & Sheppard, 2006). Furthermore, as Weil suggested, this evolution was being fu-

eled by “a rapidly evolving electronic information environment” (Anderson, 2012, p185). The birth of the Internet was driving sociological changes that would make it essential for museums to realign their missions to be more about connecting with their communities, and to program more responsively around the issues of social justice that those communities felt were relevant.

This modern concept of the museum as an institution for the promotion of social justice brings into question the role of the curator. Traditionally, the curator was the voice of authority, the arbiter of cultural excellence. How can a museum curator be an arbiter for social justice? John Cotton Dana, back in 1917, referred to them as “high priests of a peculiar cult, who may treat the casual visitor with tolerance only when he comes to worship rather than to look with open eyes and to criticize freely” (Anderson, 2012, p25). Sarah Cook, who has curated exhibitions for the National Gallery of Ottawa and the Walter Phillips Gallery in Banff, wrote a description of the traditional art curator based on the history of the profession: “a museum curator’s role is in selecting, assigning and categorizing - namely engaging in research in order to issue judgements of quality” (Townsend, p170). These judgements are based on the curators’ training in aesthetics and art history and lead to the creation of context (Townsend, 2003). One shift in modern curatorial practice Cook identifies is the way in which curators are trained. Today, she claims, they are more frequently students from museum studies programs. “The field of curating itself has changed from one of strict and specialized connoisseurship of individuals and their oeuvres to one that...has more to do with public service, diplomatic management, and cutting-edge knowledge of the problems at

play in contemporary society” (Townsend, 2003, p173). She sees the role of the curator as a collaborative one, with artists, and also with community leaders. The curator is a moderator of sorts in the museum as a forum for social discourse.

In the new “Knowledge Age,” Falk & Sheppard see curators as a part of a museum management team without silos; as members of a knowledgeable staff that helps answer the questions society deems valuable (Falk & Sheppard, 2006). According to Falk, the museum must relinquish and share curatorial authority and interpretation with stakeholders, including diverse interpretations that might be more personal or rooted in tradition rather than scholarship. Although the traditional authority of the curator has been earned through “long periods of research and study” (Falk & Sheppard, 2006, p227), validating the personal knowledge and expertise of the visitor would establish a new sense of mutual trust and respect. Some curators are critical about shared authority, especially in new experiments such as crowd-curation. Traditional curators feel that their expertise is being trivialized (Sanchez-Laws, 2015). While curators’ expertise is very valuable, they are collaborating more and more often with community members and artists, and thus “reducing curatorial autonomy” (Guenther, 2014, p22).

The loss of a singular authoritative voice, not only in the museum world, but on the web, has engendered the concept of “radical trust” (Sanchez-Laws, 2015). Radical trust is simply about trusting the community. In 2006, Jim Spadaccini, Founder and Creative Director of Ideum, a firm specializing in software and hardware for interactive exhibit elements, commented on the idea of radical trust on the Ideum blog:

We can only build emergent systems if we have radical trust. With an emergent system, we build something without setting in stone what it will be...we allow and encourage participants to shape and to sculpt and be co-creators of the system...we know that abuse can happen, but we trust (radically) that the community and participation will work (Sanchez-Laws, 2015, p64).

Wikipedia is a website, for example, that operates under the auspices of “radical trust.”

Folksonomy, the tagging of photos in a museum collection by the public for better identification and search retrieval, is another. Detractors of social media, like Andrew Keen, believe that the blurring of lines between expert and amateur is detrimental to culture and a civilized society. Keen writes: “...the real consequence of the Web 2.0 revolution is less culture, less reliable news, and a chaos of useless information. One chilling reality in this brave new digital epoch is the blurring, obfuscation, and even disappearance of truth” (Keen, 2007, p16). Maxwell Anderson offered an antidote to Keen’s vitriol when he wrote:

The assault of documents composed from untutored and unfocused ramblings will doubtless be massive. Yet such might be said of the printing press as well since the pool of available information before the press was shallow indeed. An ever-widening pool is only as threatening as one chooses to make it, since blathering will continue around the world, with or without the Internet (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p23).

In the following section, I’ll discuss how engaging the public in the curatorial process through crowd-sourced and crowd-curated exhibitions, as well as in co-creation through social media may be a solution to the sustainability of museums in the digital age. I then describe a social media campaign for the University of San Francisco’s Thacher gallery, with which I was involved, and suggest how an academic gallery might further redefine itself in the digital age, promote social justice and engage the participa-

tion of the urban community as well as the digitally native young adults that are its primary stakeholders.

Case Studies

“I share, therefore I am.” This is the ethos of young adults who have never known a world without digital devices, writes Lynda Kelly in “The Connected Museum.” “Participation is not only embraced, it is expected, 24/7” (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p66).

We live in a new world. The Internet has changed the way we communicate, and by doing so has caused a paradigm shift in the way knowledge and culture are created and disseminated. Lynda Kelly in her essay “The Connected Museum in the World of Social Media” goes on to say “...humans are currently in the fourth great information age. Since early times, humans have experienced periods of massive change beginning with the invention of writing; followed by the move from the scroll to codex; then the emergence of the printing press; and now, the Internet and mobile communication (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p55). Social media is an integral part of this communication revolution which is changing society and therefore museums as well. Amelia Wong, who manages social media outreach and develops web content for the United States Holocaust Museum, believes that social media has democratizing potential because it can advance “democratic notions that all people are equal and should have equal access to participate in public discourse” (Sandell & Nightingale, 2012, p283). With equal access to communication platforms, there is now a wealth of information available on the Internet, creating the need for new ways of organizing, filtering and contextualizing content. This points to a new role for the museum and the curator (Guenther, 2014). Museums must now determine how to incorporate a myriad of voices without diminishing public trust in the institution as a source of knowledge (Holdgaard & Klastrup, 2014).

Museums now have websites, and many have a presence on social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and LinkedIn. Some have more robustly embraced these platforms by experimenting with ways to use social media to fulfill their public service missions to increase access and encourage connection, interaction and participation in the preservation, dissemination and creation of cultural heritage. Not all of these experiments have been deemed successful in terms of audience building either online or onsite (Holdgaard & Klasttrup, 2014). However, there is general agreement among experts that the goals and the results of social media initiatives are difficult to assess, and that more research and better evaluation techniques are necessary (Fletcher & Lee, 2012; Padilla-Melendez & Aguila-Obra, 2013; Holdgaard & Klasttrup, 2014). There is also, however, general agreement among American museum professionals that becoming involved with social media is an important component of new communication strategies designed to encourage museum visitor participation and engagement (Fletcher & Lee, 2012).

Through an examination of several recent, outstanding exhibitions that have used social media in the curatorial process, such as “Click! A Crowd-Curated Exhibition” at the Brooklyn Museum, as well as an analysis of expert opinions surrounding social media use by museums generally, I propose that nimble experimentation in the use of social media is vital to the sustainability of museums in light of rapid technological and social change (Klindt, 2017). I also describe a recent social media campaign for the University of San Francisco’s Thacher Gallery with which I was involved, and from which infer-

ences can be drawn that inform several proposals for future iterations of social media use by University galleries.

According to Maj Klindt in her article “When and How Do We Participate” (Klindt, 2017), “...museums today are in a crisis because the traditional model of the museum reflects a culture that no longer exists” (Klindt, 2017, p37). We now live in an “Experience Economy” where participation is key (Klindt, 2017). We no longer consume media, we create and share it. There is a rise in “vernacular creativity” in social relations broadly, brought about in part by the combination of the digital camera and the mobile phone. People share everyday creativity within a social matrix of friends and family that provides context in a personalized community (Hinton, 2013). Amelia Wong writes: “Museums may come to be seen as more ‘everyday’ than ‘event’ as they make daily appearances within a user’s broader news-stream of updates from friends, family, national newspapers and the corner bakery” (Sandell & Nightingale, 2012, p284). The public has also become accustomed to sharing their opinions. “Thus as museum goes,” Ana Luisa Sanchez Laws reflects in the introduction to *Museum Websites & Social Media*, “we expect increased input into museum collections, for example by having online tools to group our preferred objects and share these with friends in social media sites, and we might even find the curator’s blog and engage them in conversations about these objects” (Sanchez Laws, 2015, p16). Curators are becoming more accessible as they begin to engage in a dialogue with users and to share their knowledge and expertise with the public through social media.

The word “curate” itself is being used in a much wider and more flexible context than it has been in the past. We curate our clothing, our collection of Star Wars memorabilia, our social media profiles. Amanda Guenther points out that “it is now fashionable to call any activity that involves culling or selecting a form of curation” (Guenther, 2014, p19). Glynda Hull and John Scott suggest in their essay “Curating and Creating Online” that “‘curation’ is now used as a metaphor to characterize online identity and communicative practices, as young people cultivate representations of themselves on social networking sites such as Facebook, Tumblr, and Pinterest” (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p131). Guenther concludes: “Curators today may not be intimidated by the broadened usage of the word, but it is clear that a tension exists around the title of the position of curator” (Guenther, 2014, p19).

Lev Manovich in *The Language of New Media* describes how, in a post-industrial society, “every citizen can construct her own custom lifestyle and ‘select’ her ideology from a large (but not infinite) number of choices” (Manovich, 2002, p41). In industrial mass society, a media object, whether a television program, a movie, or newspaper, for example, was created for a society that valued conformity. Identical versions were delivered to the masses. In the digital age, the principal of variability, as a consequence of the computer’s way of representing data, allows us to manipulate media to suit our own individual tastes. We can change the profile of a game character, for example, rearrange our desktops, and edit the size, color, and degree of detail in a photograph. We can download artwork from a museum website, include it in our social media profile, and share it on our networks. There is not only a vast amount of information available,

but innumerable choices to be made about how to use it. This concept bleeds over into the marketing world as well, as commercial companies harvest profiles from social media sites and target consumers individually. One downside, as Manovich points out, is that there is a “moral anxiety that accompanies the shift from constants to variables, from traditions to choices in all areas of life in a contemporary society” (Manovich, 2002, p44).

Museums, in the service of public good, can address the moral anxiety of contemporary society by offering participatory experiences that are both fun and transformative, as well as by providing a safe place for individuals to engage with their community around art objects. Respected museologist Elaine Gurian has noted that “the need to be in a congregative setting is perhaps much more important than we in the museum business commonly acknowledge” (Gurian, 2006, p159). Maj Klindt refers to the founders of the concept of the “experience economy,” Joseph Pine and James Gilmore, who suggest that “the experience economy is not only about adding entertainment to existing activities, but about engaging the audience through new kinds of experiences that are entertaining, as well as educational, aesthetic and escapist” (Klindt, 2017, p44). John Falk also sees a growing change in consumer desires from goods and services to experiences, particularly transformative ones (Falk & Sheppard, 2006). Amanda Guenther notes that “museums are responding to a cultural and economic shift that asks them to become centers of community engagement and entertain as well as to educate the public” (Guenther, 2014, p1). The issue that museums face today is how to engage the audience they already have, as well as, according

to Wong, “encourage visitation from people who find museums irrelevant or intimidating and typically spend their leisure time elsewhere” (Sandell & Nightingale, 2012, p283). Guenther cites Catherine Evans, chief curator of Philadelphia’s Carnegie Museum of Art, who says painting and sculpture exhibitions have traditionally been designed to serve the 1%. “She wants to create art experiences for the 99% - like the crowd-sourced exhibitions that have taken place in museums she has worked with. Evans believes it is possible to frame a presentation and structure art engagement ‘without dumbing anything down’” (Guenther, 2014, p6). Ross Parry points out that museums have a history of offering entertaining interpretations of objects. He claims that there is a long-standing “fictive tradition” in museum history that museums today are resisting:

This is a fictive tradition of using artifice (alongside the original), the illusory (amidst the evidenced), and make-believe (betwixt the authenticated). These are the well-established curatorial techniques of imitation (showing and using copies), illustration (conveying ideas without objects), immersion (framing concepts in theatrical and performative ways), and irony (speaking figuratively, or even presenting something knowingly wrong for effect) (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p18).

Nancy Proctor believes it’s difficult to overstate the importance of narrative, especially when it comes to mobile apps: “The story is what the audience remembers” (Proctor, 2011, p39). Hull and Scott also support narrative structure and cite M.C. Tang from his article “Representational practices in digital museums” (Tang, 2005). Tang sees “narrative-structured exhibitions [as] the most capable of conveying a message that evokes common memory and a sense of ‘imagined community’. The community that emerges around this shared narrative experience forms collective identities, but also introduces content for appropriation by new narratives, particularly for digital profile

curations...” (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p141). Lynda Kelly includes storytelling in the list of skills a modern museum professional needs. She writes that staff must be: “... content producers across a range of platforms, not just technological ones; experts in the field, but not the sole experts; facilitators, not teachers; storytellers, using the tools of narrative to weave a range of stories around content from a range of perspectives...” (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p66). Social media present many opportunities to use the “fictive tradition” to connect with varied audiences, especially the younger, “digitally-native” generations as well as underserved communities.

Researchers Antonio Padilla-Melendez and Ana Rosa del Aguila-Obra refer to the definition of social media written by Kaplan & Haenlein (2010) which identifies social media as “a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, which allows the creation and exchange of user-generated content” (Padilla-Melendez & Aguila-Obra, 2013, p5). Amelia Wong takes this further, and suggests that social media also refers to a culture that “celebrates openness, frequent communication, participation, customization, collaboration, and the visible articulation of identity and networks” (Sandell & Nightingale, 2012, p282). This is also a culture that has given rise to pop-up museums such as The Museum of Ice Cream, the name of which suggests that the word “museum” itself, like “curator,” is being used in a much wider and more flexible context than ever before.

The Museum of Ice Cream is worth examining. Arielle Pardes reviewed the Museum for *Wired* in an article entitled “Selfie-Factories: The Rise of the Made-For-Instagram Mu-

seum.” She noted that; “when it opened in 2016, it was more a temporary curiosity than a rival to, say, the Whitney Museum of American Art, which stood just across the street” (Pardes, 2017, p2). Comprised of rooms decorated with oversized ice-cream themed props, the museum achieved cult status on social media within a year of opening, with more than 241,000 followers on Instagram, and over 66,000 images with the #museumoficecream hashtag. Its San Francisco location opened in September, 2017, with single tickets going for up to \$38. The initial six-month run sold out in less than 90 minutes. While one of the co-founders, millennial Maryellis Bunn, denies that Instagram played a role in shaping the museum, its success definitely says something about our “selfie-dominated culture” (Pardes, 2017, p6). Pardes continues; “Visitors are allotted about 90 minutes to explore the museum, but it’s hard to imagine what you’d do during that time if you weren’t taking photos” (Pardes, 2017, p4). She points out that this kind of “spectacle exhibition” actually started in the contemporary art world at places like the Smithsonian’s Renwick Gallery, which opened “Wonder” in 2015. “Wonder” was an immersive art experience featuring the work of nine contemporary artists exhibiting objects such as ten towers of index cards glued together, and a room papered with dead insects. Pardes notes that “Wonder became famous on social media, bringing more visitors to the Renwick during the show’s six-week run than the museum had seen in a year” (Pardes, 2017, p7). Pardes quotes Jia Jia Fei, Director of Digital at the Jewish Museum of New York, who said during a TED talk on Art in the Age of Instagram, “When you think of the very Instagramable exhibitions of the last five years - the course in which Instagram has existed - you think of Yayoi Kusama and her Infinity Mirrored Room...and then artists like James Turrell or the Rain Room at MoMA. These are artists

who really have very critical bodies of work, but created installations that have taken on new meaning because of social media” (Pardes, 2017, p10). This is a quantum leap from Peter Samis’ “Visual Velcro,” that helped hook visitors in the first decade of the 21st century (Dinn & Hecht, 2007). Now visitors are engaged in making their own meaning out of art installations by replicating them, manipulating them and sharing their creations online. Jia Jia Fei also points out that the difference between contemporary artwork such as a mural by Sol LeWitt and the rooms inside the “The Color Factory,” is context. She says: “without that context, one might consider that to be created for Instagram. But there’s nuance in that artist’s practice. It’s about minimalism, and a period in time in which that work was created” (Pardes, 2017, p20). Sarah Cook believes “one of the primary roles of a curator, whether in the field of art, history, anthropology, or science, is in the creation of a context” (Townsend, 2003, p169). What sets museums apart from entertainment venues is context. Sarah Cook refers to film professor D.N. Rodowick who writes that “this opposition [between linguistic and plastic representations] which has been the philosophical foundation of aesthetics since the 18th century, is explicitly challenged by the new electronic, televisual, and digital media. In this respect, the electronic media have inaugurated a new regime of signs and a new way of thinking” (Townsend, 2003, p171). Cook concludes that a curator today, specifically a curator of contemporary art, does not so much need years of specialized connoisseurship, as a “cutting-edge knowledge of the problems at play in contemporary society” (Townsend, 2003, p174). Nancy Proctor in her inaugural editorial for *Curator* copies a list created by David Allison, Chair of IT and Communication at the Smithsonian’s National Museum of American History, of what’s “in” and “out” in the digital

age. Curators as experts are out. Curators as collaborators and brokers are in (Proctor, 2010, p35). Proctor surmises: "Recognizing that it is impossible for any individual to 'know it all' in the age of the Internet (if it ever was), the curator today can have an even greater impact by becoming a curator of information in the public domain, and an expert communicator and interpreter, stimulating interest and helping audiences navigate to the information sources that satisfy their curiosity" (Proctor, 2010, p38). An important distinction here is that curators are listening to the audience to find out what they want to know, rather than telling them what they need to know. "Art museums now require activating" says Nick Gray, founder of Museum Hack, a museum tour guide company geared toward millennials. "Visitors need creative support to engage with objects so that they become accessible to them" (Guenther, 2014, p17). This "activation" signals a paradigm shift recognized by many museum experts (Weil, 2002; Simon, 2010; Anderson, 2012; Hooper-Greenhill, 2011). Nanna Holdgaard and Lisbeth Klasttrup point out that in the experience economy "museums have been compelled to introduce alternative visitor experiences that ideally engage audiences and transform them from passive observers into active participators and creators" (Holdgaard and Klasttrup, 2014, p190). Ross Parry in his essay "The Trusted Artifice" argues that there is a way to reclaim a notion of the authentic after postmodernity by recognizing this shift "away from the primacy of *authentic object*...to the primacy of *authentic experience*" (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p27). In his essay "New Voices in the Museum Space," Bruno Inge-mann states that "This will often entail that the communicative professionals among the museum staff must be moved up front in the design process, and that the scholarly curators must take one step back" (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p202).

“Click! A Crowd-Curated Exhibition” was organized by Shelley Bernstein, manager of information systems at the Brooklyn Museum. It opened in June, 2008, and generated a great deal of interest and debate. It was the first crowd-sourced and crowd-curated exhibition to receive national attention, and as Guenther points out, serves as a landmark of this “ground-breaking trend” (Guenther, 2014). Ken Johnson, the arts writer for *The New York Times*, wrote in a 2008 review: “The results are inconclusive, at best, and the exhibition itself is not very interesting to look at, but the issues it raises are fascinating” (Johnson, 2008). Nina Simon, exhibition designer and museum director was more enthusiastic: “When it comes to cultural institutions taking an ambitious, creative approach to designing a platform with specific values, “Click!” takes the cake” (Simon, 2010, p115).

According to Nancy Proctor, “the term ‘crowdsourcing’ was coined by *Wired* contributing editor Jeff Howe in 2006 to name the new practice of engaging a specific group, community, or the general public to perform tasks as a group that previously were undertaken by staff or contractors” (Proctor, 2010, p37). The Brooklyn museum’s website states that “Click!” took its inspiration from “the critically acclaimed book *The Wisdom of the Crowds*, in which *New Yorker* business and financial columnist James Surowiecki asserted that a diverse crowd is often wiser at making decisions than expert individuals, ‘Click!’ explores whether Surowiecki’s premise can be applied to the visual arts - is a diverse crowd just as ‘wise’ at evaluating art as the trained experts?” An open call went out via the museum’s website asking for electronic submissions of one photograph per participant responding to the exhibition’s theme, “Changing Faces of Brook-

lyn.” The 389 images received were then anonymously displayed on the museum’s website, and the public was encouraged to evaluate them on a scale from “most effective” to “least effective.” The members of the public who rated the photos were required to create a profile with two data points: geographic location and self-reported art knowledge. Art knowledge was organized into four predetermined categories: expert, above average, more than a little, and some. The top 20%, or 78 of the photographs, rated by 3,344 participants, were selected for the exhibition and printed in four sizes, with the larger sizes for higher rankings. They were then hung salon-style, unframed, in a small gallery, which, according to Nina Simon, became “...a highly social space. The community of people who had been involved in making it - photographers and judges alike - came to share the experience with each other and with their own networks” (Simon, 2010, p117). Johnson was unimpressed by the quality of the photographs, and raised the following questions in his *New York Times* review: “What if you go to museums to learn from experts who have devoted long, deep and careful study to certain subjects? What if one of the things you value most in contemporary art is its resistance to mainstream taste, its willingness to forgo popularity in pursuit of ideas and experiences that few have already had?” (Johnson, 2008). Johnson concluded that although he found the artwork uninspiring, the issues were interesting:

How people arrive at consensus in the art world is worth studying. So is the tension between experts and non-experts, which can reach to the highest reaches of the culture industry...But it will take a lot more persuasive reasoning to convince anyone with a serious interest in artistic quality that ‘crowd-curating’ is a good idea. The best you can say for ‘Click!’ Is that it’s a good conversation starter (Johnson, 2008).

Guenther suggests that the point of exhibitions like “Click!” is “to make the process of exhibition-making more transparent, to break down any perceived barriers that keep large segments of the population out of art museums, demystifying the curatorial process” (Guenther, 2014, p14). She also suggests that experiments such as “Click!” support traditional museum exhibitions by making them seem more relevant to a digitally engaged public. Guenther reports that Bernstein herself, as reported by Carol Vogel of *The New York Times* in 2011, was primarily interested in engaging Brooklyn Museum’s “loyal Web followers” (Guenther, 2014, p8). Guenther also quotes art critic Lance Esplund’s response to the exhibit: “Art is not a popularity contest or a platform in which the viewer gets to be heard. A museum’s mission is to offer us cultures’ highest achievements, regardless of whether or not the general public takes notice” (Guenther, 2014, p2). Nina Simon observed; “Interestingly, the top ten photos selected by judges of all levels of self-reported art knowledge included eight of the same images” (Simon, 2010, p118). Finally, Guenther reports that Surowiecki wrote in a museum blog post; “At least in some media, the gap between popular and elite taste may be smaller than we think” (Guenther, 2014, p14).

What happens to common cultural objects, such as those created or curated by the public, when they enter the museum environment? Beyond the transparency of the curatorial process made possible through crowd-sourced and crowd-curated exhibitions, Amanda Guenther suggests that the meaning of the objects that are consequently incorporated into the museum by these exhibitions changes. The conversation concerning the dichotomy between high and low art, and the issues raised by the inclusion of

common objects in museum exhibitions is complex and ongoing. So-called low culture is basically entertainment. High art, on the other hand, is meant to encourage thinking and critical engagement (Hinton, 2013). What happens when the community participates in the designation of what is thought provoking and engaging? Nancy Proctor thinks perhaps we need to recognize that expertise does not need to come from a curatorial elite. John Falk realized that “handing over the interpretive process to others, whose interpretation may be more personal or rooted in tradition rather than scholarship, requires a willingness to accept that there are other criteria for knowing and understanding” (Falk & Sheppard, p153). Proctor then suggests that a “conceptual shift is necessary to reconcile these seemingly contradictory intentions: to democratize control of and access to culture through programs involving ‘citizen curators’ and ‘user-generated content,’ while preserving and valuing the subject expert and a traditional curatorial role” (Proctor, p40).

There are those who argue that the museum, relying upon the expertise of curators, should maintain the traditional role of arbiter of cultural authority. Neal Stimler, from the Image Library at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, responding to the question “What is curatorial voice in the age of social media?” tweeted by Nancy Proctor, emailed back: “While scholars and museum visitors contribute to the enrichment of curatorial practice through a social media dialogue, I do not share the view that using social media makes everyone a curator. Curators are the most trusted art experts, whose aggregated knowledge, critical thinking abilities, and aesthetic observations define the meaning and value of art” (Proctor, 2010, p40). In a Museum-iD article entitled “Participation on

Trial - Is it always a good thing?" the authors Anna Salaman, Andrea Cunningham and Polly Richards write:

Some critics have accused participation of a number of heinous cultural crimes including undermining knowledge, dumbing down, perpetuating banality and mediocrity, and false democratization...The case against participation argues that, in the participatory museum, personal responses are prioritized and the interpretation and narrative becomes minimal. The idea being that the objects are open to a multiplicity of responses and readings and that the viewer's interpretation is as valid as any other" (Salaman, Cunningham & Richards, 2017, p3).

The authors do applaud social media's ability to discover and disseminate hidden history, however, by describing the United States Holocaust Museum's interactive website feature, "Remember Me?" which posted the photos of refugee children after World War II. Since its launch in 2011, many of the children have been identified. (Salaman, Cunningham & Richards, 2017). Thus social media in museums does have the potential for forwarding issues of social justice. Pam Meecham believes that "such possibilities speak of a shift in power relationships between the established authority of the museum and the visiting public" (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p33). Ross Parry believes that "Contemporary Museology is providing us with new definitions of the 'authentic' that shift its definition away from an emphasis on the genuine and the original, and more toward terms such as honesty and humanity. In this frame of reference, authenticity becomes much more to do with intent and impact, and much less to do with provenance and authorship alone" (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p25). Elaine Gurian foresees a world where populations and cultures continue to migrate and intermingle and where:

Institutions called museums that include more active methods of cultural transfer will be created...Now as we no longer produce much of the unique thing, we may be becoming much more comfortable with the idea and use of reproduc-

tions and copies. Uniqueness is losing its importance, and the definition of authenticity is broadening” (Gurian, 2006, p176).

According to Ross Parry, authenticity can now extend to experience:

The visitor, we might say, has an authentic experience even though what he or she sees is substantially artificial. From this new realist perspective, the museum can creatively explore the web as a medium for authentic experience - and, in doing so, more confidently draw upon the fictive tradition and culture of make-believe that has served it so well in the physical venue (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p27).

Amanda Guenther broaches the topic of financial considerations that may impact the adoption of social media in many museums. “Crowd-sourced and crowd-curated exhibitions present unique opportunities and challenges for art museums looking to engage broader audiences, but most museum administrators only feel comfortable with limited and contained experiments because these projects expose the tension within the museum between catering to elite funders and ticket buyers” (Guenther, 2014, p4). According to a study conducted by Adrienne Fletcher and Moon J. Lee (2012), the economic drive to embrace interactive programming is undeniable. “Of the different organizations involved with social media, museums are one type of organization whose relationship maintenance heavily influences its survival. Without strong relationships with visitors, donors and volunteers, museums would not be successful and would cease to exist” (Fletcher & Lee, 2012, p506). There are no direct costs involved with joining most social media sites, and museum professionals agree that the benefits of social media include access, reach, and speed. The study concludes that the majority of museums are “mostly involved with one-way communication strategies using Facebook and Twitter to focus on event listing, reminders, reaching larger or newer audiences by increas-

ing the number of fans and promotional messaging. However, there is some evidence that museums are trying to increase their use of social media for multi-way communication strategies to encourage participant engagement” (Fletcher & Lee, 2012, p518).

Amanda Guenther describes ten interesting exhibitions, or “experiments,” designed with exactly this goal in mind. There are aspects of each one of these well executed, social media driven exhibitions that are worthy of further analysis, but three in particular, “O Snap! Your Take on Our Photographs,” at the Carnegie Museum of Art in Philadelphia, “Public Property” at the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore, and “Photo Hunt” at the Columbus Museum of Art, will serve to show how these projects can build interest and audience engagement for museums willing to experiment with digital platforms.

The Carnegie Museum of Art has the reputation of being a very traditional museum of fine arts. The goal of “O Snap!,” directed by Jeffrey Inscho, the web and digital media manager at the museum, was to reach new audiences; 41% of the participants were in the target audience of 20-40 year-olds. “The museum invited the public to submit photographs inspired by one of 13 recent acquisitions to the museum’s photography collection, chosen by the photography curator, according to Inscho, for their ability to inspire ‘creative responses’” (Guenther, 2014, p43). The project was designed to operate through a dedicated website, rather than existing social media sites, allowing the museum greater control over the process. 1,263 photos were received over a two month period. “They were pasted on the wall of the Forum Gallery daily next to the framed

and labeled inspiration photograph” (Guenther, 2014, p43). This gallery is free to the public, but participants were issued passes which allowed them to visit the rest of the museum as well. The project also fostered a new way of working within the museum’s internal hierarchy, with cross-departmental collaboration between the marketing, communications, education and curatorial departments.

“Public Property” at the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore was organized by Emily Blumenthal, manager of family programs, and Dylan Kinnett, the social media manager.

“The experiment asked the question, what better way to benefit the public than to give them exactly what they want to see by letting them choose?” (Guenther, 2014, p41).

The public had a voice at each stage of the curation process. They voted on the title, theme and objects for the exhibition during four voting sessions. The curator of ancient art vetted the objects in the object pool, and then online users voted for their favorites with an internet application called “photocracy,” a name combining the words “photo” and “democracy.” (Guenther, 2014, p42). 53,000 votes were cast by 7,166 participants. The exhibit was reviewed by Matthew Sullivan of *The Washington Post*, who wrote that the result was “a provocative meditation on taste, the mechanics of decision-making and the growing trend of crowd-sourced culture” (Guenther, 2014, p42). The museum gathered extensive data from visitors, including a response to the statement “After seeing this exhibition, I believe that public participation is important to museums.” 80% of the respondents answered “very much.” Response from the staff was not as enthusiastic (Guenther, 2014, p43).

“Photo Hunt” is an example of a social media driven crowd-sourced exhibit that was considered successful enough to repeat many times. This was an Instagram-driven project, designed by Jennifer Poleon, digital communications manager for the Columbus Museum of Art, in close collaboration with the photography curator and education director. “Photo Hunt” assignments were announced to the public every two weeks through the museum’s blog and other social media tools. Participants were asked to submit a photo to Instagram in response to a particular artwork from the museum’s collection. The photography curator then chose the best submissions which were later posted next to the artwork in the gallery space. The organizers discovered, much like Nina Simon did about the community reaction to “Click!,” that the gallery became a very active social space, with friends and families coming to see their loved ones’ photos “where previously only digital conversations had taken place through the museum’s website” (Guenther, 2014, p40). The museum staff felt that the goal of increased audience interaction had been achieved. “It’s much more than a ‘digital connector’,” Poleon said. “It’s about building a creative community and a deeper connection to art” (Guenther, 2014, p40).

It’s clear from the preceding case studies as well as the analysis of expert opinions, that museums must have a strong social media presence to fulfill their mission of public service and remain relevant and sustainable cultural institutions in today’s digital world. Social media has already become an integral part of the communication channels that are maintaining and building relationships between museums and their current and potential users. The next step is to experiment with social media in a way that

maximizes the two-way capabilities of social networking sites to fully engage the public in the shared creation of knowledge and context. It's also vital that museums create safe, social spaces where members of the community can gather and interact around artwork that reflects who they are, what they are interested in learning, and what they can create themselves, and share. An element of entertainment is essential, but one carefully scaffolded by the museum staff to ensure that the experience is potentially transformative. The ultimate goal is the full participation of the public in the democratization of cultural heritage.

In the fall of 2018, the M.A. in Museum Studies Curatorial Practicum at the University of San Francisco co-curated an exhibit for the University's Thacher Gallery entitled "Quiet Spaces: Picturing Sanctuary in the Illustrated Book." As a member of that class, I was able to participate in the co-curating process and experience first-hand many of the practical implications of the issues covered in this paper. Professor Kate Lusheck and Thacher Gallery Director Glori Simmons chose the theme of the exhibition; sanctuary as it related to image and text found in modern illustrated books in the permanent collection of the University's Donohue Rare Book Room. They vetted an object pool of approximately 70 volumes from which the class could choose. After examining the books, we each made a list of those we felt best represented the theme, and were assigned a few about which we would research and write. We were also divided into four exhibition teams: Design, Subject/Content, Public Programming/Education, and PR/Outreach. Each team developed a strategy in their area of focus, with guidelines and

oversight by Professor Lusheck and Gallery Director Simmons. The teams then presented their concepts to the class as a whole, once they were fully developed.

As a member of the exhibition PR/Outreach team, I had the opportunity to design a social media campaign in collaboration with two student colleagues: Jessica Noyes and Ana Pao Romero. The main goal, as outlined in our proposal (Appendix B), was to support the Gallery's mission "to foster creativity, scholarship, and community." The second goal was audience building, especially among the Gallery's leading stakeholder; the USF student body. Not only did the PR team want to boost attendance, we also wanted to engage the students and make them aware of the potential community of interest for them represented by the Thacher Gallery and its social media followers. Studies suggest that engagement in educational communities and extra-curricular activities can reduce student attrition (Ternes, 2013; Sutherland, Davis, Terton & Visser, 2018). Social media, now an integral part of students' lives, can help them connect with these communities both online and onsite. We hoped that by building Thacher Gallery's followers on social media and by creating opportunities for two-way communication and participation through interactive posts, we could also support students by connecting them with others in the University community. We also hoped to reach out to additional stakeholders including; USF faculty and staff, the surrounding neighborhood community, students at other colleges in San Francisco, particularly those involved in museum studies and arts programs; library and bookstore patrons in the city; and other local museum staff and users.

The social media plan utilized the Gallery's already well established social media networking sites. USF's Museum blog was used for a "behind-the-scenes" post about the co-curating process. Three posts were made to the Gallery's Facebook page; one directing attention to the blog post, and two inviting visitors to the opening. The Thacher Gallery staff used their monthly email blast to focus on the exhibition. They also distributed the press release, produced the flyer and postcard, and coordinated their distribution campus-wide. The PR team covered the physical distribution to the other stakeholders. The main participatory thrust of the campaign, however, took place on Instagram (Appendix C).

A total of 22 Instagram posts were scheduled; three per week for the month leading up to the opening of the show, three per week during the first month of the exhibition, and one per week for the remainder of the run. The first two months of postings included two "story" features and one post per week. The first story in each week included a query or poll with the hashtag of #Picturingsanctuary. This hashtag was initially empty, making it easy to harvest responses. For the second story each week, the best responses were reposted. Themes related to community and scholarship were highlighted, such as; "Is San Francisco your sanctuary?"; "Where do you find sanctuary?" and "What book makes you flip!?" The posts encouraged creativity and scholarship by requesting responses and focusing attention on the volumes in the exhibition. The goal of audience building was met by the increased distribution of traditional media and by cross-references between social media platforms, but mainly by the viral marketing feature inherent to Instagram. The objective of using hashtags and reposting responses

was to build a new audience of Thatcher Gallery followers. Chris Alexander, Manager of Interactive Technology at San Jose Museum of Art, and USF faculty for the M.A. in Museum Studies Tech Practicum, highly recommended, during an interview, that we re-post on the University site as well. The campaign also increased the level of engagement of the Gallery's posts by incorporating stories that users could flip through and queries with easy and fun ways to respond. We used apps that allowed us to post interesting videos of the gallery space to engage users and encourage onsite visitation. The Instagram campaign was designed to be iterative and responsive.

This was an exciting and informative process and ideas evolved quickly from the feedback received. It did become apparent that even a social media campaign involving a small gallery with a relatively modest number of followers takes a significant amount of time to manage. Although Fletcher & Lee (2012) point out that the cost of entry into the social media arena is negligible, Holdgaard & Klastrop observe: "In reality, social media campaigning is highly unpredictable and requires a substantial investment of resources if the producer of a campaign is to maintain a continuous communicative presence online" (Holdgaard & Klastrop, 2014, p198). Budgeting for any social media campaign, even one run primarily by volunteers, should reflect staff time that must be devoted to creating content and responding to participants. Although ideally, in a larger organization, these duties can and should be shared interdepartmentally and inter-generationally, the amount of time required to realize project goals is significant.

The exhibition planning for “Quiet Spaces” and the writing of this paper were concurrent, therefore it is not possible to accurately report on the effectiveness of the PR campaign. Outcome based evaluation for audience building might be problematic for the Thacher Gallery regardless because of the nature of the site. The gallery is located within the Gleeson Library in the center of campus. Many students pass through the gallery while using various Library resources, making it difficult to assess how many students visit the gallery intentionally, how many linger upon noticing the artwork serendipitously, and how many simply pass through. Additionally, although open to the public, a University identification card is needed to enter the building. This is a serious barrier to participation for those outside the university community. However, despite these drawbacks, a new form of evaluation suggested by Andrew J. Pekarik, a program analyst at the Smithsonian Institution, would be useful for the Thacher Gallery, as well as for other museums responding to the paradigm shift to participatory engagement. Pekarik calls it “Participant-based Evaluation,” and it requires the ongoing involvement of the exhibition development team. That means more staff time devoted to the project. Chris Alexander pointed out, that in reality; “evaluation is always an afterthought that gets cut because of budget or time.” However, museum professionals, Alexander included, concur that research and evaluation is essential (Falk & Sheppard, 2006; Din & Hecht, 2007; Anderson, 2012; Fletcher & Lee, 2012; Padilla-Melendez & Aguila-Obra, 2013; Holdgaard & Klasttrup, 2014).

In his essay “From Knowing to Not Knowing,” Pekarik explains that outcome based evaluation grew rapidly during the 1970’s “in connection with the professionalism of

evaluation and the need to determine the effectiveness of new, large-scale government programs (for example, Project Head Start)” (Anderson, 2012, p402). This movement culminated with the passage of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA). Funding entities wanted to see actual measurements that would demonstrate that the outcome of a project met the intention. Pekarik suggests that this method implies a paternalistic relationship between the organization and the public, much like old industrial age models of museum governance. Outcome based evaluation seeks to control visitors by predetermining learning goals and the nature of the visitor experience. Participant based evaluation is much more flexible, allowing for multiple viewpoints (Anderson, 2012). Pekarik explains; “In place of the single producer-oriented reality represented by objectives and outcomes, this approach admits that each of the participants is constructing his/her own perception of reality. Evaluators seek out the diversity of these perceptions” (Anderson, 2012, p407). By observing how visitors actually interact with the exhibit, exhibition designers are able to engage in an iterative process, during which the exhibition evolves based on a study of the participants. This frees the design team to experiment and respond to diverse visitor responses (Anderson, 2012, p408). Pekarik concludes: “The exhibition itself can be viewed not as a product to be constructed in its entirety and then judged as successful or not, but as an experiment whose components will be altered” (Anderson, 2012, p408). This seems a reasonable and useful approach to evaluation in the participatory, rapidly evolving exhibition environment of the modern museum. The exhibition is no longer a static entity, but one which morphs depending upon a feedback and response loop established between the visitor and the design team. Gail Anderson notes “the paradigm shift from

collection-driven institutions to visitor-centered, community-responsive museums has largely taken root” (Anderson, 2012, p11). This calls for experimentation and a more flexible approach to all aspects of museum programming from promotion to curation and exhibition design.

The call for experimentation has been heard from the onset of digital technology’s inroads into the museum world. “Experiment!” wrote Guy Hermann, then Director for Information Services, Mystic Seaport, in his essay for *The Wired Museum* back in 1997 (Jones-Garmil, 1997). Hermann continues, “The cautious approach would be to wait until everything else settles out and we can ‘do it right’ the first time. But the opportunity we have now (and perhaps the responsibility) is to learn from the mistakes experiments inevitably spawn and to use those lessons to move forward” (Jones-Garmil, 1997, p84). Allegra Burnette and Victoria Lichtendorf in their essay “Museums Connecting with Teens Online” (2007) wrote, “From the examples we have seen, the key to success appears to be an openness to experimentation” (Din & Hecht, 2007, p95). In 2013, Lynda Kelly speaking directly to the issue of social media and museums concurred that; “the connected museum will need to be prepared to let go of authority and take risks through trying new approaches to program development based on audience interests and needs, not on the museums” (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p67). This can in part be achieved, as Maj Klindt suggested in 2017, by following the advice of media researcher Nico Carpentier “to open up for more expansion in and variation of professional roles so a more diverse range of people have access to the production or interpretation of museum narratives, exhibitions and exhibits. In this sense, the democratic

significance of the concept of participation has played and continues to play a key role in opening up the museum to the public.” (Klindt, 2017, p49).

Amelia Wong, social media outreach manager for the United States Holocaust Museum when she wrote the essay “Social Media Towards Social Change,” realistically acknowledges that the “democratizing and transformative effects of social media are ambiguous” (Sandell & Nightingale, 2012, p288). Although the potential of social media to advance democratic practices is great, social media can also be used to spread misinformation, and replicate and reinforce social bias. There is also the danger that museums will appear too commercial, by harvesting information about visitors, and advertising to individuals directly. Ana Luisa Sanchez Laws points out, however, that museums have a social responsibility and must be committed to social equality. She quotes Richard Sandell, who wrote that: “...museums cannot be conceived as discreetly cultural, or asocial- they are undeniably implicated in the dynamic of (in)equality and the power relations between different groups through their role in constructing and disseminating dominant social narratives” (Sanchez Laws, 2015, p31). Social media are opening up the channels of communication for diverse voices, both within the organizational structure of museums, and between museums and their communities, online and on-site. The main benefit for museums using social media is to remain relevant, thus sustainable in the future. Amelia Wong concludes that museums must recognize social media’s complexity, however, “recognizing that social media do not inherently or instantly realize museums’ democratizing goals need not prevent their use or inhibit experimentation” (Sandell & Nightingale, 2012, p289). It’s essential that museums as cul-

tural institutions stay current with the technologies that are impacting societies globally and shaping cultural heritage worldwide. As long as museums experiment in a responsible and trustworthy manner, they can use social media networks to continue making important contributions to the evolution of democratic principles both in society, and in the creation, preservation, and dissemination of global cultural heritage in the digital age. As Nik Honeysett wrote; “Museums are here for the public good, and the public are online” (Din & Hecht, 2007, p153).

Conclusion

“Is the digital with its lack of original the logical outcome put in motion by the Guttenberg Press? At a basic level, did those who hand scripted the manuscript in the 16th century utter dire warnings about original versus the printing press’s reproductive capacity, or is much more at stake” - Pam Meecham (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p45).

The expert opinions cited in this paper suggest that the digital era is impacting museums in fundamental ways that demonstrate much more is at stake than the proliferation of digital images. Authority and authenticity are the key issues surrounding the use of social media in museums. Social media is expanding the definition of the authentic beyond the object to include the authentic experience. Social media is also paving the way for the inclusion of multiple voices in the museum narrative, as well as in the designation of what is culturally significant. Although the inclusion of differing viewpoints in the curatorial arena may seem threatening to those with traditional views of curatorial authority, it is exciting, empowering and liberating for those who embrace the paradigm shift towards participation brought about by the Internet. These changes are essentially democratic, since the participation of the public is a democratic ideal. As Ana Luisa Sanchez-Laws writes: “the shift from mass media to new media as a journey towards increased democracy is a predominant interpretation of the technological changes that the web has brought about” (Sanchez-Laws, 2015, p34).

Broadening access to curation and exhibition design is one way museums can remain relevant and sustainable. Museums are redefining their missions to reflect this paradigm shift towards community engagement and participation. Digital strategies are not being designed solely to increase audience, but also to forward this new museum

mission. Monika Hagedorn-Saupe, head of the department of Visitor-Related Museum Research and Museum Statistics at the Institute for Museum Research in Berlin, writes:

These days, museums are no longer stand-alone institutions - this is not in the least reflected in ICOM's current definition of museums as "permanent institutions in the service of society." Rather museums are hubs in modern society - they connect people, they connect activities, they connect people with activities. In this way, museums exert a high social influence, and such social influence and responsibility implies the fostering of participation at many levels - for citizens both at the neighborhood level, but also organized networks focusing on many different issues. (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p126).

Museums and curators have new roles in modeling collaboration and expert thought in the social museum environment. By maintaining a high level of expertise, museums will remain trustworthy institutions online. As Ross Parry states: "Together these academic credentials, ethical frameworks, social responsibility, and empirical evidence create a matrix of trust, in which museums online are habitually located" (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p23). Museums can validate public concerns, individual identities, and mitigate the anxiety that the overabundance of information and options in the digital age has created.

Another source of anxiety is the rapid pace of change. Today's most popular social media platform will be replaced by a new one tomorrow. It's essential that museums remain current, experiment, and not fear failure in this volatile online environment.

There should be staff dedicated to digital engagement, with cross-departmental participation in the development and maintenance of digital strategies. The efficacy of collaboration between teams is one of the lessons gleaned from the co-curation experience behind "Quiet Spaces."

Although the exhibition design teams into which we were divided to create “Quiet Spaces” became essential decision making units considering the tight time frame, we learned of each other’s strategies only once those strategies were finalized. Nuanced-transparency between teams might have led to a more cohesive design. John Falk writes forcibly about breaking down such silos:

Faced with reinventing museum work, most museums have acknowledged that such divisions of labor and attitude can only hold them back. They keep them from addressing common goals and set up artificial barriers. Working collaboratively and flattening museum hierarchies requires new skills, the skills of project management that are more common perhaps in the changing workplace than in museum studies programs (Falk & Sheppard, 2006, p124).

The Subject/Content team, for example, considered using hashtags on the object labels. The PR team was unable to coordinate efforts which might have made this a meaningful part of the exhibition. The Design team, which was in charge of developing interactive elements for the exhibit, decided to include an iteration of a recent print project related to the theme of sanctuary by San Francisco artists Sergio de la Torre and Chris Treggiari. The PR team might have been able to coordinate an online version of this iteration if there had been more interplay between the teams at an earlier stage. Time was obviously a major factor, as it will be in the design of any exhibition. There was also the ongoing maintenance of the social media campaign to consider. Once the semester was over, the project would be left in the hands of the gallery staff, without assistance from the PR team. This curtailed any long range initiatives. However we did experiment with different types of posts, some based on observing the Instagram activity of other museums.

Over the course of three months, from September through November, 2018, I followed thirty-four museums on Instagram. These ranged from mega museums such as the MOMA in New York City and the Tate in London, to University galleries such as the Hammer in Los Angeles and the Yale Art Gallery in New Haven. One outcome of this observation period was the realization that it takes a significant amount of time just to follow social media! It was also interesting to note that the number of followers for each of these museums increased, even during this short three month period. The growth of social media is palpable. The Thacher Gallery itself started with 450 followers in September; that number grew to over 600 by the end of November. The number of followers on other museum Instagram accounts were impressive (Appendix D).

The museum postings fell into categories, although every so often one museum would break out with a new concept or twist. I found them all interesting, but tended to linger on posts that were more visual. Almost all of the posts had links leading to sites with more information, and hashtags ranging in number from none to twenty-three. The average number of hashtags was ten. Some of the posts were surprisingly mundane; for example many museums were fond of wishing artists in their collections “happy birthday” with a picture of the artist’s work and a short bio. Posts related to the weather were quite well received. Most common were posts about art on view, listings of upcoming events, and announcements of exhibition closures. General interest posts and those around holidays received the most likes, such as spooky artwork for Halloween, “dogs are welcome,” “free first Sunday,” and “bring the kids.” There were quite a few

"thank you" posts; to members, volunteers, and to those who gave lectures or workshops. The Field Museum, one of the only science museums I followed, had posts from the conservator. MOCA posted a call to vote in the midterm elections, and engaged in a short chat with the Broad to congratulate an artist they shared. The Barnes Foundation responded to the #metoo movement by inviting users to "fill in the blank by tagging or naming all the women who empower you to keep going." Many used themes, such as "black history," "hispanic heritage," or "indigenous peoples day" to highlight artwork in their collections. SFMOMA gathered artists' submissions via Tumblr and shared them each Friday.

These ideas and those from the research for this paper inform the following suggestions to enhance the Thacher Gallery's engagement with its stakeholders. Crowdcuration within the University community might make students feel more a part of the University community. Collaboration with the Art Department could lead to a crowd-curated exhibition of student artwork, rather than one curated by faculty or staff. The Thacher Gallery could also post a general query asking students what kind of artwork they'd like to see in the gallery space. They could post photos of artwork in current exhibitions and ask students to respond with their own photos, rapidly including copies of the participants' photos in the gallery space. It would be wonderful to see the Thacher Gallery turn into a "social space" much like the one that developed around "Click!" or "Photo Hunt." The Thacher Gallery could also collaborate with other University galleries, such as The San Francisco Art Institute, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive, San Francisco State University, City College and the Cantor to co-curate

exhibits both online and onsite. If Thatcher is committed to reaching out to the neighborhood community, it will have to find a way to throw open the doors of the library. The only way to do this might be online by connecting with community centers and other neighborhood libraries to co-curate exhibits.

Not all exhibitions will include user-generated or crowd-curated content. In the future, however, users should be able to navigate exhibitions, whatever the content, in a customized way that reflects both their chosen level of personal engagement and their purpose for visiting; be that social, intellectual, emotional, spiritual, or escapist. Peter Samis wrote in his essay “The Exploded Museum:”

The promise of these new technologies, then, is dual: if they can be made effortless and transparent enough, they can help art ideas to penetrate more effortlessly into visitors’ lives, to aid visitors in processing and digesting these ideas and images in their own personal terms. Conversely, new technologies can also open museums to the multiplicity of meanings that our objects trigger in the community of viewers - meanings we haven’t even dreamed of and which stand to be richer and far more diverse than the art historical discourse that is our stock-in-trade” (Anderson, 2012, p311).

Triggering a new experience is key to remaining relevant. Augmented and virtual reality are making headway into the museum space, and these new technologies will again redefine the authentic experience. Imagine a world where you can interact with artifacts in their original condition and setting, by yourself or with others. Imagine artwork that only occurs in Virtual Reality. This world is on the horizon. Museums, as trusted sources of knowledge and caretakers of our cultural heritage, have the responsibility of modeling moral and ethical use of new technology. Ross Parry refers to the Platonic

legacy which “runs deep in traditions of museology” when he writes: “The modern curatorial tradition is one that has continued to accommodate the distinctions of Plato’s ‘cave’ - especially its unease with image and illusion. Challenging this mistrust of the image are the traditions of ‘mimesis’ (that which is edifyingly imitative) and ‘the virtual’ (that which is ideally real)” (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p28). Mimesis has already arrived in the shape of social media. By experimenting with ways to make social media use participatory, educational and entertaining, museums will be better prepared for the next dynamic development in the evolution of the modern museum: the Virtual.

Appendix A

Annotated Bibliography

Anderson, Gail, ed. *Reinventing The Museum, The Evolving Conversation on the Paradigm Shift*. Lanham: Altamira Press, 2012.

Reinventing The Museum is a comprehensive survey of some of the most highly regarded writing from the past century on the role of the museum in society from a field-wide perspective. The essays are organized around the theme that museums must undergo a “paradigm shift” from being repositories of knowledge with access for the elite, to being socially responsible institutions offering an educational experience that is visitor-centered and participatory. All of the contributors, from viewpoints as diverse as educator, director, conservator, exhibition designer, communications coordinator and manager, see this shift as absolutely essential for the long-term viability of the museum in the twenty-first century.

Of initial interest are essays that provide historical context for the paradigm shift from collection-driven to socially responsive. “The Gloom of the Museum,” by John Cotton Dana, is an iconic work written in 1917 by one of the greatest visionaries in the field of museology. “The Museum, a Temple or the Forum” (1971), by Duncan F. Cameron, shows the slow adoption of Dana’s ideas through the twentieth century by posing questions that relate to Dana’s concerns about the role of the museum as an object centered establishment

versus a place for participatory learning and debate. Without question, attention must be paid to Stephen E. Weil's seminal and oft quoted essay "From Being *About* Something to Being *For* Somebody: The Ongoing Transformation of the American Museum" (1999). Here we see that education has in fact become a cornerstone of museum practice, which Weil applauds and encourages. However, he introduces a further step in the evolutionary scheme: that of public service for social change. Weil writes: "Over three decades, what the museum might be envisioned as offering to the public has grown from mere refreshment (the museum as carbonated beverage) to education (the museum as a site for informal learning) to nothing short of communal empowerment (the museum as an instrument for social change) (Anderson, 2012, p175). Along with this new perspective, Weil adds the observation that the Internet, rather than the museum, has become the current repository of knowledge, with its "infinitely branched linkages" (Anderson, 2012, p185). He also notes that museum workers will need new skills in public programming, and that credible evaluation of outcome will be more and more crucial moving forward.

The notion of public service expands into one of public engagement in the twenty-first century, with the development of two-way communication between the museum and visitors, on-site, off-site, and on-line. In the essay "The Exploded Museum" (2008), Peter Samis investigates the impact of technology, and emphasizes the importance of choosing the right technology for the best outcome. The brave new world of evaluation is broached by Andrew J. Pekarik,

who views outcome-based evaluations as obsolete. In his piece entitled “From Knowing to Not Knowing: Moving Beyond ‘Outcomes’” (2010), Pekarik proposes a new method called “participant-based evaluation.” This theoretical model of analyzing effect would potentially free the exhibition development team, allowing them to create experimental designs, with the expectation of iterations.

Reinventing The Museum is a foundational resource for this paper, including historical references crucial to an understanding of how social media use follows in a natural progression of museum practice.

Din, Herminia and Phyllis Hecht, eds. *The Digital Museum, A Think Guide*. Washington DC: American Association of Museums, 2007.

The Digital Museum, A Think Guide is the middle volume in what could be considered a trilogy of AAM publications tracing the trajectory of digital technology’s integration into museum infrastructure and outreach strategy from 1997 to 2011. All three books are compilations of essays by leading practitioners in the museum field. In *A Think Guide*, contributor Matthew MacArthur refers to the earlier volume, *The Wired Museum* (1997), as “seminal,” and reflects upon the debate raging then over the impact of public access to collections online.

Would this cause the demise of brick and mortar museums? “Today those concerns seem quaint” (Din and Hecht, 2007p60). As Selma Thomas notes in the introduction, “...most institutions came to recognize the inexorable presence of the Web, as well as its potential for supporting public programs” (Din and

Hecht, 2007, p3). Both analog and digital solutions to new issues surrounding public engagement and interpretation are evaluated. Digital activity has not yet moved onto mobile devices, as it will in *Mobile Apps for Museums* (Proctor, 2011), the third AAM publication on digital technology. In *A Think Guide*, we see the first signs of prototyping, collaboration and iteration that are more fully developed by those such as Andrew Pekarick (Anderson, 2012) in his essay “From Knowing to Not Knowing.” The concept of “Radical Trust” (Din and Hecht, p60) also arises, as museum professionals face the evolution of the institution from guardian and arbiter of cultural heritage to a more porous relationship with community stakeholders.

Social media networks are just making their appearance on the cultural horizon in 2007. These authors anticipate and ponder their functionality, without the commercial concerns that will develop in the near future. Museums are, in fact, encouraged to partner, not only amongst themselves, but with experts in the commercial sphere, such as game developers, to learn more about the rules of successful digital engagement. This was a risk-taking time that helped move the museum world more fully into the digital age.

Drotner, Kristen and Kim Christian Schroder, eds. *Museum Communication and Social Media*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

This collection of essays advances the concept that social media is a central force propelling the transformation of museums from conservators of cultural heritage and one-way transmitters of knowledge, to social sites of dialogue,

connectivity and two-way communication with users. The essays originated in a symposium hosted by the Danish Research Center on Education and Advanced Media Materials (DREAM) held in 2010, and have an overarching emphasis on the pedagogical aspects of museums and new media. The writings are connected by a philosophical thread reaching back to 1891 and the work of George B. Goode, whom author Lynda Kelly quotes: “The people’s museum should be much more than a house full of specimens in glass cases. It should be a house full of ideas” (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p67). The authors are all philosophical descendants of this educational perspective, furthered by John Cotton Dana and Stephen Weil. Weil is quoted several times in the essays, having popularized the assertion that ‘connected museums must transform themselves from being about something to being for somebody’ (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p8). The essayists grapple with many of the issues museums face in becoming participatory, such as; trust and authority, the nature of authenticity, sharing collections and opening up to dialogue, satisfying diverse stakeholders, as well as technological obsolescence and sustainability. The authors themselves ascribe to the dialogic, not offering solutions, but forwarding the discussion of how the museum as an institution will remain relevant in the digital age.

I was especially delighted by Ross Parry’s essay “The Trusted Artifice” (Drotner & Schroder, 2013, p17). He points out that museums have a “fictive tradition” from the pre-web past, long before user-generated content was being shared

across social media networks. Underlying the rich line of philosophical inquiry that informs these essays, there is a palpable sense of excitement about the possibilities for social and political action and reform through the use of social media. Due to the pedagogical nature of the inquiries, the focus is on tech savvy, constantly connected young people, a key target group both for museums in general, and for the Thacher Gallery social media campaign in particular.

Falk, John H., and Beverly K. Sheppard. *Thriving in the Knowledge Age: New Business Models for Museums and Other Cultural Institutions*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2006.

Falk and Sheppard find motivation for transformation within a financial framework. In response to the burst of the dot.com bubble in 2001, the authors warn that in order for museums to avoid similar catastrophic failure, they must stop using Industrial Age models for marketing, customer service, curating and exhibition planning. They posit that we have entered a new age - "The Knowledge Age," a time when consumers are looking for personal growth and satisfaction rather than the simple sustenance and upward mobility of the past. Falk and Sheppard outline a new "visitor centered business model" around five visitor identities; the explorer, the facilitator, the professional/hobbyist, the experience seeker and the spiritual pilgrim. Museums should choose one or more of these identities most in line with their collection and programming strengths, and create customized experiences for visitors. They claim that the days of marketing to the masses and aiming for the broadest possible audience are over. Instead, museums must develop long term relationships with a targeted audience. Mu-

seums need to create new mission statements that are community oriented rather than institutionally based. In this way, museums can stay relevant, fulfill their social and educational responsibilities and increase revenue. The goal is still to do public good, measured by careful evaluation of customer satisfaction.

Falk and Sheppard's description of "mass customization," the kind of marketing that Amazon and Netflix do when they post individualized recommendations on their websites is a potential link to how social media might be used to customize the museum experience. Social media can be used to connect in a highly personalized manner.

Gurian, Elaine Heumann. *Civilizing the Museum: The Collected Writings of Elaine Heumann Gurian*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

A champion of inclusion in museums since the 1980's, Gurian's collected writings underscore the basic concepts of her progressive, sociopolitical museum philosophy. These include cultural inclusion and diversity, social responsibility, the importance of participatory learning and the notion of authenticity. She believes that museums should welcome all, because they are "institutions of memory" and contain the memories of all. The author articulates, however, why collections are intrinsically biased, freeing us to re-evaluate concepts of conservation and ownership. Gurian writes about the need to rectify the exclusionary past of museums by opening up collections to the public, doing whatever is necessary to make everyone feel welcome. Gurian also believes there can be

no civil society without safe places to congregate, and museums can offer those places. Although she is not an advocate for discarding “the object,” neither is she afraid of making room for the new. The new encompasses the “objectless museum,” such as the innovative children’s, science and cultural heritage museums she has helped develop. Gurian credits Frank Oppenheimer, director of the Exploratorium in San Francisco from 1968-1985, and Michael Spock, director of the Boston Children’s Museum from 1962-1986 with “introducing contextual, direct-experience interactivity to the exhibition floor...which changed the face of museums permanently by inviting the public to participate in their own learning.” (Gurian, 2006, p153). Like Ross Parry in his essay “The Trusted Artifact,” Gurian validates the entertainment aspects of some exhibitions, and embraces performance and oral history as possible “objects.” The author calls for a broader definition of authenticity as well, with reference to copies of classical artwork historically displayed in the Louvre, the ubiquitous reconstruction of dinosaur bones, and the proliferation of digital images.

A seminal source, frequently cited in museology literature, Gurian’s work is an inspiration to many in the museum field. In her essay “Noodling Around with Exhibition Opportunities,” Gurian suggests that “installing computers and interactive media” might offer the visitor greater access to information. Written 27 years ago, this reveals the glacial pace of innovation in the museum world. Her theories will ground the argument that social media have an important role to

play in museums today in the promotion of greater inclusion, accessibility, connectivity, sociability, and learning.

Hinton, Sam, and Larissa Hjorth. *Understanding Social Media*. London: Sage Publications, 2013.

Commercial exploitation of social media users in a capitalist society gives Hinton and Hjorth's analysis a very serious slant. Now recognized as an integral part of everyday life, "networked societies" blur the boundaries between the personal and professional, between public and private. Social media profiles can be harvested by corporations and sold. Content on social media networks, such as photos on Facebook, can be re-contextualized and further consumed. Hinton and Hjorth argue that despite these dangers, museums have been compelled to make their collections available online in order to justify public funding as well as fulfill their missions to serve the public. This is, in effect, eroding the traditional role of museums as cultural arbiters, which in turn is changing the role of the curator. "People are being engaged in curatorial processes that were once solely the domain of curators" (Hinton and Hjorth, p95). Users have access to content that allows them to build their own pathways through collections. The authors point out that museums are encouraging crowd-sourced grass roots curatorial roles for users through social media. This implies a paradigm shift in attitude towards the audience; that of inclusion and participation. The authors further predict the rise of "vernacular creativity" (Hinton and Hjorth, p78), not just in art, but in social relations generally.

Understanding Social Media presents a strong argument for a vastly different cultural scenario in which museums and other cultural institutions have a new role. That role is not, as of yet, clearly defined, but the focus, as exemplified by the attributes of social media, is a shift to the individual user and to personalization in locally created networks.

Jones-Garmil, Katherine, ed. *The Wired Museum: Emerging Technology and Changing Paradigms*. Washington DC: American Association of Museums, 1997.

The book begins with a fascinating timeline of technological milestones as they relate to museums, from 1963-1995, created by the editor, Katherine Jones-Garmil. It continues in a fairly speculative manner, based on observations of innovations to date, as the writers outline the potential benefits of digitizing collections and embracing the internet. The essays are aimed at convincing museum professionals to become involved with technological trends or risk losing 21st century audiences. 1997 represents a pivotal moment in the evolution of the museum from guardian to facilitator as the authors urge all museums to start digitizing their collections. One of the main reasons for holding back, upon which all of the contributors concur, is that technological changes happen so quickly. However, there is also a consensus that museums have a great deal to gain, foremost being their mission of providing educational opportunities and greater access to the public. Reassuring arguments are made that digital collections will not lead to the demise of brick and mortar museums, but will, in fact, increase attendance by creating a more knowledgeable and curious audi-

ence base. The curator is also saved from extinction by being hypothetically recast as a search engine, providing interpretation for the masses. Another roadblock is funding, and the contributors offer several scenarios for overcoming this, including; government funding, especially in response to furthering the mission of public service, increased attendance, and new revenue sources from Internet initiatives and collaborations.

This reference provides a useful snapshot of where the museum industry stood at the end of the twentieth century with regards to the adoption of digital technology in many facets of the museum business; from collection management to office management, from curating to fulfilling the mission of public service. It is yet another clarion call for museums to move faster when it comes to using technology in a rapidly evolving, globally digital world.

Keen, Andrew. *the cult of the amateur*. New York: Doubleday, 2007.

There is a dark side to social media, and it's all about trust. With mostly free and unfiltered access to anyone who has an Internet connection, how can we believe what we see on-line? This is a serious issue confronting museums as they try to weigh the value of engaging in social media against their public responsibility to be a trustworthy source of information. Keen's popular diatribe upon the evils of Web 2.0 enumerates museums' greatest fears. For example, Keen points out that many search engines, such as Google, answer queries with what is most popular, with no attention to authenticity or cultural signifi-

cance. This can be especially troublesome with tagging in museum databases. Ross Parry in his essay “The Trusted Artifice” quotes Keen in his discussion of trust-based behavior: “The cult of the amateur has made it increasingly difficult to determine the difference between reader and writer, between artists and spin doctor, between art and advertisement, between amateur and expert...the real consequence of the Web 2.0 revolution is less culture, less reliable news, and a chaos of useless information.” (Drotner, 2013) Maxwell Alexander offers an antidote to Keen’s vitriol. “The assault of documents composed from untutored and unfocused ramblings will doubtless be massive. Yet such might be said of the printing press as well, since the pool of available information before the press was shallow indeed. An ever-widening pool is only as threatening as one chooses to make it, since blathering will continue around the world, with or without the Internet.” (Jones-Garmil, 1997). Nevertheless, Keen, who is himself a blogger, paints an accurate and dramatic picture of the downside of social media.

Keen’s opinions elucidate some of the reasons museums have been slow to adopt interactive technologies, especially surrounding social media and trendy sites frequented by young people such as Twitter and Instagram.

Manovich, Lev. *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.

Lev Manovich is an artist, computer programmer and professor of new media art. Born in Russia, where he commenced studies in art and computer science,

Manovich moved to the United States in the 1980's to complete his education. His book *The Language of New Media* (2002) reflects his global and deeply theoretical perspectives on the development of the new "network society." Manovich provides keen insights into the emergence of new media as a cultural form deeply relevant to the young audience that is so vital to the survival of museums today. Manovich pinpoints the emergence of new media to the early 1990's with the rise of the Internet. He theorizes that new media is based on previous cultural conventions going back to the printing press and then on to the development of the modern cinematic language. He also posits, like John Falk and Beverly Sheppard in "Thriving in the Knowledge Age," that new media was born out of industrial era logic, but has morphed into a new "cultural meta-language, something that will be at least as significant as the printed word and cinema before it" (Manovich, p93). What makes new media so innovative and impactful are four key trends Manovich identifies as "modularity, automation, variability and transcoding" (Manovich, p10). These trends fit the logic of post-industrial society which values individuality over conformity, and sets new media apart from previous cultural interfaces. Although we are using familiar conventions such as pages, files, copy, cut and paste commands all set in a rectangular frame, the user now has many choices about how to organize and access an overabundance of information, all of which is customizable.

Manovich proposes that "the emergence of new media coincides with the second stage of media society now concerned as much with accessing and

reusing existing media objects as with creating new ones” (Manovich, p35).

These issues are salient for the use of digital media in the museum world as it attempts to organize material from collections and exhibitions in a way that users can access in meaningful, personalized ways.

The Language of New Media provides a deeply theoretical background for the development of social media use by cultural institutions. We now have a generation of “digital natives.” Manovich suggests there is some “moral anxiety that has accompanied this shift from constants to variables, from traditions to choices in all areas of life in a contemporary society” (Manovich, p43). Recognizing this new reality, and finding ways to communicate through social media networks is crucial to museums; especially to academic galleries with a target audience of digitally native, possibly anxious young adults who might benefit from inclusion in the cultural community of interest that a university gallery should be.

Marty, Paul F. and Katherine Burton Jones. *Museum Informatics: People, Information, and Technology in Museums*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

This volume picks up where *The Wired Museum* (1997) left off. Interestingly, the conclusion is written by the same author who wrote the introduction to the latter, Maxwell Anderson. We are now firmly in the “Information Age,” (as opposed to the “Digital Age” or “Knowledge Age”) and interactivity has arrived. This is the greatest difference between the two books, and changes the tone dramatically. Much like Sanchez Laws in *Museum Websites and Social Media* (2015),

Marty and Burton Jones temper their enthusiasm for social media networks and interactivity by enumerating the emerging problems and potential pitfalls, along with the innumerable advantages. The call for more evaluation and study is louder than ever. Anderson again makes a plea for museums to invest in high tech precisely because there are so many socially important lessons to be learned about interactive visitor engagement with educational content. One concern is that museums will spend huge sums developing interactive experiences that are more commercial than mission-driven. The stern reminder is to keep the focus on public service, and the funds will come. Some of the positive developments discussed include: better content management, the broad accessibility and ability to reuse detailed information, the development of methods to conserve born digital information, compatible metadata, digital surrogates, the virtual museum, on-line access targeted to specific users, audio tours with higher levels of interaction and the ability to reach underserved populations such as the disabled and marginalized groups. The downsides mostly concern the unknown effects of interaction. Is personalization asocial? Does it deny the user the chance of serendipitous discovery? Do mobile apps detract from the social experience? What are the consequences of museums now having the ability to collect more information about the visitor? Change is still a constant, and evaluation critical. Despite the cautionary tone, it's clear that the authors are invested in the future of interactivity. I was particularly inspired by the observation that young people are impatient with passive encounters.

Hopefully, these museum experts will keep pushing for innovation and not become the impediments to change they pushed against ten years ago.

Proctor, Nancy, ed., *Mobile Apps for Museums: The AAM Guide to Planning and Strategy*. Washington, DC: American Alliance of Museums, 2011.

A guidebook by and for museum professionals, this compilation of twelve essays paints a picture of mobile technology's state-of-play in museums as of 2011. The essays provide a succinct overview of the most popular mobile technology options in development, including audio tours, podcasts, augmented reality (AR), games and iPad enhanced group tours. Edited by Nancy Proctor, then head of mobile strategy and initiatives for the Smithsonian Institution, program chair for the Museum Computer Network (MCN) and Digital Editor of *Curator: The Museum Journal*, this book highly recommends that museums ramp up their mobile technology strategies. The essays offer practical advice on business models and content development, and make a case for future visitor experience research. Published by the American Alliance of Museums (AAM), this publication clearly states that in order to fulfill their responsibility to make collections meaningful and accessible to the public, museums will need to investigate the use of Web 2.0 platforms to connect communities and facilitate conversation.

Although this volume does not address social media directly, it does show that the AAM was committed to the development of mobile media strategies by 2011, and was beginning to consider the use of digital media as an essential

part of the industry. The fact that this highly regarded professional network is clearly in favor of the development of Web 2.0 tools supports the theory that social media, including social networking sites such as Instagram, should play a part in museums' strategic plans.

Sanchez Laws, Ana Luisa. *Museum Websites & Social Media: Issues of Participation, Sustainability, Trust and Diversity (Museums and Collections)*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2015.

Museum Websites & Social Media is a one of the most recently published books in this bibliography, and provides evidence that the role of the museum is well within the process of transforming from a repository of cultural heritage to a site for public debate and connectivity. The discussion is no longer whether museums should allow public access to collections, or opportunities to participate. The discussion now centers around how museums should best use websites and social media to invite the public to participate, while furthering their social missions. The author does not take a light-hearted approach to the museum mission in transition. Her main goal is to discuss how museums should engage with the creation, dissemination and preservation of digital heritage, including user-generated content, in meaningful ways, other than for marketing purposes or audience building. Sanchez Laws has empathy for the curators who feel their expertise is being trivialized, and using the Museum of London as a case study, argues that the image of the museum remains under "tight control of the organization" (Sanchez Laws, 2015, p20) even while constantly creating opportunities for community involvement. In an attempt to level the playing field

between the tech savvy public and museum staff, the author includes two very interesting chapters on practical considerations. She walks a would-be, non-Web 2.0 savvy staff member through the steps necessary to become digitally literate, starting with the basics of blogging. The book is well researched, including a history of social media and museums from the 1990's to 2015, discussions of new building functions and administrative and curatorial practices that are emerging due to social media, issues of trust, authenticity, authority, diversity, social inclusion, sustainability and the future of digital heritage.

Sanchez Laws takes a scholarly approach towards the inclusion of social media in the future of cultural institutions. Although the social media campaign for the Thacher Gallery is meant to do exactly that which she believes to be trivial, audience building, her research and resources are very helpful. She also recommends use of behind-the-scenes material in social media to engage visitors; mentions "Click! A Crowd-Curated Exhibition," developed in 2008 by the Brooklyn Museum; and she admits that social media is a great way to engage young people, like those wandering around the USF campus.

Simon, Nina. *The Participatory Museum*. Santa Cruz: Museum 2.0, 2010.

The purpose of this book is to present ways in which cultural institutions can become participatory. In the opening paragraph, Simon clearly states why this is a crucial mandate for museums; according to the National Endowment for the Arts, attendance is down, and less diversified than the general population.

“People have turned to other sources for entertainment, leaning and dialogue” (Simon, 2010, pi). After this strong warning, Simon continues in an optimistic and almost gentle vein, as if she is targeting conservative and traditional institutions that have not yet begun to embrace new museology concepts. The author also carefully follows her own participatory advice by maintaining a website @www.participatorymuseum.org. Simon places herself firmly in the theoretical lineage of John Cotton Dana, Elaine Heumann Gurian, and Stephen Weil; in fact, she could be the next evolutionary mutation. Simon writes that “instead of being ‘about’ something or ‘for’ someone, participatory institutions are created and managed ‘with’ visitors.” (Simon, 2010, piii) This is “from me to we” design thinking. Simon describes many avenues that “from me to we” might take. It’s a question of finding the way that aligns with the institutional mission, and then experimenting. These experiments, however, should be carefully planned, and scaffolded, providing enough cognitive support to guarantee quality outcomes. “Scaffolding” is a process used in the education field to provide structure for students as they progress through a series of tasks. In the museum world, this may mean providing resources or guidance for visitors as they approach a participatory exhibit. The case studies Simon offers are fascinating examples of attempts by museums to become more relevant and receptive, and successes as well as efforts in need of iteration are outlined. In the end, the author cites lack of evaluation as one of the greatest factors in the slow acceptance and use of participatory projects in the museum field, and advocates for more research, and sensitively designed methods of gauging effect.

I found this book very inspiring, and took away a number of good ideas for an Instagram campaign. Although many of Simon's suggestions are couched in low-tech terms, they translate easily to social media. These include making sure that the campaign includes clear instructions as well as a plan for sharing user contributions. More ideas concerned content: should it revolve around a question? Would that question be personal or speculative? Could we use objects from the exhibit itself to inspire participation? Should we suggest juxtaposing user-generated content with exhibition content? Could we initially engage potential visitors by posting behind-the-scenes content of the exhibition in the planning stages? How will we evaluate the effectiveness of the campaign? I also liked Simon's description of "Click! A Crowd-Curated Exhibition," developed in 2008 by the Brooklyn Museum, which is outlined in this paper.

Journals:

Budge, Kylie. "Objects in Focus: Museum Visitors and Instagram." *Curator, The Museum Journal* 60, no. 1 (January, 2017): 67-85.

An interesting article outlining a research study about Instagram use by visitors to the exhibition "Recollect: Shoes," held at the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences in Sydney, Australia in 2015. The object of the study was to apply visual content analysis to visitors' Instagram posts, which were captured from the site, stored on a Word document, printed out and studied. The author's methodology is similar to one possible strategy for the Thacher Gallery cam-

paign, although the inclusion of the public posts into the exhibition itself would be ideal.

Fletcher, Adrienne and Moon J. Lee. "Current social media uses and evaluations in American Museums." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 27, no. 5 (December 2012): 505-521.

The goal of this study is to evaluate how American museums are using social media, and whether these museums consider their social media activity effective in relationship building. Museums are identified as organizations that could greatly benefit from social media, as their very existence depends upon strong relationships with supporters. The benefits of social media include access to a global audience, the speed with which messages are sent and received, the ability to personalize communication and to foster engagement. The drawbacks include the time required by staff to implement and then continually maintain the social media sites.

The authors sent out a total of 875 online surveys to a sampling of museums by using Internet research to identify museums accredited by AAM, as well as by posting open invitations on listservs such as MUSEUM-L. They received back 315 surveys which were analyzed along with the responses to nine in-depth interviews with professionals working with social media, six of whom were in the museum field. The study represents the kind of structured evaluation process from which museums could greatly benefit in the development of social media strategic plans. Results indicate that those surveyed believe using social media

is important, although communication is still primarily one-way. There is, however, some evidence that museums are developing multi-communication strategies as well.

Guenther, Amanda M. "Today's Curation: News of the Art Museum and the Crowd." *Professional Projects from the College of Journalism and Mass Communication* 5. (December, 2014): 1-57.

Amanda Guenther's focus is on modern technology as it pertains to recent experiments in breaking down the barriers between the curator and the user in the museum world. Guenther suggests that crowd-sourced and crowd-curated exhibitions may be a solution for the sustainability and relevancy of museums in the twenty-first century. Her argument is based on the theory that museums evolve in accordance with cultural shifts and society's understanding of the institution's purpose and function. The latest shift is being driven by technology. Guenther believes that audiences, especially younger "digitally native" stakeholders have come to expect active learning experiences and the opportunity to voice their opinions. They want participatory experiences. However, traditional curators with their expertise and authority, are not yet convinced that sharing their role as cultural arbiter with the masses is the right move. Guenther believes that Weil's "battle of the forum and the temple" will rage on for a few more years, as museums continue to struggle with this dual identity.

Guenther places the development of public engagement in exhibitions in an historical context, describing the evolution of the museum from an elite estab-

lishment meant to set high aesthetic standards, to an institution of learning for the general public, to a new socially and aesthetically democratized cultural venue. She credits the art movements “Institutional Critique” and “Fluxus” from the 1960’s and 70’s with adding this populist element to the museum mission. Museum professionals, she argues, are not taking this cultural shift entirely seriously. Crowd-sourced and crowd-curated exhibits are currently viewed as experiments in revenue and audience building rather than as a cultural phenomenon that may have lasting impact on the meaning of museum objects, and represent a major shift in curatorial practice. These exhibitions are, for the most part, being developed and organized by professionals from the digital engagement and education departments, not by curators. Guenther does recognize that there are those who believe that the traditional curator, and curated content, must remain to ensure institution-based trust, and that the museum object may in fact become more important as technology breaks down established models of authority. However, a new role for the curator is emerging, as an expert facilitator with artists and the community, and as a vital member of cross-departmental collaborations.

Guenther breaks down types of public engagement into three categories; contributory, collaborative, and co-creative, and then describes a number of recent exhibits that exemplify these new curatorial developments. Particularly useful are Guenther’s descriptions of the following exhibitions: “Click! A Crowd-curated Exhibition,” the Brooklyn Museum, “Photo Hunt,” the Columbus Museum of

Art, “O Snap! Your Take on Our Photographs,” the Carnegie Museum of Art, “On Demand: a Crowd-sourced Curatorial Experiment,” the Hallie Ford Museum of Art, and “Downtown Visions,” the Fresno Art Museum. The article ends with a quote from Cheryl White, organizer of “By Popular Demand,” at the Chrysler Museum of Art in Norfolk, VA. “I loved the idea of being an expert,” she said. “Ultimately...it is more engaging to access multiple points of view” (Guenther, p53).

Proctor, Nancy. “Digital: Museum as Platform, Curator as Champion, In the Age of Social Media.” *Curator* 53, no. 1 (January 2010): 35-43.

In her first column as Digital Editor for *Curator*, Proctor shares some items from a list of what’s “in” and “out,” compiled by David Allison, chair of ITC at the Smithsonian:

| | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Out | In |
| Stability/stodginess | Change |
| Curators as Experts | Curators as collaborators |
| Monographs | Stories |
| Control | Collaboration |
| Web 1.0 | Web 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 |

This list succinctly sums up many, much more exhaustively researched essays, yet serves as an accurate sketch of where the museum world was headed in 2010. Proctor’s focus is on the transition of the curatorial role from expert to fa-

cilitator, but what struck me most about the article was the tone of inevitability, in a good way. Proctor points out that museums, whether willingly or not, are part of the social media scene because their visitors are. Museums might as well embrace the crowd(sourcing). Proctor also offers a counter opinion to Andrew Keen, by citing New Yorker financial analyst James Surowiecki, who “asserts that a diverse crowd is often wiser at making decisions than expert individuals.” She follows with several examples of crowdsourced exhibits, including “Click!: A Crowd-Curated Exhibition,” which frequently appears in literature about social media and museums.

Ternes, Jacob. “Using Social Media to Engage Students in Campus Life.” *Master’s Thesis*, Emporia State University (2013): 1-46.

This thesis, submitted for the degree of Master of Science from Kansas State University, argues that the use of social media by higher education professionals can positively impact student engagement, an important part of success in college. Ternes references the work of Alexander Astin, a leading researcher within the field of higher education, to provide evidence that students who are more involved both in-class, and in out-of-class educationally purposeful activities, stand a better chance of success in the college environment. Jacob goes on to propose that social media can be used to engage students and help them connect with communities of interest on campus. He recommends that establishments of higher education use social networking sites such as Facebook

and Twitter to connect with students in a two-way forum in order to increase engagement with educational campus activities.

This paper provides evidence that university organizations, such as the Thacher Gallery, are following sound educational principles by engaging students via social media. Connecting on-line is an activity most young people are comfortable with, making it possible to offer campus connections that can positively impact a student's college experience.

Appendix B

“Quiet Spaces” PR campaign proposal

“Quiet Spaces: Picturing Sanctuary in the Illustrated Book”

The Thacher Gallery, University of San Francisco
Nov. 29 - Feb 10, 2018

PR/Outreach Campaign

Thacher Gallery is a public art space located in the main library of San Francisco University. 2018 marks the gallery’s twentieth year as a showcase for a range of artistic expression, from traditional to experimental, from emerging artists to masters. With a focus on the art of California, the gallery also presents creative expressions from around the world, reflecting the University’s commitment to social justice, and in pursuit of Thacher’s own mission to foster creativity, scholarship, and community. In addition, the gallery holds an annual student art exhibition, serves as a training ground for museum studies students, and organizes lectures and musical events.

It is our intention in the promotional campaign to address the social justice concerns of the University, the gallery, and the exhibit itself, as well as foster creativity and a sense of community for the gallery’s audience and potential visitors.

The Thacher’s target audience is first and foremost USF students. The gallery is located in a focal point of student activity, at the center of campus in the Gleeson library. It is

easily accessible to students and frequently traversed. One of our primary goals is to make sure that this audience is aware of the exhibition, and through social media engagement, is invited to linger and look. We also plan to connect with other USF communities, including faculty and guest lecturers, lifelong learning participants, and employees.

Additional potential audiences for the gallery in general and this exhibit in particular, include members of the local community, museum and gallery professionals, library professionals and patrons, museum studies students at other local universities, and book lovers everywhere.

“Quiet Spaces: Picturing Sanctuary in the Illustrated Book” will showcase approximately 40 books from the permanent collection of USF’s Donohue Rare Book Room. Exquisite illustrations and accompanying text have been chosen to encourage varied experiences and perceptions of sanctuary, synchronizing with the University wide program surrounding similar issues. Our promotional campaign begins with the press release. We then propose to enhance active emotional and intellectual involvement by posing questions on Instagram that allow followers to respond. Two blog posts will give readers a behind-the-scenes look at the process of creating the exhibition, with reflections from student curators. Three Facebook posts will advertise the opening and related lectures and events, as well as direct attention to the blog posts. One email blast will also be sent to invite Thacher’s dedicated community to the opening. A flyer may also be distributed around campus.

The PR/Outreach campaign will be orchestrated by a student team. The three-member team will write and make the posts, subject to the approval of the curatorial class, the Professor and the Thacher Gallery staff. The PR team will monitor and follow up all responses. The campaign provisionally ends on December 3rd, but team members will be available to continue monitoring responses, and will provide the class and Thacher Gallery with a brief evaluation.

“Quiet Spaces” promotional timeline:

October:

| | |
|-------|-----------------------------------|
| 10/5 | Press release draft |
| | PR/Outreach campaign draft |
| 10/12 | Press release and campaign finals |

November:

| | |
|-------|--|
| 11/5 | Instagram Post 1 |
| 11/8 | Instagram Post 2 |
| 11/10 | Instagram Post 3 |
| 11/12 | Blog Post 1/behind the scenes curatorial |
| 11/13 | Instagram Post 4 |
| 11/15 | Instagram Post 5 |
| 11/17 | Instagram Post 6 |

11/19 Facebook Post 1/invite

11/20 Instagram Post 7

11/22 Instagram Post 8

11/24 Instagram Post 9

11/26 Facebook/invite 2
email invite

11/27 Instagram Post 10

11/29 Instagram Post 11

December

12/1 Instagram Post 12

12/3 Blog Post 2/behind the scenes installation
Facebook/focus on blogposts

Appendix C

“Quiet Spaces” Social Media Plan

| Assigned | Initials / Complete | Date to Post | Platform | Type | Text | Images | Hashtags | Notes |
|----------|---------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | T, 1/16 | Instagram | Story w/ Question feature | What is your sanctuary? (displayed on 1st image in question prompt feature); #QuietSpaces #QuietSpacesSanctuary (incorporated within the following 2 images) | 11_6_A 11_6_B 11_6_C | QuietSpaces, Picturesanctuary, TheaterGallery, utica | |
| | | R, 1/18 | Instagram | Story w/ Question feature | Is San Francisco your sanctuary? (displayed on 1st image in poll feature, 1 #QuietSpaces #QuietSpacesSanctuary (incorporated within the following 2 images)) | 11_8_A 11_8_B 11_8_C | QuietSpaces, Picturesanctuary, TheaterGallery, utica | |
| | | S, 1/19 | Instagram | Story w/ responses | (Most appropriate) quickly responses received from the previous two questions displayed across all three images) #QuietSpaces #QuietSpacesSanctuary (incorporated with all 3 images) | 11_10_A 11_10_B 11_10_C | QuietSpaces, Picturesanctuary, TheaterGallery, utica | |
| | | M, 1/12 | Facebook | Blog Post | Topic: Curatorial behind the scenes | behind scenes photos | | Drove traffic to blog post |
| Anna | | T, 1/13 | Instagram | Story | 20sec video of “Sanctuary” cataloging 20sec video of “Quiet Spaces” cataloging Coming soon: Exhibition Poster | 11_13A 11_13B 11_13C | QuietSpaces, Picturesanctuary | |
| Anna | | R, 1/15 | Instagram | Story | Do you find Sanctuary in routine? (displayed on 1st image in question prompt feature); #QuietSpaces #QuietSpacesSanctuary (incorporated within the following 2 images) | 11_15A 11_15B 11_15C | QuietSpaces, Picturesanctuary | |
| Anna | | S, 1/17 | Instagram | Post | Getting lost in the pages of a book is one of our favorite places to be. Where do you find Sanctuary? | 11_17 | QuietSpaces, Picturesanctuary, TheaterGallery, utica | |
| Anna | | M, 1/19 | Facebook | Post (invite) | When do you find Sanctuary? Join the Theater Gallery in their new exhibition Quiet Spaces: Finding Sanctuaries in the Illustrated Book as they explore the diverse experiences and perspectives of sanctuary through the lens of modern illustrated books | FLYER / PRESS IMAGE | | Invitation to Quiet Spaces exhibition + Who can add a link to the Press Release here. |
| Valerie | | T, 1/20 | Instagram | Post | Illustrates are sanctuaries. Check out the rare illustrated books in the exhibit “Quiet Spaces” opening Thursday Nov 29 (image of Gleason Library) | Gleason library jpg | QuietSpaces, utica, Theater Gallery | Suggested post to go up on USF main page |
| Valerie | | R, 1/22 | Instagram | Story with question feature | What book makes you flip? (1st image in question prompt/video of flipping pages (2nd image); Tell us your fave! (survey) or post a picture #QuietSpacesSanctuary (3rd image) Happy Thanksgiving (image of food from exhibit book (4th image)) | video of flipping pages, book jpg | Picturesanctuary only so that we can easily harvest responses | Interactive post to encourage participation |
| Valerie | | S, 1/24 | Instagram | Story | Book: you love! (1st image) Best picture responses to book survey (images 2, 3, & 4) | harvest photos from #Picturesanctuary | QuietSpaces, utica, co-oration | |
| Jessica | | M, 1/26 | Facebook | Post (invite) | Join us for our opening event: “Sanctuary in Dialogue: Resonance and Practice.” We will have a short poetry reading, a panel discussion and a Q&A session with Professor Cristina Yeh, Professor Arturo Arango, and Professor/Artists Roy Rasmussen and Rick Urban at 7:00pm. Followed by a reception at Theater Gallery. | Specific images for program? Or whatever Two main screenshots as cover. | | Share Event on Facebook and type text as description |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------|--|------------|------------|--------------|--|--------------------|---|---|
| Valerie | | M, 1/12/26 | Email | Email Invite | intro with flyer.jpg | flyer.jpg | | reach out to Teacher's core followers |
| Jessica | | T, 1/12/27 | Instagram | Post | | | | |
| Jessica | | R, 1/1/29 | Instagram | Post | Promote panel & opening | | | Suggested post to go up on USF main page |
| Jessica | | R, 1/1/29 | Instagram | Story | During Panel | | | |
| Jessica | | OPEN | | | | | | |
| Jessica | | S, 12/1 | Instagram | Story | | | | |
| Valerie | | M, 12/3 | Facebook | Post (blog) | Exhibit information with picture of exhibit space, invite to link to blog post on installation process | | | Drive traffic to blog post |
| Ana | | M, 12/3 | MUSJL Blog | Blog Post | Topic: Group Installations | | | |
| Ana | | T, 12/4 | Instagram | Post | | | | |
| Ana | | R, 12/6 | Instagram | Post | | | | |
| Ana | | S, 12/8 | Instagram | Post | | | | |
| Ana | | T, 12/11 | Instagram | Post | | | | |
| Valerie | | T, 12/18 | Instagram | Post | Take some time to chat (fast forward video through exhibit landing on a steady shot of an open book) | fast forward video | Quellegans, utica, Teacher Gallery | engage students as they leave for the holidays |
| Valerie | | T, 12/25 | Instagram | Post | Merry Christmas! May you find sanctuary wherever you are. (family image from exhibit book) | book.jpg | Quellegans, utica, Teacher Gallery | |
| Valerie | | T, 1/1 | Instagram | Post | Happy New Year! Keep the dream alive (landscape image - Adams...) | book.jpg | Quellegans, utica, Teacher Gallery | |
| Valerie | | T, 1/8 | Instagram | Post | Add you thoughts - Join all photo of responses on interactive wall) | photo of wall.jpg | Quellegans, utica, Teacher Gallery, Sengo de chy/Caudal Santuario | encourage audience attendance and participation |
| Jessica | | T, 1/15 | Instagram | Post | | | | |
| Jessica | | T, 1/22 | Instagram | Post | | | | |
| Jessica | | T, 1/29 | Instagram | Post | | | | |
| Jessica | | T, 2/5 | Instagram | Post | | | | |
| Jessica | | S, 2/8 | Instagram | Post | | | | |

Appendix D

Museum Instagram Account Data

Data for Selected Museum Instagram Accounts, gathered on 12/1/2018

| Museum | City | Instagram Name | Number of posts | Number of Followers |
|---|---------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| The Museum of Modern Art | New York City | MoMA | 3,360 | 4,100,000 |
| Tate | London | tate | 1,952 | 2,500,000 |
| Guggenheim Museum | New York City | guggenheim | 3,147 | 2,000,000 |
| Brooklyn Museum | Brooklyn | brooklynmuseum | 2,761 | 681,000 |
| The Museum of Contemporary Art | Los Angeles | MOCA | 2,439 | 407,000 |
| SFMOMA | San Francisco | sfmoma | 2,054 | 327,000 |
| Hammer Museum | Los Angeles | hammer-museum | 2,613 | 166,000 |
| de Young Museum | San Francisco | deyoungmuseum | 1,444 | 102,000 |
| Field Museum | Chicago | fieldmuseum | 1,089 | 66,200 |
| Yale University Art Gallery | New Haven | yaleartgallery | 1,213 | 51,000 |
| Harvard Art Museums | Cambridge | Harvardartmuseums | 705 | 48,200 |
| Barnes Foundation | Philadelphia | barnesfoundation | 1,911 | 44,500 |
| Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive | Berkeley | BAMPFA | 828 | 12,500 |
| San Francisco Art Institute | San Francisco | sfaiofficial | 868 | 8,690 |
| San Jose Museum of Art | San Jose, CA | san_jose_museum_of_art | 741 | 3,160 |
| Cantor Arts Center | Stanford, CA | cantorarts | 525 | 2,873 |
| Thacher Gallery, University of San Francisco | San Francisco | thachergalleryusf | 301 | 608 |

References

- Anderson, Gail, ed. *Reinventing The Museum, The Evolving Conversation on the Paradigm Shift*. Lanham: Altamira Press, 2012.
- Conn, Steven. *Do Museums Still Need Objects?* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.
- Cook, Sarah. "Toward a Theory of the Practice of Curating New Media Art." In *Beyond the Box, Diverging Curatorial Practices*, edited by Melanie Townsend, 169-181. Banff, AB: Banff Centre Press, 2003.
- Din, Herminia, and Phyllis Hecht, eds. *The Digital Museum: A Think Guide*. Washington DC: American Association of Museums, 2007.
- Drotner, Kristen and Kim Christian Schroder, eds. *Museum Communication and Social Media*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Falk, John H., and Beverly K. Sheppard. *Thriving in the Knowledge Age: New Business Models for Museums and Other Cultural Institutions*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2006.
- Fowle, Kate. "Who cares? Understanding the Role of the Curator Today." In *Cautionary Tales: Critical Curating*, edited by Steven Rand and Heather Kouris, 26-35. New York: apexart, 2007.
- Genoways, Hugh H., ed. *Museum Philosophy for the Twenty-first Century*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2006.
- Gurian, Elaine Heumann. *Civilizing the Museum: The Collected Writings of Elaine Heumann Gurian*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Hinton, Sam and Larissa Hjorth. *Understanding Social Media*. London: Sage Publications, 2013.

Jones-Garmil, Katherine, ed. *The Wired Museum: Emerging Technology and Changing Paradigms*. Washington DC: American Association of Museums, 1997.

Keen, Andrew. *the cult of the amateur*. New York: Doubleday, 2007.

Manovich, Lev. *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.

Marty, Paul F. and Katherine Burton Jones. *Museum Informatics: People, Information, and Technology in Museums*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Proctor, Nancy, ed. *Mobile Apps for Museums. The AAM Guide to Planning and Strategy*. Washington, DC: American Alliance of Museums, 2011.

Sanchez Laws, Ana Luisa. *Museum Websites & Social Media: Issues of Participation, Sustainability, Trust and Diversity (Museums and Collections)*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2015.

Simon, Nina. *The Participatory Museum*. Santa Cruz: Museum 2.0, 2010.

Wong, Amelia. "Social Media Towards Social Change." In *Museums, Equality and Social Justice*, edited by Richard Sandell and Eithne Nightingale, 281-293. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Journals:

Budge, Kylie. "Objects in Focus: Museum Visitors and Instagram." *Curator, The Museum Journal* 60, no. 1 (January, 2017): 67-85.

"Click! A Crowd-Curated Exhibition." *Brooklyn Museum website*.
<https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/exhibitions/click/>

Fletcher, Adrienne and Moon J Lee. "Current social media uses and evaluations in American Museums." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 27, no. 5 (December 2012): 505-521.

- Guenther, Amanda M. "Today's Curation: News of the Art Museum and the Crowd." *Professional Projects from the College of Journalism and Mass Communication* 5. (December, 2014): 1-57.
- Holdgaard, Nanna and Lisbeth Klastруп. "Between control and creativity: challenging co-creation and social media use in a museum context." *Digital Creativity* 25, no. 3 (2014): 190-202.
- Johnson, Ken. "3,344 People May Not Know Art but Know What They Like." *The New York Times* (July, 2008): <https://nytimes.com/2008/07/arts/design/04cllc.html?smid=pl-share>
- Klindt, Maj. "When and How Do We Participate? On Participation from a Museological and Cultural-Political Perspective." *ARKEN Bulletin* 7 (2017): 35-53.
- Padilla-Melendez, Antonio and Ana Rosa del Aguila-Obra. "Web and social media usage by museums: Online value creation." *International Journal of Information Management* 33, no. 5 (October 2013): 892-898.
- Pardes, Arielle. "Selfie Factories: The Rise of the Made-For-Instagram Museum." *Wired* (2017): 1-26
<https://www.wired.com/story/selfie-factories-instagram-museum/>.
- Proctor, Nancy. "Digital: Museum as Platform, Curator as Champion, In the Age of Social Media." *Curator* 53, no. 1 (January 2010): 35-43.
- Salaman, Anna, Andrea Cunningham and Polly Richards. "Participation on Trial - Is it always a good thing?" *Museum-ID* 21 (2017):
<http://museum-id.com/participation-trial-anna-salaman-andrea-cunningham-polly-richards/>
- Simon, Nina. "How to Develop a (Small-Scale) Social Media Plan." *Museum 2.0* (2009): <http://museumtwo.blogspot.com/2009/06/how-to-develop-small-scale-social-media.html>.
- Sutherland, Karen, Cindy Davis, Uwe Terton, & Irene Visser. "University student social media use and its influence on offline engagement in higher educational communities." *Student Success* 9, no. 2 (March, 2018): 13-24.

Ternes, Jacob. "Using Social Media to Engage Students in Campus Life," *Master's Thesis*, Emporia State University (2013): 1-46.