

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in International Journal of Heritage Studies on 17/12/2020, available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13527258.2020.1861065>

MAKING SPACE FOR CO-CREATION: Heritage Attractions that Host Contemporary Art

Abstract: Contemporary art provides a novel means to interrogate historical evidence, along with the institutions that conserve and curate it. With reference to more nuanced understandings of 'co-creation' and 'cultural capital', the paper explores the relationships that facilitate art interventions in heritage attractions. It considers two interrelated but distinct domains of co-creation: the varied forms and dynamics of collaborations between host institutions and artists who produce site-responsive pieces; and the agency of visitors who co-produce their own experiences within a creative environment mediated by the artists and other actors external to the heritage institution. Art interventions combine affective and intellectual responses, especially on contentious and sensitive issues, through visual narratives that challenge visitors to draw their own conclusions. Nevertheless, concerns arise over unintended exclusions and tensions that have yet to be resolved.

Keywords: co-creation, cultural capital, heritage attraction, creative spaces, rationale

1. INTRODUCTION

MacCannell (1999 [1976]), 42) once portrayed the social practice of visiting places deemed worthy of preservation as a modern ritual performed with a 'collective sense that certain sights must be seen'. Today, few contend that 'sense of duty' (ibid) provides sufficient impetus. In her extensive review of visitor attraction research, Leask (2016) highlights experience-making in the context of rising and more discerning consumer demand. Heritage attractions face particular challenges. Critics argue that some lack vitality and personalized interaction (Melanie Smith et al 2006). Further, opinions diverge - sometimes profoundly - on how to present 'dissonant' heritage (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). At variance with authorized discourse (Laurajane Smith 2006), competing claims are made on sites and objects (Wang 2020; Lee & Zarandona 2020; Murtagh et al 2017; Huang 2017; Zhu 2015). Attitudes shift over time, and differ between localities (Čaušević 2019; Knudsen & Andersen 2019; Chhabra & Zhao 2015). Anodyne descriptors seem inappropriate; definitive, totalizing explanations lack credibility with contemporary audiences.

Mindful of these criticisms and sensitivities, an overarching ambition is that visitors will create their own, service-facilitated experiences through activities that expand their knowledge and give them pleasure (Calver & Page 2013). Institutions such as science and natural history museums exploit the sophistication of interactive digital technologies that sometimes trigger 'transformational experiences' (Patel et al. 2016, 70). More generally, Kempniak et al (2017) confirm that people value interaction with the heritage and its setting, and that enhanced communication can increase satisfaction. Nevertheless, whatever the medium, specialists from established disciplines - archaeologists, biographers, botanists, historians, etc. - continue to generate words, figures and images that non-expert audiences find hard to dispute. Some visitors become 'satiated', disengaged and bored, due to the serial effect of authoritative explanations, especially where they are asked to follow pre-determined routes and trails (Antón et al. 2018).

A very different option for heritage attractions that want to facilitate more dynamic, personalized involvement is to collaborate with visual artists, e.g. sculptors, ceramicists. Through their on-site 'interventions' guest artists raise questions and

uncover layers of meaning that might be hard for directors and curators to convey by more conventional means. Some reveal neglected aspects of historical evidence (Cass 2020) that they connect with present-day concerns. Artists that have a high media profile can attract new audiences (Linden & Linden 2017), including followers of contemporary artists who may not otherwise encounter the heritage they display. Putnam (2009, 154) reviews its development from the 1970s as an international movement conscious of itself, and defines it thus:

'[T]hese so called "interventions" involve the interweaving or juxtaposing of the artists' work so that it merges or interferes in some way with the museum collection or site. More significantly, artists are sometimes given the opportunity to undertake a temporary rearrangement of the galleries and to provide a personal commentary on permanent exhibits'.

Adorno (1981) [1967] likened the ambience of a museum [to that of a mausoleum: the unchanging container of things preserved for all time, their worthiness beyond dispute. In *Beuys Block* [1970] at the Hessisches Landesmuseum, artist Joseph Beuys exploited this association in an intervention that recalled the melancholic quality of holy reliquaries, with vitrines containing personally symbolic objects that he had collected (Putnam 2009, 16-17). Fittingly enough, curators' explanatory texts are sometimes known as 'tombstone' descriptors: succinct, factual summaries of expert opinion (McClusky 2011). In general, they privilege 'objectivity', but there is seldom sufficient space to discuss how meanings come to be inscribed and by whom (Macdonald 2011, 3). In contrast, art interventions open up discursive ways of seeing heritage. Over time, these have become a more accepted feature of a heritage attraction, i.e. 'any property that attracts the public by virtue of its explicit connection with the past' (Garrod & Fayell 2000, 685).

The notion of art interventions in heritage attractions is closely related to 'site-specific' art that 'articulate[s] exchanges between the work of art and the places in which its meaning are defined' (Kaye 2000, 1). Kwon (2002, 12, 74) refers to the insistence of sculptor Richard Serra (1994) that his work should not be relocated, and that the artist should interrogate the site as a social and political construct. Serra eschewed harmony: the artist should unsettle the viewer. Kwon (2002, 47) notes how Fred Wilson adapted these principles to disturb the (seemingly) calm atmosphere of local history museums in the USA by interrogating their hegemonic narratives of identity. His commissions to rearrange items from their permanent collections with ironic tombstone descriptors attracted new visitors and received acclaim from the artworld and popular press. At the invitation of the Maryland Historical Society, Wilson parodied conventional interpretation of prestige objects associated with slave-owners and their silences on the lives and culture of slaves in *Mining the Museum* [1992] (Putnam 2009, 30-1; Robins & Baxter 2012, 248-252).

Through such projects artists stimulate affective as well as cerebral responses. Fred Wilson described his approach as one of 'surprise', allowing visitors to react 'on an emotional level before the intellectual self kicks in' (Buskirk & Nixon 1996, 187-90). This concurs with wider appreciation of 'tragic' or 'joyous' encounters that make deep impressions on 'memory and place by affixing our emotions to time and space' (Carter 2019, 212; cf. Villar & Vicencio 2019). Some interventions address painful topics that arouse feelings of anxiety and unease (Bennett et al, 2016). Others are quirky, ludic, light in tone. Echoing Adorno's metaphor, Grayson Perry collaborated with the British Museum to present *The Tomb of the Unknown Craftsman* [2011]: an

exhibition which he described as ‘a ritual to satisfy a set of emotional needs, conscious or otherwise’ (Perry 2011, 20). Combining humour with reflections on the role of artists and craftworkers, he selected objects from the reserve collections juxtaposed with his own pieces as a ‘memorial’ to ‘all those countless un-named skilled individuals who have made the beautiful man-made wonders of history’ (ibid).

MacGregor (2011, 7) observes that practicing artists are well placed to interpret heritage and inspire others. Nevertheless, a better understanding is required of the reasons why heritage attractions invite artists to make and install such interventions, the actors and relationships that enable this to happen, and how host institutions assimilate the outcomes. Art interventions embrace two interrelated but distinct domains of ‘co-creation’. The following section explores the varied forms and dynamics of collaborations between host institutions and artists that they invite to express personal interpretations of heritage and install them on their premises. The paper then reviews the agency of visitors who co-produce their own experiences within a creative environment mediated by artists and other actors external to the institution that support their interventions. The authors consider how two heritage attractions have nurtured these relationships: *The Foundling Museum* which has hosted interventions for over 10 years, and the *Freud Museum London* for over 25.

2. COLLABORATING WITH ARTISTS

Contemporary art in the unexpected setting of a heritage attraction evolved from counter-cultural experiment, around fifty years ago. With data collected in the 1960s, Bourdieu & Darbel (1991 [1969]) had concluded that museums and galleries reinforced structural inequalities in society. Bourdieu (1984) [1979] contended that they favoured established artforms: pieces that could be fully understood and enjoyed only by an elite with sufficient ‘cultural capital’ acquired through the ‘habitus’ of privileged upbringing and everyday routine. In this context, disruptive interventions by artists such as Beuys and Wilson offered critical perspectives, radically at odds with the status quo. Prima face, the development seemed to vindicate Featherstone’s (1991) observation that cultural institutions were relaxing former conventions to broaden their appeal. Collaborations with artists could help to break the mould of exclusionary policy and practice; art interventions could re-examine historical evidence, address social injustices, and facilitate reconciliation (Marstine 2017).

There are, however, significant variations in the attraction-artist relationship. Occasionally, ‘guerilla’ artists intervene without permission. Undetected, in a gallery of the British Museum [2005], street artist Banksy installed a concrete fragment, engraved with images resembling rock art that depicted someone pushing a shopping trolley. Titled *Peckham Rock*, its label mocked the conventional descriptor (Marabou 2019). Such interventions concur with Serra’s notion of site-specific art above, but clearly do not involve ‘collaboration’. In other scenarios artists ask permission, e.g. Christo & Jeanne-Claude approached the State authorities that eventually agreed to their *Wrapped Reichstag* in Berlin [1995], an installation that attracted six million people (Wainwright 2017). On a more intimate scale, Angela Wright, an artist who uses the medium of wool, approached Southwark Cathedral to install *Forty Days* in Lent [2014], and was delighted when the Dean gave permission. Wright (2015) emphasized the importance she attached to that location:

‘Nowhere else would I have wanted it to be. But, of course... the people you're dealing with are taking a big risk, because they have to wait to see what develops, so they are trusting you. That sort of mutual trust is extraordinarily important... This was a very site-specific piece’.

Heritage attractions continue to commission artists to make pieces for their exclusive use. More commonly, they identify artists who are willing to lend them pieces (often free of charge) for an agreed period. Some collaborate with a single artist; others assemble the work of several artists in a themed event or exhibition. For their part, some artists design ‘mobile’ pieces that take on different meanings in several locations. For the Venice Biennale [2019] ceramicist Edmund de Waal constructed a pavilion at the Ateneo Veneto titled *Library of Exile*, its walls inscribed with names of libraries lost or destroyed. The structure contained books by authors forced to leave their own country or displaced within it. Later, he installed it at the Japanisches Palais, Dresden, and then at the British Museum. Seligman (2020, 51) describes how the artist brought his moveable installation ‘into dialogue with objects from the world’s historic libraries and its collections’.

Morra (2018, 14) refers to ‘site-responsive’ pieces, a term that in this context seems more appropriate than Serra’s ideal of an uncompromising, disruptive intervention, constructed to be installed in one specific place. Collaborations between heritage attractions and artists generally evolve more pragmatically; the resulting artworks often migrate from site to site. Artists have different priorities and different audiences to their hosts. Some challenge authorized heritage discourse (Laurajane Smith 2006). Directors/curators must necessarily allow them some latitude. Nevertheless, the underlying notion of guest artists who enjoy unrestrained liberty to criticize their hosts may be open to question, especially where their work is formally commissioned. Besterman (2011, 246) comments on the astuteness of museums that diversify their ‘authorial voice... transparently dismantling the traditional structures of editorial control’. Interventions by well-known living artists can attract considerable media attention. They can also increase visitation from new audiences, but their appeal to traditional and other non-art visitors cannot be guaranteed.

Thomas (2016, 39-40) asserts that contemporary art offers an international language ‘as accessible to middle class urban youth as music, design and cinema’. Bodo (2012, 184) praises art interventions that make Italian history meaningful to non-Italians in ‘intercultural spaces’. However, the assumed accessibility of contemporary art should not go unchallenged (Bennett 2018; Hanquinet et al. 2014; Newman et al 2014). Far from dismantle established structures, venues that show contemporary art can reproduce ‘embodied social capital’: tacit knowledge, dispositions and taste (Bridge 2006, 720), and reinforce a social tone that attracts other members of a privileged ‘creative’ elite (Miles 2015). Robins & Baxter (2012, 250-252) comment on a recurring criticism of interventions in heritage attractions that speak primarily to ‘artworld insiders’, bewildering those ‘without requisite training in contemporary art’. Visitors unable to decode their meaning may well be disappointed and deterred. As Cass (2020) demonstrates, some respond with indifference or irritation where interventions disrupt their enjoyment of a valued heritage setting.

3. EXTENDING CO-CREATION

Figure 1 describes in outline the co-creative relationships that enable the development of art interventions in heritage settings. Whether artists approach host attractions or vice versa, their directors and curators must envisage proposed interventions in situ and justify them to their institutions. The proposal must be practical and make appropriate use of resources, including space. If the idea is approved, they engage the artist(s) and seek support from other external actors, some of whom have significant creative agency (e.g. guest curators), others less so (e.g. volunteer guides), and some are gatekeepers to resources, especially sponsors. The host institutions negotiate with their collaborators, and determine the precise form and content, siting and timing of the intervention. When the institution presents it for public display, their visitors may also become agents of co-creation. An important aspiration is that the mediation of artists through visual storytelling will help involve visitors more actively and personally with heritage, and that positive experiences will help them develop closer, longer-term relationships with the host attraction.

Figure 1: Developing art interventions through co-creative relationships (lead author)

From a management and marketing perspective, closer cooperation between producers and consumers can be mutually beneficial. High quality interactions can enable individual customers to co-create unique experiences; for producers, such customers can help unlock new sources of competitive advantage (Prahalad & Ramaswamy 2004), and encourage product development (Hoyer et al 2010). In leisure and tourism studies, an early definition of 'creative' tourism referred to development of the visitor's 'creative potential through participation in courses and learning experiences' and involvement with the destination (Richards & Raymond 2000, 18). Today, it encompasses less overtly educative activities (Cloke 2007). Distinguishing features include participation and personal development (Sui et al 2013; Tan et al 2013; Richards, 2011). Tourism providers 'facilitate experiences and suggest meanings' rather than *supply* them (Prentice & Anderson 2007, 91). Creative spaces are neutral environments, designed to accommodate wide-ranging experiences that stimulate the imagination of participants (Richards & Wilson 2006).

The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (2018, 3) is a World Heritage Site and major attraction with an important role in protecting ecosystems worldwide. It aims:

'to interpret [its] scientific role and heritage to a larger and more diverse audience, and promote innovative public education programmes'.

The institution continues to use labels and boards, but over the last decade or so these have been complemented by pieces such as *The Hive* by Wolfgang Buttress, a steel framed walk-in structure which had been the UK's pavilion at the Milan Expo 2015. Re-installed in Kew Gardens [2017], it focuses on the symbiosis between plants and pollinating insects, and the decline of bee populations. Informed by research on bee communication at Nottingham Trent University, it emits multisensory pulses in light and sound, tuned to the movement of bees in hives nearby. Other collaborators, including musicians, created a soundscape to enhance the experience. The artist expresses his intention to discuss these issues inclusively and without pontificating (Buttress quoted in Fry 2016, 29):

'I'm keen that the artwork doesn't shout or preach, but talks quietly about what is happening to

the bee'.

Figure 2: *The Hive*, The Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (photo lead author)

Ross et al (2017) advocate visitor-centred approaches that allow people to interpret material culture more imaginatively, rather than simply absorb information, e.g. at archaeological sites. Dicks (2016) considers the valuable prior knowledge of non-elite groups, and recasts 'habitus' to acknowledge the relevance of *their* upbringing and everyday experience, e.g. visitors to museums of domestic and working life who demonstrate deep understandings of objects that they observe. Likewise, armed service personnel and their families may have a profound appreciation of military museum collections. The UK National Army Museum (NAM) in Chelsea, London attracts such 'traditional' audiences. Nevertheless, its mission (NAM 2016, 3) highlights the imperative of reaching wider publics:

'[t]o gather, maintain, and make known the story of the British Army and its role and impact in world history... a museum experience that... connects the British public with its Army'.

The NAM is accountable to the Ministry of Defence (MoD) which provides its core funding: its work must demonstrate 'the necessary strategic alignment with overall MoD objectives'. It is also a registered charity, and a company limited by guarantee (MoD 2017). Its activities are closely scrutinized by its board of trustees to ensure that all these obligations are fulfilled. With oversight by the latter, a Heritage Lottery Fund grant (HLF 2014) enabled refurbishment of its premises. Associated restructuring encouraged new initiatives, including a pilot intervention featuring participatory art-making, developed by NAM curator Rebecca Newell.

The aftermath of war raises many issues that link historic conflicts with the present day and has the potential to engage empathetic visitors with very different levels of knowledge. It was agreed, through the Museum's governance system, to commission an artist who would address a highly emotional topic: "rehabilitation" of ex-soldiers who have been homeless and suffered mental illness, alcohol and drug abuse. To ensure appropriate guidance for the institution's first art intervention, a special-purpose panel was established with representatives of relevant bodies, e.g. the Army Art Society. The Museum commissioned artist Susan Stockwell who, in a preliminary phase, worked with charities that help rehabilitate and house them (Newell 2014). Ex-servicemen joined workshops facilitated by the artist and curator to capture their imaginative insights, e.g. through dark humour, poems and word-diagrams. The artist brought together their ideas and source material around the theme of 'sewing'. The work acquired the double-title *Peace Makers/Piece Makers* and alludes to army blankets and a mobile patchwork draftsboard from the Crimean War in the reserve collection (Furneaux & Prichard 2015). Stockwell (2018) highlights:

'the fragmentary nature of the recovery process and... the profound challenges associated with duty, solidarity, loss and pride'.

Peace Makers/Piece Makers was itself designed to be mobile. When the site closed for refurbishment [2014-17], it toured Regimental Museums across the country, where it gained the attention of local and regional audiences (Newell 2014).

The extension of ‘co-creation’ to embrace interaction between attractions, artists, other external actors and visitors fits well with Binkhorst & Dekker’s (2009, 315) conceptualization of ‘experience co-creation networks’, comprising ‘all the people and things’ that foster innovation. Campos et al (2018, 392) build on O’Dell’s (2010) concept of ‘experiencescape’: the materiality of its structures, social actors, organizational dynamics, and aspects of service delivery. These can be important aspects of a wider set of ‘creative resources in the local enabling environment’ with which visitors interact (Duxbury & Richards 2019, 6). Performance artists, e.g. actors, dancers enhance the experiencescape by interacting with visitors on site and face-to-face. Those who have intervened in museum and heritage attraction environments include Andrea Frazer, whose various persona have included a bespectacled guide, leading a tour of unlikely spaces of museums, such as cloakrooms and cafeteria, and parodying ‘expert’ discourse (Putnam 2009, 98-99, cf. Besterman 2011, 369-370).

In general, visual artists are not available for personal dialogue, except during special appearances, discussion groups and outreach sessions where they meet particular audiences. Nevertheless, as Fraser & Coulson (2011) comment, their unseen presence may be strong; in contrast to the more usual anonymous descriptors, as they are the named and sometimes well-known authors of unfinished stories that they ask visitors to complete.

4. FACILITATING CONVERSATIONS

To summarize so far, contemporary art provides a novel means to interrogate historical evidence, along with the institutions that conserve and curate it. From formal commissions to benevolent loans, collaborations between attractions and artists facilitate site-responsive interventions that suggest new perspectives on heritage and address issues on which opinions may be divided. These can, in turn, inspire visitors who draw from personal knowledge to co-create their own experiences as they traverse the site. Both literally and metaphorically, host institutions are making space for creative interactions in heritage settings. The attractions elicit and coordinate inputs from artists, other external actors, and their visitors. The interest that interventions generate can attract new audiences, especially aficionados of contemporary art. Nevertheless, host institutions have had to answer objections that they deter others, including more traditional audiences.

The following study considers two smaller specialized heritage attractions that host contemporary art interventions. Both are located in London, but away from major tourism honeypots. Their examples illustrate emerging policy and practice to collaborate with artists and enable visitors to co-create experiences. The study reviews the various forms and dynamics of co-creative relationships that they seek to nurture. Three research questions were framed:

Rationale: Why do heritage attractions host art interventions?

Process: Who initiates them, with whom do they co-create, and how do these relationships develop?

Outcomes: From the attraction’s point of view, what benefits and issues arise from hosting contemporary art interventions?

Methodology

No database exists to identify heritage attractions that work with artists. The Museums and Galleries Yearbook for Greater London provided a spatial sampling frame, and questionnaires were sent to 90 institutions. From 69 responses, seven confirmed that they host art interventions. Three of these institutions embrace contemporary art to address challenging topics in their presentation of heritage, and are reasonably comparable in terms of their scope and type of location. As Eisenhardt (1989, 548-9) notes, case study-based research is appropriate to incremental theory building on a new topic area. Yin (2009, 18) concurs, defining it as investigation of 'a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used' (cf. Farquhar 2012; Flyvbjerg 2006). For Stake (1995, 63), similarity with respect to context is a prerequisite for comparative analysis.

This study uses sources from multiple viewpoints, including missions, annual reports etc., together with observations, media reviews, photos, maps and floorplans. This evidence was cross-referenced with semi-structured interviews (60-90 minutes) conducted by the lead author with directors and curators, who reflected on the underlying rationale, the process (sequence of activities) and their outcomes. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed using NVivo software to code-up emerging themes as a preliminary to closer examination and comparison. Parent nodes included: 'Artists' as creators of visual artwork; the 'Pieces' they create; 'Places' where pieces are installed; 'Agencies' that makes this happen; and 'Audiences' who attend.

The Foundling Museum

Context: The Museum opened in 2004 on the site of London's first children's charity: the 'Foundling Hospital' in Coram Fields (1745-). It has an independent board of trustees, a small establishment and over 100 volunteers who provide support, e.g. as guides. It aims '[t]o inspire people to make a positive contribution to society by celebrating the power of individuals and the arts to change lives' (TFM 2015, 6). The Museum combines purpose-built exhibition space with reconstructed C18th. interiors that still display art and craftworks gifted by creative benefactors, including Founder-Governor W. Hogarth. In Georgian London, these pieces, together with music composed by G. F. Handel, enhanced the Foundling as 'popular visitor attraction' and an 'elegant venue' for the institution's fundraising (TFM 2014a, 79). Today, artists in many fields offer long-term commitment as 'Foundling Fellows' who generate ideas for collaborative projects that they initiate and deliver (ibid, 81-83). Links are made with contemporary issues, especially vulnerable children and those who care for them.

Rationale: Thus, the 'creative DNA' has been revived, as the building now provides (TFM 2014a, 80-81):

'a space for twenty-first century artists and visitors enter into a dialogue with their C18th. and C19th. forebears. Contemporary artists have been particularly adept at giving voice to the absent presence of the foundling mothers'.

The Museum's Director Caro Howell (2014) observed:

'These artists can invite our visitors into an ongoing conversation that they, and in the case of those artists who are working with vulnerable young people, they are conversations that the artists and the young people are having with their ancestors. It is a conversation that we want everybody to join in with'.

Process: To mark the Museum's 10th. birthday and 250 years since Hogarth's death, Howell initiated and curated *Progress*, an exhibition [2014] that reinterpreted 'Rake's Progress': Hogarth's (1735) social commentary on male vanity, lost hopes and abandoned loved ones. Guided by the mission and trustees, and drawing on the Museum's extensive artworld contacts (including Fellows), she approached three well-known male artists: David Hockney, Grayson Perry and Yinka Shonibare, who agreed to lend their work. Sponsorship by the Arts Council enabled her to combine these with a commissioned work by Jesse Brennan, a younger female artist. Like Hogarth, Brennan refers to 'Progress' with irony in her depiction of a social housing estate, then due for demolition, and the erosion of worthy ideals (TFM 2014b).

The exhibition area provided purpose-built hanging space, where visitors could view Perry's tapestries *The Vanity of Small Differences*. However, the historic interiors offered both constraints and opportunities for the other artworks to 'respond' to the historic setting. (Howell 2014) commented:

'We [the Museum team] had originally thought about having Yinka's series of posters going up the stairs, and liked the idea of physical progress, but the works aren't glazed, so that wasn't possible'. For Hockney's 16 prints '...the anteroom worked very well as a kind of C19th. print room feel, where you were completely surrounded by the two rows of prints'.

Howell (ibid) likened their approach to 'a kind of choreography' allowing visitors to enjoy 'quiet little conversations between the artworks and themselves'.

The Foundling Museum suggests that visual artists can also interact more directly with audiences, e.g. an educational event was conceived and directed by Foundling Fellow Yinke Shonibare. In *Foundling Back to Front Weekend*, children dressed in C18th. century costumes became teachers, while leading artworld figures became their pupils (TFM 2012). Shonibare commented (ibid):

'Its all about challenging the norm, making institutions re-think their positions, creating chaos and mayhem'.

Outcomes: For smaller museums with no core external funding, income from entry and retailing is critical. The Annual Report (TFM 2015, 11) confirmed that *Progress* attracted 14,864 visitors over its three-month run, sometimes drawing twice the weekly average. It also brought positive media coverage, and income generation through sales of products specially designed by Brennan, Perry and Shonibare. In previous exhibitions, works by other famous artists had drawn big audiences, but some had provoked media criticism, e.g. Tracey Emin's installation which one press review characterized as 'mawkish' and 'self-absorbed' (Adams 2010). Nevertheless, Howell (2014) stressed that pieces aren't 'simply tacked on': artists are involved, not only in generating ideas, but also in service delivery, e.g. through participative approaches to on-site and outreach education above.

Freud Museum London

Context: Since 1986 the Museum has occupied the final home of Sigmund Freud, 'father of psychoanalysis, and his daughter Anna, pioneer of child psychoanalysis' (Seigel 2014, 6). Like the Foundling, it has no core external funding, an independent board of trustees, and a small establishment and volunteers. Its collection and exhibitions, including art interventions, are accommodated in a large Edwardian house in a quiet residential area. The Freud family arrived in 1938 after fleeing Nazi persecution. The Museum (FML 2019a) 'exists to promote the intellectual and cultural legacies of Sigmund and Anna Freud for the learning and enjoyment of all'. Through its educative mission and wider social engagement, the Museum facilitates discussion on current developments in psychology and psychoanalysis.

Rationale: Although it has the characteristics of a 'personality museum', it eschews the notion of a time capsule with objects preserved as relics, and to counter such perceptions, it has hosted interventions informed by contemporary debates on psychoanalysis (Morra 2018, 39-40). Further, the personal responses of artists explore human emotions with which psychoanalysis continues to be concerned. To this end, artists are invited to collaborate (Ruers & Seigel 2014, 34) within:

'a potent mix of family home, laboratory of ideas, doctor's office, and lastly a museum. This is a site where many layers of meaning, many personal and cultural memories can be explored...'

Art interventions raise important questions about Freud's legacy. Some address wider theory and practice, past and present. *Mad, Bad and Sad: Women and the Mind Doctors* [2013-14] (FML 2019b) examined the 'experience of women and their relationship to those who confined, cared for and listened to them' through pieces by Alice Anderson, Louise Bourgeois, Helen Chadwick, Tracey Emin, Anna Furse, Susan Hiller, Sarah Lucas and Francis Upritchard.

Process: The Museum continues to develop collaborations with artists that encourage visitors to reconsider psychoanalysis and explore its lesser known aspects, as well as the life of Sigmund Freud and his family. Given the reputation it has gained over nearly three decades for showing contemporary art, the Museum receives a great many unsolicited proposals from artists who want to exhibit their work. Seigel (2015) explained how the institution responds:

'In fact, now, we have a small group, a couple of our trustees, members of staff and a couple of people that we've invited, so that we assess proposals and then decide who would work well here, who is saying something, whose work will fit and who is interested in psychoanalysis, who is interested in the house and is interested in producing work that responds to things here'.

In general, however, guided by the institutional mission and trustees, the Director initiates a series of interventions which the Museum hosts as special exhibitions. To assemble contemporary artworks alongside objects from the Museum's reserve collection in the exhibition *Love, Lust and Longing* [2014-15], she appointed a guest curator, Janine Burke. Seigel (2014, 6) writes:

the exhibition explores Sigmund Freud's 'revolutionary ideas on love and libidinal drive through the innovative combination of works from Freud's own art collection, his writings and letters, contextualized with works by contemporary artists'.

In response to invitations from the Museum, selected artists loaned their pieces for the exhibition: a sculptural triptych by Rachel Kneebone; ceramics by Edmund de Waal; and photography by Hannah Collins (Ruers & Seigel 2014, 34-7). As with *Progress* above, the Museum combined these with a new commissioned work: Jodie Carey's pair of plaster sculptures *Untitled (Love and Lust)* designed to be installed in the garden, one in a protective coating, the other exposed to the elements.

Outcomes: Seigel (2015) acknowledged that audiences sometimes struggle: 'with why we bring contemporary artists into the house. This was an attempt to link it more closely with the themes of an exhibition'.

She observed that in the early 2000s the house was generally seen as a 'specialized' museum, but it has since acquired a considerable 'art audience'. One or two exhibitions by high-profile artists have generally received positive coverage in art-related media, and attracted larger numbers of their followers:

'were really here only to see Sigmund Freud's last home because, really, the work was all over the house in a very dominant way, which was fantastic for the many people that came to see that, but, again, usually, we make a compromise which accommodates both the art audience and the regular audience and we hope that the two coalesce and talk to each other'.

Visitors represent 'a huge component of our income'. The interventions complement a lively set of events, e.g. talks by artists, curators, authors and others who provide:

'a way of bringing in new visitors, of keeping the Museum in the public eye, of reminding people of what we're about, and perhaps also introducing subject areas, scenes or topics that aren't covered in our permanent displays'.

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In marked contrast to the conventional discourse of subject specialists, artists are given licence to express subjective, if not idiosyncratic interpretations of historical evidence. On-site interventions co-created by heritage attractions and artists can make unique contributions to the mission of the host institution by intertwining affective and intellectual responses, especially on contentious and sensitive issues. Characteristically, they bring together past and present, strange and familiar, expert and non-expert views. Thus, they have the potential to stimulate 'conversations' with heritage, rather than dutiful sightseeing. The Foundling Museum hosts contemporary pieces to initiate dialogues on emotional themes, including separation of children from their parents. At the Freud Museum London artworks help dispel impressions of entering a hallowed shrine; the intention is that they encourage continuing critical debate, and exploration of the very emotions that psychoanalysts investigate.

Such collaborations provide opportunities for artists to show their work to new audiences, and for attractions to refresh their offerings. The motivations and modus operandi of artists differ from those of heritage attractions, and this may enable them to shed new light on the heritage. Some artists approach potential hosts with

unsolicited proposals, others respond to invitations. In either case, directors/curators exercise discretion, and thus agency. On the one hand, their institutions welcome provocative pieces that enable visitors to co-create their own experiences. On the other, they must be satisfied that interventions are truly aligned with its mission and core values. Further, they exercise judgment on what terms are agreed with the artist, *who else* should get involved and *how*, e.g. guest curators, sponsors, volunteers. The two institutions considered in the section above combine pieces that artists lend to them with new work that they commission. Installed in the Freud family garden, Carey's plaster sculptures *Untitled (Love and Lust)* seem close to the principles of site-specific art. However, Brennan's drawings at The Foundling Museum, like Stockwell's textile *Peace Makers/Piece Makers* at the National Army Museum, can be relocated to other sites; such pieces suggest a more pragmatic approach.

Fraser & Coulson (2011) foreground open-ended interventions that challenge viewers to draw their own conclusions. There is, however, a fine line between stretching the viewer's understanding and confusing people who are less familiar with the artist's pictorial language. Tensions between 'traditional' and 'art' audiences can be accentuated in smaller, more intimate venues. Over-crowding and intrusion by the latter can diminish the enjoyment of others, e.g. those whose main motivation is to see Sigmund Freud's last home. Such concerns have not been fully resolved, and echo Cass's (2020) findings in the Brontë Parsonage Museum. If visitors are to engage meaningfully with interventions, their interactions must be supported. Approaches that are explicitly inclusionary and accessible, e.g. *The Hive* above, may offer a way forward where they enable visitors with diverse backgrounds, interests and level of interest to 'draw on their beliefs, values and imaginations' (Su et al 2018, p. 33).

Over time, ad hoc interventions may evolve into a regular series with associated activities. In doing so, they raise the profile of the host institution as an eventful place (cf. Richards & Duif 2019). This resonates with Richards & Wilson's (2006) model of flexible, creative spaces that accommodate a lively programme of activities. However, the notion of blank slates 'empty of fixed ideas' (ibid, 1218) seems inappropriate where the artworks respond to historic features and objects selected from collections to suggest new layers of meaning for visitors. Within such environments, considerable care must be taken with the precise positioning of artworks, not only to optimize their aesthetic appeal, but to overcome the physical constraints of the site: principles that were demonstrated in the presentation of Shonibare's posters and Hockney's prints in the reconstructed rooms of the former Foundling Hospital. For viewers, such environments contrast sharply with the non-distracting space of 'white cube' galleries (O'Doherty 1976).

Heritage attractions that host contemporary art can build up co-creative networks of practitioners in heritage and the arts that exchange ideas and share their expertise. A notable example is The Foundling Museum, where artists meet periodically around the table with staff members to discuss proposals for 'public-facing activities' (Howell 2014). In the longer term, openness and dynamic relationships with external actors can inform institutional learning. Thus, art interventions can influence wider mainstream policy and practice, e.g. the Fries Museum, Netherlands, periodically reconfigures its 'permanent' displays, juxtaposing (seemingly) unrelated objects to 'stimulate the imagination of curators and audience[s] alike' (Lehmann & Spijksma 2017, 13). With regard to their visitors, an optimistic

take is that co-creative experiences will foster personal development whereby followers of contemporary art will come to appreciate the heritage and vice versa: the two will 'coalesce and talk to each other' (Seigel 2015).

REFERENCES:

- Adams, T. (2010). Mat Collishaw, Tracey Emin and Paula Rego: At the Foundling. *The Observer*. 31 January 2010. Last accessed 15.03.20:
<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2010/jan/31/collishaw-emin-rego-foundling-museum>
- Adorno, T. (1981) [1967]. Valery Proust Museum. In Theodore Adorno (ed.) *Prisms*, Translated by S. and S. Weber (pp. 175-185). Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Antón, C., Camarero, C. and Garrido, M-J. (2018). A journey through the museum: Visit factors that prevent or further visitor satiation. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 73, 48-61.
- Bennett, R., Shaw, S., and Kottasz, R. (2016). Using artwork to market sensitive issues within heritage museums: three case studies. *Museum Management and Curatorship*. 31 (5), 460-473.
- Bennett, T. (2018). *Museums, Power, Knowledge, Selected Essays*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Besterman, T. (2011). Cultural equity in the sustainable museum. In J. Martine (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics: Redefining Ethics for the Twenty-First Century Museum* (pp. 239-255). Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Binkhorst, E. and Dekker, T. D. (2009). Agenda for Co-Creation Tourism Experience Research. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*. 18: (2-3), 311-327.
- Bodo, S. (2012). Museums as Intercultural Spaces. In R. Sandall and E. Nightingale (eds.) *Museums, Equality and Social Justice*, (pp. 181-191). Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) [1979] *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. and Darbel, A. (with Schnapper, D.) (1991) [1969]. *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and their Public*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Bridge, G. (2006). Perspectives on Cultural Capital and the Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*. 43 (4), 719-730.
- Buskirk, M. and Nixon, M. (eds.) (1996). *The Duchamp Effect*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Calver, S. J., and Page, S. J. (2013). Enlightened hedonism: Exploring the relationship of service value, visitor knowledge and interest. *Tourism Management*. 39, pp. 23-36.
- Campos, A.C., Mendes, J., Oom do Valle, P. and Scott, M. (2018). Co-creation of tourist experiences: a literature review. *Current Issues in Tourism*. 21 (4), 369-400.
- Carter, P. L. (2019). Looking for something real: Affective encounters. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 76, 200-213.
- Cass, N. (2020). Provoking numinous experience: contemporary art interventions at the Brontë Parsonage Museum, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 26 (3), 299-316.
- Čaušević, S. (2019). Reclaiming heritage from anti-communist discourse. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 77, 12-25.
- Chhabra, D. and Zhao, S. (2015). Present-centered dialogue with heritage representations. *Annals of*

Tourism Research 55, 94–109.

Cloke, P. (2007). Creativity and tourism in rural environments in G. Richards and J. Wilson (eds.), *Tourism, Creativity and Development* (pp. 37- 47). Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Dicks, B. (2016). The Habitus of Heritage: a Discussion of Bourdieu's Ideas for Visitor Studies in Heritage and Museums. *Museum & Society*. 14 (1), 52-64.

Duxbury, N., & Richards, G. W. (2019). *Towards a research agenda for creative tourism: developments, diversity, and dynamics*. In N. Duxbury, & G. Richards (Eds.), *A Research Agenda for Creative Tourism* (pp. 1-14). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study Research. *The Academy of Management Review*. 14 (4), 532-550.

Farquhar, J. (2012). *Case study research methods for business*. London: Sage Publications.

Featherstone, M. (1991). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. California, London, Newbury Park: Sage.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006), Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 12 (2), 219-245.

Fraser, A. and Coulson, H. (2012). Incomplete Stories. In S. MacLeod, L. Hourston Hank and J. Hale (eds.) *Museum Making: Narratives, architectures, exhibitions* (pp. 223-233). London and New York: Routledge.

FML (2019a) Homepage, Freud Museum London. Last accessed 13.07.19: <https://www.freud.org.uk/about-us/>.

FML (2019b) Exhibitions, Freud Museum London. Last accessed 13.07.19: <https://www.freud.org.uk/exhibitions/mad-bad-sad/>.

Fry, C. (2016). Inside the Hive. *Royal Botanical Gardens Kew Magazine*. Summer, Issue 89, 25-29.

Furneaux, H. and Prichard, S. (2015). Contested Objects: Curating Soldier Art. *Museum and Society*. 13 (4), 447-461.

Garrod, B. and Fyall, A. (2000). Managing Heritage Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 27 (3), 682-708.

Hanquinet, L., Roose, H. and Savage, M. (2014). The Eyes of the Beholder: Aesthetic Preferences and the Remaking of Cultural Capital. *Sociology*. 48 (1), 111-133.

HLF (2014). Heritage Lottery Fund £11.5 m grant for National Army Museum expansion. Last accessed 13.07.18: <https://www.hlf.org.uk/about-us/media-centre/press-releases/£115m-grant-national-army-museum-expansion>.

Howell. C. (2014). Interview with Caro Howell, Director TFM (interviewer lead author) at The Foundling Museum, London, 12.09.14.

Hoyer, W. D., Chandy, R., Dorotic, M., Krafft, M., Singh, S. (2010). Consumer Cocreation in New Product Development. *Journal of Service Research*, 13 (3). 283-296.

Huang, S-M. (2017). Ethics of heritage: locating the punitive state in the historical penal landscape of Taipei. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 23 (2), 111-124.

Kaye, N. (2000). *Site-Specific Art: Performance, Place and Documentation*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Kempiak, J., Hollywood, L., Bolan, P. and McMahon-Beattie, U. (2017). The heritage tourist: an understanding of the visitor experience at heritage attractions. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 23 (4), 375-392.
- Knudsen, B. T. and Andersen, C. (2019). Affective politics and colonial heritage, Rhodes Must Fall at UCT and Oxford. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 25 (3), 239-258.
- Kwon, M. (2002). *One Place After Another: Site-specific Art and Locational Identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Leask, A. (2016). Visitor attraction management: A critical review of research 2009-2014. *Tourism Management*, 57, pp. 334-361.
- Lee, R. and Zarandona, J. A. G. (2020). Heritage destruction in Myanmar's Rakhine state: legal and illegal iconoclasm. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 26 (5), 519-538.
- Lehmann, A., and Spijksma, J. (2017). Flattening Hierarchies of Display: The Liberating and Leveling Powers of Objects and Materials. *Stedekjik Studies*. 5, 1-18.
- Linden, H., and Linden, S. (2017). *Fans and Fan Cultures: Tourism, Consumerism and Social Media*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- MacCannell, D. (1999) [1976]. *The Tourist: A new theory of the leisure class*. Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- MacGregor, N. (2011) Director's Foreword. In G. Perry. *The Tomb of the Unknown Craftsman* (p. 7). London: The British Museum Press.
- Macdonald, S. (2011). Expanding Museum Studies: An Introduction. In S. Macdonald (ed.), *A Companion to Museum Studies* (pp. 1-12). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Marabou (2019). *Banksy's "Peckham Rock" at the British Museum*. *Marabou at the Museum 01.02.19*. Last accessed 29.08.20: <https://marabouatthemuseum.com/2019/02/01/banksys-peckham-rock-at-the-british-museum/>
- Marstine, J. (2017) *Critical Practice: Artists, Museums, Ethics*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- McClusky, P. Z. (2011). "Why is it here?": Art museum texts as ethical guides. In J. Martine (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to Museum Ethics: Redefining Ethics for the Twenty-First Century Museum* (pp. 298-315). Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Miles, M. (2015). *Limits to Culture: Urban Regeneration vs. Dissident Art*. London: Pluto Press.
- MoD (2017). *Ministry of Defence Review of the Armed Forces Service Museums*. London: MoD. Last accessed 19.08.20: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/review-of-the-armed-forces-service-museums>.
- Morra, J. (2018). *Inside the Freud Museums: History, Memory and Site-Responsive Art*. London and New York: I.B. Taurus.
- Murtagh, B., Boland, P. and Shirlow, P. (2017). Contested heritages and cultural tourism. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 23 (6), 506-520.
- NAM (2016). *National Army Museum Trustees Report and Report of Council, Year ended 31st. March 2016*. London: NAM. Last accessed 12.07.18: <https://www.na4m.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/accounts-2015-16.pdf/>.
- Newell, R. (2014). Interview with Rebecca Newell, Public Information & Outreach Curator NAM (interviewer lead author) at National Army Museum, London, 18.06.14.

- Newman, A., Goulding, A., and Whitehead, C. (2014). Contemporary visual art and the construction of identity: maintenance and revision processes in older adults, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 20 (4), 432-453.
- O'Dell, T. (2010). Experiencescape. In P. O'Dell and T. Billing (eds.), *Experiencescapes: Tourism, culture, and economy* (pp. 11–33). Koge: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- O'Doherty, B. (1976). Inside the White Cube: notes on the gallery space, part 1. *Artforum*. 14 (7), March, 24-30.
- Patel, M., Heath, C., Luff, P., von Lehn, D. and Cleverly, J. (2016). Playing with words: creativity and interaction in museums and galleries. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 31 (1), 69-86.
- Perry, G. (2011). *The Tomb of the Unknown Craftsman*. London: The British Museum Press
- Prahalad, C. K. and Ramaswamy, V. (2004) Co-creation Experiences: the Next Practice in Value Creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*. 18 (3), 5-14.
- Prentice, R. and Anderson, V. (2007). Creative tourism supply: creating culturally empathetic destinations. In G. Richards and J. Wilson (eds.), *Tourism, Creativity and Development* (pp. 89-106). Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Putnam, J. (2009). *Art and Artefact: the Museum as a Medium, revised edition*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Richards, G., and Duif, L. (2019). *Small cities with big dreams: Creative placemaking and branding strategies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Richards, G. (2011). Creativity and Tourism: The State of the Art. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 38 (4), 1225-1253.
- Richards G., and Wilson J. (2006). Developing creativity in tourist experiences: A solution to the serial reproduction of culture? *Tourism Management*. 27 (6), 1209–1223.
- Richards, G., and Raymond, C. (2000). Creative tourism. *ATLAS News*. 23, 16–20.
- Robins, C., and Baxter, M. (2012). Meaningful encounters with disrupted narratives: artists' interventions as interpretive strategies. In S. MacLeod, L. Hourston Hank and J. Hale (eds.) *Museum Making: Narratives, architectures, exhibitions* (pp. 247-256). London and New York: Routledge.
- Ross, D., Sexana, G., Correira, F., and Deutz, P. (2017). Archaeological Tourism: A creative approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 67, 37-47.
- Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (2018). *World Heritage Management Plan 2019-2025, draft for consultation*. London: RBG, Kew.
- Ruers, J., and Seigel, C. (2014). Freud and Eros: Contemporary Art at the Freud Museum. In FML *Freud and Eros: Love Lust and Longing* (pp. 34-37) Exhibition 22 October 2014 - 8 March 2015). London: Freud Museum London.
- Seigel, C. (2015). Interview with, Carol Seigel, Director FML (interviewer lead author) at The Freud Museum, London, 17.04.15.
- Seigel, C. (2014). Foreword in FML *Freud and Eros: Love Lust and Longing* (pp. 6-7), Exhibition 22 October 2014 - 8 March 2015). London: Freud Museum London.
- Seligman, I. (2020). Recording Exile. *The British Museum Magazine*, Spring/Summer, 50-51.
- Serra, R. (1994). *Writings/Interviews*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Smith, L. (2006). *Uses of Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Smith, M., Carnegie, E., and Robertson, M. (2006). Juxtaposing the timeless and ephemeral: staging festivals and events at World Heritage Sites. In A. Leask and A. Fyall (eds.) *Managing World Heritage Sites* (pp. 110-124). Oxford and Burlington MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stockwell, S. (2018). Peace Maker, National Army Museum, London. Last accessed 13.07.18: http://www.susanstockwell.co.uk/medium.php?image_id=2014-04-27-1.
- Su, R., Bramwell, B., and Whalley, P. A. (2018). Cultural political economy and urban heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 68, pp. 30-40.
- Sui, N., Y-M, Zhang, T. J-F., Dong, P., and Kwan, H-K. (2013). New service bonds and customer value in customer relationship management: The case of museum visitors. *Tourism Management*. 36, 293-303.
- Tan, S-K., Kung, S-F., & Luh, D-B. (2013). A model of 'creative experience' in creative tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41, 153–174.
- TFM (2015). *The Foundling Museum Annual Report and Financial Statements*, 31st March 2015. London: TFM.
- TFM (2014a). *The Foundling Museum: An Introduction*. London: TFM.
- TFM (2014b). *The Foundling Museum, Progress: Exhibition 06 June 2014 – 07 September 2014*. Last accessed 18.08.20: <https://foundlingmuseum.org.uk/events/progress-2014/>
- TFM (2012) *Foundling Back to Front Weekend by Yinka Shonibare, The Foundling Museum*. Last accessed 17.08.20: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fXA5FV1CXcU>
- Thomas, N. (2016). *The return of curiosity: What museums are good for in the 21st century*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Tunbridge, J. E. and Ashworth G. J. (1996). *Dissonant Heritage: the management of the past as a resource in conflict*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Villar, J.G. and Vicencio, F.C. (2019). Social emotions, heritage and recognition. The Struggle of Colina Stonemasons in Santiago, Chile. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 25 (12), 1263-1278.
- Wainwright, O. (2017). Interview: How we made the wrapped Reichstag. *The Guardian*, 07.02.17. Last accessed: 15.03.20: <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2017/feb/07/how-we-made-the-wrapped-reichstag-berlin-christo-and-jeanne-claude-interview>.
- Wright. A. (2015). Interview with Angela Wright, artist (interviewer lead author) at Southwark Cathedral, London, 27.04.15.
- Yin, R. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Wang, S-Y. (2020). A social approach to preserve difficult heritage under neoliberalism – a leprosy settlement in Taiwan and beyond. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 26 (5), 454-468.
- Zhu, Y. (2015). Cultural effects of authenticity: contested heritage practices in China. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. 21 (6), 594-60.