

## ACTIVIST MUSEUMS – BETWEEN INTENTIONS AND PERCEPTIONS

### Alexandra ZBUCHEA

National University of Political Studies and Public Administration  
30A Expozitiei Blvd., Sector 1, 012104 Bucharest, RO  
[alexandra.zbucea@facultateademangement.ro](mailto:alexandra.zbucea@facultateademangement.ro)

### Monica BIRA

National University of Political Studies and Public Administration  
30A Expozitiei Blvd., Sector 1, 012104 Bucharest, RO  
[monica.bira@comunicare.ro](mailto:monica.bira@comunicare.ro)

### Mauro ROMANELLI

Parthenope University of Napoli  
Via G. Parisi 13, 80132 Napoli, IT  
[mromanelli@uniparthenope.it](mailto:mromanelli@uniparthenope.it)

### Abstract

*During the last decade, changes in society have triggered a series of new strategic activities undertaken by museums. They transitioned to an increased and more consistent presence in the digital space, as well as they began to participate in conversations about recent concerns that currently affect communities. This paper aims to investigate the perception of the general public regarding museums in terms of activism, considering several dimensions - minorities, migration, global warming, education, and social inclusion. It offers a broader vision of how museums in Romania are perceived both as participatory institutions and active „citizens” of society as opposed to their foreign counterparts.*

### Keywords

*Activist museums; museums and communities; participatory museums; Romanian museums.*

### Introduction

As Nina Simon (2010, 2016) stresses in her books – instant bestsellers and points of reference for museum professionals around the world –, contemporary museums should be about participation, they should be partners of their communities, concerned not only with the cultural development but also with the general evolution in those communities. Museums manage and study heritage in connection with communities, having in mind also the social, economic, and political frameworks. They develop their exhibitions and public programs together with their audiences not only for their benefit. Museums are relevant only if they involve communities and stakeholders.

Museums seem to become agents of social change. Contemporary dynamic museums should also act as active citizens, aware of the social and political environments, and the concerns of their communities. They should offer support for social debate, invite to reflection about circumstances of injustice and oppression, both in the past and in present-day society. The ways museums get involved vary from PR tactics to complex cultural projects. In this new framework, museums have a voice stressing past wrongdoings – which might affect present-day societies – as well as react to present

offenses around the world. Today, both academia and practices in the field advocate for inclusive and activist museums.

Having this new framework in mind, museums have changed the way they interact and communicate with their community. They have extended the array of selecting topics for their exhibitions and programs, as well as their discourse. They have not only cultural and educational aims, but also they engage in social and civic ones. Nevertheless, it seems to be a gap between the perceptions of the public and the activity of museums. The present investigation explores the extent to which museums in Romania are acting like activist museums, from the perspective of their public, as well as from the perspective of the museum professionals. Better understanding the public's perception could help museums better communicate, be more convincing, and even more effective.

### **Toward an activist museum, relevant for the wider society**

Deriving from their position as institutions centered on society and their communities, museums have a social role within the society (Knell, 2019). Also, in their capacity of memory institutions and sites for critical reflection on the past (Hooper-Greenhill, 1995) museums contribute to sustainable development, improving the quality of life (Pop & Borza, 2014) and supporting participation and activism of their communities.

One way of promoting activist practices on behalf of museums is to launch themes and debates that are going towards the interest of sustainable development to deal with the challenges that the society faces, in terms of ethical behaviors and social injustice (Sandell, 2007).

Promoting activism within museums implies museums use heritage to help their communities develop a sense of belonging and of control over their heritage and life (Mears & Modest, 2013). According to Sandell (2002) "all museums have an obligation to develop reflexive and self-conscious approaches to collection and exhibition and an awareness and understanding of their potential to construct more inclusive, equitable and respectful societies" (p.4). Museums should identify what is distinctive and memorable about the experience of visiting a museum in terms of values, ideas that orient behaviors of people within society and communities. Museums are in charge of ethical responsibilities and tasks by building public and political support for a particular vision of the good society and strengthening the accountability of government and public sector's behaviors (Janes & Sandell, 2019). Museums as providers and custodians of knowledge and culture tend to increasingly assume a more proactive role within a knowledge-driven and open global society.

Today, museums are not only knowledge providers and information-oriented organizations but also social drivers of change and actors that contribute to promoting the challenges to global problems and matters of concern for their communities and the society at large. Increasingly, museums tend to behave as agents of social inclusion and regeneration, and justice too (Sandell, 1998). Promoting social responsibility and combating social inequality as task museums have to perform implies that museums "must consider their impact on society and seek to shape that impact through practice that is based on contemporary values and a commitment to social equality" (Sandell,

2007, p.110). Museums provide a social mission and contribute to processes of social value creation and inclusion. According to Lynch (2011) “a substantive form of democratic engagement experienced through participation in museums is, instead, one in which people might begin to exercise their political agency as citizens, and might include processes of mobilization and local cultural and social activism” (p. 456). Museums should use their capabilities to help others to use their capabilities. In becoming a public sphere of contestation, museums as a participatory institution enter at the heart of civil society, engaging the community partners as proactive beneficiaries (Lynch, 2011). Museums should contribute to playing a formative role in defining and reproducing those relationships through their policies and narrative practices (Coffee, 2008). As Mears and Modest (2013) have explained, museums can use and interpret their collections to promote and strengthen the need of increasing social justice as an issue and value that should sway the mission of audience-oriented and knowledge-driven museums. In particular, the work of museums is to target the ways museums are to re-inscribe the categories of phenomena and events that they represent by using their catalogs, the voice, language or positionality they adopt (Mears & Modest, 2013).

Activist museums offer educational support for their communities as a source to strengthen social inclusion and justice. The activist museum as an agile and learning organization helps learning and educative processes creating inclusive work environments and work practices are crucial to moving the museum forwards in promoting social inclusion (Taylor, 2017). By promoting activism, museums should restart in enhancing museums' human resources by promoting activist practice enabling the museum professionals to assume agency and keep the responsibility of their action or inaction (Janes & Sandell, 2019). As proceeding towards sustainability as a source for value creation, museums should redefine the ultimate purpose and standards of work within their boundaries, rethinking their role in terms of mission, leadership, and design too.

Understanding the role of activism in museums helps to strengthen the museum community as a global actor able to exercise its power beyond education, entertainment, and consumption functions. According to Janes and Sandell (2019) museum activism tends to be claimed as a source for driving political, social, and environmental change (Janes & Sandell, 2019). For example, promoting activist practices in museums may benefit the defense of human rights and helps the support of women's rights, increasing the strength of the feminist movement which relies on museum's potential to reclaim rights and social instances for equality and fair treatment, and justice (Bartlett & Henderson, 2013).

One effective way towards museum activism is participation. The participatory museum (Simon, 2010) refers to a relatively new approach in museums – involving communities and visitors to engage with museums, to participate in developing and delivering the museum offer. A museum visit is not only about developing a visitor's experience (Falk & Dierking, 2016; Best, 2018), but also about designing a new and innovative museum offer. This particular approach is a result of the many transformations that recently took place within the museum sector.

A participatory museum is "a place where visitors can create, share, and connect with each other around content. Create means that visitors contribute their ideas, objects, and creative expression to the institution and each other. Share means that people

discuss, take home, remix, and redistribute both what they see and what they make during their visit. Connect means that visitors socialize with other people—staff and visitors—who share their particular interests. Around content means that visitors' conversations and creations focus on the evidence, objects, and ideas most important to the institution in question" (Simon, 2010). This approach contributes to successfully achieving the museum's mission while meeting the needs and desires of the audience as well as being relevant for the audience. Relevance is more than experience, connectedness, or dialogue. It is all these but also deep meaning, a positive cognitive outcome (Simon, 2016). This would be obtained by a visitor-centered approach, by developing effective relationships with communities and society, by developing the museum's communities.

Not only aiming to fulfill social roles is essential, but also creating a mechanism to reach them. Curators and educators, together with their audience, have a crucial role in this process (Austin, 2018). They have to design a compelling and engaging message, to have a significant impact.

Considering this participatory approach, museums could be at the forefront of debates in their communities, by the continuous reinterpretation of their collections to be relevant and add value for the present society. This aim might be achieved through dialogue and participation. Tschen (1992) launched the concept of "dialogic museum", as a museum organized by the community. The role of scholars and museum professionals would be to collaboratively explore the memory and meaning-making of the community. They ensure a learning environment to empower the community, thus contributing to its development. Letting communities reflect on their past, their culture, on critical social aspects, makes them not only more aware of all these aspects but also helps them to better understand all these issues. It also determines increased awareness and awareness from the part of third parties as well as of other communities and individuals. Tschen points out that "such acts of self-discovery shape and reshape individual and collective identities" (1992, p.293). In this way, museums would be more relevant and actively contribute to social change and welfare.

Nevertheless, there are risks associated with such an approach. The view could be too narrow and even exclusivist; some groups might be excluded or marginalized, the broader framework could be missed entirely. "The meaning of self should be created in relation to others" as specified by Mikhail Bakhtin (cited by Ananiev, 2011, p.6). To avoid such issues, museum professionals have a major role. In this way, a museum becomes relevant for all visitors.

Dialogic approaches are not always easy to consider, even if the necessary resource is available. Difficult topics might raise everyone's suspicion and the sensitive communities might not want to get involved and "exposed" in a museum. But diplomatic and strategic approaches might contribute to overpass barriers, as in the case of "Visualizing others", an exhibition on the LGBT community in Taiwan (Cheng, 2011). Critics of the dialogic approach consider that this is rather a conceptual ideal, and its implementation is rather formal, to comply with fashionable left-wing politics, or could be politically instrumentalized to promote ideologies, to impose a "correct" view (Harris, 2011). We would observe that ineffective strategies or propagandistic approaches are risks associated with any other method to interpret and present the museum's collections. Other critics observe that museums tend to present a "monologue

position" even when they aim to be dialogic, that they already select and direct the choices offered to the audience with which they want to have bi-directional communication, and museums only offer to the public space for expressing themselves (Maranda, 2011). Museums are criticized because they "will continue to ask questions and engage in dialogue with their visitors who in turn will continue to be a sounding board for museum change. Whether the museum heeds what its visitors have to say is often irrelevant, as the museum will continue to seek to know and define itself through others" (Maranda, 2011, p.92). This philosophical observation is useful to draw attention to the difficulties of being dialogic considering a wide variety of publics, considering the need for relevance across communities and correctness in the interest of society, as well as respect for facts and scientific realities. The result of a dialogic design of museum offers should be relevant as much as possible, pondering several different systems of reference.

Some authors consider that the current trends in the museum sector, a too prevalent voice of certain communities, might make museums and museum discourse less inclusive and museums could be more inclined to reach out to all communities (Gurt & Torres, 2007). Some other concerns, which might limit the free/honest implications of museums as social agents are of economic, ethical, and even political nature (Shermatova, 2015). Museums might find themselves in divisive situations linked to (part of) various groups. Additionally, voices are observing that the social and activist approaches of museums are not successful, part of the explanation being the lack of public recognition (Kinsley, 2015), lack of engagement, or controversial engagement from part of (some) groups (Robinson, 2017).

Relationships between museums and their audiences are now more important than ever. To have a relevant impact, the public should be open, should cooperate with the museum. Awareness and positive perceptions are factors favoring these processes. A public aware of the activist role museums could play, of its participatory approaches is more open to cooperating with a museum, and more receptive to its discourse. Having this in mind, we designed a study to explore the opinions of the Romanian public related to how participatory and activists are museums.

## **Methodology**

The survey was conducted during March and April 2020, online, self-administered. To have a more comprehensive sample, the questionnaire was simplified having only a few questions. Several Facebook ads have also been launched to stimulate a wide variety of respondents, not only those interested in museums, or culture, in general. Nevertheless, the sample reflects a more culturally active public and is not representative of the entire population. To also register the opinions of museum professionals, we posted repeatedly the survey in the specialized Facebook group.

Two main aspects were evaluated: participation and activism. The second one had several sub-dimensions: minorities, migration, global warming, education, and social inclusion. These are among the main concerns of the contemporary society, part of the worldwide sustainable development agenda and often covered by mass media.

## The profile of the respondents

515 persons filled in the questionnaire. In terms of demographic profile (see Table 1), almost two-thirds of the respondents are women, the average age is almost 39 years old. The employees in the cultural sector are a bit older, while those in IT, business & economic fields, and the nonprofit sector are the youngest respondents. More than half of the respondents live in Bucharest, the capital of Romania. In terms of educational profile, most respondents have a university degree, with a high percentage of post-graduates. Most respondents have no managerial positions.

**Table 1. The general sample structure**

18-39 years old		40-59 years old		+60 years old	
F	B	F	B	F	B
179	74	144	85	21	12
253		229		33	
Rural area	Rural, in the metropolitan area of a large city	City with less than 100.000 inhabitants	City with 100.000 to 300.000 inhabitants	City with 300.000 to one million inhabitants	City with over one million inhabitants
21	19	61	59	65	289
Undergraduate (high school and post-high school degree)		Graduate (university degree)		Post Graduate (MA and Ph.D. degrees)	
46		178		114+177	
No managerial position		Middle management		Top management	
352		117		44	

Considering the professional activity, 12% do not work or are retired, 21% (109 persons) work in a museum or a similar organization, 10% work in the cultural field (except in a museum or any other organization managing heritage), while the others work in various sectors (economy, health, education, etc.). Table 2 details the profile of the museum professionals taking part in the study. Most of them have certain experience but no managerial position, work in museums in large cities, and are, as expected their job responsibilities, postgraduates.

**Table 2. The sample structure of museum professionals**

18-39 years old		40-59 years old		+60 years old	
F	B	F	B	F	B
18	16	43	18	3	1
Rural area	Rural, in the metropolitan area of a large city	City with less than 100.000 inhabitants	City with 100.000 to 300.000 inhabitants	City with 300.000 to one million inhabitants	City with over one million inhabitants
4	3	13	21	22	45
Undergraduate (high school and post-high school degree)		Graduate (university degree)		Post Graduate (MA and PhD degrees)	
4		27		78	
No managerial position		Middle management		Top management	
73		29		6	

### ***Behaviors and attitudes to culture***

In this section, we investigate the relationships with museums of the respondents, segmented after their activity domain. The aspects explored were the frequency of museums visitation, the familiarity with museums in Romania and abroad, the desire to visit museums, and the general interest in culture. A 5-point Likert scale has been used, ranging from 1 – not at all, to 5 – to a very large extent. Table 3 presents the mean and the mode for the three segments: museum professionals, employees in cultural organizations (except for museums), and the general “lay” public.

**Table 3. The main statistics analyzing the respondent relationship with cultural participation and museums**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mode</b>
<b>General public</b>		
I am a frequent museum visitor.	3.08	3
I would like to visit museums more often.	4.07	5
I am familiar with museums in Romania.	3.36	3
I regularly visit museums abroad when I have the opportunity.	3.51	5
I consider myself a person generally interested in culture.	3.91	5
I would like to have more time to watch/participate in various cultural activities	3.99	5
<b>Employees of cultural organizations (except museums)</b>		
I am a frequent museum visitor.	3.87	4
I would like to visit museums more often.	4.52	5
I am familiar with museums in Romania.	3.92	4
I regularly visit museums abroad when I have the opportunity.	4.13	5
I consider myself a person generally interested in culture.	4.58	5
I would like to have more time to watch/participate in various cultural activities	4.50	5
<b>Employees of museums and similar organizations</b>		
I am a frequent museum visitor.	4	5
I would like to visit museums more often.	4.29	5
I am familiar with museums in Romania.	4.13	5
I regularly visit museums abroad when I have the opportunity.	4.03	5
I consider myself a person generally interested in culture.	4.44	5
I would like to have more time to watch/participate in various cultural activities	4.26	5

The general respondent is an average museum-goer in terms of frequency self-evaluation, while people working in cultural organizations consider that they are more frequent visitors. All respondents but museum professionals consider they visit museums abroad more when given the chance. They all also declared to be interested in culture and they would like to attend more museums and cultural activities.

The employees of cultural organizations reported figures a bit higher than museum professionals to all items except for the museum frequency. This is not evidence that they actually visit museums more often, but rather suggest a desire to be more connected to museums and culture. People active in nongovernmental organizations

reported figures higher for museum frequency, in Romania and abroad, compared to the ones of cultural professionals. The highest desire to visit museums, similar to one of the employees of the cultural organization was shown by research. The lowest figures have been generally declared by unemployed/ retired persons.

When we investigate the mode, we observe that in most cases the majority evaluated the items at the highest levels. This shows their strong desire to be culturally active. At the same time, it might also cover strong social desirability, considering the topic investigated.

### ***The civic engagement of the respondents***

Considering the topic investigated, the perceptions of the public on how activists are museums might be influenced by the respondents' activism and civic attitude. Therefore, they have been surveyed if they would describe themselves as active citizens and if they consider themselves informed. The data obtained are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. The main statistics analyzing the civic profile of the respondents**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mode</b>
<b>General public</b>		
I'm following what's going on in society.	4.05	4
I am an active person in terms of civic involvement.	3.38	3
<b>Employees of cultural organizations (except museums)</b>		
I'm following what's going on in society.	4.35	5
I am an active person in terms of civic involvement.	3.75	4
<b>Employees of museums and similar organizations</b>		
I'm following what's going on in society.	4.24	5
I am an active person in terms of civic involvement.	3.57	3

The field of activity is a predictor. Persons working in cultural organizations and those in NGOs are more interested and involved in social aspects than the other respondents. People which are not actively involved in any organization present the lowest figures.

## **Findings and discussions**

### ***How participative are the museums?***

To ensure common references, the survey defined a participatory museum as "a museum that involves various groups, communities, and visitors to enter into dialogue with the museum, to participate in the development and delivery of the museum's offer, a museum that is part of discussions of interest to the society in which it operates". Also, for a more comprehensive view, respondents were asked to compare museums at home with those abroad. Table 5 shows how respondents evaluated museums.



**Table 5. The main statistics analyzing how participatory are museums**

Item	Mean	Mode
<b>General public</b>		
Romanian museums	2.71	3
Museums abroad	3.85	4
<b>Employees of cultural organizations (except museums)</b>		
Romanian museums	2.43	2
Museums abroad	3.84	4
<b>Employees of museums and similar organizations</b>		
Romanian museums	2.62	2
Museums abroad	3.81	4

Respondents agree that museums abroad are in a rather wide degree more participatory than the Romanian museums. This is in line with the opinion reflected in the cultural Eurobarometer, showing a greater interest of Romanian for museums abroad, considering that a main barrier for visiting museums at home is their poor offer (EC, 2017, p.61). The most critical towards the Romanian museums are those working in IT and NGOs. Those most positive about abroad museums are the unemployed/retired, health workers, and NGO professionals.

Analyzing the mode, one observes that when evaluating Romanian museums, employees in the cultural sector (including museums) tend to be critical, while a few are very positive. When evaluating the museums abroad, only a few are critical compared to a generally positive evaluation.

The age of the respondents is generally not a predictor of their evaluation of how participatory are museums, as well as their attitude and behavior related to culture and museums. Pearson test shows a slight negative correlation between age and the way cultural employees evaluate museums abroad. Also, a slight positive correlation is between visiting museums abroad and being interested in culture and the way abroad museums are evaluated by people working in cultural organizations.

### ***How activists are the museums?***

Overall evaluation of the activism of the Romanian museums is rather low, under the average (see Table 6). The only dimension slightly better evaluated is education. Nevertheless, we believe that the respondents might have had in mind, not the activist approach of museums to discuss and contribute to a more effective educational ecosystem, but rather the educational value of the museum experience.

**Table 6. Evaluation of how activist are museums**

	minorities	migration	Global warming	education	Social inclusion	other
<b>Romanian museums</b>						
General public	2.35	2.04	1.89	3.25	2.26	2.96
Cultural organizations	2.42	2.04	1.66	3.00	2.13	2.64

Museums	2.57	1.86	1.64	3.27	2.06	2.70
<b>Museums abroad</b>						
General public	3.06	2.98	3.12	3.92	3.20	3.56
Cultural organizations	3.33	3.36	3.19	4.09	3.45	3.85
Museums	3.26	3.10	3.00	4.06	3.40	3.34

As in the case of the participatory dimension of museums, the respondents better evaluate museums abroad, but the differences are not under one point. The evaluations are correlated neither with the behavior or the attitude towards museums, culture nor social connectedness. The demographic descriptors also have no significance. The residence and the position in the organization are also not significant. A very small correlation exists in the case of the level of education, the more educated being the more critical.

There is an average correlation between the general evaluation of how participative Romanian museums are and how activists they are perceived. The correlation is weaker in the case of museums abroad.

## Conclusions

During the exceptional time of lockdown in March and April 2020, museums in Romania were, generally, a lot more active in the digital environment, especially on Facebook. However, for the general public, this did not necessarily spell participation. The participatory and activist museum, as described by the domain literature, is a complex, dynamic, and adaptive institution built over time. Meanwhile, museum involvement in helping their audiences generally or, more specifically, to overcome some difficulties generated by the Covid-19 lockdown is perceived in a more general frame. More specifically, museums in Romania are constantly seen as being less activist and less participative than their foreign counterparts.

All three groups that we investigated (general public, people working in cultural institutions except for museums and people working in museums) present more or less the same image: museums are rather averagely participatory and activist; museums in Romania are perceived as being less involved in current conversation within society. The lowest perceived involvement concerns the *global warming theme*, and the highest seems to be *education* closely followed by *minorities* and *migration*.

All in all, the results above might as well be reflecting the general current of opinion in Romanian society, which tends to see everything happening elsewhere in Europe (or generally speaking in the “western world”) as being of better quality or more relevant. Therefore, we should also add an insufficient exploration of the broader context to the main limitations of the current research. One of these limitations is the lack of representativity for the general audience in Romania, due to the online administration of the questionnaire. Nevertheless, the sample reflects the opinion of those more interested and connect to cultural activity. Another limitation is the possible effect of social desirability when answering questions on museum frequentation, and generally on cultural participation.

The fact that even during an exceptional situation such as the Covid-19 lockdown museums in Romania were seen as being less involved in helping audiences coping with the lockdown than their foreign counterparts implies that general frames are perhaps more powerful than particular actions undertaken by museums in particular situations. Although museums' digital presence increased overwhelmingly (as international and domestic studies show) this remains but a small step on the way of building an activist and participatory museum in the eyes of the public.

## References

- Ananiev, V. (2011). The dialogic museum, dice and neurons: a few personal notes on the topic. In *The dialogic museum and the visitor experience* (pp.3-8), Working papers, ICOM. Retrieved from [http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%2040%20Working%20Papers.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%2040%20Working%20Papers.pdf).
- Austin, P. (2018). The designer's role in museums that act as agents of change. In Macleod, S., Austin, T., Hale, J., & Hing-Kay, O.H. (Eds.), *The Future of Museum and Gallery Design: Purpose, Process, Perception*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Bartlett, A., & Henderson, M. (2013). The Australian women's movement goes to the museum: The cultures of Australian feminist activism 1970-1990 project. *Women's Studies International Forum* 37, 85-94.
- Best, L. (2018). *Museums involving communities: authentic connections*, Taylor & Francis.
- Cheng, P. Y. (2011). From Dialogue to Understanding: A Case Study of the Taiwanese Gay and Lesbian Exhibition Curating. In *The dialogic museum and the visitor experience* (pp.26-35), Working papers, ICOM. Retrieved from [http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%2040%20Working%20Papers.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%2040%20Working%20Papers.pdf).
- Coffee, K. (2008). Cultural inclusion, exclusion and the formative roles of museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 23(3), 261-279.
- EC (2017). Cultural Heritage. Special Eurobarometer 466.
- Falk, J.H., & Dierking, L.D. (2016). *The museum experience revisited*. Routledge.
- Gurt, G.A., & Torres, J.M.R. (2007). People who don't go to museums. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 13(6), 521-523.
- Harris, J. (2011). Dialogism: the ideal and reality for museum visitors. In *The dialogic museum and the visitor experience* (pp.57-66), Working papers, ICOM. Retrieved from [http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%2040%20Working%20Papers.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/ISS%2040%20Working%20Papers.pdf).
- Hooper-Greenhill, E. (1995). Museums and communication: An introductory essay. In E. Hooper-Greenhill (Ed.), *Museum, media, message* (pp.1-12). London, UK: Routledge.
- Janes, R.R., & Sandell, R. (2019). Posterity has arrived. The necessary emergence of museum activism. In Janes, R.R., & Sandell, R. (Eds.), *Museum activism* (pp.1-21). London, UK: Routledge.
- Kinsley, R.P. (2016). Inclusion in museums: a matter of social justice. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 31(5), 474-490.
- Knell, S. (2019). *The contemporary museum*. London, UK: Routledge.

- Lynch, B.T. (2011). Custom-made reflective practice: can museums realise their capabilities in helping others realise theirs?. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 26(5), 441-458.
- Maranda, L. (2011). The dialogic museum and the visitor experience. In *The dialogic museum and the visitor experience* (pp.83-92), Working papers, ICOM. Retrieved from [http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user\\_upload/minisites/icofofom/pdf/ISS%2040%20Working%20Papers.pdf](http://network.icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofofom/pdf/ISS%2040%20Working%20Papers.pdf).
- Mears, H., & Modest, W. (2013). Museums, African Collections and Social Justice. In Sandell, R. & Nightingale, E. (Eds.), *Museums, Equality and Social Justice* (pp.294-309). London, UK: Routledge.
- Pop, I.L., & Borza, A. (2014). Increasing the sustainability of museums through international strategy. *Economia. Seria Management* 17(2), 248–264.
- Robinson, H. (2017). Is cultural democracy possible in a museum? Critical reflections on Indigenous engagement in the development of the exhibition Encounters: Revealing Stories of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Objects from the British Museum. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 23(9), 860-874.
- Sandell, R. (1998). Museums as Agents of Social Inclusion. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 17(4), 401-418.
- Sandell, R. (2002). Museums and the combating of social inequality: roles, responsibilities, resistance. In Sandell, R. (ed.), *Museums, Society, Inequality* (pp.3–23). London, UK: Routledge.
- Sandell, R. (2007). Museums and the Combating of Social Inequality: roles, responsibilities, resistance. In Watson, S. (ed.), *Museums and their communities* (pp. 95-113). London, UK: Routledge.
- Shermatova, S. (2015). National Human Rights Museums: An Engine for Social or Economic Growth? A Comparative Analyses of Conscience Museums of Canada, USA and Russia. Retrieved from [https://repository.usfca.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1071&context=artsci\\_stu](https://repository.usfca.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1071&context=artsci_stu).
- Simon, N. (2010). *The Participatory Museum*, Museum 2.0. Retrieved from <http://www.participatorymuseum.org>.
- Simon, N. (2016). *The Art of Relevance*, Museum 2.0. Retrieved from <http://www.artofrelevance.org/>.
- Taylor, C. (2017). From Systemic Exclusion to Systemic Inclusion: A Critical Look at Museums. *Journal of Museum Education* 42(2), 155-162.
- Tchen, J.K.W. (1992). Creating a dialogic museum: The Chinatown history museum experiment. In Karp, I., Mullen Kreamer, Ch., & Lavine, S.D. (eds.), *Museums and communities: The politics of public culture* (pp.285-326), Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.