

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from Narrative Inquiry 31:2
© 2021. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way. The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible only to members (students and faculty) of the author's/s' institute. It is not permitted to post this PDF on the internet, or to share it on sites such as Mendeley, ResearchGate, Academia.edu.

Please see our rights policy on <https://benjamins.com/content/customers/rights>

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Narrative affordances

Audience participation in museum narration in two history museums

Chaim Noy

Bar Ilan University

Museums offer rich material environments for studying narration as jointly accomplished by institutions and audiences. Following the narrative and participatory turns museums have taken, the research explores the narrative actions audiences' texts perform vis-à-vis museums' narrations. It examines audience participation in two history museums, as elicited by response vehicles – onsite media that serve to invite and capture audience written responses. The research argues that museum response vehicles offer narrative affordances and entitlements, which shape how audiences negotiate participation as publicly documented and displayed. Comparative findings indicate that participation is shaped by response vehicles' spatio-material affordances, including how brief textual segments function as audience-based contributions in and to the historical narration. A range of audience-generated narrative actions, entitlements, and speech acts are discerned and discussed, which typically conform with, but sometimes 'override,' museums' affordances. These narrative actions shed light on the mechanics, politics and policies of public narration and agency.

Keywords: affordances, materiality, media, museums, museum audience, institutions, participation, communicative entitlements, visitor studies, language and social interaction

Introduction

Museums offer an especially rich material environment for the study of narration, as jointly accomplished by these institutions and their audiences. This is true at least since museums have embraced the narrative turn in the last quarter of the previous century, transforming from a knowledge, collection-based institution (of the like of libraries and archives), to an experience, audience-centered

institution, whose central mode of mediation is narration (Bal, 1996; Hooper-Greenhill, 1995/2013; Katriel, 1997). Museums' narrative turn amounts to a major historical transformation, shifting from a "crucial cultural apparatus of modernity" (Andermann & Arnold-de Simine, 2012, p. 4) to a post-modern institution, wherein museums "are inevitably implicated in the construction of cultural narratives" (Sandell, 2007, p. 195). The turn has powerfully affected history museums, where past events are made to successively align with chronologically ordered displays.

Examples of the dense narrative quality of contemporary museums are ubiquitous. On the homepage of the National Museum of African-American History and Culture – the most recently inaugurated Smithsonian museum (2016) – an all capitalized text reads: "A PEOPLE'S JOURNEY, A NATION'S STORY."¹ The museum presents itself as telling the story of the African-American community, while defining its relation with the nation in distinctly narrative terms. The turn to narrative is evinced also in medium-size museums, such as the museums I study: the Florida Holocaust Museum describes itself as "full of stories," where "survivors and future generations share their stories,"² and the Ammunition Hill National Memorial Museum in East Jerusalem, under the title "Our story," presents itself as "telling the tales of the battle over Jerusalem," supplying "personal stories from the liberators of Jerusalem."³

In adopting narration as their *modus vivendi* – a necessity that resulted from the rise of neoliberalism and shrinking support for public institutions – museums make use of their tangible resources to perform historical narration, including centrally the physical space of the exhibition. By rearranging spatio-material designs, museums shape how audiences are exposed to the historical events they narrate, thus institutionally "recounting past events, in which the order of narrative clauses matches the order of events as they occurred" (Labov, 2010, p. 547). These designs offer an "evolutionary itinerary" (Bennett, 1995, p. 181), or according to Russo and Watkins (2007), an "institutional sequencing of ideals" (p. 59). Andermann and Arnold-de Simine (2012) point out that "[r]ather than as ruins of a lost past, museum objects have turned into the material hinges of a potential recovery of shared meanings, by means of narrativization" (p. 4). Objects (and labels) in these settings comprise the narrative grammar and building blocks of the historical narration that unfolds in the museum during the visit, comprising a clear illustration of Bakhtin's (1986) notion of "chronotope," where narrative engulfs a nexus of spaces and temporalities.

1. <https://nmaahc.si.edu/> retrieved May 19, 2019

2. <https://www.fhlocaustmuseum.org/explore-2/collections/> retrieved March 13, 2019

3. <http://www.g-h.org.il/en/> retrieved November 11, 2019

The pressing need to cater to audiences has also resulted in museums' turn to more participatory modes of (story-)telling. This concerns promoting greater audience involvement and engagement in institutional narration, turning audiences' personal experiences and knowledge into public texts (Kidd, 2014; Mondada, 2013; Noy, 2015b, 2016a; Pollock & Zemans, 2008; Tatsi & Aljas, 2012). As the recent definition of museums proposed by the International Council of Museums (July 2019) reveals, the terms "participatory" and the expectation for "democratization" appear for the first time, replacing the older term "communication."⁴

Recent studies have pursued an interactional narrative analytic approach to museum audiences, mostly focusing on guided tours (Avni, 2013; Burdelski, 2016; Burdelski, Kawashima & Yamazaki, 2014). The present study complements these works by focusing rather on how audience participation is afforded through *response vehicles*, that is through designated onsite media that attempt to elicit audience written responses (for elicited versus non-elicited responses see Burdelski et al., 2014). Unlike the transient nature of face-to-face oral and gestural interactions in guided tours (Fukuda & Burdelski, 2019), a media-cum-materiality view of participation highlights museum media interactional and narrational affordances, as performed in a manner that is *elicited, documented (written texts) and public (part of the public sphere)*.

Response vehicles range from traditional comment books to newer and 'smarter' digital platforms and video kiosks. They share a public character that accords with the public nature of the display itself. Therefore, audiences' texts in response vehicles comprise, at the very moment of their articulation, part and parcel of the museum narration. It is how, in Katriel's (1997) words, audiences "inscribe themselves into the museum text" (p.71).

Finally, by affording participation, response vehicles offer more than a public canvas. Research on public media where participation of 'laypeople' is elicited points at *communicative entitlements*, involving the rights people are given in order to enter the public sphere and claim a voice therein (Montgomery, 2010; Noy, 2016a; Thornborrow, 2015). The notion of communicative entitlements elucidates the point that presenting one's voice in the public sphere requires more than a communication channel; it requires also a right, which furthermore needs to be publicly demonstrated. This is true also in museums, where, as we will see, instructions and framing devices grant audience *narrative entitlements*.

In the next section I turn to describe two response vehicles in two history museums, which "figure in a dialogical encounter between 'visitor narratives' and 'museum narratives'" (Andermann & Arnold-de Simine, 2012, p.5). I focus on

4. <https://icom.museum/en/activities/standards-guidelines/museum-definition/> retrieved November 10, 2019.

these devices' *narrative affordances*, or on how they enable elicitation and display of audience participation vis-à-vis the museums' narration. Later, I turn to analyze the texts themselves.

I borrow the term *affordances* from Gibson (1979) to address the material possibilities that objects present for different types of actions; or simply put, what objects afford users. The concept is active and interactional, implying – as profitably highlighted by the New Materialism paradigm – that objects and environments possess agency (Latour, 2005). Hutchby (2001) adapted the concept to communication practices and texts, contending that media differ according to the affordances they possess (cf. Cooren, 2004). That is to say, according to the different types of (inter)actions they allow and/or restrict, encourage or discourage – presently participation in museum narration. Building on recent studies that have used affordances as a framework for analyzing audience participation in the public sphere (Noy, 2015b, 2016b), the present study turns specifically to the possibilities for action in the context of museum narration.

Response vehicles in the Florida Holocaust Museum and the Ammunition Hill National Memorial Museum

The Florida Holocaust Museum (FHM) was established in 1992 in St. Petersburg, Florida. It is a regional museum that serves the southeast of the United States, and receives about 30,000 visitors annually. Most of the visitors are North American: students from schools, colleges and universities in the surrounding area, domestic tourists who visit Florida for recreation, and some international tourists (mostly from Mexico and Canada, some from Europe). The museum's core exhibition is titled: "History, Heritage, and Hope" – a title that frames a narrative mode of display, indexing a chronological structure that progresses from the past ("history"), through a past-present connection ("heritage"), to the future ("hope"). This title was given by the museum's current Executive Director, reflecting a contemporary trend in Holocaust commemoration discourse in the United States and globally. It evokes a hope-coated visitor-friendly approach, aiming to instill the museum visit with a more positive experience combined with a sense of redemption (Macdonald, 2008).

The response vehicle at the FHM includes a large comment book, consisting of 150 white unruled pages. It is positioned near the exit, in a corridor through which visitors must pass on their way out. In this way, visitors cannot avoid seeing the texts written inside the book (which is typically open) (Figure 1). Another element of the response vehicle is a grey wall that rises behind the book, on which inspirational quotes are engraved. These include famous sayings by figures known for their moral standing, such as: "Be the change/ that you want to/ see in the

world./ Mahatma Gandhi” and “Kind words can be/ short and easy to/ speak, but their/ echoes are truly/ endless./ Mother Theresa.” Across the corridor, a quote from Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel reads: “For the Dead and the Living We Must Bear Witness.” All the quotes are signed (attributed), and their engraving is shaped to resemble handwriting. In this way the museum signals how audiences should pursue participation, namely by leaving only after making a lasting contribution that expresses a sense of hopefulness that rests on personal agency. Audiences are reassured that they can and should bring about a positive moral social change. In the museum’s words: “empowering people to make positive change in the world.”⁵ By and by, the museum also supplies a concise lesson in *participatory literacy*, illustrating how to use the response vehicle: audiences are cued to produce short and concise handwritten texts, which are signed and attributed (an issue of voice and authorship).



Figure 1. The response vehicle at the exit of the FHM: Comment book, inspirational wall, and sign (permission for publication granted)

5. <https://www.fhlocaustmuseum.org/mission/> retrieved November 18, 2019

The third element of the FHM response vehicle is a sign that addresses visitors with a directive: “Tell us about your Museum experience!” and in smaller letters: “Thank you for your visit.” The address instructs visitors as to what action is expected of them and how to proceed, or what needs to be related in the texts they are to compose. The thank you token accords with the location of the response vehicle near the exit, where it serves to symbolically to mark the end of the visit. Hence while the response vehicle affords participatory activity in the shape of (hand)writing, the sign grants a specific participatory entitlement. The museum affords audience participation here by asking for a publicly performed formulation of one’s personal museum visit experience. To this, a moral component is added, which is associated with the writing activity at the Holocaust museum. As Wiesel’s quote (above) suggests, writing here bears the moral value of witnessing, and this accords with the participatory turn as well as with “museums’ newly perceived function of giving voice to the individual fate and transforming bystanders and later generations into ‘secondary witnesses’” (Andermann & Arnold-de Simone, 2012, p.7).

Audience participation at the FHM is afforded, then, at the very end of the visit, which coincides with the end of the museum narration. Katriel (1997) argues that in these contexts, visitors’ texts comprise an “audience-contributed gesture of closure” (p.71). In Labovian/classical narrative terms, eliciting audiences’ responses at the exit amounts to a participatory entitlement that concerns the *articulation of a coda*. It is a location designated for visitors’ signaling of the end of the narration by “returning the verbal perspective to the present” (Labov & Waletzky, 1997 [1967], p.35), often including resolutions and evaluations (Blum-Kulka, 1997).

The second museum is the Ammunition Hill National Memorial Museum (AHNMM). This is an Israeli military heritage complex, established in 1974 in East Jerusalem. It commemorates a difficult and famous battle that took place at the site during the 1967 War, between the Jordanian army and the Israeli army. At the same time, the museum also celebrates the victorious results of the battle and the War, framing its political outcomes in terms of Jerusalem’s “Liberation” and “Reunification” (“the greatest event in the history of the People”).⁶ The museum is relatively small, dark, and partly sunken – qualities which echo the trenches on the Hill where the battle took place. The exhibition portrays the battle by means of multiple documents, maps, historical armory, and descriptions that glorify heroism and military masculinity, and the sacrifice the soldiers had made.

The museum’s national commemoration ideology is conveyed through the Commemoration Wall, on which the names of the deceased soldiers are engraved in gold, and through letters soldiers sent their families and personal diaries they

6. <http://www.g-h.org.il/about-us> retrieved July 1, 2019

kept. These artifacts validate the museum's claim for authenticity and establish it as a legitimate site of national and military heritage. They also serve to humanize the soldiers, and strengthen the emotional linkage between the historical figures and the audiences, along a triangle whose nodes are nationalism, militarism, and hegemonic masculinity.

The response vehicle in the AHNMM consists of a large comment book with a thick leather cover, whose pages are made of parchment-like material (not paper). The pages are not blank but contain symbols of the State, the Jerusalem Municipality, the Israeli army, and the museum's logo. The comment book is offered inside an especially designed monument-like steel structure (Figure 2), which is the main display in the hall. In the background, an audio recording repeatedly recites names of dead soldiers, including their ranks, affiliation, nicknames, and the names of their parents. This further contributes to a sense of familiarity, and intensifies the multi-sensory commemorative environment.

Crucially, the AHNMM's response vehicle is *not* located near the exit, but in a location that is symbolically reverse: in one of its innermost "sacred" commemoration halls, near the last hall where the Wall of Commemoration and the eternal burning light are displayed. Thus positioned, the response vehicle's narrative affordances diverge considerably from those at the FHM. They invite less reflection and conclusion and more participation amidst commemoration.

A sign near the comment book addresses visitors directly with requests regarding *how* to write: "Students, Soldiers, and Visitors/ Please indicate your impressions in a concise and respectful manner/ Kindly, regard the guest book in a manner appropriate to the Ammunition Hill Site". Here too the sign is part of the museum's "prescriptivist discourse," where "metapragmatic directions are often formulated as explicit 'instructions'" (to borrow Agha's, 2005, p.51, terminology). In other words, the museum instructs audiences as to norms of language use, through which it seeks to ensure a connection between the texts they author and the institutional context where participation is afforded ("a manner appropriate to the Ammunition Hill Site").

Researching museums

Studying museums requires initially gaining 'entry to the field,' which in both museums I have secured through meetings with institutional gatekeepers. In Florida the process was formal and longer and involved email exchanges that lead to meetings with the museum's Executive Director and Board Members. Discussions revolved around clarifications concerning photography in the museum, and assuring that my observations would not be distracting for audiences (seen as stalking). At the AHNMM I had one meeting with the museum's CEO, which I



Figure 2. The response vehicle amidst commemoration at the AHNMM: Comment book and monument-like structure (permission for publication granted)

secured through ‘weak’ personal ties (I taught his nephew once), and which was informal. In both cases, I successfully secured access to the museums, allowing repeated entries, picture-taking, and fully documenting texts in the response vehicles and activities around it (Noy, 2011, 2015a).

At the FHM my research took place between 2012–2015. I visited the museum multiple times, observing staff and visitors, and noting changes in the display and the curatorial approach. I documented over 3,023 texts in the museums’ comment book, most of which were in English (98%), with an average length of 16.3 words per text. At the AHNMM research took place between 2006–2012. I documented over 1,032 texts, mostly written in Hebrew (65%) and English (28%; and to lesser degrees in French, Russian, and German), with an average length of 16 words per text.

Estimating the number of visitors who engage in response vehicles is tricky. Overall, about a third of the visitors read the book, and about 10% of those pursue writing (compare Macdonald, 2005, whose figure is 20%). Yet these figures pertain to *all* visitors, including many school groups who are rushed through the museum with no time or opportunity to stop by the response vehicle. The figures

are quite higher when smaller groups are observed (families, couples and individuals), about half of whom spend time reading, and a fifth of those also pursue writing. I note that both museums offer guided tours (the FHM also offers an audio guide), yet these end before they reach the exit area. While I sometimes heard teachers and docents encourage school-age visitors to write in the visitor book (mostly in the FHM), the dynamics which led to writing were usually not part of the tours.

Closing gestures and participatory narrative entitlements

I turn to examine audience's texts, which are telegraphic and clearly not "distinct, fully fledged units" of narrative (Georgakopoulou, 2007a, p.36). Nonetheless, I argue that within the museums' narrational context they perform narrative functions. I discuss four generic types of texts (Bakhtin, 1981, p.251) at the FHM (Evaluating experience, Commissives/directives, Critical evaluations, and Biographic anecdotes) and three at the AHNMM (Writing as an action, Evaluating the museum visit, and Critical and polemic evaluations). The texts are grouped according to their situated "meaning effects" (Blommaert, 2015), which concerns the pragmatic action they accomplish (what discourse *does* in particular contexts, such as through various types of speech acts), and specifically the narrative functions they perform (evaluations, complicating actions, coda).

Closing gestures at the FHM

"My Holocaust Experience was Great!": Evaluating experience

Most of the texts (about half of the book's texts) address the experience of the museum visit, expressing positive evaluations, sometimes along with tokens of gratitude (which serve evaluatively as well). In this way, audiences show that they understand what needs to be done at the response vehicle, and that they can construct the appropriate texts. Accordingly, these texts echo the words of the museum sign, and indeed the words "experience," "museum," and "thank you" are among the five most frequently used words in the book.⁷

Text 1: Excellent Experience/⁸ Thanks very much !/ E

7. Transcription notation: *italicized words* were written in Hebrew; a slash/ indicates a line break; two question marks ?? indicate an unclear/unreadable word; and words in [square brackets] were added by me (clarifications). To keep, anonymity, visitors' family names are not presented.

8. Misspelling in the original.

Text 2: My Holocaust/ experience was great!/ It was very/ interesting and/ made me want/ to learn more/ ♥ Taylor/ [surname]/ (3/20/13)

Text 3: Profound 8-16-2013

These short texts function as closing gestures or coda, which echo the museum's wording, sometimes verbatim, and through which an intra-textual association is established between audience texts and the institution. It is how visitors accomplish the participatory narrative work they are asked to perform.

The first text is representative of a minimal participatory currency, namely a very brief and formulaic gesture that includes a positive evaluation of the (museum) experience, and is followed by an expression of politeness (in the order of the text in the museum sign). Text 2 possibly includes a misunderstanding. It implies that the visitor understood the task of formulating an experiential coda that needs to address the museum's theme positively (hopefulness). Yet these 'ingredients' got mixed up while writing, resulting in that the adjective "excellent" refers to the Holocaust and not the museum/experience. After addressing the museum experience, the writer (Taylor) turns to its consequences, by associating between the visit, which is ending, and its effects, which are just beginning. The text reminds us of the liminal positioning of this response vehicle, located as it is on the premises but *facing outside* – towards the social spheres that lie beyond the spatio-temporal confines of the visit. Text 3 is a one-word evaluative token. It illustrates the highly contextual nature of participation here, where a single adjective (with no grammatical subject) achieves meaningfulness and comprises a token of participation. It speaks of narrative "immediacy" (Georgakopoulou, 2007a, p. 40).

At the end of the visit, audiences are required to present literacy skills in the shape of formulating a positive evaluation that includes the description of the experience they had had, and that marks the conclusion of the ritual of the visit. The evaluation is often combined with words of gratitude, which take the shape of expressive speech acts and, sometimes, are also conveyed non-verbally (smilies, hearts). The documented public evaluation of the experience gains significance in light of the *narrative entitlement* that audiences are granted: while the museum is entitled to mediate the past, narrate the history of the Holocaust, establish its truthfulness and supply moral evaluation, audiences are entitled to report on their onsite experience, to evaluate it, and thus to stabilize the institutional narration. This is the contribution and validation that *they* can perform in and to the narration.

"I vow to never again sit by": Commissive and directive speech acts

The second frequent group of closing gestures (about 40% of the texts) includes future-oriented texts, which accomplish closure by marking the onset of that

which will follow the visit (typically not focusing on or evaluating the museum or the visit). Like Text 2 above, these texts concern the consequences of the visit, and serve to extend its effects. They call to mind a point made in the study of “small stories,” that it is not the past that lies at their core, but future events and actions. As Georgakopoulou (2007b) writes, “[s]tories become rehearsals for later action more than reconstructions of the past; they are more about imagining the future than about remembering the past” (p.150). The texts accomplish this task by expressing their authors’ commitment or by instructing others to engage (using commissive and directive speech acts, respectively); and while they do not possess a narrative structure, they convey a stronger sense of narrativity than did the previous textual group, where evaluating experience was at the core.

Text 4: One of the most profound and/ spiritual experiences of my life./ I vow to never again sit by and allow/ antisemitism to go unnoticed. History/ cannot be allowed to repeat itself./ Thank you for creating a beautiful/ space for memories to be/ preserved. ??

Text 5: It was a/ intresting/ experience & I had/ a wonderful time,/ Don’t be a bystander/ – Keith [surname]/ 2K13 😊 / [drawing of lips/kiss]

Text 6: Lest we forget...!

Texts 4–5 begin with a positive evaluation of the museum, yet here these serve as a springboard for commissive (“I vow to never”) and directive (“Don’t be a bystander”) speech acts that immediately follow. The texts draw a connection between the historical narrative the museum conveys, and its extension on to the present and the future. In an explicit and proactive manner, these texts expand the narration by supplying continuity. The texts testify that the institution’s narrative points at a historical moral breach, which creates a sense of personal accountability; this, in turn, propels audiences to publicly take action. This action is first and foremost a narrative and declarative one: the act of engaging the response vehicle by formulating a moral coda vis-à-vis Holocaust narration.

In comparison to the first group of texts (above), the authors’ “I” is present. In Text 4, between the formulaic opening and ending, the commissive speech act evokes the author in a moral statement that is correlated with the immensity of the experience (“One of the most profound and spiritual experiences of my life”). The moral connection between past and future is established in the following text as well, here through a directive. The resemblance between the texts rests on the moral character of the speech acts, combined with a future orientation. Note that the directive in Text 5 creates a shift in addressivity. The text is, typically, directed at the museum, and yet by instructing other visitors as to what (not) do to (“Don’t be a bystander”), the author momentarily assumes an entitlement of communicating *directly with visitors*. This shift in addressivity demonstrates an additional

narrative entitlement, where the author-visitor assumes the right to align with the museum and address the visitors, which is the museum's communication prerogative. The third text (Text 6) is brief and includes an indirect, plural commissive speech act, whereby the author positions her/himself as "we". It is reminiscent of Text 3 ("Profound"), resting on the highly contextual nature of narration here. Authors show that they understand the moral bearings of the museum narration, and that, moreover, they need to convey moral commitment through declaring future undertakings.

In her work on short evaluative narratives on TripAdvisor, Vásquez (2011) finds a similar employment of speech acts that serve as actions that bind past and future. Vásquez shows that the coda of the stories she studied typically consisted of "advice, suggestion, warning, directive, or admonition" (p.112). More than marking the end of the narration, or drawing a connection to the present, the coda that these texts perform serves to preclude the "what happened then" question (Labov, 2010, p.547). Compared to the first group of texts (evaluation of experience), these texts assume a stronger narrative entitlement: they invoke their authors, as also other members of the audience, through directives and first-person plural commissives.

Finally, while these texts do not repeat the words in the sign nearby, they are nonetheless part of the canonic global discourse of Holocaust commemoration. Frequent expressions such as "never forget!" and "Never again!" are common ("never" is the fourth most frequent word in the comment book). They bring to mind Macdonald's (2005) observation, that these are clichés that perform "a talismanic activity that can contribute towards warding off a bad future" (p.170). Vows and pledges are future-oriented and serve, as argued above, to extend the museum's narration – through audiences' voices/actions – thus intertextually tying it to global discourses. If this is true, then visitors are demonstrating their literacy in global Holocaust commemoration discourse. If the former group of texts used citation to establish intra-textuality (repeating the words in the sign), these texts draw on intertextuality and interdiscursivity to connect with – and import – global discourses.

"America is an angry place today": Critical evaluations

The third group of closing gestures stands out because, by formulating negative or critical evaluations, the texts perform critical closures of the institution's narration.

Text 7: America is an angry/ place today. The Holocaust/ experience occurs many times in/ various forms Thru out

Text 8: I FEAR WE ARE ON/ THE PATH TO HISTORY/ RepeATIng ITSeLf.

Text 9: This level of violence and/ hate is overwhelming – but/ the worst[c] part is that it/ Continues today./ May we learn./ KeNtucky/ Somerset/ 2-10-14

These texts do not address the museum experience and barely evoke Holocaust clichés or perform intertextualities. Instead, they are *critical and sometimes polemic*, referencing genocides, past and present. This referencing stands in contrast with the institutional narrative entitlement that directs audiences to reflect on their museum visit/experience, and not on historical events or other genocides. In fact, the word “Holocaust” is not mentioned anywhere near the response vehicle, and consequently it appears in less than 5% of the texts. Referencing the Holocaust directly in these texts serves as a springboard for a critical assessment of the present, and not the past. Compared to most of the book’s texts, referring to the Holocaust not as a singular event (“occurs many times”), and proposing that there are worse things (“the worst part is that it Continues today”), are rare and *destabilizing*. In such ways, the texts are *not aligned* with the institutional-endowed entitlements and with their optimistic, hopeful, and agentic terminology.

Consider Text 7, which commences not with a reference to the museum, and not even to Germany, the Reich, or to Jews, but to “America”; moreover, the text does not reference the past, but the present. Evoking America is powerful because it *recalibrates* the place of the narration (topos), while the word “today” does the same for the timeframe (chronos). Together, a critical and subversive coda is formulated: the moral atrocity is not removed to a different time-space (then/there), but is an immediate concern of the here-and-now. This is the new chronotopic calibration or narrative-focusing of the museum’s narration. It is furthermore augmented by a shift in the emotional register: while the exhibit evokes sadness, fear and despair, and towards the exit seeks to instill a sense of hopefulness, these texts inject anger and frustration.

The coda that these texts offer indicates a problematization, not a resolution, as the texts contend that the Holocaust narrative should not any longer be a “contained account” of the past (Macdonald, 2008, p.173). The texts critique the failure of implementing moral lessons of the Holocaust, its moral mediation and pedagogy – and therefore also of the prevention of genocides – which are precisely the subject matter over which this and other Holocaust museums preside. Accordingly, the narrative entitlement that these texts demonstrate diverges from the museum’s designation as from the entitlements expressed in other texts.

“I witnessed the Kristalnacht”: Biographical anecdotes and personal connection to the Holocaust

Texts in the fourth and last group of closing gestures at the FHM perform *historical biographical anecdotes*. They are the only texts that manifest a narrative structure. The museum or the experience are rarely mentioned, nor are commissive or directive speech acts. This group represents less than 1% of the overall number of texts, but includes the longest texts on average (25 words per text).

Text 10: I witnessed the Kristalnacht/ I was 11 years old/ Fimi? [Surname]

Text 11: I was living near Amsterdam and/ witnessed deportation of the Jews to/ camps (includes a family friend./ ??

Text 12: DP Camp/ at Landsburg/ is where I was/ born and as I/ walked around/ this building -/ there was a/ picture of it -/ I stared at/ it – oh my./ it really exists/ Evelyn [Surname]/ 12/22/13/ [drawing of a David shield]

These brief autobiographical vignettes clearly have historical events as their focus. They do not remediate the exhibition but add to it mini-narratives of personal knowledge, experience and memory. For their authors, historical events comprise what Blommaert (2015) calls “contexts available to me” (p.113). Their narrative actions align them with the museum, which mediates the past, and not with other audiences, who remediate the display. Their narrative entitlement is accordingly unique, i.e. telling a relevant story of personal historical experience.

Texts 10–11 mention the act of witnessing explicitly (and reflexively), in this way establishing their authors as historical figures who possess *direct access* to iconic Holocaust events: Kristallnacht and deportations of Jews. Structurally, the first text begins with a complicating action (witnessing) followed by an orientation (the author’s age), and the second text with an orientation (where he lived), followed by a complicating action (witnessing). Text 12 is more developed. It too focuses on the Holocaust, but it interestingly incorporates the museum. This autobiographical vignette commences with an orientation, after which the visit serves as the complicating action (“walked around”, “stared”). During the visit, the visitor sees a picture of the displaced persons camp where she was born. The word “museum” is not mentioned but “this building,” endowing her storied experience with a sense of palpability and drama. The short story’s crescendo arrives when the visitor-survivor reports having surprisingly recognized the place as her birthplace, at which point she says (to herself): “oh my. it really exists” (see Vásquez & Urzúa, 2009, on dramatization effects of reporting on inner mental states). In this and other texts, representative speech acts are frequent, serving to validate historical events.

Texts in this small group are the only structured narratives in the book, and although they were written at the exit, they do not function as conclusions. Arguably, had these visitors the opportunity to articulate their stories in different points along the chronologically ordered exhibition, they might have offered them elsewhere, not at the end of the visit/historical narration.

Closing gestures at the AHNMM

I begin by noting that while the largest group of texts at the FHM perform closure by repeating the museum's words, at the AHNMM such practice is rare. Visitors do not reference the intuitional address (sign), and words that appear in the sign (such as "impressions") are absent from the corpus. There are several possible explanations, such as cultural differences in audiences' compliance, or different knowledges and discursive resources that audiences possess and employ when formulating texts. Audiences are rather responding to the spatio-narrative affordances of the museum's response vehicle. Recall that the response vehicle at the AHNMM is physically and symbolically positioned in one of the museum's innermost halls, and not anywhere near the exit.

"To the fallen brothers in arms. [I am] saluting you": Writing as action in the commemorative narration

The largest group of texts (nearly 65%) position their authors as *actors in the historical commemorative narrative the museum narrates*. The texts do not serve as a coda that concludes the narration or as a reflexive evaluation of the museum/visit, but as events that are part of the historical scene (complicating actions) which has not ended and is not contained.

Text 13: *To the fallen brothers in arms./ [I am] saluting you./ A warrior.*

Text 14: *3.5.2006/ In your merit we live here in Mt. Scopus⁹/ and Unified Jerusalem/ May your memory be a blessing/ Jacqueline*

Text 15: *Thank you for giving your lives to/ Jerusalem¹⁰/ Avinoan [surname]*

Text 16: *To the soldiers -/ We owe you/ EVERYTHING*

Most of the texts in this group are in English, and they position their authors as interactants who are *directly communicating with the commemorated historical figures*. This is accomplished by a specific type of addressivity, where a second-person address is directed to the historical figures, which sets the texts' action

9. Mt. Scopus is a Jewish neighborhood located nearby.

10. Note the language shift (or codeswitching, also in text 16), which is frequent in English texts, where words such as Jerusalem and The Land of Israel, are often written in Hebrew.

arena (Noy, 2009). As mentioned, the narrative entitlement that these texts demonstrate seems to ensue from the response vehicle's spatio-narrative affordances and not from the sign that addresses the visitors.

Text 13 is succinct in a militaristic style. It performs an iconic gesture of display of honor: a salute. The text consists of three lines or parts: address, action, and signature, where the last element establishes the identity of the visitor as an insider. This also concerns a communicative entitlement, indexing an action that befits its author's right. The next three examples represent texts that express gratitude directly to the soldiers, whose ultimate sacrifice in the past enables civic and leisure life in the present. The commemorated soldiers are often described admiringly as "warriors," "heroes," "lions," "righteous," "angels," and "kings," whose past actions are actively shaping the present. The visitors re-establish and re-validate the political narrative that the museum draws between the past, which is narrated as heroic and mythic, and the present, which is mundane and ordinary, and is populated by laypeople and everyday events. This is the nexus between the ethos and the public, and it suggests that the past has not passed, but is part of the visitors' everyday lives and experiences.

These texts 'short-circuit' the institutional mediation and avoid addressing the museum or the experience of visiting it altogether. Instead, by positioning their authors as acting directly within the same sphere of past military heroes ("brothers in arms"), they invoke a homologous chronotope – a relationship of times and places that serves in "denying the relevance of intervening patterns of change and development" (Blommaert, 2015, p.111). As media scholar Scannell (2000) writes in relation to mediation in public media, "history is relocated: it is no longer 'then', but 'now', no longer 'there' but 'here'" (p.21).

An additional explanation for the frequency of direct addresses to deceased figures lies in the museum's location, which is where the historical events took place. This location grants the museum a powerful indexical quality, whereby it "maintains a real spatial contiguity with the trauma itself" (Violi, 2012, p.39; which the FHM lacks). AHNMM is a "hot" site, where the historical narration is anchored in the historical site, and this quality manifests itself in the texts, which also reconstitute it. From a narrative affordances perspective, these are geo-spatial affordances that *augment* the special location of the response vehicle inside the museum space, adding the politics of the location of the museum within the urban spaces of (East) Jerusalem.

"It was very moving": Evaluating the museum visit

Despite the response vehicle's unusual location and ensuing narrative affordances, a third of the book's texts nevertheless show that their authors understand their narrative-historical role in a manner typical to response vehicles. Consequently,

in this group of texts participation is performed by formulating an evaluative conclusion in relation to the visit and the narrative that the museum conveys (like the first group of texts in the FHM).

Text 17: The museum is/ a true testament to the/ courage + bravery of the/ soldiers who died for Jerusalem/ + Israel/ Jo-Ann [surname], London/ 8 Aug 2006

Text 18: *This museum is very very important, and very/ moving, I didn't stop crying of excitement./ [it's] so important to commemorate the/ place and all the people who gave their/ lives may their memory be a blessing./* Chava [surname]/ Boynton Beach/ Florida

Text 19: *The visit has taught us about the difficult battles/ and the high price in blood that we paid/ so that today we can walk around and live in Jerusalem, freely and quietly./ it was a moving visit/ The Shaked Family*

Most of the texts in this group are in Hebrew, and the museum/visit comprises their subject. Where an explicit address is offered, it is directed to the museum or the staff, who are viewed as the accountable agents of commemoration. In Text 17, the term “testament” is mentioned in relation to the museum, which is praised for successfully communicating not only historical facts, but also the heroes’ qualities (“courage + bravery”). The adjective “true” serves as a public recognition of the museum’s mediational quality. In Text 18, the museum is described as “important” and “moving” (stressed by intensifiers), and its commemoration of both “place” and “people” is acknowledged and praised. Text 19 focuses on the visit’s educational theme. The Shaked family conveys what it has learned during the visit, namely the *causal narrative connection* the AHNMM seeks to establish between the past (“difficult battles”/“high price in blood”), and the present (“walk around and live in Jerusalem”). This family demonstrates that it fully grasped the museum’s political-historical narrative, and moreover, that it can now *retell* its highlights concisely, in its own voice. The threefold repetition of the first-person plural form is noteworthy: the first instance references the family (“us”), the second references the imagined Israeli-Zionist collective in the past (“we paid”), and the third references the imagined Israeli-Zionist collective at the present (“today we can walk”). The repetition blurs the distinction between the actual family presently visiting the museum, and the imagined “national ‘we-group’” (Wodak, et al., 2009, p. 33). It thus secures the connection between past and present, dead war heroes and ‘ordinary’ museum audiences.

In terms of affordances, texts in this group illustrate the point that affordances are not an objective quality of media, but relational in the sense that users make use of them selectively. For the authors of these texts, the positioning of the response vehicle is not a consequential affordance, and there are rather

other elements that shape audience participation, including norms and previous knowledge.

“Enough already”: Critical and polemic evaluations

The third and last group also has the museum and its narrative as its subject, yet the closing gesture these texts performs is *critical and at times polemic*. Here the coda supplies a negative assessment of one or another elements of the narration. This occurs infrequently (less than 2% of the texts), and exclusively in Hebrew texts.

Text 20: *I enjoyed very much but/ all is [“]my power and the strength/ of my hands have produced this wealth/ for me[”]¹¹ where/ is God [mentioned]???* / David

Text 21: *In God’s help this place is very very moving with the story/ and all the soldiers that have fallen but the question is until when/ will these wars persist enough already I/ hope and wish that it’ll stop forever and that there’ll be/ peace amen in Israel the Holy Land./ France*

Text 22: *With the end of the deportation of Jews from Gush Katif/ a museum needs to be erected/ a memorial/ in memory of a region/ that was torn[,] destroyed and annihilated / at the hands of evil cursed people/ with no heart no compassion*

Text 20 commences with a positive token of evaluation, which is immediately curtailed by a divine moral reprimand (a citation from the Book of Deuteronomy). The quotation reprimands those claiming their success is a result of their own doings, rather than of divine agency. It is a criticism of the attribution of agency that the museum makes, and as such it criticizes a core element in its narration. The visitor then poses a rhetorical question, which is rare in the corpus, but common in signaling opposing arguments in public discourse (Badarneh, 2009). Similarly, Text 21 begins with a positive evaluation that is followed by the contrastive “but,” to raise a rhetorical question, which it then answers. This critique addresses the museums’ sanctification and heroization of the dead soldiers, devoid of any possibility for non-violent resolution. This critique, too, aims at a core element in the museum’s ideological (militaristic) narrative. Text 22 is more oppositional and offers no words of politeness whatsoever. It proposes that a different museum be built instead in order to commemorate a *different and antithetical* historical event – Israel’s Disengagement Plan from the Gaza of Strip (which was executed during Prime Minister Shaorn’s administration, in August 2005) – which the

11. Quotation from Deuteronomy 8:17. Bible Gate online translation.

<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Deuteronomy+8%3A17-18&version=NIV>

author frames by the pregnant formulation: “deportation of Jews.” Evoking “deportation” establishes an interdiscursive analogy between the actions of the State of Israel and those of the Third Reich.

Texts in this group have the museum and its narration, of which they are critical, as their focus. Critique is not made regarding the historical events themselves, including, for instance, the fact that the battle at Ammunition Hill is presently viewed as unnecessary and its execution as severely flawed. In this way, these texts are similar to the critical textual subgroup at the FHM, where both groups show understanding of the museum’s narrative, but diverge with regards to one or more elements in how it interprets history and the future-lessons it teaches. The third text is more radical than the former two in that it does not suggest a ‘correction’ to the institutional narrative, but its comprehensive replacement.

Conclusions

Studying the texts that museum audiences author sheds light on narrative affordances and entitlements in contexts of participation in larger narrations. The comparison between the two museums’ response vehicles (onsite media) and their audiences’ texts, allows to comparatively discern what connections exist between institutional affordances and entitlements, on the one hand, and audiences’ texts, on the other hand.

The main findings suggest that audience contributions to institutional narration are heavily shaped by the spatio-material affordances of the museums’ response vehicles. At the FHM, the response vehicle is positioned near the exit, intended thus to elicit formulations of a coda to the museum’s historical narration. Consequently, most of the texts offer positive reflections on, and evaluations of, the museum visit or experience. The texts supply public expression of a personal (inner/mental) experience, granting authenticity and validation to the institution, which rest on the perceived spontaneity of expression of laypeople in the public sphere (Montgomery, 2010). Contrarywise, the response vehicle at the AHNMM is positioned in the ‘heart’ of the commemoration display. Consequently, most of the texts position their authors as actors in the commemorative narrative realm the museum recounts. They do not offer reflections or conclusions but ‘pull’ the past to the present (and vice versa), using the response vehicle as a time-portal that allows access to a homologous chronotope.

These differences are evinced also in a range of narrative entitlements: showing indebtedness to the museum for a comprehensive and meaningful narration (FHM) versus ignoring the museum and addressing admiration directly to the commemorated historical figures (AHNMM). At stake are different chronotopes

which audiences enact and which establish them differently as historical actors in the “co-occurrence of events from different times and places” (Blommaert, 2015, p.109). Entitlements and chronotopes are communicated by using different speech acts, ranging from commissive and directive, through expressive, to representative speech.

Findings also highlight texts that *diverge* from the institutions’ affordances and entitlements. Texts which attest to their authors’ personal connection to the Holocaust do not address the museum/visit or offer narrative conclusions or evaluations. Instead, these are brief biographical testimonies, which establish visitors’ *unmediated* relation to the past. Additionally, in both museums polemical texts are voiced, albeit differently: at the FHM these texts express anger and frustration at the colossal moral failure of preventing genocides and of offering a “contained” account of the Holocaust (Macdonald, 2008, p.173). They refute a view of a “narrative of progress” that the museum narrates (Crane, 2006, p.107), and reject the option of redemptive re-tellings. At the AHNMM, polemical texts are more blatantly confrontational, criticizing the historical narration on theological and political grounds. All diverging texts share the quality of ‘overriding’ contextual narrative affordances and entitlements, which they do by employing audiences’ pre-existing knowledges and ideologies.

These findings offer several theoretical connections and contributions. First, they reaffirm the argument made by the “small stories” analytic perspective (Georgakopoulou, 2007a, 2007b), that brief expressions that do not possess a narrative structure may nonetheless function narratively within larger narrative contexts. The findings confirm the “growing recognition,” in Vásquez’s (2012) words, “of the diversity of narrative types and narrative activities” (p.105). Second, viewed through the lens of New Materialism, the findings are part of a conceptual shift from looking at the effects that material designs have on narration (unidirectional ‘media effects’ approach), to focusing on spatio-material narrative affordances and complex co-anchoring of media materiality and narratability. Affordances tap simultaneously on channels for narration *and* on entitlements to narrative action. In this light, audience texts are best seen as assemblages (Latour, 2005), incorporating institutions, historical narratives or chronotopes, and media materialities and affordances – showing different distributions of agency. Here Cooren’s (2018) theory of ventriloquation (after Bakhtin) springs to mind, suggesting that audiences’ texts range from how audiences use museum media to narrate, to how museums narrate or ‘speak’ through their audiences (ventriloquizing the latter). A question of voice and agency.

Relatedly, Blommaert (2015) argues that Bakhtin’s idea of chronotope connects materiality and history through the notion of *scale*, i.e. the micro-macro spheres of narration. Museums are macro narrators that conjure large spreads of

pasts and places that they ‘scale down’ and make tangibly present to their audiences. Response vehicles are then interfaces by which audiences negotiate scalar accessibility and entitlement, and are able to narrate participation in different chronotopes.

All this leads to issues of power relations and politics as manifest in representation and performativity, and how public institutions offer (and guard) entry to the public sphere. Museum narration is clearly a political action (Barrett, 2011; Bennett, 1995), where response vehicles serve as “metonymy of the museum itself” (Bounia, 2012, p. 117), suggesting that the “issue of access to places of visibility is a central political question” (p. 116). Findings point at differential distribution of semiotic resources and narrative entitlements, and this carries practical implications regarding the mechanics, politics and policies of engaging audiences and enhancing democratization of narratives in museums’ public spheres. Especially so when audiences bring with them to museums challenging entitlements, knowledges and ideologies.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to two anonymous reviewers of *Narrative Inquiry*, for their constructive and helpful comments, which have helped improve the paper significantly. All errors are my own.

An earlier and partial version of the paper was presented at the 23rd annual conference of the Israel Communication Association (ISCA), April 16th, 2019, Hadassah Academic College, Jerusalem, Israel.

References

- Agha, A. (2005). Voice, footing, enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 38–59. <https://doi.org/10.1525/jlin.2005.15.1.38>
- Andermann, J., & Arnold-de Simine, S. (2012). Introduction: memory, community and the new museum. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 29(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276411423041>
- Avni, S. (2013). Homeland tour guide narratives and the discursive construction of the diasporic. *Narrative Inquiry*, 23(2), 227–244. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.23.2.01avn>
- Badarneh, M.A. (2009). Exploring the use of rhetorical questions in editorial discourse: a case study of Arabic editorials. *Text & Talk*, 29(6), 639–659. <https://doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2009.033>
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). The problem of speech genres (V.W. McGee, Trans.). In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.) *Speech genres and other late essays* (pp. 60–102). Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Bal, M. (1996). *Double exposures: The subject of cultural analysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Barrett, J. (2011). *Museums and the public sphere*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bennett, T. (1995). *The birth of the museum: History, theory, politics*. London: Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. (2015). Chronotopes, scales, and complexity in the study of language in society. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 44, 105–116.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102214-014035>
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk: Cultural patterns of sociability and socialization in family discourse*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Bounia, A. (2012). The visitor book: Visibility, performance and representation. In F.V. Bose, K. Poehls, F. Schneider, & A. Schulze (Eds.), *Museum X* (pp. 111–118). Berlin: Panama Verlag.
- Burdelski, M. (2016). We-focused and I-focused stories of World War II in guided tours at a Japanese American museum. *Discourse & Society*, 27(2), 156–171.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926515611553>
- Burdelski, M., Kawashima, K. & Yamazaki, K. (2014). Storytelling in guided tours: Practices, engagement, and identity at a Japanese American museum. *Narrative Inquiry*, 24(2), 328–346. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.24.2.08bur>
- Cooren, F. (2004). Textual agency: How texts do things in organizational settings. *Organization*, 11(3), 37–393. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508404041998>
- Cooren, F. (2018). Materializing communication: Making the case for a relational ontology. *Journal of Communication*, 68(2), 278–288. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqx014>
- Crane, S.A. (2006). The conundrum of ephemerality: Time, memory, and museums. In S. Macdonald (Ed.), *A companion to museum studies* (pp. 98–109). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996836.ch7>
- Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967/1997). Narrative analysis. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1–4), 3–38.
- Fukuda, C. & Burdelski, M. (2019). Multimodal demonstrations of understanding of visible, imagined, and tactile objects in guided tours. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 52(1), 20–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2019.1572857>
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2007a). *Small stories, interaction, and identities*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sin.8>
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2007b). Thinking big with small stories in narrative and identity analysis. In M. G. W. Bamberg (Ed.), *Narrative – state of the art* (pp. 145–154). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. <https://doi.org/10.1075/bct.6.15geo>
- Gibson, J.J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E. (Ed.) (1995/2013). *Museum, media, message*. London: Routledge.
- Hutchby, I. (2001). Technologies, texts and affordances. *Sociology*, 35(2), 441–456.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/S0038038501000219>
- Katriel, T. (1997). *Performing the past: A study of Israeli settlement museums*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kidd, J. (2014). *Museums in the new mediascape: Transmedia, participation, ethics*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate.
- Labov, W. (2010). Oral narratives of personal experience. In P.C. Hogan (Ed.), *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the language sciences* (pp. 546–548). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Macdonald, S. (2005). Accessing audiences: visiting visitor books. *Museum and Society*, 3(3), 119–136. <https://doi.org/10.29311/mas.v3i3.65>
- Macdonald, S. (2008). *Difficult heritage: negotiating the Nazi past in Nuremberg and beyond*. London: Routledge.
- Mondada, L. (2013). Displaying, contesting and negotiating epistemic authority in social interaction: Descriptions and questions in guided visits. *Discourse Studies*, 15(5), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445613501577>
- Montgomery, M. (2010). Rituals of personal experience in television news interviews. *Discourse & Communication*, 4(2), 185–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481310364322>
- Noy, C. (2009). “I WAS HERE!”: Addressivity structures and inscribing practices as indexical resources. *Discourse Studies*, 11(4), 421–440. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445609105218>
- Noy, C. (2011). The aesthetics of qualitative (re)search: Performing ethnography at a heritage museum. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(10), 917–929. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800411425008>
- Noy, C. (2015a). *Thank you for dying for our country: Commemorative texts and performances in Jerusalem*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199398973.001.0001>
- Noy, C. (2015b). Writing in museums: Towards a rhetoric of participation. *Written Communication*, 32(2), 195–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088315574703>
- Noy, C. (2016a). “My Holocaust Experience was Great!”: Entitlements for participation in museum media. *Discourse & Communication*, 10(3), 274–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481315623901>
- Noy, C. (2016b). Participatory media new and old: Semiotics and affordances of museum media. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 33(4), 308–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2016.1227865>
- Pollock, G., & Zemans, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Museums after modernism: Strategies of engagement*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Russo, A., & Watkins, J. (2007). Digital cultural communication: Audience and remediation. In F. Cameron & S. Kenderdine (Eds.), *Theorizing digital cultural heritage: A critical discourse* (pp. 149–164). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262033534.003.0009>
- Sandell, R. (2007). *Museums, prejudice, and the reframing of difference*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203020036>
- Scannell, P. (2000). For-anyone-as-someone structures. *Media, Culture & Society*, 22(1), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016344300022001001>
- Tatsi, T., & Aljas, A. (2012). Democratising collections through audience participation: Opportunities and obstacles. *International Journal of the Inclusive Museum*, 4(4), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-2014/CGP/V04I04/44362>
- Thornborrow, J. (2015). *The discourse of public participation media: from talk show to twitter*. London: Routledge.
- Vásquez, C. (2011). Complaints online: The case of TripAdvisor. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1707–1717. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.11.007>
- Vásquez, C. (2012). Narrativity and involvement in online consumer reviews: The case of TripAdvisor. *Narrative Inquiry*, 22(1), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ni.22.1.07vas>
- Vásquez, C., & Urzúa, A. (2009). Reported speech and reported mental states in mentoring meetings: Exploring novice teacher identities. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 42(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08351810802671693>

Violi, P. (2012). Trauma site museums and politics of memory: Tuol Sleng, Villa Grimaldi and the Bologna Ustica Museum. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 29(1), 36–75.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276411423035>

Wodak, R., Cillia, R. D., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (Eds.). (2009). *The discursive construction of national identity* (2nd ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Address for correspondence

Chaim Noy
School of Communication
Bar Ilan University
Ramat Gan, 5290002
Israel

chaim.noy@biu.ac.il

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2801-9120>

Publication history

Date received: 5 December 2019

Date accepted: 25 May 2020

Published online: 8 July 2020