

**Voices from the Museum:
Survey Research in Europe's National Museums**

(EuNaMus Report No. 5)

Alexandra Bounia, Alexandra Nikiforidou,
Niki Nikonanou & Albert Dicran Matossian

Copyright

The publishers will keep this document online on the Internet – or its possible replacement – from the date of publication barring exceptional circumstances.

The online availability of the document implies permanent permission for anyone to read, to download, or to print out single copies for his/her own use and to use it unchanged for noncommercial research and educational purposes. Subsequent transfers of copyright cannot revoke this permission. All other uses of the document are conditional upon the consent of the copyright owner. The publisher has taken technical and administrative measures to assure authenticity, security and accessibility. According to intellectual property law, the author has the right to be mentioned when his/her work is accessed as described above and to be protected against infringement.

For additional information about Linköping University Electronic Press and its procedures for publication and for assurance of document integrity, please refer to its www home page: <http://www.ep.liu.se/>.

Linköping University Interdisciplinary Studies, No. 16

ISSN: 1650-9625

Linköping University Electronic Press

Linköping, Sweden, 2012

URL: <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:liu:diva-84966>

© The Authors, 2012

This report has been published thanks to the support of the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for Research - Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities theme (contract nr 244305 – Project European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen). The information and views set out in this report are those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Union.

Cover photo: Theopisti Stylianou-Lambert.



Funded under Socio-economic Sciences & Humanities



Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to the museum visitors who took part in the survey, staff from all the national museums who helped facilitate the data collection and to the researchers involved in collecting, analysing and writing up the quantitative data.

University of the Aegean Research Team

Alexandra Bounia
Alexandra Nikiforidou
Niki Nikonanou
Albert Dicran Matossian
Evi-Maria Pitsiava
Aggeliki Zoumbouli
Maroussa Tsakogianni
Federica Mancini

Data collection teams

University of the Aegean

Alexandra Bounia
Alexandra Nikiforidou
Niki Nikonanou
Evi-Maria Pitsiava
Aggeliki Zoumbouli
Federica Mancini

University of Leicester

Jocelyn Dodd
Ceri Jones
Andy Sawyer
Andrew Jamieson
Georgina McMahon
Kaija de Valk
Willeke Rodenhuis

University of Linköping

Bodil Axelsson
Elin Lundquist
Hannah Kroksson
Viveca Hellman Vold

University of Tartu

Kristin Kuutma
Pille Runnel
Pille Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt
Reet Ruusmann
Linda Lotina
Toms Kęcis
Kaspar Jassa
Paavo Kroon
Diana Grahina
Anita Püsiäinen
Laura Jamsja
Anna-Stina Kangro
Ergo-Hart Västrik
Maria Jufereva
Liene Bergmane
Ieva Gūža
Ieva Balode
Signija Druviņa

Table of Contents

List of tables.....	5
List of diagrams	8
Notes on authors.....	10
Conclusions.....	13
Key findings	16
Chapter 1 – Introduction	21
National Museums from the Visitors’ Perspective	23
The layout of the report.....	25
The research process.....	25
Chapter 2 – Context and Museums.....	39
Introduction	40
Museum Context	40
Chapter 3 – Who visits national museums and why	51
Introduction	52
Visitors’ profiles: Who visits national museums?	52
Chapter 4 – National Museums and Identities	83
Introduction	84
The role of material culture.....	84
Personal definitions of identity.....	109
Chapter 5 – What does being a national museum mean?.....	119
Introduction	120
Awareness and definition of a national museum	120
National museums: for whom and why	144
Agents responsible for the creation of national museums	156
Chapter 6 – Perceptions of imageries and identities presented in the national museums	165
Introduction	166
Historical imageries	166
Bibliography	199
Appendix 1	202

List of tables

Table 1: Data collection at the nine museums	22
Table 2: Research objectives and questions	27
Table 3: Case studies undertaken by each research team	29
Table 4: Themes of the questionnaire	33
Table 5: Distribution of questionnaires, according to language	34
Table 6: Distribution of questionnaires per museum and language	35
Table 7: Annual Visitor Number per museum	36
Table 8: Scaling factor	37
Table 9: Distribution of questionnaires per nationality	52
Table 10: Distribution of questionnaires per nationality and language	53
Table 11: National Museum of Estonia: nationality of respondents Nationality ^a	53
Table 12: German Historical Museum: Nationality of respondents	54
Table 13: National Historical Museum of Athens: Nationality of respondents	54
Table 14: National Museum of Ireland: Nationality of respondents	54
Table 15: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Nationality of respondents	55
Table 16: Rijksmuseum: Nationality of respondents	55
Table 17: National Museum of Scotland: Nationality of respondents	55
Table 18: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Nationality of the respondents	56
Table 19: Nordiska museet: Nationality of respondents	56
Table 20: All case studies: Gender of the respondents	57
Table 21: All case studies: Nationality and gender	58
Table 22: National Museum of Estonia: Gender of respondents	58
Table 23: German Historical Museum: Gender of respondents	58
Table 24: National Historical Museum of Athens: Gender of respondents	59
Table 25: National Museum of Ireland: Gender of respondents	59
Table 26: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Gender of respondents	59
Table 27: Rijksmuseum: Gender of respondents	60
Table 28: National Museum of Scotland: Gender of respondents	60
Table 29: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Gender of respondents	60
Table 30: Nordiska museet: Gender of respondents	60
Table 31: All case studies: Age of participants in the research	61
Table 32: National Museum of Estonia: Age groups of the sample	61
Table 33: German Historical Museum: Age groups of the sample	62
Table 34: National Historical Museum of Athens: Age groups of the sample	62
Table 35: National Museum of Ireland: Age groups of the sample	62
Table 36: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Age groups of the sample	63
Table 37: Rijksmuseum: Age groups of the sample	63
Table 38: National Museum of Scotland: Age groups of the sample	63
Table 39: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Age groups of the sample	64
Table 40: Nordiska museet: Age groups of the sample	64
Table 42: Occupation of the respondents in all museums	66
Table 43: National Museum of Estonia: Occupation of the participants in the research	66

Table 44: German Historical Museum: Occupation of the participants in the research	67
Table 45: National Historical Museum of Athens: Occupation of the participants in the research.....	67
Table 46: National Museum of Ireland: Occupation of the participants in the research	68
Table 47: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Occupation of the participants in the research.....	68
Table 48: Rijksmuseum: Occupation of the participants in the research.....	69
Table 49: National Museum of Scotland: Occupation of the participants in the research	69
Table 50: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Occupation of the participants in the research.....	70
Table 51: Nordiska museet: Occupation of the participants in the research	70
Table 52: Education of the respondents in all museums	71
Table 53: National Museum of Estonia: Education of the respondents	72
Table 54: German Historical Museum: Education of the respondents	72
Table 55: National Historical Museum of Athens: Education of the respondents	72
Table 56: National Museum of Ireland: Education of the respondents	73
Table 57: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Education of the respondents	73
Table 58: Rijksmuseum: Education of the respondents.....	73
Table 59: National Museum of Scotland: Education of the respondents.....	74
Table 60: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Education of the respondents.....	74
Table 61: Nordiska museet: Education of the respondents.....	74
Table 62a: Reasons for visiting the Museum today.....	78
Table 62b: Reasons for visiting the Museum today.	79
Table 63: Visitor motivation to the national museums: comparing across the 9 museums.....	80
Table 64: All cases-studies: sources of information on national history.....	81
Table 65: National Museum of Estonia: Objects relevant to national history.....	85
Table 66: German Historical Museum: Objects relevant to national history.....	85
Table 67: National Historical Museum of Athens: Objects relevant to national history.....	85
Table 68: National Museum of Ireland: Objects relevant to national history.....	86
Table 69: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Objects relevant to national history.....	86
Table 70: Rijksmuseum: Objects relevant to national history	86
Table 71: National Museum of Scotland: Objects relevant to national history.....	87
Table 72: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Objects relevant to national history	87
Table 73: Nordiska museet: Objects relevant to national history	87
Table 74: National Museum of Estonia: Reasons that objects are interesting.....	104
Table 75: German Historical Museum: Reasons that objects are interesting.....	104
Table 76: National Historical Museum of Athens: Reasons that objects are interesting.....	105
Table 77: National Museum of Ireland: Reasons that objects are interesting.....	105
Table 78: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Reasons that objects are interesting.....	106
Table 79: Rijksmuseum: Reasons that objects are interesting	106
Table 80: National Museum of Scotland: Reasons that objects are interesting	107
Table 81: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Reasons that objects are interesting	107
Table 82: Nordiska museet: Reasons that objects are interesting.....	108
Table 83: Reasons that objects are interesting: comparing across the 9 museums.....	108
Table 84: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: National museums only for the people of the same nation.....	145

Table 85: Museum of the History of Catalonia: National museums only for the people of the same nation	145
Table 86: Nordiska museet: National museums only for the people of the same nation	146
Table 87: All case studies summary: Agents for the establishment of national museums	157
Table 88: Comparative presentation of the agents for the creation of national museums per nationality.....	158
Table 89: National Museum of Estonia: Agents for the creation of national museums	159
Table 90: German Historical Museum: Agents for the creation of national museums	159
Table 91: National Historical Museum of Athens: Agents for the creation of national museums.....	160
Table 92: National Museum of Ireland: Agents for the creation of national museums	160
Table 93: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Agents for the creation of national museums	161
Table 94: Rijksmuseum: Agents for the creation of national museums.....	161
Table 95: National Museum of Scotland: Agents for the creation of national museums.....	162
Table 96: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Agents for the creation of national museums...	162
Table 97: Nordiska museet: Agents for the creation of national museums.....	163
Table 98: Presentation of the history of the nation: comparing across the 9 museums.....	167
Table 99: Presentation of the history of the country/state: comparing across the 9 museums ...	168
Table 100: National Museum of Estonia: Representation of the history of the region.....	169
Table 101: German Historical Museum: Representation of the history of the region	170
Table 102: National Historical Museum of Athens: Representation of the history of the region	170
Table 103: National Museum of Ireland: Representation of the history of the region.....	170
Table 104: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Representation of the history of the region	170
Table 105: Rijksmuseum: Representation of the history of the region	171
Table 106: National Museum of Scotland: Representation of the history of the region.....	171
Table 107: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Representation of the history of the region	171
Table 108: Nordiska museet: Representation of the history of the region.....	171
Table 109: Presentation of Europe: comparing across the 9 museums	173
Table 110: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Controversial history in the museum	176
Table 111: National Historical Museum of Athens: Missing stories from the museum	177
Table 112: National Museum of Estonia: Missing from the museum	177
Table 113: German Historical Museum: Missing stories from the museum.....	177
Table 114: National Museum of Scotland: Missing stories from the museum	178
Table 115: National Historical Museum of Athens: Missing groups from the museum.....	178
Table 116: National Museum of Estonia: Missing groups from the museum	178
Table 117: German Historical Museum: Missing groups from the museum	179
Table 118: National Museum of Scotland: Missing groups from the museum.....	179

List of diagrams

Diagram 1: All case studies: Gender of the respondents	57
Diagram 2: All case studies. Age of participants in the research.....	61
Diagram 3: All case studies: Nationality and age groups.....	64
Diagram 4: All case studies: Occupation of the respondents	65
Diagram 5: Education of the respondents in all museums	71
Diagram 6: Have you visited the museum before?.....	75
Diagram 7: Positive and negative replies to Q1, according to nationality	75
Diagram 8: Who did you visit the museum with today?.....	76
Diagram 9: Reasons for deciding to visit the museum. Summary of all museums.....	77
Diagram 10a: Why did you come to the Museum today. Responses by nationals	78
Diagram 10b: Why did you come to the Museum today? Responses by non- nationals/tourists.....	79
Diagram 11: Are there objects particularly relevant to history of the nation?	84
Diagram 12: National Historical Museum of Athens: Objects relevant to national history, nationals/non-nationals.....	88
Diagram 13: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Objects relevant to national history, nationals/non-nationals.....	88
Diagram 14: Rijksmuseum: Objects relevant to national history, nationals/non- nationals	89
Diagram 15: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Objects relevant to national history, nationals/non-nationals.....	89
Diagram 16: All case studies. The reasons visitors found objects interesting.....	103
Diagram 17: Reasons of attraction of particular objects according to nationality – all case studies	103
Diagram 18: All case studies. Is this a national museum?	120
Diagram 19: Has this knowledge influenced your decision to visit – all case studies	121
Diagram 20: Considering this a national museum – nationals vs. tourists: all case studies.....	121
Diagram 21: National Museum of Estonia: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality	122
Diagram 22: National Historical Museum of Athens: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality.....	122
Diagram 23: National Museum of Ireland: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality.....	123
Diagram 24: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality.....	123
Diagram 25: Rijksmuseum: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality.....	124
Diagram 26: National Museum of Scotland: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality	124
Diagram 27: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality	125

Diagram 28: German Historical Museum: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality.....	125
Diagram 29: Nordiska museet: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality.....	126
Diagram 30: All case studies: National museum should only address the people of its nation.....	144
Diagram 31: All case studies: National museums should cater only for the needs of the people of the same nation: according to nationality.....	146
Diagram 32: All case studies: National museums should cater only for the needs of tourists/non-nationals	147
Diagram 33: All case studies: Displaying the past, the present or the future	148
Diagram 34: All case studies: Displaying the past, the present and the future, according to nationalities	148
Diagram 35: National Museum of Scotland: Displaying the past, the present and the future	149
Diagram 36: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Displaying the past, the present and the future.....	149
Diagram 37: National Historical Museum of Athens: Displaying the past, the present and the future.....	150
Diagram 38: All case studies: National museums should display the nation's treasures	150
Diagram 39: All case studies: National museums should tell the stories of great events and heroes.....	151
Diagram 40: All case studies: National museums should tell the stories of ordinary people.....	152
Diagram 41: All case studies: National museums should give an accurate history of the nation.....	153
Diagram 42: All case studies: National museums should present what it means to be a member of this nation.....	153
Diagram 43: All case studies: National museums should show the relationship between this nation and Europe	154
Diagram 44: All case studies: National museums should be places where controversial history is displayed.....	155
Diagram 45: All case studies: National museums should promote a state's position on disputed heritage/history.....	156
Diagram 46: All case studies: Agents of establishing national museums	156
Diagram 47: All case studies: Representation of the history of the nation.....	166
Diagram 48: All case studies: Representation of the history of the country/state.....	167
Diagram 49: All case studies: Representation of the history of the region.....	169
Diagram 50: All case studies: Representation of the history of Europe	172
Diagram 51: All case studies: Representation of the history of the world.....	173
Diagram 52: All case studies: Hierarchies of the histories of the museum according to the respondents.....	174
Diagram 53: All case studies: Controversial history presented in the museum	175
Diagram 54: All case studies: Missing stories from the museum.....	175
Diagram 55: All case studies: Missing groups from the museum	176

Notes on authors

Alexandra Bounia

Alexandra Bounia is an associate professor of museology at the University of the Aegean, Greece, Department of Cultural Technology and Communication. She studied archaeology and history of art at the University of Athens, Greece and museum studies at the University of Leicester, UK. Her research interests are on the history, theory and management of collections and museums, the interpretation of material culture, and the use of audiovisual technologies as interpretive media. She has published in Greek and international journals and participates in research projects in Greece and abroad. She co-edited with Susan M. Pearce the book *Collector's Voice: Ancient Voices*, which was published in 2001 by Ashgate Press. Her book *Collectors and Collections in the Ancient World: The Nature of Classical Collecting* was published in 2004 by the same publisher, while in 2009 her book *"Behind the Scenes of the Museum": Collections Management in Contemporary Museums* was published in Greek by Patakis Publications.

(E-mail: abounia@ct.aegean.gr)

Alexandra Nikiforidou

Alexandra Nikiforidou has been working in the museum sector for nearly twenty years, ever since she completed her postgraduate degree in museum studies, at the University of Essex, UK. In the early years of her career she worked as an employee of a number of cultural organizations, including the Hellenic Society of Ethnographical Museology, the Foundation of the Hellenic World and the Museum of the City of Athens. Since 2002 she has been working mainly as a freelance professional and consultant, developing exhibitions and being involved in evaluation projects for a broad range of institutions. As a museum professional she teaches museology and cultural management at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens and the Hellenic American Union. She has collaborated with the Museology Laboratory of the University of the Aegean on several occasions. (E-mail: anikifor@otenet.gr)

Niki Nikonanou

Niki Nikonanou is an assistant professor of art history and museum education at the Department of Preschool Education of the University of Thessaly (Greece). She has studied German Language and Literature (BA), Art History (MA) and Museum-Education (PhD) at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Greece) and at the University of Cologne (Germany). Her research interests include the theory and practice of museology, museum education and communication, the use of digital media in museum and art education, museum evaluation. She works with museums, educational and cultural institutions for the planning and organization of museum educational activities and exhibitions as well as evaluation projects. She has published several articles in Greek and international scientific journals. She is the author of the book *Museum Education: from theory to practice* (in Greek) (Patakis Publications, Athens). She has participated as a researcher in a number of research projects, both national and international. (E-mail: niknik@uth.gr)

Albert Dicran Matossian

Albert Dicran Matossian was born in 1961. He is a graduate of the Department of Mathematics, University of Ioannina (Greece) and a PhD candidate at the University of the Aegean (Greece). He has been teaching mathematics in secondary education since 2003. He has been a scientific collaborator in the extended education program of Environmental Cartography of the University of the Aegean from 1998 to 2005; he was in charge of the Arithmetic Literacy courses in the Second Chance School of Mytilene from 2003 to 2008; he has worked as a teaching assistant in mathematics and statistics in the Department of Environmental Studies of the University of the Aegean from 2000 to 2008. He has published articles on both scientific and educational matters in Greek and international journals and conference proceedings. He speaks French, Greek, English and Spanish. (E-mail: nalmat@env.aegean.gr)

Conclusions

This report presents the results of surveys of 5356 people who filled in questionnaires distributed in nine European national museums within the period from May 2011 to September 2011.

Who visits national museums and why

- The visitors involved in this research can be categorized in two broad groups: those born or living in the nation (47.11% of the self-completed questionnaires); those visiting from outside the nation (non-nationals /tourists) (52.9% of the self-completed questionnaires). They were mostly well-educated people, students or “white collar” workers either in the private or in the public sector. Even though in the largest proportion they were not familiar with the particular museum, they were familiar with museums in general and similar museums in other parts of the world. They belonged to different age groups and were both male and female.
- In accordance with previous studies regarding criteria for museum visits, results showed that most people visit national museums expecting to entertain themselves or find pleasure in their visit, especially in countries where the notion of “edutainment” has a long history, such as in Sweden and the UK. Following closely, the second most common reason given for visiting national museums is education and learning. This is a first choice especially in countries with more conservative educational agendas.
- Museums rank high in the minds of people as reliable sources of information on national history.

National Museums and Identities

- Visitors to European national museums do remember particular objects that belong to the museums they have visited and specifically refer to these objects. A large number of visitors collectively refer to all/most of the objects in an exhibition gallery/unit and specifically remember the title or theme of this exhibition unit/gallery. The way a museum is laid out or where it puts its emphasis, on its collections or on an explicit narrative/story, hugely affects what people remember/think is important (particular objects or exhibition units/themes) or the way they remember this.
- It seems that most people can “place” objects and themes in the historical narrative that each museum is striving to compose as well as relate these objects and themes to personal interests/stories/tastes, etc. (collective/ individual identities).
- Regarding personal historical roots as denominators of personal identities, visitors tend to prioritize their geographical provenance. Countries come first as places of origin (this seems the obvious choice for people who have not given much thought to the question), followed by specific cities and regions. Europe features in a number of answers either by itself or combined with other countries. Fewer people see their roots in their cultural/social/national past and family history or in different periods of global history in general. The values of humanity and human traits feature in a few answers as well.

What does being a national museum mean?

- The vast majority of visitors understand the museums they visited to be “national”, and visitors’ opinions in all research case studies seem to converge into a few major categories; the museums participating in the research are national because:
 - They narrate an important part of the country’s/ nation’s history.
 - They are about a specific nation and mainly about a specific nation.
 - They hold national treasures/ important collections.
 - They are “all-inclusive”, presenting a comprehensive picture of the nation/country they belong to.
 - They promote/represent national identity and the notion of the nation.
 - They employ (in some of the case studies anyhow) advanced methods of presentation and interpretation.

There were a few other reasons provided to argue for the national character of the case-study museums, such as their central location, their European and/or international scope, or being funded by the state; very few people only did not consider these museums national, mainly because they did not fulfill the above- mentioned criteria for national museums. Interestingly enough, the European or international scope of some of these museums was given both as an argument for and against their national character.

- In the opinion of the vast majority of visitors, national museums should cater to the needs of both nationals and non-nationals.
- The majority of visitors in all case studies also believe that national museums should be for the nation’s past, present and future. Those, however, who think that they should be about the past and the present, combined with those who believe that they should be only about the past, exceed this percentage. Regardless of results in specific case studies, such as the museums of the stateless nations of Scotland and Catalonia where the museum might play an important role in shaping “consciousnesses” for the future, there seems to be a more conservative preoccupation with the past and its effect in the present when visitors consider the role of national museums.
- When the role of national museums is dissected into particular goals, the majority of visitors agree with most of them. It is interesting that these goals, schematically presented in the questionnaire, coincide with many of the “arguments” provided freely by visitors in the open-ended question (5b) about the national character of each case-study museum. National museums should hold and preserve national treasures, give an accurate account of the nation’s history and the stories of its heroes, and promote national identity. In addition, when prompted about the role of national museums in telling the stories of ordinary people and the relations between each nation and Europe, most people agree with both statements. These two parts of the national museum’s role, however, do not feature prominently in the answers to the aforementioned open-ended question. It seems that these are ideas that people have not thought about or could not see in the national museums they visited but nevertheless seem to like; they should probably be taken into consideration when designing future exhibitions in national museums.

- On the sensitive issue of controversial history it seems that most visitors hold a rather progressive or neutral position. Museums should be places where issues of controversial history are debated and the nation's/ state's official stance on matters of disputed heritage or history should not always take prominence.
- Finally, European national museums ought to be established by authority bodies, i.e. governments, public benefit institutions and in some cases by local authorities. Although very few people in each case-study museum answered the open-ended field "other" in this question, answers from all case studies are fairly similar and agree upon the following points: a) National museums should be established by members of the academic community who are knowledgeable and can be objective and b) the establishment of national museums should be a collaborative venture among all bodies of authority and stakeholders. This again will probably ensure, in the minds of the visitors, a degree of objectivity and inclusiveness.

Perceptions of imageries and identities presented in the museum

- All the national museums we examined share similar hierarchies when it comes to presenting their stories: the state is mostly represented (42.8%), with the nation following closely (42.3%). The region (7.6%), Europe (4.1%) and the world (3.2%) are marginally present in the museum exhibitions, according to the visitors' perceptions, possibly to support the story of the country or the nation. Native visitors seem to prioritize the nation, whereas non-national ones the country. The national museums we researched in Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Germany and Catalonia seem to place greater emphasis on the nation; in the case studies in Sweden, Scotland and Ireland emphasis seems to be on the state; in the Rijksmuseum there seems to be an equal division between the two. Regional history seems to be important in the Nordiska museet (14.8%), in the Museum of the History of Catalonia (14.9%), and in the German Historical Museum (9.2%), whereas European history represents a non-negligible percentage only in the cases of the Rijksmuseum (6.3%) and the German Historical Museum (7.4%).
- Visitors were mostly not aware of whether there were any stories or people/communities missing from the museum narrative (35.5% claimed that there are no missing stories and 38.2% replied that there are no missing groups; 34.6% claimed ignorance when asked about controversial history, another 49.7% claimed the same when asked about "meaningful silences", and 50.5% did not know what to answer when asked about particular groups or communities not included in the narratives). The answers of people who did have an opinion seem to converge in all case studies on the absence of a) ethnic and religious minorities, b) deprived groups, c) specific events and historic periods and d) 'taboo' issues which deviate from the dominant national discourse.
- National museums should represent and reflect upon contemporary national issues and identities.
- National museums should engage visitors in discussions about what it means to belong to a nation, about what it means to be "European", and about multiple viewpoints.

Key findings

1. Who visits national museums and why?

According to our research, national museums in Europe are visited by both visitors from the same nationality as the museum and by non-nationals, usually tourists visiting the city where the museum is located. The visitors' profile of this research corresponds to the profile that has been described by previous visitor studies literature, i.e. well-educated adults, working either in the public or the private sector ("white collar" workers), who are willing to spend time in the national museum either of their own country or of the country they visit as a part of an entertainment and learning experience. Non-nationals seem to be particularly attracted to well-known museums, such as the Rijksmuseum, or to museums that they believe will provide an opportunity for them to see and understand the character(istics) of the country/nation they visit, even for a short period. On the other hand, people from the same nationality visit national museums in order to see particular aspects of their culture (as for instance was the case with the Museum of the History of Catalonia), or in order to spend enjoyable time with their families (as for instance in the case of the Open-Air Museum of Latvia).

Women are more represented in the sample than men, but this also corresponds to the results from other visitor studies research, where women appear to visit museums more than men. In terms of age, people over 65 were less represented in our sample than the ages between 18 and 65.

Not surprisingly, nationals have been to the museum before (58%), whereas non-nationals/visitors to the country had not (80.6% visit the museum for the first time). This percentage varies from museum to museum: it seems that in the cases where national museums are really active and organise various events for their visitors, repeated visits by both national and non-national visitors increase. Usually nationals tend to repeat their visits to the museum more than non-nationals do; in the case of well-known museums, such as the Rijksmuseum, repeated visits by non-nationals also have a high percentage (19%). In the case of this Museum, this might also be the result of a re-exhibition currently still in progress.

Similarly to previous research, it seems that museum visits are social experiences. The majority of the respondents were visiting with friends and family; only 14.4%, on average, claimed that they had visited the museum alone. The low percentage of group visits most probably reflects the lack of time to respond to the questionnaire, rather than a particular pattern of visitation.

When it comes to the the reasons for visiting the museum, on average, priority was given to entertainment/pleasure, followed closely by learning/education. The role of the museum as an authoritative source of knowledge is obvious in many choices of the visitors. They expect that their visit will provide them with insights regarding the nation, history, and the past in general. This relationship of trust between visitors and museums is obvious not only when they answer why they decided to visit, but also when they acknowledge that they do not know whether this is "the whole story" or not, whether there are "missing people, or missing stories" from the museum. Some of the replies to the open-ended questions underline this particular relationship, since visitors express their trust in the museum, which sometimes becomes "support" for the museum's choices (as for instance in the cases they argue that "the museum cannot present

everything and it has to make choices”). Finally, museums are places that people mention as sources for information regarding the past: almost 50%, on average, claim that they always think of the museum as a source of knowledge about the past, whereas 47% mention that this happens sometimes. Even though the museum does not reach the same level of reference as the Internet, and in a way scores lower than friends and family, it does have a strong position among the sources of knowledge people look up to.

It seems that the cultural and educational policies of each country influence the relationship between visitors and the national museums: for instance, in the case of Scotland, where emphasis has been placed during the last years especially on entertainment and making museums a place of enjoyment for visitors, both the museum and the people prioritize this aspect of the visit. In other cases, as for instance in Greece, where emphasis has been placed on museums as institutions for the protection of heritage and collaborators with schools, this relationship is reflected both in visitation patterns and in the expectations visitors have from their experience.

2. National museums and identities

Personal and national identity seems to be both complicated and evolving. Visitors come to the museum having specific ideas about the nation, Europe, and the world, and they use their visit in order to reinforce and support their pre-existing views and ideas. Nevertheless, the contents of the museum, the structure and the exhibition approach do influence their understanding and help negotiate their identity construction.

The relation between national museums and identities therefore seems to be strong, even though not always clear. Visitors expect to see in the museum artefacts that they will use in order to define their identities – at least the national ones. There seems to be an interesting relation between museums and the notion of “historical roots”: even though the majority of the respondents used a spatial perspective in order to talk about their “historical roots”, usually in the form of a country, a region, a city, the museum does have a role as well. It becomes the site where people go to find out about their historical roots, but also, by being a space where a cultural representation of the “national space” takes place, it becomes a *locus par excellence* for the display of the self, both for nationals and non-nationals alike. In that sense, national museums are expected to, and do, build consciousness and collective identity.

National identity is prioritized by most visitors as their primary identity (in the context of the national museum). According to visitors’ replies there are three categories of self-proclaimed “national identity” amongst visitors: a single national identity; a hybrid national identity (two or more heritage roots); and a trans-national identity, which places an emphasis on European, cosmopolitan ideals, universal humanity or the importance of the individual in determining identity.

Often national identity is complemented with other identities: class, gender, education, origins of some sort. National museums seem to be well located to express those ideas as well, since they provide historical models with which people can understand and identify themselves.

A further discussion about the relation between national museums and identity was explored in the interviews and the focus groups, which will be the subject of the subsequent report.

3. What does being a national museum mean?

The role of a national museum seems to be rather easy to define on behalf of the visitors:

- (a) National museums, in order to “deserve” the name, need – according to their visitors — to present the “birth and the development” of a nation, “give overviews of a nation”, present “national history and identity”. The phrasing becomes different from museum to museum, but irrespective of the content and/or the special circumstances of each museum, the requirements seem to be there.
- (b) National museums are all about “completeness”: a “complete” history, a “complete image”, a “complete” repository of the nation or/and its history are phrases that keep coming up in each case study; lack of completeness is often a reason not to qualify a museum as a national one.
- (c) The importance of the collection comes third: even though national museums are expected to house artefacts of national importance, it is not their holdings *per se* that identify them as national. Of course, this might also be because this is considered self-evident, or because the previous two requirements are understood to be accomplished through material culture. In any case, objects are important but their presence alone does not seem to be enough.
- (d) The methods of presentation and their effectiveness in terms of public education, interpretation and experience are also highly important when it comes to national museums. Visitors place great emphasis on the museum providing an accurate image of their collective self for nationals and non-nationals alike, for educating the young and for informing the “Others”, respectively.
- (e) Visitors seem to expect the government to take an active role in the creation of national museums, but they do not believe that they are the sole agents. Regional authorities, public benefits foundations, civil societies seem to be important too and to share responsibilities for a “real” national museum to be there.

4. Perceptions of history presented in national museums

Visitors expect museums to present an objective, true history / account of past events. This is an expectation based on the trust visitors have in the museum, both as an institution and as a source of knowledge.

It is within this perspective that they reply that national museums should not be places of political propaganda, in the sense of promoting only national views on disputed heritage, but they should be places of dialogue, where controversial history and multiple viewpoints are presented. The “neutrality” of the institution seems thus to be supported, more than the “political” role of the institution. On the other hand, the view that national museums should be “academic institutions only”, presenting hard facts and artefacts, seems to be losing ground to the national museum as a place of dialogue and communication.

5. Museums as sites where people go to learn about national history and European history

As presented before, almost half the visitors (50%) associated the national museum with learning about national history. Formal education, archaeological/historical sites, libraries, archives, etc.,

follow in people's choices for this knowledge. Nevertheless, national museums do seem to share similar hierarchies when it comes to the presentation of history: national and state histories come first, to be followed by regional, European and world histories.

Placing the nation and/or the state within a larger picture, be it the region, Europe or the world, does not seem to be a priority. Visitors in the German Historical Museum seemed to be most aware of (and interested in) the notion of Europe and European identity, but in the other museums we researched this has not been the case.

6. Who supports/should support the creation of national museums?

National museums are not expected to be associated with a specific government or propaganda, as became obvious from the visitors' reluctance to accept the view that national museums should express official views about disputed issues. However, they expect governments to support national museums as part of their responsibility towards the people, to create and encourage them to play their institutional part. Visitors are also willing to accept other shareholders to take part in this effort: regional authorities, public benefit foundations, professional bodies, academics, grass-root initiatives, minorities. The responses varied according to the cultural policies and traditions of each country, but also its special circumstances: for instance, in countries with strong centralised policies a more centralised perspective was supported, whereas in cases where regional authorities have strong claims to national or cultural matters, a more distributed perspective was favoured.

It seems that national museums are not just a matter of governments anymore, but places where different stakeholders are and should be involved.

7. What should a national museum present? What are the stories national museums should be about?

There is an agreement across national museums about their contents, as far as visitors are concerned: historically important artefacts, "heroes" of the past, important events, representative personalities and artefacts, but also everyday people, various groups in terms of religion, age, gender and so on, should be included in the contents of a national museum. Controversial history needs also to be discussed within national museums, as visitors agree.

Naturally, different circumstances lead to different suggestions about specific events/personalities and artefacts that can and should be included per country; but the general pattern remains the same.

8. Museums as inclusive spaces

Minorities are not represented in national museums: as the focus groups' discussions pointed out, they are not expected to be included. Maybe this partly explains why visitors at large felt that nothing important was missing from the museum, according to the replies in the self-completed questionnaires. Mainstream history seems to be the rule and this is what people expect from the museum. Nevertheless, in the cases where there are references to missing stories and groups, it is obvious that these are minorities of some sort (national, religious, social, gender), or stories of the "difficult" past, i.e. stories about dictatorships, colonialism, exploitation, war, injustice and so on.

9. Interesting objects / emblematic objects and their role in the museum

Participants in the research recognized the importance of artefacts and museum collections for representing the past and national identities. Interestingly, though, the artefacts they chose as representative of their interest and as bearing historical importance present great similarities from case to case. In each museum the “star objects”, i.e. the objects that the museum chooses to highlight either in its publicity or in other forms of communications (sometimes even just the leaflet) attract attention, grab people’s interest and are easily recalled when asked about the museum. Aesthetically pleasing artefacts seem also to attract interest: traditional costumes, paintings, dolls and doll houses, furniture, ivories and silverwork attract attention in almost all museums. Objects related to or belonging to important personalities are also among the favorites in all museums – relics of the past seem an all-time favorite.

The method of display and the themes the exhibition is divided into are also very important: in all museums visitors referred to the titles of the rooms/exhibitions/themes that they thought were interesting or relevant to the nation and to themselves. A narrative-oriented method of display made this even more prominent. In the cases where there were reconstructions of rooms or buildings, these also seemed to attract attention as full–environments that allowed for a better – and thus memorable – understanding of the ideas of the exhibition.

Weapons, uniforms, flags and other military artefacts also seemed to attract attention from both male and female visitors. Further research needs to be undertaken in order to understand the reasons for those choices: whether they have to do with the museum and the display, or with the interest people invest in morbid themes, or the association of national pride with victory against the enemy, or even with the curiosity/fear imbedded in human nature about death and destruction are issues to be further explored.

10. Expectations from a national museum. Are they met or not? Suggestions to the museum

Most of the visitors claimed that they were satisfied by their visits. Taking into account the points made before, it is obvious that visitors in their majority either expect national museums to engage them (i.e. they leave the initiative to the museum), or they trust the institution so deeply that they do not doubt its choices. Overall, visitors expect national museums to help them build national consciousness and collective identity, when it comes to nationals; and help them understand difference and similarity when it comes to non-nationals/visitors to the nation. They want museums to tell the truth, to be well informed, to hold and treasure artefacts; they want museums as repositories, expressions of national pride to have and to show. Nevertheless, the potential offered by such expectations is often under-exploited. The research based on interviews and minority groups makes this even more explicit [see following section/report].

In general, it seems that explicit narratives help visitors understand and critically evaluate what they see in the museum, more than when presentation methods consist of just artefacts, no matter how well they are individually interpreted. This may explain the reasons a more nuanced understanding of national stories is evident in museums that follow a narrative-oriented approach instead of an object-oriented one.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction



This report will focus on the views of 5356 people who filled in the questionnaires distributed in nine European national museums within the period from May 2011 to September 2011. The research was funded by the FP7 program EuNaMus (European National Museums: identity politics, the uses of the past and the European citizen) and it was conducted by three research teams coming from the Universities of Leicester in the UK, of Tartu in Estonia and of the Aegean in Greece. Part of the research in one museum was also undertaken by the University of Linköping in Sweden.

The museums where this research took place were the following:

- The Estonian National Museum, Tartu (Estonia)
- The Latvian Open-Air Museum, near Riga (Latvia)
- The German Historical Museum, Berlin (Germany)
- The National Historical Museum of Athens (Greece)
- The Nordiska museet, Stockholm (Sweden)
- The National Museum of Ireland (Collins Barracks branch), Dublin (Ireland)
- The National Museum of Scotland, Edinburgh, (UK)
- The Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (The Netherlands)
- The Museum of the History of Catalonia, Barcelona (Spain)

The research took place during a particularly difficult period for the European countries. Greece was going through a rough phase, marked by social unrest, evident in the capital during the summer of 2011. Ireland was also in the middle of a debt crisis that had led to the need to receive support by the IMF and the EU. On the other hand, Estonia joined the Euro zone in January 2011. As a result, issues related to the European Union, the financial crisis of Europe and the overall future of the Euro zone were in the media and have influenced both visitor numbers in some cases (as, for instance, in Athens), and visitors' opinions in others (as, for instance, in the cases of Ireland and Estonia). From a different perspective, the political developments of the period have also been very influential: in May the Scottish National Party won majority in the Scottish Parliament elections. Germany has been in the forefront of all Euro zone discussions, whereas in Spain, a debate about financial affairs between the central government and the autonomous communities, such as the Catalan, exemplified the relation between the two levels of administration.

Table 1: Data collection at the nine museums

	<i>M</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>Ju</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>N</i>
Estonian National Museum			X	X			
Latvian Open-Air Museum			X	X			
German Historical Museum				X			

	<i>M</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>Ju</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>N</i>
Nordiska museet							
National Museum of Ireland		X					
National Museum of Scotland	X						
Rijksmuseum			X				
Museum of History of Catalonia			X	X	X		

National Museums from the Visitors' Perspective

The field of visitor studies is not a new one. Interest in who visits museums and why has been present even from the time of the museum's ancestors, in the Renaissance. The visitors books, where important guests of the princely rooms and the cabinets of curiosities were expected to sign (Findlen 1996), were expressions of an early interest in the audience of these spaces: the number and the importance of the guests were both indications of the importance of this particular space and therefore of the importance of its owner. In a similar manner interest in who visits the museum and why has been used to reflect on the role of museums for their current "owners", i.e. the society and the state. Learning about why people choose *not* to visit museums is equally illuminating in this respect.

In modern times, interest was developed about the meanings that visitors took away from their experience of visiting museums and cultural heritage institutions: at the beginning this meaning was estimated in purely cognitive terms, although eventually interest in the experience and in learning perceived more widely became the centre of enquiry.

Usually visitor studies employ two lenses (to use the term John Falk introduced – 2009). The first lens refers to the content and the exhibits and aims to understand how these can influence visitor numbers and experiences: in other words, how everything that the museum does influences perceptions. The second focuses on the visitor and aims to understand how everything that the visitors bring with them (be it themselves in the form of their age, education etc or the social companion) influences the process of meaning making in the museum. David Carr (2001) argued that "a museum is an open work" that needs the visitors in order to be completed. It is the visitor's presence, interpretation and understanding that complete the museum.

There are two main focuses in visitor studies research: one is about visitor motivation and the second about visitor segmentation. Falk (2009: 48ff) presents an overview of research since the 1980s regarding motivation for visiting museums and the related segmentation. He also offers an approach towards identity-related motivation for visiting museums and heritage attractions that ends with a visitor segmentation perspective.¹

¹ For a presentation of his approach see Falk 2009 and Falk 2011. For a critique of his model see Dawson and Jensen 2011.

From another perspective and within the program “Inspiring learning for all”, funded by the British ‘Museums, Libraries and Archives Council’, researchers have developed a framework that helps cultural heritage institutions to review and improve their performance. They argue that there are five Generic Learning Outcomes that can describe what and how people learn in heritage institutions, identify the benefits people get from their involvement and provide a background that allows for measurement of performance to be achieved. The GLOs are combined with Generic Social Outcomes, i.e. a list of three criteria that can be used to assess the long term benefits of a cultural institution for its society and to demonstrate its impact in encouraging well-being, health and social cohesion.²

This research did not focus on the experience of museum visiting, visitors’ segmentation or motivation; our aim was not to evaluate the effectiveness of a gallery or an exhibition. Our research focused on understanding how visitors **use** national museums – in the definition provided by Aronsson (2011) – to construct their national self and how they understood the role of the national museum within a wider European perspective. Identity has been a key word in our research; it was understood not in the sense of identity-motivated visitors (i.e. according to Falk’s model), but as part of the “reflexive activities’ through which people create and sustain identity, i.e. as described by Rounds (2006). Visiting a museum is both about construction of identity and signaling of identity; museums offer opportunities of affirming our identity, but they also offer a safe environment where we can explore other identities and gain materials to “construct” ourselves (Rounds 2006: 138). In this sense, national museums provide a unique environment that allows visitors that belong to the nation to reaffirm their identity, but also to non-national visitors to explore other identities.

This research was designed so that it consisted of three parts: a self-completed questionnaire that would provide background comparable data regarding visitors’ perceptions in different museums and different parts of Europe; interviews that would provide the opportunity of in-depth discussions with individuals about their identity-construction and understanding of the museums; and focus-groups discussions so that people who are not among the usual museum visitors, i.e. belong to what we would call a ‘minority group’ would be heard and their views taken into account. The multiplicity of methods and the extent of the research are also particularly important since they allowed for a unique (in terms of geographical coverage and volume) set of data to be collected.

This report focuses on the data provided through the questionnaires, whereas an analysis of the data collected through the interviews and the focus-groups follows in a separate report.

² See also <http://www.inspiringlearningforall.gov.uk/> (last accessed 23/7/2012)

The layout of the report

This report focuses on the quantitative analysis of the data collected through the distribution of questionnaires in the nine museums mentioned previously. It is divided in the following sections:

A summary of the key findings is presented at the beginning.

1. Introduction: overview of the research assumptions and objectives, along with the general framework that led to the production of the questionnaire and the collection of data.
2. Context of the data collection: in this part we are going to present in brief the characteristics of each of the museums we have used as a case study, focusing on their collections and their narrative. The aim of this part is firstly to justify the selection of these case studies and secondly to provide a broad framework for understanding the data.
3. Who visits national museums and why: this section will present the key findings of the research regarding who visits national museums and why.
4. National museums and identities: in this part of the report we will present the key findings regarding the relationship between identities and their presentation in the museums.
5. What does being a National Museum mean? This part of the report will be devoted to the presentation of the key findings regarding the expectations of visitors by national museums.
6. Perceptions of imageries and identities presented in the museum: in this part we will discuss the results from the questions addressing the perceptions of visitors about the representations of the national museums they visited.
7. Conclusions: in this part we will attempt to draw together some of the significant findings of the report and provide some discussion on the implications of our data for European national museums.
8. Bibliography and Appendices: in this part, the bibliography used for this report as well as the questionnaire of the research is presented.

The research process

In this section we are going to focus on the practical concerns regarding the collection of data:

Questions and objectives

One of the main concerns of the overall research project EuNaMus was to locate the European citizen as an active participant in making national museums and allow him/her become an active agent of social change. If the national museum is to have an impact, then it must fully understand the reception of its institutional context and nature, of its attempts to tell (and re-tell) a national story, to construct a national self through material culture and exhibition making.

EuNaMus placed particular importance in providing a definition of the national museum and employ comparative strategies in order to generalize but also to individualize its research. This study has been in ongoing interaction with other parts of EuNaMus, both in terms of the selection of case studies and in terms of using their results to formulate its hypotheses. The policy of nation-building through museums involved people in two ways: first, national museums are sites for the construction of identity and citizenship since they provide representations of the historical past through which people negotiate their historical identities. Second, people are active producers of notions of identity and citizenship and not merely consumers. It is thus important

to focus on the interaction, or the meeting point of these two stances, and explore how these two perspectives interact. In other words, the aim was to gain some understanding of the citizens' values and perspectives and thus understand the social relevance of and the possibilities for the representation of the past in the museum.

The objectives of the research undertaken in EuNaMus can be summarized as follows:

- (a) To understand who visits national museums and why, in a comparative perspective
- (b) To understand how national and European identities are perceived by museum visitors
- (c) To provide analyses relating to the forms and narrative content and political implications of communities situated within and around the museum
- (d) To understand how national, ethnic, regional, local and personal imagery is connected to the creation of national and civic identities within these museums
- (e) To explore in qualitative terms and through different methodologies the impact of museum narratives which use the past particularly in regard to the idea of citizenship in Europe.

In order to pursue these objectives we used a mixed-methods methodology, comprising of three sets of data: data deriving from a self-completed questionnaire; data deriving from semi-structured interviews; and data deriving from focus groups discussions. In this report, we are going to focus on the first set of data and the results from it.

More specifically, the objectives of the questionnaire were the following:

- To understand who visits national museums and why
- To understand how national and European identities are perceived by museum visitors
- To explore how visitors understand the role of national museums
- To understand how national, ethnic, regional, local and personal imagery is connected to the identities presented in the museum
- To understand how museum visitors perceive imageries and identities represented in the national museum

In order to shape our objectives into specific research questions, a pilot study was undertaken in the Byzantine and Christian Museum of Athens (February 2011) by the research team of the University of the Aegean. During the pilot the questionnaire was tested; the results were then discussed with the other research teams in a workshop that took place in Tartu, Estonia, on February 26-27th 2011.

The questionnaire was divided into 3 parts: the first part consists of 9 questions that relate to the specific museum visit and ask the respondent to express their views on the reasons they visited this museum and how they perceive the imageries and identities represented in the museum. The second part consists of 5 questions that aim to understand visitors' perceptions about the role of national museums in general. The third part consists of 8 questions that aim to understand the profile of the visitor as well as how their personal imageries are connected to those of the museum. The questionnaire is presented in Appendix 1.

The following table shows the relation between the objectives and the questions of the questionnaire.

Table 2: Research objectives and questions

	Research objectives	Research questions
(a)	To understand who visits national museums and why	<p>Nationality Gender Age group Residence Occupation Education</p> <p>Have you been to this Museum before? Who did you visit the Museum with today? Why did you come to the Museum today? Where would you go to find out about national history?</p>
(b)	To understand how national and European identities are perceived by museum visitors	<p>How well, if at all, the following histories are presented by this Museum? (national, state, regional, European, world)</p> <p>Which of the above seems to be the most important for the Museum?</p>
(c)	To explore how visitors understand the role of national museums	<p>Do you consider this to be a National Museum? (If yes, explain why? If no, explain why?)</p> <p>A National Museum should present the history of the nation... only for people of the nation / only for foreign visitors</p> <p>National museums are mostly about...? Which groups should establish national museums?</p> <p>In your opinion, what are National Museums for?</p> <p>National Museums and Controversial history: read the statements and express your agreement</p>
(d)	To understand how national, ethnic, regional, local and personal imagery is connected to the identities presented in the museum	<p>Where do you feel your historical roots lie?</p> <p>Is there an object (or a group of objects) in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?</p> <p>Why did you find this object interesting?</p>

	Research objectives	Research questions
(e)	To understand how museum visitors perceive imageries and identities represented in the national museum	<p>How well, if at all, the following histories are presented by this Museum? (national, state, regional, European, world)</p> <p>Which of the above seems to be the most important for the Museum?</p> <p>In your opinion, does this Museum contain any history that is controversial?</p> <p>Are there any stories about the past that you think are missing from this Museum?</p> <p>In the past, certain people have been excluded from the National Museum, including religious groups, social groups, ethnic groups and others. In your opinion, are there any people or groups of people missing from this Museum?</p>

A quantitative research design

This study followed a mixed-methods approach. The first part of the research, on which this report focuses, aimed to collect responses from museum visitors that would allow for a broad picture of who visits national museums and why to be formulated. Responses were collected with the use of a self-completed questionnaire consisting of multiple-choice, scaled and open-ended questions. The multiple choice questions were often supplemented with an open-ended part as well, so that visitors could add their own comments and ideas.

The method of the questionnaire was selected because it allows for a larger sample to be collected compared with interviews or other forms of data collection and it reduces biases caused because of the characteristics of the interviewer and the variability in interviewers' skills. Both these elements were important if we take into account the aim of the research to collect views, ideas, opinions and self-reported behaviors of museum visitors in more than one museums and national contexts, as well as by the involvement of more than one research teams in this project (Seale 2012: 184-185).

The disadvantages of the questionnaire (short and simple questions, inability to reach in-depth understanding) were counterbalanced by complementing this method with the collection of qualitative data, through interviews and focus groups.

The aim of the questionnaire was to provide the research teams with a set of comparable data about national museums, their visitors and perspectives in many different countries, each presenting a different approach to issues of national identity and the creation of the national self. This first set of data would then enable us to better understand and articulate the issues rising from the interviews and the focus group discussions.

In order to prepare the questionnaire the following steps were taken:

1. Determination of the information to be sought during this part of the research

2. Definition of the population to be studied
3. Design of the questionnaire
4. Pilot the questionnaire in the Byzantine and Christian Museum in Athens
5. Discussion of all previous steps with all research teams in a workshop organized by the University of Tartu in Estonia, in February 2010.
6. Finalization of the questionnaire (along with the population and the information)
7. Translation of the questionnaire to the languages of the respective countries
8. Preparation of the questionnaire in a professional layout that would also allow for it to be scanned in the next phase.
9. Printing and distribution of the questionnaire to the three research teams, along with information regarding the practical approach to its distribution and collection.

In the sections that follow these steps will be discussed in greater detail.

Case studies

The museums that were selected to become case studies have their own historically defined character. All hold an important, often nationally specific, collection. Each is part of a distinct museological tradition, and each relates in a different way to the state that supports it and the nation that it serves. These differences but also the similarities among the museums and constraints of language, time and budget, informed the decisions made by the research teams.

The nine museums involved in this research are the following:

Table 3: Case studies undertaken by each research team

University of the Aegean	University of Leicester	University of Tartu
National Historical Museum in Greece (Athens) (NHMA)	National Museum of Scotland (Edinburgh) (NMS)	National Museum of Estonia (Tartu), (NME)
German Historical Museum in Germany (Berlin), (GHM)	National Museum of Ireland (Collins Barracks branch) (Dublin) (NMI)	National Open-Air Museum of Latvia (Riga), (NOAML)
Museum of the History of Catalonia in Spain (Barcelona) (MHC)	Rijksmuseum in the Netherlands (Amsterdam), (RM)	Nordiska museet in Sweden (Stockholm), (NM) – <i>in collaboration with the University of Linköping (Sweden)</i>

Data through interviews were collected from six of the above museums (the first two per research team in Table 2), and focus groups were organized in four of the above museums (first two in Table 2 for the University of Leicester and first in Table 2 for each of the other teams). Further information about this part of the research is provided in EuNamus report no 6 .

The reasons for the selection of these case studies were:

- Contextual information emerging from previous Work Packages, especially 2 and 3;

- We were interested in collecting data from different geographical regions of Europe: from the north, the south, the centre, the east and the west of the continent. For this reason we selected national museums from countries in these parts of Europe (Sweden, Greece and Spain, Germany and the Netherlands, Estonia and Latvia, Scotland and Ireland respectively).
- We were interested in a range of museums regarding their content: as a result we included national museums focusing on ethnography (as in the cases of the National Museum of Estonia, the Open-Air Museum in Latvia and the Nordiska museet), to historical museums (such as the German Historical Museum, the National Historical Museum and the Museum of the History of Catalonia), art museums (such as the Rijksmuseum), but also what we could call “encyclopedic museums” (such as the National Museum of Scotland and the National Museum of Ireland), i.e. museums holding a range of collections, from antiquities to contemporary art and industry.
- We were also interested in different national expressions: from the old to new nations (Greece for instance was organized as a nation-state in 1830, while Estonia and Latvia in 1991), from state-less nations, such as the Catalan, to nations that have recently acquired their independent status, such as Scotland.
- Finally, practical concerns, such as language and time were also important in the selection of our case studies.

Research methodology

Questionnaires were distributed to visitors of all museums for a period of between one to seven weeks, depending on local circumstances. In-depth interviews were conducted in six museums during the same period (NMS, NMI, NME, NOAML, GHM, NHMA). In four of these (NMS, NMI, NME, NHMA) focus-group research was conducted with immigrants in Scotland and Ireland, members of the Roma community in Greece and Russian immigrants in Estonia (for the findings see Qualitative Report).

In order for all teams to follow the same procedure for the collection of data, the following steps were taken:

Preparation

1. Written permission of each museum allowing research to take place within its spaces was collected in advance. The partner who was responsible for research in each case study museum had the responsibility to collect those permissions.
2. Before proceeding with the quantitative research, information regarding visitors’ numbers during the last 2-3 years was gathered. This information varied greatly from one country to the other: for example, in the cases of the National Museums of Estonia, Latvia and Greece annual visitor numbers were provided, whereas in the cases of the German Historical Museum or the Nordiska museet detailed information were available regarding nationality of visitors, sex, age, etc.
3. At the entrance of each case study museum was prominently displayed a sign (A3 size) describing briefly the project and informing the visitors that a research was in progress in the museum. An example of this text was attached to the manual for the quantitative research that was sent to the research teams.

During the Research

4. The teams were asked to explain to museum visitors the importance and scope of the investigation, so that visitors could complete the questionnaires as correctly and effectively as possible.
5. In each museum, the researcher(s) was assigned the task to distribute and collect the questionnaires. Each questionnaire was printed in 2 double sheets of paper, in red color (so that it could be scanned). These had the same barcode so that each visitor could fill in the right pair of sheets. The researcher(s) had to ensure that visitors did complete both papers (although during the analysis it became obvious that some did not).
6. Each questionnaire was unique, since it had its own barcode.
7. For the completion of the questionnaires, visitors could use pencil, only, since this was necessary for the questionnaires to be properly scanned.
8. Questionnaires could not be bended or folded (in order to be right for the scanning).
9. The researcher(s) was asked to make sure that the visitors did not make any additional comments on the questionnaire where the indication “Please do not write here” was printed. If something was written there the form could not be scanned.
10. The researcher(s) were also asked to make a few photocopies of questionnaires in black for people with difficulty in reading text in red. After these questionnaires were filled, the researcher(s) was instructed to copy the replies in the original questionnaire (bearing the same code as the photocopy) and to make a note in the daily report/diary of the research.
11. The same approach was used in the case of the additional questionnaires, i.e. those translated in Catalan that had not been printed in the same format as the others (for financial reasons), but were also transcribed at the end of the day by the researcher(s).

At the end of the day

12. The researcher(s) was instructed to collect the questionnaires regularly during the day. These were to be counted and placed in an envelope. The researcher(s) should seal the envelope and indicate on them the number of questionnaires enclosed. At the end of the day, all envelopes were put together in a larger one, and the number of questionnaires was written on top, along with the date of the research, the title of the Museum and the name of the researcher.

General comments

13. The research teams were asked for a minimum of two researchers conducting the research at each site.
14. They were asked to make sure that there was a table available and some seats for visitors to sit down and complete the questionnaires in reasonable comfort.
15. The researchers were also asked to count the visitors entering the museum in each case, and to fill in a denial form in the cases the visitors denied filling in the questionnaire. In some cases, the information regarding the number of visitors entering the museum per day was acquired in collaboration with the museum (as in the cases of the Museum of the History of Catalonia or the German Historical Museum).

16. In the cases of groups, the research teams were instructed to ask only the group leader to fill in the questionnaire. In some cases, this did not happen, though, since it was difficult to be certain about who were the group members, but also due to the decision of the research team.

Translating replies

1. In order to proceed to the analysis, it was not necessary to have a full transcription of each questionnaire. Nevertheless, it was necessary for the open-ended answers to be transcribed and translated in English, so that they were accessible to the team of the University of the Aegean that was responsible for the next step of analysis. The translations were made either on a specially designed form provided within the manual, or in an excel file sent by the teams.

Sampling method

1. In order for the sampling to be correct, the research teams were asked to make sure that their sample was as representative as possible. For this reason, the teams were advised to cover all periods of the museum opening, i.e. research was conducted during all days of the week and at all times during the museum's opening hours. The percentage of different categories (i.e. tourists, male/female, etc) should correspond to the museum's data if these were available. In the cases such data were not officially available, research teams were advised to collect such information in collaboration with the museum personnel (front-of-house staff).

Research diary

1. A diary of the quantitative research was completed at the end of each day, as well as a summary at the end of the week (forms were provided in the manual of research).

Piloting the research

In order to finalize the questionnaire, a pilot research was undertaken. The pilot took place in the Byzantine and Christian Museum in Athens (BCM), which is housed in a recently (2008-2011) inaugurated building located in the centre of Athens. Due to the financial problems of the country, the permanent exhibition galleries of the Museum were temporarily closed to the public (due to lack of personnel) and therefore the research was conducted in the temporary exhibition available at the time (February 2011), entitled "Duchess of Plaisance: the history behind the myth". The exhibition presented the 'historical truth' about the noblewoman in whose residence the Museum has been housed since the beginning of the century: Villa Ilissia remains in the centre of the new construction and the symbolic house of the Museum.

The collection of data took place during the first week of February 2011. Self-completed questionnaires were handed out to visitors on their way out of the exhibition. Ninety-four (94) questionnaires were collected and ninety (90) of them were valid. It has to be noted here that the Museum does not keep any kind of data regarding the number or demographics of its visitors. The only set of data available through the official sources (Hellenic Statistics Office) count the paying visitors and not those who visit the museum for free. In addition, on Sunday there is no admission fee, and as a result, visitor numbers are usually higher and not recorded. The research took place during two weekdays (Thursday and Friday) and two weekend days (Saturday and

Sunday). Half of the answers (46/94) were collected on Sunday, whereas 24/94 were collected on Saturday. Visitor numbers were really low during the weekdays, not only because of the entrance fee but also because during these days there were public transport strikes.

The questionnaire consisted of 19 questions organised in three sets: the first was that of the demographics (Q1-7). Then followed a set of questions regarding the specific visit and how the visitor related to the Museum (Q8-13). Then there was a list of questions that aimed to focus on the opinions of museum visitors about national museums in general and their expectations of them (Q14-19). Questions 16 and 17 in particular aimed to bring the visitor in front of some choices regarding the role of national museums, their creation and representation. Q18 aimed to associate the results of the two previous questions to the specific visit, and thus create a link between the two sets of questions. During the research it became apparent that we needed to rephrase Q16 and Q17 so that they were clearer to the visitors. Nevertheless, their content and emphasis did not change.

The results of this pilot as well as the difficulties we observed during the process of data collecting and during the analysis were discussed in the workshop organised by the University of Tartu for the three University teams. As a result, the questionnaire was redesigned so that the lessons learned during the process would be taken into account and inform future decisions. The questionnaire was finalized at the end of February and it was then translated and professionally printed so that to be used in the nine case studies across Europe selected as the main sample of our research.

Description of the questionnaire

The final questionnaire (see also Appendix 1) was structured in three parts that have already been presented above.

More specifically, the questionnaire was designed in order to collect information on the following (Table 4):

Table 4: Themes of the questionnaire

Theme	Question number
Demographics	Q15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20
Personal definitions of identity	Q21
Familiarity with each museum	Q1
The social context of the visit	Q2
Motivation for visiting the museum	Q3
The role of material culture	Q4 and Q4a
The reasons of interest in these objects, or the role of material culture in the construction of identities	Q4b
The public understanding of a national museum	Q5, 5a, 5b
The relation between this understanding and the specific visit	Q5c
The content(s) of a national museum	Q6, 6a, 7, 8, 9, 9a
The role of a national museum	Q10, 11, 13, 14, 22
Agents of creating national museums	Q12

The questionnaires were produced in English and then were translated in eight more languages: German, Greek, Swedish, Estonian, Latvian, Dutch, Spanish and Catalan. The translations were made by the respective teams; the translation in Catalan was done by both the museum staff and Dr. Laia Pujol Tost. In addition, English questionnaires were available for visitors who did not speak the language of each country. In the cases of Scotland and Ireland the research was undertaken using only the English questionnaires.

Table 5: Distribution of questionnaires, according to language

Museum	Languages of questionnaires
Estonian National Museum	Estonian, English
Latvian Open-Air Museum	Latvian, English
German Historical Museum	German, English
National Historical Museum	Greek, English
Nordiska museet	Swedish, English
National Museum of Ireland	English
National Museum of Scotland	English
Rijksmuseum	Dutch, English
Museum of History of Catalonia	Spanish, Catalan, English

Sampling

In order to create our sample we had to take into account the special characteristics of research in museums. Since it was impossible to know the full details of museum visitors so that a random sample could be created and museum visitors would reply only in the case they had the time and the wish to do so, our sample was an *availability one*. The disadvantages of an availability sample (biases on behalf of the researchers in the selection of the people to be asked, initiative undertaken by strong personalities only etc) were to be counterbalanced by working in advance in collaboration with the museum staff (front-of-house and/or administration) in order to create clusters of visitors and make the approach of people more targeted. Clustering museum visitors was done in two ways: first, research in all museums took place in different days and times of the museum opening, including weekends and week days, free entrance and paying days; second, an effort was made to include all the major groups that formulate the museums' audiences during the period of our research, i.e. both nationals and non-nationals, people belonging in different age groups, both male and female and so on. Researchers were asked to approach visitors randomly, but also taking into account the clusters of age, sex, nationality and social context (i.e. visitors who were visiting alone and visitors who were accompanied). We decided not to include school groups, which were not available anyway during the period of the research (summer).

In reality the population of our research was unknown and it was part of our work to find out more about it. Our sample was thus aimed to be a prism through which we could record a population, i.e. visitors to the national museums, whose description would be done *a posteriori*. And even though this kind of approach does not allow generalizations to the general public, it

does provide the possibility to identify phenomena, mechanisms, procedures and typical characteristics. For that purpose, we were also very thorough in recording the denials to participate in our research and to the “missing voices” that we tried to cover through alternative methods, namely the interviews and the focus groups.

The number of questionnaires we collected from each museum differed greatly, from the 257 questionnaires collected in Greece to the 974 questionnaires collected in Ireland. The reasons also varied and were related to the specific circumstances of the period the research took place (for example, in Athens it was a period of serious social turmoil, that resulted in many strikes and demonstrations that reduced the already small visitor numbers to the museum) and to the general visitation patterns of the museums (for instance, the summer is a busy period for the Open-Air Museum in Latvia or the Museum of Ireland, but not for the Athens museums that relies heavily for its visitation patterns on school groups).

The table that follows (Table 6) presents the number of the questionnaires we collected, per museum and per language of questionnaire.

Table 6: Distribution of questionnaires per museum and language

Museum			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
National Museum of Estonia	Valid	Estonian	210	58,8	58,8	58,8
		English	147	41,2	41,2	100,0
		Total	357	100,0	100,0	
German Historical Museum	Valid	German	455	69,5	69,5	69,5
		English	200	30,5	30,5	100,0
		Total	655	100,0	100,0	
National Historical Museum	Valid	Greek	123	44,9	44,9	44,9
		English	151	55,1	55,1	100,0
		Total	274	100,0	100,0	
National Museum of Ireland	Valid	English	974	100,0	100,0	100,0
Open-Air Museum of Latvia	Valid	Latvian	409	73,2	73,2	73,2
		English	150	26,8	26,8	100,0
		Total	559	100,0	100,0	
Rijksmuseum	Valid	Dutch	145	20,0	20,0	20,0
		English	581	80,0	80,0	100,0
		Total	726	100,0	100,0	
National Museum of Scotland	Valid	English	603	100,0	100,0	100,0
Museum of the History of Catalonia	Valid	Spanish	209	32,7	32,7	32,7
		Catalan	283	44,3	44,3	77,0
		English	147	23,0	23,0	100,0
		Total	639	100,0	100,0	
Nordiska Museum	Valid	Swedish	389	72,2	72,2	72,2
		English	150	27,8	27,8	100,0
		Total	539	100,0	100,0	

We collected a total of 5356 valid questionnaires from the nine museums.

In order to make our sample more representative, we needed to scale the results according to the general visitor numbers (and in that sense the “size”) of the museum. In order to do that we took into account the only common information that we had available from all museums, i.e. the annual visitor numbers as these were given by the institutions. The table below shows the annual visitor numbers per museum and the year of which this information was available. The arrows indicated the rounding up of the numbers made in some cases, in order for the statistical formula to be prepared.

Table 7: Annual Visitor Number per museum

Museum	Annual Visitor Number	Year
National Museum of Estonia	40.000 (estimated visitor number)	2011
German Historical Museum	824.001 → 820.000	2010
National Historical Museum of Athens	40.000 (estimated)	2010
National Museum of Ireland	258.812 → 260.000	2010
Open-Air Museum of Latvia	113.923 → 110.000	2011
Rijksmuseum	669.607 → 670.000	2011
National Museum of Scotland	833.324 → 830.000	2008
Museum of the History of Catalonia	204.410 → 200.000	2011
Nordiska museet	217.982 → 220.000	2009

According to the table above, a scaling factor was statistically developed in order to bring representative balance to the results: the numbers of respondents (frequency) has been multiplied per answer and per country by the fraction of the number of visitors of the correspondent museum to the total number of visitors of the nine museums (according to the given number of visitors by each museum rounded to the nearest ten thousand – e.g. as for Ireland the scaling factor was: $260.000/3.190.000 = 26/319 = 0.08$, see Table 8). Then the correspondent percentages of the modified frequencies have been calculated (it is important to note here that as the new produced scaled frequencies were no more integers – they have no direct physical meaning, they were rounded to the nearest integer in the tables, since it is better to work with the relative frequencies – percentages).

The scaling factor is presented in the table that follows and it is the one used in order to scale all the results presented in the next parts of this report.

Table 8: Scaling factor

Museum	Number of visitors	Scaling factor
National Museum of Estonia	40.000	$4/319 = 0,01$
German Historical Museum	820.000	$82/319 = 0,26$
National Historical Museum	40.000	$4/319 = 0,01$
National Museum of Ireland	260.000	$26/319 = 0,08$
Open-Air Museum of Latvia	110.000	$11/319 = 0,03$
Rijksmuseum	670.000	$67/319 = 0,21$
National Museum of Scotland	830.000	$83/319 = 0,26$
Museum of the History of Catalonia	200.000	$20/319 = 0,06$
Nordiska museet	220.000	$22/319 = 0,07$
Totals	3.190.000	1

Analysis and interpretation

The questionnaires were professionally designed by the Hellenic American Union based in Athens, and they were printed in a scannable format and color (red). They were then posted to the research teams in each case study museum. After the completion of the data collection, they were returned to the University of the Aegean, where they were professionally scanned by the Hellenic American Union and in particular by Pelagia Piperaki under the supervision of Stephen Basigkal. The data produced in excel forms were then transferred into the statistical package SPSS (v.19) and were analyzed by Ntigran Albert Matosian. The open-ended questions were transcribed in Microsoft Office excel software by Maroussa Tsakogianni, Alexandra Nikiforidou and Alexandra Bounia. The next state involved coding the open-ended questions and analysis and interpretation of data, undertaken by Niki Nikonanou, Alexandra Nikiforidou and Alexandra Bounia.

CHAPTER 2

Context and Museums



Photo: National Historical Museum, Athens, Greece (Photo: Evi Pitsiava) (August 2011)

Introduction

In this part of the report we are going to present in brief the museums that served as the case studies of this research. Each museum has its own collection, narrative and structure that inform many of the opinions and ideas that museum visitors express. This is particularly relevant to the first part of the questionnaire that refers to the specific visit, since it asks visitors to express their views about national museums in relation to the museum they are currently in.

Museum visitors who filled in the questionnaire based research can be categorized in two main groups: visitors born and/or living in the nation and visitors who came from outside the nation (tourists). For the purposes of this report, we are going to use the term “nationals” to refer to the first category of visitors and “non-nationals/tourists” to refer to the second category of visitors.

Museum Context

National Historical Museum of Athens (Greece)

The Museum was established and still belongs to the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece, which was created in 1882 in order to collect, save and present the heirlooms and the *testimonia* of contemporary Greek history. It has been supported by a large number of historians and intellectuals of the period, as well as by the Municipality of Athens and the State. The Museum focuses on the creation of a narrative regarding the past of the Modern Greek nation, but also on the establishment of a definition of the Modern Greek nation.³ It aims to create “*a continuous narrative that will present the continuity of the Greek nation from antiquity to the present day. Special emphasis is given to the development of a patriotic sentiment and the knowledge about the history and the nationally important personalities of the past.*” These aims reflect the well documented interest of the Greek nation to support its relation to antiquity which had been disputed and thus to acquire a role in the contemporary world.⁴

The Museum is housed in the Old Parliament of Greece, since the 1960s. The building was created in 1871, even though its planning was conceived in 1854. The design was initially made by the French architect François Boulanger, but it was completed by the Greek architect Panagiotis Kalkos. The Parliament was housed in this building from 1875 to 1935, when it was transferred to its current position, i.e. the old Palace.

The exhibition was inaugurated in 1961 and still remains largely unchanged. The Museum is a private Legal Entity and it is financed both by the State and the Society that founded it.

The permanent exhibition is structured as follows:

- Corridor 1: **The End of the Byzantium (1453 AD)**
- Hall 2: **The French Occupation and the Ottoman Occupation (13th-18th centuries)**
- Hall 3: **The Awakening of Greek National Conscience (1678-1821)**
- Hall 4: **The Greek War of Independence (1821-1827)**
- Hall 5: **The Weapons of the Greek War of Independence**

³ National Historical Museum of Athens website www.nationalmuseum.gr (last accessed 12/9/2012).

⁴ For a detailed presentation of the importance of this narrative for Greek museums see Hadjnikolaou (2003) and Gazi (2011). For a more general discussion see Hamilakis (2007) and Plantzos and Damaskos (2008), where also further bibliography.

- Hall 6: **Greek Intellectuals in the West (14th-15th c.)**
- Corridor 7: **Episodes of the Greek War of Independence**
- Corridor 8: **Philhellenism**
- Corridor 9: **The Sea-battles of the Greek War of Independence**
- Hall 10: **The Establishment of the modern Greek nation (1830)**
- Hall 11: **The Establishment of the Parliamentary System and the expanding of national borders**
- Hall 12: **The Balkan Wars (1912/13)/ The First World War (1914-1918) / The Asia Minor Catastrophe (1919-1922)**
- Hall 13: **The Second World War (1940-1944)**
- Corridor 14: **Memorabilia from the reigns of Kings Otto and George I**
- Hall 15: **The Folk Collection (folk costumes)**
- Hall 16: **The Folk Collection (folk costumes)**
- Hall 17: **The Folk Collection (folk costumes)**
- Hall 18: **Greek Society (19th c.)**

In the middle floor of the Museum, temporary exhibitions are organised. During the period of our research, there was no temporary exhibition in the middle floor of the museum – only a small exhibition (three cases of photographs and documents about the history of the Museum itself) which was located at the Corridor towards the exit.

Ethnographic Open Air Museum, Latvia

The Museum was founded in 1924 in order to house homesteads and social buildings from the four regions of Latvia, i.e. Kurzeme, Zemgale, Vidzeme and Latgale.⁵ It claims to be one of the oldest open-air museums in Europe and it follows the lead of Hazelius and his famous Skansen, in the sense that it aimed to relocate, reconstruct and furnish important buildings from all the parts of the country.

The first building was transferred to the museum in 1928 and gradually more buildings and artefacts were collected. By 1939 all the regions were represented in the collection. Nowadays, the collection consists of 140.000 objects; more than 121 old buildings are presented, whereas 3000 household objects are used to furnish them. The museum aims to represent “*all the sections of the population and ethnic groups as well as their social and material culture*” as well as to “*reward the visitor with the intimacy of these treasures of our predecessors*”. It warns the visitors though that “*this feeling, like any reminiscence of contemporary man (sic), may be vague, imperfect or too subjective though nursed by many and winnowed by the time*”.

The museum includes farmsteads of Latvian farmers, craftsmen and fishermen; the buildings house their tools, furnishings and everything needed to provide information about the period, the area and the owner. In addition the museum organises various events, seasonal festivities, craftsmen workshops, an annual fair and so on. The museum occupies a part of a pine forest on the shores of Jugla Lake and attracts nature lovers as well as museum lovers, due to the rich plant and animal life there. There is also a playground, an operational church, as well as eating and

⁵ Ethnographic Open Air Museum of Latvia website, www.muzeji.lv (last accessed 12/9/2012).

other facilities in it. According to the museum website:⁶ “*At the Museum visitors can: **find out and learn** about the history and development of crafts, technologies and traditions; **experience** the joy of dancing, singing, playing music and games; have a **good time and meaningful** day with your children, family, relatives, friends and contemporaries; **observe and try out** the old craft and taste the traditional food; **relax and enjoy** being in nature; visit the **applied folk art fair** during the first weekend of June.*”

The Museum is one of the 83 accredited museums in Latvia, 36 of which are owned by the State.⁷

National Museum of Estonia

The Museum is one of the 13 centrally controlled museums, governed by the Ministry of Culture of Estonia as an independent state agency.⁸ It was initiated in the 1860s by Estonian intellectuals and it was part of the Estonian national awakening. The collections were the result of the work of two learned societies that were actively collecting artefacts of national importance, along with narratives and other cultural expressions, inspired by a similar movement in Finland.

After a series of adventures (in particular during the period that Estonia was part of the USSR) the Museum was relocated in the Railway Workers Club and a new exhibition was inaugurated in 1994. Today it contains the largest ethnographic collection in Estonia, along with a manuscripts archive as well as drawings, photographs and films/video archives.

The exhibition of 1994, currently still in place, is entitled “Estonia. Land, People, Culture” and aims to cover different aspects of Estonian daily life. It is divided in the following parts:

- **Everyday Life** (this part is devoted to the Estonian farmstead that was structured around the barn and the other outbuildings. Tools, farm equipment and reconstructions of buildings dating from the 19th century onwards are presented in this part of the exhibition)
- **Holidays and festivities** (This part of the exhibition is devoted to the special meanings of things and places for the Estonian people).
- **Regional peculiarities of Estonian folk culture** (In this part of the display the differences between folk art traditions in the country are presented, along with similar artefacts from coastal Sweden and Russian-speaking Old Believers)
- **“To be an Estonian ...”** (This part displays the national renaissance in the second half of the 19th century when Estonian nationalism and patriotism became important)
- **Interiors and pictures through the 20th century – expectations and reality** (this part presents reconstructed interiors and photographic material related to the events that characterized Estonian history of the 20th century).

The relocation of the museum in a new building and the re-exhibition of the collections is currently a matter of debate in the country (Kuutma 2011).

German Historical Museum

The Museum was founded in 1987 by the Federal Republic of Germany and the Land Berlin, after the initiative of Fr. Helmut Kohl, the former Federal Chancellor, and the Mayor of Berlin,

⁶ Ethnographic Open Air Museum website: <http://www.brivdabasmuzejs.lv/lv/language> (last accessed 12/9/2012).

⁷ For a history of the Latvian museums see Kencis and Kuutma (2011).

⁸ For the history of the museums in Estonia, and of the Estonian National Museum in particular see Kuutma (2011).

Eberhard Diepgen. It was the end of a long process and a fierce debate between supporters and opponents of the idea of the creation of a historical museum of national importance. The main idea behind its establishment was to create a museum that “*would delineate the structures and developments, traditions and continuities of German History within the European context*” (Aronsson and Bentz 2011).

The Museum is financed by the Federal Republic of Germany, supervised by a board which comprises participants from the founding bodies, i.e. the Federal Government and the Land (the Region of Berlin).

The basic concept of the museum is to “*strive to help the citizens of our country to gain a clear idea of who they are as Germans and Europeans, as inhabitants of a region and members of a worldwide civilization*”.⁹

The permanent exhibition was inaugurated in 2006 and occupies the two floors of the Zeughaus very close to the Museum Island of Berlin: on the first floor the story of German history from the 1st century BC to the end of the First World War in 1918 is presented. The story develops in the following sections:

- **Early cultures and the middle ages**
- **Reformation and the Thirty Years' War**
- **Supremacy and German dualism in Europe**
- **From the French Revolution to the second German Empire**
- **The German empire and the First World War**

The ground floor is dedicated to what is called “Small Twentieth Century” and it covers the following periods:

- **The Weimar Republic**
- **The National-Socialist Regime and the Second World War**
- **Germany under Allied Occupation**
- **Divided Germany and Re-unification**

The last room in the exhibition provides a space for thought and “history” in its creation is presented.

The permanent exhibition’s themes correspond to the museum’s objective of presenting a multiplicity of perspectives on German history, as well as placing it within the international context. For example, among the issues discussed the visitor can find: everyday life of upper and lower classes, the relation between the city and the country, violence and resistance, revolution and counter-revolution or the German cartographers of the 15th and 16th centuries, and the era of imperialism. In addition, the various contemporary viewpoints and evaluations of historical events are often placed alongside each other in order to provide different perspectives/views on the same subject. The exhibition addresses some general questions at the beginning, regarding basic information about Germany and Germans (where is it, what unites them, who ruled, who obeyed, who resisted, what leads to war, how is peace made, what did people believe, how did they use to live, etc.). The exhibition though does not necessarily answer these questions: rather, it provides visitors with the opportunity to find their own interpretations, based on what they have seen (Koschick 2008).

⁹ Museum website <http://www.dhm.de> (last accessed 12/9/2012).

A chronological route allows the visitor to get a quick overview, while side paths branching off from the main route offer more in-depth presentations. In addition visitors can access a wealth of more detailed information with the help of so-called “media stations”. Finally, a series of “milestones” – designed as illuminated steles on a square base – provide fundamental information on a period on each of their sides.

At the time of the research three temporary exhibitions were available in the museum: “Order and Annihilation – The Police and the Nazi Regime”, “On Living. Photographs by Thomas Hoepker and Daniel Biskup” and “The XXth Century - People-Places-Times – Two Decades of the German Historical Museums' Photo Collection”.

National Museum of Ireland (Collins Barracks Branch)

The Collins Barracks branch is the newest part of the National Museum of Ireland. It is located in the recently refurbished Collins Barracks which occupies 18 acres of land just north of the river Liffey. The museum focuses on the decorative arts, incorporating economic, social, political and military history. The display consists of artefacts ranging from weaponry, furniture, folklore and costumes to silver, ceramics and glassware. Interactive multimedia accompany the exhibits on both floors.

Responsibility for the Museum was passed in 2002 to the Department of Arts, Sport and Tourism; in 2005 it was finally established as a semi-state autonomous agency under its own Board.

The Collins Barracks complex started out in 1702 as “The Barracks”; in the early 19th century it became the “Royal Barracks”, and was re-named Collins Barracks in 1922, when it was taken over by the Free State. The original buildings were designed by Col. Thomas Burgh and the complex, which includes 18th and 19th-century buildings, housed troops for three centuries. It was assigned to the National Museum of Ireland to use in 1994 and the first phase of exhibitions on the site opened in September 1997. Work on a subsequent phase commenced in 2009.

The museum covers the history of Ireland from c. 1550 to the present. It also houses the national collection of decorative arts. There is no specific route and the visitors can visit either the decorative arts section or the history one, or both. The exhibition is structured as follows:

- **Reconstructed Rooms: Four Centuries of Furnishings** (a series of room settings from the 17th century to the high style of the 19th century)
- **Eileen Gray** (She was one of the most influential designers and architects of the 20th century – the exhibition illustrates both her life and work)
- **The Way We Wore** (Costumes and jewellery worn in Ireland mainly from the 1760s to the 1960s)
- **Curator's Choice** (25 objects selected by the curators from the decorative and technological parts of the collection)
- **Out of Storage** (an exhibition resembling open storage, so that visitors could have an impression of how the storage looks like in terms of contents)
- **Irish Silver** (It traces the development of silversmith from the 17th century to the present)
- **Airgead, A Thousand Years of Irish Coins & Currency** (the story of Irish coins and currency from the 10th century to the present)
- **What's In Store?** (Visible Storage facility)

- **The Easter Rising: Understanding 1916** (This exhibition examines the decade of disturbance between 1913 and 1923, from the Dublin Lockout, through the Easter Rising to the end of the Civil War.)
- **A Dubliner's Collection of Asian Art – The Albert Bender Exhibition** (the private collection that a Dubliner donated to the Museum that also provides an opportunity to present Asian art and culture)
- **Irish Country Furniture** (An exhibition of the furniture typically found in a traditional Irish rural home; apart from the evolution in furniture this exhibition highlights the changes in Irish social and economic life during the 19th and 20th centuries)
- **Soldiers & Chiefs** (Ireland's military history from 1550 to the 21st century)

At the time of the research four temporary exhibitions were available in the museum: “Irish High Crosses” (early Irish sculpture), that featured plaster cast replicas of High Crosses from various parts of Ireland, “21st Century Irish Craft”, featuring the Irish contemporary craft collection of the museum, “Blaze Away-Duelling, Gun makers and Sword makers in 19th century Ireland”, which examined duelling in Ireland and the work of two Irish families who made swords and guns in Dublin in the 19th century and “Franciscan Faith: Sacred Art in Ireland 1600 – 1750”, which included religious silver and other material from several of the Franciscan houses, displayed together for the first time.

Rijksmuseum

An initiative of King Louis Napoleon, the Museum was inaugurated in the early 19th century. The building was constructed in the 1880s on a piece of land donated to the State by the City of Amsterdam. The Museum's ground plan is a reference to the town hall of the city, and its elevation refers to the Dutch Golden Age of the 16th and 17th centuries. The collection was formed by bringing together different national collections of decorative art and fine arts whose common denominator was their importance for the history of the country (Bodenstein 2011). Interestingly, and even though the museum is well known as a museum of art, it was conceived from the beginning as a history museum. Nevertheless, the importance of painting for Dutch history was considered such that it is not surprising that the main national museum of the country focuses on the Dutch school of painting. Carel Blotkamp argues: “*Painting was prototypical of Dutch culture as such: it was seen as a faithful reflection of a self-confident bourgeois society, founded on the pillars of realism, industry, domesticity, neatness, and liberal attitudes in religious and political matters. (...) Painting is in the blood of the Dutch; painting is their principal contribution to European culture. The clichéd view, formed in the late-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, is stubbornly persistent?*” (2004: 295). Thus the museum seems to valorize what seems to be the most important national master narrative, i.e. the genius of artistic expression which is related to the rendering of liberal, bourgeois, industrious and civically democratic values – all of them considered as inherent to the most famous themes of Dutch golden age painting (Bodenstein 2011).

The Museum closed for refurbishment, which has been a protracted process taking ten years. In the meantime, the Museum presents a small scale exhibition of its masterpieces in the newly furnished Philips Wing. The exhibition entitled “Rijksmuseum. The Masterpieces” is advertised

as offering the opportunity to see the highlights of the “Golden Age” in one place.¹⁰ This phrasing is often repeated by the visitors, as we will soon find out.

The popularity of the museum remains constant as the following comparison shows: in 2003, when the whole museum was open and 700 paintings and 1 million objects were on display there were 1 million visitors. In 2010, despite the vastly reduced displays, there were 600,000 visitors.

The main parts of this small-scale exhibition in place during the research are the following:

- **Dutch Republic**
- **World Power**
- **Frans Hals**
- **Rembrandt and his pupils**
- **The later Rembrandt**
- **Johannes Vermeer**

National Museum of Scotland

The National Museum of Scotland is located in Edinburgh; it was built in the late 1990s adjacent to the 19th century Royal Scottish Museum. The NMS opened in 2008, the same year and even month that the first independent Scottish Parliament was established. The Museum became thus a highly symbolic place, both in cultural and political terms (McLean and Cooke 2003). The Museum consists of six main parts: the **Grand Gallery** (used for the display of large scale objects), **Natural World**, **World Cultures**, **Art and Design**, **Science and Technology** and **Scotland**: this last section presents the history of Scotland from antiquity to the present time. According to the map distributed to the museum: “*archaeological finds, social history and design: real things found, made and used in Scotland*” are the contents of this part of the Museum.

More particularly, the exhibition is organized in the following sections:

- **Beginnings** (explores the evolution of the Scottish landscape, flora and fauna)
- **Early People** (archaeological collections from prehistory to the Roman times)
- **Kingdom of the Scots** (it covers the period from the Declaration of Arbroath in 1320 to 1707 when Scotland was an independent nation)
- **Scotland transformed** (the history of Scotland as part of Britain, and the technological and industrial developments of the 18th and 19th centuries)
- **Industry and Empire** (it explores the life in 19th century Scotland, the emigration of Scottish people and the trade of the British Empire)
- **Scotland: a changing nation** (it tells the story of Scotland from the First World War to the present day).

Nordiska museet¹¹

Nordiska museet is the Swedish museum of cultural history. It was founded by Artur Hazelius, in 1873, who also was the founding father of Skansen, the first open air museum, opened in 1891. *Nordiska museet* and *Skansen* were private initiatives until the early twentieth century when

¹⁰ See webpage of the museum http://www.nms.ac.uk/our_museums/national_museum.aspx (last accessed 12/9/2012).

¹¹ See also the Museum’s website: <http://www.nordiskamuseet.se> (last accessed 12/9/2012).

Nordiska museet was incorporated into a foundation that is owned by the State but has its own board of trustees (Widén 2011). The Museum is considered one of the most important producers of “Swedishness”: it exhibits people and popular culture from different areas of Sweden, but all flagged as Swedes, and presents a multifaceted set of regional identities as a homogenized Swedish ethnicity. It also discusses groups like the Sámi and attempts to present what it means to be Swedish. It is therefore one of the most important national museums of Sweden (Widén 2011).

The museum presents a series of exhibition on issues ranging from the home, clothes and fashion, customs and traditions and aims to “*uncover daily life in Sweden through the ages*”.

Among its permanent exhibitions are the following:

- **Sápmi.** This is an exhibition about Sami life in Sweden. Apart from presenting the life of this community it also aims to “*show how the Sami have influenced the Swedish and the Swedes have influenced the Sami.*”
- **Swedish Folk Art.** It presents folk art as it developed in Sweden during the 18th and 19th centuries. The exhibition focuses on inspiration and its influences.
- **Images in time.** This is an exhibition presenting photographs from the Nordiska museet archives.
- **Table Settings.** The display features table setting from the 16th century to circa 1950, in order to highlight food and drink as well as customs and traditions that relate to food and drink.
- **Interiors.** It is an exhibition on Swedish interior design from 1870 to 2000.
- **Strindberg at Nordiska museet.** The exhibition is devoted to August Strindberg, one of Sweden’s best-known authors. The exhibition highlights the multi-faceted interests and also the debates that this controversial personality created. It is also related to the museum itself: Strindberg knew Artur Hazelius and contributed ideas and acquired objects for the museum’s collections. After Strindberg’s death, much of his property came to Nordiska museet.
- **Traditions.** The exhibition highlights the importance of celebrations and festivals throughout life, “*why, when and how we observe traditions.*”

During the period of research there were the following temporary exhibitions in the Museum:

- “Garbage” (an exhibition on keeping and throwing away, meaning and emotions about garbage)
- A selection of Nordiska museet’s exhibition posters (1900-1950)
- “The Nail on the Head” (a selection of museum artefacts)
- “A Furor of Images” (photographs from Italy)
- “Guldknappen 1981-2011” (an exhibition on an annual fashion prize instigated by a fashion magazine)
- “Tourism” (photographs capturing the spirit of tourism in Sweden).

The Museum of the History of Catalonia¹²

The decision to launch a museum dedicated to the history of Catalonia was taken by the Executive Council of the Generalitat de Catalunya in 1993 with the unanimous support of the Catalanian Parliament. The Museum was established by Decree 47 in 1996. The purpose of the museum is described as *“to conserve, exhibit and raise awareness of the history of Catalonia as our joint heritage and to strengthen citizens' sense of identification with the nation's history”*. In order to achieve these objectives, the museum *“is to encourage and organise activities to raise awareness of the history of Catalonia and to co-operate with others to increase the study and dissemination of this history”*. It is financed and run by the autonomous government of Catalonia, the *Generalitat de Catalunya*.

The Museum is situated in the port of Barcelona, in a building known as the Palau de Mar. It used to be the former General Stores, the sole building of Barcelona's Old Port still standing. The Stores were designed in 1881 by the engineer Maurici Garrán, the first director of the Barcelona Port Board of Works, and were intended for use as trading depots.¹³

The permanent exhibition of the museum is organised in the following sections:

- **The Roots:** This part of the exhibition covers the history of the Catalan lands since the Lower Palaeolithic period to the end of the 5th cent. AD, when the Roman Empire was defeated by the Visigothic kingdom.
- **The Birth of a Nation:** This part of the exhibition follows the history of the region from 711 (when Arabs won the Visigothic kings till the 12th cent.). This part of the exhibition argues that this is the period when the word “Catalunya” and the Catalan language first emerged.
- **Our Sea:** The growth of the Catalan region from the 13th to the 15th centuries is presented in this part of the exhibition.
- **On the Edge of the Empire:** This part claims that Catalonia remained a state during the Habsburg Empire and follows the history of the region within the European developments in terms of monarchies. The Reapers' War (1640-1659) and the War of the Spanish Succession (1705-1715) are also presented along with developments in art and language.
- **A Steam-powered Nation:** The impact of the 18th century industrial revolution in Catalonia is presented in this part of the exhibition. The section also looks at the revitalization of Catalan language and culture through the Renaixença and Modernisme.
- **The Electric Years.** This part of the exhibition discusses the first 30 years of the 20th century. It focuses on the labour movement, but also on the political events that marked this period, among which very important are: the Mancomunitat de Catalunya (1914-1925), with Enric Prat de la Riba as its president; the declaration of the Second Republic in 1931 that paved the way for the establishment of the Generalitat, with Francesc Macià and then Lluís Companys, from ERC (Republican Left of Catalonia), as its presidents; and the military coup d'état of 1936 that became the beginning of a long dictatorship and the end of the self-government of the Catalans.

¹² For further information see also the museum's website: <http://www.en.mhcat.cat/> (last accessed 12/9/2012).

¹³ For a detailed presentation of the Museum, see MHC (2006).

- **Defeat and Recovery:** This part is devoted to the impoverishment of economy, but also political and cultural issues during the Franco dictatorship (1939-1975) and it ends with the restoration of civil liberties in 1979.
- **Portrait of Contemporary Catalonia (1980-2007):** This is the final part of the exhibition; it presents a portrait of the Catalan nation since Franco's death and its close relationship to the historical dynamics of the whole of Spain and the rest of the world.

The Museum has a very active program of exhibitions of various issues. During the time of the research there were two temporary exhibitions: one on POUM, i.e. the left party of Catalonia and the second on the genesis of the Generalitat. Both exhibitions were very popular with local visitors, who often came to the museum just to visit these two exhibitions. On the other hand, tourists either from other parts of Spain or from other countries visited mainly the permanent exhibition.

CHAPTER 3

Who visits national museums and why



Introduction

This section looks at the key findings regarding the first objective of this research, i.e. who visits national museums and why. We will present the results from the questions regarding the demographics (Q15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20), the familiarity with the museum (Q1), the social context of the visit (Q2), the motivation for visiting the museum (Q3), as well as where people would go in order to find out about national history (Q22) – a question which allows us first to make assumptions about why people choose to visit national museums, but also about what they think as the national museums' role.

Visitors' profiles: Who visits national museums?

Nationality

Out of the 5356 questionnaires collected during our research, 2662, i.e. 52,9% of the total, were completed by people of another nationality than that of the museum we did the research in, whereas 2371 questionnaires, i.e. 47,1% of the total were completed by nationals, i.e. visitors who *did* belong to the same nationality as the museum.

Table 9: Distribution of questionnaires per nationality

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	2371	44,5	47,1	47,1
	Other	2662	50,0	52,9	100,0
	Total	5033	94,5	100,0	
Missing		293	5,5		
Total		5326	100,0		

80,8% of the respondents who claimed to belong to the same nationality as the museum used the questionnaire in their native language, whereas 19,2% of the respondents, even though they claimed not to belong to the same nation, knew the language of the nation they were visiting and replied in the native language.

Similarly, 96,5% of those who used the English questionnaire claimed that they did not belong to the same nation as the museum, whereas 3,5% of people using the English questionnaire claimed that they *did* belong to the same nation as the museum.

Table 10: Distribution of questionnaires per nationality and language

Visitor			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
National	Valid	Of this nation	2280	78,4	80,8	80,8
		Other	543	18,7	19,2	100,0
		Total	2823	97,0	100,0	
	Missing	0	70	2,4		
		System	16	,6		
		Total	86	3,0		
Total			2909	100,0		
Non-national	Valid	Of this nation	76	3,3	3,5	3,5
		Other	2119	92,6	96,5	100,0
		Total	2195	95,9	100,0	
	Missing	0	68	3,0		
		System	25	1,1		
		Total	93	4,1		
Total			2288	100,0		

These percentages differ per museum. In the Estonian museum 56% of the respondents were from the same nation, whereas 44% were of a different nationality. In Estonia the non native respondents were mainly from Finland, Germany, Belgium and the US.

Table 11: National Museum of Estonia: nationality of respondents Nationality^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	192	53,8	56,0	56,0
	Other	151	42,3	44,0	100,0
	Total	343	96,1	100,0	
Missing		14	3,9		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

In the German museum, the percentage of the same nationality is 55,3%, whereas non-nationals were 44,7 % of the respondents. The majority came from the UK, Holland, France and the USA.

Table 12: German Historical Museum: Nationality of respondentsNationality^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	343	52,4	55,3	55,3
	Other	277	42,3	44,7	100,0
	Total	620	94,7	100,0	
Missing		35	5,3		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum: German Historical Museum

In the Greek museum, the foreign visitors are more (55,9%) than the local ones (44,1%).

Table 13: National Historical Museum of Athens: Nationality of respondentsNationality^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	116	42,3	44,1	44,1
	Other	147	53,6	55,9	100,0
	Total	263	96,0	100,0	
Missing		11	4,0		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens

The non-national visitors came mainly from the USA, Spain, France and Germany.

Similar was the case in the Irish museum with the non-nationals reaching 53% and the Irish 47%:

Table 14: National Museum of Ireland: Nationality of respondentsNationality^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	409	42,0	47,0	47,0
	Other	462	47,4	53,0	100,0
	Total	871	89,4	100,0	
Missing		103	10,6		
Total		974	100,0		

a. Museum: National Museum of Ireland (Collins Barracks)

The non-national visitors mainly came from the USA, followed closely by British, Canadian and Australian citizens.

In the Latvian museum, on the contrary, the largest proportion of the respondents was nationals (60,2%).

Table 15: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Nationality of respondentsNationality^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	321	57,4	60,2	60,2
	Other	212	37,9	39,8	100,0
	Total	533	95,3	100,0	
Missing		26	4,7		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum = Open-Air Museum of Latvia

For the non-national ones, the largest number came from Russia, Germany and the USA.

In the Rijksmuseum, most of the respondents are non-nationals (79,3%). Most of them came from Germany, the USA, France and Italy.

Table 16: Rijksmuseum: Nationality of respondentsNationality^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	146	20,1	20,7	20,7
	Other	558	76,9	79,3	100,0
	Total	704	97,0	100,0	
Missing		22	3,0		
Total		726	100,0		

a. Museum = Rijksmuseum

In the National Museum of Scotland, 38,6% of the respondents were of the nation, whereas 61,4% of another. The majority came from Britain, Canada, the USA and Germany.

Table 17: National Museum of Scotland: Nationality of respondentsNationality^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	222	36,8	38,6	38,6
	Other	353	58,5	61,4	100,0
	Total	575	95,4	100,0	
Missing		28	4,6		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

In the Museum of the History of Catalonia, the percentage becomes 50,3% for those replying that they are of *this* nation (i.e. Catalan) and 49,7% who reply that they are from a different nation. In this case, though, extra care should be shown since in many replies there have been misunderstandings with the use of the word “nation”, that seemed to confuse many of the non

Catalan respondents, particularly those from outside Spain, but also visitors coming from other regions of the country.

Table 18: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Nationality of the respondents

Nationality^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	310	48,5	50,3	50,3
	Other	306	47,9	49,7	100,0
	Total	616	96,4	100,0	
Missing		23	3,6		
Total		639	100,0		

a. Museum = Museum of the History of Catalonia

Finally, in Sweden 61,4% of the respondents were of the same nation, whereas 38,6% of other nations. From those who were non-nationals, the largest number came from Germany, USA and France.

Table 19: Nordiska museet: Nationality of respondents

Nationality^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Of this nation	312	57,9	61,4	61,4
	Other	196	36,4	38,6	100,0
	Total	508	94,2	100,0	
Missing		31	5,8		
Total		539	100,0		

a. Museum = Nordiska museet

Gender

When it came to gender, 55,8% of the respondents in total were female and 44,2% were male. From observation we know that in many cases, couples were answering together the questionnaire, although at the end they made a decision about who was mentioned in this set of questions.

Diagram 1: All case studies: Gender of the respondents




Table 20: All case studies: Gender of the respondents

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	2247	42,2	44,2	44,2
	Female	2840	53,3	55,8	100,0
	Total	5087	95,5	100,0	
Missing		239	4,5		
Total		5326	100,0		

Per nationality and gender the percentages are the following:

Table 21: All case studies: Nationality and gender

Gender

Nationality			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
National	Valid	Male	969	40,9	41,1	41,1
		Female	1389	58,6	58,9	100,0
		Total	2358	99,5	100,0	
	Missing	13	,5			
Total			2371	100,0		
Non national	Valid	Male	1224	46,0	46,5	46,5
		Female	1407	52,9	53,5	100,0
		Total	2631	98,8	100,0	
	Missing	31	1,2			
Total			2662	100,0		

By museum these percentages vary as follows:

In the National Museum of Estonia females participated in the research more than men.

Table 22: National Museum of Estonia: Gender of respondentsGender^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	118	33,1	34,4	34,4
	Female	225	63,0	65,6	100,0
	Total	343	96,1	100,0	
Missing		14	3,9		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

In the German Historical Museum the opposite was the case.

Table 23: German Historical Museum: Gender of respondentsGender^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	342	52,2	54,3	54,3
	Female	288	44,0	45,7	100,0
	Total	630	96,2	100,0	
Missing		25	3,8		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum = German Historical Museum

In the National Historical Museum of Athens the ratio was the same.

Table 24: National Historical Museum of Athens: Gender of respondentsGender^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	151	55,1	57,2	57,2
	Female	113	41,2	42,8	100,0
	Total	264	96,4	100,0	
Missing		10	3,6		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens.

In the Irish museum more female than male respondents filled in the questionnaires.

Table 25: National Museum of Ireland: Gender of respondentsGender^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	407	41,8	46,1	46,1
	Female	475	48,8	53,9	100,0
	Total	882	90,6	100,0	
Missing		92	9,4		
Total		974	100,0		

a. Museum: National Museum of Ireland

In the Latvian museum is the same.

Table 26: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Gender of respondentsGender^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	196	35,1	36,2	36,2
	Female	345	61,7	63,8	100,0
	Total	541	96,8	100,0	
Missing		18	3,2		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum = Open-Air Museum of Latvia

In the Rijksmuseum the percentage of female respondents is larger than that of the male ones.

Table 27: Rijksmuseum: Gender of respondentsGender^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	289	39,8	40,8	40,8
	Female	420	57,9	59,2	100,0
	Total	709	97,7	100,0	
Missing		17	2,3		
Total		726	100,0		

a. Museum = Rijksmuseum

And so is in the cases of the National Museum of Scotland, the Museum of the History of Catalonia and the Nordiska museet.

Table 28: National Museum of Scotland: Gender of respondentsGender^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	268	44,4	45,5	45,5
	Female	321	53,2	54,5	100,0
	Total	589	97,7	100,0	
Missing		14	2,3		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Table 29: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Gender of respondentsGender^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	291	45,5	47,1	47,1
	Female	327	51,2	52,9	100,0
	Total	618	96,7	100,0	
Missing		21	3,3		
Total		639	100,0		

a. Museum = Museum of the History of Catalonia

Table 30: Nordiska museet: Gender of respondentsGender^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	185	34,3	36,2	36,2
	Female	326	60,5	63,8	100,0
	Total	511	94,8	100,0	
Missing		28	5,2		
Total		539	100,0		

a. Museum = Nordiska museet

Age

When it comes to the age groups represented in our sample, the distribution can be presented in the following diagram and table:

Diagram 2: All case studies. Age of participants in the research




Table 31: All case studies: Age of participants in the research

Age group

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	319	6,0	6,3	6,3
	18-30	1692	31,8	33,2	39,4
	31-45	1233	23,2	24,2	63,6
	46-65	1350	25,3	26,4	90,0
	over 65	510	9,6	10,0	100,0
	Total	5104	95,8	100,0	
Missing		222	4,2		
Total		5326	100,0		

Per museum this distribution can be illustrated in the following tables:

Table 32: National Museum of Estonia: Age groups of the sample

Age group^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	19	5,3	5,4	5,4
	18-30	127	35,6	36,2	41,6
	31-45	79	22,1	22,5	64,1
	46-65	83	23,2	23,6	87,7
	over 65	43	12,0	12,3	100,0
	Total	351	98,3	100,0	
Missing		6	1,7		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

Table 33: German Historical Museum: Age groups of the sampleAge group^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	17	2,6	2,7	2,7
	18-30	250	38,2	39,6	42,3
	31-45	136	20,8	21,6	63,9
	46-65	189	28,9	30,0	93,8
	over 65	39	6,0	6,2	100,0
	Total	631	96,3	100,0	
Missing		24	3,7		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum = German Historical Museum

Table 34: National Historical Museum of Athens: Age groups of the sampleAge group^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	8	2,9	3,0	3,0
	18-30	97	35,4	36,3	39,3
	31-45	75	27,4	28,1	67,4
	46-65	76	27,7	28,5	95,9
	over 65	11	4,0	4,1	100,0
	Total	267	97,4	100,0	
Missing		7	2,6		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens

Table 35: National Museum of Ireland: Age groups of the sampleAge group^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	74	7,6	8,4	8,4
	18-30	289	29,7	32,7	41,1
	31-45	216	22,2	24,4	65,5
	46-65	225	23,1	25,5	91,0
	over 65	80	8,2	9,0	100,0
	Total	884	90,8	100,0	
Missing		90	9,2		
Total		974	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Ireland

Table 36: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Age groups of the sampleAge group^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	43	7,7	7,8	7,8
	18-30	154	27,5	28,0	35,8
	31-45	160	28,6	29,1	64,9
	46-65	146	26,1	26,5	91,5
	over 65	47	8,4	8,5	100,0
	Total	550	98,4	100,0	
Missing		9	1,6		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum =Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Table 37: Rijksmuseum: Age groups of the sampleAge group^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	52	7,2	7,3	7,3
	18-30	289	39,8	40,8	48,2
	31-45	161	22,2	22,7	70,9
	46-65	165	22,7	23,3	94,2
	over 65	41	5,6	5,8	100,0
	Total	708	97,5	100,0	
Missing		18	2,5		
Total		726	100,0		

a. Museum = Rijksmuseum

Table 38: National Museum of Scotland: Age groups of the sampleAge group^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	48	8,0	8,3	8,3
	18-30	228	37,8	39,4	47,7
	31-45	120	19,9	20,7	68,4
	46-65	116	19,2	20,0	88,4
	over 65	67	11,1	11,6	100,0
	Total	579	96,0	100,0	
Missing		24	4,0		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Table 39: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Age groups of the sample

Age group ^a		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	39	6,1	6,3	6,3
	18-30	150	23,5	24,2	30,5
	31-45	178	27,9	28,7	59,2
	46-65	159	24,9	25,6	84,8
	over 65	94	14,7	15,2	100,0
	Total	620	97,0	100,0	
Missing		19	3,0		
Total		639	100,0		

a. Museum = Museum of the History of Catalonia

Table 40: Nordiska museet: Age groups of the sample

Age group ^a		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 18	19	3,5	3,7	3,7
	18-30	108	20,0	21,0	24,7
	31-45	108	20,0	21,0	45,7
	46-65	191	35,4	37,2	82,9
	over 65	88	16,3	17,1	100,0
	Total	514	95,4	100,0	
Missing		25	4,6		
Total		539	100,0		

a. Museum = Nordiska museet

The relation between the age groups of the participants in the research and their nationality is illustrated in the following diagram and table:

Diagram 3: All case studies: Nationality and age groups




Table 41: All case studies: Nationality and age groups

Age group

Nationality			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
National	Valid	under 18	179	7,5	7,6	7,6
		18-30	606	25,6	25,7	33,3
		31-45	603	25,4	25,6	58,8
		46-65	647	27,3	27,4	86,2
		over 65	325	13,7	13,8	100,0
		Total	2360	99,5	100,0	
	Missing	11	,5			
Total		2371	100,0			
Non national	Valid	under 18	134	5,0	5,1	5,1
		18-30	1061	39,9	40,1	45,2
		31-45	611	23,0	23,1	68,3
		46-65	675	25,4	25,5	93,8
		over 65	165	6,2	6,2	100,0
		Total	2646	99,4	100,0	
	Missing	16	,6			
Total		2662	100,0			

Occupation

The following diagram and table present the average distribution of respondents in different occupations:

Diagram 4: All case studies: Occupation of the respondents




Table 42: Occupation of the respondents in all museums

Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	110	2,1	2,2	2,2
	Student	1302	24,4	26,0	28,2
	Unemployed	123	2,3	2,5	30,7
	Retired	621	11,7	12,4	43,1
	Working in the private sector	1094	20,5	21,9	65,0
	Working in the public sector	1201	22,5	24,0	89,0
	Self-employed	373	7,0	7,5	96,4
	Other	179	3,4	3,6	100,0
	Total	5003	93,9	100,0	
Missing		323	6,1		
Total		5326	100,0		

The largest proportion of the participants is students and people working in the public sector, with those working in the private sector to follow.

Per country these are the occupations people chose to describe themselves with are the following:

Table 43: National Museum of Estonia: Occupation of the participants in the researchOccupation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	4	1,1	1,2	1,2
	Student	102	28,6	30,2	31,4
	Unemployed	2	,6	,6	32,0
	Retired	53	14,8	15,7	47,6
	Working in the private sector	50	14,0	14,8	62,4
	Working in the public sector	87	24,4	25,7	88,2
	Self-employed	21	5,9	6,2	94,4
	Other	19	5,3	5,6	100,0
	Total	338	94,7	100,0	
Missing		19	5,3		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

Table 44: German Historical Museum: Occupation of the participants in the research
Occupation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	15	2,3	2,4	2,4
	Student	190	29,0	30,5	33,0
	Unemployed	7	1,1	1,1	34,1
	Retired	51	7,8	8,2	42,3
	Working in the private sector	120	18,3	19,3	61,6
	Working in the public sector	176	26,9	28,3	89,9
	Self-employed	43	6,6	6,9	96,8
	Other	20	3,1	3,2	100,0
	Total	622	95,0	100,0	
Missing		33	5,0		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum = German Historical Museum

Table 45: National Historical Museum of Athens: Occupation of the participants in the research

Occupation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	3	1,1	1,1	1,1
	Student	81	29,6	30,8	31,9
	Unemployed	10	3,6	3,8	35,7
	Retired	19	6,9	7,2	43,0
	Working in the private sector	45	16,4	17,1	60,1
	Working in the public sector	66	24,1	25,1	85,2
	Self-employed	29	10,6	11,0	96,2
	Other	10	3,6	3,8	100,0
	Total	263	96,0	100,0	
Missing		11	4,0		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens

Table 46: National Museum of Ireland: Occupation of the participants in the researchOccupation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	27	2,8	3,2	3,2
	Student	250	25,7	29,2	32,3
	Unemployed	23	2,4	2,7	35,0
	Retired	118	12,1	13,8	48,8
	Working in the private sector	170	17,5	19,8	68,6
	Working in the public sector	176	18,1	20,5	89,1
	Self-employed	62	6,4	7,2	96,4
	Other	31	3,2	3,6	100,0
	Total	857	88,0	100,0	
Missing		117	12,0		
Total		974	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Ireland

Table 47: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Occupation of the participants in the researchOccupation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	20	3,6	3,7	3,7
	Student	94	16,8	17,3	21,0
	Unemployed	24	4,3	4,4	25,5
	Retired	67	12,0	12,4	37,8
	Working in the private sector	136	24,3	25,1	62,9
	Working in the public sector	142	25,4	26,2	89,1
	Self-employed	39	7,0	7,2	96,3
	Other	20	3,6	3,7	100,0
	Total	542	97,0	100,0	
Missing		17	3,0		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum= Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Table 48: Rijksmuseum: Occupation of the participants in the researchOccupation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	10	1,4	1,4	1,4
	Student	238	32,8	34,0	35,4
	Unemployed	15	2,1	2,1	37,6
	Retired	60	8,3	8,6	46,1
	Working in the private sector	152	20,9	21,7	67,9
	Working in the public sector	148	20,4	21,1	89,0
	Self-employed	49	6,7	7,0	96,0
	Other	28	3,9	4,0	100,0
	Total	700	96,4	100,0	
Missing		26	3,6		
Total		726	100,0		

a. Museum = Rijksmuseum

Table 49: National Museum of Scotland: Occupation of the participants in the researchOccupation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	15	2,5	2,6	2,6
	Student	162	26,9	27,9	30,5
	Unemployed	8	1,3	1,4	31,8
	Retired	86	14,3	14,8	46,6
	Working in the private sector	119	19,7	20,5	67,1
	Working in the public sector	130	21,6	22,4	89,5
	Self-employed	49	8,1	8,4	97,9
	Other	12	2,0	2,1	100,0
	Total	581	96,4	100,0	
Missing		22	3,6		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Table 50: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Occupation of the participants in the research

Occupation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	11	1,7	1,8	1,8
	Student	112	17,5	18,5	20,3
	Unemployed	27	4,2	4,5	24,8
	Retired	76	11,9	12,5	37,3
	Working in the private sector	174	27,2	28,7	66,0
	Working in the public sector	134	21,0	22,1	88,1
	Self-employed	45	7,0	7,4	95,5
	Other	27	4,2	4,5	100,0
	Total	606	94,8	100,0	
Missing		33	5,2		
Total		639	100,0		

a. Museum = Museum of the History of Catalonia

Table 51: Nordiska museet: Occupation of the participants in the research

Occupation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Looking after the house	5	0,9	1,0	1,0
	Student	73	13,5	14,8	15,8
	Unemployed	7	1,3	1,4	17,2
	Retired	91	16,9	18,4	35,6
	Working in the private sector	128	23,7	25,9	61,5
	Working in the public sector	142	26,3	28,7	90,3
	Self-employed	36	6,7	7,3	97,6
	Other	12	2,2	2,4	100,0
	Total	494	91,7	100,0	
Missing		45	8,3		
Total		539	100,0		

a. Museum = Nordiska museet

Education

The results were not surprising and are related to those of the question regarding professional occupation, since the majority of the respondents had higher education, as other research has shown as well¹⁴ and as we can assume from the answers to the previous question.

In average 68% of the respondents replied that they had attended higher education institutions, while only 6% claimed that they had only basic education:

Diagram 5: Education of the respondents in all museums




Table 52: Education of the respondents in all museums

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Basic education	301	5,7	6,0	6,0
Valid High / secondary school	1058	19,9	21,2	27,2
Valid Higher education	3393	63,7	68,0	95,2
Valid Other	238	4,5	4,8	100,0
Valid Total	4990	93,7	100,0	
Missing	336	6,3		
Total	5326	100,0		

And then, per museum, the percentages are the following:

¹⁴ See the classic Bourdieu and Darbel (1971), but also the research by Merriman 1991.

Table 53: National Museum of Estonia: Education of the respondentsEducation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic education	16	4,5	4,8	4,8
	High / secondary school	81	22,7	24,2	29,0
	Higher education	217	60,8	64,8	93,7
	Other	21	5,9	6,3	100,0
	Total	335	93,8	100,0	
Missing		22	6,2		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

Table 54: German Historical Museum: Education of the respondentsEducation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic education	39	6,0	6,3	6,3
	High / secondary school	165	25,2	26,5	32,7
	Higher education	401	61,2	64,4	97,1
	Other	18	2,7	2,9	100,0
	Total	623	95,1	100,0	
Missing		32	4,9		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum = German Historical Museum

Table 55: National Historical Museum of Athens: Education of the respondentsEducation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic education	10	3,6	3,8	3,8
	High / secondary school	32	11,7	12,1	15,9
	Higher education	202	73,7	76,5	92,4
	Other	20	7,3	7,6	100,0
	Total	264	96,4	100,0	
Missing		10	3,6		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens

Table 56: National Museum of Ireland: Education of the respondentsEducation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic education	52	5,3	6,1	6,1
	High / secondary school	203	20,8	23,9	30,0
	Higher education	557	57,2	65,5	95,4
	Other	39	4,0	4,6	100,0
	Total	851	87,4	100,0	
Missing		123	12,6		
Total		974	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Ireland

Table 57: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Education of the respondentsEducation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic education	42	7,5	7,8	7,8
	High / secondary school	128	22,9	23,9	31,7
	Higher education	326	58,3	60,8	92,5
	Other	40	7,2	7,5	100,0
	Total	536	95,9	100,0	
Missing		23	4,1		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum = Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Table 58: Rijksmuseum: Education of the respondentsEducation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic education	18	2,5	2,6	2,6
	High / secondary school	123	16,9	17,6	20,1
	Higher education	539	74,2	77,0	97,1
	Other	20	2,8	2,9	100,0
	Total	700	96,4	100,0	
Missing		26	3,6		
Total		726	100,0		

a. Museum = Rijksmuseum

Table 59: National Museum of Scotland: Education of the respondentsEducation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic education	31	5,1	5,3	5,3
	High / secondary school	95	15,8	16,4	21,7
	Higher education	424	70,3	73,1	94,8
	Other	30	5,0	5,2	100,0
	Total	580	96,2	100,0	
Missing		23	3,8		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Table 60: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Education of the respondentsEducation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic education	60	9,4	9,9	9,9
	High / secondary school	117	18,3	19,3	29,2
	Higher education	402	62,9	66,2	95,4
	Other	28	4,4	4,6	100,0
	Total	607	95,0	100,0	
Missing		32	5,0		
Total		639	100,0		

a. Museum of the History of Catalonia

Table 61: Nordiska museet: Education of the respondentsEducation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Basic education	33	6,1	6,7	6,7
	High / secondary school	114	21,2	23,1	29,8
	Higher education	325	60,3	65,8	95,5
	Other	22	4,1	4,5	100,0
	Total	494	91,7	100,0	
Missing		45	8,3		
Total		539	100,0		

a. Museum = Nordiska museet

Basic education was claimed by 9,9% in the Museum of the History of Catalonia, the highest among all the museums, whereas the lowest percentage of respondents claiming basic education appears in the Rijksmuseum. On the other hand, in the Rijksmuseum, the National Historical

Museum of Athens and the National Museum of Scotland percentages of higher education reach beyond 70%, whereas in the other museums they are around 60%.

Familiarity with the museum

Most of the visitors who took part in the research had *not* visited the museum before (64,5%). This was the case mostly for non-nationals, although there was a significant percentage (19,4%) of non-nationals who *had* visited the museum before. A significant percentage of nationals (42%) visited the respective museum for the first time.

Diagram 6: Have you visited the museum before?





Diagram 7: Positive and negative replies to Q1, according to nationality




The percentages of first time visitors – nationals and non-nationals – are different in each museum: in the National Historical Museum of Athens the percentage is 76,56%; in the German Historical Museum 74,16%, the Rijksmuseum 71,45% and the National Museum of Ireland 69,95%. In all these cases, this percentage is higher than the average. On the contrary, in the Museum of the History of Catalonia (60,88%), the National Museum of Estonia (53.80%), the Nordiska museet (53,73%), the National Museum of Scotland (51,41%) and the Open-Air Museum of Latvia (38,63%) the percentage is lower.

A quick look at the numbers of nationals who had previously been in the museums may be proof of a close relationship between some of the museums and their nationals: in the Latvian museum the percentage of repeated visits by Latvians is approximately 79,80%; in the Scottish museum the percentage of repeated visits by native people reaches 77,90%; in the Estonian museum 70,30%; in the Dutch museum 64,80%; in the Swedish 60,20%; in the Irish 50,90%; in the Catalan 49%; in the Greek museum 45,10%; and finally in the German museum 33,30%. In other words, the museums in Latvia, Scotland, Estonia and Sweden seem to have repeatedly attracted their audiences or have frequent visitors. The number of non-nationals/tourists who had visited these museums before is low, approximately 8% for each case; the Rijksmuseum is the only exception, since the percentage of repeated non-national visitors is 19%. This is probably because this is a large museum holding an important collection of works of art of international acclaim. In some cases comparing the results of this question with others, makes it obvious that a museum might encourage repeated visits through temporary exhibitions (as for instance in the case of the Nordiska museet), or it is a favorite destination for family events (as in the case of the Open –Air Museum of Latvia).

Social context of the visit

The majority of the visits (an average of 77,80%) took place with family and friends. Only for 14,40% of the visitors was the visit part of a group activity, and for 7,80% it was an activity they did by themselves.

Diagram 8: Who did you visit the museum with today?



Who did you visit the Museum with today?


Scaling: Scaled

We have to bear in mind that this result may reflect the decision to participate in the research as well as the visitation patterns in the museum. Groups have always a very tight time-schedule, whereas families visiting with older children or friends or lone visitors may be more flexible in their schedules. As expected most of the friends and family visitors were nationals, whereas non-nationals /tourists were more often members of a group. Group visits were a larger percentage of the sample in the cases of the National Museum of Estonia (39,09%) and the Museum of the History of Catalonia (22,20%). In the case of the Estonian museum this has also been influenced by the decision of the researchers to offer the questionnaire to many members of the same group.¹⁵

Motivation for visiting the museum

The largest proportion of visitors identified as their reason for visiting the national museum “pleasure/entertainment” (43,2%), followed by “education/learning” (39%).

Diagram 9: Reasons for deciding to visit the museum. Summary of all museums



Why did you come to the Museum today?

Scaled

There are not great differences between nationals and non-nationals in their explanations regarding the decision to visit.¹⁶

¹⁵ This was a decision mostly influenced by the low visitor numbers during the period of research. As a result, the period of the research in this museum was longer than in other museums and the researchers decided to target members of the groups as well as individual visitors.

¹⁶ This is a multiple choice question, where visitors can tick as many options as they want. As a result, the total number of replies does not correspond to 5356, i.e. the total number of the collected questionnaires.

Diagram 10a: Why did you come to the Museum today. Responses by nationals




Table 62a: Reasons for visiting the Museum today.

Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Visit a specific exhibition	482	20,3%	1889	79,7%	2371	100,0%
Entertainment / pleasure	945	39,9%	1426	60,1%	2371	100,0%
Education / learning	754	31,8%	1617	68,2%	2371	100,0%
To experience the past	571	24,1%	1800	75,9%	2371	100,0%
Visiting with my friends / family	530	22,4%	1841	77,6%	2371	100,0%
Other reason	201	8,5%	2170	91,5%	2371	100,0%

Case Summaries

Nationality

Visit a specific exhibition	Entertainment / pleasure	Education / learning	To experience the past	Visiting with my friends / family	Other reason
482	945	754	571	530	201

a. Nationality = National

Diagram 10b: Why did you come to the Museum today? Responses by non-nationals/tourists




Table 62b: Reasons for visiting the Museum today.
Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Visit a specific exhibition	329	12,4%	2333	87,6%	2662	100,0%
Entertainment / pleasure	1250	47,0%	1412	53,0%	2662	100,0%
Education / learning	1208	45,4%	1454	54,6%	2662	100,0%
To experience the past	690	25,9%	1972	74,1%	2662	100,0%
Visiting with my friends /family	525	19,7%	2137	80,3%	2662	100,0%
Other reason	140	5,3%	2522	94,7%	2662	100,0%

Nationality

Visit a specific exhibition	Entertainment / pleasure	Education / learning	To experience the past	Visiting with my friends /family	Other reason
329	1250	1208	690	525	140

a. Nationality = Visitor

The next option selected by 25,10% of the total sample mentions the wish to “experience the past”, whereas social reasons (“to share something with friends and family”) is the next choice.

When dealing with each museum in particular we can see that education/learning is the first priority for visitors in the German Historical Museum (53,30%), the National Historical Museum of Athens (52,20%), the National Museum of Estonia (48,50%) and the Museum of the History of Catalonia (48,50%), whereas entertainment and pleasure is a priority in the Rijksmuseum (55,10%), the National Museum of Scotland (50,90%), Nordiska museet (48,20%), the National Museum of Ireland (45,10%), and the Open-Air Museum of Latvia (44%). Experiencing the past is the third choice in almost all cases, with only the German museum visitors having this as a second choice (43,20%). Another exception is the Latvian museum, where entertainment and pleasure is followed by visiting with family and friends, i.e. two choices highlighting the social character of the experience. We can assume that the Latvian Open-Air Museum, a well-loved summer attraction for Latvian families is very important in forging experiences of other types rather than merely learning ones. In the Catalan and German museums learning has been identified as particularly important mainly among nationals, whereas in the Greek museum this percentage is higher among non-nationals. In the National Museum of Scotland the percentage is almost equally divided between non-nationals and nationals. In the case of the Swedish museum there seems to be a larger interest in temporary exhibitions by local visitors.

Table 63: Visitor motivation to the national museums: comparing across the 9 museums¹⁷

Museum	To visit a specific exhibition	For entertainment / pleasure	For education / learning	To experience the past	Visiting with friends and family	Other
National Museum of Scotland (NMS)	13,3%	50,9%	36,2%	16,6%	22,9%	9,3%
National Museum of Ireland (NMI)	16,3%	45,1%	34,1%	22,4%	15,5%	5,3%
Rijksmuseum (Rik)	18,0%	55,1%	35,8%	19,0%	20,9%	5,4%
National Museum of Estonia (NME)	17,1%	29,4%	48,5%	23,5%	14,6%	<i>10,4%</i>
Open-Air Museum of Latvia (OEML)	13,4%	44,0%	24,7%	24,9%	35,2%	9,7%
Nordiska museet (NM)	26,2%	48,2%	28,2%	21,0%	21,7%	5,0%
German Historical Museum (GHM)	16,2%	24%	53,3%	43,2%	21,7%	6,6%
Museum of the History of Catalonia (MHC)	15,0%	43%	48,5%	26,4%	20,2%	5,3%
National Historical Museum of Athens (NHMA)	5,8%	41,6%	52,2%	33,9%	10,2%	5,1%

Total number of questionnaires: 5356. Total number of answers (multiple choice question): 9059

¹⁷ Red for the larger percentage, green for the second larger, in italics the larger per choice.

In the open ended questions in most cases there are either explanations of the circumstances of the visit (e.g. “My daughter has a meeting in Amsterdam”, “A wedding event” [OAML]); in some cases, the replies rephrase the options given in the questionnaire with a subtle difference in meaning, such as in the cases of answers like: “To be inspired to create” [NM]; “In search of new ideas” [NME]. Practical reasons are also present: “It was raining” (NMS); “The other museums that I wanted to visit were closed” (NM); “It was recommended to me” (NMS).

Where would you go to find out about national history?

In order to understand where museums and other cultural institutions stand in terms of where people would go to find out about national history, we suggested a series of possible sources of information and asked participants to the research to choose among them and scale how often they consult them.

This is a question that can be related to the role of museums (sources of information about national history), but it is also a question that can be linked to the trust museums enjoy.

The answers to this question were the following (in average):

Table 64: All cases-studies: sources of information on national history

Category	Always	Sometimes	Never
Internet	60,4%	36,8%	2,7%
Museum	49,7%	45,9%	4,3%
Library	44,4%	46,9%	8,7%
Archaeological/historical site	35,3%	53,1%	11,6%
Formal education	31,6%	49,9%	18,5%
Mass media	27,2%	61,9%	10,9%
Archive	24,2%	42,8%	32,9%
Family / friends	24,0%	63,8%	12,2%

N = 5326

The results are interesting when we consider that people mention that they would always go to the internet at 60,4% to find out about national history; the museum comes second at 49,7%, whereas all the other sources follow. It is also interesting to notice the high percentages who answer they “never” go to the Archive (39,2%), which is followed by 18,5% in the choice of “formal education”! People also reply that they would sometimes go to ask friends and family about national history, something which is interesting and important.

CHAPTER 4

National Museums and Identities



Introduction


In this part of the report we are going to focus on the questions that aimed to reveal information about how national, ethnic, regional, local and personal imagery is connected to the identities presented in the museum. We are going to focus on the questions regarding the role of material culture for the creation of that identity (Q4, 4a, 4b) as well as on the question regarding the historical roots of the individuals involved in this research (Q21).

The role of material culture

National museums hold objects relevant to national history

The majority of the answers to the questionnaires revealed that visitors do find particular objects interesting/relevant to the nation's history. On average, 63,8% replied positively to the question of relevancy, with the rest being divided between the negative answer and the inability to respond (19,8% / 16,4% respectively).

Diagram 11: Are there objects particularly relevant to history of the nation?



The focus on specific objects is more prominent in some museums, such as the Greek one (80, 67%), the Irish museum (79,66%), the Estonian museum (75,94%) and the Catalan museum (72,53%); in the cases of the museums in Sweden (65,65%), Scotland (65,09%) and the Netherlands (66,48%) people find certain objects interesting, whereas in the cases of Latvian (59,96%) and German museums (50%) visitors are less interested in the material culture of the exhibition and more in the historical circumstances and the narrative. In these two cases, this lack of interest in particular objects can be interpreted by the exhibitions themselves, which in the case of the German museum is event-centered while in the case of the Latvian museum is context oriented.

In greater detail the answers per museum are the following:

Table 65: National Museum of Estonia: Objects relevant to national history

Is there an object in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	262	73,4	75,9	75,9
	No	24	6,7	7,0	82,9
	Don't know	59	16,5	17,1	100,0
	Total	345	96,6	100,0	
Missing	System	12	3,4		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

Table 66: German Historical Museum: Objects relevant to national history

Is there an object in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	321	49,0	50,0	50,0
	No	194	29,6	30,2	80,2
	Don't know	127	19,4	19,8	100,0
	Total	642	98,0	100,0	
Missing	System	13	2,0		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum = German Historical Museum

Table 67: National Historical Museum of Athens: Objects relevant to national history

Is there an object in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	217	79,2	80,7	80,7
	No	31	11,3	11,5	92,2
	Don't know	21	7,7	7,8	100,0
	Total	269	98,2	100,0	
Missing	System	5	1,8		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens

Table 68: National Museum of Ireland: Objects relevant to national history

Is there an object in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	760	78,0	79,7	79,7
	No	100	10,3	10,5	90,1
	Don't know	94	9,7	9,9	100,0
	Total	954	97,9	100,0	
Missing	System	20	2,1		
Total		974	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Ireland

Table 69: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Objects relevant to national history

Is there an object in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	325	58,1	60,0	60,0
	No	92	16,5	17,0	76,9
	Don't know	125	22,4	23,1	100,0
	Total	542	97,0	100,0	
Missing	System	17	3,0		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum = Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Table 70: Rijksmuseum: Objects relevant to national history

Is there an object in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	478	65,8	66,5	66,5
	No	139	19,1	19,3	85,8
	Don't know	102	14,0	14,2	100,0
	Total	719	99,0	100,0	
Missing	System	7	1,0		
Total		726	100,0		

a. Museum = Rijksmuseum

Table 71: National Museum of Scotland: Objects relevant to national history

Is there an object in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	386	64,0	65,1	65,1
	No	105	17,4	17,7	82,8
	Don't know	102	16,9	17,2	100,0
	Total	593	98,3	100,0	
Missing	System	10	1,7		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Table 72: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Objects relevant to national history

Is there an object in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	433	67,8	72,5	72,5
	No	95	14,9	15,9	88,4
	Don't know	69	10,8	11,6	100,0
	Total	597	93,4	100,0	
Missing	System	42	6,6		
Total		639	100,0		

a. Museum = Museum of the History of Catalonia

Table 73: Nordiska museet: Objects relevant to national history

Is there an object in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	344	63,8	65,6	65,6
	No	60	11,1	11,5	77,1
	Don't know	120	22,3	22,9	100,0
	Total	524	97,2	100,0	
Missing	System	15	2,8		
Total		539	100,0		

a. Museum = Nordiska museet

It is also interesting to notice that in terms of distribution between nationals and non-nationals, in the cases of the museums in Greece, Latvia, Holland and Catalonia nationals tend to identify more with specific objects than non-nationals.

Diagram 12: National Historical Museum of Athens: Objects relevant to national history, nationals/non-nationals




Diagram 13: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Objects relevant to national history, nationals/non-nationals




Diagram 14: Rijksmuseum: Objects relevant to national history, nationals/non-nationals





Diagram 15: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Objects relevant to national history, nationals/non-nationals



The objects of national importance

The open-ended question asking visitors to identify the nation-specific objects in the museum has had significant results in terms of the number of answers alone. In Estonia for instance there were 259 entries out of 357 questionnaires; in Sweden 387 entries out of 539 questionnaires; in Latvia 301 entries out of 539 questionnaires; even in Germany, which has one of the lowest percentages of identifying particular objects there is a very large number of replies, referring mostly to periods, interpretative material but also objects. In all museums “star objects” are mentioned, but they are not alone. They are often mentioned along with less known artefacts, as for instance in the case of the Rijksmuseum where along with the iconic “Night Watch” by Rembrandt, the dollhouse(s) or the “boat” (vessel in the first gallery) are also mentioned.

National Historical Museum of Athens

One-hundred and ninety-nine [199] visitors answered that they were interested in particular objects or groups of objects and exhibition themes.

Forty-one [41] participants named **personal items and human remains of historic figures** represented in the Museum: “*Personal items*”, “*Greek Revolution heroes' items*”, “*Personal items of Th. Kolokotronis*”, “*Kolokotronis' armour - fighter's watch*”, “*Kapodistrias' personal items and the bullet that killed M. Botsaris*”, “*The chessboard of Al. Ypsilantis*”, “*Miaoulis boat*”, “*Items of 1821's fighters*”, “*Kanaris' heart*”.

Twenty-eight [28] people generically referred to topics/ exhibition sections related to **the Greek War of Independence**: “*Room 5 Revolution 1821 – 1827*”, “*1821 Items*”, “*Anything related to 1821*”. Another five [5] referred to ‘struggles/wars’ in general and the ‘Macedonian struggle’ in particular. Three [3] more mentioned the ‘naval wars’.

One hundred twenty-five [125] people **referred to specific objects or groups of objects**.

Thirty-four [34] referred to the ‘costumes’.¹⁸ Twenty-eight [28] chose ‘weapons’ in general, sometimes referred to as ‘kariofilia’, guns or ‘swords’. Eight [8] preferred the ‘maps’. Four [4] of those specifically referred to ‘Rigas’ map’. Another twenty-three [23] visitors referred to the portraits and paintings. Eighteen [18] of those specifically named the “*Naval Battle of Naffaktos (Lepanto) [10]*”, “*Paintings with battle images*” [2], “*Paintings of fighters*” [5] and a “*Satirical popular print 1840 caricature of the politician Dimitrios Christidis*” [1]; five [5] referred to ‘flags, in general, while five [5] people to the ‘Revolution flags’, the ‘Turkish flags’, the ‘flag of the Greek volunteers in Crimea’ and the ‘flag of Hydra’. Eight [8] participants named ‘the Constitution’: “*Original of the 1844 Constitution*”, “*The Constitution of 1843*”, while three [3] more referred to the ‘Fountain pen used to sign the Treaty of Sevres’. Four [4] respondents named ‘naval stuff’, ‘ship masks’, ‘the Averof battleship piece’ and ‘ships’ in general, while another three [3] named the ‘figureheads’. One [1] respondent chose the “*Ottomans' armours*”, one [1] the “*(Printing) Press of the National Printing House*”, one [1] “*George I room*” and another [1] “*All the objects related to Cyprus*”.

For sixteen [16] visitors the historic site itself, **‘the Old Parliament Hall’**, was a favourite.

Six [6] respondents referred to objects/ exhibition topics associated with the **Monarchy in Greece**: “*Personal belongings of Kings*”, “*The objects of Greek Monarchy*”, “*King George I*”, “*Royal info*”.

¹⁸ They were displayed in the last exhibition section and presented a more ‘universal’ theme than national relics, thus a favourite among non-nationals.

Another six [6] mentioned miscellaneous exhibition topics and objects: “*The Philhellenic exhibition*”, “*Isias commander*”, “*Women's participation in the revolution*”, “*Symbolic and written documents*”, “*State beads*”, “*The founding of the modern Greek state*”, “*Desk where Constitution was signed*”.

Finally, five [5] referred to all the objects on display in general: “*Everything*”, “*All*”.

Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Three-hundred and four [304] visitors answered that they were interested in particular objects, groups of objects and of course reconstructions of buildings.

Eighty-four [84] people answered the question by referring to **churches in general or specific churches**. Forty-eight of them [48] referred generically to churches or “*religious buildings*”: “*Chapels and churches*”, “*Incredibly beautiful church*”, “*Don't remember the name (church)*”, seventeen [17] named “*Usmas Church*”, another eight [8] the “*Lutheran Church*”. Five [5] more people mentioned churches from specific historical periods: “*Wooden church made in the 16th century*”, “*17th century church*”, two [2] “*Eleonora's chapel*”, two [2] “*Vecborne's Church*” and two [2] “*Latgale church*”.

Fifty-eight [58] visitors mentioned “***The windmill(s)***”. Four [4] of them referred to “*The Dutch Windmill*”.

Twenty-four [24] people chose to refer generically to all the **homesteads/ living houses** in the Museum: “*The wonderful houses*”, “*Ancient houses*”, “*Houses from various regions*”, “*All houses*”, while four [4] more mentioned their interiors: “*Interior of households - daily domestic things*”.

Thirty [30] people referred to **fishermen's homesteads/ villages**. Twelve [12] referred generically to them: “*Fishermen's village*”, “*Fisherman's household*”, “*Fisherman's place*”, seventeen [17] referred specifically to “*Kurzeme's Fisherman household/ village*”, while three [3] more named “*Kurzeme's Fisherman's fence*”.

Six [6] referred to the fisherman's household in Vidzeme: “*Fishermen's homestead in Vidzeme*”.

Ten [10] visitors named the “*The household of Zemgale*” or features of it: “*Zemgale's fence*”. Another ten [10] to “*Latgale's household*” or features of it: “*Fence of Latgolians*”, and eleven [11] more to “*Libiešu (Livonian) household*”. Four [4] people named the “*Craftsman's household*” and another four [4] the “*Farmer's new house*”. One [1] named the house “*Namelis*”, another [1] “*Jumti household*”, one [1] “*The potter's house*” and one [1] “*Lurki, Mauri, Lihuisu yard*”.

Five [5] people named the pub: “***1847 g. Pub***”, while four [4] more “***Priedes café***”.

Eight people [8] people referred to the **buildings** of the Museum in general: “*All museum buildings*”.

Four [4] people referred to **different exhibitions or exhibition themes**: “*Exhibition hall*”, “*Exhibition of ancient jewellery*”, “*Amber exhibitions*”, “*Life in Latgale's region*”.

Two [2] visitors named the “***Crucifix***” and two [2] more the “***Barn***”.

Twenty-six [26] people **referred to specific objects, groups of objects or other exhibition features associated with these objects**:

- Wooden figures, woodwork factory, wood workers [7]
- Baby cribs [3]
- The locomotive [2]
- Kitchen where summer food is cooked [2]
- Vidzeme pottery kiln [2]

- Kurzeme Region objects [1]
- Steam threshing machine [1]
- Children toys [1]
- Furniture and clothes [1]
- Hand - made things [1]
- Baskets [1]
- The stone, the death-chair [1]
- Guard in the house [1]
- European Features [1]
- Needle-work machine, flowers surrounding buildings, horse riders [1]

Two [2] visitors in answer to the question made the following comments: *“You can touch the history”, “To know the old culture”*.

Finally, twenty-one [21] people referred **collectively to the objects** of the exhibition: *“I enjoyed all of them”, “Every object”, “Loved all it”, “All of them”, “I like everything”, “All the objects were interesting”*.

National Museum of Estonia

One hundred sixty-four [164] visitors focused on different groups of **objects** or specific objects. Very popular objects are the Estonian handicrafts and especially the textiles [95 answers]: *“Estonian folk costumes”, “Traditional national knitting”, “Everything is interesting, but traditional clothes, and patterns especially”, “Curious knee-length socks”, “Belts, belt patterns”* are among the most common answers.

Twenty-six [26] visitors mentioned different **tools**, household tools or in general ethnographic tools: *“Beer cans”, “Blacksmith's tools”, “Ethnographic/old tools”*.

Eleven [11] chose the wooden items, ten [10] the **agricultural exhibits** and eight [8] the **furniture**: *“The boats made of wood”, “the kitchen tools made in wood”, “Artifacts related to the history of Estonian agriculture”, “Soviet furniture”*. Some others mentioned **musical instruments** [3] and **porcelain dolls** [2].

Others referred to objects such as weapons [1], 19th c. toys [2], a calendar [1], Mart's pipe [1], wild animal traps [1], sacrificial stone and peasant shoes [1]: *“Children were interested in peasant shoes”*.

Fifty-two [52] visitors mentioned the **exhibitions and the interpretative material** used. Most of them [34] referred to the **house interiors**, the house models and especially the model of the farmyard, which they found particularly interesting: *“Interiors of 20th century”, “Rooms in Estonian farmhouses from different eras”*. Ten [10] of the visitors were interested in the **photographs** and four [4] in the **permanent exhibition** in general: *“Photos presenting Estonian traditional culture”, “The whole first floor of the permanent exhibition”, “Probably the **second floor** of the exhibition: ethnic dress and ornaments”*. Another five [5] mentioned the interpretative material such as *“Wall timeline”*.

Six [6] visitors mentioned other sides of the **museum** such as the collections, the Archive and the workshops and eight [8] gave too general answers: *“Silver collection”, “Almost everything”, “Estonian objects”*.

Sixteen [16] answers mentioned customs-feasts-traditions of **everyday life and culture** such as: *“Living room through the ages”, “National clothes & traditions”: ”Displays concerning wedding traditions”, “Christmas billy goat”, “Tõnn [old Estonian deity], old pagan beliefs”, “Old Tallinn”, “Beer making”*.

Four [4] answers pointed out specific **historical periods**, such as the fight for independence, the Soviet period and the periods since 1920 or since 1980 until 2004.

Three [3] answers mentioned the “People of Estonia”, the farmers and the ethnic minorities.

German Historical Museum

One hundred and fifty-nine visitors [159] named **specific historical periods** such as:

- the beginnings of German History [13],
- the Middle Ages [11],
- the Thirty Years’ War [1],
- Prussian history [3],
- the period between the 18th and 19th centuries [8],
- the 1848 Revolution [4],
- the Industrialisation [2],
- Imperial Times [11],
- the 20th century [18] and more specifically:
 - WWI and the interwar period [21],
 - WWII and National Socialism [43],
 - the Berlin Wall [12],
 - the life in GDR and the Cold war [7]
 - and the German reunification [5]

Another fifteen [15] visitors said that they were interested in the general thematic of the museum, **history**: *“German and European history”, “German and French History”, “Recent history”, “War history”*.

Twenty-five [25] answers referred to **historic personalities** and museums exhibits connected with them, such as:

- Napoleon [7]: *“Napoleon’s courage”, “Portrait of Napoleon” “Napoleon’s sword/bat”*
- Bismarck [4]: *“Bismarck paintings”, “Bismarck’s uniform”*
- Karl the Great [3]
- Luther [3]: *“Luther Bible”, “Portrait of M. Luther”*
- Gutenberg Bible [1]
- Hitler [2]
- but also to groups such as the Jews [5]: *“Persecution of Jews”*

Only thirty-six [36] visitors focused on different groups of **objects** or on specific objects. Fourteen [14] mentioned photographs and posters from different periods: *“Photos and propaganda posters”, “Posters of the Weimar Republic”, “Kathe Kollwitz posters”, “DDR-Photos”, “Image of German troops. Triumph over the Danes. Danish flag in on the ground”*. Seven [7] mentioned groups of objects belonging to different periods, such as 16th-17th century, Weimar artefacts, Roman antiquities, objects of Middle Ages etc. Another seven [7] found interesting the cloths-uniforms and

costumes, four [4] the everyday life objects and five [5] the weapons: “18th century cloths”, “The Gestapo Uniforms”, “DDR athletes jersey”, “Plague doctor garment!”, “Everyday life objects”, “WW2 stuff - War objects”, “The weapons of the Celts”, “Sword armaments”. Another six [6] mentioned different paintings like:

“Portraits of the Prussian King”, “The picture with 3 emperors”, “The liberty war of the Greeks, the painting by Delacroix ‘Liberty’ 1859”, “National parliament proclaimed by William II (Painting)”.

Other objects mentioned were the following:

- Pieces of the Berlin Wall [3]
- Doll houses [2]
- The Revolutionary French Book [1]
- The British bomber engine [1]
- Mosaic floor [1]
- First globe of world [1]
- The newspaper that announces the death of Hitler [1]
- Technical objects from early 1900 [1]
- Video Schabowski 11.11.89 [1]

Thirty-five [35] visitors mentioned the **exhibitions and the interpretative media**. Three [3] of them referred to the permanent exhibition and twelve [12] the temporary exhibitions “Order and Destruction”, “Ueberleben” and “Photo collection. The 20th century people-places-times” presented during this period in the Museum. Concerning the interpretative material, six [6] visitors mentioned the maps, three [3] the audiovisual material and nine [9] photos, pictures and paintings: “European maps from different eras”, “Maps showing political boundaries in Europe”, “Interactive screens”, “The illustration of the concentration pagers”, “Model of the Hall of the people”.

Finally ten [10] visitors focused on different **exhibition subjects** such as Reformation [4], Migrations [2], the Enlightenment topic [3], Women rights [1], the way of life [1] and German Culture [1].

National Museum of Ireland

Seven-hundred and fifty [750] visitors answered that they were interested in particular objects, groups of objects and historic personalities in the National Museum of Ireland (Collins Barracks); most of them though mentioned exhibition galleries/ themes.

Six hundred and thirty-nine [639] people answered the question by referring to the **subject matter of the permanent or temporary exhibitions** of the Museum and in some cases by generically referring to the **themes** or **the artefacts in these exhibition sections**.

One hundred and twenty-three [123] chose to refer in various ways to the **‘Easter Rising: Understanding 1916’** exhibition: “Information on Irish uprising”, “Understanding 1916”, “1916 Rising”, “The 1916 documents”, “1916 exhibits”, “1916 collection”, “1916 display”, “1916 exhibits”, “Exhibition regarding Irish Revolution”, “1916 History of the Uprising”, “Easter rising exhibit”, “The Easter Rebellion”, “Easter Rising 1916”. Six [6] generically referred to the theme of ‘Irish history or Irish and British history’.

Seventy-two respondents [72] referred to the **‘Soldiers & Chiefs’** section: “Solders & Chiefs exhibit”, “The contents of the ‘Soldiers & Chiefs’”, “Irish soldiers’ exhibit”. Another seventy-seven [77]

also referred to the above section by focusing on ‘the military history/war’ theme: “*Military*”, “*The Irish Army*”, “*Military History*”, “*Modern military history*”, “*Military Exhibition*”, “*Military section*”, “*Military history*”, “*War collection since 1550*”, “*The Irish at War Exhibition*”. Five [5] of them focused on the ‘daily life of common soldiers’ theme. Twenty-three [23] more named themes from the ‘Soldiering Abroad’ and the ‘Soldiering in the 20th and 21st centuries’ sections of the ‘Soldiers & Chiefs’ exhibition: “*Wild Geese & the Irish Involvement in Euroforce*”, “*Irish involvement in the American civil war*”, “*Wild Geese Exhibition*”.

Sixty-seven [67] visitors mentioned the ‘**The Way we Wore**’ permanent exhibition: “*No 12: The Way We Wore*”, “*What we wore*”, “*Victorian Dress*”, “*Clothes*”, “*Dresses*”, “*What we wore*”. Six [6] more referred to the ‘jewellery’ display.

Twenty-two [22] chose the ‘**Coins and Currency**’ permanent exhibition: “*Coins*”, “*Coin development*”, “*Coins and Currency*”, “*Old money*”, “*Coins collection*”.

Another thirty-four [34] preferred the ‘**Eileen Gray**’ section: “*Eileen Gray*”, “*Eileen Gray, design furniture*”, “*The Eileen Gray Part*”.

Thirty [30] referred to the ‘**Irish silver**’ rooms: “*Silver objects*”, “*Irish Silver*”, “*Silver*”.

Thirteen [13] more chose the ‘**Reconstructed rooms**’ exhibition: “*Furniture*”, “*Irish Period Furniture*”, while six [6] remembered the ‘**Irish Country Furniture**’ display.

Thirteen [13] more mentioned the ‘**Albert Bender collection**’ cited also as Asian Art exhibition.

Two [2] named the ‘**Curator’s choice**’ exhibit.

Finally, one hundred and fourteen [114] people referred to the ‘**High Crosses**’ temporary exhibition: “*The display of the Celtic Crosses*”, “*High Crosses*”, “*The High Cross Exhibit*”. Another thirteen [13] also named temporary exhibition themes: six [6] the **Neillí Mulcahy**, five [5] more the ‘**Blaze Away- Duelling**’ and ten [10] the ‘**21st Century Irish Craft**’ one.

Another significant category of participants singled out **specific objects or groups of objects** from the above-mentioned sections:

- Military uniforms [16]
- Swords and Guns [13]
- Weapons (in general) [10]
- Planes & tanks [8]
- Flags [6] “*GPO flag*”, “*Civil War [rep flag]*”, “*Irish Republic Flag*”
- The Collins Barracks itself [5]
- The Tara brooch and Celtic jewellery [4]
- Japanese Armour [4]
- Medals [3]
- The “Home Rule” Teapot [2]
- The wedding dress [2]
- The ‘death machine’ [1]
- The 4-barreled pistol [1]
- Blue and lace dress [1]
- Pocket watches [1]

- The personal effects of the proclamation signatures [1]
- Apprentice Staircase / unable to see today [1]
- House skeleton [1]
- Cabinet (ornate) [1]
- Lady's Lead (bust) 15th Century [1]
- Vampire Jet [1]
- The smashed chair [1]
- Bantry boat [1]
- The instruments [1]
- The Irish harp [1]
- The Adam & Eve chair [1]
- Articles from Frongoch internment camp [1]
- Horse [1]
- Panhard Personnel carrier etc. [1]
- Textiles [1]
- The paintings about the war in 1921 [1]
- The soldiers personal belongings from the Trenches of WWI [2]
- The red cross collection [1]
- Shoes [1] etc.

One [1] participant chose a variety of objects and gave an interesting answer: *"Hard to decide maybe the hair curling ball, Dual purpose settle & bed / me 18-19, Model of Naombhog Hair Curling Ball (The tiny boots) Mace of Lord Chancellor of Ireland 1765 -HUGE! & he was a "2nd rate lawyer" :)"*.

Seven visitors [7] named **objects associated with historic/famous figures**: James Connolly's shirts [3], Michael Collins' coat [3], Liam Lynch's jackets [1].

Five [5] people referred to **historic/ famous or anonymous individuals**, such as *"Robert Emmett"*, *"Lost leaders"*, *"Dickie Bird"*, *"Irish Soldier"*.

Seven [7] people named the following **themes from Irish history/culture**.

- Irish life [1]
- English & European [1]
- Also the Jewish women killed in Holocaust, Personal Stones [1]
- Where Political / Social Views and Needs combined [1]
- History regarding the ships sent from France / Spain to defeat British in Ireland [1]
- Celtic origins [1]
- The different cultures [1]

Finally, seven [7] people referred **collectively to all the objects** of the exhibition: *"Everything"*, *"All"*.

Rijksmuseum

Three-hundred and sixty two [362] visitors answered that they were interested in particular paintings, painters, objects or groups of objects and exhibition themes.

Ninety-four [94] visitors named specific paintings. Forty-eight [48] referred to the most famous painting in the Museum, **Rembrandt's 'Night watch'**. Another [15] mentioned **Vermeer's 'The Kitchen maid'** frequently quoted as the 'Milkmaid'. Two [2] more named **Verspronck's 'The Girl in Blue'** and two [2] **Van de Venne's 'Fishing for souls'**.

Other paintings referred to, were:

- "Woman at her toilet" [1]
- "Vermeer, Love Letter" [1]
- "Vermeer portrait" [1]
- "Cannon, still life" [1]
- "Still life with goblet" [1]
- "Paintings of Demo and Republicans (lover)" [1]
- "St. Nicholas scene painting" [1]
- "The Andy Warhol's one (can't remember the name)" [1]
- "Ritratti" [1]
- "The picture from Spitsbugen /waling" [?] [1]

Several visitors answered the question by referring to groups of paintings: "*Still life*" and "*Landscape paintings*" [6], "*All paintings*" [9], "*The highlights (collections)*" [1], "*A particular painting*" [1].

Sixty-three people [63] people answered the question by generically referring to the **work of Rembrandt**: "*The Rembrandt's pictures*", "*Rembrandt*", "*Rembrandt's collection*", "*The Rembrandt works*", "*Rembrandt's paintings*", "*All Rembrandt*", "*Rembrandt's portraits*". Rembrandt was mentioned in another fifty two [53] answers in combination with the work of other artists or objects in the displays: "*Delft pottery*", "*Rembrandt*", "*Degas and Rembrandt*".

Fourteen [14] visitors generically referred to **Vermeer or his work**. Vermeer was mentioned in another forty [40] answers in combination with the work of other artists or objects in the displays, mostly together with Rembrandt: "*Vermeer section and Rembrandt, especially older Rembrandts*".

Other painters mentioned by name either on their own or in combination with other painters and/or objects on display were:

- Degas [13]
- Steen [6]
- Other (Hals, Ruisdael, De Velde, etc) [6]

Nine [9] visitors referred collectively to the "**Golden age painters**" or "*Dutch masters*".

Seventy-eight [78] people **referred to specific objects or groups of objects**.

Twenty [26] people named the '**Doll's house(s)**', although it is not clear in each case whether they meant the object(s) or the painting.

Twenty five [25] people referred in various ways to **Delftware**: "*Delft pottery*", "*The Dutch reproductions of China*", "*Porcelain*", "*The Dutch reproductions of China porcelain*".

Other objects mentioned were the following:

- "Model(s) of (a) ship(s)" [13]
- "Silver collection" [7]
- "The furniture" [2]

- “Ivory things (first floor)” [1]
- “The goblet in Room 2” [1]
- “The plaque from the Turkish ship captured from Chatham” [1]
- “Flower Vases” [referred to as] [1]
- “The comic books by Bane” [1]

Finally, thirty-eight [38] visitors named **themes from Dutch history and/or culture** as depicted in paintings or represented through several objects or groups of objects:

- The VOC [11]: *“Paintings regarding the Republic and the VOC”, “Dutch East India Company”*
- Military history (wars, battles, sea wars) [10]: *“The paintings of battles”*
- The Republic [9]: *“Republic as super power”*
- The (colonial) trade [5]: *“Pictures of colonial trade”*
- Dutch history in general [4]: *“All that had historical bearing (weapons, paintings with treaties, bottles)”*
- Dutch daily life [3]: *“Paintings depicting life in early years”*
- Iconoclast fury [2]
- Colonial history [2]
- The William and Mary room [1]
- Room with portraits of Dutch people in Africa and Asia [1]

National Museum of Scotland

Three-hundred and fifty [350] visitors answered that they were interested in particular objects, groups of objects, exhibition galleries/ themes, historical periods and historical personalities.

One-hundred and eleven [111] people answered the question by referring to the **subject matter of an exhibition ‘level’, a whole gallery or of particular exhibition sections/ themes and in some cases by generically referring to ‘all the artifacts’ or just ‘items’ in these galleries or exhibition sections.** Eleven [11] chose to refer to all the **Scottish Galleries:** *“Scottish history”, “Historical displays”,* eight [8] to the **Beginnings Gallery:** *“Beginnings display, “Early beginnings”,* twenty-six [26] to the **Early-people Gallery:** *“Early peoples”, “Archaeology items in early people display”,* twenty-one [21] to the **Kingdom of the Scots Gallery:** *“Kingdom of the Scots”, “Kingdom of Scotland”, “Whole kingdom of the Scots area”,* one [1] to the **Scotland Transformed Galleries,** four [4] to the **Jacobite section** of the Galleries: *“Jacobite Section”,* twenty-one [21] more to the **Trade and Industry** section: *“Industry”, “Industrial machines”, “Industrial revolution”, “Industrial era”.* Nine [9] visitors referred to the **Changing Nation Gallery:** *“Changing nation 6th floor”, “Changing nation”,* and five [5] to the **Sports Hall of Fame** section. Six informants [6] mentioned the **Dolly the Sheep exhibition,** four [4] the **Science and Technology Galleries,** while three [3] referred specifically to the **Robots** section: *“Robotics section”.* Another three [3] focused on the **Connect** section, four [4] more to the **Ancient Egypt** section, three [3] to the **space exhibit,** two [2] to the **Communicate exhibition,** two [2] to the **Animal World Galleries** and two [2] to the **Discovery zone.** Finally, one person [1] referred to all the exhibitions, another [1] to the Textile Exhibition while eighteen [18] mentioned the ‘A Passion for Glass’ temporary exhibition: *“The passion for glass”, “Glass exhibition”.*

One-hundred and twenty-seven people [127] **referred to specific objects or groups of objects**. Most popular among them were the following:

- Lewis chessmen [21]
- Gold jewellery (torcs) [18]
- Animals [13]
- Pictish items (St. Ninian's treasure) [9]
- Steam engines and locomotives [9]
- Religious objects [7], "*Items about Scottish Medieval Church*", "*Catholic objects*"
- Arthur's seat coffins [7]
- Textiles [6] and textile machines [1]
- The maiden (guillotine) [6]
- Musical instruments [6], "*Clarsach displays*"
- Masks [4]
- Dinosaurs [4]
- Telegraph poles and phones [4]
- Swords [3], "*Giant claymore*"
- Fossils [2]
- Coins [2]

Other objects mentioned were:

- The rail [1]
- Forth rail bridge [1]
- Bridges [1]
- Tay bridge rail track [1]
- The old cars, planes, etc [1]
- The Scottish mill in Riccarton [1]
- Printing presses / mills [1]
- Carronade [1]
- Roman helmet [1]
- Tobacco shop sign [1]
- Level 0, Stone carving of woman on horse [1]
- The model of the new Parliament [1]
- The Fetternear banner [1],
- Cruck –house [1] etc.

Twenty five [25] visitors named several **exhibition themes** that they detected in the exhibition galleries: Geology [7], Natural History [4], the Declaration of Arbroath [2], burial techniques and materials [2], origins of languages [1], beautiful architecture [1], radio-communications [1], biodiversity [1], Skara Brae [1] etc. Two more [2] referred to specific periods of Scottish history: "*New empire of Scotland*", "*Medieval Scotland*".

Ten visitors [10] named **objects associated with historic/famous figures**: "*Not one, lots of things, like King's and Queen's stuff*", "*Rings Charles 1st and 2nd*", "*Miniatures of Charles I and 2nd*", "*Graeme*

Obrees' Bicycle". Three [3] of them named the *"Jackie Stuart F1 car"*, while two [2] more named Queen Mary's tomb and coffin.

Nine [9] people referred directly to **historic/ famous individuals**, such as Sir Jackie Stewart [5], the Stuarts [2] and Queen Mary [2], Robert the Bruce [1], William Wallace [1], Burns [1] and Livingstone [1].

Two visitors [2] mentioned two kinds of **interpretative material**, the "video regarding Scots worldwide" and the "interactive area".

Nordiska museet

In this case, visitors mentioned two hundred and forty-three [243] different **groups of objects** or specific objects. Forty-four [44] of the answers mentioned the **Swedish houses- interiors**, thirty-five [35] the **table settings** and twenty-three [23] the **furniture**:

"Swedish interior", *"Folk culture, Swedish houses"*, *"Household utensils and furniture"*, *"Fourth Floor / Furniture"*. Other preferences were:

- **textiles** [13]
- the **clothing** [62]: *"Dressing Style & Traditional related"*, *"The children's baptism clothes"*
- **folk art objects** [15]
- **dollhouses** [14]
- **photos** [9]
- **toys** [2]
- objects made from specific material [3], such as **faience and porcelain**
- the **Golden Needle** [1]
- **handmade representations of animals** [1],
- the **posters of the expositions 1900-50**, [1]

Twenty-one [21] visitors named objects in relation to historical personalities, such as August Strindberg [13], Gustav Vasa [6], Viking ale horns [1]: *"Strindberg's pictures and paintings"*, *"The statue of Gustav Wasa"*. Only one [1] answer referred to a historic period: *"Sweden's good years in the post-war period"* and one [1] referred to *"Peasant society"* in general.

Seventy-one [71] answers referred to the **customs-feasts-traditions**. Thirty-eight [38] answers mentioned traditions in general, fourteen [14] the feasts and customs such as Christmas, Midsummer and yearly rituals in general, nine [9] the everyday life, seven [7] food traditions and three [3] culture in general: *"Swedish traditions / daily lives / folk art"*, *"Traditions - Easter – Christmas..."*, *"Swedish feasts"*, *"Swedish way of living"*, *"Food and celebration [fest] tradition during history"*, *"Old culture"*.

Fifty-five [55] visitors mentioned the **exhibitions and the interpretative material** used. Thirty-two [36] of them found the exhibition on Sami culture particularly interesting, seven [7] the textile gallery and fashion exhibitions, eight [8] the temporary exhibitions (The Golden Button, Trends, The garbage exhibition, "På Spiken"), two [2] the period rooms, three [3] the exhibition about how people lived in Sweden, one [1] the dollhouses exhibition and one [1] the photography exhibition: *"Sami's crafts and this architecture"*, *"The collection of textiles in the boxes"*, *"The exhibition På Spiken"*, *"The clothes/fashion exhibitions"*, *"The rooms from the 50s and 60s"*, *"Exhibition about festivals and life – events"*.

One [1] visitor referred to the interpretative material, a video: *“Interiors (exhibition 1851) and video about how long it took to get dressed (10 min. etc.)”*. Finally, another six [6] mentioned other sides of the Museum such as the children’s gallery, the building as such and the research institute. Five visitors [5] gave general answers such as *“The collections”, “Everything was informative”*.

Museum of the History of Catalonia

Visitors in the Museum of the History of Catalonia mentioned one hundred and eighty-four [184] groups of objects or single objects. Twenty-eight [28] focused on the **housing reconstructions**, twenty-seven [27] on **different machines** (steam power machines, wine press machine, hydro-electric machine, printing machine, water wheel, textile machine, mills) and twenty-four [24] on **armour**: *“Houses of the 3rd floor in general”, “The kitchen installation”, “The Roman house, the workshop, artisan houses”, “Machinery in general”, “The finia (machine for rafting water)”, “The textile machine”, “Mill with water and ax with water”, “Arm, warrior arms”, “Medieval armour”*

Twelve [12] answers focused on **ancient objects** like prehistoric findings, Greek objects, Roman Ballista (Barcelona), Roman cargo vessel, Goddess of fertility.

Very popular exhibition objects and installations are:

- the School [17] *“The Francoist/Republican classroom”*,
- the anti-aircraft refuge of the civil war [9],
- the horse [8],
- the bar [6],
- the castle [5],
- the cine [5]
- The Sagrada Famiglia model [5]
- The Catalan Flag: *“The stripes of the Catalan shield”* and *“The origin of the flag of the Catalan country”* [5]
- *“The company at the balcony of the “Generalitat”* [3].
- The cars [3]
- The Chapel of the Middle Ages [2]

Some visitors named **group of objects** like: *“objects of the 60s “ [3], “Furniture and posters”* [1], *“Billboards and magazines of the 70s”* [1], *“Ceramics, glasses”* [1], *“The collection of bronze artefacts”* [1], *“Posters and pictures from 1900-1950”* [1], *“Objects of the Renaissance”* [1], *“Agricultural objects”* [2], *“Manifestation leaflets”* [1].

Other objects mentioned were:

- ships [1]
- the Romanic arch [1]
- the train [1]
- the Submarine [1]
- the Photo of the ruins of Catalonia [1] etc.

Eighty-seven [87] visitors named **specific historical periods** such as pre-history [11], ancient history [1], Roman history [3], Middle Ages [13] or specific centuries [8] such as: *“XVIII century, XIII century”*. Sixteen [16] of them focused on more recent periods mentioning industrialisation [5], modernism [1], and mostly the 20th century [10]: *“Not an object, but a period- the 19th and 20th*

centuries”, “The 70s years”, “The history of the post war”. Thirty-one [31] visitors were interested in the **civil war**: “Objects about civil war”, “Those dedicated to Civil war, to the pavements of the streets, to the identifications”. Three [3] mentioned the Franco-period and one [1] “The 2nd of September 1714”.

Seventy-eight [78] visitors mentioned the **exhibitions and the interpretative material**. Twenty-four [24] of them found interesting the temporary exhibitions “POUM” and “The birth of the ‘Generalitat’ of Catalonia” and five [5] particular parts of the permanent exhibition: “The second floor, all that represent the history of a nation”, “The permanent exhibition from the prehistoric to 1714”.

Concerning the interpretative material, visitors mentioned the audiovisuals [15], documents, especially of the POUM exhibition [6], models and reconstructions [4], maps [2], dioramas [2]: “Documents of the origins of the Generalitat, Interview of the survivals of POUM”, “Archaeological work and models and reconstructions”, “The maps of the old empires”, “VIDEO of NODO”, “Videos about the past”. Twenty [20] visitors mentioned the interactive displays: “Hands on access on several objects”, “The objects for children that can be touched and experienced”, “The possibility to interact with the objects”. Six [6] visitors made some general comments about the museum exhibitions: “Beautiful presentation of all objects”, “The clear and understandable information of the whole 3rd floor”, “They prove that now the truth is told”.


Thirty-five [35] visitors focused on different **exhibition subjects**, such as the displays of typical life [7], war history [3], Moroccan influence [1], the tramway [1] or “All stories about revolutions” [1]. Most of them [23] chose aspects of the exhibition concerning Catalonia such as: “All the cultural and religious differences of the Catalonia of nowadays”, “The creation of the Catalan country”, but also more specific like: “The Reapers (Els Segadors)” [7], “CNT, Anarchist hymn” [1], “Those of the tragic week” [2], and one [1] noticed critically that “Olympics and their “impact” appear missing”.

Eleven [11] answers focused on **historic personalities** like Jaume I [4], Guifredo el Belloso [2], Ludovico el Piadoso [1], or **groups of people** such as “The bomb anarchists” [1] “The nuns and warriors” [1], Carlists [1], and current population and homosexuals: “The photographs of current population, especially gay couples”

The reasons of the objects’ importance

In the second question of this set, visitors were asked to explain ‘why’ they were attracted to these objects. The answers in their majority favored one of the choices offered in this multiple-choices question: “historically interesting” is the first choice (54,8%); “beautiful to look at” is the second (17,8%); “uniqueness” is the third choice (8%), “representativeness of the nation” is the next one (7,5%); “personal associations” follows (5,0%); next come “other reasons” (4,3%); the choice that attracted the fewest answers was that the object is “representative of European identity” (2,6%).

Diagram 16: All case studies. The reasons visitors found objects interesting




Why did you find this object interesting?

Scaling: Scaled

History and aesthetics come first for non-nationals, whereas representativeness of the nation and personal associations are more common among nationals. European identification is less common among nationals than among non-nationals (although very slightly).

Diagram 17: Reasons of attraction of particular objects according to nationality – all case studies



Why did you find this object interesting?

Per museum the results are the following:

Table 74: National Museum of Estonia: Reasons that objects are interesting

Why did you find this object interesting?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Beautiful to look at	14	3,9	6,5	6,5
	Historically interesting	121	33,9	56,3	62,8
	Representative of our nation	34	9,5	15,8	78,6
	Expresses our European identity	4	1,1	1,9	80,5
	It is (they are) unique	14	3,9	6,5	87,0
	Means something to me personally	15	4,2	7,0	94,0
	Other	13	3,6	6,0	100,0
	Total	215	60,2	100,0	
Missing	System	142	39,8		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

Table 75: German Historical Museum: Reasons that objects are interesting

Why did you find this object interesting?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Beautiful to look at	9	1,4	3,2	3,2
	Historically interesting	209	31,9	73,3	76,5
	Representative of our nation	19	2,9	6,7	83,2
	Expresses our European identity	9	1,4	3,2	86,3
	It is (they are) unique	12	1,8	4,2	90,5
	Means something to me personally	12	1,8	4,2	94,7
	Other	15	2,3	5,3	100,0
	Total	285	43,5	100,0	
Missing	System	370	56,5		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum = German Historical Museum

Table 76: National Historical Museum of Athens: Reasons that objects are interesting

Why did you find this object interesting?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Beautiful to look at	11	4,0	6,1	6,1
	Historically interesting	96	35,0	53,0	59,1
	Representative of our nation	32	11,7	17,7	76,8
	Expresses our European identity	8	2,9	4,4	81,2
	It is (they are) unique	18	6,6	9,9	91,2
	Means something to me personally	10	3,6	5,5	96,7
	Other	6	2,2	3,3	100,0
	Total	181	66,1	100,0	
Missing	System	93	33,9		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens

Table 77: National Museum of Ireland: Reasons that objects are interesting

Why did you find this object interesting?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Beautiful to look at	126	12,9	17,8	17,8
	Historically interesting	423	43,4	59,8	77,7
	Representative of our nation	61	6,3	8,6	86,3
	Expresses our European identity	17	1,7	2,4	88,7
	It is (they are) unique	36	3,7	5,1	93,8
	Means something to me personally	30	3,1	4,2	98,0
	Other	14	1,4	2,0	100,0
	Total	707	72,6	100,0	
Missing	System	267	27,4		
Total		974	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Ireland

Table 78: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Reasons that objects are interestingWhy did you find this object interesting?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Beautiful to look at	58	10,4	18,1	18,1
	Historically interesting	155	27,7	48,4	66,6
	Representative of our nation	19	3,4	5,9	72,5
	Expresses our European identity	8	1,4	2,5	75,0
	It is (they are) unique	50	8,9	15,6	90,6
	Means something to me personally	18	3,2	5,6	96,3
	Other	12	2,1	3,8	100,0
	Total	320	57,2	100,0	
Missing	System	239	42,8		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum = Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Table 79: Rijksmuseum: Reasons that objects are interestingWhy did you find this object interesting?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Beautiful to look at	148	20,4	35,6	35,6
	Historically interesting	149	20,5	35,8	71,4
	Representative of our nation	20	2,8	4,8	76,2
	Expresses our European identity	15	2,1	3,6	79,8
	It is (they are) unique	58	8,0	13,9	93,8
	Means something to me personally	10	1,4	2,4	96,2
	Other	16	2,2	3,8	100,0
	Total	416	57,3	100,0	
Missing	System	310	42,7		
Total		726	100,0		

a. Museum = Rijksmuseum

Table 80: National Museum of Scotland: Reasons that objects are interestingWhy did you find this object interesting?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Beautiful to look at	60	10,0	16,8	16,8
	Historically interesting	188	31,2	52,5	69,3
	Representative of our nation	28	4,6	7,8	77,1
	Expresses our European identity	4	,7	1,1	78,2
	It is (they are) unique	31	5,1	8,7	86,9
	Means something to me personally	29	4,8	8,1	95,0
	Other	18	3,0	5,0	100,0
	Total	358	59,4	100,0	
Missing	System	245	40,6		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Table 81: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Reasons that objects are interestingWhy did you find this object interesting?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Beautiful to look at	27	4,2	6,8	6,8
	Historically interesting	262	41,0	66,2	73,0
	Representative of our nation	35	5,5	8,8	81,8
	Expresses our European identity	9	1,4	2,3	84,1
	It is (they are) unique	14	2,2	3,5	87,6
	Means something to me personally	28	4,4	7,1	94,7
	Other	21	3,3	5,3	100,0
	Total	396	62,0	100,0	
Missing	System	243	38,0		
Total		639	100,0		

a. Museum = Museum of the History of Catalonia

Table 82: Nordiska museet: Reasons that objects are interestingWhy did you find this object interesting?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Beautiful to look at	48	8,9	15,6	15,6
	Historically interesting	172	31,9	55,8	71,4
	Representative of our nation	42	7,8	13,6	85,1
	Expresses our European identity	10	1,9	3,2	88,3
	It is (they are) unique	9	1,7	2,9	91,2
	Means something to me personally	15	2,8	4,9	96,1
	Other	12	2,2	3,9	100,0
	Total	308	57,1	100,0	
Missing	System	231	42,9		
Total		539	100,0		

a. Museum = Nordiska museet

Table 83: Reasons that objects are interesting: comparing across the 9 museums

Museum	Beautiful	Historically interesting	Representative of the nation	European identity	Unique	Personal meaning	Other	Missing
National Museum of Scotland (NMS)	10,0%	31,2%	4,6%	0,7%	5,1%	4,8%	3,0%	40,6%
National Museum of Ireland (NMI)	12,9%	43,4%	6,3%	1,7%	3,7%	3,1%	1,4%	27,4%
Rijksmuseum (Rik)	20,4%	20,5%	2,8%	2,1%	8,0%	1,4%	2,2%	42,07%
National Museum of Estonia (NME)	3,9%	33,9%	9,5%	1,1%	3,9%	4,2%	3,6%	39,8%
Open-Air Museum of Latvia (OEML)	10,4%	27,7%	3,4%	1,4%	8,9%	3,2%	2,1%	42,8%

Museum	Beautiful	Historically interesting	Representative of the nation	European identity	Unique	Personal meaning	Other	Missing
Nordiska museet (NM)	8,9%	31,9%	7,8%	1,9%	1,7%	2,8%	2,2%	42,9%
German Historical Museum (GHM)	1,4%	31,9%	2,9%	1,4%	1,8%	1,8%	2,3	56,6%
Museum of the History of Catalonia (MHC)	4,2%	41%	5,5%	1,4%	2,2%	4,4%	3,3%	38%
National Historical Museum of Athens (NHMA)	4%	35%	11,7%	2,9%	6,6%	3,6%	2,2%	33,9%

Historical importance is highlighted more in the cases of the German Historical Museum, the National Museum of Ireland, the National Museum of Scotland and the Museum of the History of Catalonia; representation of the nation seems quite important in the cases of the National Museum of Estonia, the National Historical Museum of Athens, and the Nordiska museet. Aesthetic appreciation is more important in the case of the National Museum of Ireland, the Open-Air Museum of Latvia, the National Museum of Scotland and the Rijksmuseum.

The high percentage of choices referring to the historical importance of the object might be related to the fact that the question itself conditioned this orientation because of its phrasing: “Is there an object/ or a group of objects that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation’s history?”

It is also interesting to notice that this question was a multiple choice one that required from the respondents a single answer. Nevertheless, a large number of participants replied with more than one choices. These cases have been considered invalid by the system, and therefore appear as missing values in the tables above.

Personal definitions of identity

The last part of the questionnaire includes Q. 21 (Where do you think your historical roots lie); it has been a difficult question to answer for many of the participants in this research, as both the replies and our observations made clear. Interestingly though, visitors did write that this is a difficult question and they did not simply ignore it. For instance, in the case of the Rijksmuseum there are 575 answers in a total of 726 questionnaires (i.e. an answering rate of 79,20%); or, in the case of the Nordiska museet there are 404 replies in a total of 539 questionnaires (74,95%); in Estonia the rate is 88,23% and so on. The aim of the question was to allow people to define in

their own terms their historical affiliations. During our observation, we also noticed that in the cases where more than one person filled in the questionnaire, this was a question that attracted discussion and sometimes disagreements.

In the majority of the answers, it seems that the spatial axis of history prevails over the temporal one. In other words, the word “roots” seems to carry more weight than the word “historical”. As a result, in most cases respondents identify their historical roots with the space (more often than not the state) that they live in, or they have been born in, either themselves or their forefathers. Often the country is associated (or replaced) by a region – as for example in the cases of Estonia (where 140 people replied using the name of a region or city), or Sweden (where 121 replies mentioned a specific region or city), or Greece (where the regions also appear very prominently).

Europe is mentioned in a smaller number of questionnaires. For instance, in the German Historical Museum 99 visitors argued that their historical roots lay in Europe, 32 in specific European countries, whereas four specified their roots as being in Central, Western, South and North Europe. In the Rijksmuseum there are 73 answers mentioning Europe (its history or space) as their historical root, either in association with a country, or a region, or even another continent. In the Nordiska museet there are 30 similar answers; in the National Museum of Estonia only 17; whereas in the National Historical Museum of Athens this number becomes 26. Of course, this question should be also associated with nationals and non-nationals using these identifications for themselves.

Specific historical periods are also mentioned in association with the historical roots. For instance, “*Ancient Greece*” (MHC); “*In time 12th-15th cent.*” (MHC); “*Swedish bruksamhälle in the 60s and 70s*” (NM); “*Postwar Germany*”, the era of the “*Fall of the Wall*” (GHM) and so on.

In some questionnaires personal circumstances or values are mentioned: for instance, “*my grandparents were servants*” (NOAML); “*In relation to my relatives and my surroundings*” (NM); “*From father's side from Vologda, mother from a mixed Estonian-Russian family in Kallastelt (near lake Peipsi)*” (NME); “*my historical roots lie from where my family comes from*” (GHM) and so on.

The replies to this question per museum are the following:

National Historical Museum of Athens

In the question where visitors felt their historical roots lay, one hundred and forty two [142] visitors named **countries, specific regions or cities**. Seventeen [17] referred to Greece or particular regions or cities and towns in Greece [49] as their country of origin while [10] referred to places from the so-called “lost homelands” of Greece: “*Asia Minor*”, “*Constantinople (Istanbul)*”, “*In Pontos*”, “*Eastern Thrace region*”. Another forty-five [45] named other countries of the world, first Belgium [6], second China [5] and the UK [5], and third the Netherlands [4], followed by Russia [3], Germany [3], France [3], Poland [3], Cyprus [3] and the USA [2]. Sixteen [16] visitors referred to combinations of more than one country. Fifteen more [15] said their historical roots lay in **Europe** while two [2] of them specified central and western Europe. Seven [7] respondents combined **Europe with mostly European countries**. Finally, two [2] people mentioned the world.

Fifteen [15] people said that their roots lay in the **history and/or the culture of their nation**: “*In the beginnings of the Greek Nation's history*”, “*Minoan civilisation*”, “*Our origin is a patchwork of all*

people that settled in Greece (Persians, Venetians, Turks)", "They originate in places where Hellenism has at times prospered", "In our history as Greeks", "Nordic history", "In the Nation's history", "I have learned to understand my historical roots lie in the documented history and culture of the nation I represent". Three [3] of them included **European history/culture** in their answer: "Between Italic history & North-Europe", "In Ancient Greece & the European Enlightenment".

Seven [7] visitors referred to **the history/past and values of humanity** in general: "B.C. history in general", "In the past", "Museums", "In the liberty and people's freedom". Three [3] more referred in a 'poetic' way to places: "In the savannah of Africa", "In [the] Mediterranean sea".

Three [3] visitors answered with **personal values**, like places of living and the family: "In the countries of my ancestors", "In the city where I live and in the regions of my ancestors' origin" while three [3] more referred to education: "School knowledge", "Studies and interest".

Two [2] participants claimed that their roots lay in particular ethnic groups: "Women Arvanites", "In the Slavic people who settled in the Greek islands".

Four [4] people gave more idiosyncratic answers: "I feel Greek - I don't feel that I belong to some chosen people", "Personally, I consider having the European culture more developed than the Greek. Nevertheless, I believe that Greece has more common features with the East than with the West.", "I feel grief for now (the present)", "... but also a philhellene".

Finally, five [5] visitors pointed out their difficulty/ lack of interest to express a specific answer: "Not to lie, but no sure of my historical roots", "I am not very (Or "I don't feel very...") concerned by my own historical roots".

Open-Air Museum of Latvia

About where visitors felt their historical roots lay, four hundred and sixty one [461] people named **countries, specific regions** and **cities**. Two-hundred and ninety-three [293] visitors, with Latvian origin mentioned either **Latvia as a country** [77] or **cities and specific regions of Latvia** [216], mostly combining regions and/or cities. Another one-hundred and twenty two [122] answered by mentioning other countries of the world, first Russia [23] and Germany [23], second Poland [15] and third France [6] and the Netherlands [6], followed by Denmark [5] and the Ukraine [5], Finland [3], Italy [3], Sweden [3], USA, Italy, the UK, Switzerland and Spain [3]. Thirty nine [39] combined more than one country, with seventeen [17] of them combining Latvia with another country.

Sixteen [16] visitors said their historical roots lay in **Europe** while four [4] of them specified western, northern and southern Europe. Only one [1] respondent combined **Europe with his/her country of origin**: "In big cities of Hungary and Europe".

Finally, one [1] visitor mentioned the **world**, as a whole.

Ten [10] visitors answered with **personal values**, like the place of birth or places of living and the family: "My home", "My mountains", "In my homeland...", "The Land of your Ancestors", "In my countryside where my grandparents are", "In family".

Seven [7] visitors named **history (or specific national histories), culture and the past**: "In learning about the past and historical heritage", "American history", "In European, esp. German history", "European/ German culture". Two [2] more referred to the museum they were visiting or archives in general: "Here, at the Ethnographic open-air museum", "In the archive".

Eleven [11] visitors pointed out the difficulty to understand the question [2]: *“I don't know how to understand this question”* or their difficulty to express a specific answer [9]: *“I don't know”, “It's hard to say”, “Everywhere”*.

National Museum of Estonia

In this case study, two hundred seventy replies [270] named **countries, specific regions and cities**. One hundred sixty-two [162] visitors with Estonian origin mentioned either Estonia as a country [22], or cities or specific regions of Estonia [142], mostly combining regions and/or cities. Another eighty-six [86] answered by naming other countries of the world, first Finland [13], second Belgium [12] and third the U.K. [10], followed by Germany [9], France [7], the Netherlands, Lithuania, the USA and China [5]. Twenty-two [22] combined more than one country in their replies.

Seventeen [17] visitors only felt that their historical roots lay in **Europe**, six [6] of them in specific European countries as well, three [3] of them in the European history or culture: *“Northern Europe”, “Central Europe - France, Germany, Czech Republic”, “European history/culture”, “In the German / middle-European cultural area”*. One of them made a comment about national and European identity: *“Of course I feel more Greek than European but this doesn't mean that I don't find anything in common with what I call Europe”*.

Twelve [12] answers referred to **personal values**, like ‘my country’, but most of them [7] to the birthplaces of the **family members**, which was in all cases Estonia: *“In my country (where people speak the same language, share common traditions)”, “From father's side from Vologda, mother from a mixed Estonian-Russian family in Kallastelt (near lake Peipsi)”, “In South-Estonia (mother) and Viljandi county (father)”*.

Eight [8] visitors said that their historical roots lay in certain historical regions, which do not exist as such nowadays: *“Banat Region”, “Karelia (Enso)”, “The old Belgae”, “Estonian Republic [she refers to the period 1918-1940 which is considered a kind of “golden era”, “Germany, Preussen (Poland)”*.

Interesting is the case of two [2] visitors who found their roots in **museums**: *“In this type of museums”*. Presumably these visitors interpreted the question as “where would you go to find about your historical roots” – similar interpretations have been given by visitors in other museums as well.

Finally two [2] answers noted the problem of a person who has lost his/hers roots or does not feel that he/she has any roots at all or simply does not know: *“Once I was on my way to Arcadia, but was born in Põlva”¹⁹, “Nowhere”, “I don't know”*.

German Historical Museum

In this case study, two hundred and seventy-one [271] answers named **countries, specific regions or cities**. One hundred and twenty-seven [127] visitors, most of them of German origin, mentioned either Germany as a country [62], or cities and specific regions of Germany [65], usually combining both. Another hundred and twelve [112] named other countries of the world, with the U.K. coming first [27], followed by the Netherlands [19], Spain [9] and France [4]. Six [6]

¹⁹ It's a rephrase of a famous poem of Estonian writer Karl Ristikivi (1912-1977); the original beginning is “Once I was on my way to Arcadia although I was born in sauna (in poverty).” This poem talks about **loosing his roots**. The final row of the poem is: ... “because you don't know, you don't feel my feelings of being without a fatherland”.

visitors named wider geographical areas, the Arab world, Scandinavia, the Mediterranean area and Latin America, and thirty-two [32] combinations of more than one country.

Ninety-nine [99] visitors wrote that their historical roots lay in **Europe**, thirty-two [32] of them mentioned Europe combined with certain European countries, while four [4] specified Central, Western, South and North Europe. Europe is present in another five [5] answers pointing out religious or political values, gender issues, or generally European contexts or, in one case, combining Europe with gay history: *“European, influenced by Christian education”, “Europe, democracy”, “Europe, gay history”*. Nine [9] answers pointed out the **world** as a whole: *“World citizen”, “In the whole world”*.

Thirty-four [34] visitors said that their historical roots lay in certain **historical periods or places** such as GDR [11], Post-war Germany [7], German past [5], FRG [4], the era of the “Fall of the Wall” [1], Renaissance, French revolution [1], Huguenot [1], Nordic history [1], Celtic Britain [1], ancient Greeks [1], Roman / Saxon / Britons [1]: *“Ancestors in Germany”, “Experiences of the post-war period”, “The era “Fall of the Wall” = historical roots”*,

Religion appears in eight [8] answers and in two [2] of them combined with the social class: *“In western Christian culture”, “German, Protestant, rural working class”*.

The **social class** and wider **ideology issues** were named in another four [4] answers, while two [2] visitors mentioned the western civilisation: *“1848, in left-liberal middle class of the 19th century”, “Indian worker - and peasant class in the GDR”, “Western, rational civilization”*.

Fifteen [15] visitors answered with **personal values**, like family [6], education [3], the place of birth and the different places of living [2], personal culture [2], friends [1] and museums [1]: *“In values of traditional education”, “I feel that my historical roots lie where my family comes from”, “My culture, values from my country as well as my family”, “All places I have lived”*.

Eleven [11] visitors pointed out diverse issues such as “in the past” [2], “in humanity” [1], “in the desire for freedom” [1], in “historical examples and good people” [1], in Adam and Eve [1], in a rootless family [1], in “chance” [1] or “in a constantly alternation of the historical roots” [1]: *“My historical roots alternate constantly”, “Our historical roots are not only the regional or national roots but also that of humanity in general”, “Weird question, should I respond with a place / country? It is more of a zeitgeist: desire for freedom above all”*.

Fourteen [14] visitors expressed their difficulty in answering the question: *“I do not know”, “Hard to say. I was born in Poland but educated in France. I feel that my roots are in France, but I know they are not really there”, “I’m not sure”*.

National Museum of Ireland

Four hundred and ninety one [493] visitors named **countries, specific regions or cities**. One hundred and fifty five [155] referred to **Ireland** as their country of origin and another fifty-six [56] particular **regions or cities/towns in Ireland**. Ninety-seven [97] visitors combined Ireland with another/other country(ies). One hundred fifty-five [155] visitors named other countries of the world, first the UK [53], second the USA [13] and third Germany [11], followed by France [8], Italy [7], the Netherlands [5], Northern Ireland [4], China [4]. Thirty [30] more referred to combinations of more than one country.

Twenty [20] respondents said their historical roots lay in **Europe**, while five [5] of them specified central, western, northern and eastern Europe. Sixteen [16] combined Europe with

mostly European countries. Finally, one [1] person mentioned the world, as a whole: *“A mixing pot of the world”*.

Thirty-six [36] visitors answered with **personal values**, like the place of birth or places of living and the family: *“At home”, “Family”, “In my own country and my own people”, “In my traditions, my culture, my family heritage”, “In the country my parents are from”, “In the land of my birth”, “In the place where I grew up”, “They are lying in my country, in my mind”*.

Twenty-three [23] said that their roots lay within **Irish history/past** (struggles, periods, heroes): *“Honouring the people who sacrificed their lives for Ireland”, “In our fight for freedom”, “In our recent history”, “Steeped in Irish History! Very proud to be Irish”, “In the past around time of Easter Rising or civil war”, “National Identity and the foundation of modern Ireland”, “I’m an Irish republican, so Irish history is important”, “In British / Irish connection over centuries”*. Eight [8] more referred to the **history or historic peoples** of other countries: Four [4] of them named the Vikings, while another four [4] referred to *“Danish history”, “Scottish Reformation”, “USA - American Modern History”, “European history”*.

Eight [8] visitors referred to **culture/heritage**: *“Language, traditions, music, culture, food”, “Church, museum, heritage”, “Museum and historical places”, “In oral history - stories etc. of past”*, while two [2] more mentioned **education**.

Six [6] respondents gave highly idiosyncratic answers: *“(Anarchist) - I don't identify as being Irish”, “As a German we can only hope to tell a part of resistance against fascism”, “Free starter”, “Internet mainly”, “Wish I were Irish!”* etc. Some of them can be attributed to misinterpretation of the question (as for instance the answer “Internet”), while some others probably express personal ideas and views.

Two [2] said that their roots lay with particular **social groups**: *“Jerant [Tenant?] Farmers”, “Working class people”*. Two [2] more named **the ground**: *“In the ground, where I’ll be planted”*.

Finally [21] visitors pointed out their difficulty to express a specific answer [19] or the difficulty to understand the question [2]: *“I don't know”, “I'm not sure”, “Somewhere abroad”, “Everywhere”, “Nowhere”, “What does this question mean? It's ambiguous”*.

Rijksmuseum

In this case, two hundred ninety-one [291] visitors named **countries, specific regions or cities**. Only [9] referred to the **Netherlands** or particular regions or cities in the Netherlands [5] as their country of origin. The remaining two hundred and seventy seven [277] named other countries of the world, first Germany [37], second the UK [33], and third Spain [22] and the USA [22], followed by France [22], Poland [10], Australia [8], China [4] and Russia [4], Czech [3], Ireland [3], South Africa [3], Denmark [3], India [3], Mexico [3], Canada [3]. Forty-four [44] visitors referred to combinations of more than one country. Forty [40] visitors said their historical roots lay in **Europe** while four [4] of them specified Central, Southern and Eastern Europe; one [1] said Christian Europe. Twenty-eight [28] respondents combined **Europe with mostly European countries**. Finally, two [2] people mentioned the **Balkans** [1] and the **world** [1], as a whole: *“All over the Balkan Peninsula”, “All over the world”*.

Six [6] visitors answered with **personal values**, like places of living and the family: *“My grandparents were Hungarian and Russian immigrants to the USA”, “Irish ancestors”, “History of people in my family tree”, “From family history and also school”, “At home”*.

Twelve [12] visitors referred to **the history and culture of humanity** in general and the **remnants of the past**: *“My roots lie all over the world, in the part that I am part of the human beings and their different cultures”*, *“I am the human attitudes all over the world”*, *“In the history of the whole world as a human being”*, *“In paint/music/architecture/arts/politic, etc.”*, *“Not only in historical buildings and monuments, paintings, etc, but also in every single event in the past, in the stories and poems...”*, *“Museums”*.

Another ten [10] said that their roots lay in the **history and/or the culture of their nation**: *“In Denmark's trading”*, *“In Germany, education, middle class, church”*, *“Jewish heritage of Israeli history”*, *“In what I can see in my nation, in the present and depends on my past”*, *“In the great fjords of north-western Norway and among the Vikings”*, *“Norman Invasion of Ireland!”*. Three [3] more included **European history/culture** in their answer: *“In the Norwegian and European history/culture”*, *“History of Europe, esp. Ireland”*. Three [3] referred to their historical background without specifying the country/nation of their origin: *“In a mixture of two pasts”*, *“Historical background”*.

Four [4] visitors referred to the ancient past: *“Ancient Greece”*, *“In the Roman Empire”*, *“Classical culture”*.

Eighteen [18] visitors pointed out their difficulty to express a specific answer [15]: *“Nowhere special”*, *“I do not feel strongly to belong to a country”*, *“I don't know”*, *“I usually don't think about history”*, *“Not deep rooted anywhere”*, *“I don't have precise historical roots, I do not feel part of the Italian history”*, *“This is tricky, I've been searching them!”*, *“This answer would be too long and take too much time”* or the difficulty to understand the question [3].

Finally, one [1] individual named the planet [probably] *“Pluto”*.

National Museum of Scotland

In the case of the NMS four hundred and fifty two [452] visitors named **countries, specific regions or cities**. Forty nine [49] referred to the **UK, Great Britain or Britain** as their country of origin and another one hundred and ninety four [194] a part of the country: **Scotland** [115] or particular **regions or cities in Scotland** [29]; **England** [16] or particular regions or cities in England [17]; **Northern Ireland** [4]; **Wales** [3]; Eleven [11] visitors combined Scotland with/and other parts of the UK. Another eighty [80] named other countries of the world, first Ireland [8], the Netherlands [8] and the USA [8], second Spain [7] and third Germany [6], followed by Canada [4], China [4] and India [4], the Czech Republic [3], Sweden [3], Singapore [3], Australia [3], Argentina [3], Greece [3] and France [2]. One [1] named Asia. Seventy-eight [78] visitors referred to combinations of more than one country.

Twenty-six [26] visitors said their historical roots lay in **Europe**, while seven [7] of them specified Central, Western, Northern and Eastern Europe. Twenty-three [23] respondents combined Europe with mostly European countries. Finally, two [2] people mentioned the world, as a whole: *“In all the world”*.

Thirteen [13] visitors answered by writing about **personal values**, like the place of birth or places of living and the family: *“Back home”*, *“In my background”*, *“In my hometown”*, *“In my own country”*, *“My parents, Grand-parents, Great grandparents”*, *“I guess from mum”*, *“In my culture and people”*. One of them [1] simply said *“personal beliefs”*.

Twelve [12] visitors named **issues of religion, culture and ideology**. Five [5] visitors mentioned that their historical roots lay in education, material culture and reading: *“Education, experience, reading”*, *“In the words of the people”*, *“In writing and objects”*. Culture and human beings were

referred to in five [5] more answers: *‘From, for and by the people’*, *‘In the garden of cultural memory’*, *‘In all the cultural influences that informed the interconnected society...’*. Religion appears in one [1] answer: *‘Jewish’*. One [1] respondent named *‘animals’*.

Seven [7] visitors said that their historical roots lay in certain **historical periods or places** such as *‘Latin / Roman empire’*, *‘Arabia’*, *‘Celtic history’*, *‘With American history and the history of the countries my ancestors came from – Wales’*, while two [2] more named *‘history’* and *‘the past’* in general.

Fourteen [14] visitors pointed out the difficulty to understand the question [4] or their difficulty to express a specific answer [10]: *‘Modern USA - no roots at all’*, *‘Nowhere in particular’*, *‘Don't know’*, *‘Haven't thought about it’*, *‘I have no historical 'roots’*.

Nordiska museet

In this case study, three hundred and twenty-two [322] visitors named **countries, specific regions or cities**. Hundred and eighty-nine [189] of them, visitors with Swedish origin, mentioned either Sweden as a country [68], or cities and specific regions of Sweden [121], mostly combining both. Another eighty [80] named other countries of the world, first Germany [10], followed by Norway [8], Finland [6], [France [6], the Netherlands [6], England [5] and the USA [5]. Another nineteen [19] mentioned Scandinavia or the Nordic Countries: *‘In the Nordic countries (Finland and Scandinavia)’*, *‘Sweden – the Nordic countries’*. Another thirty-four [34] answers combined more than one countries.

Thirty [30] visitors answered that their historical roots lay in **Europe**, fifteen [15] of them in certain European countries as well: *‘Western Europe’*, *‘Mixed, Poland / Europe’*, *‘Europe, Germany’*.

Sixteen [16] visitors rejected the sense of a local identity and claimed that their roots derive from their **social class** [7], **culture** [6] – books, museums, tradition and language, they can be found in **nature** [2] and in **religion** [1]: *‘Working class’*, *‘Peasant society in Halland’*, *‘In the struggle of the oppressed classes’*, *‘In all aspects of culture and values’*, *‘Everywhere; museum, family scrapbooks, books, stories you hear etc.’*, *‘Culture - language - tradition - formal education’*, *‘In nature, anywhere in Sweden’*.

Twelve [12] answers referred to **personal values**, like the place of birth and the environment of growing up [6], but also the history of the family and places where relatives live [6]: *‘(1) Place of birth ... Later place of living and people you meet’*, *‘Where I was born and grew up’*, *‘My family has ties across whole Eastern Europe’*, *‘As [a] child of immigrants it is Australia and Italy’*, *‘Värmland and Västergötland [provinces]. Places I visited as a child and where I have relatives’*.

Five [5] visitors wrote that their historical roots lay in certain historical periods or places, such as: *‘Sweden and American Revolution’*, *‘Ancient Greeks’*, *‘In the history of Norway and the Nordic countries’*, *‘Finnskogen²⁰’*, *‘Swedish brukssambälle in the 60s and 70s’*.

Three [3] visitors mentioned that their historical roots lay in the **world** as a whole: *‘Everywhere I move around’*. And finally, twelve [12] visitors expressed their **problems with the question**: *‘I have never thought about that, I don't know’*, *‘I don't know if you can point to a place’*, *‘I don't understand the question’*.

Museum of the History of Catalonia

In this case study, three hundred and fifty eight [358] respondents named **countries, specific regions or cities**. Two hundred and forty-nine [249], most of them of national origin, mentioned

²⁰ Part of Sweden bordering Norway where people from Finland settled in the 17th century.

either Spain as a country [15], or (more often) just Catalonia [161] and Barcelona [21], or other regions of Spain [25]; in some cases visitors combined Catalonia with Spain [15] and Catalonia with other Spanish regions [15]. Another hundred and nine [109] named other countries of the world, first the USA [9], second Portugal [8] and third Italy [7], followed by France [6], the Netherlands [5] and Greece [5]. Seven [7] named wider geographical areas, Latin America [4], the Iberian peninsula [2] and Scandinavia [1] and, twenty one [21] combinations of more than one countries.

Thirty-two [32] visitors replied that their historical roots lay in **Europe**, three [3] of them specified Roman, Central and Eastern Europe, fifteen [15] combined Europe with certain mostly European countries, and two [2] Europe with the world. Another seventeen [17] mentioned the **world, the earth** as a whole: *“I have no roots; I belong to the world”, “I am a citizen of the world”*.

Thirty-nine [39] visitors answered by **personal values**, like the place of birth or places of living [17] and the family [15]: *“In my country of origin”, “My hometown in the US”, “In the past of my people, in Europe”, “In my parents and grandparents, Uruguay”, “According to my DNA I am Spanish (Balearic islands); in the Mediterranean”, “In my people”*. Three [3] of them named the **museum** as an institution where they do find their historical roots: *“In my historical museum”, “In place: museums...”*. Three [3] visitors referred to specific groups of people like: *“women in Catalonia”* and *“Among immigrants to the Western hemisphere”*, and one [1] *“inside me”*.

Fourteen [14] visitors named **issues of religion, culture and ideology**. Nine [11] visitors mentioned that their historical roots lie in cultural traditions, like western civilisation, Romanic, Catalan or European art and culture: *“Europe (Cervantes, Shakespeare, Tolstoy, Dante)”*. Religion appears in two [2] answers, like *“Northern German protestant”*. The social class and wider ideology issues were named in another four [4] answers: *“In the class struggle...”*, *“Next to people that struggle for freedom against totalitarianism, in Catalonia and at the same time in all the countries of Spain and Europe”*, *“In the free and democratic Catalonia, always dreamed”*.


Six [6] visitors said that their historical roots lay in certain **historical periods or places** such as Ancient Greece, Enlightenment, Barcino (Barcelona in the Roman period), Mesopotamia, XII-XV century.

Fifteen [15] visitors pointed out the difficulty to understand the question [7] or their difficulty to define a specific answer [8]: *“Maybe Paris but probably nowhere”, “I do not identify with any culture”, “I am still looking for it.”*



CHAPTER 5

What does being a national museum mean?



Introduction

In this part of the report we are going to focus on the questions that aimed to explore how visitors understand the role (and responsibilities) of national museums. We are going to focus on the questions regarding whether they consider this particular museum they visited a national one and why (or why not) (Q5, 5a, 5b, 5c), what should a national museum present and for whom (Q10, Q11, Q13, Q14), as well as who should be the agents for the creation of national museums (Q12).

Awareness and definition of a national museum

In order to collect information about how visitors understood the concept of a “national museum” we developed two questions: the first one aimed to provide answers as to how much aware were visitors about the fact that they were visiting a national museum and whether this has influenced their decision to visit. On a second level, two open-ended questions invited the respondents to justify their selections by arguing why they considered this particular museum as a national one, or why not.

Awareness of the museum being a National Museum

The majority of the respondents (77,9%) replied that they were aware of the fact they had visited a national museum. However, for 52,8% this knowledge did not influence their visits, whereas for 47,2% of respondents this knowledge did influence their visit.

Diagram 18: All case studies. Is this a national museum?






Diagram 19: Has this knowledge influenced your decision to visit – all case studies



More nationals were aware of the fact than non-nationals (80,5% instead of a 76,1%), even though the difference is not significant.

Diagram 20: Considering this a national museum – nationals vs. tourists: all case studies



The awareness was greater than the average in the cases of the National Museum of Estonia, the National Historical Museum of Athens, the National Museum of Ireland, the Open-Air Museum of Latvia and the National Museum of Scotland, probably because in these cases the

word “national” appears in the title of the museum. The awareness of non-nationals is larger in the cases of the German Historical Museum and the Nordiska museet, whereas in the other case studies nationals seem to be more interested in that aspect.

Diagram 21: National Museum of Estonia: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality




Diagram 22: National Historical Museum of Athens: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality




Diagram 23: National Museum of Ireland: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality




Diagram 24: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality




Diagram 25: Rijksmuseum: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality




Diagram 26: National Museum of Scotland: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality




Diagram 27: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality




Diagram 28: German Historical Museum: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality





Diagram 29: Nordiska museet: Awareness of this being a national museum, according to nationality



The definition of a national museum

The open-ended questions where visitors justify their negative or positive answers are very informative of the associations made with the concept of a national museum, both locally and internationally. For instance, the Rijksmuseum does not qualify as “national” in the eyes of many of its visitors because “*it is not large enough*” or “*it does not resemble the Louvre or the British Museum*”. Of course, this is a direct reference to the small exhibition space currently available at the Museum. On the other hand, the Museum of the History of Catalonia is a national museum according to a large number of respondents since “*the museum deals with the birth of the Catalan identity*”. Catalan respondents seem to be more aware of that, compared to visitors from other parts of Spain or other countries. In the case of Greece, people define the national museum as follows: “*It covers the history of the Modern Greek Nation*”; “*The nation’s history is unfolded with objects*” or “*It contains a large range of very important historical items/ relics that consist a historical treasure*”.

Visitors, on the other hand, do not consider the German Historical Museum a national museum because it does not present only the German history, but it mostly presents the European or even the international history. We can see, thus, that the museum’s European dimension can be used as an argument both in favour and against its description as a national museum.

The German Historical Museum, but also the National Museum of Estonia and the Nordiska museet are considered to be “national” because they present an overview of history, a “complete/detailed” presentation, or a “wide/pluralistic” presentation (NME, NM) or a “Swedish” or “German” perspective (respectively) or a “Nation-focused” perspective (NME) –

presentation/narrative seems to be important along with methods. Visitors also argue that some exhibitions are either “limited” or there is something “missing” from them; and this is a reason they do not consider this museum to be a national one (see RM above, but also NME and NM).

We are going to present the responses to this question per museum, in greater detail in the following section.

National Historical Museum of Athens

Two-hundred and fourteen [214] participants thought that the NHM was a national museum.

Most visitors, one hundred and four in all [104], said that the NHM was a national museum because it **presented Greek history** or at least an important part of Greek history, namely **Modern Greek history**: *“History”, “It is dedicated to modern Greek history”, “Very important History”, “Greek main history. Reflects the history of Modern Greece”, “Because here is a part of the history of Greece”, “Because it talks about the most important history/events of Greece”, “The museum shows very detailed and interesting the Greek history of modern Age”, “It shows the timeline of the Greek history”, “Because it represents the history and the people”, “It has a lot of historical information”, “It exposes Greek history”, “Because the museum represents really well the history of Greece in some things not always described in other museums. Good job”, “It shows the different evolution stages of the Greek history”, “It contains our history”, “It has features from various historical time periods of Greece”, “It exhibits the country’s history in a time period”*. Thirty-six [36] specifically talked about **national history** or the **history of the nation**: *“Broad summary of national history”, “Excellent explanation of brief history of nation”, “It’s national history for a certain period of time”, “Overview of the development of the Greek nation”, “It is a national story of Greece”, “Because it represents the history of our nation”, “It represents our nation’s course”, “The modern history of our nation is unfolding through the museum’s exhibition”*. Thirteen [13] more people thought that the national character of the Museum was demonstrated through its focus on the **Greek struggles for independence**: *“It contains objects from the struggles of the Greek Nation”, “It demonstrates the Nation’s struggles for existence & Independence”, “Represents the history of Greek people & their struggle to be an independent nation”*. Another eight [8] said that the NHM was a national museum because it represented the **establishment of the nation-state**: *“Shows the beginning of the Greek state understood as nation and territory”, “Reflects the growth of the Modern Greek nation and its constitutional development”, “It shows the beginning of the nation”*.

Another significant group of answers [37] focused on the **Museum’s collections** to argue for its national character; the NHM is a national museum because it **collects and displays the “treasures” of the nation**, material testaments of national history and relics associated with the “heroes” of the nation: *“There are objects from people and moments that have marked our national history”, “Because it exhibits treasures of the Greek nation”, “It has objects of the nation’s history”, “It contains objects representative of moments in our Nation’s modern history”, “The Nation’s history is unfolded with objects”, “Certain important items of the Greek history are contained in it and through them it narrates the story of important events in the establishment of the Greek state”, “Because it contains a wide range of very significant historical items - relics that consist a historical treasure”, “It contains unique items of 1821’s heroes, especially of the ‘protagonists’”, “The collection is very important”, “Lots of historically relevant artefacts”, “Has many artefacts that are of national significance to Greek history & culture”*.

Eleven [11] visitors claimed that the NHM promoted **national awareness** and was associated with the **notion of the nation and national identity**: *“National Greek awareness”, “Tells about Greek national identity”, “It represents the nation”*, while two [2] more that it inspired **national pride**:

"I felt national pride". Three [3], however, believed that it had an obvious **nationalistic** point of view: *"It's obvious, all the exhibits have relation with the Greek revolution from the Greek point of view", "Displays nationalistic identity"*.

Ten [10] participants said that the Museum was national because it **covered most aspects of Greek culture and parts of Greek territory**: *"It reports on the history of the whole of Greece and it has items and costumes from all the regions of the country", "Because it contains items from all over Greece and all periods", "Exhibits from all over Greece", "Focus is on the whole of Greece not only one part or one group", "Cultural information such as clothing of different times", "Because it exposes most of our traditions and most important citizens"*.

Ten [10] more focused on the **educational value** of the museum: *"Teaches a lot about Greek history", "It strengthens history & education", "Because I love historical museums and I wanna learn my history"*.

For three [3] visitors the NHM was a national museum because it reflected the **relationship between Europe and Greece**: *"Because it is a living memory of Hellas History and Europe's History", "It encompasses many aspects of Europe's clothing, parliament, weapons, etc"*, while one [1] more needed more info on the subject: *"Didn't explain the context of Greek independence between European history"*.

Three [3] participants said that the NHM was a national museum, because it was **housed in a historic site**: *"It consists a historical site", "The building of the Old Parliament <if> it is national?"* and three [3] more referred to **its name**: *"It is known as national museum", "It is the National Historical Museum"*.

One [1] said that it was a typical national museum, one [1] that it was run by the state and another [1] implied that its national character was self-evident. One [1] visitor thought that the Museum was unique and therefore national: *"Yes, because it's unique"* and one [1] stated that *"Without the past I don't have reference neither to now nor to tomorrow"*.

Twenty-three [23] participants provided an answer as to why **they do not consider** the NHM a national Museum.

Sixteen [16] thought that the NHM is not a national museum because it is **small and limited in scope and contents: Covers only one historic period** [6] *"Because it just represents a piece of Greece history", "Because not all periods of Greek history are presented", "It's too small and represents only a short historical period of Greek history"*, **the collection is not comprehensive** [4]: *"I think personally that this is a small museum, more stuff and space is required", "It doesn't concentrate all the exhibits scattered in other museums in the country"*, **it's monothematic** [1]: *"It is only military history, not the whole history, life of people, not overview"*. Five [5] people focused on **'Ancient Greece'**: *"There is only one part of the Greek history. It would be nice to see the ancient Greek history as well", "But what about earlier times? Greek Gods?"*.

Another four [4] participants said that the NHM is **outdated, conservative and lacks interpretative material**: *"Old fashioned museum. Lack of explanations & interactive tools..."*, *"Too much influenced by the official history (Paparrigopoulos) and therefore it fails to mention the regional stories during the Turkish occupation. An official history a little too correct ("langue du bois"). It should open up to new studies of Greek historians"*.

One [1] visitor claimed that the NHM is not a national museum because **not all its contents are Greek**: *"Because some items related to Turkey & Ottoman do not have relation to Greece"*, another [1] questioned the very idea of the nation: *"The nation is a constructed modern concept which doesn't exist. It's*

been devised” and one [1] more felt that he/she did not have enough knowledge of Greek history to make a comment.

Open-Air Museum of Latvia

The majority of participants supported their opinion for the national character of the Museum by referring either to the presentation of the past or the “telling” of Latvian history. It is hard to tell, however, whether they used the terms “past” or “history” as synonyms or they felt the ever disputed distinction between the past (“events that once happened”) and history (“selective reconstruction of features of the past”).²¹

More specifically, ninety-nine [99] people thought that it was the **presentation of past life** (culture, traditions etc) that made the Museum national: *“Museum shows our nation’s life and traditions”, “It is our past”, “It shows the lifestyle of Latvia”, “It shows Latvian culture and ancient lifestyle in different regions”, “The lifestyle and culture of the nation are shown”, “The lifestyle and culture of citizens of Latvian regions”.*

Ninety-six [96] participants said that the Museum is a national museum because it **relates the history of Latvia**: *“Documents Latvian history and development”, “It explores the history of Latvia”, “Because the museum represents people history of Latvia”, “Explain[s] history”, “It’s about Latvian history”, “It shows your history”.*

Eighteen [18] of them referred to **national history (or history of the nation)** in order to characterize the museum as national: *“It reflects the history of our nation”, “Shows history of my nation”, “Reflects nation’s history”.*

Another significant number of visitors, fifty – five [55] in particular, thought that the museum was national because it **focused on Latvia** and the presentation of **Latvian identity** (national identity/“Latvianess”): *“Museum is Latvian identity”, “The whole exposition is related to Latvia”, “Reflects the identity of Latvia”, “It shows Latvian identity”, “There are a lot of presentations about Latvia in the museum”, “Because everything in this museum is related to [the] history of Latvia”, “This is the real Latvia just really small (in miniature)”, “Museum represents identity of Latvia’s nation”, “Because it is very Latvian”, “It keeps the national identity”, “Very characteristic to Latvians”, “It’s very Latvian!”, “Identity of Latvians”.*

Thirty-two [32] participants said that the Museum was national because it held **important collections** (of national importance): *“In the museum you can see objects, which tell us and shows us the lifestyle and past of Latvian history”, “Because the objects you can see are making connection with the history of Latvia”, “Because of historical monuments and objects of history of [the] nation”, “The vault of national treasures”, “Priceless historical collections”, “It is a national treasure”, “Historical heritage”, “Tangible and intangible history”.*

Another thirty-one [31] people thought that the fact the Museum was **all inclusive/comprehensive of all /different aspects of Latvian territory/history/past** was what made it a national museum: *“Things from Latvia’s various regions from different centuries are collected here”, “Because it describes all of Latvia”, “Because all expositions are gathered from all parts of Latvia”, “Because this museum is all kinds of people not just one special group”, “Because there you can see regions in Latvia”, “It reflects the history of all the regions of Latvia”.*

²¹ Newsletter, 2005, John Carter Brown Library, 35, at http://www.brown.edu/Facilities/John_Carter_Brown_Library/images/IN_JCB_35.pdf (last accessed 17/7/2012)

Twenty-one [21] said that the Museum was **unique** in Latvia and therefore the National Museum of Latvia: *“All pieces of the exhibition are a historical and unique piece of our nation”, “Because it’s unique in Latvia”, “The only museum of this kind in Latvia”, “Because it is unique”, “Because it is the only open air museum in Latvia”, “This kind of museum exists only in Latvia”, “Only we Latvians, have a place like this”.*

Nine [9] more made flattering comments; they thought that the Museum was national because it was **“beautiful” and “interesting”**: *“Because it’s beautiful”, “Because it is a beautiful museum”, “Very nice place!”, “Because the museum looks adorable”, “Very interesting”, “I like it, it’s interesting”.* Another three [3] referred to its **size**: *“It is big and I think something special for Latvia”, “Largest Ethnography Museum of Latvia”.*

Nine [9] people mentioned its **educational value** (of national importance): *“I got to know our ancestor’s history”, “I got familiar with the history of Latvia’s regions”, “Because here it’s gathered valuable information”, “Because you can learn so much here!”.* Two [2] of them emphasised the fact that the museum related the “official history”: *“Historically accurate”, “Widely recognized Latvian history and ethnography”.*

For seven [7] participants the national character of the Museum was **self-evident**: *“Because it’s simply like that”, “It just is”, “It’s simply so, you can’t see similar”, “Because it is the open-air museum of Latvia”.* Four [4] more stressed the fact that the Museum was in the open: *“Because it’s outside”, “Because it is a beautiful park and museum”.*

There were six [6] miscellaneous answers to the question:

- “Because of our guide’s feelings” [1] (the guide communicated feelings of national pride)
- “The word ‘national’ reminds me of traditional” [1]
- “Because it is in Latvia” [1] (location makes the answer self-evident)
- “I advise everybody to visit this museum at least a couple of times in the year” [1]
- “But I’m sorry that so many places were closed today” [1]
- “Didn’t understand the question” [1]

Only three [3] participants thought that the Open Air Museum of Latvia **was not a national** Museum because it was **not all inclusive/ comprehensive**: *“It did not express all of Latvia’s history”, “It does not cover the entire Latvian history”, “It is not enough to understand national life”.*

One [1] visitor just did not know: *“Don’t know”.*

National Museum of Estonia

Most visitors [66] considered this Museum to be a National Museum because it presents the **Estonian history** [26], Everyday Life [13] but also Culture and Traditions [11] and Estonia and the Estonians [16] in general: *“Tells a story of the Estonians throughout centuries”, “It describes former everyday life in the countryside as well as in town”, “It deals with the roots and traditions of Estonians & wide topics of everyday life and festivities”, “It is dedicated [the exhibition] to significant aspects for the Estonians”.*

Fifty-four [54] answers referred to the presentation of the **Nation** [13], Nation’s Heritage/ History/culture [34], National **Identity** [8] and also **personal identity** [9]: *“It gives an overview of Estonians as a nation”, “preserves national heritage, national memory, everyday life ways”, “Helps to maintain our national identity”, “It brings out our roots, every Estonian has a joy of recognitions”.*

Thirty-eight [38] answers gave their attention to the museum-collection and named the importance of the **historical objects** and their **national significance** [21], but also noted the fact that the museum presents a **great variety** [15] of exhibits, characteristic for different historical periods and representative of different regions which makes the collection one of the most diverse ones in terms of ethnographic material. Another two [2] answers mentioned the **uniqueness** of the material heritage presented in the museum. *“Because it collects and displays significant historical artefacts and other important things of the Estonians”, “Items which characterise different periods”, “Items from everywhere in the country”, “Because NME presents varied and in the same time unique parts of our national material heritage”.*

Thirty-five [35] answers focused on the **ways of presentation**, which are characteristic for a National Museum. First of all, thirteen [13] characterised the presentation as wide/pluralistic, which includes past and present of the Estonians, a lot of information about national culture and history, the culture of nations living in Estonia: *“This museum comprises Estonian folk culture in the widest sense”, “Here is all Estonian nation, represented through the items – activism, everyday life etc.”, “Presents culture of nations living in Estonia”.* Another eleven [11] evaluated the museum exhibition saying that history is presented well and gives a good overview of the Estonian nation, culture, history: *“It gives a good overview of the Estonian nation, culture, history”, “Here is the flavour/touch of old Estonia”.* Eight [8] replies made comments about the aspects/perspectives presented in the exhibition, such as a nation-focused display or narrative of National History but in European Perspective: *“Museum features way of thinking in one common culture”, “Nation-focused display is exposed in permanent exhibition”, “Narrative of National History but in European/Constructivism Perspective”.* Finally, two [2] found the ways of presentation very interesting for everybody and one [1] mentioned the issue of experiencing history: *“Because it presents to us common and familiar things in a way that is interesting and new even to ourselves”, “You can experience the history and way of living of Estonian people”.*

Sixteen [16] visitors discussed the **role and aims of a national museum**, that of educating [9], collecting, preserving, presenting [5] and, but also the museums responsibility to the next generations [1]: *“It has been the historical role of the Estonian National Museum to be a National Museum”, “You learn a lot of this country”, “Explains the history and culture of the nation”, “Preserving culture, displaying not only old, but also contemporary culture”, “It reminds the beauty of Estonia as it used to be to the newer generation”.*

Fifteen [14] answered that this is a National Museum because of its **Title** [8], its **Size** [1] and because it is an old museum [4]: *“Because the name of the museum is National Museum”, “Biggest in Estonia”, “It has been so 100 years”.*

Twenty-one [21] participants chose to make an **evaluation of the museum** at this open field of the questionnaire. Seven [7] of them found the Museum very interesting, two [2] mentioned that the museum has a pluralistic view and one [1] said that it is significant for introducing Estonian culture to foreigners: *“It provides very interesting information about 19th [century] cultural history”, “Because the National Museum has a good approach of Estonian identity”, “You’ve created a total image of Estonia”, “In National Museum could be featured only Estonians, but we have ethnic minorities and they are presented as well”, “It is good for introducing our culture to foreigners”.* Another three [3] visitors approached critically the Museum and mentioned that it could have more data, that it ignores ethnic minorities and that it should include world history and more recent history: *“It seems more specifically a ‘folk’ museum and what is here is wonderful but could be expanded upon to give a greater idea of*

Estonia's history in the context of world history & more recent history". Finally, eight [8] made some general statements about the Museum, such as how important it is to know the past, or how often they visit it: *"It is important to know the past"*, *"It is always good to come, it's nice (nostalgic) to be here. I've visited this place so many times with my pupils"*.

Five [5] visitors argued that the Museum **is not a National** one, since some exhibition topics are either **limited or missing**: *"There is very little about the essence of what forms/makes the nation"*, *"Not all aspects of culture are involved in researching and collecting"*, *"It's rather an ethnographic museum by essence, so the former name was more appropriate"*.

Three [3] visitors expressed their **personal opinions** about what a National Museum should be. One visitor said that national museums should not necessarily be connected to the national culture and another that this Museum presents the history of districts, the history of the Estonian people, not the history of the nation; a third visitor argued that the Museum exhibits other Nations and cultures we all as the Estonian one: *"A National museum should not be necessarily connected with national culture, see for example – national theatre"*, *"Other nations and cultures are also exposed among Estonian shows [in the temporary exhibitions]"*, *"Features history of districts, history of Estonian people, not nation"*.

German Historical Museum

Most visitors [102] believed that the German Historical Museum is a national museum because it presents **German History**; another fifty-two [52] referred only to Germany, **German people, culture** from the beginnings till today: *"It presents important stations of the German history"*, *"Here the German history is being collected"*, *"It's about Germany"*, *"Shows the history of the 'German People' from the beginning to the present"*, *"Because it is concerned particularly with the development of the German state and culture"*, *"Shows how it came to Germany of today"*.

A smaller number of people [32] decided to speak about **National History** often stressing the importance of national history: *"National history stands in the foreground"*, *"Because it reflects the history of my Nation with all the high and low moments"*, *"it encompasses national history not local and it is given from national viewpoints"*, *"Because history is what forms the nation"*. Another ten (10) visitors defined the significance of the museum in formulating **National Identity**, while one (1) rejected the importance of national history itself: *"Good presentation of the national identity"*, *"Because, although it records world events they focus on the German territory and they illustrate the identity formation of the German people"*, *"The museum shows the national history and identity of the Germans"*, *"The concept of the nation does not make sense in this context!"*.

Another group of answers [108] focused on the **ways of presentation** as characteristic for a national Museum. Sixty four replies [64] focused on the **completeness/detailed presentation**, often stating that it shows all the periods and the whole of Germany: *"It's big and everything seems to be here"*, *"It tells the history of the entire country"*, *"Because it represents all the periods and inhabitants"*, *"It presents the German history in detail and vivid"*. Other answers [29] agreed with such statements referring to a good overview, summary of history etc.: *"Overview of the German history"*, *"Important insight to the German history"*, *"It was a good summary of the country's history"*. Only one [1] visitor said that the museum does not offer an analytical presentation, claiming though that for the same reason he considers it a national one: *"Because it does not include detailed position on topics of the entire history"*. Eight [8] visitors considered the museum as neutral, unemotional and objective, and they

claimed that a clear and concise presentation is characteristic for a national museum: *“It deals with the German history in a neutral and unemotional way”, “Very representative, decent information, hence the whole history is shown in a clear way”, “It displays German history very well, short and concise”*. There was also reference to the **German perspective** [5] of the presentation, the significance of political history and of the historical narrative of the exhibition: *“It deals with history from a German perspective – the emphasis is on German history”, “Political history important background for this country's history”, “Because everything is explained towards ‘the Germans’, ends relatively national-enthusiastic with reunification”*.

Another significant number of answers [40] referred to the **aims of presentation** noticing the importance of a national museum for the public education, information, explanation, and experience, both for Germans and tourists: *“Because it educates about German history”, “It records the whole history of Germany, it has a national significance which the foreign visitor must see”, “This museum helped me understand how Germany came to be”, “Cultural heritage for future generations”, “German/National history experience”*.

Other visitors [29] focused on the exhibition's **European and/or international dimension**, considering it characteristic and adequate for a national museum: *“Intensive dealing with German and European history”, “Overview of Europe”, “It shows the history of Germany and in connection with other countries”, “Through German history we learn history from all Europe”, “It has a lot of information about interesting history for (almost) every country in Europe”*.

Only a few visitors [22] defined the term “national museum” according to its **exhibits**. This fact coincides with our remark that the museum's communication policy is based on providing a historical narrative, while the exhibits function as illustrations of this narrative: *“Many German things/objects/documents”, “Because here all the German historical art works, weapons, clothing are found”, “Exhibits reflect all German history”*.

In a few cases [18], the location of the museum, **Berlin**, its **Size** and **Name**, together with its contents and its view are considered enough to describe it as a national museum: *“Because it shows the history of Germany and it is in Berlin”, “If the GHM is called German Historical Museum, that is supposed to be a national museum”, “Large, well explained information, wide variety of information”*.

Finally, twelve [12] visitors expressed a critical judgment of the museum: *“The best history museum of the world”, “The history is well told and understandable history”, “If this is not a national museum, I don't know what is”, “It gives Germany the History it needs”, “It is a credit to the country to have such a wonderful museum”*.

Most [25] of those who considered that the German Historical Museum **is not a national** museum remarked that it presents not only German history, but mostly **European** or even the international history: *“Because history is not national German history is always also European history”, “Always shows it in a well depicted European context”, “It is interesting as part of European history”, “The events depicted here relate deeply to the whole world”, “Objects of many nations are being shown”*.

Eleven [11] visitors expressed their opinions about national museums in general. They seemed to believe that whatever is national is partly nationalistic too, as it displays the national myths, and that the German Historical Museum could not be described as a national museum because of its objectivity: *“Because a national museum in my opinion is glorified / idealized by the national history”, “The GHM does not express a national myth, but has been striving for objectivity”*.

Seven [7] visitors have pointed out that there are missing stories and thus the German Historical Museum cannot be qualified as a national one: *“It shows only [the] historical development and less [the] cultural”, “Historical museum, no other sciences”.*

Two visitors stated clearly their rejection of anything national, while one said that national should mean also critical, an aspect missing in GHM: *“National is for me personally too negative”, “Not critical enough, current history and end of 20th century missing”.* Finally, two answers referred to the visitors, claiming that the GHM could not be considered as a national museum because it addresses not only Germans but also tourists: *“The exhibition is also designed for foreign visitors, not only for the Germans”.*

National Museum of Ireland

A majority of one hundred and eighty-nine [189] visitors argued for the national character of the Museum by referring to **the representation of Irish history**; the NMI gives (an) account(s) of important historic events of Ireland and is therefore a national museum: *“Has a lot of Irish history”, “Represents last 100 years of country’s history”, “Contains part of Irish history”, “Represents important & significant areas of Irish history”, “Displays an impression of Ireland’s history”, “All Irish history”, “Covers Irish History”, “A national museum captures as much history as it can”, “Because it expresses the history of Ireland”, “Historically very representative”, “Reflects History”.* Thirty [30] of them talked about **national history**: *“Displays the history of our nation”, “Explores areas of national historical interest”, “It contains Ireland’s national history”.* Interestingly enough, another twelve [12] thought that the NMI is national because it mainly relates military history: *“Irish Military history”, “Military history very relevant to the formation of the state”, “Because it recounts the part Irish soldiering has played worldwide”.* Seven [7] more stressed the fact that it is history told from **the Irish perspective**: *“It represents the nation’s historical view and incidents”, “It demonstrates the past from the Irish perspective”, “Definitely expresses the history of Ireland from the perspective of a free Ireland looking back”.*

Another large number of participants, specifically one hundred and six [106], focused on the content, size and quality of **the Museum’s collections**; it collects and displays the **“treasures of the nation**, a lot of historically and nationally relevant objects: *“Significant items of Irish history; It retains our national treasures”, “It has exhibits and artifacts (or replicas) of national importance”, “Objects that show parts of the national history and represent aspects of Ireland”, “The name & amount of artefacts”, “Contains objects of national significance”, “Because of the exhibits it displays”, “Collection of Irish artefacts”, “Has historical artefacts”, “Because it contains many unique, historical objects that represent our history”, “National artefacts from birth of our nation exhibited”, “Because it holds items unique to Ireland”, “Artefacts are of Irish Origin or production”, “Because it’s got most of the objects to identify the history”, “Covers national treasures”.*

Sixty-six [66] visitors, thought that the fact the Museum was **all inclusive/ comprehensive of all /different aspects of Irish territory/culture/past** was what made it a national museum: *“It covers so many aspects of the life and culture of our nation”, “Contains interesting things about many areas”, “Contains many aspects of Irish history, diverse”, “It represents various aspects of our heritage - history of war, struggle, art, coinage”, “Explored different aspects of the country and was very thorough & honest”, “It appears to accomplish a one-stop opportunity for people who may only see this museum”, “Inclusive of entire country”, “The Museum covers a broad range of Irish culture & history”, “Because of the broad spectrum of Irish art & history”.*

Another sixty [60] said that the museum was national because its main **focus was Ireland, Irish identity and heritage**: *“Is a fine example of Irish life”, “As its mainly about Ireland”, “Introduces very Irish themes and interests”, “Focus on Irish culture and history was impressive”, “There is a lot of focus on Irish”, “Because deals with Ireland”, “It clearly represents Ireland”, “Expresses Irish identity and spirit of independence”, “For the Irish culture and history”, “It’s all about Ireland and its people”, “Because it displays everything Irish”, “It contains a lot of Irish heritage”.*

Twenty-eight [28] more visitors claimed that the NMI specifically displayed a **representation of the nation and of national identity**: *“Represents the finest of national identity”, “Represents the nation”, “It has all the elements of the Irish Nation”, “Seems to represent Ireland as a nation”, “Nationally oriented”.* Another fourteen [14] said that the Museum was national because it inspired feelings of **national pride** and gratitude for the past: *“Makes me proud to be Irish”, “Makes you proud to be Irish”, “To show the world how a fantastic place it is”, “To honour the past”.*

Thirty-nine [39] visitors focused on the **educational value** of the Museum and the possible **learning outcomes** in order to argue for its national character: *“Because there is a bit of everything here to learn about”, “Because it helps the understanding of national history”, “I can learn Ireland’s history and the other things”, “Is very interesting and you learn a lot about Ireland”, “I learned much about the national Irish history”, “As a visitor its exhibitions taught me about Ireland, history, arts, culture”, “From me (a tourist) it teaches me important events in the history of Ireland”, “It’s very useful to learn about Irish History”, “Explains a lot of Irish History to residents and non residents”, “It will help people understand our history better and the reason for Irish/British difference”.* Two [2] added that it caters for the needs of all people.

Thirty-five [35] people argued that the Museum was national because of its **presentation methods** and expressed very positive opinions of it; **it is a “very good” museum**: *“Very well done”, “Interesting”, “Exhibits very well displayed”, “Beautiful settings layout and information easy to access”, “Because the way the things are placed and displayed”, “It’s just overwhelming”, “Very, very good”, “Because it was nice”, “It is very interesting”, “b/c it’s awesome”.* Eleven [11] more focused on the **size of the Museum and the range of its exhibits**: *“Because it’s big and amazing”, “It’s big with lots of different exhibitions”, “Range of exhibits”.*

Eighteen [18] visitors thought the national character of the Museum was self-explanatory, because of its **name**: *“That’s what it says on the door”, “Represents such, named such”, “Called National Museum of Ireland”, “It said it was on the front”, “I am from Canada and this is called a National Museum”.* Two [2] more had seen the name in guides.

Fifteen [15] people mentioned that the Museum was **state funded, run by the government** and **free** for the public and therefore national.

For ten [10] people the NMI had an **international scope**: *“Multicultural exhibits”, “Info on other nations”, “International sections showed”.*

Eight [8] thought that the NMI was a national museum, because it was **housed in a historic site**: *“Historical significance of the building”, “Nationally significant building and location”, “In a historical site which thus relates to what’s inside. Important to me”.* Six [6] more focused on the location of the Museum, **in the capital city** of Ireland: *“It’s in Dublin”, “Dublin is the capital so it should have a national museum”, “Located in Nation’s capital, of national significance, features nation’s history”.*

Finally, there were five [5] miscellaneous answers

- “Because it encompasses the past & present & provides a mirror to the future” [1]
- “It certainly defies any other description! (Bizarre question)” [1]

- “Old Irish Literature” [1]
- “Because I don’t know” [1]
- “Should be more regarding Irish history 1969, 1994, 1998 peace agreement” [1]

Thirty-one [31] participants provided an answer as to why **they do not consider** the NMI a national Museum.

Sixteen [16] visitors claimed that the NMI was **too limited in scope and only partially covered the history of Ireland**: *“It doesn’t deal with a lot outside the South history”, “Missing lots of information”, “The early history of the country didn’t seem represented”, “Not much about Ireland”, “Lacking Northern conflict articles”, “No historical overview”, “Rural Ireland not represented”, “Because is not complete”*. One [1] more added that the Museum was too small: *“Do not consider complex and large enough for national museum”*.

Seven [7] people thought that the NMI was more **international** in scope than national: *“Of international interest”, “Too many objects not pertaining to this country”, “Too much junk (of little value) from all over the world incoherently displayed”, “Very similar to things saw in UK as well”*. One [1], on the contrary, believed that it should have more international relevance: *“Museums should attract all nationalities and political history unbiased”*.

Three [3] participants were not sure how to answer this question: *“I am a tourist and would not know whether this represented Ireland well”*.

Three [3] used the field to express suggestions about the NMI: *“More interactivity would be nice”, “Have we too many museums? I would reconvert it is an army barracks. Sorry!”, “Your combined Museums represent a unity which is important. Would include the museum at Cultra as part of this unity or totality”*.

Two [2] people seemed to have used the field to answer the previous question: *“It shares the history of this great country”, “It has many artifacts re Irish history”*.

Rijksmuseum

A large number of visitors, one hundred and thirteen [113], thought that the RM was a national museum because it **presented the history of the country** (summary/aspects of the history): *“Because it tells part of NL history”, “History portrayed”, “I think it express Dutch history”, “There is a collection explaining country’s history”, “It is a summary of the Dutch history”, “Documents Dutch history”, “It represents a wide variety of aspects of the history”, “Because it tells us the history of the country and the city”, “History of the Netherlands!”, “Its organisation is closely tied to the evolution of the history of the Netherlands”, “Represents Dutch history”, “Interesting aspects of Dutch history”, “It reflects the history of Holland”, “It depicts the history of Netherlands”*. Nineteen [19] of them referred to **national history (or history of the nation)** in order to characterize the museum as national: *“Explains part of the history of the nation”, “Paintings depict history of the Dutch nation; historically significant figures of the Dutch nation”, “It has examples typical of national history”*.

Another ninety-two [92] visitors said that the RM was national because it presented mainly the work of **Dutch artists**; mostly those considered **national painters**: *“Dedicated to Dutch artists”, “Because most of Dutch paintings and artists are collected here”, “Most Dutch artists are collected here”, “Mainly Dutch artists”, “It is especially about Netherlands painters”, “It does contain only Dutch artists and concentrates on the Dutch culture”, “Displays work of Dutch artists”, “Dutch masters on display”, “Because it displays national artists and history”, “Because there are painters of the country (and I paint too)”, “For series of 16th century painters of Holland”, “Some of the most important Dutch painters are on display with works showing*

much of the nation's history”, *“Mostly Dutch art and artists”*, *“National painters and pieces of history, specifically explained in the guide”*, *“The artists and works are all from the nation”*.

Forty-seven [47] more informants thought that the Museum was **representative of the country and national identity**; it is a national museum because it **focuses on Dutch culture** and **‘Dutchness’**: *“It’s representative”*, *“It is representative of your nation”*, *“Because there are a lot of objects and paintings which are typical of this nation”*, *“Because it represents how the country was during the golden age”*, *“I think it represents Dutch national heritage”*, *“Represents the true spirit of Dutch culture”*, *“It represents Netherlands”*, *“Wide representation of national culture”*, *“As it represents the best of the Netherlands”*, *“Very focused in Netherlands”*, *“Have lot of Dutch spirit!”*, *“There are some objects you can see only there; they help to understand deeply the Dutch”*, *“So Dutch!”*. Another six [6] emphasized the **comprehensiveness** of the Museum’s contents: *“Because it contains the pictures of a whole nation”*, *“Dealt with multiple different parts of Holland”*, *“It is widely representative: large range of objects (paintings...) and styles”*.

Forty-five [45] participants focused on the collections; the RM is a national museum because it holds a **prestigious collection** of (national) art and other important artefacts: *“It has a great collection of art”*, *“La prestige de la collection”*, *“Because it is very famous and has impressive collection”*, *“Because of all the masterpieces”*, *“Beautiful paintings”*, *“Because it contains beautiful paintings”*, *“Quality of works”*, *“Quality of paintings and other art; broad selection of items and subjects”*, *“This museum has a very large collection of unique paintings”*, *“Priceless art of Rembrandt, Degas”*, *“For the artistic value of everything in this museum”*, *“Contains national treasures”*, *“Artefacts belonging to nation reveal vast details of its past”*.

The museum was national in the minds of eighteen [18] people, mostly tourists in Amsterdam, even before their visit; it is a **world famous** museum and a reason to visit Amsterdam: *“It’s world famous”*, *“Because it is very famous and has impressive collection”*, *“I’ve heard of it overseas”*, *“For a foreigner like me it is the only museum (together with the V. Gogh museum) that is known”*, *“I have heard it in the UK”*, *“Well-known throughout the world”*, *“We came to Amsterdam just to see the museum pieces”*.

Seven [7] used the field to praise the **importance of the RM**; a museum of national importance: *“Because it is the most important museum of the Netherlands”*, *“Extremely significant museum”* and another six [6] to praise its **educational value**: *“Very interesting for education”*, *“It contains valuable information”*, *“Interesting new knowledge”*. Three [3] on the other hand gave their criticisms: *“But only art - not general”*, *“I think that there is more about Holland than a few paintings and pieces of porcelain. Also lots of remarkable well known paintings are missing. We were expecting to see those”*.

Few visitors, five [5] in particular, thought the national character of the Museum was self-evident just from its **name**: *“It is in the name”*, *“Cause this is the national (Reich’s-)Museum”*.

Three [3] people thought that the RM had the **international scope** appropriate for a European national Museum *“Lot of Dutch painters and also very open on others nationality painters (e.g. Degas)”*, *“Explains the European identity and history”*, *“It feels like the equivalent of London’s National Gallery”*, while two [2] more mentioned the breadth of the exhibitions: *“Breadth of exhibitions”*, *“Detailed display”*.

In two cases [2] the Museum’s location was given as the reason for its national character: *“In the heart of Amsterdam”*.

Finally, there were five [5] miscellaneous answers to the question:

- *“Went to see the highlights, the masterpieces”* [1]
- *“I could find no reason of why not”* [1]
- *“Chance to be seen by more visitors”* [1]

- “It seems to have been projected from such a perspective” [1]
- “History of art and its origins must be maintained” [1]

Forty-six [46] participants provided an answer as to why **they do not consider** the RM a national Museum.

Eleven [11] thought that it was **too small** for a national museum: *“The visit is too short in time”, “The fact that one part of the museum was closed is not specified before the entrance”, “Too small”, “It’s a museum and not large”, “Very small exhibitions for a national museum (vs. Louvre, Prado, British Museum)”*.

Another eight [8] visitors claimed that the RM was **too limited in scope and covered mainly just one historic period** and one city: *“It displays just art of the XVII and XVIII centuries, not of all Dutch history”, “Linked mainly to Amsterdam, not all cities”, “Because I think the history of the country should be analysed not only focusing on one century (XVII)”, “Specific of a time and a region but not ‘national’”*.

Seven [7] more thought that it was more of **an art museum** than a national one: *“Museum of art is suitable name”, “It’s too much focused on paintings”, “Only paintings, not much else”, “Too much focused on art and missing general things about Dutch history”*. And then there were nine [9] visitors who believed that even **the collection of art itself wasn’t comprehensive** enough: *“Not enough J. Vermeer’s pictures”, “Very few paintings”, “Because it does not have a wide variety of artists”, “Not enough works on display”, “Focused on too few artists on a short period”*.

Six [6] people said that the RM is an **international museum**: *“Because it contains paintings that they are international interest”, “Because it is international”, “I find art not to be particularly nationalistic, but European artists expressing themselves”, “As Spaniard I could find interesting things about my own history and a shared past with Holland”*.

Five [5] visitors gave the following answers to the question: *“Unaware”, “Mostly in national museums has more personal items”, “I was mostly interested in Rembrandt and Degas work”, “I was expecting an ‘experience’. I found there wasn’t enough explanation and historical info”, “It does not look national. It looks like something owned by a private company”*.

National Museum of Scotland

One hundred and two [102] people said that the Museum is a national museum because it **relates the history of Scotland**: *“Great tour of Scotland’s history right through the ages”, “It tells the history of Scotland”, “Well, there is the history of the land from the early ages. What other museum would do that?”, “It is largely about Scottish history”, “Because of historical, natural and landscape history and development of Scotland”, “It contains past history of Scotland of how it went through the stages throughout the decades”, “Good Scottish history display”, “It dives into the history of Scotland as it should”, “It charts Scotland’s history”, “Tells Scottish history with key historical exhibits”, “Explores all Scottish history”*.

Twenty-six [26] more referred to **national history (or history of the nation) and national identity** in order to characterize the museum as national: *“Represents national identity, displays national history”, “It provides a history of the nation”, “In depth history of the nation - explores Scotland and its people / nationals”, “Gives insights to the Scottish identity”, “Because it’s a museum on the Scottish nation’s history”*. Four [4] of them felt the need to highlight the fact that **Scotland is indeed a distinct nation**: *“Because Scotland is historically and culturally a distinct nation”, “History of a distinctive nation. Expressive of political change and self-confidence”. “Scotland is its own nation”*. Another five [5] thought

that the museum is national because it **emanates pride** for the country and its history: *“Reflects pride of the country”, “Pride in country without going into excessive patriotism”*.

A significant number of visitors, seventy-six [76] in all, thought that the fact the Museum was **all inclusive/ comprehensive of all /different aspects of Scottish territory/culture/past** was what made it a national museum: *“Because it covers geology, people, church, kings, etc., “Because it’s got stuff about all of Scotland”, “Has examples from many areas of Scotland’s past”, “Showcases most of Scotland”, “It seemed to cover all aspects of Scottish history”, “Extensive content”, “It has general exhibits”, “Contains information / exhibits covering many subjects”, “Covers the nation’s history overall”*.

Sixty-nine [69] participants focused to the **breadth of the collections and their significance**. The NMS is a national museum because it contains national/Scottish artifacts: *“Extensive collection”, “Objects relate to Scotland”, “It consists of objects of interest connected to Scotland”, “Because there are lots of things”, “Because it has a lot of interesting historical objects”, “Loads of Scottish things that I find interesting”, “Quantity and span of artefacts”*. Six [6] of them emphasised the national character of the objects on display: *“Collection represents history of nation from early times”, “Holds objects of national importance”, “The objects represent national history and identity”*. One [1] named a specific object, the *“Clann Reg. Flag”*.

Fifty-six [56] said that the museum was national because its main **focus was Scotland**, its past and “Scottishness”: *“It emphasizes Scotland and its accomplishments”, “Focuses on Scotland, not UK or Europe”, “Very much a Scottish focused museum”, “Mostly about Scotland”, “Focuses on Scotland”, “It’s about Scotland”, “Focus on Scottish peoples”, “It’s rich in themes about ‘Scottishness’”, “Encompasses Scotland’s past and contributions”, “Represents Scotland’s past”*.

Twenty-one [21] participants on the other hand thought that the Museum had a more **international scope**, characteristic of European national museums: *“It’s free to the public and aims to educate about our country’s / world’s history”, “It contains a lot more than just Scottish artefacts”, “It highlights Scottish, British, world and natural heritage”, “Prolific British and European history - socially relevant”, “Because there are things from all over the world. And it’s really good”, “Good balance of national and international pieces”, “Museum well represents Scotland as a nation as well as providing information on other parts of the world”*.

Twenty-eight [28] people argued that the Museum was National because of its **excellent communication and learning strategies**: *“Interesting and instructive”, “Creating understanding”, “Because one can learn about our heritage”, “Because of the historical explanations”, “Because you can learn too many things of your past and of Scotland”, “Lots of relevant information”, “Its state of the art/world class presentation techniques”, “It is amazing”, “It is very interesting and it is the best museum I have visited”, “Fantastic displays - engaging Innovative - on history and development of Scotland”*. Five [5] more focused on the sheer **size of the Museum and its contents**: *“Because it’s huge and wide, you can find everything”, “Scale and diversity of exhibits”, “It’s very huge and has a lot of information”, “The scale of the exhibits and the breadth of knowledge is on par with other National Museums I have visited”*. Another five [5] stressed the Museum’s **uniqueness**; it is the Museum of Scotland: *“Unique in Scotland”, “It’s the only one we got”*.

For thirty-one [31] visitors the **name of the Museum** was self-explanatory: *“Because it is called the National Museum of Scotland”, “Displayed on entrance”, “Dab!! It’s called NMoS and holds the Scottish National collections”, “The name, for starters leaves precious little in imagination”, “Self explanatory”*.

Twenty [20] thought that the Museum was centrally located, **in the capital city** of Scotland and therefore national: *“In the capital city of Scotland”, “Museum in the capital (Edinburgh)”, “Because it’s in Edinburgh”*. Two [2] of them included “for free” in their answers. One more [1] thought that it was national because it was funded by the state: *“It is paid for by National Lottery funds”*.

Another seventeen [17] visitors thought that the Museum was national because it was **for everyone** - provided access to/ catered for the needs of different visitor groups: *“It gathers things for adults and children, it is very full and interesting”, “In the city, contains lots of history and artefacts, great for kids and adults”, “Because it is good for all ages”, “Children and adults alike are able to enjoy history and art”, “Because it is for everyone”, “It is for all not just for nationals”*.

For three [3] people the Museum was national because it was relevant to their **personal identities**: *“Because I’ve lived here for 50 years”, “Born in Edinburgh, grown up with museum. It’s important to have that Scottish identity”*.

Finally, five [5] visitors expressed a negative opinion for the Museum, which in their mind was limited in scope and presumptuous: *“Need more info on west coast (Scots) but overlooked”, “The items and exhibits are limited and ...”, “Doesn’t tell enough Scottish history”, “Presumption”*. One [1] of them thought that it was not easily accessible to the whole population: *“Only some of the population can reach it easily”*. Two [2] people could not express an opinion: *“Have only visited two galleries”, “Quickly stepping in but now I want to look around”* and two [2] more made critical comments: *“The presentation of objects and supporting text suggest a national perspective on the part of the curators”, “I think within the constraints of the preserved material culture - in a way”*.

Only four [4] participants provided an answer as to why **they do not consider** the NMS a national Museum: *“Because the idea of a nation is so fraught with difficulties. It’s a museum of artefacts from very different cultures in a contiguous geographical area. More space needed to fully answer”, “However, I personally think, as a Northerner (north old Scotland that is) it is too Anglo-centric in some respects for my taste”, “Scotland is the result of a lot of different cultures”, “Not from here”*.

Nordiska museet

One hundred and thirty one [131] visitors considered this Museum to be a National Museum because it presents the **history** of Sweden [50] or it is generally about Sweden [25]: *“Because it shows how Sweden was in the past”, “It’s about Sweden”*. Some of them mentioned special themes of the exhibitions such as Everyday Life [24] and the Swedish people [5], the Swedish Culture [18] and Folklore [3]: *“Because of the history of life (daily) in Sweden”, “It is about the Swedish people throughout time”, “Because it shows Swedish cultural history”, “The museum shows art and tradition of Sweden”, “It gives you an idea of the Swedish folklore”*.

Another six [6] visitors pointed out that this is more a museum about **Nordic countries**, about Nordic culture and history, meaning that it exceeds the role of the national museum of Sweden: *“It’s a Nordic museum. It has old stuff. About Sweden”, “More than national, Nordic. Can tell by the name”, “This and Skansen are the only museums specialised in Nordic culture (and history)”*.

Thirty-five [35] visitors referred to the presentation of the **Nation** [18], the Nation’s history and people, the building of the Nation and the approach of national issues and questions: *“It represents the history of the nation and its people pretty well”, “It represents the nation Sweden through the times and the provinces”, “Because it shows what is national”*. Another four [4] visitors expressed the opinion that the Museum represents the **National Identity** and twelve [12] believed that this is their

personal identity as well: “Represents a National identity”, “It shows how we in Sweden have lived and live. We recognize ourselves”, “Partly my own history”, “Our cultural heritage”. Finally, another five [5] replies mentioned the national importance of the museum: “Important for all of the nation”, “Shows Swedish pride”, “Deals with national questions”.

Thirty-seven [37] visitors gave their attention to the **museum-collection** and named the importance of the historical objects and their national significance [19], but also the fact that the museum presents a great variety [4] of exhibits representing different aspects of Swedish cultures at different times and several places in the country. “Collections / artefacts are from all of Sweden & from all historic periods”, “The museum shows objects that are strongly connected to Sweden as a nation”, “It contains objects that add to a narrative of Swedish history”, “The objects are from several places in the country”, “There are objects representing different aspects of Swedish cultures at different times”. Another four [4] mentioned the uniqueness of the material heritage presented in the museum: “Here you get to see some unique objects”, “Many national treasures are exhibited”. Six [6] visitors named specific objects, or groups of objects such as: “Furniture, porcelain, history”, “Gustav Vasa by Carl Milles [sculpture]”.

Thirty-five [35] visitors focused on the **ways of presentation**, which are characteristic for a National Museum. Twelve [12] visitors noticed the **wide/pluralistic presentation**, which reflects the history of many parts of Sweden in terms of both geography and time; ten [10] made comments about the **Swedish perspective** presented in the exhibition or generally about the scope of the exhibitions, but two [2] criticized the presentation as one-dimensional. “Covers all areas of Sweden”, “Wide representation of art and folk art”, “Focused on Swedish aspects and aspects important for Swedes.”, “History is shown from a Swedish perspective”, “The goal of the museum [is] to reflect the Nordic countries in a wide class perspective”, “Shows one side of Sweden”. Another nine [9] of them evaluated the museum exhibition and said that Swedish traditions and history are well presented and that it gives a good comprehensive picture of Sweden: “A lot of things to see, well presented, well explained”, “Shows Swedish traditions/history in a good and clear manner”, “It is Sweden in miniature”, “[It] Includes Swedish history with affect”.

Eleven [11] visitors mentioned the **aims of a national museum**, as **educating** and explaining Swedish history and traditions for everyone [7], the Museums’ responsibility to preserve the history and tradition for the next generations [2], but also the fact that the exhibitions offer experience of the past [1] and show “our” origins [1]: “They do a good job of teaching about Sweden”, “Explains Swedish history/traditions for everyone regardless of background, religion etc”, “Important to preserve the history for the next generation”, “Because you can experience the past here”, “To show our origins”.

Four [4] answers focused on the **international perspective** of the Museum, which does not only represent the Swedish way of life but also provides an outlook to the world: “Representing Swedish way of life and place in the world”, “Its contents and a little outlook to the world”.

Forty- four [24] visitors said that this is a National Museum because of its **Name** [7], its **Size** [5], but mostly because of the size of the collections [9]; three [3] of them mentioned also the old building and the central location of the Museum: “It says so in the name”, “It is a wide museum”, “The guidebook said so!”, “An unique, beautiful building with lots of exhibition space”, “Extensive collection of Swedish cultural artefacts”, “It is big, old and centrally located in the capital”.

Finally, nineteen [19] participants chose to make an **evaluation of the museum** at this open field of the questionnaire. Eight [8] found the Museum **very interesting** and four [4] went a little bit further declaring the **importance of a visit** to this Museum for Swedish people as well as for

foreigners. Another four [4] evaluated this museum as the best or as complementary to the National Museum; two [2] were positive to the exhibition policy of the Museum, while one [1] mentioned that the Museum has to offer more entertainment: *“Always has interesting exhibitions”, “Everyone should have been here at least some time”, “Important for Swedes and tourists to be able to discover the history of the country”, “Complements the National museum”, “It is the best”, “Always new exhibitions on Swedish everyday history”, “Because it shows a Sweden of the past. But needs to be made more fun”.*

Most [18] of those who considered that the Nordiska museet **is not a national museum** focused on the **limited or missed museum contents**. Five [5] of them expressed general views such as: *“Not having enough content”, “As an outsider, new to Sweden, I expected a more comprehensive treatment of Sweden”, “Does not reflect Sweden’s history”, “The collections are not broad enough to represent the nation”.*

Ten [10] visitors stressed the need for a **broader historical perspective**, that would include the early history of the country and not only the last 400 years back in time; also they were expecting to see more about history in general than about art and tradition, more about the national developments from the past through to the present time: *“It only goes 400 years back in time”, “A national museum should include all of the history”, “More limited to art than history, though creatively exhibited!”, “More historical and national development – present time”.* Four [4] mentioned specific missing stories such as: *“I think there can be more info and details about other specific things like <wars>, army, science etc”, “Perhaps something is missing. About ‘new Swedes’ in Sweden, their life in Sweden”, “Didn’t see regional differences”.*

Three [3] answers mentioned the small **size** of the museum and that it is not interesting, *“Too small & boring”, “Less interesting than others museums”.* Two [2] participants said that the Museum has a broad **theme** for a national museum of Sweden, including all the Nordic countries: *“Because it is from all the Nordic countries not from Sweden only”;* another two [2] answers included a **critical approach to the Museum** claiming that it is an *“Upper-class project to produce a ‘national’ Sweden”* or to national museums in general: *“What is a nation and how do you make a museum about a nation?”.* Finally, one [1] participant believed that it is *“Not a specific museum”.*

Museum of the History of Catalonia

Most visitors decided to speak about **National History or National and Catalonian Identity** [126] as a reason to characterize the Museum as a national one. Most of them stressed the Museum’s importance for the Nation [36] and focused more on the fact that it is a national museum because Catalonia is a nation [34]: *“Covers much of the history of Catalonia and it is of national importance”, “Shows the history of Catalonia as a nation and clearly shows pride in the nation.”, “Because it shows the birth and the development of the Catalan nation”, “Because Catalan is an autonomous governing body”, “Because I have no doubt that Catalonia is, and will always be, a nation”.* Some [56] focused on issues of national and/or Catalonian identity, often in conjunction with their personal identity: *“Expresses identity of Catalan people”, “Because it gives a special place to the Catalan identity and to Catalonia”, “Because we are a nation”, “It is our identity, history”.*

Another significant group of answers [55] focused on the **ways of presentation** as characteristic for a national museum. Namely, some of them [20] focused on the **completeness of the presentation**: *“Because it speaks about the whole Catalonia”, “In this place I could see all periods of developments of nations”.* Other answers [23] agreed with such statements referring to a good

presentation which should be characteristic of a National Museum: *“The content is good enough to be a National Museum”, “Because it explains in a clear way the history of Catalonia even before its existence”, “Cause it is very interesting and interactive”*. Some visitors [11] mentioned the Catalan or nationalistic perspective of the presentation: *“Articulates Catalan point of view in historical questions”, “Strong national orientation”*, while two [2] made comments about the lack of Spanish explanations: *“Because there is nothing in Spanish”*.

Less than before, but still a large number of visitors [87] believed that the museum is a national one because it presents **the history of Catalonia** and/or **Spain**. Sixty-four [64] spoke about the history of Catalonia: *“Here is the history of Catalonia”, “Because it is about a specific region in Spain”, “It represents life and history of Catalonia”, “Because of the history and the forefathers”, “Because it is the collection of the history of one country”, “Because it makes a tour of the history: the origin of the Catalan-speaking territories”*. Two [2] answers focused on the history of **Barcelona**: *“It encompasses the entire history of Catalonia, although Barcelona predominates”*.

Thirty-one [31] of the replies referred to the relationship between Spanish and Catalanian history with statements that express the different perspectives and approaches of national history and national identity in contemporary Spain: *“It reflects all the history, not only of Catalonia, but of Spain in general.”, “History of Catalonia is history of Spain”, “The national understanding of Catalonia that is linked with the Spanish community”, “It represents the Spanish development and history”, “Even if regional is part of Spain”,* but also some expressed critical points of view such as: *“It’s rather about Catalanian story than Spanish story”, “It focuses especially on Catalanian history, not the Spanish one”*.

Fewer visitors [22] defined the term “national museum” according to its **exhibits** and exhibition contents. Ten [10] of them referred to the significance of the exhibited objects such as: *“It contains an insightful display of historical pieces relevant to Catalonia”, “Because there are many historical and representative items of Catalonia”*. Nine [9] answers referred to the exhibition contents covering different aspects of Catalonia or even outside the region, or special exhibitions: *“It gives us a social image of the Barcelona of nowadays”, “It has other interesting information on outside of Catalonia, i.e. Martin Luther”, “For the temporary exhibition of the history of POUM”*. Another three [3] of them mentioned the interpretative material of the exhibition and more generally the information included in the presentation: *“For the historical maps of Catalonia”, “For its information”*.

Another significant category of answers [38] referred to the **aims of presentation** noticing the importance of a national museum for public **education, information, explanation**, as a very important aspect for the visitors but also for the Nation in general: *“We can understand the history of Catalonia”, “It explains completely the Catalanian history” “It is educational and interesting”, “Because it effects on all of us”, “It makes a dissemination of national issues”*.

Few visitors [6] focused on the exhibition’s **European or international dimension**, considering it characteristic and adequate for a national museum: *“Because you can find objects and other things representing Europe”, “It includes historical information of the worldwide”*.

In a few cases [5], the museum’s **title** was considered enough to describe it as a national: *“It is called that way, isn’t it?”, “Because its name indicates museum of history of Catalonia”*.

Finally, seven [7] visitors expressed their judgments on the museum and its historical importance, such as: *“Historical significance is relevant to all of Spain”, “It is very interesting”*, or expressed [1] their critical views: *“It should be more than it is, but anyway it is close enough”*. Finally,

some visitors [6] made some general comments such as: “Because it belongs to Spanish people”, “I try to think over the identity of a nation”, “The reasons can be explained just by seeing the museum”.

Most [32] of those who believed that the Museum is not a national one remarked that it presents only regional history, that of Catalonia: “It would be necessary to explain more about the growth of Spain and not only Catalonia”, “It’s a museum of (the history of) Catalonia, not a Spanish museum”, “It’s a museum that shows one aspect of Spanish culture”, “Because it represents the Catalan community (Barcelona) and not the whole of the Spanish nation”.

Six [6] visitors have mentioned difficulties in naming it as a National Museum, because of the size of the museum and its limited content in general: “It misses important items”, “It does not reflect all the cultural reality”, “Little, limited content”.


Eleven [11] visitors expressed their personal opinions about the specific Museum such as: “There are others more representative, like the archaeological one”, “It looks like a humanist museum”, “It lacks reviews in Spanish”, “It is history, not nationalism” or made statements about Catalonia such as: “Because Catalonia is not a nation”, “Autonomous regions may get increasing influence in Europe”.

National museums: for whom and why

For whom?

The question about whom the national museum should address was pursued through two claims that visitors were asked to agree or disagree with. The first claim, that national museums should only address the people of the nation they represent, met with disagreement from the majority of the respondents (58%). Nevertheless, there are 25,8% who either strongly agree or simply agree with that statement.²²

Diagram 30: All case studies: National museum should only address the people of its nation



²² This view has been expressed in some of the open ended questions presented in previous sections, when visitors were asked about their perceptions of the definition of a national museum.

The largest percentage of agreement was offered in the Open-Air Museum of Latvia (35,3%) and the Museum of the History of Catalonia (40%), while the lowest in Nordiska museet (18,3%).

Table 84: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: National museums only for the people of the same nation

Only for the people of the nation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	77	13,8	14,4	14,4
	Agree	112	20,0	20,9	35,3
	Neither agree / Nor disagree	94	16,8	17,6	52,9
	Disagree	130	23,3	24,3	77,2
	Strongly disagree	122	21,8	22,8	100,0
	Total	535	95,7	100,0	
	Missing	0	23	4,1	
System		1	,2		
Total		24	4,3		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum = Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Table 85: Museum of the History of Catalonia: National museums only for the people of the same nation

Only for the people of the nation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	157	24,6	27,2	27,2
	Agree	74	11,6	12,8	40,0
	Neither agree / Nor disagree	68	10,6	11,8	51,8
	Disagree	112	17,5	19,4	71,2
	Strongly disagree	166	26,0	28,8	100,0
	Total	577	90,3	100,0	
Missing	0	59	9,2		
	System	3	,5		
	Total	62	9,7		
Total		639	100,0		

a. Museum = Museum of the History of Catalonia

Table 86: Nordiska museet: National museums only for the people of the same nation


Only for the people of the nation^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly agree	37	6,9	7,6	7,6
	Agree	52	9,6	10,7	18,3
	Neither agree / Nor disagree	50	9,3	10,3	28,5
	Disagree	92	17,1	18,9	47,4
	Strongly disagree	256	47,5	52,6	100,0
	Total	487	90,4	100,0	
	Missing	0	50	9,3	
	System	2	,4		
	Total	52	9,6		
Total		539	100,0		

a. Museum = Nordiska museet


The Museum of the History of Catalonia addresses the Catalan people and it forms part of an attempt to build national consciousness and collective identity. The German Historical Museum and the Rijksmuseum, on the other hand, present a less strong “nationalistic” perspective. Obviously, non-nationals disagree more with this statement than the nationals.

Diagram 31: All case studies: National museums should cater only for the needs of the people of the same nation: according to nationality



The second statement that a national museum should be for non-national people only met even larger disagreement. 38,6% expressed strong disagreement and 29,6% disagreement, making the overall percentage 68,2% of the sample. Only 14,6% agreed with this statement.

Diagram 32: All case studies: National museums should cater only for the needs of tourists/non-nationals




Disagreement was equally large in all countries, ranging from 76,61% in the Swedish museum to 55,01% in the Open-Air Museum of Latvia. In the National Museum of Estonia this percentage is 73,3%; in the German Historical Museum it is 73,27%; in the National Museum of Scotland 72,39%; in the National Historical Museum of Athens 70,09%; in the National Museum of Ireland 65,91%; in the Rijksmuseum 61,6%; and, finally, in the Museum of the History of Catalonia 58,64%. Obviously, national museums are considered important both for the nation they represent and for the “foreigners” wishing to acquire an accurate “image” of this nation.

Displaying the past, the present or the future

The question about whether national museums are about the nation’s past, present and/or future provided interesting views by the respondents. 45% of them felt that it should refer to past, present *and* future. Nevertheless, 32,3% felt that only the past and present are relevant, while 20,1% that only the past is relevant in the national museums. Answers of both nationals and non-nationals were similar.


Diagram 33: All case studies: Displaying the past, the present or the future



National Museums should mostly be about:

Scaled

Diagram 34: All case studies: Displaying the past, the present and the future, according to nationalities



National Museums should mostly be about:

The National Museum of Scotland and the Museum of the History of Catalonia offer a somewhat higher percentage than the average for past, present and future, probably bearing in mind the possible political impact of a national museum in the construction of the national self, and thus the future. In the National Historical Museum of Athens, on the other hand, there are no answers for the choice about the future only: 33,6% argues that *only* the past is relevant for a national museum, 33,2% refers to past, present and future, while 32,4% refers to past and present only, possibly reflecting on the one hand the Greek nation's obsession with the "glorious" past

and on the other an overarching pessimism for the future deriving from the economic and social situation during the time of the research.

Diagram 35: National Museum of Scotland: Displaying the past, the present and the future




Diagram 36: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Displaying the past, the present and the future






Diagram 37: National Historical Museum of Athens: Displaying the past, the present and the future



What are national museums for?

The question about the specific role of national museums is also quite revealing about hierarchies and the understanding of national museums by people: national museums are the right places for the display of the nation's treasures according to 84,5% of the participants in this research.

Diagram 38: All case studies: National museums should display the nation's treasures




In the National Museum of Estonia this percentage is higher (89,2%); and so is in the Open-Air Museum of Latvia (93,6%), the National Museum of Ireland (93,2%), the Rijksmuseum

(91,5%), the Nordiska museet (89,8%), the National Museum of Scotland (89,4%) and the National Historical Museum of Greece (88,2%). In the Museum of the History of Catalonia though the percentage is lower than the average (84,3%) and in the German Historical Museum it is even lower, with 67% only. Again this is probably related to the nature of the German museum, which is not object-centered at all. Or, it might be because the term “nation/al” in Germany has a rather negative meaning (=nationalistic), something that makes visitors more sceptical or reluctant to use it.


Great events and heroes of the past are also part of the contents of a national museum, according to the visitors. 89,8% agrees with that (even more than the average in the case of the nation’s treasures). In the Greek museum this percentage becomes 97,3%, while in the German one 82,5%. In the other museums the percentages become the following: National Museum of Ireland 97,1% ; Museum of the History of Catalonia 94,4% ; National Museum of Scotland 92,8%; the Rijksmuseum 90,4%; the Nordiska museet 88,3%; the Open- Air Museum of Latvia 87,7%; the National Museum of Estonia: 87%.

Diagram 39: All case studies: National museums should tell the stories of great events and heroes



Stories of ordinary people also seem an important part of national museums. 82,9% of the respondents on average claim so. [This is further supported by the open-ended question about who is missing from this museum, where “ordinary people” also appear. See following section.]


Diagram 40: All case studies: National museums should tell the stories of ordinary people



The percentage is much higher in the case of the Nordiska (92,9%) but much lower in the case of the National Historical Museum of Athens (74,5%). For the other museums they are the following: 90,1% for the National Museum of Ireland; 87,7% for the National Museum of Estonia; 87,1% for the Open-Air Museum of Latvia; 85% for the National Museum of Scotland; 80,9% for the Rijksmuseum; 79,9% for the Museum of the History of Catalonia; 76,7% for the German Historical Museum. The presence of different traditions in each country is evident in this question. In Greece, where museums are supposed to present the great heroes of the past and the national treasures [see also open-ended questions about what a national museum is], ordinary people do not have a central role in the museums. On the other hand, it seems that museums with ethnographic collections, like the Swedish, the Estonian and the Latvian ones, are more oriented towards the ordinary people, and it is only natural that their stories should be presented in these museums.


An accurate history of the nation is the aim of the museums according to 90,8% of the visitors asked. Almost all museums present similar results, ranging from 96,6% in the case of the National Museum of Ireland to 82,8% in the case of the National Museum of Estonia. In the other museums the percentages are the following: National Museum of Scotland 95,4%; Nordiska museet 92,1%; Museum of the History of Catalonia 91%; National Historical Museum of Athens 88,4%; the German Historical Museum 88,2%; Rijksmuseum 86,7%; the Open-Air Museum of Latvia 84,2%.

Diagram 41: All case studies: National museums should give an accurate history of the nation



The question about the role of museums as showcases or representations of national identity attracted weaker support. Even though agreement was expressed by the largest number of participants in the research (60,8%), this was not as uniform as in the previous cases.

Diagram 42: All case studies: National museums should present what it means to be a member of this nation




In the Estonian museum agreement was expressed by 78,7% of those answering the questionnaire, whereas in the German case only 45,2% agreed. In the National Museum of Ireland positive was 79,5%; in the Rijksmuseum 76,3%; in the National Museum of Scotland 71,3%; in the Museum of the History of Catalonia 71,1%; in the Open-Air Museum of Latvia

70,4%; in the National Historical Museum of Athens 64,8% and in the Nordiska museet 58,6%. In the case of the German museum agreement with this statement was mainly expressed by non-nationals who expected to see “the German nation” in the museum; similar was the response in the Swedish case study (58,6%), where non-nationals expressed a similar wish to see in the museum a representation of the nation, whereas the nationals were more reluctant about that.

The last statement that visitors were asked to agree or disagree on referred to the role of the national museum as a showcase of the relationships of the nation with Europe. On average 69,1% of the respondents agreed that this is indeed within the scope and role of a national museum.


Diagram 43: All case studies: National museums should show the relationship between this nation and Europe



The higher percentage of agreement was offered by the German museum (81,7%), whereas the lowest by the Latvian one (61,3%). In the other museums the percentages were the following: National Museum of Ireland 73,2%; National Museum of Estonia 68,8%; National Museum of Scotland 65,3%; National Historical Museum of Athens 63,9%; the Museum of the History of Catalonia 63,5%, Rijksmuseum 62,8%; Nordiska museet 62,3%. The German case study has in all cases the highest percentage of positive answers when it comes to issues that relate to European identity, something which is confirmed and explained by the interviews we conducted in this museum. Next in line in expressing agreement with this statement, are the museums in Dublin (33,1%) and Barcelona (28,8%).

The final set of questions regarding the role of national museums refers to controversial history. The majority of the respondents (66,6%) agree with the idea that national museums should present controversial or disputed history in their exhibitions.


Diagram 44: All case studies: National museums should be places where controversial history is displayed



In the National Museum of Estonia this percentage is the lowest (58,5%) whereas in the German Historical Museum the highest (76%). The National Historical Museum of Athens presents a 58,1% of agreement and the National Museum of Ireland 67,1%. The Open-Air Museum of Latvia is less confident about that with only a 43,2% agreeing with the statement, while in the Rijksmuseum visitors are more certain with a 59,7%; the National Museum of Scotland and the Museum of the History of Catalonia present high percentages of answers which agree that controversial history should be part of the national museum narrative, 65,1% and 67,7% respectively, and in the Nordiska museet answers such as that gain an even more confident 69,6%.

The last statement in this set refers to the role of national museums in the promotion of a state's position on disputed heritage or history. An average 43,6% agrees that this should be the case with nationals expressing a more positive view than non-nationals.

Diagram 45: All case studies: National museums should promote a state's position on disputed heritage/history



Scaling: Scaled

Interestingly the highest percentage among our case studies came from the Swedish museum (65,4%). On the other hand, the lowest percentage came, unsurprisingly, from the German one (37,3%). The percentages per case study are the following: Nordiska museet 65,4%; Museum of the History of Catalonia 54,2%; National Historical Museum of Athens 51%; Open-Air Museum of Latvia 46,9%; National Museum of Estonia 45,9%; National Museum of Ireland 45,5%; Rijksmuseum 44,6%; National Museum of Scotland 39,9%; German Historical Museum 37,3%.

The percentages of the cases-studies in Greece and Spain/Catalonia are also high: Greece has a long history of similar uses of museums and the Museum of the History of Catalonia has been created to highlight the cultural characteristics of the Catalan nation and thus reinforce a specific political and national view.

Agents responsible for the creation of national museums

Ideas about who should be responsible for the establishment of national museums depend on the country's cultural policy and traditions.

Diagram 46: All case studies: Agents of establishing national museums





Table 87: All case studies summary: Agents for the establishment of national museums
Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	2413	45,3%	2913	54,7%	5326	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	962	18,1%	4364	81,9%	5326	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	1999	37,5%	3327	62,5%	5326	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	374	7,0%	4952	93,0%	5326	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	881	16,5%	4445	83,5%	5326	100,0%
Non government organizations	1124	21,1%	4202	78,9%	5326	100,0%
European authorities	977	18,3%	4349	81,7%	5326	100,0%
Governments	2767	52,0%	2559	48,0%	5326	100,0%
Individuals	796	14,9%	4530	85,1%	5326	100,0%
Private business	513	9,6%	4813	90,4%	5326	100,0%
Other	192	3,6%	5134	96,4%	5326	100,0%
None	81	1,5%	5245	98,5%	5326	100,0%

Table 88: Comparative presentation of the agents for the creation of national museums per nationality



In the cases of the Estonian, German and Swedish museums public benefit foundations²³ attract the majority of choices, whereas the government comes second. In the Greek case, where most of the museums are run by the state, the majority answers in favor of the government (59,9%), while public benefit foundations and local/regional authorities share the second place with 48,5% each. In the case of Ireland the government also attracts the majority of the answers with 57,4%, while public benefit foundations the second place with 41,4%. The pattern is similar in the Latvian case (50,3% and 28,8% respectively), in the Dutch (56,1% and 47,7% respectively) and in the Scottish ones (64% and 50,2% respectively). The pattern changes in the Catalan museum where the primary role of the government (41,5%) is followed by the regional and local authorities (38,7%).

We should notice here the percentages given to two other options as well. In some countries different ethnic groups are considered possible agents for the creation of national museum – for example, 33,6% of the respondents in the Estonian museum and 26,8% in the Latvian one claim so, while in the other museums we examined this option gets a much lower percentage (lower than 20%).

²³ Public benefit foundations are not the same all over Europe. Nevertheless, they share some similar characteristics. According to the definition offered by the European Foundation Centre: “Public-benefit foundations are asset-based and purpose-driven. They have no members or shareholders and are separately constituted non-profit bodies. Foundations focus on areas ranging from the environment, social services, health and education, to science, research, arts and culture. They each have an established and reliable income source, which allows them to plan and carry out work over a longer term than many other institutions such as governments and companies.” This is a definition based on the articles of the EFC’s draft “Model Law for Public Benefit Foundations in Europe”, which were identified and agreed upon by experts and actors in the field among the EFC membership. (<http://www.efc.be>) (last accessed 14/9/2012).

European authorities as agents for the creation of national museums receive 26,4% in the German case study, 25,9% in the Dutch case, 21% in the Estonian one and 20,1% in the Greek one, but much lower percentages in the Latvian (19,3%), the Catalan (15,8%), the Scottish (14,1%), the Irish (12,9%) and the Swedish cases (12,2%).

Per case study, the results are the following:

Table 89: National Museum of Estonia: Agents for the creation of national museums
Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	197	55,2%	160	44,8%	357	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	75	21,0%	282	79,0%	357	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	159	44,5%	198	55,5%	357	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	28	7,8%	329	92,2%	357	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	120	33,6%	237	66,4%	357	100,0%
Non government organizations	96	26,9%	261	73,1%	357	100,0%
European authorities	75	21,0%	282	79,0%	357	100,0%
Governments	192	53,8%	165	46,2%	357	100,0%
Individuals	66	18,5%	291	81,5%	357	100,0%
Private business	24	6,7%	333	93,3%	357	100,0%
Other	21	5,9%	336	94,1%	357	100,0%
None	3	,8%	354	99,2%	357	100,0%

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

Table 90: German Historical Museum: Agents for the creation of national museums
Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	367	56,0%	288	44,0%	655	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	112	17,1%	543	82,9%	655	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	256	39,1%	399	60,9%	655	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	39	6,0%	616	94,0%	655	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	109	16,6%	546	83,4%	655	100,0%
Non government organizations	144	22,0%	511	78,0%	655	100,0%
European authorities	173	26,4%	482	73,6%	655	100,0%
Governments	284	43,4%	371	56,6%	655	100,0%
Individuals	68	10,4%	587	89,6%	655	100,0%
Private business	46	7,0%	609	93,0%	655	100,0%
Other	21	3,2%	634	96,8%	655	100,0%
None	17	2,6%	638	97,4%	655	100,0%

a. Museum = German Historical Museum

Table 91: National Historical Museum of Athens: Agents for the creation of national museums

Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	133	48,5%	141	51,5%	274	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	57	20,8%	217	79,2%	274	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	133	48,5%	141	51,5%	274	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	50	18,2%	224	81,8%	274	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	37	13,5%	237	86,5%	274	100,0%
Non government organizations	64	23,4%	210	76,6%	274	100,0%
European authorities	55	20,1%	219	79,9%	274	100,0%
Governments	164	59,9%	110	40,1%	274	100,0%
Individuals	30	10,9%	244	89,1%	274	100,0%
Private business	23	8,4%	251	91,6%	274	100,0%
Other	10	3,6%	264	96,4%	274	100,0%
None	1	,4%	273	99,6%	274	100,0%

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens

Table 92: National Museum of Ireland: Agents for the creation of national museums

Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	403	41,4%	571	58,6%	974	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	154	15,8%	820	84,2%	974	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	281	28,9%	693	71,1%	974	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	69	7,1%	905	92,9%	974	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	123	12,6%	851	87,4%	974	100,0%
Non government organizations	187	19,2%	787	80,8%	974	100,0%
European authorities	126	12,9%	848	87,1%	974	100,0%
Governments	559	57,4%	415	42,6%	974	100,0%
Individuals	131	13,4%	843	86,6%	974	100,0%
Private business	80	8,2%	894	91,8%	974	100,0%
Other	26	2,7%	948	97,3%	974	100,0%
None	10	1,0%	964	99,0%	974	100,0%

a. Museum = National Museum of Ireland

Table 93: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Agents for the creation of national museums
Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	161	28,8%	398	71,2%	559	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	137	24,5%	422	75,5%	559	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	233	41,7%	326	58,3%	559	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	52	9,3%	507	90,7%	559	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	150	26,8%	409	73,2%	559	100,0%
Non government organizations	96	17,2%	463	82,8%	559	100,0%
European authorities	108	19,3%	451	80,7%	559	100,0%
Governments	281	50,3%	278	49,7%	559	100,0%
Individuals	48	8,6%	511	91,4%	559	100,0%
Private business	63	11,3%	496	88,7%	559	100,0%
Other	12	2,1%	547	97,9%	559	100,0%
None	2	,4%	557	99,6%	559	100,0%

a. Museum = Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Table 94: Rijksmuseum: Agents for the creation of national museums
Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	346	47,7%	380	52,3%	726	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	104	14,3%	622	85,7%	726	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	216	29,8%	510	70,2%	726	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	45	6,2%	681	93,8%	726	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	119	16,4%	607	83,6%	726	100,0%
Non government organizations	146	20,1%	580	79,9%	726	100,0%
European authorities	188	25,9%	538	74,1%	726	100,0%
Governments	407	56,1%	319	43,9%	726	100,0%
Individuals	156	21,5%	570	78,5%	726	100,0%
Private business	120	16,5%	606	83,5%	726	100,0%
Other	23	3,2%	703	96,8%	726	100,0%
None	18	2,5%	708	97,5%	726	100,0%

a. Museum = Rijksmuseum

Table 95: National Museum of Scotland: Agents for the creation of national museums
Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	303	50,2%	300	49,8%	603	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	99	16,4%	504	83,6%	603	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	252	41,8%	351	58,2%	603	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	34	5,6%	569	94,4%	603	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	65	10,8%	538	89,2%	603	100,0%
Non government organizations	173	28,7%	430	71,3%	603	100,0%
European authorities	85	14,1%	518	85,9%	603	100,0%
Governments	386	64,0%	217	36,0%	603	100,0%
Individuals	109	18,1%	494	81,9%	603	100,0%
Private business	75	12,4%	528	87,6%	603	100,0%
Other	25	4,1%	578	95,9%	603	100,0%
None	9	1,5%	594	98,5%	603	100,0%

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Table 96: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Agents for the creation of national museums

Case Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	212	33,2%	427	66,8%	639	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	138	21,6%	501	78,4%	639	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	247	38,7%	392	61,3%	639	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	28	4,4%	611	95,6%	639	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	65	10,2%	574	89,8%	639	100,0%
Non government organizations	99	15,5%	540	84,5%	639	100,0%
European authorities	101	15,8%	538	84,2%	639	100,0%
Governments	265	41,5%	374	58,5%	639	100,0%
Individuals	100	15,6%	539	84,4%	639	100,0%
Private business	42	6,6%	597	93,4%	639	100,0%
Other	23	3,6%	616	96,4%	639	100,0%
None	7	1,1%	632	98,9%	639	100,0%

a. Museum = Museum of the History of Catalonia

Table 97: Nordiska museet: Agents for the creation of national museumsCase Processing Summary^a

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Public benefit foundations	291	54,0%	248	46,0%	539	100,0%
Grass-root initiatives	86	16,0%	453	84,0%	539	100,0%
Regional /local authorities	222	41,2%	317	58,8%	539	100,0%
Religious authorities/Church	29	5,4%	510	94,6%	539	100,0%
Different ethnic groups	93	17,3%	446	82,7%	539	100,0%
Non government organizations	119	22,1%	420	77,9%	539	100,0%
European authorities	66	12,2%	473	87,8%	539	100,0%
Governments	229	42,5%	310	57,5%	539	100,0%
Individuals	88	16,3%	451	83,7%	539	100,0%
Private business	40	7,4%	499	92,6%	539	100,0%
Other	31	5,8%	508	94,2%	539	100,0%
None	14	2,6%	525	97,4%	539	100,0%

a. Museum = Nordiska museet



CHAPTER 6

Perceptions of imageries and identities presented in the national museums



Museum of the History of Catalonia, Barcelona, Spain (Photo: Alexandra Bounia) (July 2011).



Introduction

In this part of the report, we will focus on the questions that aimed to understand how museum visitors perceive imageries and identities represented in the national museum. In this sense, we are going to focus on the questions about how well, if at all, the national, state, regional, European and world histories they think that are presented in the museum and which one is the most important (Q6, 6a), whether they think that the museum does contain any controversial historical reference (Q7), whether they think that there are missing stories from the narrative of the museum (Q8) or any missing groups (Q9).

Historical imageries


The next set of questions asked visitors to express their understanding of the hierarchies of the museum they visited, in terms of the representation of the nation, the state, the region, Europe and the world. In addition, visitors were asked to consider how inclusive the museum is, i.e. whether it includes and represents specific communities, groups, historical events etc or not.

Historical hierarchies in the museum

The history of the nation

The majority of visitors answering the questionnaire felt that each museum presented well the history of its nation (84,3%).

Diagram 47: All case studies: Representation of the history of the nation



A good representation of the nation is acknowledged by 93,4% of the visitors in the Museum of the History of Catalonia; 89,1% in the National Museum of Scotland; 88,8% in the German Historical Museum; 86,7% in the National Museum of Ireland; 82% in the Open-Air Museum of Latvia; 78,8% in the Rijksmuseum; 73,3% in the National Museum of Estonia; 72,7% in the National Historical Museum of Athens; 51,7% in the Nordiska museet. Non-national visitors acknowledged national representation more than national visitors in the National Museum of

Estonia, the National Museum of Scotland and Nordiska museet, whereas nationals were more satisfied in the Museum of the History of Catalonia and the Open-Air Museum of Latvia.


Table 98: Presentation of the history of the nation: comparing across the 9 museums

Museum	Well presented	Under presented	Not presented
National Museum of Scotland (NMS)	89,1%	10,0%	0,9%
National Museum of Ireland (NMI)	86,7%	12,5%	0,8%
Rijksmuseum (Rik)	78,8%	18,8%	2,4%
National Museum of Estonia (NME)	73,3%	22,8%	4%
Open-Air Museum of Latvia (OEML)	82%	13,1%	4,9%
Nordiska museet (NM)	51,7%	28%	20,4%
German Historical Museum (GHM)	83,5%	9,8%	0,8%
Museum of the History of Catalonia (MHC)	93,4%	5,2%	1,3%
National Historical Museum of Athens (NHMA)	72,7%	24,6%	2,7%

Representation of the history of the country/state

The history of the state is also well-presented in the museums, according to their visitors. On average 85,9% of the respondents expressed this view.

Diagram 48: All case studies: Representation of the history of the country/state



In the National Museum of Scotland this positive feeling is expressed by 93,4% of the respondents; in the German Historical Museum by 92,6%; in the National Museum of Ireland by 85,9%; in Nordiska museet by 82,3%; in the Rijksmuseum by 79,2%; in the National Historical Museum of Athens by 80,7%; in the National Museum of Estonia by 78%; in the Open-Air Museum of Latvia by 66,5%; and, finally, in the Museum of the History of Catalonia by 67,6%. The most interesting cases are those of the Latvian and the Catalan museums where there is the feeling that the nation is better represented than the state. In the Catalan case this reflects the focus of the museum, since nation and state do not correspond.


Table 99: Presentation of the history of the country/state: comparing across the 9 museums

Museum	Well presented	Under presented	Not presented
National Museum of Scotland (NMS)	93,4%	6,4%	0,2%
National Museum of Ireland (NMI)	85,9%	13,8%	0,2%
Rijksmuseum (Rik)	79,2%	19,4%	1,3%
National Museum of Estonia (NME)	78,0%	20,5%	1,5%
Open-Air Museum of Latvia (OEML)	66,5%	28,9%	4,6%
Nordiska museet (NM)	82,3%	16,2%	1,5%
German Historical Museum (GHM)	92,6%	7,4%	-----
Museum of the History of Catalonia (MHC)	67,6%	29,1%	3,2%
National Historical Museum of Athens (NHMA)	80,7%	18,1%	1,2%

Representation of the history of the region

Regional history is less satisfactorily presented in the museums, according to the respondents: 64% replied that the regional history (i.e. the history of the area within which the country/nation is located) is well presented, whereas 30,2% replied that it is under-represented. Non-nationals were more positive than nationals, who are probably more aware of the regional history.

Diagram 49: All case studies: Representation of the history of the region



Regional history is under-represented according to visitors in the Rijksmuseum (51,7%), the National Historical Museum of Athens (47,5%), the Open-Air Museum of Latvia (46,5%), the Nordiska museet (44,2%), and the National Museum of Estonia (41,3%), while the exhibitions in the museums of the Museum of the History of Catalonia (79,4%), the National Museum of Scotland (72,5%), the National Museum of Ireland (66,3%) and the German Historical Museum (71,2%) provide a more comprehensive historical presentation and thus include regional history as well. A completely negative answer (i.e. regional history is not presented at all) is given by 18,6% of the questionnaires collected in the National Museum of Estonia, 10,6% of the questionnaires collected in the National Historical Museum of Athens, 12,2% of the questionnaires from the Open-Air Museum of Latvia and 15,9% of the questionnaires from the Nordiska museet. If we add these percentages to those of the claim that regional history is under-represented in the museums, then it becomes even more obvious that in these specific cases visitors feel that regional history does not have the role it should in the museum narrative – since it is either under-represented or not presented at all.

Per country the following tables display the above:

Table 100: National Museum of Estonia: Representation of the history of the region

The history of the region to which the country belongs^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Well presented	127	35,6	40,1	40,1
	Under presented	131	36,7	41,3	81,4
	Not presented	59	16,5	18,6	100,0
	Total	317	88,8	100,0	
Missing	System	40	11,2		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum: National Museum of Estonia

Table 101: German Historical Museum: Representation of the history of the regionThe history of the region to which the country belongs^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Well presented	420	64,1	71,2	71,2
	Under presented	155	23,7	26,3	97,5
	Not presented	15	2,3	2,5	100,0
	Total	590	90,1	100,0	
Missing	System	65	9,9		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum = German Historical Museum

Table 102: National Historical Museum of Athens: Representation of the history of the regionThe history of the region to which the country belongs^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Well presented	99	36,1	41,9	41,9
	Under presented	112	40,9	47,5	89,4
	Not presented	25	9,1	10,6	100,0
	Total	236	86,1	100,0	
Missing	System	38	13,9		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum: National Historical Museum of Athens

Table 103: National Museum of Ireland: Representation of the history of the regionThe history of the region to which the country belongs^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Well presented	529	54,3	66,3	66,3
	Under presented	234	24,0	29,3	95,6
	Not presented	35	3,6	4,4	100,0
	Total	798	81,9	100,0	
Missing	System	176	18,1		
Total		974	100,0		

a. Museum: National Museum of Ireland

Table 104: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Representation of the history of the regionThe history of the region to which the country belongs^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Well presented	222	39,7	46,5	46,5
	Under presented	197	35,2	41,3	87,8
	Not presented	58	10,4	12,2	100,0
	Total	477	85,3	100,0	
Missing	System	82	14,7		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum = Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Table 105: Rijksmuseum: Representation of the history of the regionThe history of the region to which the country belongs^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Well presented	342	47,1	51,7	51,7
	Under presented	258	35,5	39,0	90,8
	Not presented	61	8,4	9,2	100,0
	Total	661	91,0	100,0	
Missing	System	65	9,0		
Total		726	100,0		

a. Museum = Rijksmuseum

Table 106: National Museum of Scotland: Representation of the history of the regionThe history of the region to which the country belongs^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Well presented	372	61,7	72,5	72,5
	Under presented	120	19,9	23,4	95,9
	Not presented	21	3,5	4,1	100,0
	Total	513	85,1	100,0	
Missing	System	90	14,9		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Table 107: Museum of the History of Catalonia: Representation of the history of the regionThe history of the region to which the country belongs^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Well presented	443	69,3	79,4	79,4
	Under presented	109	17,1	19,5	98,9
	Not presented	6	,9	1,1	100,0
	Total	558	87,3	100,0	
Missing	System	81	12,7		
Total		639	100,0		

a. Museum = Museum of the History of Catalonia

Table 108: Nordiska museet: Representation of the history of the regionThe history of the region to which the country belongs^a


		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Well presented	178	33,0	39,9	39,9
	Under presented	197	36,5	44,2	84,1
	Not presented	71	13,2	15,9	100,0
	Total	446	82,7	100,0	
Missing	System	93	17,3		
Total		539	100,0		

a. Museum= Nordiska museet

Representation of Europe

Almost half the visitors who filled in the questionnaires feel that the history of Europe is under-represented in these museums. If we add a 13,7% that claims that it is not presented at all, we reach a 62,1% expressing the view that there is a very limited or no European perspective within the museums. Visitors from the same nation and non-nationals respond very similarly to this question.

Diagram 50: All case studies: Representation of the history of Europe



The European perspective is very little represented according to the museum visitors in the National Historical Museum of Athens (18,4%), the National Museum of Estonia (13,9%), the Open-Air Museum of Latvia (13%) and Nordiska museet (12,4%), whereas a more European perspective is suggested as present in the cases of the Rijksmuseum (31,7%), the Museum of the History of Catalonia (33,5%), the National Museum of Scotland (33,9%), the National Museum of Ireland (40,5%), and the German Historical Museum (54,7%). This can be explained by both the focus of the exhibitions and the overall attempt of these countries/nations to be connected to Europe, an attempt which takes different forms according to the geographic location of a country (centre/periphery), its history, its relation to its neighbors, and so on.


Table 109: Presentation of Europe: comparing across the 9 museums

Museum	Well presented	Under presented	Not presented
National Museum of Scotland (NMS)	33,9%	49,5%	16,6%
National Museum of Ireland (NMI)	40,5%	48,6%	10,9%
Rijksmuseum (Rik)	31,7%	53,1%	15,1%
National Museum of Estonia (NME)	13,9 %	42,7 %	43,4%
Open-Air Museum of Latvia (OEML)	13,0%	47,9%	39%
Nordiska museet (NM)	12,4%	45,1%	42,5%
German Historical Museum (GHM)	54,7%	42,3%	3 %
Museum of the History of Catalonia (MHC)	33,5%	53,9%	12,6%
National Historical Museum of Athens (NHMA)	18,4%	46,2%	35,5%

Representation of the world

Global history is not well-presented in the museums we discussed. Only 23,1% of the total number of museum visitors claims that this is well presented. Nationals and non-nationals agree on that.


Diagram 51: All case studies: Representation of the history of the world



In the National Museum of Estonia only 9,8% recognizes global history as presented in the museum; in the National Historical Museum of Athens this percentage becomes 11,1%, in the Open-Air Museum of Latvia 9,7% and in the Nordiska museet 8,6%. Larger percentages are gathered in the Rijksmuseum (18%), the German Historical Museum (21,5%), the Museum of the History of Catalonia (26,1%), the National Museum of Ireland (31,9%) and the National Museum of Scotland (35,7%). Whether this is related to the colonial past of some countries (such as the Netherlands or Spain) or to the diaspora of some of these nations (such as Irish and Scottish) remains to be examined.

Overall, it seems that the national museums we examined share similar hierarchies when it comes to presenting their stories: the country comes first (42,8%), with the nation following closely (42,3%). The region (7,6%), Europe (4,1%) and the world (3,2%) are marginally there, possibly to support the story of the country or the nation. Nationals seem to prioritize the nation, whereas non-nationals the country. In the cases of the National Museum of Estonia, the National Historical Museum of Athens, the Open-Air Museum of Latvia, the German Historical Museum and the Museum of the History of Catalonia greater emphasis is placed on the nation; in the cases of the Nordiska museet, the National Museum of Scotland, and the National Museum of Ireland emphasis seems to be placed onto the state; the Rijksmuseum seems to be divided between the two. Regional history seems to be important in the cases of the Swedish museum (14,8%), the Catalan (14,9%) and the German ones (9,2%), whereas European history presents a non-negligible percentage only in the Rijksmuseum (6,3%) and the German museum (7,4%).

Diagram 52: All case studies: Hierarchies of the histories of the museum according to the respondents



Controversial history, communities and minorities

Despite the fact that during the last decade or so, under the influence of globalization, post-nationalism, multiculturalism, and so on, national museums are challenged to redefine their role and put emphasis not on the nation but on civic society and inclusion, answers to both the previous questions about hierarchies and inclusiveness provide a more traditional image of the national museum. The majority of the respondents did not see any controversial history in the museum they visited (53,7%); whether this was the case because there is none or because they did not look for it remains to be discussed along with data from the interviews and the focus groups.

When asked whether there are any stories or people/communities missing from the museum narrative, 35,5% claimed that there are no missing stories, whereas 38,2% replied that there are not any missing groups. The largest percentage though claims ignorance in all cases: 34,6% on average claim that they do not know if there is controversial history presented in the museum; 49,7% on average claims that they do not know whether there are “meaningful silences” in the museum; 50,5% on average replies that they do not know whether particular groups or communities are not included in the narratives.

Diagram 53: All case studies: Controversial history presented in the museum




Diagram 54: All case studies: Missing stories from the museum





Diagram 55: All case studies: Missing groups from the museum



In the cases of the Museum of the History of Catalonia, the National Museum of Ireland and the German Historical Museum there seems to be greater awareness of the existence of controversial history (13,3%, 13,8% and 13% respectively). On the other hand in the Open-Air Museum of Latvia only 3,9% sees any kind of controversial history included in a museum whose aim seems to be to re-affirm identities and to provide comfort and familiarity.

Table 110: Open-Air Museum of Latvia: Controversial history in the museum

In your opinion, does this Museum contain any history that is controversial?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	21	3,8	3,9	3,9
	No	302	54,0	55,6	59,5
	Don't know	220	39,4	40,5	100,0
	Total	543	97,1	100,0	
Missing	System	16	2,9		
Total		559	100,0		

a. Museum = Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Acknowledgement of missing stories was larger in the National Historical Museum of Athens (30,4%) and the National Museum of Estonia (20,5%), as well as a larger acknowledgement of missing groups/communities (18,2% and 16,8% respectively). On the other hand, 47,7% of the respondents in the German museum claim that there are no missing stories, and 51,7% that there are no missing groups. Similarly in the National Museum of Scotland, 34,4% believe there are no missing stories and 40,8% that there are no missing groups.

Table 111: National Historical Museum of Athens: Missing stories from the museumAre there any stories about the past that you think are missing from this Museum?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	78	28,5	30,4	30,4
	No	59	21,5	23,0	53,3
	Don't know	120	43,8	46,7	100,0
	Total	257	93,8	100,0	
Missing	System	17	6,2		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens

Table 112: National Museum of Estonia: Missing from the museumAre there any stories about the past that you think are missing from this Museum?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	71	19,9	20,5	20,5
	No	66	18,5	19,0	39,5
	Don't know	210	58,8	60,5	100,0
	Total	347	97,2	100,0	
Missing	System	10	2,8		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

Table 113: German Historical Museum: Missing stories from the museumAre there any stories about the past that you think are missing from this Museum?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	93	14,2	15,0	15,0
	No	295	45,0	47,7	62,8
	Don't know	230	35,1	37,2	100,0
	Total	618	94,4	100,0	
Missing	System	37	5,6		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum = German Historical Museum

Table 114: National Museum of Scotland: Missing stories from the museumAre there any stories about the past that you think are missing from this Museum?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	78	12,9	13,5	13,5
	No	198	32,8	34,3	47,8
	Don't know	302	50,1	52,2	100,0
	Total	578	95,9	100,0	
Missing	System	25	4,1		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Table 115: National Historical Museum of Athens: Missing groups from the museumIn your opinion are there any people that are missing from this Museum?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	47	17,2	18,2	18,2
	No	86	31,4	33,3	51,6
	Don't know	125	45,6	48,4	100,0
	Total	258	94,2	100,0	
Missing	System	16	5,8		
Total		274	100,0		

a. Museum = National Historical Museum of Athens

Table 116: National Museum of Estonia: Missing groups from the museumIn your opinion are there any people that are missing from this Museum?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	56	15,7	16,8	16,8
	No	76	21,3	22,8	39,5
	Don't know	202	56,6	60,5	100,0
	Total	334	93,6	100,0	
Missing	System	23	6,4		
Total		357	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Estonia

Table 117: German Historical Museum: Missing groups from the museumIn your opinion are there any people that are missing from this Museum?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	64	9,8	10,4	10,4
	No	315	48,1	51,1	61,5
	Don't know	237	36,2	38,5	100,0
	Total	616	94,0	100,0	
Missing	System	39	6,0		
Total		655	100,0		

a. Museum=German Historical Museum

Table 118: National Museum of Scotland: Missing groups from the museumIn your opinion are there any people that are missing from this Museum?^a

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	39	6,5	6,8	6,8
	No	234	38,8	40,8	47,6
	Don't know	300	49,8	52,4	100,0
	Total	573	95,0	100,0	
Missing	System	30	5,0		
Total		603	100,0		

a. Museum = National Museum of Scotland

Whether this has to do with the museums being inclusive or with the visitors being reluctant to recognize the existence of different groups and stories that are not represented remains to be examined.

To the open-ended questions related to the above, in the cases there are answers, the suggestions about missing stories and groups are the expected ones, i.e. groups whose presence in the museums is very limited, as we know from previous research as well (see Sandell et al. 2010). The general categorization is the following:

- Minorities and ethnic groups
- Immigrants
- Social classes or religion
- Historical groups (e.g. “Vikings”, in the case of the Nordiska museet);
- Objects (e.g. “arts and crafts from the 20th century”, in the case of the Nordiska museet).

In a number of cases people also provide comments in this question, like: “*Obviously a museum cannot represent every group in a society*” (Nordiska museet); “*Someone is always missing*” (National Museum of Estonia); “*Why necessary?*” (Rijksmuseum).

In greater detail, the open-ended part of these questions provided the following answers per museum:

National Historical Museum of Athens

Twenty-eight [28] visitors thought that there were pieces of controversial history in the Museum.

Seven [7] referred to **events and historic figures from the War of Independence** and its aftermath: *“The subject of the flag being raised by P.P. Germanos on the 25/3”, “Post-revolutionary period”, “The relation of the pre-revolutionary ‘status quo’ and its role afterwards (the cases of Odysseas Androutsos, Kolokotronis, etc.), “Several, such as the reason of Kapodistrias’ assassination”.*

Seven [7] more named issues related to **WWI, the National Schism and the Asia Minor Catastrophe** which followed: *“World War I & the Catastrophe of Smyrna - E. Venizelos’ absence”, “The disagreement between Constantine and Eleftherios Venizelos for Greece’s stance in WWI”, “National division”, “Asia Minor campaign”.* Another two [2] referred to **WWII**.

Six [6] visitors thought that the presentation of historic events was **biased and nationalistic**: *“Greek view of history & battles”, “Nationalistic tendencies”, “It glosses over the violence on the Greeks & does not mention positive Ottoman influences”, “The global stance is biased”.*

Four [4] people raised issues of **foreign policy**: *“The exchanges between Greeks and other communities (Slavic and Ottoman) are in this museum”, “The Eastern Question”, “The Macedonian”.* One [1] named Kings Paul and Constantine II.

Finally, one [1] visitor referred to an issue of social relevance: *“The wealth that the rulers had then as well”.*

Eighty eight [88] people thought there were missing stories from the Museum.

Sixty one [63] participants referred to **several missing historic events/periods/figures**: **Ancient Greece and the period before 1821** [14]: *“Early times, myths, Gods, beliefs”, “Hellenistic stories”, “Ancient Greece”, “Life before 1000 A.D.”;* **1821 and the aftermath** [3] *“Division of fighters”, “The expectations on the part of the State from the heroes of the Revolution – their plight”;* **The National Schism and the Asia Minor Catastrophe** [9]: *“Division - E. Venizelos – Goudi”, “The controversy between King Constantine and El. Venizelos”, “The Asia Minor Catastrophe”;* **Balkan and World Wars** [6]: *“The World Wars”, “It doesn’t cover historical events from the Balkan Wars the World Wars”.* **The National Resistance, German Occupation and the Civil War that followed** [12]: *“The resistance against the Nazis”, “The period of German Occupation”, “Civil War ((1946 - 1949)”;* **Recent history** [12]: *“(Athens) Polytechnic (uprising)”, “The new story; From 1930 until today”, “Post - war history”, “Modern history; 1967 – 1974”, “King Paul, King Constantin, Queen Sophia of Spain and her wedding to Juan Carlos”;* **History beyond the Greek borders** [7]: *“Other parts of Europe”, “Ottoman Balkans and Greeks outside Greece”, “History of Greeks from Asia Minor, N. Italy, Pontos”.*

Six [6] needed more on **regional (local) history and the contribution of specific areas to national causes**: *“It lacks a more extended reference to the Cretan Liberation Struggle”, “The Messolonghi exodus”, “History - Homage to the contribution of Northern Epirus and Cyprus to the Nation’s struggles”.*

Six [6] more focused on the **relations between the Greeks and the Ottomans/Turks** in different times: *“What happened during the 360 years of Ottoman occupation?”, “The influence of the Ottoman”, “Exchange of Greek and Turkish populations”, “1914 - 1923 Turks embarked on plan to exterminate Christians, program of genocide preceded Greek liberation of 1919”.*

Seven [7] people commented on the Museum’s communication policies. Five [5] wanted to see **other perspectives** on the dominant national historical narrative: *“Only the dominant/ state narrative is displayed, minorities and the opposite side are not represented”, “The story here is rather one-sided”, “Historical truth”.* Two [2] wanted more **interpretation and info on historic events** rather than objects:

“There could be more connection with history beside items’ exhibition, e.g. by organising seminars - guided tours, projections, speeches, etc”, “Moreover, it focuses on objects and not events”.

Four [4] participants missed **the stories about ordinary people/women**: *“Story of everyday people”, “Women’s History in Greece”.*

Two [2] more added *“Scientific activity of the Nation’s Greeks”, “Detailed examples of patriotism”.*

Finally, two [2] participants **were not sure** as to what is missing or should be added: *“They are pretty ‘small’ but important events which I don’t know though if they could be within the boundaries of this museum. Nevertheless, it’s wonderful”, “Plenty, where does history begin from?”.*

Forty four [44] people believed there were missing groups of people in the Museum.

Thirteen [14] visitors named several **ethnic groups and immigrants and historic minorities**: *“Vlachs”, “Bulgarian”, “Turkish population in Greece during occupation by Osman Empire”, “Albanians”, “African and Asian people are also not represented”, “Pontian Greeks”, “Foreigners’ minorities: Armenians, Ottomans, Albanians”, “Arvanites - Laliotes & other groups of Greek population allied to the Turkish”.*

Eleven [11] more referred to **religious minorities**: *“Muslims, Jews”, “Jewish population and their culture”, “Religious minorities”.*

Seven [7] participants thought that **women and other ordinary people** were missing: *“Women fighters”, “Inadequate representation of women and ordinary soldiers”, “Common people”.*

Six [6] people named several **historic figures**: *“Members of the Society of Friends (Filiki Eteria)”, “The fighters of the National Resistance”, “Kings Paul, Constantine and Queen Sophia of Spain”, “Turkish generals, Romans, Danish Royals, Venetian important persons”* and one [1] more a historic event: *“WWII and the Communist party movement against German Army”.*

Four [4] participants thought that **the poor and the deprived** were missing: *“Working class”, “Individuals living in poverty”, “Individuals of low economic status, homeless, unemployed, etc”, “Those lacking education”.*

Finally, one [1] said that it is a matter of choice, anyway: *“But you have to choose what is important so don’t worry”.*

Open-Air Museum of Latvia

Eleven [11] visitors gave basically miscellaneous answers to the “controversial history” question.

- **Hardship of life in the past** and living conditions [2]: *“Conditions of living, for example, Jews”, “It was not the ‘good old times”.*
- Dealing with **national identity** issues [2]: *“Identity and territorial belonging”, “Nation’s diversity”.*
- **Religious** issues [2]
- **Political conflicts** [2]: *“A history of suppression and struggle for freedom”, “In Soviet Union period created exposition (?) (Sudmaju sauna)”.*
- **Paganism** (Evil Spirits) [1]
- **Miscellaneous** [1]

One [1] visitor expressed his/her aversion to the question: *“Can’t something be without politics here?”*

Thirty - seven [37] people thought there were missing stories from the Museum.

Four [4] visitors mentioned the issue of **occupation**: *“Occupation throughout history”, “About Latvian life in Russian Empire”*.

Three [3] more thought that it would be nice to have people **enacting scenes from the past**: *“The man and woman is working with a technical of a past, it will be nice, and maybe a school”, “Practical you can see daily life”, “There should be people relating stories about the history”*. Another three [3] claimed that there were **no representations of schools and/or other institutions** *“School?”, “Power of the church, student life”, “Lacks upper ground regions buildings, industrial objects (watermill), country store, school”*. Three [3] visitors needed **more about daily life**: *“About everyday life”, “Everyday events”, “Everyday life, traditions, lifestyle personal stories”*.

Six [6] people focused on the **lack of information** on several exhibition themes and museum practices: *“Would like more information”, “Lacks explanation”, “More about every village/region”, “How were objects collected”*.

Three [3] informants commented on the lack of info concerning the **Jews and other minorities**: *“There is no info about Jews in LV”, “Also historic minorities -LV = multi-cultural”*.

Two [2] visitors mentioned the lack of **recent history** [2], *“20th century”, “Years 40-50-60”*, and one [1] the **remote past** [1]: *“Perhaps some older things”*.

Miscellaneous missing themes:

- Animals [1]
- Locomotion [1]
- Of wars [1]
- Causko time [1]
- Related to certain region [1]
- For the year 1905, witch lawsuits [1]
- The plague [1]

Four [4] people made the following comments:

- “Some buildings are closed” [1]
- “Finally cleaned pendent (?) the administration building, it should clean up ‘the manor house and area’” [1]
- “I don’t know” [1]
- “Many” [1]

Fifty-six people answered the question about missing groups of people:

Twenty-five [25] informants named **the Jews**: *“Maybe the Jewish are missing”, “What about the Jews?”, “Israel’s nation”* and fifteen [15] the **Gypsies**: *“About gypsies (Roma)”*, sometimes in combination. Other **ethnic minorities** mentioned were the Livs [8]: *“Museum could tell more about all the parts of society, especially Libiesi, because it tells only a little about them”*, the “Russians” [3], the “Seli” [2]: *“People who lived in the Region of Selia”*, the “Latgalians” [2], the “Lithuanian” [1], the “Estonian” [1] and the “Tartars” [1]. One of these informants summed it up in one sentence: *“Historical Russians - old believers Livornians, Latgalians -> LV is and has been multi-cultural”*. Five [5] visitors referred to the missing groups in a generic way: *“Ethnic minorities”, “Latvian national minorities”, “Many nations who lived in Latvia”, “Other religious groups”*.

Four [4] more referred to the “**underprivileged**”: *“Ordinary people, poor”, “The poor ones”, “Those who can't pay for it”, “People who work in the forest”.*

Three [3] on the contrary named **the privileged groups**: *“Land owners”, “Nobles”, “About rich people and landowners”.*

Two [2] people thought that there were a lot of the groups mentioned in the question missing, while one [1] could not specify.

National Museum of Estonia

In the question about controversial history in the National Museum of Estonia ten [10] visitors mentioned **specific historical periods** [2] and especially the Soviet period [6], the Baltic-German influence and the Soviet deportations.

Two [2] referred to issues like the different governmental systems and the difference between manor and peasant life: *“Different systems of government”, “The difference between <manor> and peasant life”.*

Another two [2] pointed out general issues of presentation (*“Viewpoint of individual persons”*) and one [1] chose an exhibit, the *“Stalin Statue”*. Two [2] visitors expressed their concern about this particular question: *“Depends on the nationality”.*

In the question about the missing stories in the Museum twenty [20] visitors said that there are certain **historical periods** which are underrepresented such as the ancient and medieval periods, the past beyond 1700, the Russian/German occupation, the Soviet period but also Contemporary history: *“The soviet period could be more presented”, “The beginning of the collectivization [by Soviet powers] in 1939-1955, especially country life”, “Politics before WWI and after (EN183), time before WWI. Inter war period”.*

Nine [9] answers pointed out issues of **cultural history**, such as language and literature, folklorist heroes and traditional beliefs, but also living conditions in towns and impact of other cultures on Estonian culture. *“What happened with the hedgehog in [the Estonian epos] Kalevipoeg”, “Folklore’ (folklorist stories about Kalevipoeg or Suur Toll [folklorist heroes])”, “The town life of Estonians through different periods is poorly presented”.*

Six [6] visitors noted the absence of a presentation for the **minorities groups**, such as the German and Swedish, the Russians, or other subcultures: *“The stories of the different nations and powers who have acted here”, “Needs more info on non-ethnic Estonians in modern day Estonian, especially as there are so many of them...”*

Six [6] visitors mentioned that they missed information about **emigrants**, the large Estonian communities outside Estonia: *“The faith of the Estonians who have emigrated to Russia”, “It would be interesting to have something on Estonians around the world – where they went to – what became of them in other parts of the world”* and one [1] the immigrant communities.

Twelve [12] answers were concerned with other **issues missing** in the exhibition, such as politics, religion, topics of everyday life, the Finno-Ugric context, conflicts between manor owners and the peasantry, the difficult transition to a non-agricultural society, the losses of the wars, the Forest Brotherhood after WWII and the contemporary development of Estonia in EU. *“Some things/details about politics”, “The topics of everyday life (maybe I haven’t enough looked, but daily rhythm in the farm (by the clock as well during the different powers))”, “More on the early Finno-Ugric tribes”, “It concentrates rather on the peasantry neglecting manor owners [=Baltic Germans] & their conflicts with the*

peasantry and 20th century”, “*About the difficult way to a non-agricultural society*”, “*The harms through losses and wars*”, “*Forest Brotherhood [after WWII]. The Forest Brothers have grown potatoes, carrots also in the forest, e.g. the FB Karuks in the Padaküla forest ...*”, “*The reasons why Estonia comes in the EU*”.

Only one [1] visitor mentioned specific **objects missing** in the exhibition, exhibits of WWII and photos from 20.08.1991.

Six [6] visitors used this field to make **personal statements and comments** on the question; most of them noting that there are always missing stories in museums: “*Probably more stories are missing as I could write here. But I suppose that some of them are just waiting for their turn*”, “*There are so many missing stories that I’m not able to mention only some of them*”

In the question about certain people excluded from the national museum twenty-eight [28] named **minority groups** and other nations living in Estonia [5] like the Russians, the Germanized Estonians, the Polish, Latvian, Swedish ethnic minorities, Roma people, Jews, Germans etc. “*All the other nations who live in Estonia*”, “*Ethnic minorities and their culture is not presented like Russian Old Believers, who have influenced Estonian culture through centuries*”, “*Russians, especially & perhaps other groups e.g. Swedes & Germans*”.

Ten [10] visitors mentioned **religious groups**: “*Although I’m not sure but it seems to me that different religious groups and ethnic groups who live/are in Estonia, are underrepresented*”, “*The variation of national religious groups*”.

Six [6] answers referred to other groups of people such as town people, craftsmen, servants, criminals, underground groups, the people who were sent by the Soviet powers and neighbour nations. One of them mentioned “*Rosenberg for example*” referring to the high Nazi official Alfred Rosenberg who was born in Tallinn.²⁴

Three answers referred to **emigrants**, “*Estonians abroad*”, “*Estonians in East (emigrants)*”. One [1] visitor stated the Estonian gay culture and another [1] the differences between members of different social classes: “*Estonian gay culture*”, “*... the difference between rich and poor*”

Three [3] answers concerned with **historic periods**, 1918-1990 and very ancient culture and another three [5] commented that there is always something missing in the museums, that some districts are superficially presented, and that the relatively small Jewish community, is well presented: “*Somebody always missing*”, “*Superficial presentation of some districts, for example Viljandimaa (all the areas except Setomaa and islands)*”, “*Although the Jewish part in Estonia is relatively small they were/are there*”.

German Historical Museum

When asked about controversial history, most [14] of the answers referred to the presentation of national-socialism and the 3rd Reich, the struggle against it, but also the role of the police, since there was a temporary exhibition on this issue: “*The Nazism and the fight against it*”, “*Imperialism, 3rd Reich*”, “*National socialism, police*” during the period of the research.

Nine [9] answers mentioned the **Jewish Question**, Holocaust and Anti-Semitism, another six [6] **WWII** in general, five [5] visitors **WWI** and four [4] both wars: “*The Jewish problematic during*

²⁴ He was labelled on the exhibition of Estonian Historical Museum as one of the famous people who were born in Estonia but this part was removed from the exhibition, after a serious social debate.

second war”, “*Rise of Nazism, treatment of Jews*”, “*Dealing with the German population in the WWII*”, “*War-responsible question first World War*”, “*Time from / development of the WWI*”

Three [3] answers referred to the **period of the Cold War** and the relationship between GDR and FRG: “*GDR section*”, “*DDR Topics, but don’t speak about advances, neither the black side of RFA*”.

Three [3] visitors focused on the Napoleonic wars, two on the role of France before 1871 and two [2] on the history of Protestantism: “*The history of Protestantism is being seen differently by some Protestants*”.

Other issues, or personalities, mentioned were:

- The coronation of Charlemagne the Great [1]
- The Period of Weimar Republic, fight against re-armament [1]
- Historical conflicts between European Nations [1]
- Racism [1]
- The Beginnings of Germany [1] and
- Helmut Kohl [1]

Finally, nine [9] visitors choose to express either their opinions about the fact that history is always controversial, or their difficulty to deal with the question, or gave too general answers such as “the 20th century”, the “first floor of the permanent exhibition” etc.: “*Has to represent a point of view*”, “*All museums have to be selective*”, “*Every history is controversial*”, “*What does "controversial" mean?*” “*Modern 20th century*”

In the question about stories missing from the Museum twenty-three [23] answers referred to **WWII**, eight [8] of them concentrating on the **Jews and the Holocaust**: “*The European perspective e.g. the Jews in World War II*”, “*How East and West have protected the memory of the Shoah (Holocaust)*”, “*Events and concepts sometimes had to be explained better, a little more on anti-Semitism in the 19th century*”. Fourteen [14] visitors who mentioned WWII needed more information about the **Resistance**, the **Role of the Wehrmacht**, of the **Justice**, the **Euthanasia** of the psychologically ill, **WWII experiences**, the **Effects of Soviet repression**, the **Night of the Long Knives**, the **suffering, starvation and death of the Greeks during the German occupation from 1941 to 1944**: “*Role of the Wehrmacht (Armed Forces) Justice (World War 2)*”, “*WW2 experiences*”, “*Resistance movements, e.g. Red Orchestra (Kapelle) and Kreisauer Kreis*”, “*Destruction of the SA, e.g. the Night of the Long Knives*”.

Cold war issues were mentioned in six [6] answers and concerned **GDR** and **FRG**: “*More about the wall coming down*”, “*Corruption in the politics of FRG*”, “*The recent past of GDR*”.

Ten [10] answers focused on the need of the presentation of post-war period and the recent history such as **second part of the 20th century**, the **’80s and ’90s**, the **world economic crisis**, the **21st century** and **EU**: “*In principle 90% of what has happened since 1945. Both for West - and East German postwar history. As the years 1945-2011 are missing 17 full years of national history*”.

In the same context there are five [5] interesting answers, focusing in the **history of RAF**: “*RAF – Terror*”, “*RAF (Photo’s)*”.

Six [6] visitors mentioned issues of **migrations and German colonies**: “*Conflicts with European superpowers in Africa*”, “*Migrations to America and also German Colonies*”, “*German emigrants e.g. in the USA*”.

Another six [6] visitors claimed the enrichment of the exhibitions with **cultural issues** such as literature and language, music and the arts, science & technology and another four [4] with

religious issues: “*German heroic legends*”, “*History of German language*”, “*More on intellectual development*”, “*Music and the arts*”, “*Reformation in Germany*”, “*Role of the Church in the Empire*”.

Five [5] visitors focused on the need for a presentation of social history issues, such as: “*Labour movement history*”, “*The life of the civilian population*”, “*People/ Structures in former times*”.

Two [2] answers pointed out the **regional differences** in Germany and especially the particularities of Bavaria and Württemberg. Other answers mentioned specific historical periods or personalities missing such as:

- **Pre-history** [2]
- Detailed descriptions **before 1500** [1]
- The **Staufer Dynasty** [1]
- **Vikings** [1]
- **Russian - German relationships** [2]
- **Losses of German-speaking territories**, Alsace, East Prussia [1]
- Prussian reforms [1] and the role of **Frh. V. Stein** [1]
- **Napoleon’s influence** [1]
- **Marx, Rosa Luxemburg** [1]

Eight [8] visitors referred to the ways of presenting history, claiming the need for an alternative or wider interpretation; they accepted, though, the difficulties of presenting everything in an exhibition: “*Presentation of alternate interpretations*”, “*Various, but where to find the space/enough place*”, “*Connection with other countries*”, “*Nothing can be completely represented*”.

Two [2] visitors asked questions such as: “*Charlemagne was a German or a Frenchman?*”, “*Who took the body of Hitler?*”.

Another two [2] visitors referred to issues that have to do with the history of other countries, probably because of their nationality (the expulsion of Greeks from Turkey in 1922 and the free French).

In the question about certain people excluded from the national museum, thirteen [13] named the **immigrants** and the multicultural society, which has formed the contemporary culture in Germany: “*People with migration background*”, “*Immigrant workers and their career in Germany from late 60’s*”, “*Maybe I missed it but it seems to me the foreign workers and migrants, who also crucially shape the culture, are underrepresented*”, “*More about recent, e.g. Turkish, immigration*”.

Eleven [11] people named **minority groups**, like Sinti and **Roma, Gypsies, Jews, Muslims** and **Slavic groups**: “*Ethnic minorities (such as Serbs) cannot find mention*”, “*There were certain minorities such as Roma (?), homosexuals who had same problems with Jews, but are not presented as much*”, “*Jews - they shaped the 18th and 19th century Germany significantly*”.

Four [4] answers focused on the colonial policy of Germany and mentioned groups of African and south Asian origin: “*Victims of German colonial policy 19./20. century*”, “*African people -colonial policy*”.

Five [5] mentioned the exclusion of **homosexuals**, three [3] of **disabled** people and two [2] of **women**: “*Women are mostly under represented*”.

Four [4] visitors mentioned historical personalities: Heinrich Heine, Humboldt, Arminius the Chrusci, Maria Theresa and Martin Luther. The two answers about Martin Luther are in the same

context with another two [2], which focused on the church history: *“Ecclesiastical developments are treated too little”*

Seven [7] visitors mentioned specific issues or groups of people such as:

- Pacifism, non-violent resistance to US
- Anthroposophy
- Sects, enemies of the state
- Other groups persecuted during 20th Century
- Resistance GDR
- Knights / - armors
- WWII slave labourers
- Less info on Switzerland and Poland

Finally five [5] visitors made a critical approach to the question itself, either by considering it unnecessary, or by commenting that it is impossible for a museum to present everything: *“There is no museum in which everything is presented”*.

National Museum of Ireland

Seventy-eight [78] visitors thought that there were pieces of controversial history in the Museum.

Seventeen [17] visitors referred to the ever “tensive” **relationship between Ireland and Britain** and to “stories” associated with it: *“British v Ireland”, “English treatment of the Irish”, “Irish viewpoint on British occupation”, “Between the Irish & English war”, “British oppression”, “Black & Tans”, “The IRA terrorists”, “Absence of Anglo-Irish patriots”*.

Another sixteen [16] specifically named the **1916 uprising** and the history associated with it: *“War or Independence”, “Irish Rising”, “Easter Rebellion”, “1916 is forever controversial”, “Narrative in 1916”*, while six [6] more focused on the **Civil War** that followed: *“Civil war & events of 20th century”, “Both sides of Civil War”*.

Eight [8] people referred to “controversial” history related to **Northern Ireland**: *“The troubles in Northern Ireland”, “Nationalist & Unionist Hist”, “The tension between Republicans and Loyalists”, “Bloody Sunday”, “Stating that Ireland’s troubles are always overshadowed by N. Ireland”*.

Fourteen [14] people talked about the **Irish participation in several wars**, in general: *“Irish wars”, “Soldiers & Chiefs”, “War”, “Irish mercenaries killing defenceless natives”, “The Irish participation in foreign war and operation”, “Invasion & greed”, “Irish people called to fight in World War I”, “Ireland’s role in WWII”*.

Five [5] participants commented on what they perceived as **biased perspectives** of the Irish history: *“Too militaristic”, “Nationalism as entirely heroic”, “The Irish perspective of history”*.

Three [3] people thought that **all history is a priori controversial**, while three [3] more directly commented on the question: *“But that’s good”, “Not here to check for this”, “Yes and no. It depends on your point of view”*.

Finally, seven [7] participants thought that the following themes/issues/items were controversial history:

- “The truth” [1]
- “Money” [1]
- “Nazi objects” [1]

- “History of last 50 years” [1]
- “The hardship of times” [1]
- “Conflict / Clothing” [1]
- “Ireland’s culture” [1]

One-hundred and thirty -three [133] people thought there were missing stories from the Museum.

Twenty-three [23] named the **potato famine**: “*The Famine 1940s*”, “*Famine*”, “*Famine years*”, “*The Great Famine*”.

Sixteen [16] participants missed stories about **Early Irish history, the Celtic culture and the Vikings**: “*Early Irish History i.e. resettlements*”, “*Ancient Irish history*”, “*Brief overview of History of Ireland from earlier times*”, “*Celtic & Pre-celtic*”, “*Celtic origins*”, “*Celtic mythology*”, “*Gaelic and Viking history*”, “*Maybe the Vikings?*”.

Another fourteen [14] wanted more on recent **social Irish history/culture**: “*Maybe some later social history not just military*”, “*More recent history in Ireland*”, “*History of science in Ireland...*”, “*Medical history e.g. medical instruments*”, “*The civilian history, political history*”, “*Broader view than war*”, “*More cultural information*”, “*St Patrick*”, “*Strong power of the Church*”, “*Story of G.A.A.*”, “*Philately*”. Fifteen [15] more participants missed **folklore, stories about ordinary people** (lifestyle, making a living) and **the poor**, as well as about **women**: “*Discovery of country & way of life*”, “*Life lifestyle / Industry / Trade*”, “*Legends and Folklore*”, “*Cucullin type stuff*”, “*Lower class people of Ireland / Non-military history of Ireland*”, “*I think I learned a lot, but it would have been interesting to learn a little bit about how Irish people lived and made a living through history*”, “*Novels etc of ordinary folk*”, “*Stories of average families, aristocratic families in Irish history*”, “*Women’s role in Irish history*”, “*Maybe more stories from the ordinary women who helped in the struggle for Irish Independence*”.

Six [6] people said that the involvement of Ireland in **World War II** was missing: “*1940-1945 in full*”, “*More about Irish neutrality in WWII*”.

Four [4] people wanted more info on the history of **N. Ireland** and two [2] more on **the IRA**.

Three [3] respondents referred to missing **ethnic groups**: “*Traveller Histories*”, “*Irish ethnic minorities*”, while two [2] needed information on the origins of the **Irish language**.

Three [3] referred to emigration and the global Diaspora of the Irish. Two [2] more missed info on the **connection between Ireland and Europe** and one [1] wanted more on other countries of the world.

Twenty-five [25] visitors named other missing **themes/events from different periods of Irish history**

- “Penal Laws” [2]
- Events in Galway Cork and other areas in 1916 i.e. Liam Mellows in Athlery [2]
- “The Squad” [1]
- “Flight of the Earls” [1]
- “Civil war in Ireland a bit more on that would be nice” [1]
- “Irish connection to Latin America” [1]
- “A lot more on ARMADA” [1]
- “More about the early monks from 6th Century onwards would be good” [1]
- “Irish history” [1]

- “Victorians” [1]
- “1970s Border Ireland” [1]
- “More History Colins Devoln” [1]
- “The contribution made by the RIC”
- “History of Ireland (1500-1750)” [1]
- “Relation between Indian Army and Irish Army” [1]
- “Children's history (though here is same)” [1]
- “Maybe Brian Boru, Clontarf - Before & After” [1]
- “Region of Dublin history” [1]
- “Wexford was crucial in the 1798 Rebellion but it is not mentioned at all” [1]
- “Perhaps more on 1798” [1]
- “The Renaissance? 1400-1600” [1]
- “Irish soldiers fighting alongside Scots in Scotland” [1]
- “Internment in to Curragh '35-'37” [1]

Three [3] more referred to **missing items**:

- “Paintings” [1]
- “There are holes in the exhibits i.e. furniture exhibit” [1]
- “Dinosaurs!” [1]

Finally, six [6] respondents claimed that there were **too many** missing stories to recount although some felt that this is justified in a museum exhibition: *“I can't be specific, but one place can't hold 6000 years of human history”, “Too many to count”, “There's always more stories out there”, “Space is limited”,* four [4] felt they **could not express an opinion**: *“But nothing in particular”, “I'm from Germany, so I don't know much about Irish history before I visited the museum”, “Not sure”, “Don't know”* and four [4] used the field to **express an opinion** about the Museum's communication weaknesses: *“Don't know but some translation would be helpful e.g. French for foreign visitors”, “Not sure of specific stories but there's very little broad storytelling, little object interpretation - not very enlightening”, “The 1916 exhibit assumes background knowledge”.*

Eighty [80] people answered the question about missing groups of people.

Ten [10] participants named **religious minorities** like the *“Non-Catholic / Protestant religious groups”, “Protestant and other world religions”, “Only a small Jewish section”, “Muslim people”.* Two [2] more referred to the role of the Irish clergy: *“I think the role of Religious orders in 20 C Ireland helped ... to up students to culture”, “Clergy and mass”.*

Ten [10] more mentioned **minority/ethnic groups**, such as: *“Black people”, “Asians in Ireland”, “People who came to live in Ireland from elsewhere in the world”, “The foreigners as part of Ireland history”, “There should be sections showing artefacts from those groups”.*

Fifteen [15] participants referred to the **“underprivileged”**: *“Poor people of Ireland. Everything seems to be about wealthier possessions”, “Lower class”, “Peasantry”,* **women**: *“There isn't much about women's role in history”,* and other **ordinary people**: *“General population who lived during troubled times”, “People”,* as well as **marginalized groups**: *“New Irish Nationals, LGBT”, “More on counterculture movements”, “Those without a voice or ability to see or hear or touch. Basically the unwritten about”.*

Seven [7] mentioned the **“Irish Travelers”**.

Six [6] respondents referred to stories related to **Northern Ireland**: “*Republican 70/s to 2000 N.I. conflict*”, “*Paratroopers in Northern Ireland*”, “*Didn’t get a sense of who Northern Ireland are. How that fits in*”, while six [6] more thought stories about the **relationship between the UK and Ireland** were missing: “*The Irish Unionist Tradition strangely enough*”, “*Possibly people of Unionist tradition underrepresented – protestant traditions*”, “*British influence on Irish Culture*”, “*The British perspective*”, “*Anglo Irish aristocracy*”.

Two [2] visitors named the **early peoples of Ireland**: “*Pre-Christian Irish Celts*”, “*Indigenous*”.

Two [2] referred to the **influential Irish in the USA**: “*Commodore John Barry from Wexford - created the US Navy and is honoured by the US*”, “*Irish that immigrated to America and became very influential people in the United States*”.

Two [2] more missed stories from **world history**.

Two [2] did not specify although felt that there *were* missing groups of people: “*Lots of diverse groups but there is only so much room*”, “*All variety of people*”.

Eleven [11] visitors named other **themes, groups of people or individuals from Irish/world history/culture (and social history)** missing:

- “Egyptians, Vikings” [1]
- “Modern Immigration” [1]
- “The exhibitions short in Turlough House” [1]
- “Art” [1]
- “History of Left” [1]
- “Nazi” [1]
- “St Patrick etc” [1]
- “Michael Collins” [1]
- “Arthur Griffith and Patraig Plunkett” [1]
- “Wasn’t relevant for warfare” [1]
- “Dinosaurs!” [1]

One [1] visitor thought “It’s a silly question” and another [1] wasn’t sure what to say.

Finally, three [3] participants understood “missing people” in terms of **accessibility to the museum**: “*Don’t know if you mean a) certain groups excluded from visiting museum or b) certain groups excluded from being represented in museum*”, “*Poorly attended by overseas tourists - 3rd level students tend to be Language schools etc.*”, “*I brought my neighbour child, 8 years old. Never been into a museum*”.

Rijksmuseum

Thirty-seven [37] visitors thought that there were pieces of controversial history in the Museum.

Sixteen [16] people referred to **the slave- trade and colonialism**: “*Involvement in slave trade*”, “*Dutch colonial history*”, “*Slave period*”, “*Slavery, exploitation of non-civilised countries that contributed to the wealth and development of the Netherlands*”.

The **religious conflicts** were mentioned in six [6] answers: “*Religious differences*”, “*Differences between Catholics and Protestants*”, “*Religious conflict*”.

Three [3] visitors mentioned **wars or battles**: “*About war victories in the past*”, “*War with Spain*”.

Two [2] people probably referred to the **Bodies of the De Witt Brothers** painting: “*Two brothers shown dead*”, “*Two lynched bodies*”.

Another two [2] referred to heritage **“loot”**: *“It is loot!”*, *“Failure to identify roles of Jews lost, i.e. paintings ‘plundered’ under Nazi occupation”*.

One [1] visitor claimed that **most history is controversial**: *“History is always a construct which represents a certain side of a story”*, while two [2] more generically referred to history and the past: *“The living behaviour of the past”*, *“It mentions the historical events”*.

Two [2] visitors did not understand the question.

Finally, five [5] informants gave the following answers:

- “Too much patriotic! The ‘best in the world’ does not exist!” [1]
- “Punishing people” [1]
- “The model of a ship” [1]
- “Andy Warhole” [1]

Fifty seven [57] people thought there were missing stories from the Museum.

Fourteen people [14] referred to missing information on **the slave-trade and colonialism**: *“About slaves”*, *“Involvement with slavery”*, *“The rise of the Netherlands in economy in ‘golden age’ on behalf of slavery”*, *“About maritime empire and colonies”*, *“Colonial history”*, *“The misery of Asia being influenced by Europe and Holland”*, *“The ‘dark’ side of the golden age”*.

Thirteen [13] visitors thought that the exhibition covered a limited time span; **other historic periods missing**: *“Before Golden age”*, *“The stories before XVI century and after XVIII century”*, *“The current exhibition only cares for 2 centuries”*. Nine [9] of them focused on modern history/ modern art history: *“19th-20th century”*, *“XIX and XX century history through paint”*, *“Modern history”*, *“Modern history/art”*.

Six [6] more said that information on the **lives of ordinary people** was missing and living in **regional Holland** : *“People’s life”*, *“Maybe more from other parts of the area, rural areas etc, more insight into the past lives of people from different backgrounds/ areas of Netherlands, different walks of life”*, *“There could be more images/ objects from the lives of the past”*, *“Regional history”*.

Five [5] participants needed more information on the **relationship of Holland with other parts of the world**: *“The connection between American and Dutch relationships”*, *“Impact on world history”*, *“Political background, parallels with other countries”*.

Four [4] thought that there were certain **artists missing** or expected more on them: *“Van Gogh!”*, *“Vermeer”*, *“Rembrandt and Jews”*, *“Degas more”*. Two [2] more said that **women artists** [1] and **international art** were missing [1]: *“I saw one painting by a female artist – obviously there were more famous male artists, but more (women) would be nice”*, *“Hard to answer but I would like to see more international art, Chinese, Japan and Russia”*.

Certain issues from **Dutch and the world history** (social history) were mentioned as missing stories:

- “Why Holland fell from world no. 1 to unrecognisable” [2]
- “Stories about wars and conflicts” [1]
- “The crown” [1]
- “Economic[al] history is not presented properly” [1]
- “William III of Orange and England” [1]
- “Spanish revolution” [1]
- “How was the commerce in the world around 1500” [1]

- “World Wars I and II” [1]
- “Minorities (Jews)” [1]

Finally three [3] participants felt that they were in no position to answer: *“My knowledge of Dutch history isn’t that great”, “I just want to know more because of know little of European history”*.

Forty-two [42] people answered the question about “missing people” in the Museum.

Fifteen [15] named **minority/ethnic groups and immigrants**, and especially people from the former colonies of Holland: *“Ethnic minorities”, “People from former colonies”, “Slaves and sailors, colonies”, “Immigrants”, “African”, “South Africans”, “Display of the history of ethnic groups and foreigners in Holland”, “People from the conquered lands...”*.

Twelve [12] referred to **religious minorities**: *“Islamic and especially Jewish history”, “The Jews”, “Maybe religion groups”, “Muslims”*. Three [3] of them also included ethnic minorities in their answers: *“Muslim, Asian”, “Muslims, just general minorities”*.

Three [3] participants thought that **the poor and the farmers** were missing while in two [2] answers **gay people** were mentioned.

Three [3] more referred to **art from other nations**: *“African art, Eastern Europe”, “Other painters not Dutch”, “Russian art. It is live poetry”*.

Two [2] people made general comments about these groups: *“These different groups are the story of our country, too”, “People who were suppressed, left the country because of that”*.

Two [2] referred to **fairly recent history**: *“Maybe a little bit about the modern, not always about 17th!”*, *“Transition of Dutch colonies to independence”*.

Three [3] participants believed for different reasons that there was **no point in including more groups** in the displays: *“They are irrelevant”, “A lot but you can’t get everyone!”*, *“Why necessary?”*.

Finally, two [2] did not know: *“I do not know; I was expecting to find out here”* and one [1] mentioned: *“Judges”*.

National Museum of Scotland

Forty-one [41] visitors thought that there are (or not) pieces of controversial history in the Museum.

Seven [7] people claimed that **most history is controversial** or that the notion of the nation and national identity as such are problematic as well: *“Much of history is controversial”, “Always some inaccuracy”, “The idea of a nation is”*.

Five [5] people referred to **Dolly the sheep and the process of cloning** as controversial history: *“The cloning of dolly the sheep”*.

Three [3] participants mentioned **political conflicts and in particular 20th century politics**: *“Politics of 20th century”, “Recent politics”*.

Another three [3] visitors referred to the **“bias” of the interpretation** in the exhibitions: *“That all those who have ever lived in this geographical area necessarily have something more than just this in common”, “The text presented is full of assertions which are actually opinion but presented as fact”, “It needs some different types of emphasis”, “Bias natural history”*.

Three [3] mentioned the **controversial relationship with England**: *“Relationship with England”, “English rule of Scotland”*.

Two [2] people observed that the **Museum could not present more than one view** or that it is “objective” enough when dealing with controversial issues: *“It could only be one way view”, “Both*

views of historically controversial subjects". Another [1] commented on the Museum's approach on "Scottish identity": "*Romanticization of Scottishness*".

Two [2] visitors **expressed how they felt** about the approach of the Museum on controversial issues: "*Gets me angry*", "*I would hope so*".

Nine [9] participants named **a theme from Scottish history/ social history**

- "Role of Scots in civilization of Asia / Africa" [1]
- "Kings / Queens vs Democracy" [1]
- "Immigration. History of Scottish immigrants" [1]
- "Highlights social need" [1]
- "The ghost" [1]
- "Land clearances" [1]
- "Murder, death, savagery" [1]
- "Underrepresented views from Scottish Gaelic language" [1]
- "Some of the Church history is very complex" [1]

Two [2] named **objects**:

- "The hell clock" [1]
- "Maiden and other objects for torture" [1]

And two [2] referred to **European and global history**:

- "The history of Europe" [1]
- "Origin of the Universe" [1]

One-hundred and fourteen [114] people thought there were missing stories from the Museum.

Sixteen [16] visitors referred to missing themes from **Scottish social and financial history**: "*Ordinary people*", "*Scottish laws and the effect it has on society*", "*Linoleum industry*", "*Religious persecution*", "*History of the women's movement and popular social movements*", "*Oppressed minorities*", "*Clearances*", "*Mr Boom*".

Fourteen people [14] referred to certain **periods and events from Scottish history** like: "*Early modern Scottish Gaelic history at home and abroad*", "*I still miss the 20th c. display on level 6*", "*Not enough regarding WWII in Scotland*", "*Picts vs Scots battles*", "*Scottish medieval history*", "*English and Wales history*".

Nine [9] participants wanted more on **specific historic figures**: "*William Wallace*",

"*Would like to see more about important Scottish historical figures, e.g. Mary Queen of Scots and William Wallace*". "*Did not see any things on James Maxwell*", "*The history of Maria Estuardo*", "*Boadicia*".

Eight [8] participants named themes from **Natural History and Scottish landscape**: "*Creation*", "*Evolution undersold*", "*More dinosaurs*", "*St Kilda*", "*Crannogs*".

Five [5] needed more information on different **Scottish regions and particularly the Highlands**: "*It's too lowland based*", "*Highland*", "*Highlands island history*".

Five [5] people thought there should be more about the **relationship with England, France or Ireland**: "*French old alliance against England and future option for Scotland as a nation*", "*Relationship to France – England*", "*More about the link with Ireland*".

Another five [5] thought that there were stories about **Scottish colonialism** missing: "*Slave trade*", "*More negative aspects of Scottish colonialism*", "*The relationship of Scotland with the South Pacific colonization*".

Three [3] wanted **specific objects**: “*Bag pipes*”, “*The head-less piper*”, “*1000% more giant deer*”.

Three [3] people referred to **global historical periods**: “*Egypt history*”, “*Trojan times*”.

Finally, two [2] more expressed an opinion regarding what is missing in the **presentation of the displays**: “*Order*”, “*Too many to recount. There is background info about all the objects that can be presented*” and three [3] felt that they **could not express an opinion**: “*Not Scottish – don’t know enough to know what is missing*”, “*Haven’t been round whole exhibit*”, “*Too early to judge*”. One [1] expressed **an opinion about the question** as such: “*I don’t think it is the place of the museum to present stories but to preserve artefacts*”.

Thirty eight [38] people answered the question about missing people.

Fifteen [15] named **minority/ethnic groups**, such as: “*Gypsies, other migrants spread across larger regions*”, “*Scottish Gaels, give them voice – they are treated as another or not discussed*”, “*Recent (19th century) Irish immigrants*”, “*Those who have immigrated to Scotland in any major groups*”.

Seven [7] visitors referred to the “**underprivileged**” and **women**: “*Farmers not well represented*”, “*Workers*”, “*Women’s and working class histories underrepresented*”, “*Disabled people*”.

Six [6] answers referred to **church history or religious minorities** like “*Muslims and Jews*”, “*Religious persecution*”.

Eight [8] visitors mentioned other **historic/professional/social/political groups** of people or individuals such as:

- “Musicians” [1]
- “School children” [1]
- “Authors and Poets” [1]
- “Romans” [1]
- “Lepers” [1]
- “Red Clydesiders” [1]
- “Lees” [1]
- “Ruben Molano” [1]

One [1] person stated: “*Have not yet been around museum*”, another [1] said: “*everyone*” [mentioned in the question] and one [1] gave a reason for this: “*Nationalistic reasons*”.

Nordiska museet

Most [26] of the answers about controversial history referred to the presentation of **Sami minority**, the way Sweden treated them or the indigenous people in general: “*Sami story*”, “*How we treated the Sami*”. One [1] adds to the Sami cause also the Finns, “*The cause of the Sami and the Finns*”.

Three [3] answers mentioned the Swedish **race biology**, two of them focusing again on the racism against the Sami, “*Swedish race biology*”, “*Racism against the Sami*”.

Three [3] focused on other exhibits- exhibitions like the class-related interiors and all the furniture and the exhibition on garbage. Finally, two visitors mentioned nationalism and especially “*Sweden and 1940-45 war*”.

In the question about missing stories, twenty [20] answers mentioned specific historical periods, which are missing from the museum exhibition. Ten [10] referred to the periods before 1600 and/or the time after 1980 until today, mentioning specifically the absence of a link between past and present, but also the historical borders within contemporary Sweden: “*Not far*”.

enough back in time”, “Present times, that means 1980-2010”, “The nearer past; Missing a link between past and present”, “Historical borders within contemporary Sweden”.

Eight [9] visitors spoke about war history, mostly the Second World War and the role of Sweden, but also the women’s roles: *“Lots, e.g. our behaviour during WWII”, “The hardship/history of the war and for instance women’s roles and perspectives”.* Another three (3) referred to the Vikings – history: *“There isn’t anything about Vikings”.*

Nineteen [19] visitors noted different specific exhibitions themes such as:

- Economy / labor [2]
- School education, [2]
- New year’s eve [2]
- Sports, techniques [1]
- Guild, history of craftsmanship [1]
- Health conditions [1]
- Politic, Art [1]
- Industrial history [1]
- How was Sweden made [1]
- Swedish furniture and their development [1]
- Hair styles, life styles [1]
- Cities and architecture [1]
- Dolls, dolls’ clothes, dolls’ prams [1]
- Mythology [1]
- Communications [1]
- Story telling/oral traditions [1]
- Nonconformist church movements [1]

Five [5] answers referred to different **minorities** such as the Sami, Jews, Romani and the Baltic people. Another five [5] mentioned the missing Nordic perspective or general Nordic history, the Finns’ part of Sweden or generally the presentation of Sweden and other Northern countries; *“More about how badly the Sami were treated”, “I don’t see a lot of the Nordic perspective”, “The Finns’ part of Sweden”.*

Emigration, especially to America is another missing story that is mentioned by three visitors: *“New Sweden Colony 1638- the Americas”.*

Four [4] answers expressed the need for more content about **ordinary people** and how they lived (work, leisure), the poor people, the working classes: *“Working classes are missing in relation to their proportion of the population”, “More about how ordinary people lived”.*

Four [4] questionnaires named specific **Swedish regions** such as Norrbotten, Northern Norrland, Dalecarlia. Two [2] mentioned the **immigrants** and the influence of immigration on culture and another two [2] the following missing **Objects** and **Personalities**: the Swedish horse, the king’s history and Hazelius’ collection policy.

Two [2] have missed the **queer perspective** in the exhibition.

Four [4] answers are used to **evaluate the exhibition** with comments such as *“It needs to be less boring”, “Some things are not explained in English”,* and a critical approach to what is history in the

museums' view such as *"Swedish history - not just folk life history"*, *"Swedish history must contain more than this"* and *"World history is pretty extensive"*.

Another four [4] visitors expressed thoughts about the content of the question mentioning that it is not possible for a museum to cover everything and difficulties answering the question; *"But you cannot narrate everybody"*, *"There is not room for everything and there couldn't be"*, *"Difficult to define without reflection"*.

In the question about certain people excluded from the national museum twenty [20] named **minority groups** like the Sami, the Jews, the Gypsies, the vagrants and Muslims but also the rest of the Nordic countries and other ethnic groups: *"Too little about the rest of the Nordic countries, Romani, Jews, the Baltic countries"*.

Fifteen [15] answers focused on the exclusion of the **immigrants**, the recent but also the earlier, their life conditions in Sweden and one [1] also mentioned the issue of **emigration** from Sweden: *"Immigrants are /were getting more and more. They have been a part of Sweden"*, *"Immigrants 1600; 1700; 1800; 1900; 2000 – onwards"*, *"Immigration to Sweden and emigration from Sweden"*.

Six [6] visitors spoke about the exclusion of the **lower classes** of the museum presentation and another six [6] of **religious groups**: *"It's too much upper class stuff"*, *"Vagrants and poor people in Sweden"*, *"I think that the influence of Christianity is portrayed in negative terms"*, *"Lower classes, non-Christians (or non-protestants)"*.

Four [4] visitors named other **groups of people** such as "New Swedes", members of Subcultures and female Swedish authors: *"Subcultures in the Swedish cultural heritage"*, *"People in modern suburb"*. Another three [3] visitors referred to **historical groups** such as the Vikings or traditional occupations and guilds. One [1] answer concerned specific objects from 1900-onwards: *"Arts and crafts from the twentieth century (from 1900-onwards)"*.

Two [2] visitors commented that there is always something missing in the museums, but also that all people and groups of the area should be represented: *"I believe all people and groups of the area should be represented"*, *"Obviously, a museum cannot represent every group in a society"*.

Museum of the History of Catalonia

In terms of controversial history, most [21] of the answers referred to the **presentation of Catalonia** and some [8] of them to its relationship with Spain: *"The same national identity of Catalonia"*, *"The independence of Catalonia"*, *"I think there is a very nationalist Catalan view"*, *"The Spanish oppression"*, *"Catalonia vs. Basque region in terms of acceptance by Spain"*, *"History of Spain, Why are Catalonia considered independent?"*.

Twenty-one [21] answers mentioned **historical periods and events**, most of them the civil war and the Francoist period (*"Franco oppression"*, *"Dictatorship"*), but also the 20th century: *"The final part of the history"*. Some of them mentioned also *"The 80 years war"*, *"The Colon"*, *"Maps and explanations of Aragon, Phoenicians"*, *"War of the Spanish succession"* *"The historical meaning of the term sovereignty"* *"The reiteration of the antagonisms"* *"Republicanism"*, *"Too little renouncing the worst repressions received 1714 - 1909 – 1939"* and *"France period"*.

Fourteen [14] visitors either chose to **express their opinions** about the fact that history is always controversial: *"History writing is always biased/controversial"*, or gave too general answers, such as *"Political aspects"*, *"Religion and war politics"*, or made an evaluation of the Museum such as: *"It contains many anachronisms"*.

Three [3] referred to controversies of different **religions** and the Spanish Inquisition.

Regarding the missing stories, twenty-eight [28] replies referred to certain **historical periods** and **events** like: “*The Medieval era*”, “*The wedding of Ferdinand & Izabel*”, “*The revolution of the miners of Figol*” or “*The Second World War is very poor in explanations*”, but also to historic **personalities** like “*Magellan*” and “*Kingdom of Navarre*”.

Thirteen [13] of the replies focused on **issues and events** specific of **Catalonia** like: “*The bombing of liceu, school of Lleide, the Catalan Guernica!!*”, “*The origins of the identity*” and “*It misses information about the birth of the Catalan language*”, or “*Details of the roles played by Catalans during WWs*”.

Three [3] visitors needed more information about Francoism: “*The influence of Franquistas in the transition to democracy. The pact of forgetting between the left and the right.*” and “*The collaboration with Francoism*”. Six [6] visitors mentioned the relationship **with other countries and regions in Spain** like the “*Basque country*”, “*The empire of Toledo*”, “*The History of Aragon*” or “*What about France?*” and two [2] mentioned the exclusion of the **History of Spain**.

Five [5] answers focused on the need to present the story of **colonialism** and especially the “*Colonisation of America*”, four [4] mentioned the **Jewish history**, “*The Jewish people and their influence*”, and another four [4] **Art**: “*Gaudi, Picasso, Miro*”.

Two [2] answers pointed out the exclusion of religious facts: “*Colon and the dita Catholic*” and two [2] **the immigrants** “*Nothing missing, perhaps more needed on modern non-European immigrants to Catalonia*”.

Five [5] visitors needed more on: “*Alternative and feminist movement*”, “*Armed groups, like ETA and Tierra Lliure*”, “*The negative role of the Stalinists*” “*More history of Islam and the Greeks*”.

Some visitors made personal comments on the presentation, either positive like: “*Everything it does, is good for me*”, or negative like: “*It lacks the explanation of the links between the facts that determine the history*” or “*It might add a lot*”.

In the question about certain people excluded from the national museum twenty four [24] named **minority groups**, most of them the Jews, followed by the Gypsies, the Arabs and the Basques, **immigrants** or other ethnicities in general.

Seven [7] answers referred to **church history** like “*Protestants*”, “*non Catholic people*” or “*The Friars*”. Three [3] visitors focused on **political groups** like the “*The workers' movement*” and three [3] on “*People of colonies*”. Two [2] mentioned the exclusion of **homosexuals** and another [2] of **masonry**. Only one [1] mentioned a historical personality, *Jean Paul II*.

Nine [9] visitors mentioned other groups of people such as:

- Handicapped
- Hippies
- The women are less represented
- The Nazis
- The prisons
- North Europeans
- The armed group ‘Tierra Lliure’
- The Penitentiary
- Gironella and the 11th of September

Finally six [6] visitors made some general statements such as: "... there are always people under-represented", "Here everyone is Catalan? And the others that have built Catalonia?" or "For the moment I find it correct".

Bibliography

- Aronsson, P. and Bentz, E. (2011), "National Museums in Germany: anchoring competing communities" in Aronsson and Elgenius (eds), pp. 327-359
- Aronsson, P. and Elgenius, G. (eds) (2011), *Building National Museums in Europe 1750-2010*. Conference proceedings from *EuNaMus, European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen, Bologna 28-30 April 2011*. EuNaMus Report No 1. Published by Linköping University Electronic Press: http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp_home/index.en.aspx?issue=064
- Aronsson, P. (2011) 'Explaining National Museums. Exploring comparative approaches to the study of national museums', in Knell, S. J., Aronsson, P. and Amundsen, A., (eds) *National Museums. New Studies from around the World*, p. 29-54. London: Routledge.
- Blotkamp, C. (2004) 'Visual arts: the doom of the Golden Age', *Accounting for the Past: 1650-2000*, in volume 5 of *Dutch Culture in a European Perspective*, D. Fokkema and F. Grijzenhout (eds) Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 273-295.
- Bodenstein, F. (2011) "National Museums in the Netherlands" in Aronsson and Elgenius (eds), pp. 595-614.
- Car, D. (2001), "A museum is an open work" *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 7(2), pp. 173-183.
- Dawson, E. and Jensen, R. (2011), "Towards a contextual turn in visitor studies: evaluating visitor segmentation and identity-related motivations" in *Visitor Studies* 14(2), pp. 127-140.
- Falk, J.H. (2009), *Identity and the Museum Visitor Experience*, Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek.
- Falk, J.H. (2011) "Contextualising Falk's identity-related visitor motivation model" in *Visitor Studies* 14(2), pp. 141-157.
- Findlen, P. (1996) *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy*, University of California Press.
- Gazi, A. (2011), "National Museums in Greece: history, ideology, narratives" in Aronsson and Elgenius (eds), pp. 363-399.
- Hadjinikolaou, T. (2003), "Introduction", *Ethnographica*, vol 12/13, Nafplion, Peloponnesian Folklore Foundation and Museum, pp. 11-26 (in Greek)
- Hamilakis, Y. (2007). *The Nation and its Ruins*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ķencin, T. and Kuutma, K. (2011). "National Museums in Latvia" in Aronsson and Elgenius (eds), pp. 497-520.
- Kuutma, K. (2011) "National Museums in Estonia" in Aronsson and Elgenius (eds), pp. 231-260.
- Koschick, L. (ed.) *German Historical Museum. German History in Pictures and Documents*, Prestel, Muenchen, Berlin, London, N.Y., 2008.
- Museum of the History of Catalonia (2006), *The Museum of the History of Catalonia*, Generalitat Catalunya.
- Plantzos, D. and Damaskos, D. (eds) (2008), *A Singular Antiquity: archaeology and Hellenic identity in twentieth-century Greece*, Mouseio Benaki 3rd Supplement, Athens: Benaki Museum.
- Rounds, J. (2006), "Doing identity work in museums" in *Curator* 49(2), pp. 133-150.
- Sandell, R., Dodd, J. and Garland-Thomson, R. (eds), (2010), *Representing Disability: Activism and agency in the museum*, London: Routledge.

Seale, C. (ed.) (2012) *Researching Society and Culture*, 3rd edition, Sage Publications.

Widén, P. (2011), “National Museums in Sweden: a history of denied empire and a neutral state” in Aronsson and Elgenius (eds), pp. 881-902.

Eunamus – the project

European National Museums: Identity politics, the uses of the past and the European citizen

EuNaMus research project explores the creation and power of the heritage created and presented by European national museums. The focus in our project is on understanding the conditions for using the past in negotiations that recreate citizenship as well as the layers of territorial belonging beyond the actual nation-state.

This project is one of the few humanistic projects supported by the Seventh Framework Programme, run by the European Commission. It has grown out of collaboration between university partners connecting starting with a network of young and senior cultural researchers supported by the Marie Curie programme, and will for three years (2010–2013) proceed by a series of investigations beyond the stereotypical ideas of museums as either a result of outstanding heroic individuals, exponents of a materialization of pure Enlightenment ideas or outright ideological nationalistic constructs disciplining citizens into obedience.

The research is pursued through multi-disciplinary collaboration between eight leading institutions and a series of sub-projects studying institutional path dependencies, the handling of conflicts, modes of representation, cultural policy and visitors' experiences in national museums.

Understanding the cultural force of national museums will provide citizens, professionals and policy makers with reflexive tools to better communicate and create an understanding of diversity and community in developing cultural underpinning for democratic governance.

The major results will be available via Open Access, but a series of books will also come out of the efforts. The best way to keep up is to follow www.eunamus.eu.

Areas of research:

Mapping and framing institutions 1750-2010: national museums interacting with nation-making

Uses of the past: narrating the nation and negotiating conflict

The museology of Europe: the language of art, the local nation and the virtual Europe

Museum policies 1990-2010: negotiating political and professional utopia

Museum citizens: audience identities and experiences

National museums, history and a changing Europe

Coordinator:

Peter Aronsson, Professor of Cultural Heritage and Uses of the Past, Linköping University, SE

Partners:

Simon Knell, Professor of Museum Studies, University of Leicester, UK

Alexandra Bounia, Associate Professor of Museology, University of the Aegean, GR

Dominique Poulot, Professor in the History of Art, Université Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne, FR

Kristin Kuutma, Professor of Cultural Research, University of Tartu, EE

Arne Bugge Amundsen, Professor of Cultural History, University of Oslo, NO

Ilaria Porciani, Professor of Modern and Contemporary History and the History of Contemporary Historiography, University of Bologna, IT

Constantin Iordachi, Associate Professor of History, Central European University (Közép-Európai Egyetem), HU

Appendix 1

EuNaMus: Museum Citizens Questionnaire

We are carrying out an investigation into museum visitors with funding from the European Commission.
Please complete this short questionnaire and hand it back to the researcher. It should only take 8-10 minutes.
We really appreciate you taking the time to complete this questionnaire, thank you.
Your participation in the research will remain anonymous.



Legal Notice: The views expressed here are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

Right: ● Wrong: ○

Your Museum visit

Q1. Have you been to this Museum before? (Please tick one)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Q2. Who did you visit the Museum with today? (Please tick one)

- Alone
- With friends / family
- With a group

**Q3. Why did you come to the Museum today?
(Please tick all that apply)**

- To visit a specific exhibition or display
- For entertainment / pleasure
- For education / learning
- To experience the past
- Visiting with my friends and / or family
- Other reason (Please specify) _____

Q4. Is there an object (or a group of objects) in this Museum that you found particularly interesting regarding the nation's history?

- Yes (continue to Q.4a and Q.4b)
- No (continue to Q.5)
- Don't know (continue to Q.5)

Q4a. Please write the name of the object (or group of objects):

**Q4b. Why did you find this object (or group of objects) interesting?
(Please tick one)**

- Beautiful to look at
- Historically interesting
- Representative of our nation
- Expresses our European identity
- It is (they are) unique
- Means something to me personally (Please specify) _____
- Other (Please specify) _____

Q5. Do you consider this to be a National Museum?

- Yes (continue to Q.5a)
- No (continue to Q.5b)
- Don't know (continue to Q.6)

Q5a. If yes, please explain why _____

Q5b. If no, please explain why _____

Q5c. Has this knowledge influenced your decision to visit the Museum?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please do not write here

• **Q6. How well, if at all, are the following histories presented by this Museum?**

Statement	Well presented	Under presented	Not presented
The history of the this nation (beyond national borders)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The history of this country	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The history of the region to which this country belongs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The history of Europe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The history of the world	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6.a: Which, in your opinion, appears to be the most important for this Museum? (Please tick one)

- The history of this nation (beyond national borders)
- The history of this country
- The history of the region
- The history of Europe
- The history of the world

Q7. In your opinion, does this Museum contain any history that is controversial?

- Yes (continue to Q7a.)
- No (continue to Q8.)
- Don't know (continue to Q8.)

Q7a. If yes, what does it present? _____

Q8. Are there any stories about the past that you think are missing from this Museum?

- Yes (continue to Q8a.)
- No (continue to Q9.)
- Don't know (continue to Q9.)

Q8a. If yes, what are they? _____

Q9. In the past, certain people have been excluded from the National Museum including religious groups, social groups, ethnic groups and others. In your opinion, are there any people or groups of people that are missing from this Museum?

- Yes (continue to Q9a.)
- No (continue to Q10.)
- Don't know (continue to Q10.)

Q9a. If yes, who are they? _____

Please do not write in this area.

National Museums - some general questions

The following questions ask you to respond to some statements about National Museums more generally.
Please indicate your answer by ticking the appropriate response.

Q10. A National Museum should present the history of the nation:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree / Nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Only for the people of the nation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Only for foreign visitors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q11. National Museums should mostly be about: (Please tick one)

- The nation's past
- The nation's present
- The nation's future
- The nation's past and present
- The nation's present and future
- The nation's past, present and future

Q12. Which groups should establish National Museums? (Please tick up to 4)

- Public benefit foundations
- Grass-root initiatives
- Regional / local authorities
- Religious authorities / Church
- Different ethnic groups
- Non-government organizations (NGOs)
- European authorities
- Governments
- Individuals
- Private business or company
- Other (Please specify) _____
- None



Legal Notice: The views expressed here are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European commission.

Right: Wrong:

Q13. In your opinion, what are National Museums for?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree / Nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
To display the nation's treasure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To tell the story of great events and heroes in the nation's history	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To tell the stories of ordinary people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To give an accurate history of the nation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To present what it means to be a member of this nation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
To show the relationship between this nation and Europe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (Please specify) _____					

Q14. National Museums and controversial history. Please read the following two statements carefully before making your answer.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree / Nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
National Museums should be places where controversial heritage or history is debated	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A national museum should be used to state a nation's position on disputed heritage or history	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

About you

The following questions will only be used to help us to understand who has completed a questionnaire.
Your answers will be kept anonymous.

Q15. Nationality (Please tick one)

- Of this nation
 Other (Please specify) _____

Q16. Gender (Please tick one)

- Male
 Female

Q17. Age group (Please tick one)

- under 18
 18-30
 31-45
 46-65
 over 65

Q18. Residence (Please tick one)

- In this city
 Elsewhere in the region
 Elsewhere in the country
 In another country(Please specify) _____

Q19. Occupation (Please tick one)

- Looking after the house (homemaker)
 Student (school, college, university)
 Unemployed
 Retired
 Working in the private sector
 Working in the public sector
 Self-employed
 Other (Please specify) _____

Q20. Education (Please tick one)

- Basic education
 High / secondary school
 Higher education
 Other (Please specify) _____

Q21. Where do you feel your historical roots lie? (Please write your answer)

Q22. Where would you go to find out about national history?

	Always	Sometimes	Never
Formal study e.g. school, college, university course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Museum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Archaeological / Historical site	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Archive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Internet	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mass Media (film, TV, etc)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Family / Friend	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<input type="radio"/> Other (Please specify) _____			

Thank you very much for your time!

Please do not write here