Rewarding Citizen Participation in Exhibitions: A Questionnaire Surveying Museum Practices

Julia Ferloni
Mucem and Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis

Alina Maggiore
Mucem, Aix-Marseille Université, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

Florent Molle
Mucem and Cergy-Paris Université, EUR Humanités, Créations et Patrimoine

Abstract: The paper presents the results of a quantitative and qualitative study undertaken by a team of museum professionals and researchers based at the Museum of Civilizations of Europe and the Mediterranean (Mucem) in Marseilles, France, in 2020. The survey aimed to investigate the contemporary curation practices of European museums by asking in what ways collaboration enters into their scientific projects, curation and remuneration practices. The analysis draws on the survey responses of 118 French and international participants in their capacities as independent curators, representatives and professionals from European museums and patrimonial associations. In addition, two semi-structured interviews gave further insights into specific examples of collaborative or co-creative exhibitions, designed with vulnerable communities, that break with the norm of habitual power structures and dominant heritage production. The results indicate that, while the notion of 'participation' entails ambiguous categorizations ranging from academic to institutional to community actors, remuneration remains a desideratum, thus highlighting issues of acknowledgment, durability and, ultimately, the social legitimacy and justice of museal practices.
[collaboration, source communities, exhibitions, remuneration, survey]

Introduction

Since 2018, the Museum of Civilizations of Europe and the Mediterranean (Mucem) has been experimenting with new forms of collaborative work. This has included two exhibitions run by the museum in close collaboration with groups of people from socially vulnerable communities[1]. In arranging these exhibitions, the project teams were faced with the issue of remuneration for collaborative work: could the museum pay for this work and, if so, how, and how much? As members of the teams seeking answers

---

1 For more on socially vulnerable communities, see Cornwall (2008).

to these questions were considering wider practice, but were faced with a lack of answers both internally and in the scientific literature, we constructed a questionnaire to solicit the expertise of museum professionals working in France and abroad. This questionnaire data was enriched by interviews with two survey respondents who gave feedback and insights into specific examples of collaborative or co-creative exhibitions with vulnerable communities that break with the norm of habitual power structures and dominant heritage production[2].

This article reports on the results and responses obtained through the questionnaire and interviews, thereby providing a contemporary perspective on the design and use of participatory museological methods and principles. First, we will describe the background to the study, beginning with a brief introduction to the theory and terminology before turning to the specific museal context at the Mucem that inspired us to generate the questionnaire. In section 3, we cover the methodology and in section 4 we present and analyze the results obtained, including giving an overview of the forms of remuneration proposed by the responding museum institutions. The results indicate that, while the notion of 'participation' entails ambiguous categorizations ranging from academic to institutional to community actors, remuneration remains a desideratum, thus highlighting issues of acknowledgment, durability and, ultimately, the social legitimacy and justice of museal practices.

Background to the Study

The background to our study lies in the concepts of 'participation' and 'collaboration', terms which have become inescapable in recent developments in international ethnographic and society museums as institutions seeking to make the museum more inclusive and democratic. As noted above, the other key motivation for the study relates to specific projects at the Mucem that prompted our questionnaire. Both background aspects will be detailed below.

Theoretical Background: Participation and Collaboration

Participation in the museum has generated significant academic interest, with numerous publications and symposia having emerged over the last fifteen years (see, for example, McSweeney and Kavanagh 2016; Golding and Modest 2013; Simon 2010; Marstine 2008). Among these, French museologist Serge Chaumier's *Altermuséologie: manifeste expologique sur les tendances et le devenir de l'exposition* (2018) provides a key

---

2 The first interview was conducted with Fanny Wonu Veys, curator of the Oceania Department at the National Museum of World Cultures (Netherlands), and the second with Aurélie Samson, director, and Céline Salvetat, head of the audience department, at the Museon Arlaten (France).

background text which describes four expographic forms that have structured the phases of museology since the creation of the discipline. The last and most recent of these is the 'participatory exhibition', which Chaumier argues 'is not the result of a fashion, but of a profound mutation'[3] (2018:14).

Our second background concept, collaboration, has been given different names by different theorists. In using it, we mean a particular working method that aims to associate a curator from a museum institution with a group of specialists and people concerned with the subject of an exhibition. In doing so, we draw on the work of both the US-American Nina Simon, who developed her now-classic categorization of 'co-creation' in *The Participatory Museum* (2010), and that of Chaumier (2018), who writes of 'co-construction'. In his manifesto, referring to examples of community museums that have developed this practice for political reasons connected with the legitimacy of speech, he justifies co-creation/co-construction in these terms:

> This approach, which might seem demagogic at first sight, means above all that the word is shared, that the expert's knowledge can be debated, even negotiated, and even reconstructed on the basis of the contributions of others. It is especially important to note here what this means in terms of the relationship to knowledge and the way it is shared. What we are witnessing is a renewal of the traditional scheme.[4] (ibid. 2018:111)

Beyond these theoretical developments, participation and collaboration are also being addressed at the state level in some countries. In France, for instance, Jacqueline Eidelman (2017) submitted a voluminous report she had commissioned to the Minister of Culture and Communication on 'inventing museums for tomorrow'. The report emphasized the importance of participation by encouraging the museums of France to become even more 'ethical and civic', as well as 'inclusive and participatory'. Mucem, one of France's sixty-one national museums and one of the largest in terms of collections (with approximately one million artefacts), as it claims to be a museum of anthropology linked to communities, had to set an example.

The Background to the Project

As the heir to the Musée national des Arts et Traditions Populaires (MnATP), the Mucem, inaugurated in Marseilles in 2013, had already developed expertise in the field of participation (Chougnet and Girard 2022). Historically, society museums and ecomuseums have had a privileged link with participatory practices (Delarge 2018). According to Calafat and Viatte (2018), Georges Henri Rivière (1897–1985), founder of the MnATP, is one of the inventors of modern museology and a key theorist of the

---

3 Our translation from French.
4 Our translation from French.

ecomuseum, a concept he created with Hugues de Varine in the late 1960s to refer to institutions linked to a territory and its inhabitants[5].

While the Mucem had been familiar with questions of citizen collaboration since its opening, mainly in the form of the collection of information and the building of collections (on which, see Chevallier 2008), it consciously launched into participatory exhibitions in 2016. Most notably of all, it created the 'Young people make their museum' program, co-commissioning a 100-square-metre exhibition in the museum's Conservation and Resource Center with pupils from Marseilles' secondary schools. From 2017, two larger projects, *HIV/AIDS: The Epidemic Is Not Over!* and *Barvalo: Roms, Sinti, Manouches, Gitans, French Travelers…*, furthered the collaboration with citizens, working with 'source communities', following Peers and Brown's definition of them as 'the communities from which museum collections originate' (ibid. 2003:1).[6]

The first of these exhibitions, *HIV/AIDS*, was held in Marseilles from December 2021 to May 2022 and aimed to look back at the social history of this epidemic. Diversity of knowledge was at work in the exhibition's co-construction. It was prepared by a steering committee made up of a curator and a collections manager from the Mucem and researchers in the human sciences—sociologists and anthropologists of health and heritage—associated with a community committee made up of people concerned, in different capacities, with the epidemic (people living with HIV, carers, activists, etc.). For two years, the scientific committee organized study days, in which the members of the community committee were invited to participate, allowing the development of common knowledge. Subsequently, the scientific committee had the task of steering the writing and choice of *expôts*[7] with the community committee, while the latter was invited to identify the essential subjects to be dealt with in the exhibition, to suggest works and objects to be exhibited, to discuss and enrich the message of the exhibition and to endorse the choices of the steering committee (Molle 2019).

The second exhibition, *Barvalo*, held in Mucem from May to September 2023, is about the history of the Romani[8] people in Europe. The exhibition aims to show how

---

5 Ecomuseums were born in France in the early 1970s, under the leadership of these two figures. Rivière wanted to develop a model of museum that was closely associated with its natural and cultural environment, while for Varine, the ecomuseum was a museum at the service of community development (Varine 1978, 2006, 2018). The concept of the ecomuseum was established by the International Council of Museums in 1971, and a charter setting out its objectives and specific features was signed on March 4, 1981. In France, the term was gradually dropped in the early 1990s to give way to the notion of the 'Musée de société' (society museum), which is more encompassing because it values both the recipient and the object of its missions (Drouguet 2015:103).

6 In this case, the two programmed exhibitions were based on the Mucem's previous collections, which the work with the source communities helped to update (Dallemagne et al. 2023).

7 Marc-Olivier Gonseth defines *expôt* or *exponat* as 'a concept designating all objects in the broad sense, thus including visual, sound, tactile or olfactory materials, likely to carry meaning in the context of the exhibition' (Gonseth 2000:157).

8 We have chosen to use the word 'Romani' as a noun and adjective in order to characterize the Roma,

antigypsyism has been established in our societies for centuries by revisiting possible prejudices about Romani communities and by showing these communities as actors, not just as victims of history. To do this, a two-stage design process was conceived: a curatorial team of five synthesized and put into museological form the reflections of a committee of fourteen experts on the subject. These nineteen collaborators of Roma, Sinti, Gitano, French Traveler and non-Roma origin are of different nationalities and socio-cultural profiles, some with academic backgrounds, others with situated knowledge in Donna Haraway's sense (1988).

In society museums, situated knowledge is often of equal importance to academic knowledge, although the former is often perceived as subjective and is therefore not always used. However, holders of both academic and situated knowledge all have a qualified and legitimate point of view on the subject (Chaumier 2018:116). The joint use of situated and academic knowledge gives a wider spectrum of action to citizen participation. Therefore, in the case of *Barvalo*, the title 'expert committee' was chosen for the participants in the project design, as they have experience, in the sense of knowledge, of the subject.

In both cases, the two collectives were asked to develop the exhibition's purpose and its scientific, aesthetic and artistic content. They were also asked to contribute to the catalogue, think about the mediation and event programming, be field investigators, propose acquisitions to the museum, reflect on the heritage of their community, imagine the communication around the exhibition and give an opinion on the envisaged sponsorship, among other tasks. It is therefore a real consultancy job, if not more.

Faced with the magnitude of the tasks asked of the two exhibition collectives at the Mucem, the authors of this article were quickly confronted with the following questions: How can we recognize (i.e., salute, thank and acknowledge) contributions? What is the status of the 'source communities'? Should these source communities be paid as contributors, and if so how, when their profiles and professional statuses are so diverse? Indeed, although many affiliated researchers are already paid by their host institutions to participate in projects of this nature, how can we allow for the involvement of other experts who offer their time without it being understood as working time? In the case of *Barvalo*, for example, two of the members of the expert committee were fairground traders, and thus time spent on the project was time not spent earning at the markets. These questions were even more acute because they sometimes came from members of the collectives involved in these exhibitions, who were aware of their fragility and their desire for empowerment[9].

Sinti, and Gitano groups, as well as any person identifying as of Romani origin. In this we follow both recent Romani studies and the choice made collectively by *Barvalo*'s committee of experts.

9 We understand 'empowerment' in the sense defined by Andrea Cornwall (2008): as the process by which an individual or a group frees itself from the phenomena of domination of which it may be the victim.

To answer these many questions, we first contacted museologists renowned for their detailed knowledge of participatory practices. They confirmed that there was little academic literature on the subject, giving us answers on a case-by-case basis and showing that there was not one but several practices. It was then that the project of a questionnaire was born, allowing us to survey participatory museum practices around the world. This is the task we undertook in 2019[10], with the support of our host institutions and their networks.

Methodology

A Short Questionnaire

We designed a short questionnaire, using LimeSurvey software[11]. These were self-administered on a voluntary basis, with no compensation. The purpose of our study was set out in the email inviting recipients to complete the survey[12].

The questionnaire was structured as follows: after a text introducing the survey and briefly explaining its framework[13], there were standard questions aimed at identifying the respondent in terms of institution of origin, professional status, age, gender, etc. Next, eight questions were asked about collaborative exhibitions, some of which were closed questions with a limited choice of answers, while others were open, calling on the respondents to provide detailed content, generally induced by a positive answer to the previous closed question. The themes of these questions were as follows: the definition of the institutional framework for collaborative exhibitions and the methods for

---

10 The global COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting health and social upheaval took hold just as we had finished collecting the data. It slowed down the analysis by a year, which was presented in June 2021 at the 15th Congress of the International Society for Ethnology and Folklore, Helsinki, and published in Ferloni et al. (2022).

11 LimeSurvey is an online survey tool whose data-processing complies with the German Data Protection Act (BDSG), the Telecommunications Act (TKG) and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). For more information, see https://www.limesurvey.org.

12 'The Mucem is experimenting with new ways of creating exhibitions. For the past two years, it has been working on collaborative projects. As these projects have progressed, we have realized that we lack concrete examples to draw on, examples that cannot necessarily be found in the specialized literature, particularly for French museums. We therefore seek your help and expertise. Would you be so kind as to answer the online questionnaire?'

13 'The Mucem is currently preparing two exhibitions in a collaborative manner with two distinct communities. [...] For the purposes of this questionnaire, by 'communities' we mean groups of people from civil society who are concerned in different ways with the subjects that interest the museum. We also think of collaboration as the collective construction of all or part of the exhibition and associated projects (communication, event programming, mediation, etc.). Collaboration ranges from consultation to co-curation.'

their implementation (inclusion in the institution's scientific and cultural project, presence of a community manager, contractualization of the collaboration, existence of an ethical charter); the definition of collaborators; and the offer of compensation (financial or otherwise) to the latter.

Once the questionnaire had been drawn up, it was tested by a few museum colleagues before being distributed between February and April 2020. We targeted the professional networks that we could reach in the museum world in France and abroad. For French museums, we sent the questionnaire to all French heritage curators listed in the alumni directory of the Institut National du Patrimoine[14]. Then we used the networks of the French section of the international council of museums (ICOM)[15], the Federation of Ecomuseums and Society Museums (FEMS)[16], the Office de Coopération et d'Information Muséales (Ocim)[17] and the Association Musées-Méditerranée[18]. In order to reach museums abroad, the questionnaire was distributed through the ICOM network[19] and through other networks of museums or heritage professionals that the authors of this article are linked with, such as the Smithsonian Institution's museum networks or the Association of Critical Heritage Studies (ACHS)[20]. It was also sent to colleagues through contacts made in the past. Finally, it was shared on Twitter by the Mucem and one of the authors of this article to the accounts of several European museums[21].

---

14 The Institut National du Patrimoine (INP) is a higher education institution of the Ministry of Culture that trains all French heritage curators. For more on this, see: https://www.inp.fr/. The alumni directory is available here: https://www.inp.fr/Annuaires-des-anciens-eleves.

15 See: https://www.icom-musees.fr/

16 For more on this, see: https://fems.asso.fr/

17 See: https://ocim.fr/

18 This organization is part of the Association Générale des Conservateurs des Collections Publiques de France (AGCCPF), which is a national association open to heritage curators that brings together all the museums of France – as identified by the Ministry of Culture – whatever their specialty and other public heritage (historical monuments, archaeology, heritage libraries, inventory). For more on the Association Musées-Méditerranée, see: http://www.musees-mediterranee.org/. For more on AGCCPF, see: https://www.agccpf.com/.

19 We sent the questionnaire to all ICOM committees. Their e-mail addresses can be found in the Internet website of the ICOM: https://icom.museum/fr/reseau/repertoire-des-comites/.

20 For more on this, see: https://www.criticalheritagestudies.org/.

21 Details on the survey's recipients are given to underline the fact that there may still be a selection bias in the composition of the survey population because, despite the survey's wide distribution, not all museum professionals could be contacted. The selection criteria may seem subjective, as they are partly based on the professional networks of the authors of the article. Nevertheless, they do not seem any less illuminating, given the quantity and diversity of the sample.

Criteria for Constituting the Corpus

To constitute our sample, we established a quota method and selection criteria allowing us to retain a sample from our overall population. In total, 570 people responded to our questionnaire, but only 145 responded in full, thus restricting our data. Based on the data given in the introductory questions concerning the professional situation of the respondents, we excluded a further 27 questionnaires as not coming from people belonging to institutions that organize exhibitions, the target population of our survey. The questionnaires we retained were based on the following criteria: a) respondents who ticked the box 'museum professional' were included; b) those who declared themselves to be 'researchers' and 'professionals from non-museum cultural institutions' were added only when they specified they had produced exhibitions. Where respondents indicated that they had done so, we endeavored to include only those who belonged to the institution that had put on the exhibition, thus rejecting those who took part in these projects as participants.

Of this final group of 118 respondents, 32 identified as male, 84 as female[22]. Females therefore made up most respondents at 71.2%. Many respondents were French (62.7% or 74 respondents), followed by Belgians (11% or 13 respondents), Swiss and Canadians (3.4% or 4 respondents each), Dutch and Slovenians (2.5% or 3 respondents each) and Swedes, Germans and Austrians (1.7% or 2 respondents each). There was also one respondent each from Bulgaria, Cameroon, Estonia, Italy, Monaco, Morocco, New Zealand and South Africa (0.84% each), while one further respondent did not wish to specify a country of origin. Museum professionals (self-specified) made up 78.81% of the respondents, while 11.86% belonged to a non-museum cultural institution, 4.24% were researchers, 2.54% were independent curators and 2.54% did not fit into any of the proposed categories. As some of the respondents belonged to the same institution, it was interesting to note that sometimes their answers varied, reflecting the different perceptions of what collaboration means for different people within the same museum.

Constitution of the Analytical Grid

For the analysis, the responses were separated into two categories: quantitative questions (closed) and qualitative questions (open). Once this first stage of the study was completed, these two categories were cross-referenced. For the qualitative part and the analysis of question 3 concerning the modalities of participation, the authors chose to use two different but complementary analytical grids.

Museums in general, and social history museums in particular, often rely on a variation of Sherry Arnstein's (1969:217) scale of citizen participation to determine its different types and its levels of success. Arnstein, a pioneer of participatory thinking, established the following scale of participation, which reads from the top down:

---

22 Six respondents chose the answer 'other', which means that at least four of them chose two answers ('other' and 'male' or 'female').

Citizen power
- • Citizen control
- • Delegate power
- • Partnership

Tokenism
- • Placation
- • Consultation
- • Informing

Non-participation
- • Therapy
- • Manipulation

According to Arnstein, all practices below which she designated as 'partnership' are tokenism, a symbolic measure, or even an instrumentalization of the voice of individuals outside the institution if we take the last stage of her ladder (manipulation) as a non-participation step.

However, Arnstein developed her theory specifically in the context of the social and political sciences, and therefore it does not fit museum participatory practices very well (Ferloni and Sitzia 2022). We therefore decided to cross-reference it with a tool especially designed for museums. Although many definitions of participatory practices have been proposed by museologists, here we chose Simon's (2010) now classic definition, as adpated by McSweenney and Kavanagh (2016). Simon's model is broken down into four degrees of involvement in ascending order:

> **Consultation**: involves inviting specialists as well as non-specialists to help identify particular audiences' expectations and needs, thus informing the museum's practice.
> **Contribution**: involves asking for and receiving content from audiences.
> **Collaboration**: entails open-ended collaborative activity with participants, where the museum sets the concept and outline plan but then works with audience groups to develop the detail and make it happen.
> **Co-creation**: is defined as 'creating an output together', with ownership of the concept shared between the participants and the Museum.

However, it is difficult to encompass the many layers of a participatory exhibition in a single ladder or model, even when drawing on two, as we have here. As Bryony Onciul states regarding Arnstein's ladder, field experience can offer a complicating challenge:

> Despite echoing the model, the case studies do not completely reflect the hierarchy implied by their placement on Arnstein's ladder. Five factors can account for this: first, the realities of engagement are much more untidy and fluid than any model

or category can account for. Second, during the process of engagement all the different kinds of participation listed in typologies such as Arnstein's may occur at different stages. Third, museums and communities do not enter into engagement with a predetermined or fixed amount of power, it is always open to negotiation, theft, gifting, and change. Fourth, influences beyond the engagement zone such as logistics and institutional requirements limit what is made possible by engagement. Finally, the top rung of the ladder, citizen control, does not solve the problem of representation or relations between individuals within a community or an institution such as a museum. (Onciul 2013:82–83)

This is an opinion that we fully share based on our own field experience as collaborative exhibition curators. Nevertheless, we needed a conceptual framework, and thus it is with full awareness of its limitations that we have adopted the cross-referenced model applied here.

Supplementary In-Depth Interviews

To refine the analysis, two respondents were selected from among those who had described the framework of their collaboration with source communities and had agreed to a more in-depth interview. They were interviewed during in-depth, semi-structured, one-to-one interviews, conducted by videoconference. Our aim was to collect the testimony of professionals who had been involved in an exhibition set up with the maximum degree of collaboration, including vulnerable communities. We also based our selection on geography, size and, in one case, the type of participants involved in the project: a group of Romani origin.

Ultimately, we chose to speak with two representatives of a French museum who, between 2010 and 2016, had worked with the Gitano population in its territory, in Provence, southern France, location of the Museon Arlaten[23]. The collaboration consisted of a collection of memories exhibited in 2013 as *A la gitane* ('Gitano style'). We then interviewed a representative from a European institution divided into four museums, the Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen (National Museum of World Cultures) in the Netherlands[24], focusing the interview on gender issues in the *What a Genderful World* exhibition, displayed in 2019.

---

23 Founded by Frédéric Mistral (1830-1914), folklorist, poet and Nobel Prize winner for literature, the Museon Arlaten ('Arlésian Museum' in Provençal) is one of the oldest ethnographic museums in France, created in 1899 in Arles, Provence, southern France. Today, it is a museum of society that explores and questions the Provençal society of today. There is evidence of the ancient presence of the Arles Gitano community in Provence, and they are represented in the collections of the Museon Arlaten.

24 The National Museum of World Cultures is a Dutch national museum of ethnography, grouping four sites: the Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam; the Africa Museum in Berg en Dal; the Museum of Ethnology in Leiden and the Wereldmuseum in Rotterdam.

Results and Analysis

Source Communities: A Notion with Blurred Boundaries

The answers to our survey show that 55% of respondents declared themselves to have already worked with source communities in the context of an exhibition. At the same time, almost all respondents said they had already collaborated with external partners, who were mostly identified as cultural institutions, artists, pupils from primary and secondary schools, or businesses. Researchers in general and those originating from source communities were equally defined as partners, as well as associative actors or activists.

The interview with Fanny Wonu Veys, curator at the Nationaal Museum van Wereldculturen (the Netherlands), shows that some heritage professionals involve more general or less essentialist audiences, whom they refer to using terms such as 'stakeholders' instead of 'source community'.

> Every time we do an exhibition now, we try to see with – what they call here in the bureaucratic jargon – stakeholders. For example, we did an exhibition that just opened in Amsterdam on healing practices in the world. So, we worked with traditional healers from different worlds, different countries.

> Each time we try to find people who have an important voice, and even if this voice is not the voice we agree on, we still try to have this differentiation in the ideas we bring with us. And obviously if the ideas are really aggressive, racist, it's not a voice we represent in the museum. We are quite careful. It's not that people can't say it, but the museum won't represent that voice, won't vouch for that voice.[25] (04/03/2021)

Returning to the questionnaire, given we had particularly targeted society museums and ecomuseums,[26] whose mission it is to work on and with local populations, we expected that respondents would correlate external partners with 'source communities'; however, this was not the case. Our expectation was that respondents would identify source communities as privileged external partners, whereas in fact many mentioned more habitual types of publics with which museums collaborate. What is more, 43% of the respondents who indicated that their institution had collaborated with external partners did not consider themselves as having worked with source communities, establishing a clear-cut difference between the two categories. The responses indicate the

---

25 The quote is from an interview that the art historian and Mucem intern Emma Danet conducted online with Fanny Wonu Veys, curator of the Oceania Department at the National Museum of World Cultures, on 4 March 2021 (our translation from French).

26 That said, while privileging these types of institution, we have also opened our survey to art, history and science museums.

vague semantic benchmarking of source communities among museum professionals. Does this linguistic instability also translate into an instability concerning the conception and implementation of collaborative practices?

Collaboration: A Notion Used for Different Practices

In order to categorize the collaborative actions of the respondents, the poll invited them to situate their practices on a ladder of participation inspired, as already mentioned, by Simon (2010) and Arnstein (1969). Most of the answers included the concept of 'partnership' (78%), and to a lesser extent 'consultation' (8%), 'delegation' (6%), 'conciliation' (5%) and 'information' (3%).[27]

From qualitative analysis of some responses, it can be seen that the concept of 'collaboration' varies widely from one person to another, often depending on the type of institution in which they work, but also on their country of residence and sociopolitical context. The professionals from fine arts museums declared that they are just beginning to apply collaborative curatorial formats, while their counterparts in society museums state they have 'always' organized participatory projects. Based on these answers, we might assume that they understand 'collaborative exhibitions' as projects led in co-creation[28] with external partners, which comes closest to sharing the curatorial authority. However, the majority of those surveyed (mostly French) saw collaboration as a form of information and consultation with the partners, but where museums retained the ultimate authority over the content of the exhibition.

The responses from one of the interviewees at the Museon Arlaten illustrate this tendency. From 2010 to 2016, the Museon conducted an ethnographic study of Catalan Gitanos, a group that has been living in Arles for several generations. During the eleven years in which the museum was closed for renovations, the institution developed numerous external projects, including a mediation project entitled 'Sharing Gitano Memories'. This was aimed at children and gave them the ethnographic tools to collect the memories of their elders. This project evolved considerably. The Museon partnered with the mediation association 'Petit à Petit', which had connections with and the trust

---

27 Respondents who answered, 'yes' to the question 'Did your museum already collaborate with external partners originating from a community in the context of an exhibition (also called a 'source community')?' were asked to answer the question 'What was the level of participation?' and were asked to 'choose the appropriate response for each item': Non-participation / Information / Consultation / Conciliation / Partnership / Delegation / Autonomous control. This question model captures the respondent's degree of agreement or disagreement, according to a Likert scale, a tool for measuring attitude in individuals. The scale consists of one or more statements for which the respondent expresses his or her degree of agreement or disagreement with five response options, which cover the spectrum of opinions, from one extreme to the other: strongly agree, agree, neither disagree nor agree, disagree, and strongly disagree.

28 According to Simon (2010:263ff.), co-creation is defined as 'creating a production together'. In this way, the ownership of the concept is shared between the participants and the museum.

of the source community after leading a previous project about housing. 'Petit à Petit' connected the museum with a Gitano mediator working in a school including Gitano children. He agreed to take part in the 'Gitano committee' that the Museon Arlaten set up.

The museum's staff was not integrated into the latter to allow the committee members to express themselves without staff interference.

The collected data originated from three different types of collector: the members of the source community (mostly Gitano women and children), the museum staff and the association 'Petit à Petit'. The museum was keen to be very transparent in the collection of data (both objects and testimonies) by inviting the families surveyed and the Gitano associations to listen to field reports and make comments once a year. This was intended to allow them to express their views on what had been collected during the six years of this survey project. The project thus resulted in the enrichment of the collections, educational workshops with Gitanos and non-Gitano schoolchildren, the publication of various testimonies on the daily lives of the families visited from 2010 to 2016 and an exhibition.

In 2013, as part of the event 'Marseilles, European Capital of Culture', this participatory work resulted in the exhibition *A la gitane*, which was presented in Marseilles in the J1, an emblematic metal port building created by the Eiffel Company in 1923 that had been transformed into an exhibition space for the European Capital of Culture season. It was displayed some months afterwards at the *Espace Van Gogh* in Arles.

The project was based on the premise that Gitano identity seems to be conceived in 'Gitano ways of doing things' rather than in identity markers that are visible at first glance. This exhibition was therefore based more on verbs than on concepts: to tell oneself, to know oneself, to live in a community, to inhabit, to express one's identity. In the making of the exhibition, the Museon Arlaten only consulted a little with Gitano communities when displaying the material collected during the 'Sharing Gitano Memories' project. According to its director, Aurélie Samson,

> It's our role to channel things and to lead the exhibition, always maintaining the link, the consultation meetings to identify the taboos, for example. We shared a great deal on a certain number of things. But on the other hand, for the scenography, the writing of the texts and the final selection of the objects to be presented, we played our role as experts[29]. (03/03/2021)

This 'Contribution' – according to Simon's analysis – can be established on 'practical' grounds, with Samson further testifying that:

---

29 The following quotes are from an interview that Alina Maggiore conducted online with Aurélie Samson, director, and Céline Salvetat, head of the audience department, at the Museon Arlaten on 3 March 2021 (our translation from French).

> We had six to eight months to put it together, to construct the speeches, to select the objects and contents, to choose a scenographer. It was quite short. I repositioned myself in the project by saying that, for the exhibition, the expert is the museum. (03/03/2021)

While the Arles Gitano community was consulted extensively on both aspects of the project –the collection of memories and the exhibition – the question of their remuneration was also raised, which Céline Salvetat, head of public services, says she had asked herself 'a lot':

> During the first focus groups, one of the acknowledged members of these communities said to me: 'What are we going to gain from participating? Will it help us get a family plot?' As a museum professional, I was not used to being told this. There was no particular desire for recognition on their part, and so he asked me what good it did him, which was completely understandable. And so, it's true that it's more in the cultural programming, given that there is this relay association, that we've been able to get women to participate in some way or other, for example. During the performances, they were the ones we could pay via the cultural program. (03/03/2021)

Salvetat's extended answer reflects the shorter responses we received to our questions on remuneration in the last part of our questionnaire.

What are the Contracting Policies and Remunerations for Collaboration?

The analysis of the answers given to the questions concerning remuneration indicates that most respondents agree with the importance of remunerating external partners[30] and that they are satisfied with the remunerative practices carried out by their institutions[31].

However, beyond statements of purpose, remuneration does not seem to be a practice that is adopted by all respondents. To the question that motivated our survey – 'Have you remunerated external partners with whom you have collaborated?' – 66% answered in the affirmative, while 34% answered in the negative. For the respondents who stated that they did remunerate external partners, they did so predominantly on a financial basis. Non-monetary compensations were also named and included entry tickets or exhibition catalogues. Tax exemptions were a possible option, but were only adopted in a few instances, as were other options that were not specified by the respondents.

---

30 When asked 'Is the remuneration of external partners important to you?', 38% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, while 29% fully agreed and 25% agreed.

31 When asked 'Are you satisfied with the remuneration of external partners?', 45% of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, while 32% agreed and 13% fully agreed, and 7% did not agree.

In response to the question 'Did you issue contracts for this collaboration?', 54% answered in the affirmative. As we wanted to determine the methods involved in these, the participants were asked to select from among the following, with order placements (text writing, creating artworks, mediation, etc.) representing the preferred option at 41%, followed by curation contracts (25%), volunteering (20%), other types of compensation without further details (13%), non-remunerated work contracts (8%) and civil service (4%). It seems that the most popular method of working with external partners is the classic model of work contracts or orders.

One response is worth including here:

> I understand that the question concerns collaboration with participating citizens. In that case it was a question of volunteering. In fact, they never really posed the question since the project was presented as an opportunity to commit/express oneself actively in, for and with an institution, while at the same time developing a common objective inside a group. = citizen experience.[32]

This pint of view confirms that the issue is not in question from the perspective of the participants of collaborative exhibitions, which contrasts with our experience in our own projects. This view is further challenged by our experiences, where external collaborators have expressed a fear of seeing their knowledge and competences exploited by the museum, especially if they originate from vulnerable communities. It is usually the museum that needs the communities rather than the other way around (Lynch 2011). Even though we noted that several professions express real determination not to propose volunteering as the sole answer to involving source communities[33], acknowledging this collaboration as a contribution of expertise for which they are remunerated is still not obvious. Most of the given responses suggest that there is a lack of adequate procedures for these situations, which are in fact resolved case by case, without museums having well-defined policies on the matter.

Nevertheless, some questionnaire respondents reported more mindful remuneration practices. This was attested, for instance, in the following extract:

> Remuneration is considered when 1) the collaborating party is not employed by or engaged voluntarily as part of an NGO; 2) the collaborating party is expected to provide or deliver more than just a mutual sharing of ideas/resources; 3) the collaborating party represents a community/voice or expert that is particularly vulnerable and often misused without payment for their expertise knowledge. This could be experts from ethnic groups as well as artists.

The questionnaire responses were complemented by interviews, including the situation Samson underlined for the Museon Arlaten. Through the cultural program, an order

---

32 Our translation from French.

33 'We find it most important to remunerate people from source communities at the same rate as other people' (our translation from French).

for a giant paella was given to the Gitano women who participated in the collection of memories for which a financial counterpart was proposed, corresponding to a 'budget line' existing in the practices of the museum. And so, the Gitana group cooked a big festive meal for the museum's audience and were paid for this.

> But it was not directly a remuneration for their involvement in the project. In the end, it was a form of work that involved them in the project, but in return for payment because they were offering a service to the visitors. (03/03/2021)

The interview with Fanny Wonu Veys, curator of the exhibition *What a Genderful World* at the Museum of World Cultures in Amsterdam in 2019, also shed light on how participants from the source community were involved in the project and how they were compensated:

> In terms of collaboration, we worked with a group of about ten people, with people who questioned or dealt with gender issues but came from very different worlds: academics, people who were transgender and helped young people in their search for their identity. There were also people from the world of theatre who questioned gender in their plays. There was a stylist from the fashion world who also questioned these ideas of gender. They were people from very different worlds, but they helped us to formulate and structure the exhibition. … They were paid. I don't know exactly how much, but we had three or four meetings with them. … They were like ambassadors for the exhibition. Especially one person who is a journalist, who is used to the media, who writes a lot. This person took on a more important role. We also developed a whole program around mediation and the exhibition. Unfortunately, most of the things were not done because of the confinement[34]. But the intention was there. … There were guided tours given by these people, during which they gave their perspectives on the exhibition. They made their own choices. … They were paid according to activities, not according to profiles. If they didn't come to the meeting, they weren't paid. And if they chose to do a guided tour, they were paid for that. (04/03/2021)

We note, through the results of the questionnaire, but also through the details provided by the interviews, that there is a discrepancy between the desire to remunerate stakeholder participation and the reality. Museums are not accustomed to contracting outsiders who do not provide scientific, artistic or technical expertise or competence. Professionals therefore implement strategies to resolve this paradox that allow them to activate 'budget lines'. Stakeholders then take on the role of mediator or chef sometimes, in order to be paid.

Perhaps it is time for museums to change their habits. It seems quite normal today to give a voice to artists or external curators who build exhibitions from subjective and

---

34 The confinement due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

sensitive narratives. Why shouldn't it be the same for members of socially vulnerable communities?

Quite certainly, the key to suitable remuneration and a better sharing of museal authority lies in taking into consideration the social vulnerability of certain groups. Acknowledging and taking into consideration the social domination that affects some groups allows for a consideration and valorization of their expertise per se. This would mean reconsidering the role of museum professionals, who, in addition to being responsible for the scientific truthfulness of what is said in the museum, could also strengthen their role as mediators between different types of knowledge.

Conclusion

The answers to our survey testify to the strategies developed in one hundred museums concerning the remuneration of source communities in the context of collaborative exhibitions. The analysis of our results suggests that, although all responding institutions declare that they establish collaboration on the level of partnership, in reality the practices that are put into action are more diverse. Most museums formed associations with external partners by informing them and consulting with them, without contracting policies, whereas other museums more easily apply collaboration by legally framing it. Some cases of co-creation originate in institutions that belong to nations in which minorities are very active politically, and often comprise Indigenous or native communities. Sharing authority, however, remained an exception among the surveyed museums. In many cases, the participants of our survey define collaboration as a commitment to the public with the objective to retrieve information for specific museal projects (collecting objects and/or documenting / exhibitions / mediation) which corresponds to a conception of collaboration as depending on the authority of the museum.

Since the 1980s and the emergence of the new museology, anthropological critiques of representation and political and cultural challenges issued by postcolonial movements, the move to make visible the processes and systems of domination has formed the backbone of museological reflection, as well as the formation and consolidation of identities. These theoretical and praxeological efforts are aligned with a hope for increased dialogue with the public and the populations that are present on the territory of each institution. Our study shows that, between the hope and the practice, there are still too many gaps that manifestly show the disparities in remunerating (or not) source communities.

Acknowledgements

References

Arnstein, Sherry Ann 1969: 'A Ladder of Citizen Participation', *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35(4):216-224. doi:10.1080/01944366908977225, accessed October 15, 2023.

Calafat, Marie-Charlotte, and Germain Viatte 2018: *Georges Henri Rivière, voir, c'est comprendre.* Marseilles: Mucem/RMN-GP.

Chaumier, Serge 2018: *Altermuséologie: Manifeste expologique sur les tendances et le devenir de l'exposition.* Paris: Hermann.

Chevallier, Denis 2008: Collecter, exposer le contemporain au Mucem. *Ethnologie française*, 4(38):631–637.

Chougnet, Jean François; and Emilie Girard eds. 2022: *Projet scientifique et Culturel (PSC) du Mucem.* Marseille: CCI Imprimerie.

Cornwall, Andrea 2008: Unpacking participation: models, meanings, practices. *Community Development Journal* 43(3):269–283.

Dallemagne, Françoise, Julia Ferloni, Alina Maggiore, Anna Mirga-Kruszelnicka, and Jonah Steinberg 2023: Construire un patrimoine romani dans les collections nationales françaises : collecte éthiques et ré-indexation des inventaires. In: *Barvalo: Roms, Sinti, Manouches, Gitans, Voyageurs…*, exhibition catalogue. Marseilles: Mucem/Anamosa.

Delarge, Alexandre. ed. 2018: *Le Musée participatif : L'ambition des écomusées.* Paris: La documentation française.

Drouguet, Noémie 2015: *Le musée de société : de l'exposition de folklore aux enjeux contemporains.* Paris: Armand Colin.

Eidelman, Jacqueline ed. 2017: *Inventer des musées pour demain.* Rapport de la mission 'Musées du XXIe siècle'. Paris: La Documentation française.

Ferloni, Julia, Alina Maggiore, and Florent Molle 2022: Partager l'autorité muséale: La rémunération de la participation des communautés-sources en question. *Culture & Musées* 39:342–347.

Ferloni, Julia, and Emilie Sitzia 2022: Quand le musée de société donne du pouvoir: enjeux de la construction participative d'expositions au Mucem. *Culture & Musées* 39:135–162.

Golding, Vivien, Wayne Modest eds. 2013: *Museums and Communities: Curators, Collections, Collaboration*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Gonseth, Marc Olivier 2000: L'Illusion muséale. In Gonseth, Marc Olivier, Jacques Hainard, et Roland Kaehr eds., *La Grande illusion*. Pp. 155–164. Neuchâtel: Musée d'Ethnographie.

Haraway, Donna 1988: Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14(3):575–599.

Lynch, Bernadette 2011: Collaboration, Contestation, and Creative Conflict: On the Efficacy of Museum/Community Partnerships. In: Janet Marstine ed., *Redefining Museum Ethics*. Pp. 146–163. London: Routledge.

Marstine, Janet 2008: *New Museum Theory and Practice: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

McSweeney, Kayte, and Jen Kavanagh eds. 2016: *Museum Participation: New Directions for Audience Collaboration*. Edinburgh: MuseumsEtc.

Molle, Florent 2019: Construire une exposition sur l'histoire sociale du VIH-sida au Mucem. *La Lettre de l'OCIM* 183:32–39.

Onciul, Bryony 2013: Community Engagement, Curatorial Practice and Museum Ethos in Alberta, Canada. In: Golding, Viv, and Wayne Modest, *Museums and Communities*.

Curators, Collections, and Collaboration, Pp. 79–97. London, New Delhi, New York: Bloomsbury.

Peers, Laura, Alison K. Brown, eds. 2003: Introduction. In: *Museums and Source Communities: A Routledge Reader*. Pp. 1–16. London and New York: Routledge.

Simon, Nina 2010: *The Participatory Museum*. http://www.participatorymuseum.org/read/, accessed January 5, 2021.

Varine, Hugues de 1978: L'écomusée. *Gazette*:28–40.

Varine, Hugues de 2006: L'écomusée : Un mot, deux concepts, mille pratiques. *Mus-A, Revista de los museos de Andalucia*, *Sevilla* 8:19–29.

Varine, Hugues de 2018: Émergence de la participation dans les musées. In: Alexandre Delarge eds., *Le musée participatif.* Pp. 45–54. Paris: La documentation française.