

Museumverse. A New Typology for User Positioning in Museum Dissemination

JENS F. JENSEN

Abstract: *This article presents a new typology for user positioning in museum dissemination. First, I develop a framework for the typology by identifying relevant, central dimensions and variables within the area of user positioning in museum dissemination. Next, the individual types within the typology is studied and representative cases for each type described. Finally, the conclusion points to different uses and consequences of the typology.*

Keywords: museum dissemination, museum exhibitions, user positions, enlightenment, experiences, typology, 3-D matrix.

This article presents a new typology for user positioning in museum dissemination with the aim of providing an analytical tool to categorize and understand user positions. It offers a matrix that can be used constructively and design-wise as a creative tool for bringing new ideas into play when working with museum dissemination and design of new displays and exhibitions. It is based on an overview of the diversity, the differentiation and the field of opportunity within – and thus a *theoretical understanding* of – the overall landscape of dissemination forms, exhibition design, and user positions.

The article focuses exclusively on the dissemination dimension of museum work,

and not on other museum tasks described, for example, in the Danish law appertaining to museums.¹ Furthermore, the article works from an inclusive definition of the museum concept that comprises art, culture, natural history, science centres, cultural heritage sites and events involving dissemination of historical themes.²

X-DIMENSIONAL PRESENTATION FORMS AND THE MULTIVERSE

There is a long and widespread tradition for using 2-dimensional presentations, such as 2x2-matrixes, in scientific research and presentations. A less widespread tradition exists

for using 3-dimensional presentations, e.g. 2x2x2-matrixes, but for instance Waterworth (1992), Waterworth & Waterworth (2001), Pine & Korn (2011), Jensen (1998, 2008)³ and several others have worked with 3-dimensional matrix presentation forms. 2- and 3-dimensional matrixes are most often used to systematically typologize or categorize a particular field based on central dimensions and variables.

The reason for mentioning these examples here is primarily to document that there are precedents and a scientific tradition for working with 3-D matrix presentations of various subject areas.

Pine and Korn, for example, offer a new framework – what they call “a three-dimensional sense-making tool” (2011:9) – for discovering, exploring, describing, mapping, and designing the possibilities of producing experiences in the digital domain. They do this by identifying the movements or the transformations currently taking place in our mindsets when it comes to thinking about a given area, in Pine and Korn’s case: experience economic innovations in the digital domain. Pine and Korn summarize:

“[...] the three fundamental dimensions of the universe break down into six variables – Time and No-Time, Space and No-Space, Matter and No-Matter. These together comprise a 2x2x2 matrix, with each paring two sides of the same coin (or, in this case, two variables lying along the same dimension). Since $2 \times 2 \times 2 = 8$ this matrix delineates eight distinct universes [...]” (2011:15).

Pine and Korn choose to call this spatial universe “the Multiverse” (2011:15), because it provides a framework that captures all aspects of the “when, where, and what of an experience” (2011: 22). The Multiverse thus

consists of: three dimensions, six variables and eight sub-universes or realms.

THE MUSEUMVERSE

In our case, we want to construct a dedicated 3-dimensional matrix that can say something specific about the user dimension related to museum dissemination: A Museumverse. That is to say, a matrix that handles the point of view of the museum’s guests, visitors, or users, and says something about which positions they can adopt.⁴ In the context of this article, user positions and user positioning are understood as the ways in which the museum exhibition or dissemination situates the user in the form of preferred use, preferred usage pattern, or ‘story of use’ (Forlizzi & Ford 2000), and how the user is thus invited, encouraged, or motivated to receive and use the exhibition in specific ways.

Following Pine and Korn’s methodological ‘grip’, we first have to identify the most important transformations currently taking place in our mindsets when it comes to thinking about the given area, in our case user positions in actual museum dissemination. Or, in other words, find answers to questions like: What are the three most important or most discussed themes or dimensions in the current debate on museum dissemination and the user dimension? What are the most deep-rooted transformations concerning new trends? They are, of course, questions that can easily be made into subjects for discussion, and there can certainly be several candidates for such basic dimensions and trends. However, if you look at the contemporary scientific and professional literature concerned with museums, museum dissemination and museum exhibitions, there are nevertheless some clear trends and thus some clear candidates. In particular, the following three: 1) the experience-based, 2) the

technologically / digitally disseminated, and 3) the participatory museum. Or, more fully elaborated:

1. The use of experience-oriented forms of dissemination, expressing the dimension of experience versus enlightenment.
2. The employment of new technologies, here especially digital, interactive technologies, for museum dissemination, expressing the dimension of technology versus non-technology, or mediation versus non-mediation.
3. The drive to involve, engage, and activate the museum's visitors, expressing the dimension of active user position versus passive user position.

In the following, we will try to substantiate that these three themes represent major predominant trends and dimensions in current museum dissemination by discussing a range of scientific and professional treatments of the area.

1 EXPERIENCE VERSUS ENLIGHTENMENT

The first trend is the use of experience-related dissemination forms expressing the dimension of experience versus enlightenment.

In her keynote address to Museum 2000, *The Museum as a catalyst*, Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblet describes a paradigm shift: "From an informing to a performing museology" (2000:10). The shift is characterized by a movement from "information" to "experience", from "knowing" to "feeling", from "things" to "stories", and from "display" to "*mise-en-scène*". The new museology is signified by, among other things, a more theatrical or dramatic approach to the museum experience – also called "museum theater" (2000:5).

Instead of merely presenting objects, museum use scenography, *mise-en-scène*, tableaux, scenarios, installations, and '*habitat displays*'. This approach gives pride of place to drama, the narrative and emotional engagement. "This is a special kind of theatre", writes Kirshenblatt-Gimblet, "and its point is not information but "experience" [...] "Experience" indexes the sensory, somatic, and emotional engagement that we associate with theatre, world fairs, amusement parks, and tourism" (2000:5). Therefore, this new *modus* is also called "the expo style" (2000:5) with a reference to world fairs and the Expo-World's more performative oriented display forms that are also far more "customer focused" and "commercially positive" (2000:10). That is to say, a shift from the traditional enlightening, information-oriented museum to a more experience-oriented museum.

In the Nordic context, the Norwegian museologist Gjertrud Sæter in her article "Between Conservation and Consumption. New challenges for museums" (2004) discusses the museums' basic values and objectives from a historical perspective. She describes a major historical movement "From enlightenment to entertainment", as it is called in a heading; i.e. from the modern museum where the basic values and objectives were to teach and educate the public through displays, to the present day post-modern museum that moves towards becoming a "commercial entertainment product" (2004:59). Among other things, she writes: "The overall objective for the modern museum has been to be educative and enlightening, and the basic values are rooted in the belief in development, culture, formation, and progress. In contrast, the objective of the non-constructive, or post-modern museum, is entertainment, and the basic values are lack of worry, freedom and openness"

(2004:70ff., my translation). Here, she even speaks of a 'disneyfication' of museums: "In order to safeguard themselves economically, museums have to give in to the public's desire for entertainment. A disneyfied museum has sacrificed education and enlightenment for superficial entertainment based on illusions" (Sæter 2004:68, my translation).

In a Danish context, Lene Floris and Annette Vasström discussed whether the objective of museums was enlightenment or experience, as far back as 1999. In their book, *At the museum – between enlightenment and experience*, they relate the origin of museums to modern society's formation project and the modern democratic national states' narrative of progress and freedom. They point out that the modern project and the narrative about the necessary course of continuous progress in the present time have collapsed. The enlightenment element relates particularly to the museums' original historical form: "Providing enlightenment to the museum's visitors has always been part of the museum's history production", they write, and continue: "Often there has been talk of enlightenment in a pure, almost puritanical form where the experience aspect had only a subordinate role" (1999:382, my translation). On the other hand, they connect the experience element to more current practices: "Many museums in recent years have, to a much higher degree, made use of entertaining and activating elements of dissemination in displays and in their overall work" (1999:382, my translation). A practice that they particularly associate with the new *visit centres* and *experience centres* with historical themes. Even so, the attitude is that the museums should also learn from the experience aspects and implement the lessons learned; i.e. "[...] the museums should take up the challenge instead of blindly keeping their

distance from the experience centres etc., and stamping them as disneyfication" (1999:282, my translation). In conclusion, the book advocates a synthesis of the two aspects into one new formation project: "It is necessary to have both enlightening and entertaining experiences; it isn't a question of either-or" (1999:385, my translation).

Almost ten years later, Dorthe Skot-Hansen discussed the current situation in which the Danish public museums found themselves, especially their role in the experience economy, in the report: *Museums in the Danish Experience Economy* (2008), with the sub-title, *When Enlightenment Becomes an Experience*. She considers the experience economy to be both the cause of and solution to challenges facing the museums. The point of departure is that the state-supported museums are under both economic and political pressure in some measure because of the experience economy. The museums are challenged by competition from other more commercial experience-oriented attractions, a public increasingly pampered by more engaging and sensational experiences, demands to enter into the experience economy, and the general economic development of cities and regions. Therefore, according to Skot-Hansen, museums need to "re-evaluate their classical role as institutions of enlightenment and education" (2008:9, my translation). Hence, museums find themselves on a tight rein between enlightenment on the one hand and experience on the other. Skot-Hansen expresses it in this way: "Discussions about enlightenment versus experience permeate the public debate on the role of museums; not least the issue of where the boundaries lie" (2008:13, my translation).

At the same time, experiences and the experience economy are seen as the solution

to the challenge. Museums can and must learn to work strategically with experience development, i.e. learn from the instruments of experience economy such as staging and strengthening experience value and use orientation. Skot-Hansen concludes “[...] that is why [...] the museums, ed.] need to develop their experience potential, and for that they can learn from the experience economy. Museums have to learn to navigate in a fundamentally new knowledge and experience society integrating their basic tasks of collection, storage, research and dissemination with good experiences” (2008:130f., my translation).

One particularly relevant and central source in this context is the project description for the *Our Museum* project, from which this article originates. *Our Museum*'s overall thesis is precisely that “museums are historically created and developed in a field of tension between a perception of the museum as a means of public information and enlightenment, and as a facility for visitors’ experiences; and that this tension field becomes especially visible in the museums’ dissemination as a number of dilemmas that contemporary dissemination seeks to deal with” (Drotner et al. 2015:1ff.).

Thus, in the scientific literature, many points are made regarding the relationship between enlightenment and experience being central in the discussion of contemporary (and historical) museum dissemination. The first dimension thus concerns enlightenment versus experience where, in other words, the enlightenment-orientation and the experience-orientation respectively represent the two variables that constitute the dimension. Here, enlightenment-orientation is linked to the factual, informative, forming, and educational. Conversely, experience-orientation is related to the engaging, involving, emotional, narrative, imaginative, entertaining etc.

2 TECHNOLOGICAL DISSEMINATION VERSUS NON-TECHNOLOGICAL DISSEMINATION

The second trend is the use of new technologies, especially digital, interactive technologies in museum dissemination expressing the dimension of technological dissemination versus non-technological dissemination, or mediation versus non-mediation.

“The biggest trend in museums’ exhibition design today is the creative incorporation of technology” (2008) is the statement, for example, in a presentation of Loïc Tallon and Kevin Walker’s anthology: *Digital Technologies and the Museum Experience* (2008). And in the foreword to the same book, James M. Bradburne supplements by writing: “Now, more than ever before, new technologies allow the museum to imagine creating new experiences and enhancing familiar ones in unprecedented ways” (2008:ix).

Many others have also pointed to the technological involvement in museum dissemination. For example, Ross Perry writes in the anthology *Museums in a Digital Age* about the museums as exhibitors, and especially concerning digital technologies, that “the contemporary museum sector is one in which digital culture is now actively collected, where computer-based interpretive media allows exhibitions to support experiences in more flexible, creative and empowering ways[...]” (2010:1f.). Just as, in the same place, he insists that: “Today, it is irrefutable that computing has had a profound effect on how museums make visible their collections” (2010:2).

In the Danish context, Skot-Hansen has also examined the technological trend, here again with particular reference to digital technologies, when she points out that there has been “a larger and larger integration of the

digital media in the museums' activities as such [...]” (2008:15, my translation). An observation she further elaborates later in the presentation: “Today, an increasing number of development projects can be seen that make use of portable devices such as hand-held computers, mobile telephones and different types of digital players such as iPods” (2008:95). And Drotner et al. point out in the introduction to the anthology *The Interactive Museum* that: “Digitalization is used to develop new information and experience forms about collections, even about entire museums” (2011:15, my translation).

Thus, there are many indications that the use of technologies, especially digital, interactive technologies, plays a central and prominent role in the current handling of museum dissemination, and is representing a growing trend in exhibition practices. The second dimension thus consists of technology versus non-technology. In other words, technological dissemination and non-technological dissemination respectively constitute the variables in the dimension. In this context, the term technology must be understood relatively narrowly related to dissemination and communication; and thus as media technology, communication technology, computer technology etc.⁵ Technology is thus linked to mediated, indirect, 2nd hand experiences, while, in contrast, the non-technological is linked to non-mediated, direct, 1st hand experiences.

3 ACTIVE PARTICIPATION VERSUS PASSIVE RECEPTION

The third prominent trend is the attempt to involve, engage, and activate museums visitors constituting the dimension between the active user position and the passive user position.

A central reference to this trend comes from Nina Simon, the author of *The Participatory*

Museum (2010). Simon's fundamental point of view is that cultural institutions can only establish (or re-establish) their relationship with the public and give value to and be relevant for present-day life by inviting the public to become actively engaged as cultural participants. She associates that development closely with online media such as the internet and the social web. It happens in two interconnected ways. Firstly, both the internet and the social web have improved accessibility, thus making it much easier for the public to participate than it has ever been before. Access is now something easily achievable whenever, wherever and by whomsoever. Secondly – and clearly related – online media and the social web have already accustomed the public to having immediate access to a wide spectrum of information sources and cultural perspectives, and made it possible for them to respond to and integrate with them; i.e. users expect to be able to engage actively – to discuss, share, annotate, and remix whatever they use. And when users in this way can actively participate in cultural institutions, it means at the same time that these institutions also become “central to cultural and community life” (2010:ii).

Simon defines participatory cultural institutions more precisely as “places where visitors can create, share, and connect with each other around content” (2010:ii). Therefore, the deciding factor in recognizing the difference between traditional and participatory institutions is the way that information flows between the institution and the users: The traditional institution provides authoritative content and information that the user can consume. On the other hand, the participatory institution functions as a platform that connects different users who act as content creators, distributors, critics, co-creators etc. The participatory modus is identified as a

62 rising trend in the museums of today. Simon says: “I believe the majority of museums will integrate participatory experiences as one of many types of experience available to visitors in the next twenty years” (2010:6).

In other places, Simon has named that same tendency ‘Museum 2.0’. Here, the parallel with the web is even clearer. The web started with sites that were authoritative content distributors, and users were only passive observers and consumers. In retrospect, we can call that web 1.0. In the 2000s, that was replaced by web 2.0, characterized by an ‘architecture of participation’: i.e. “one in which users generate, share, and curate the content” (2006). Web 2.0 moved the authority away from the content supplier and to the user who became an active participant. Simon sees the museum institution undergoing a similar movement or (r)evolution from the traditional Museum 1.0, characterized by “static content authorities” and “passive visitors”, to Museum 2.0, described as “dynamic platforms for content generation and sharing” and populated by “active users” (2006). The last-mentioned modus is directly referred to as “the future of museums – Museum 2.0” (2006).

Skot-Hansen also describes the participatory, dialogical element as a trend and, like Simon, connects it directly to digital technologies and, more specifically, to the social media – here also referred to as web 2.0: “Not least, the new web 2.0 faces the museums’ web-based dissemination with new challenges. Whereas it was previously about cultural dissemination as “expert dissemination”, it is now about the subjective and listening dissemination and dialogue. The arrival of web 2.0 can lead to a “digital paradigm-shift” for the cultural institutions, where the museum inspector’s role as “custodian of cultural content” changes to become one voice among many others in

the large and open network (2008:15, my translation).

James M. Bradburne makes similar observations when he in the foreword to the anthology *Digital Technologies and the Museum Experience* writes: “For years, the space of the museum has been the preserve of curators and educators, who were solely responsible for the museum’s content. In recent decades there has been an increasing insistence on “bottom-up” approaches that open the museum to other voices and other constituencies” and, among other things, he mentions: “The idea of visitors contributing to the museum space [...]” (2008:xi). In addition, Loïc Tallon states in his introduction to the same anthology that, “The trend is toward personal relevance and interpretations, interactivity, and easy access and control of content to shape the twenty-first-century museum visitor’s experience. Today’s museum visitors are less audience than they are author – active participants in opinion-making and content-creation” (2008:xiv).

There are many similar indications that the question of the degree of user participation and involvement is a central and prominent theme in the current debate on museums and museum dissemination, just as it constitutes a growing trend in exhibition design. The third dimension, therefore, consists of the passive museum 1.0-*modus* versus the active museum 2.0-*modus*, where passivity and activity respectively constitute the two variables within the dimension. The passive museum 1.0-*modus* is to be understood here as museum use based on observation, and the relatively passive mental perception and reception. On the other hand, the active museum 2.0-*modus* is to be understood as museum use based on active physical exploration, participation, interaction, co-creation etc. The term ‘active’ is thus understood in its basic meaning, ‘engaged

in action’, ‘involving physical effort and action’, that is, actually doing something physically; while the term ‘passive’, consequently and conversely, becomes associated with the term inaction, not-doing-something physically, but ‘only’ viewing, listening, reading, observing, and perceiving.⁶

THE MUSEUMVERSE – CONSTRUCTED AND EXEMPLIFIED

The three dimensions and their variables defined above can be represented graphically as a 3-dimensional space or a 3-D-matrix, as illustrated below in fig. 1. Three dimensions, six variables, eight (=2x2x2) combination possibilities, sub-universes, or octants – one Museumverse.

Below is the 3-D matrix, The Museumverse, filled in with the eight combination options


or octants (cf. fig. 2). The octants carrying the white font lies in the foreground, and the octants carrying the black font lies in the background on the z-axis.

In the following, the individual combination possibilities or octants are examined and illustrated through a representative case. First, the four octants within the passive 1.0-modus located ‘in the front’ of the plane on the z-axis (fig. 3) are discussed. Secondly, we go through the four octants characterized by the active 2.0-modus and placed ‘in the back’ of the plane on the z-axis (fig. 4).

1. ENLIGHTENMENT-ORIENTED/NON-TECHNOLOGICAL/PASSIVE

The first octant is constituted by the combination of enlightenment-oriented, non-technological, and passive *modus*. In other

Fig. 1. 3-D matrix representation of The Museumverse.






Fig. 2. The Museumverse with the insertion of the eight combination possibilities or octants.

words, the user here is positioned as a receiver of enlightenment-oriented – i.e. objective, informative, professional – non-technologically supported or non-mediated museum dissemination in a passive 1.0-*modus*.

This type of museum dissemination is manifested, for example, in exhibitions based on artifacts displayed in glass cases and accompanied by factual, informative exhibit descriptions, where the user is positioned as a passive viewer; or in informative non-technologically supported lectures, where the public is given a relatively passive role as listener.

Examples of this type are legion in traditional museum dissemination. Therefore, the Oxford University Museum of Natural History also called OUMNH is a privileged case, as it

constitutes a proto-type for the classical natural history museum. OUMNH was founded in 1860 to merge natural-scientific studies from all parts of the University of Oxford and accommodate the university’s collection of zoological and geological objects. It has retained parts of the original exhibition practices. The museum exhibits the objects in the traditional way as simple displays arranged in series – in display cases or *Victorian cabinets* – and supplied with short, objective, and informative exhibition texts. OUMNH follows the traditional exhibition practice to such a degree that the museum itself appears as a museum of museums, a kind of meta-museum.

Museum dissemination in that traditional form is enlightenment-oriented because




Fig. 3. The Museumverse with the four octants characterized by the passive 1.0-modus in front of the plane on the z-axis.

it focuses on the factual, informative, and objective. It is not mediated because the objects are exhibited as they are, without any technological dissemination or mediation. And it is passive, as it does not require active participation by the user but is based on passive perception and cognition.

2. EXPERIENCE-ORIENTED / NON-TECHNOLOGICAL / PASSIVE

The second octant comprises a combination of experience-oriented, non-technological, and passive *modus*. In other words, the user is positioned as a recipient of experience-oriented – i.e. narrative, emotional, engaging – and non-technologically supported museum dissemination in a passive 1.0-*modus*.

This type of dissemination of, for example, history can be seen in dramatized, historical plays – such as Viking plays or medieval theatre plays – where the audience is given a relatively passive role as spectators. Another example is dramatized, guided city walks, where illustrative dramatic experience-oriented performances frame the information about the various historical sites.

A representative case of that kind of historical dissemination could be *The Fyrkat Drama*. Each summer, the *Fyrkat Drama Group* performs a so-called ‘Viking play’ in the reconstructed longhouse near the Viking settlement at Fyrkat near Hobro. This is a relatively traditional theatre piece that portrays Viking times and the Vikings’ daily life, history, and world. The actors perform in period

costumes modelled on original Viking clothes and equipped with jewellery and implements that are replicas of original artifacts from the Viking age. However, the events portrayed are fictional and dramatized in a relatively free interpretation of known and documented history.

The Fyrkat Drama is experience-oriented because it dramatizes and fictionalizes the historical content. It is non-mediated and non-technological as it is a live performance by actors, which presupposes the audience's presence at the same time and space. And it is passive 1.0-*modus*, as it is a traditional form of theatre performed by actors, while the users are positioned as 'audience' and 'onlookers'; i.e. assigned a relatively passive, observational role behind the theatre's "fourth wall".

3. ENLIGHTENMENT-ORIENTED/ TECHNOLOGICAL/PASSIVE

The third octant comprises a combination of enlightenment-oriented, technological, and passive *modus*. The user in this case is positioned as a receiver of enlightening – i.e. informative, factual – technologically supported or mediated museum dissemination in a passive *modus*.

That type of museum dissemination can be seen on the museum world's more traditional websites that, for example, primarily carry information and illustrations about the exhibited objects. In these cases, we see technologically supported dissemination and user positioning in a relatively passive 1.0-*modus*; i.e. as receivers of communicated information. But it can also be in the form of audio guides, audio walks, MP3-guided tours etc. That is to say, different forms of soundtracks carrying factual information about the buildings and locations visited

during the tour. Also in this case, the user is positioned as a relatively passive receiver of information.

A representative, and relatively advanced example of this type of museum dissemination, can be found in *Robotinho – the humanoid robot*. *Robotinho* was developed by the University of Bonn and, among others, tested by Deutsches Museum, Bonn, that includes a robot museum. *Robotinho* is a so-called "mobile, full-body humanoid museum tour guide robot" (Faber et al. 2009:7). Humanoid in this connection means that the robot has a human-type body and human-type senses enabling him to carry out intuitive, multimodal interactions with the visitors. Thus, *Robotinho* can independently conduct tours round the exhibition and orally provide information about the individual objects displayed.

Robotinho as a museum disseminator is enlightenment-oriented, because the primary aim is to communicate factual information about exhibitions and exhibits. It is obviously mediated and technologically based, as it builds on a variety of advanced robot, communication, and sensor technologies. And it is to a high degree passive 1.0-*modus*, since the museum guest is primarily positioned as a passive listener, even though there is also a certain measure of interaction at stake.

4. EXPERIENCE-ORIENTED/ TECHNOLOGICAL/PASSIVE

The fourth octant comprises a combination of experience-oriented, technological, and passive *modus*. Here, the museum user is positioned as receiver of experience-oriented – i.e. narrative, emotional, engaging – technologically supported or mediated museum dissemination in a passive 1.0-*modus*.

We find that type of museum dissemination,




Fig. 4. The Museumverse with the four octants characterized by the active 2.0-modus in the back of the plane on the z-axis.

among others, in dramatized MP3-guided tours, i.e. guided tours based on dramatized or fictionalized content in the form of audio dramas, audio plays etc., but where the listener is still positioned in a relatively passive role.

A case that represents this could be *The Da Vinci Code Soundwalk*. *The Da Vinci Code Soundwalk* is an audio-guide for the Louvre Museum in Paris that functions as a self-guided tour through the museum. The soundwalk consists of a series of sound files and helps both navigation – i.e. guides the visitor between the individual stops – and gives information about the exhibits and exhibition rooms. The soundwalk is designed, or curated, so that only the works and exhibits that feature in Dan Brown’s novel and Ron Howard’s film, *The Da*

Vinci Code, are highlighted. Thus, the visitor follows in the footsteps of the main characters in the fiction novel and film experiencing *The Louvre* according to the plot in *The Da Vinci Code*.

The Da Vinci Code Soundwalk is experience-oriented because it is not solely based on factual information, but also on fictional tales, people, and scenes, and because it uses instruments from fiction genres such as movies and novels in the form of dramatization, identification, emotional engagement etc. It is obviously mediated and technology-supported, as it is based on mobile media and digital content. And it places itself within the passive *modus*, as it predominantly positions the user as a listener, who follows instructions and receives

68 information rather than interacting and contributing information.

5. ENLIGHTENMENT-ORIENTED/NON-TECHNOLOGICAL/ACTIVE

The next four octants are characterized by the active 2.0-*modus* and lie ‘at the back’ of the plane on the z-axis (fig. 4).

The fifth octant comprises a combination of enlightenment-oriented, non-technological, and active *modus*. Here, the user is positioned as a participant in an information-oriented – i.e. objective, informative, professional – non-mediated or non-technological museum dissemination in an active 2.0-*modus*.

This type of historical dissemination is manifested in user-driven genealogical research (on condition that it is not technologically supported) and local history research that involves citizens, user-driven archeology and participatory collection processes in connection with artifacts and documents of historical interest.

A representative case example of this type of museum dissemination is the project “The mediated window”. In 1897, a large art and industrial fair was held in Stockholm called *The Stockholm Art and Industry Fair 1897*. The purpose was, among other things, to display and celebrate modern Sweden’s industrial, architectonic, and artistic innovations. The fair was held in the parkland area of *Djurgården*, close to Stockholm. It consisted of a pavilion-city specially designed for the event that also included a replica – built to half-scale – of Stockholm in the Middle Ages where visitors could see modern inventions placed in historical settings. After the end of the exhibition, all of the buildings were taken down, and there remained only very few visible traces of the event. Since then, *Djurgården* has functioned

as a recreational area – but obviously also as a hidden, not generally known *cultural heritage site*. Therefore, in 2008, it was decided to undertake an archaeological excavation of the site in the hope of finding traces and remains of “the lost city” (Gullström et al. 2008:3). The activities were conceived as “a public archaeological excavation”, inviting the general public – under guidance from professional archaeologists – to participate in the dig as a form of public, interactive archaeology. Similarly, both visitors and the general public were invited to contribute memories, artifacts and souvenirs related to the 1897 fair. In this way, they assured both a user-involved archaeological dig and participatory collection processes. The researchers behind the project describe the activities as “a participatory action research framework within archaeology” and “collective memorabilia collection processes” (Gullström et al. 2008:13). A practice they also refer to as: “A new interactive museology” (Gullström et al. 2008:3).

The aspects of “The Mediated Window” mentioned here are enlightenment-oriented because they primarily have a scientific, factual, and informative aim. They are non-technological and non-mediated, as the processes do not depend on media technologies but on direct participation in the dig and collections. And they are an expression of active 2.0-*modus* because the activity requires a high degree of user involvement and user activity.

6. EXPERIENCE-ORIENTED/NON-TECHNOLOGICAL/ACTIVE

The sixth octant constitutes the combinatorics of experience-oriented, non-technological, and active *modus*. Here, the user is positioned as a participant in an experience-related – i.e. narrative, engaging, involving – and non-

technologically supported or non-mediated museum dissemination in an active 2.0-*modus*.

This type of museum dissemination is expressed, among other things, in the special form of dissemination termed “bringing alive”. “Bringing alive” can take many forms, including *re-enactment* and *living history*. Historical *re-enactments* are ‘re-births’ or recreations of historic events or moments. The participants follow a plan or a script to re-enact particular aspects of a historical event. *Living history* or *living history museums* are, on the other hand, an activity in which a group of people attempts to recreate and portray a particular period in time or a historical way of life; not by following a fixed plan or a specific script, but interacting and improvising more freely within the frameworks, limitations, and possibilities the given historical theme sets. The activities are not undertaken by professionals for a passive audience, but involve users or museum guests as active participants to fulfill the active *modus* requirement.

A case-example of this type of history and cultural heritage dissemination could be *Tordenskjoldsdagene* (The Days of Tordenskjold). *The Days of Tordenskjold* is an event held every year in Frederikshavn to celebrate the Danish naval officer and maritime hero during the Great Nordic War, Peter Wessel Tordenskjold, along with Frederikshavn’s role as Tordenskjold’s most important base outside Copenhagen. Frederikshavn is during the event transformed into a historic setting at the beginning of the 1700s. The event itself forms the framework for a panoply of activities and sub-events: stall market, sea battles, theatrical performances, period music, soldiers in uniforms, and citizens in period costumes. *The Days of Tordenskjold* is a mixture of *re-enactment* of factual, historical events and *living history* that more generally seeks to recreate

and portray the period at the beginning of the 1700s because there are both scripted performances in the form of well-planned re-plays of historical events and rehearsed performances by amateur historical groups on the one side, and more free improvisations and regular folk-festivals with historical themes on the other.

The Days of Tordenskjold as history dissemination is mostly experience-oriented because the event is not based on any factual or documented piece of history, but more a creative improvisation around historical themes and moods. It is non-technological and non-mediated based on live performances, *face-to-face* communication and *real-life* interaction. And it represents an active 2.0-*modus* based on the active involvement and performance of the participants.

7. ENLIGHTENMENT-ORIENTED/ TECHNOLOGICAL/ACTIVE

The seventh octant is a combination of enlightenment-oriented, technological, and active *modus*. In other words, the user is positioned as a participant in information-oriented – i.e. factual and informative – technologically supported or mediated museum dissemination in an active 2.0-*modus*.

Museum dissemination of this type appears when the user functions as co-creator of knowledge over digital media. It can be in the form of the user’s *tagging* or annotating museum content on the internet, employing the user as co-curator on electronic platforms and, in general, all forms of information-oriented Museum 2.0-activities on the web. However, museum dissemination of this type can also consist of simply using interactive technologies in displays that provide information-oriented content.

An obvious case that illustrates this type of dissemination can be seen in elements of the *Reykjavík 871+/-2 The Settlement Exhibition*. The Settlement Exhibition in Reykjavík is a museum dealing with the first Vikings' arrival in Iceland. It is placed on top of the remains of a long house from the tenth century at the very place where it was found and excavated, i.e. 'in situ' (Gunnarsdottir, n.d.). The museum also houses – which is central to this case description – a couple of interactive installations. Firstly, a screen with an accompanying touch pad and a virtual 3D construction of the long house. Here, the visitors can use the touchpad interaction to enter the virtual long house, examine it in detail, and scrape layer after layer of the building in order to study its construction principles. Secondly, there is an interactive table with a model of the longhouse's ground plan. This enables the visitor to interact with different parts of the model to see how the residents of the long house lived.

The installations in *The Settlement Exhibition* are enlightenment-oriented because the aim is to provide factual information about the Vikings' houses and living conditions. They are obviously technological and mediated, as they are based on interactive digital media. And they demonstrate an active 2.0-*modus* as they pre-suppose that users explore by interacting.

8. EXPERIENCE-ORIENTED/ TECHNOLOGICAL/ACTIVE

The eighth and last octant is made up of a combination of experience-oriented, technological, and active *modus*. Here, the user is positioned as a participant in an experience-oriented – i.e. narrative, engaging, involving – technologically supported or mediated museum dissemination in an active 2.0-*modus*.

This type of museum dissemination can be

seen in all cases where the user is involved as co-creator of experiences via a technological platform in museums and cultural heritage dissemination. It can be in the form of *Alternate Reality Games* (ARGs) in museums, experience-oriented Museum 2.0-applications, interactive installations in museums that to a significant degree, are directed towards the experience dimension etc.

A representative case to illustrate this type could be the project *History Unwired*. *History Unwired*⁷ is a project examining “narrative uses of mobile technology in historic cities” (Epstein & Vergani 2006:302). The project's background was the problems arising from mass tourism, or *over-tourism*, that in recent years has hit many cities in Europe, including Venice. Every year, Venice receives a rapidly increasing number of tourists that typically gather around the popular St. Mark's Square while not visiting, or even knowing about, the alternative tourist attractions in the city. Therefore, the objective for the *History Unwired*-project was “[...] to develop a media form that would take tourists to lesser-traveled, yet culturally-rich areas of Venice and give them an intimate experience of Venetian life” (Epstein & Vergani 2006:302). This was achieved by developing a number of technologically supported walks that used location-aware (GPS and Bluetooth) mobile phones and PDAs guiding tourists around one of the less-visited and trafficked districts of Venice, Castello. The route and content for the walking tour were developed in close collaboration with local artists, residents, and others with connections to the area. Based on the information from a series of interviews and *walk-alongs* with the locals, five characters or *personas* were identified, all related to Venetian art and crafts, along with five related tour-routes, each with its own theme, while also providing a portrait of a Venetian. The tours

had a narrative structure that reflected the visual aspects and identity of the area. They took the form of a combined multimedia documentary and treasure hunt. The user was guided by the folklore-history and personal stories from the five representatives of the local population.

History Unwired's dissemination is, therefore, experience-oriented, being rooted more in *personas*, folklore, personal accounts, and anecdotes than in objective information and facts. It is mediated and technologically supported by its use of mobile media and location-based technologies. And it involves active users in at least two ways: by assuming user-involvement through interaction, investigation, and exploration, and by production and content having been based on user-generated information from local residents.

CONCLUSION

As already implied in the introduction to this article, The Museumverse can be useful in several ways. It can, of course, be used analytically to characterize and typologize existing, concrete forms of exhibition designs and user positions related to museum and cultural heritage dissemination, thus generating a greater analytical understanding of empirical incidents. Theoretically, it can create an overview and a model for deeper understanding of the many forms of dissemination and exhibition designs. It can also be used constructively and design-wise as a type of creative tool for generating new, innovative ideas for dissemination, especially using it to imagine existing exhibitions or future concepts in a new perspective or combination of perspectives. Finally, as a bonus, it can also be used methodically as a

practical demonstration of how to establish 3-D representations and matrix-mappings of a given area systematically based on central dimensions and variables that, as a method and procedure, in principle, can be transferred to a variety of other domains.

It is important to point out that the matrix is a systematic and general typology more than a description of concrete empirical user positions in given museum dissemination or concrete museums' ways of addressing the users. Dissemination activities of specific museums and cultural heritage sites will not always fit seamlessly into the individual types, and not all concrete forms of dissemination can always be unambiguously classified within one – and only one – single type in the typology. It will probably often be the case that the classification will be doubtful, unsure, or arguable. Reality is always more complex than theoretical and analytical attempts to put it in order and typologize it.

NOTES

1. In the same way as the project Our Museum (jf. Drotner et al. 2015:1ff), from which this article springs.
2. Also on this point, the article is consistent with Our Museum that similarly “points clearly to the dissemination dimension” (Drotner et al. 2015:1ff).
3. For my own part, I have worked with 3-dimensional representations in a number of other articles, for example in relation to different forms of interactivity in interactive media (cf. Jensen 1998 & 2008).
4. There is also a museum matrix, which contrastingly is based on the dimensions of the representation; i.e. which takes its departure point in the (exhibition) object and thereby takes the view of the exhibition and the artifact. This matrix

- will not be developed in this context due to space considerations, but is presented in another context (cf. Jensen, manuscript in preparation).
5. Objects and tools such as display cases, pedestals etc., are not considered 'technologies' in this understanding.
 6. It should be noted that this interpretation of the concepts 'active' and 'passive' is derived from Human-Computer Interaction (HCI), interaction design, and interactivity theory (se Jensen 1998 & 2008) and not from traditional communication theory, which in many cases does not recognize (and are unable to make) these distinctions between active and passive user positions.
 7. Cf. <http://web.mit.edu/frontiers>

LITERATURE

Bradburne, James M. 2008. "Foreword." In Loïc Tallon & Kevin Walker (eds.). *Digital Technologies and the Museum Experience*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, ix-xii.

Drotner, Kirsten, Christina Papsø Weber, Berit Anne Larsen & Anne Sophie Warberg Løssing (eds.) 2011. *Det interaktive museum*. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

Drotner, Kirsten et al. 2015. *Vores museum. (Our Museum)*. Projektbeskrivelse. Odense: SDU.

Faber, Felix et al. 2009. "The Humanoid Museum Tour Guide Robotinho." *Proceedings of 18th IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication (RO-MAN)*, Toyama, Japan, September, 1-6, DOI: 10.1109/ROMAN.2009.5326326

Floris, Lene & Annette Vasström 1999. *På museum. Mellem oplevelse og oplysning*. Frederiksberg: Roskilde Universitets Forlag.

Forlizzi, Jodi & Shannon Ford 2000. "The Building Blocks of Experience: An Early Framework for Interaction Designers." *DIS '00: Proceedings of the 3rd conference on Designing interactive systems: processes, practices, methods, and techniques*. New York: ACM, 419-423. <https://doi.org/10.1145/347642.347800>

Gullstöm, Charlie, Leif Handberg, Katherine Hauptman Wahlgren & Fredrik Svanberg 2008. "The Mediated Window. Enabling Remote Presence to Cultural Heritage Sites." *NODEM 08*, 1-18, <http://repro.nodem.org/The%20Mediated%20Window.pdf>

Gunnarsdottir, Gudny Gerdur n.d. "In The Beginnings of Reykjavik." In *Reykjavik 871 +/- 2. The Settlement Exhibition*. Reykjavik: Reykjavik City Museum, 8-9.

Jensen, Jens F. 1998. "'Interactivity' – Tracking a New Concept in Media and Communication Studies." *Nordicom Review, Nordic Research on media* 12:1, 185-204.

Jensen, Jens F. 2008. "The Concept of Interactivity – Revisited: Four New Typologies for a New Media Landscape." In *UXTV '08. Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Designing Interactive User Experiences for TV and Video*. San Francisco: ACM, 129-132.

Jensen, Jens F., manuscript in preparation. *MuseumVerse – Two New Typologies for Representation and User Positioning in Museum Dissemination*.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara 2000. "The Museum as Catalyst". Keynote address at Museums 2000: Confirmation or Challenge: <https://www.coursehero.com/file/41546651/vadstenapdf/> (accessed 7 April 2021)

Perry, Ross 2010. "The Practice of Digital Heritage and the Heritage of Digital Practice." In Perry Ross (ed.). *Museums in a Digital Age*. Oxon: Routledge, 1-7.

Pine II, B. Joseph, & Kim C. Korn 2011. *Infinite Possibility. Creating Customer Value on the Digital Frontier*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Skot-Hansen, Dorte 2008. *Museerne i den danske oplevelsesøkonomi. Når oplysning bliver til en oplevelse*. Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.

- Sæter, Gjertrud 2004. "Mellom konservering og konsum. Nye utfordringer for museene." In Trond Bjorli, Inger Jensen & Espen Johnsen (eds.). *Museum i friluft. By og Bygd*, XXXVIII, 58-75, <https://dms-cf-05.dimu.org/file/022ymUg7F6X5>.
- Tallon, Loïc 2008. "Introduction: Mobile, Digital, and Personal." In Loïc Tallon & Kevin Walker (eds.). *Digital Technologies and the Museum Experience*. Lanham: AltaMira Press, xiii-xxv.
- Tallon, Loïc & Kevin Walker (eds.) 2008. *Digital Technologies and the Museum Experience. Handheld Guides and Other Media*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.
- Waterworth, J. A. 1992. *Multimedia Interaction with Computers: Human Factor Issues*. Chichester, Sussex: Ellis Horwood, Ltd.
- Waterworth, Eva L. & John Waterworth 2001. "Focus, Locus, and Sensus. The Three Dimensions of

Virtual Experience." *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 4:2, 203-213, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/11645365_Focus_Locus_and_Sensus_The_Three_Dimensions_of_Virtual_Experience.

73

*Jens F. Jensen, Professor in interactive digital media,
jensf@hum.aau.dk*

*Department of Communication & Psychology,
Centre for Interactive Digital Media &
Experience Design
Aalborg University, Rendsburggade 14,
9000 Aalborg, Denmark
<https://vbn.aau.dk/da/persons/100994>*