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Abstract
The previous Head of Digital at Tate, John Stack, argues that digital transformation and the audience’s increasing expectation of participation are the two major changes during the last ten years (Mitchell 2014). This thesis addresses Tate Modern’s use of digital technologies with focus on how audience interaction and participation is facilitated through the affordances of digital technology. Additionally, this thesis examines how Tate’s digital policies correspond with Tate Modern’s actual practices, online and onsite, regarding audience participation and interaction.

Discrepancies regarding Tate Modern’s practical approach to audience interaction and participation in relation to its policies were identified. The audience was not genuinely invited to participate through digital technologies during the examined period.

Tate Modern, although being a leader in its field, still has some way to go in its digital development and its approach towards the audience before becoming a truly participatory museum.
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1. Introduction

This thesis examines the use of digital technologies at Tate Modern in London with focus on how audience interaction and participation is facilitated. The actual practices are examined in light of Tate Modern’s digital policies to examine potential discrepancies.

One source of inspiration for this thesis is Susanna Smith Bautista’s (Ph.D., University of California) *Museums in the Digital Age. Changing Meanings of Place, Community and Culture* (2014), in which Smith Bautista examines five American art museums’ use of digital technology. In one of the subchapters, Smith Bautista mentions Tate Museums’ way of working with digital technology but does not delve into detail due to her having focused on American museums. By applying Smith Bautista’s well documented methods of examining museums and their use of digital technology, this thesis aims at examining a museum of modern and contemporary art located in Europe: Tate Modern.

Tate Modern was chosen largely due to it being the most visited contemporary and modern art museums in the world (*The Art Newspaper* 2017:3, Henri Neuendorf 2016) and often upheld as a world leader within the museum industry that has transformed the way art is seen (Wullschlager 2016). Also, Smith Bautista’s pointing out Tate Modern as a museum that has done a remarkable job working with digital technology adds another layer of interest to the museum (2014:202).

Historically, museums have mainly been about material things. Museums have collected, preserved and exhibited physical objects and devoted the curatorial practice to exhibitions and collections revolving around the same physical objects. When entering the digital era, museums faced something that differed from the tangibility that had defined the museums up until then in terms of the onsite experience and the perception of the museum as an institution. However, much in line with museum’s mission to spread knowledge about the collections in a captivating way. Many museums today either work as, or aim at working as, media agencies (Carol Summerfield 2016) producing an extensive amount of content of various forms. When Jesse Ringham, until recently Digital Marketing Manager at Tate, specified what the communication and marketing department at Tate Modern does, he presented the following bullet points:

- “Film, imagery, articles, stories
- Experiences, memories, emotions

---

Tate Modern targets and communicates with its audience through a large number of channels many of which are digital. Eilean Hooper-Greenhill argues that: "museums, when they communicate through exhibitions, publications, advertisements and other methods such as videos, can be characterised as mass communication media" (1995:6). Nevertheless, communication through modern digital technology does not necessarily address a mass audience but a wide range of different audiences in masse. Digital technology has become increasingly interactive and enables dialogues with visitors both online (on the webpage and on social media) and onsite (at the museum). Digital developments have led to the coining of the concept ‘post-museum’ (Hooper-Greenhill 2000:xii) that highlights the changing relationship between the museum and audience where the audience are entering into a more participating role within the museum context. This change has also been brought up by the previous Head of Digital at Tate, John Stack, who argues digital transformation and the audience’s increasing expectance of participation to be the two major changes during the last ten years (Mitchell 2014).

Another concept that highlights the ever-changing nature of the museum is André Malraux’s le muse imaginaire (the imaginary museum) or ‘museum without walls’ (Parry 2010:119). This concept was developed in the late 1940s due to photographic reproductions of museum objects, but is still discussed among scholars as a way of understanding the contemporary museum.

Extensive quantities of literature have been written on the topic of museums’ use of digital technologies. As digital technologies are rapidly changing, the very nature of the subject quickly renders research obsolete for this thesis. A study done on a specific museum at one point in time doesn’t necessarily speak for other museums at a different point in time, just as theories concerning one technology doesn’t necessary apply to other more advanced
technologies. In light of this consideration, this thesis has a function and a purpose since it constitutes a contemporary view of Tate Modern’s use of digital technology.

1.1. Aim and research questions
By examining the use of digital technologies at a major European contemporary and modern art museum, this thesis contributes to the body of knowledge surrounding museums in the digital age and brings forth one of the leaders in the museum industry. In bringing forth one of the leaders in the field, this can serve as an example of good practice and the still unexploited potential. This thesis presents a combination of ethnographical research, document studies, and interview data with gatekeepers at Tate Modern from secondary sources, to triangulate the research data. The aim is to examine how Tate Modern uses digital technologies onsite and online in connection to the art collection. This examination is confined to only examining digital technologies in relation to the art collections due to collections being at the core of museum institution content and activities (Thomas 2016:65). This examination’s focus is on how Tate Modern uses digital technologies to enable participatory and interactive affordances. In particular, this thesis examines how Tate’s digital policies corresponds with the Tate Modern’s actual practices regarding audience participation and interaction. This was done using the following research questions:

- How does Tate’s policy documents address digital technologies, audience interaction, and participation?
- What kind of audience interaction and participation is made possible through the affordances of digital technology at Tate Modern?
- How does the audience use the interactive and participatory opportunities offered through the digital technologies?
- How well does the concept of the imaginary museum and the post-museum apply to Tate Modern's take on digital technologies?

1.2. Structure of the thesis
The introduction above is followed by section two which gives a short outline to the museum, Tate Modern, and puts it into context. The third section presents the theories and previous studies that this thesis draws upon and critically reflects on. The first part of the third section deals with the definitions of ‘interaction’, ‘participation’ and ‘affordances’. The second part of the third section deals with museums in the digital age while the third part moves on to the
concept of ‘museums without walls’. The fourth part of the third section deals with previous studies done on Tate Modern to demonstrate the need for an updated investigation of the use of digital technologies at the museum.

The fourth section of the thesis presents the methods used for this examination. This section also offers a reflection on ethics and the validity and reliability of the thesis. The fifth section deals with the materials used for this thesis and explains how they were dealt with. The sixth section presents gathered data from sources onsite and online together with photographs and screen prints to make the data as clear to the reader as possible. Section seven presents discussions connected to this thesis’s research questions. Section eight deals with the conclusions, implications and suggestions for further research. This is followed by references and the appendix.
2. **Background: Tate Modern**

Tate Modern has attracted millions of visitors year after year through a number of popular exhibitions and installations (Evamy 2016:56).

It all started in the year 1889 when the industrialist Henry Tate gifted his art collection to the British nation. Since it was not possible to fit Tate’s collection into the National Gallery, a new building had to be erected, the site we now know as Tate Britain. This was the first of the four major Tate sites we know today: Tate Britain, Tate Modern, Tate St Ives and Tate Liverpool.

Tate Modern opened in May 2000; explicitly to show modern and contemporary art in London. A former Bankside Power Station was chosen and converted into a gallery by the architects Herzog & De Meuron. The entrance area, also known as *The Turbine Hall*, is used for large installation displays. *The Boiler House*, connected to the Turbine Hall, became a gallery area, just as the recently built *Switch House*. Since Tate Modern opened it has been visited by more than 40 million people and generated an estimated £100 million in economic benefits to the city of London each year (Tate B).

Besides having a numerous temporary and modern art collection, Tate Modern is often considered a pioneer within the museum industry when it comes to adapting to the digital age (Barnett 2013). For example, the redesign for Tate’s webpage in 2012 was regarded a game changer within the museum industry which made Tate stand out as a “leading digital player”. The webpage has won several awards including Lovies, BIMAs, Baftas, Webbeys and best in class from SXSW (Tate G).
3. **Literary review and theoretical framework**

This section critically discusses the theories and concepts that frame and motivate this thesis focus on digital technologies used at Tate Modern.

3.1. **A brief introduction to three key concepts**

Maria Roussou (2010:248-9) provides a comprehensive definition of what exactly ‘interactivity’ is. Roussou uses *The Oxford English Dictionary*’s where interaction is described as mutual action between persons or things on each other. The interaction can take place between people, people and software, machines and machines and people and machines etcetera. Interaction takes place when the agents (human or non-human) act reciprocally on each other, together on others or with others. Roussou also brings forward the different levels of interaction in digital environments such as the higher level of interaction in for example computer games and the lower level of interaction when clicking on a mouse or using a VCR. Roussou’s distinctions will be useful when drawing conclusions regarding the audience’s interactive opportunities online and onsite.

*The Oxford English Dictionary* defines ‘participation’ as “the action of taking part in something” (2017). This definition doesn’t define any degrees of participating in something but will, non-the less, be useful when discussing the audience’s use of Tate Modern’s digital technologies and digital policies.

The concept of ‘affordances’ was coined by James Gibson in 1979. According to Anthony Chemero (2003), it is useful to understand the concept as a set of resources offered by the environment to any individual with the ability to use and perceive them. Therefore, the affordances are meaningful and provide opportunities for certain set of behaviours. This concept will be useful when examining the possible interactions and participations through Tate Modern’s digital technologies. As the concept implies, a thing or an environment offers a specific set of affordances to the individual. In this case, the affordances of Tate Modern’s digital technologies are of interest.

This thesis will look for audience participation and interaction through the affordances of digital technologies onsite and online. For example, when the audience are invited to contribute with meaning connected to the art collection or take a stance through likes and comments on social media.
3.2. Museums in the digital age

Susan Smith Bautista (2014) has used successful methods when examining museums’ use of digital technology in her book *Museums in the digital age. Changing meanings of place, community and culture*. Smith Bautista’s work revolves around five case studies at five American art museums where she examines the use of digital technologies. Smith Bautista’s study was conducted by means of site visits, interviews and observations on social media and on museum websites; a mix of methods that this thesis has drawn upon. However, Smith Bautista’s approach is more holistic; including temporary exhibitions and spaces not in direct connection to the art collection and online material concerning events unrelated to the art collection. This thesis focus is on the digital technologies in connection to the permanent collections at Tate Modern. One of the reasons for focusing on data connected to the art collection is Klaus Müller’s (2010:296) statement suggesting that the digitization of collections dominates the digital profile of most museums. When examining this, the very essence of the museum’s work with digitalisation can be discovered and presented.

As mentioned in the introduction, Smith Bautista mentions Tate Modern in one of her subchapters where she presents some of Tate Modern’s digital initiatives up to that date. However, Tate Modern launched a new webpage in June 2016 (Tate A), thus rendering Smith Bautista’s online observations from 2014 partly outdated. Smith Bautista also mentions multimedia guides in connection to the galleries and interactive zones with films, books, games and interactive media. It is however unclear if the interactive zones were in connection to the permanent exhibitions of the art collections or not during Smith Bautista’s visit.

Smith Bautista contextualized museums’ use of digital technology in a most interesting way. According to Smith Bautista (2014:27), new museology2 made the use of digital technology in museums more visitor-centric giving the audience agency in their learning and experience. The increased visitor agency has made museums work with and not merely for the visitors. This change is, according to Smith Bautista, visible in new museum experiences including “user-generated content, crowd-curated exhibitions, personalized online collections, and social media-supported affinity and membership groups” (Ibid. 28). The concept of new museology will be discussed in relation to the findings at Tate Modern in order to observe the potential move from passive visitors or audiences to active participants. This move will also be discussed in relation to the concept of the ‘post-museum’.

---

2 This concept refers to how museums started to be concerned about being socially relevant to its audience (Smith Bautista 2014:27).
This thesis’ focus is on how one of the world leaders within the museum industry, is using digital technologies in connection to the art collection and what kind of interaction is made possible for the audience. As mentioned above, Smith Bautista has included five museums in her study. Nevertheless, this case study deals with a single case. Tate Modern’s leading position in the museum industry is a crucial reason for not including more museums in this thesis, together with a more limited time-frame. Tate Modern is a trend-setting museum which makes it interesting to investigate to get a hint of where the rest of the industry is headed.

Alison Griffiths article Media Technology and Museum Display: A Century of Accommodation and Conflict offers insight on the past relationship between museums and media. Electronic media has been present in a wide range of museums since the mid 1980s. Interactive technologies have been employed as an attempt to democratize knowledge, spread information and raise museum attendance. Digital technologies regularly found in museums include computer games, touch-screens, large-screen installations etc. According to Griffith, the curator Kathleen McLean argues that multimedia platforms “[…] can activate an otherwise static exhibition with sound and moving images; provide a variety of viewpoints; engage visitors in multi-layered activities; and encourage and support interaction among people in an exhibition” (2004).

New technologies have always been discussed within the museum context. At a conference in 1903 in Mannheim, Germany, photography and the Laterna Magica were discussed as tools for museums to become more accessible to the working class. Today, curators are just as eager to make the exhibition experience more accessible to a wider audience by using new media without losing the scientific depth. According to Griffiths, new technologies help museums to compete with other amusements and educate the visitors without overshadowing the artefact. In year 1904, Dr. Ant Fritsch suggested that the museum audience could use phonograph recordings to take part of a short contextual description of the object exhibited. This method was regarded radical in the beginning of the century, just as computer installations at exhibitions were regarded in the end of the same century (2004).

The work by Griffiths offers useful insights into how new technologies historically have been utilized within the museum sector. Griffiths work will be valuable to contextualise the use of digital technologies at Tate Modern.

Ian Christie (2012) describes the postmodern and mediated museum as a “combination of Enlightenment memorial and theme park” in his article A Disturbing Presence? Scenes from the History of Film in the Museum. According to Christie, the museum has had no other choice than to “accede to its place in the culture of democratic spectacle” since mass audiences no
longer accepts exhibits that talk for themselves. The remark is sadly not further developed by Christie. The article mainly revolves around film and its place in the museum. Yet Christie believes the mediation within the museum to have gone too far to attract a larger audience. However, as brought to attention by François Penz, *United Kingdom’s museums, libraries and archives council* has identified the very same digital initiatives as crucial for engaging with new and young audiences (Penz 2012). This notion is also stressed by Michelle Henning (2006) through the ideas of Otto Neurath (one of the leading figures of the Vienna Circle) concerning the democratization of the availability of information. Just as John Falk and Lynn Dierking (2013:19) stresses the inclusion of digital media into exhibitions as “a strategy for creating museum-comfort today for tomorrow’s museum-going public” due to the digital habits of the young generations of today. Ross Parry (2010) even sees the museum’s digital presence online as equally important as their physical presence onsite. This statement is supported by Kira Eghbal-Azar et. Al.’s (2016) research in which the use of digital guides in museum galleries are growing in popularity.

In the article *Right Here…Right now…Art Gone Live!,* Gavin Hogben (2012:301-2) argue that most digital initiatives at museums are mere “tools of service and not of expression”. However, Matthew Fischer and Beth A. Twiss-Garrity (2007) argue that tools of the web 2.0, such as blogs, podcasts and image sharing, can transform the experience of the museum from passive to active. The visitors using such tools become active contributors participating in the exhibition narrative. The cultural critic and philosopher Hilde S. Hein (2006) argue the model of public art for all kinds of museums. Hein defines public art as a process of public engagement in exhibitions resulting in new cultural artefacts and knowledge. Just as Hogben and Hein, Smith Bautista emphasises the democratisation of the museum space. According to Smith Bautista:

[…] mobile technologies allow visitors to experience the museum wherever and whenever they choose. With mobile tours […], visitors can call a number to hear more about the work they are standing in front of – inside museum galleries, outside in the museum gardens or exteriors, or through the city – or visitors can call the number from their home at a later date and time, perhaps never intending a physical visit to the museum. (2014:11)

Andrea Witcomb (2013) examines the links between contemporary museums and media in the book *Re-Imagining the Museum. Beyond the Mausoleum.* One of Witcomb’s contributions is that she highlights how museums always have been associated with popular culture because of
the use of contemporary displaying techniques. Witcomb argues that the inclusion of media such as films, audio-visual technologies, interactive computer information points, magazines etc. can be understood as “making the museum continuous with modern media forms” (2003:103). This argument will be considered in the discussion regarding Tate Modern’s use of digital technologies onsite and online.

Museums’ use of digital media made Hooper-Greenhill (2000:xi) coin the term ‘post-museum’. This term addresses the changing museum authority as an effect of belonging in a digital culture where visitors are co-creators of meaning rather than mere recipients. According to Hooper-Greenhill, museums in a digital culture work with, rather than for, their visitors. However, as brought into light by Konstantinos Arvanitis (2010:172), many museum mobile applications are still using one-way transmission of knowledge rather than including other voices in the post-museum sense.

A way of communicating with the audience that has become increasingly popular is through social media. Kevin Pfefferle (2009) argues that by creating an approachable online presence on social media, the audience is more likely to interact and connect more personally to the institution. This engagement leads to a more extensive organic outreach for the content produced by the museum.

Digital culture has also affected the way museums and other sites of cultural heritage organise their information about objects. According to Lev Manovich (2010), the computer age has developed a correlate to the novel and cinema in the modern age, namely the database. Manovich offers a useful definition of the database as a structured collection of data; which is further described to lack a beginning or an end where the objects it contains is of equal importance. According to Manovich, there are different types of databases: hierarchical, network, relational and object-oriented. The different types of databases are defined by the way they organise the data. The hierarchical database model has a tree-like structure where each object has one parent, while the network database model is more flexible and represents the relationships between the objects (one object can have several parents). This differs from the relational database model where the objects are organised into tuples; grouped due to the objects relationships. The object-oriented database system organises the data into hierarchical groups that might get properties from groups higher in the hierarchy. When made publically accessible, a database can offer a user a tool for search, view and navigation. Manovich suggests that a user that interacts with a database through an interface is also a user of a specific narrative while following the links between objects built by the creator of the database. However, as Manovich states, there are databases and interfaces with multiple paths that offers hyper-narratives (to be
understood as interactive narratives). The creator of the database and the interface can control the logic of the narratives offered to the user, but not how the user chooses to interact with it (2010:64-70). Manovichs thoughts on databases will be useful when making conclusions regarding Tate’s online art collection database.

3.3. Museums without walls

The concept of ‘museums without walls‘; originally le muse imaginaire, was coined by André Malraux (Parry 2010:119). In 1947, Malraux came to question the traditional role of museums due to the spread of photography. Photographic reproductions of art objects made art available to people who never had visited a museum (Huhtamo 2010:123) nor seen the physical art object. According to Antonio M. Battro (2010:136), the concept ‘museum without walls‘, or as he calls it: ‘the imaginary museum‘, can be interpreted as a collection of images reproduced by modern technology.

What is interesting about Battro’s essay on Malraux is how he has drawn upon the thought on photography and extended it to include the digital reproductions of today. Battro (2010:140) mentions the Hermitage’s extensive work with developing high-resolution digital images of the art collection. According to Battro, this is an example of the ‘imaginary museum‘ becoming a virtual museum. One of the aspects of digital reproductions mentioned by Battro is the high educational value. Due to digitalisation, it is possible for a user to visualise an artwork reproduction without seeing the original physical art object. Digital databases often offer the opportunity to zoom into greater detail on the artworks than analogue photographic copies or the original physical artwork allows. However, as Battro highlights, browsing through an artwork collection database on a museum webpage and walking through the physical museum are two significantly diverse acts. Therefore, the ‘imaginary museum‘ is not a substitute for the physical museum, but rather an extension of it.

Another factor mentioned by Areti Galani and Matthew Chalmers (2010:161) is the social factor when visiting an art museum, either onsite or online. The authors stress the importance for the visitors to talk about the seeing art objects, not just seeing them. As a part of this argument, the authors bring forward research highlighting that interaction with digital technology can inhibit social interaction. Just as digital technology in physical galleries can draw the visitor’s attention away from the physical objects to the digital device (Ibid. 164). The authors however stress the importance of creating digital technologies supporting social interaction in museums, not just presenting information. The social interaction can take place
on site or online, but is a way of enriching the art experience (Ibid. 167). These thoughts will be relevant when discussing how the audience use the interactive opportunities online and onsite.

3.4. Tate Modern

A lot has been written about Tate Modern. Two areas that have been subject to many examinations are Tate Modern’s wide range of exhibitions (D’Arcy, 2012, Henrique 2012, Blazwick, 2001, Dudley, 2013) and the art collection (Foster, 2004, Walsh, Dewdney 2017, Martin 2015, Watson 2014). Other authors have examined how Tate Modern has affected the local Bankside neighbourhood in London (Serota; Hyslop, 2011, Wilks-Heeg; North, 2007), the architecture (Bin, 2008, Moore; Ryan; Hardwicke; Stamp 2000), issues regarding visitors (Weir, 2008, Caldwell; Cosshall 2003, Harvie, 2009, Hancock; Ross; Virden; Keizer; Cox; Jarra; Powell; Bagnell 2004, Dean; Donnellan; Pratt, 2010), museum branding (Rentschler; Hede 2009), education (Charman; Ross, 2006, Ross; Hancock; Bagnall, 2004, Dear, 2001), Tate’s vision (March 2004) and Tate’s membership program (Slater; Armstrong 2010).

When it comes to Tate Modern and its digital practices there are some interesting examinations. As mentioned, Smith Bautista brings attention to Tate Modern in her book Museums in the Digital Age. Changing Meanings of Place, Community and Culture (2014). However, Smith Bautista does not go into detail due to her focus on American museums.

Another study on the subject is Touched from a Distance. The Practice of Affective Browsing by Martijn Stevens (2016). Stevens has explored the concept of haptic vision in relation to Tate Modern’s online collection. The haptic vision refers to an experience that does not necessarily depend on the material manifestation of the object being experienced. By using Tate’s database as an example, Stevens shows how artworks get multiple connections to other artworks though being geographically or historically far removed, for example by linking them due to the –ism or mood of the artworks. Stevens refers to online collections as “technologies of absent presence” (2016:18). This means that digitised objects can be both present and absent; they mimic an object in the real world but is still fundamentally different due to its virtual being. Stevens work offers an interesting theoretical angle to use on Tate Modern’s art collection online. This thesis will however go into greater detail regarding the use on digital technologies related to the collection, not just on the website, but onsite and on social media as well.

Jenny Kidd and Rosie Cardiff (2017) have examined the need for a reflection on ethics due to Tate Modern’s dealing with visitor generated content. Through several interviews with staff members at Tate Modern, the authors come to conclude that “inconsistency and improvisation” is at the core of the museum’s approach to the content. The authors find it reassuring due to how ethics tend to be situated, often improvised and adaptive. This study won’t be of further use since this
thesis does not discuss ethical questions related to audience interaction and participation.

3.5. Chapter summary
This summary offers a presentation of the most important concepts presented in this literary review. Firstly, the concepts of ‘interaction’, ‘participation’ and ‘affordances’ are crucial for the understanding of Tate Modern’s work with digital technologies. Secondly, the concept of ’new museology’, as presented by Smith Bautista (2014). This concept will be useful when discussing the museum audience’s move towards a more active role.

Thirdly, theories regarding the importance of using digital technologies to activate and stay relevant to the audience will be discussed considering the findings at Tate Modern.

Another important concept is ‘post-museum’ coined by Hooper-Greenhill (2000). This concept highlights how digital technologies could transform the audience from mere recipients to co-creators. This concept is highly related to the concept of ‘new museology’ in terms of the audience’s changing role.

The last main concept is ‘museums without walls’; coined by Malraux, but seen through the conceptual lens of Battro (2010). One of the major contributions of Battro is the development of the concept into the ‘virtual museum’.
4. Methodology

This section presents the mingled methodologies used in the thesis and explains how they were utilised in examining the research questions.

4.1. Case study

The methodology of case studies was chosen to facilitate a deeper study of Tate Modern’s use of digital technologies. A case study is defined by its focus on an individual unit (Flyvbjerg 2006); that’s why this thesis offers a case study on a single museum. Since Adrijana Biba Starman advocates single case studies (2013), it was of great importance to find a suitable museum to conduct the study at.

The data collected at Tate Modern was examined considering relevant theories and previous examinations of digital technologies at museums. The aim was to create a combination of theories (context independent data) and practical context-dependent data. Theories was applied to context-dependent data to deepen the understanding of the use of digital technologies at Tate Modern.

As Bent Flyvbjerg (2006) argues, context-dependent knowledge is crucial for human understanding and constitutes the core of expert knowledge. Choosing to conduct a case study is more about choosing the boundaries of the material than choosing an actual method. Flyvbjerg further states that in-depth case-studies are useful to make generalizable findings since case-studies are an efficient way of finding ‘black swans’ and falsifying bad hypothesis. However, this thesis does not aim at making generalizable findings applicable to other museums. Nevertheless, the findings in this thesis might become useful in other studies regarding Tate Modern’s use of digital technologies. This study might offer insights into where the museum industry is headed due to Tate Modern’s leading position when it comes to implementing digital technologies.

4.2. An ethnographic approach

This thesis also employs qualitative ethnographic approach to examine Tate Modern’s use of digital technologies in relation to its art collection. Ethnographical research is often conducted through interviews, observations and onsite data gathering (Smith Bautista 2014). The material for this thesis was mainly collected through observations comprising of data collection onsite and online; gathering data on multimedia guides, smartphone apps, webpages, social media channels and other digital initiatives onsite with a connection to the art collection at Tate
Modern. Data from policy documents and interviews, with gatekeepers at Tate Modern was also collected. This approach was selected since no permission to access the gatekeepers in person was given. Using secondary sources with interviews was a pragmatic approach to accessing statements regarding digital technologies and audience participation and interaction. However, personal semi-structured interviews would have been preferable since this method didn’t grant a chance to ask follow-up questions to the statements.

Since this thesis uses an ethnographic research approach to Tate Modern, the museum was treated as a separate cultural community. Therefore, it was of importance that the data was collected through a combination of secondary sourced interviews, observations online and onsite to gain a fuller picture of Tate Modern’s use of digital technologies.

The ethnographic approach to the material offers direct observations of Tate Modern’s use of digital technologies and what kind of interaction the audience can engage in. As Susana Smith Bautista (2014) argues, using an ethnographical approach to digital material as well as physical, is helpful when examining how online and physical practices are related.

The scope of the online materials was limited by choosing an appropriate time during which the communication must have been conducted to be included; that is, during February. One month of gathering online material was appropriate to facilitate an analysis due to this course’s short time limit. However, the short data collection period makes it necessary to regard this thesis as a pilot study offering indicative insights for further studies of the subject.

The material onsite was gathered during four days at the museum during the same month. The material was recognized through its public accessibility and it being a digital technology, with Tate Modern as a sender, carrying content related to the art collection.

4.3. Interview data

As Allison Stewart clarifies, going through gatekeepers is necessary to gain permission to study the desired museum. Stewart recommends contacting some of the senior staff onsite and that is what was done for this thesis (2014).

Tate’s research department was contacted via e-mail to facilitate interviews with employees dealing with digital technology at Tate Modern. However, Tate turned down the opportunity to partake in interviews due to a heavy workload. Some of the senior staff members dealing with digital technology was in addition contacted through LinkedIn, but without success. Therefore, this thesis had to settle for interview data from articles, books and press releases to contextualize the data. The gathered statements made by the respondents was
questioned and/or verified through observations of Tate’s practices online and onsite. The methodological approach to the gathered data through these sources was thematic; using theme connected keywords (digital technologies, participation, interaction) to determine their relevance and contextualise the thesis.

4.4. Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis was used to describe the content found in the comment fields on Tate’s social media channels. This method identifies patterns found in the information of interest (Boyatzis 1998: vii). This was done to clarify what kind of engagement the different social media posts gained during their first day and night online. The identified themes was found on a manifest level of the texts. Due to the large number of comments, this approach enables a more conclusive discussion rather than discussing each single unit. Examples of themes found in the text used for this thesis are personal art experiences, emojis and questions posted to Tate.

4.5. Ethics

The Association of Internet Researchers have created guidelines for studies using online material. The guidelines stress the importance of treating persons who become object to research with respect and to not present them in a recognizable manner in the research text, especially when the research relates to intimate issues (AOIR 2012). However, this thesis does not cover intimate issues, but will nevertheless not present user details of people communicating with the museum online. This is because no permission was asked in order observe content produced by users on the museum’s social media posts. During the observation processes, no contributions in the online discussions were made in order not to affect the nature of ongoing dialogues.

When visiting Tate Modern, no photographs were taken of persons using the various digital technologies due to the ethical dimensions. It would not have been possible to gain permission from all visitors that potentially could have been photographed. That is why the decision not to take pictures of persons at Tate Modern was taken. However, one image of persons using the Timeline of Modern Art has been borrowed from Tate’s webpage to illustrate how multiple persons can interact with the digital touch screen.
4.6. Validity and reliability

In terms of validity, that is “the extent to which an account accurately represents the social phenomena to which it refers” (Hammersley, cited by Silverman 2015:90), this thesis offers a high amount of transparency. The collected data is summarized in the appendix and is also highlighted through several representative examples in the findings section. The selection of highlighted examples is motivated when presented. The collected data has not been subject to theoretical speculations when presented in the findings section, but is rather objectively presented due to its reader-independent qualities.

When it comes to the thesis’ reliability, that is “the degree of consistency with which instances are assigned to the same category by different observers or by the same observer on different occasions” (Ibid. 455), one can only assume that an investigation taking place during February dealing with the same questions would find the same data. However, since the examination onsite only took place during four days, an examination during another four-day period in February might have found another digital feature that wasn't present during my visit.

One aspect that adds to the thesis' reliability is its mix of methods when collecting data on Tate Modern's use of digital technologies. One being onsite and online observations, the second being gathering of interview data and the third being gathering data from policy documents. This mix of data drawn from different contexts gives a fuller picture of Tate Modern's use of digital technologies.
5. **Materials**

This section of the thesis presents the different kinds of materials used in the thesis to answer the research questions. The thesis’s approach to the materials is clarified in this section.

5.1. **Social media**

The social media examined in this thesis are the ones featured on Tate’s webpage, namely: *Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, Google+, Instagram, Pinterest and Tumblr*. All social media posts related to Tate’s art collection made during February 2017 are included in the study and are summarized and presented in the appendix. 44 social media posts were made by Tate during this period.

The social media data is presented in the appendix using the following categories: *publication date, content, format, engagement* and *data gathering date*. The first category, *publication date*, was chosen to organise the data in a chronological order and to facilitate an audit of the data. The second category, *content*, was chosen to give a picture of the communication made by Tate in the specific social media channel. Attention was particularly paid to Tate’s way of engaging the audience. The third category, *format*, was chosen to describe how the content was presented, e.g. through videos, written words, imagery etc. The fourth category, *engagement*, was chosen to highlight how the audience engages with the content created by the museum. Special attention was paid on dialogues between the museum and the audience. The engagement was measured to examine what kind of content that gets the most response from the audience. The number of likes, shares and comments was counted and are presented in the appendix. The data in the comment fields was gathered using a thematic analysis in order to find out what kind of content the audience produced in the comment fields of Tate’s posts. The fifth category, *data gathering time*, was chosen to offer the reader transparency. The longer time a post has been online, the more engagement could possibly have occurred.

When presenting the data in the next section of the thesis, the data is supported by screen prints to make the data more accessible to the reader. The social media posts that are the most representable in terms of engagement rate and/or content type have been highlighted as examples to offer a deeper understanding of Tate’s online presence.

A limitation that must be mentioned here is that this thesis only takes social media posts (and the following engagement in the comments field) created by Tate into account. Social media posts on personal accounts related to Tate’s art collection won’t be presented in the
appendix, but the phenomena will however be mentioned in the thesis’ discussion on social media. This limitation was chosen due to the large amount of related data created by the audience on personal social media pages. One example of the large amount of content on personal social media pages is the use of the hashtag #tatemodern that has been used more than 400 000 times on Instagram.

The data from Tate Modern’s social media was gathered during February 2017. An important note on Tate Modern’s social media accounts is that all accounts linked from the webpage, except for the Facebook account, are shared with the three other Tate museums (Tate Britain, Tate Liverpool and Tate St. Ives). The Facebook account is shared by Tate Modern and Tate Britain. When it comes to Twitter, there are several accounts connected to the Tate museums, such as @TateResearch, @TateBot, @TateImages, @TateLiverpool, @TateCollectives, @Tate_Publishing, @TateExchange and @TateYPs. However, only the Twitter account linked to from the webpage, @Tate, will be included in this study due to the extent of the material. However, since this thesis deals with the social media posts related to the art collection (that is shared by the four museums), the shared social media accounts won’t be a problem. Social media posts dealing with content related to a specific museum other than Tate Modern won’t be included in this study.

A final note on Tate Modern’s social media is that the Tumblr account is connected to the initiative Tate Collectives; a mission to connect young people to Tate’s art. The Tumblr account is shared by the Tate museums.

5.2. Webpage

Tate Modern shares its webpage with the three other Tate museums, which makes it hard to tell which museum is behind some of the content on the webpage. However, it is possible to find artworks from the Tate collection exhibited at Tate Modern and examine how digital technologies have been used in relation to them.

---

3 An account focusing on Tate’s research centre.
4 A bot that tweets random objects from the collection at the four Tate museums.
5 An account sharing e.g. artworks from the collection, shots from exhibitions and archival material.
6 An account focusing on Tate’s mission to connect young people to art through festivals, workshops etc.
7 An account dedicated to Tate Modern’s collaborative space called Tate Exchange that takes place once a year; bringing together the audience and international artists.
8 An account dedicated to Tate’s young Patrons aged 18-40 years old.
The observed content on the webpages is not listed in the appendix due to the extent of the material. Unlike the social media posts, the content on the webpage is mostly lacking a publication date which makes it hard to list content published in February. Since a lot of the content on the webpage is topical for longer periods (information about the collections, artworks in the collection etc.), it is important to include content published earlier than February 2017 as well. Therefore, this thesis will offer an observation overview of the webpage, as it is, during February 2017. The thesis focuses on how Tate Modern is presenting the art collection and how the audience can participate and interact with Tate Modern and each other on and through the webpage.

The data gathered on the webpage is presented together with supporting screen prints to offer a greater understanding of Tate’s online presence. The examples from the webpage have been selected to reflect the variety of the material in the data base. When presenting examples from the webpage, differences in the breadth of information are highlighted to offer an insight into how the online presentation of different artworks in the collection can differ.

5.3. Site visits
Tate Modern was visited during four days in February. During the visit, attention was paid to the use of digital technologies onsite in connection to the art collection. When examining the digital technologies, it was of great importance to find out what kind of interaction the digital technologies made possible for the user. When in the collection display galleries, attention was also paid to the visitors in the galleries using the digital technology. The aim was to get an idea about how they engaged with the digital technologies. However, this study only offers a glimpse into the actual use of digital technologies by visitors since no permission to, for example, follow them around the galleries was obtained. This has limited this thesis’ insights into the actual use made by visitors. However, as mentioned above, the focus is on what kind of interaction the digital technologies onsite offer the users. This is exemplified through photographs taken during the visit at Tate Modern and a photograph from Tate’s webpage.

Digital artworks are not included in the onsite observations. Only digital technologies highlighting the art collection with Tate Modern as originator was included in this study.

5.4. Interviews
As mentioned in the previous section of the thesis, Tate Modern turned down partaking in semi-structured interviews for this thesis. However, interview data from secondary sources such as
articles, press releases and books were gathered to contextualize this study. This approach was chosen as a way of making up for the loss of the data that could have been obtained from semi-structured interviews. The data chosen as material in this thesis deals with digital technologies and adds to the knowledge of Tate’s practices. This category of material is found in the section 6.1. Digital policies.

5.5. **E-mail newsletters**
This thesis took e-mail newsletters into account that was sent to my personal e-mail account during February 2017. This type of material was chosen since e-mail newsletters are a part of Tate’s digital presence and could offer valuable insights into how Tate is using digital technologies to facilitate audience engagement related to the art collection.

5.6. **Digital policies**
To offer insights into how Tate addresses digital technologies, data from policy documents and digital strategies was collected. Focus has been paid to issues relating to audience interaction and participation. When bringing forward strategies and policy documents, potential discrepancies between aim and outcome can be brought to attention and discussed. This category of material is found in the section 6.1. Digital policies.
6. **Findings**

This section presents the findings onsite and online regarding Tate Modern’s use of digital technologies in relation to the art collection. As an introduction to the findings, this section offers insights into Tate's digital policies as presented in strategy documents, together with interview data.

6.1. **Digital policies**

In 2013, Tate launched a digital strategy for the three year to come with the headline: *Digital as a Dimension of Everything*: which outlined a guide for the digital transformation of the Tate organisation. In this strategy, the previous Head of Digital at Tate, John Stack, developed a holistic digital proposition to achieve Tate’s goal to endorse public pleasure and understanding of art. The digital mission proceeds from Tate’s Director Sir Nicholas Serota’s idea that the future museum will be rooted in the very buildings it occupies but will address audiences around the globe. According to Serota, the authority of the future museum will depend on how well this is done (Stack 2013). This ambition led to the formulating of the following digital principles:

”Tate’s audiences will have digital experiences that:

- increase their enjoyment and understanding of art
- provoke their thoughts and invite them to participate
- promote the gallery programme
- provide them with easy access to information
- entice them to explore deeper content
- encourage them to purchase products, join Tate and make donations
- present an elegant and functional interface whatever their device
- take place on the platforms and websites they use
- minimise any obstacles they may encounter

To achieve this, we will take an approach that is:

- audience-centred and insight-driven
- constantly evaluated and enhanced
- well designed and architectured
- distributed across multiple platforms
When the digital strategy was written for the four Tate galleries, Tate’s art collection was already digitised and a new goal to digitise the archive, special library collections and artist books was set. Another goal highlighted in the digital strategy is greater curatorial engagement with the online art and archive collection and in the digital spaces overall. The experience of the galleries is also mentioned in the digital strategy; aiming at transforming visitor experiences with Wi-Fi-connections to enable the use of the extended websites for onsite use. Another dimension of the visitor experiences mentioned in the digital strategy is interactive comment walls linked to social media, which Tate Modern wishes to deploy more widely (Ibid.).

Other important digital aspects that affect the way Tate addresses the collection is mentioned in the strategy, i.e. the aim at creating short films and blog posts using the website, social media and emails. Tate’s curators are encouraged to write blog posts relating to Tate’s exhibitions. The use of social media is a way to engage the current audience and to reach out to new audiences. Another way to engage the audience is through the social collections online. The audience is encouraged to use the social learning features connected to the online art and archive collection. This is mentioned as a way to enter into a “wider digital ecosystem”, increase audience engagement and “augment the digitised collection with audience voices and ideas.” Yet another way to increase the engagement mentioned in the strategy is through smartphone apps offering digital content connected to the galleries (Ibid).

Since 2013, additions to the digital strategy has been made. The website, www.tate.org.uk, is mentioned as home to several digital initiatives, besides the online art collection, such as TateShots, Tate Kids, Tate’s online learning resources and Tate Collectives. These initiatives are still hosted on the refreshed website that was rolled out in year 2016, but are quite hard to find since they are still located in the old web environment.

Other digital initiatives mentioned in the digital strategy are new sections on the website for planning visits, a new way-finding smartphone app to help visitors to find their way in the galleries and engaging in-gallery experiences sponsored by Bloomberg (Tate C). One of the Bloomberg project that is presented in the findings section is The Timeline of Modern Art; an interactive digital screen presenting Tate’s art collection on a timeline. According to Tate’s director Serota, this is one of Tate’s efforts to meet “the growing demand for participation and digital interaction” (Tate 2015).
The until recently director of Tate Modern, Chris Dercon, argues a connection between digital availability of artworks and increasing number of visitors to museum, saying:

They [the audience] want to find out what the presence of that one strange object between other strange objects could mean, and how and why a curator or a collector decided to put them together. So we need stories. I often use the slogan: “We raise questions that Google cannot answer.” (Bechtler & Imhof 2014:74)

According to the digital strategy update from 2016 – 2017, Tate wishes to “balance the needs of visitors who come to the galleries with those who want to learn, participate and engage with art and artists on digital platforms. By providing a compelling online experience Tate will significantly grow its audience and monetise the online traffic.” As clarified in the digital strategy, focus is on gaining digital growth and engagement (Tate C).

When Stack, the previous Head of Digital at Tate, was interviewed on Tate Modern’s digital transformation, he explained that the core of the museum practices is the same as ten years ago. That is; making exhibitions, research, collection display, publishing, education and conservation. However, Stack highlights two key areas of change: audience behaviour and digital technology. The first key change is due to the audience expecting participating. This change is emphasised as a big opportunity for museums whose missions are about engagement (Mitchell 2014). The second key change, digital technology, is said to change everything. Stack believes digital technology to soon be a part of every function of the museum (Ibid).

6.2 Multimedia guide
Tate Modern has a multimedia guide available for its permanent exhibitions in the collection display galleries. The user can choose which part of Tate Modern to explore: Bolier House or Switch House (see image 1). The image illustrates the different floors in Tate Modern’s two houses and offers an easy overview of where the different parts of the collection are exhibited.

When the user has chosen which house to explore, more information about what kind of collections the different floors hosts will appear. In this step (see image 2) it is possible to see the names of the collection display, for example: Materials and Objects, Media Networks, Artist and Society and In the Studio. When entering one of the parts of the collection on display, for example Media Networks (see image 3), the user gets an overview of the artworks exhibited in that very part of Tate Modern. Each artwork in the multimedia guide has a unique number (matched to the very same number next to the physical artwork in the gallery), the artist’s name, the name of the artwork and the location of the artwork in the physical gallery.
When choosing an artwork to explore further in the multimedia guide, the user gets to see a bigger version of the artwork (see image 4). To explore the artwork further, the user can go on to “About this work” to listen to more information about the work and the artist (see image 5) or to “Credits” in order to get information about the credentials of the presented material (see image 6). The same multimedia guide structure is used for all the galleries displaying the Tate collection. However, some of the artworks are presented by audio with the artist him/herself talking about the piece, videos with artists at work, commentaries by art critics and other cultural authorities. Something that must be mentioned is that not all artworks exhibited in the galleries are included in the multimedia guide. The user will find artworks in the galleries that do not have the unique number code next to the information signs.

The multimedia guide is only accessible inside Tate Modern. If a user would try to leave the building with it, an alarm would be set off in order to prevent the exit. The multimedia guide can be rented in exchange for a fee at the multimedia desk.

During the observations made at Tate Modern, a rather small number of users were seen with the multimedia guide. Many of them were visiting the galleries by themselves; strolling through the galleries with their headphones on stopping in front of particular artworks of interest. A smaller number of parents were seen visiting the galleries at Tate Modern together with a child; each carrying a multimedia guide and headphones. Interaction between the parents and their children in connection to the multimedia guide were a result of the parent wanting to help the child with the device.
The multimedia guide does not make any advanced human to machine interaction possible. The user is only able to click on the preferred content, but cannot contribute to the content or share it on social media.

6.3. Mobile applications

The main mobile application Tate is used for the three museums Tate Modern, Tate Britain and Tate Liverpool (see image 7). The user can swipe between the museums and choose which museum to get information about. When choosing Tate Modern, the user can choose between Art, Activity and Eat and Shop (see image 8). To get to the collections, the user must choose Art. In the next step, the user can choose to explore the exhibitions at Tate Modern or the artists exhibited there. When choosing an exhibition, for example the gallery Start Display (image 9); exhibiting some of Tate Modern’s most beloved pieces from the collection, the user can choose from a wide range of options. If the user is using the mobile application onsite, it is possible to get directions from the current position in the museum to the gallery due to iBeacons located throughout the galleries (Tate Guide 2017:5). This function is also connected to all artworks in the mobile application. When finding an artwork of interest, the user can get the directions to find it in the museum. However, the user can just as well use the mobile application from a different location, such as the visitor’s home for example. By offering this remote function, Tate Modern brings the art collection into the everyday life of the user.
The user is offered a short introduction\(^9\) to the exhibition’s theme and can choose among the different rooms in the gallery. When choosing room two for example, the user gets a call to explore the art in this room and a question: what emotion do you feel when you think of a colour? When choosing among the artworks in the gallery made accessible on the mobile application, most of the artworks are presented with images followed by the name of the artist and the artwork’s name and production year. When clicking on Henri Matisse’s *The Snail* (1953) (see image 10), the user gets to see a larger image of *The Snail* but can also get directions on how to see the physical artwork in the gallery. The user can choose to take part of audio commentaries by clicking on audio links (see image 11). There’s also written information about the artwork (see image 11) and further details on the artwork such as medium, dimensions, acquisition and copyright details.

\(^9\) Some of the galleries have additional audio information about the exhibition.
All the artworks presented in this mobile application share the same structure. However, the amount of information differs. Some of the artworks are not presented with an image and others don’t have audio commentary. Just as some rooms in the galleries do have additional information about what they contain and why, while other rooms do not. This applies to the presentation of some of the artists too. It is possible to get additional information about some of the artists while the information about other artists is more limited.

When entering Tate Modern in the first step (see image 7) and choosing the Art section, it is possible to click on Or choose an artist in order to access a list of all artists currently on display at Tate Modern (see image 12). This step gives the user the possibility to get an overview of all artists displayed at the museum, but also to browse for a particular artist. When clicking on an artist’s name, for example Magdalena Abakanowics, the user gets to see all artworks made by Abakanowics currently exhibited at Tate Modern (see image 13). When clicking on an image, the user gets to see a larger version of the chosen artwork together with directions and artwork details (image 14).
This mobile application does not offer more interactivity than merely clicking on the information of interest. Just as when using the multi-media guide, the user is not a co-creator of content, but can choose how to navigate through the content on the device. There are no possibilities to save works of interest or to share them on social media. The mobile application is rather a guide tool offering one-way communication that the user can choose content from based on personal preferences.

When visiting the galleries, a lot of visitors were seen using their mobile phone. However, it was not possible to distinguish the ones using Tate’s mobile application from the ones using it for other purposes.

6.4. **The Timeline of Modern Art**

Tate Modern has a cooperation with the Bloomberg Philanthropies to develop digital projects to connect visitors with art and artists. One of the results of this project is a 6.5-metre-long interactive digital touch screen wall displaying a timeline of modern art from the collection (Tate 2015). This touch screen is not located in one of the collection display galleries but in the *Clore Welcome Room* located next to the Turbine Hall at the bottom floor in Boiler House.

*The Timeline of Modern Art* presents artworks from Tate’s collection in a constantly changing flow of artworks (see image 15). Focus is paid on artworks, artists and art movements during the modern era. The users can interact with the touch screen together; clicking on artworks or words of interest. When clicking on an artwork, it enlarges and is presented with short information about the artist and other artworks by the same creator (see image 16).
Some of the presentations of artwork and art movements are more content rich than others; showing video clips and longer text presentations. Nevertheless, since the artwork flow on the touch screen only showcases artwork images or headlines with names of art movements until clicked upon, it is what draws the visitors’ attention that determines what will be showcased. If the visitor wishes to read an extensive amount on art history, it must be stumbled upon due to the limitations of the touch screen. However, when visiting *The Timeline of Modern Art*, the observed visitors were zapping through the artworks without spending much time on reading the text content. From an observer’s point of view, it appeared as the main interest was to explore the functions of the touch screen rather than the art history, due to the quick speed when browsing through the material.

As mentioned earlier, according to Tate’s director Serota, this is one of Tate’s efforts to meet “the growing demand for participation and digital interaction” (Tate 2015). However, *The Timeline of Modern Art* does not offer the user more interaction than the mobile application or the multimedia guide. The user can’t contribute to the content nor share it on social media adding their own thoughts to it, but rather merely click on the preferred information. *The Timeline of Modern Art* is only accessible onsite and is not accessible through download etcetera.

---

10 Due to the ethical dimension, I did not take pictures of people using the digital touch screen. However, this photograph from Tate illustrates how the touch screen can be used by multiple persons and was included to illustrate this.
6.5. Digital technologies in the collection display galleries

During the four day visit at Tate Modern in February 2017, digital technologies used to highlight the art collection was examined. Most of the galleries (Materials and Objects, Start Display, Between Object and Architecture, Performer and Participant, New Acquisitions, Media Networks, Living Cities and Artist Rooms: Louise Bourgeois) only offered supplementary digital content in connection to the collection on the multimedia guide and the mobile application. There were two of the collection display galleries that offered an addition to the basic digital technology services: In the Studio and Artist and Society.

The gallery In the Studio’s room Explore in the Studio mainly offers a glimpse into studios of artists’ whose art is a part of the Tate collection. The digital addition to this room was a digital touch screen in the room Explore in the Studio presenting a flow of user generated photographs of studios. Underneath the digital touch screen, there was a note from Tate Modern saying: “Where do you feel most creative? Post your photo on Instagram using #TateStudio and it may appear here”. In this room, the visitor can become a co-creator and add meaning and content to the gallery collection (see image 17). This is an example of a call for participation when the audience answers with content and gets recognition from Tate Modern. However, when checking the amount of participation at Instagram, only 99 posts had been made using the #TateStudio hashtag by the end of February 2017. It is unclear, however, when that note was posted.

The gallery Artist and Society’s room Explore Artist and Society had a digital screen offering videos with Tate produced interviews and reportages with artists with connections to the Tate collection (see image 18). For example, one of the artists represented in this content is Henry Wessel whose art is a part of the Tate collection, however, not on current display.

This digital screen offers the user the opportunity to choose among the videos it contains by turning on the button seen on the lower right in image 18. The sound can be listened to when putting on the associated earphones. There are no other functions that the user can engage with when using this device.
6.6. The webpage

Tate’s webpage is like a maze filled with art related content and initiatives related to the art collections. There are different versions of the webpage, that are somehow layer upon each other, which makes it hard to navigate and get an overview of the content. This section offers insights into the content related to Tate’s art collection on the webpage with a focus on how the audience can interact with the content.

Each collection display gallery at Tate Modern has its own page on Tate’s website. All the pages include directions to the specific gallery, share buttons (e-mail, Twitter, Facebook and Google+) and an introduction. Some of the pages include a drop-down menu with the possibility to gain more information about specific rooms in the gallery. The rooms are named after either artist, media, concept or simply by number. Each page offers a section with Art in this Display where each artwork is presented with an image, artist, title and year. When clicking on the artwork, more information is made available to the user. For example, when entering the page of the collection display gallery Start Display, the user can choose to click on The Snail by Matisse directly under Art in this display or to browse through the rooms and find the artwork under the headline Art in this room when entering Room Two Start Display. When entering the artwork page (Tate D), the user is encouraged to share the artwork page on social media (the same channels as mentioned above), add it to the user’s personal online album

---

11 Some of the images are empty, but most of them contain the artwork in question.
(available to users who have connected Tate to their Facebook or Gmail accounts), buy the artwork as a print in the web shop and to see the artwork enlarged. This is followed by the directions to the artwork in the gallery, technical information about the artwork (artist, original title, medium, dimension, collection, acquisition and reference number) and a summery about the artwork’s background. What’s especially interesting about the summary is that some of the words in it are hyperlinks. For example, there are three hyperlinks in the first two sentences:

After 1948 Matisse was prevented from painting by ill health but, although confined to bed, he produced a number of works know as gouaches décepupées. These were made by cutting or tearing shapes from paper which had been painted with gouache (Tate D.).

Each of the marked words lead to a glossary of art terms where the words’ meanings are explained further and are exemplified with images. The summary also suggests further reading for the interested user, mainly books on Matisse. These suggestions get an addition by the larger section Further Reading on the lower part of the page. The suggestions in this section leads to blog posts on Matisse made in-house by Tate; each rich of content with further hyperlinks to related pages on Tate’s webpage.

The user can also choose to listen to three audio clips related to Matisse’s The Snail. The first contains Director Nicholas Serota on how Matisse gave up painting, the second offers kids’ commentary on The Snail and the third contains a podcast called Modern Paint with a focus on The Snail.

This page offers other ways for the user to explore the content related to The Snail. Words connected to the artwork are listed and hyperlinked under the headline Explore. The first headline in this section, Nature, has 44 090 hits in the Tate Collection. The subsections, Animals: Insects & lower animals and Snail, has 248 and 10 hits. When entering the snail section, ten artworks are presented, each with a connection to snails. This structure encompasses the entire Explore section (see image 19). One of the ten artworks with a connection to snails is Robert Huskisson’s The Midsummer Night’s Fairies on display at Tate Britain (see image 20). When clicking at the image presenting the artwork, the user ends up at an information page with the same structure as the page holding information about Matisse’s The Snail, but with less extensive content.

At the bottom of each artwork page, the user gets to explore a section called You Might Like, which lists similar artworks to the artwork in question. For example, The Dancer by
Matisse, *Draped Nude* by Matisse and *Dora Maar Seated* by Picasso are listed as similar to *The Snail* by Matisse.

To summarize this part of the webpage, each work in Tate’s collection has an individual information page within the database. The artworks are accessible when browsing through the galleries, but also through hyperlinks in related content. The user can find all the artworks in the database under the button *Art & Artists* at the top of the main landing page as well. Each artwork is presented with the same technical information (artist, the artist’s birth year (and sometimes year of death), original title, the year of the creation, medium, dimension, collection, acquisition, reference number and whether it is on display), but the rest of the information varies in its extent (the summaries, information about the artist and the number of keywords with hyperlinks etc.). When browsing the section *Art & Artists*, the user can choose to see all pages in the database unsorted (119 364 pages¹²) or to sort the pages by the following categories: *Artists, Artworks, Exhibitions & Events, Displays, Sketches, letters etc., Video & Audio, In depth and Location.*

As mentioned earlier, the user is invited to create personal albums on the Tate webpage. When logged in, the user can start an album by choosing a title, adding notes, tags and deciding whether to allow comments on the album. The user can however choose to keep the album

---

¹² This number was the number of artworks in Tate’s online collection the 28th of February. The number have gone up since.
private and not public. In the next step, the user can browse in the *Art & Artists* section to find artworks to include into the album. When the user has chosen several artworks, the artworks can be reordered if preferred. The user could also upload artworks from the user’s personal hard drive or an embedded video or audio file. However, when engaging in this part of the personal album, the user must confirm having permission of the third-party rights holder to insert the material into the album. The credits must be included in addition to the title and description of the artwork. If the user wishes, the album can be shared online by using an album specific link. If the user has chosen to enable comments, interaction with other parties concerning the personal art collection can take place. However, when creating an album, there are no guarantees of getting it featured and publically visible on the webpage.

Tate’s webpage contains several other sections with connections to the art collection. To begin with, *Art terms*; a section offering articles on specific art words such as *Pre-Raphaelite* and *Impressionism*. For example, when clicking on *Pre-Raphaelite*, the user gets an introduction to the term (with many hyperlinks to other articles), links to further articles on the subject, images of artworks defined as pre-Raphaelite, a link to the database with all artworks tagged ‘pre-Raphaelite’, a link to Tate’s Pinterest board with pre-Raphaelite artworks, suggestions on further reading, a link to a previous pre-Raphaelite exhibition at Tate Britain, information about a handful of chosen pre-Raphaelite artworks, three Tate produced videos about the pre-Raphaelite movement and links to child adapted content related to the pre-Raphaelites. At the very bottom of the page on the pre-Raphaelites, there is a section with links to other UK collections with pre-Raphaelite art.

Another section, at the start page, with a connection to Tate’s art collection is *Women artists in the collection*; showcasing artworks by artists such as Anya Gallaccio, Nan Goldin, Dorothea Tanning and Lisa Milroy. When the user chooses to click on one of them, more information about the specific artwork appears with a summary of the artwork, a display caption and a note on the technique and condition of the artwork. This is followed by an *Explore* section with related hyperlinks, a *You might like*-section with similar artworks and links to Tate’s social media channels.

For example, when clicking on Nan Goldin’s *Nan one month after being battered* (Tate E), the user gets to see a larger image of the artwork (see image 21). This is followed by information in the pattern mentioned above, which also follows the same structure as the other artworks in the *Art and artists* section. What is particularly interesting about this Goldin artwork is that it is currently not on display. This means that the webpage database offers the only current way to view this artwork in the collection. This is something that is characteristic about
Tate’s database since it contains more artworks than the four Tate museums could possibly physically exhibit onsite.

Nan Goldin

Nan one month after being battered
1984

Image 21.

Tate offers a section on the webpage called *Exam help* where the user can browse through a wide range of topics such as *Folded, Suspended, Domestic interiors* and *Isolation*. When entering the topic on *Isolation* (Tate F), the user is offered information about artworks in the collection dealing with isolation to get inspired to approach the topic further. The user is encouraged to share the material on social media using share-buttons, but cannot contribute with personal exam help material, only by making a personal album mentioned earlier.

Tate’s webpage also has a section for kids, called *Tate Kids*. It’s quite well hidden due to it being part of one of the older versions of the webpage. However, when (and if) the user finds this part of the webpage, Tate offers the possibility to play games related to Tate’s collection (such as *Art Lab* and *Art Detective*) and watch educational videos on art collection related topics such as *Childs play: Matisse at Tate Modern*. The games are quite interactive and the user gets insights into art history while solving “art mysteries” and curatorial practices while helping to
restore damaged artworks in Tate’s collection. However, the games do not offer the user much freedom compared to other more advanced online games. Another characteristic of this part of the webpage is that it does not offer as many hyperlinks as the rest of the webpage nor encouragements to share art collection related material on social media. However, the children can save images in a personal album that may get featured on Tate kids or send the result of the game in an e-mail.

To summarize, the webpage gives the user access to more art in the collection than the physical museums does. This applies to the amount of information about the artworks and artists, which is richer online than onsite (both when it comes to the material offered on the multimedia guide, mobile application and the physical signs in the gallery). The most interactive part of the webpage is the part allowing the users to create personal albums with art from the collection together with comments. Some of the user generated albums are featured on Tate’s webpage and can also be shared on social media.

6.7. Social media
In this section, the content posted on Tate’s social media channels during February 2017 related to the art collection is described. To begin with, no posts at all were made at Tate’s Google+ account and no pins or boards were made at Tate’s Pinterest account. Tate’s Tumblr page didn’t post any collection related material during this period but rather focused on submissions for an upcoming festival at Tate St Ives. During this period, only one YouTube video connected to the art collection was posted by Tate. The video contained an examination of Picasso’s artwork *Nude Woman in a Red Armchair* by Tate’s conservation team. It had nearly 3000 views after being online one day and night, 128 thumbs up, 1 thumb down and 16 comments. The comments mainly contained praise of Picasso, the artwork and of Tate’s content creation. No questions were posted to Tate in the comment field and Tate never commented on any of the audience’s comments either.

The social media that Tate produced the most art collection related posts on during this period was Facebook. During February, there were 18 posts being made related to this topic. Tate has some recurring art collection related topics that are being used for Facebook, such as *Artwork of the week, Tate Weather* and *This week’s art word.*

*Artwork of the week* highlights a chosen artwork from Tate’s collection and introduces it with an image and a written introduction. *Tate Weather* is commenting on the weather depicted in an artwork together with an image and information about the very artwork. *This week’s art*
word explains a word from the art world and exemplifies it with an artwork from Tate’s collection. These themes are serial and not just typical for February. Another serial element is art related questions posted to the audience highlighted with an image of an artwork in the collection. The questions posted during February were: “When was the last time you were filled with wonder?”, “If you could ask #Turner any question, what would it be?”, “Has an artwork ever stopped you in your tracks?” and “Has an artwork ever changed the way you see the world?”. The other Facebook posts during this period were mainly different calls to action: to donate money, to join events, to use the exam help on Tate’s webpage and to visit exhibitions. Besides the calls to action, there was also one promotion of an art collection related initiative connected to Tate’s YouTube account.

Tate’s Facebook posts with art related questions to the audience have a considerably higher engagement rate than all the other kinds of posts. The four posts with an audience question during this period, gained an average of 6650 likes (26 600 in total) and an average of 925 shares (3685 in total). This can be compared to the fourteen post without audience questions that gained an average of 1022 likes (14 306 in total) and an average of 253 shares (3548 in total). The engagement rate for posts with audience questions is higher in terms of comments as well. The four posts with audience questions got an average of 112 comments (449 in total), while the posts without had an average of 16 comments (230 in total). See below:

The most popular Facebook post during February, in both categories, was a question to the audience posted the 1st of February together with an artwork by Cornelia Parker (see image 22). The question to the audience was: “When was the last time you were filled with wonder?”, followed by a call to sign up for Tate’s newsletter. The post gained 9300 likes, 1277 shares and
140 comments during its first 24 hours online. The comments mainly revolved around Parker’s artwork and experiences connected to it (56%). The audience shared their encounters with the artwork, how it has affected them or shared their admiration for it. The second most common type of comment were users tagging their friends to discuss the artwork, shared memories of seeing it together or suggesting a visit to Tate together (14%). The answers in those comment threads represent 10% of the total engagement.

Some of the users made comments addressing Tate with questions (6%) on the artwork, where it is being exhibited and how it is constructed. However, none of those questions ever got an answer from Tate.

Since Tate posted a question to the audience about the last time they were filled with wonder, they got some replies (5%) with experiences related to other artworks than Parker’s. Parker’s artwork was questioned by some of the users in the comment field. 4% of the engagement consisted of comments questioning its value as art in different ways. The rest of the comments
had the following themes and each represented 1% or less of the comments: promotion of personal art pages, emojis, links and “nonsense comments”\(^{13}\).

As mentioned above, Tate didn’t answer any of the questions posted to the institution, nor did they comment on any of the comments they gained in this post. The only time Tate answered any comments connected to the posts concerning the collection during February was the 4\(^{th}\) of February (see image 23). In this Facebook post, Tate asked the audience to donate money to save a work of art in Tate’s collection. One user made complaints about how Tate being too far away from her hometown makes it expensive to travel there and therefore too costly for her to donate money. This comment resulted in a thread of comments from other users, and in the end, a comment from Tate as well. The other users defended Tate, highlighted the number of museums with free entrance in the UK and discussed the problems with touring exhibitions (high insurance fees for example). When Tate chose to comment in the thread, they commented on the number of loans being made to museums and galleries across the UK.

The second comment that developed into a thread was a complaint made to Tate’s social media team regarding what was considered a bad explanation on why this artwork is prioritized for a restoration. Another user agreed, while another argued people should not be too lazy to do their own research. Tate made a comment in the comment thread explaining why the painting is important to restore. The users making complaints about the social media team thanked Tate for their answer and gave them further advice on how to promote the fundraising properly.

The third comment that developed into a thread dealt with the costs of conservation which the user argues are too high. One user argued against him while another user simply tried to put the first argument down with a personal insult. The person making the comment on the conservation practices replied with an insult in his return. Tate never made a comment in this thread.

The other comments, that never developed into threads, dealt with the costs of maintaining art and making exhibitions, critique of the critique posted by other users as mentioned above, five jokes on Tate’s expense made by five different users, a promotion of a personal art account, a question about funding and two praises.

Overall, this Facebook post gained 411 likes, 48 shares and 17 comments, which is below the average for a post without a question to the audience. The most average, and therefore most representative, Facebook post by Tate during February was one posted the 24\(^{th}\) of February (see

\(^{13}\) This category of comments made no sense. The comments in this segment were addressed to no one and was not related to topics discussed in the comment field. They seemed random in their nature, for example “Wanda. What?”.)
This post does not contain a question to the audience, instead it explains the art word ‘destruction’ and exemplifies the word with the artwork *Third person* by John Stezaker. This post got 902 likes (120 less than average), 152 shares (101 less than average) and 16 comments (precisely the average).

The content of the comments had the following themes: four comments concerned the art word and one of them developed into a comment thread with a discussion of the meaning. Three of the comments contained personal art contributions. One of these comments developed into a thread where this was explained. Two comments contained tagging of friends: one with a personal question and the other with a suggestion of a London visit. Two other comments concerned the artwork posted by Tate: one positive and one negative. One of the users posted a question, not properly addressed to Tate, whether “it” is Avant-garde or not. The question was not answered by neither Tate or any of the other users in the comment field. One additional positive comment was made, it was however unclear whether the comment was positive about Tate, the artwork or the art word.

During February, Tate made 14 posts on Twitter connected to the Tate collection. The posts gained an average of 101 retweets (1427 in total), 251 likes (3520 in total) and 9 replies (129
in total). Just as on Facebook, when Tate posts a question to the audience, the engagement rates are higher than the average. The posts with questions to the audience had an average of 269 retweets (806 in total), 710 likes (2131 in total) and 28 replies (83 in total). This can be compared to the posts without audience questions that had an average of 56 retweets (621 in total), 126 likes (1389 in total) and 4 replies (46 in total). See below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Like average</th>
<th>Retweet average</th>
<th>Reply average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Pie Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Pie Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Pie Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Twitter post with the most average overall engagement rate was a post made the 14th of February (see image 25). The post contains a valentine greeting with an inserted image of Sappho and Erinna from the Tate collection with a link to an upcoming exhibition on queer British art. It gained 105 retweets (4 more than average), 245 likes (6 less than average) and 3 replies (6 less than average). However, the most popular Twitter post during this period was made the 18th of February containing the question: “Has an artwork ever stopped you in your tracks?” together with the artwork *The Three* by Philip Sutton (see image 26). It was retweeted 418 times, had 1100 likes and 30 replies during its first 24 hours online alone.

One noteworthy Twitter post was made the 12th of February, where Tate asks the audience to participate in a “#Flashfiction challenge”. The audience was asked to write a story about the featured artwork by Jonathan Leaman. This post had 60 retweets, 105 likes and 23 replies, which is a below average engagement rate. Tate never followed up on this challenge during February nor commented on the replies they received. In addition to this, the purpose of the challenge was never explained explicitly.
During February, eleven posts were made on Instagram with a connection to the Tate collection. They gained an average of 13 822 likes (152 040 in total) and 88 comments (973 in total). One of the eleven posts contained a question to the audience, namely the post from the 21th of February (see image 27). It gained 24 492 likes and 294 comments, which is the highest engagement rate among the collection related posts on Instagram during February. This can be compared with the average engagement rate connected to the posts without audience questions: 12 754,8 likes (127 548 in total) and 67,9 comments (679 in total).

Most of the comments connected to this Instagram post contains personal art experiences and only two of them turned into conversations among the users. One of the discussions evolved
around Antoni Gaudi’s church *La Sagrada Familia*, while the other discussion concerned Yves Klein’s artwork *IKB 79*.

Most of the comments (58%) consisted of personal art experiences, many of which were well developed stories about an encounter with a specific artwork or exhibition. The second most common theme among the comments was unspecific praise of the content in this post such as *great, love it, amazing* etcetera (18%). The third most common theme among the comments was emojis (11%). Another 10% of the comments was tagging of friends in the comment field, mainly together with praise of the post’s content. The rest of the comments were random hashtags.

The most popular post on Instagram had the same content as the most popular tweet during the same period (see image 26 and image 27). The reuse of content on Tate’s different social media channels is a repeated pattern. The content created for the reoccurring themes, such as artwork of the week, Tate weather and art word of the week, are themes that often are posted on several channels.

Another Instagram post that must be mentioned is one posted on the 3rd of February (see image 28). This is a repost from a user who took a selfie together with Yayoi Kusama’s *The Passing Winter* on display at Tate Modern’s gallery display *Between Object and Architecture*. This post deals with the collection but is also a way of encouraging the audience to engage with the collection and to share the content on social media. Tate highlighted how much they loved this
photograph by the visitor who took this picture when regramming this post. Tates’ regram generated 12599 likes and 64 comments, which is less than the average amount engagement.

When considering the collected social media data, there is no apparent link between the combination of formats (text, image, film, link etc.) and the amount of audience engagement. What really stands out is the difference between posts with audience questions and the ones without, as mentioned above.

6.8. **Email newsletter**
During February, I received three newsletters from Tate, none of which dealt with the collection. All newsletters promoted current and upcoming temporary exhibitions.
7. Discussion
This chapter will present a discussion connected to each research question.

7.1. Tate Modern’s policies regarding digital technologies
When reading the digital policies, it becomes clear that Tate Modern has high ambitions regarding the use of digital technologies. Digital technologies are aimed at being a dimension of everything the museum does; both online and onsite. Digital is a way to reach a global audience, but also to educate and invite the audience to participate. By involving digital technologies in the museum practices, Tate Modern wishes to promote the museum and to gain more income, for example through donations and online shopping. It can be argued that Tate’s digital strategy is in line with Penz’s (2012) reasoning regarding digital technologies as a crucial factor to stay relevant to the audience.

The documents on Tate Modern’s digital strategy are quite general in their nature; they don’t dwell into detail on the specific digital efforts. However, Tate Modern has identified digital as a way of reaching and engaging with its audience; just as Griffiths (2004) highlights digital technologies in museums as a way of competing with other entertainments and educating its audience. As Penz (2012) argues, that is particularly important when trying to reach out to the younger generations. Since Tate Modern’s ambition is: “digital as a dimension of everything”, the museum seems to be prioritizing the digital presence just as much as the physical one, or at least layering the digital dimension into each part of the museum’s being. This strategy is intimately connected to Parry’s (2010) ideas regarding the digital presence being equally important to the physical presence of the museum.

When regarding Fischer and Twiss-Garrity’s (2007) argument on tools of the web 2.0 as a way of transforming the museum experience from passive to active, this argument could be argued as compatible with Tate Modern’s digital strategy. The museum seems to be aiming at transforming the very experience of the museum just as they are trying to gain economic benefits from this very transformation in terms of higher visitor numbers, commerce and donations. This is also a way of making the museum continuous with modern media forms in Witcomb’s sense (2013), which i.e. can be seen in Tate’s use of social media and mobile applications.

One of Tate Modern’s ambitions, expressed in the digital strategy, is to develop digital technologies that increase audience participation. This can be regarded as a way of embracing Hooper-Greenhill’s (2000) idea of the post-museum where the audience are co-creators rather than mere recipients. What is particularly interesting about this approach to audience engagement is that it undermines the museum authority and creates a more democratic museum
environment. Ideally, the audience and museum could co-create meaning connected to the museum collection. The actual result of these strategies observed during February will be discussed in the next section of the discussion.

Another interesting dimension of Tate Modern’s digital ambition is that it is compatible with Malraux’s idea of *le muse imaginaire*. Tate’s art collection is gathered in a digital database where visitors of Tate’s webpage can gain access to high-resolution images of the artworks. The artworks are not just photographed, as during Malraux days in the 1940s, but digitally reproduced, distributed online and accessible to everyone around the globe with internet access. This would make Tate’s digital ambitions compatible with Battro’s (2010) idea of when an ‘imaginary museum’ becomes a virtual museum. This aspect of Tate Modern’s work with digital technologies will be discussed in greater detail in the last section of this chapter.

### 7.2. Possible interaction offered to the audience through the affordances of digital technologies

When interviewed, the former head of digital at Tate; Stack, highlighted the audience’s expectation of actively participating when visiting a museum and how digital has changed the museum (Mitchell 2014). The question is how far Tate Modern has come in this regard.

During the data collection in February, several digital initiatives were observed. To begin with, a multimedia guide offering insights into Tate’s art collection. In terms of interaction, this technology only offered the user to browse content. There was no possible way to add to, comment on or share the content in personal social media channels. Another limitation that must be mentioned is that not all artworks displayed in the galleries were accessible on the multimedia guide. This digital technology does not live up to Stack’s ambition to accommodate the audience’s wish to participate.

When it comes to the mobile application, it is just as limited regarding audience participation. The only interactivity made possible is clicking on the information of interest, whether it is regarding an artwork or its location in the museum. The mobile application user is not a co-creator of content, but rather a willing receiver of information. This is in line with Arvanitis’ (2010) argument that many museum mobile applications are still using one-way transmission of knowledge rather than including other voices in the post-museum sense.

This critique is also applicable to the digital timeline of modern art where the user can click on images and words to get more information. The concept is the same but is presented in a more playful and innovative way.
In the collection display galleries, there are one digital technology presenting Tate produced films with interviews. This technology is interactive in the same way as the ones mentioned above since the user’s freedom is limited to choosing content. However, a digital initiative in the room *Explore in the studio* invited the visitor to participate and become a co-creator. Here the user is encouraged to post a studio picture on Instagram with the chance to get featured on a digital screen in the very same room. These two digital technologies mentioned were the only interactive digital technologies implemented in the display galleries dealing with the art collection. Even though the digital initiatives in the galleries are few, the latter could be regarded as way of meeting the audience’s expectance to participate.

As mentioned in the findings section, Tate’s webpage is maze-like layering two versions of the webpage upon each other. Its maze-like nature can be said to encourage the curious webpage visitor since it always suggests other content of potential interest. The visitor is also encouraged to share Tate’s content on social media or through email. However, it is not possible to add or comment on the content on Tate’s webpage unless one creates a personal online album. When creating an album, there are no guarantees of having it publically visible since Tate seems to choose which albums to exhibit publically. No further information about the process of choosing among the user created content has been obtained due to the missing interviews with Tate employees. The visibility of user created content seems to be conditional, but the terms are not explicit.

Tate offers a webpage section for Kids where the young can engage in online games. However, the narratives are very limited, just as the possible ways for the children to engage in the games. The outcome of the game, or the specific task, either gets a good or bad grade, i.e. the dust cleaning on an oil painting can be more of less well performed. The narrative is simply not open for creative input from the kids. However, seen in light of Manovich’s (2010) thought on interfaces and databases, the narrative offered here must be seen as a hyper-narrative since the outcome of the game can differ. Nevertheless, it would be a stretch to define the children as co-creators of meaning in Hooper-Greenhill’s (2000) sense. The outcome of the games does not add meaning to the actual art collection. The games should mainly be regarded as educational tools and a way to engage the younger audience. The children can however share the outcome of the game through e-mail or save it in their own personal album online. Just as the personal albums mentioned above, not all albums are accessible to the public, as Tate chooses which ones to bring forward.

Tate’s presence on social media offers a lot of interactive and participatory opportunities for the audience. This affordance is however a built-in feature on social media and Tate couldn’t
choose to post content on i.e. Facebook without allowing the audience to engage with the material. However, Tate does encourage the audience to get involved. The clearest example is when Tate asks the audience art related questions. Since Tate did a regram of a user generated image on Instagram, this could also be interpreted as a way of encouraging the audience to create their own Tate related material.

7.3. The audience’s use of interactive opportunities
Due to the lack of interviews for this thesis, no data regarding the number of users of the multimedia guide and the mobile application was obtained. The same goes with data regarding the number of users of The Timeline of Modern Art and the use of the digital screen in the room Explore Artist and Society. However, the number of posts with the hashtag #TateStudio was counted to 99. Some of these posts were included on the digital screen in the room Explore in the Studio.

Since no interviews were made, no data regarding the number of users of the webpages interactive opportunities was obtained either. The only forums where the width of the audience engagement was accessible to this thesis was on social media. As presented in the findings section, the overall engagement on Tate’s social media is rather high. No post goes by unnoticed by the audience. The posts that gained the highest amount of interaction were the ones including a question to the audience. This applies to Facebook, Instagram and Twitter. No audience questions were posted on the other social media channels used by Tate during February. Considering this, Stack’s statement regarding the audience’s wish to participate seems accurate. When asked, the audience takes the chance to express themselves and share experiences regarding art. This also reflects Galani and Chalmer’s idea (2010) that the social factor of the museum experience is of great importance both online and onsite.

As seen in the social media data, Facebook posts with an audience question had an average of 7 times more comments, 6,5 times more likes and 3,6 times more shares. The same pattern was identified on Twitter and Instagram too. The Twitter posts with audience questions gained an average of 4,8 times more retweets, 5,6 times more likes and 11,2 times more replies. On Instagram, the post with an audience questions gained an average of 1,9 times more likes and 4,3 times more comments.

When looking at these numbers it becomes clear that Stack’s argument is true: the audience wants to participate. Another fact that supports this statement is the more than 400 000 Instagram posts using the hashtag #TateModern. The next section of the conclusion will consider how Tate Modern handles the audience contributions considering relevant theories.
7.4. Tate Modern’s use of digital technologies considering the concept of the imaginary museum and the post-museum

When discussing Tate Modern in terms of the imaginary museum, one must focus on the various ways the art collection is reproduced by modern technology. Tate’s art collection is not only photographed, but digitally reproduced and available online 24/7. The art collection online is more accessible to the public than the physical collection, since not all physical artworks are displayed at once and due to more limited opening hours.

The artworks in the database are presented with high resolution photography, making it possible to zoom in detail. Some of the artworks are also available on the multimedia guide and the mobile application. However, only the latter is possible to use at home due to the alarm system installed in the multimedia guide.

By offering access to the art collection, both through the webpage’s database and the mobile application, Tate Modern brings the collection into the everyday life of the user. By enabling this, Tate Modern offers digital technology functions that agrees with the notion of the ‘museum without walls’.

Another interesting aspect of the database is that it does not have a beginning or an end. Just like Tate’s maze-like webpage, the database offers the user the possibility to explore the collection in a wide range of ways. For example, by browsing through themes or common details in the paintings. All the artworks in the database seem to have the same significance. However, since no interviews were made, one cannot be sure that no algorithm i.e. prioritizes one artist over the other when displaying artworks similar to another. The database is however not linear in its display of artworks, but rather shows how artworks from different eras deals with the same subjects and themes. Considering Manovic’s (2010) theories on databases it seems likely that the database is relational since it links artworks together through many relations, i.e. era, motif and mood.

Some of the artworks in the art collection are distributed by Tate on social media. This makes it possible for people to interact with the artworks without visiting neither Tate Modern nor the webpage. This is much in line with Serota’s idea that the future museum will be rooted in the very buildings it occupies but will address audiences around the globe (Stack 2013).

Due to the digital transformation, images i.e. of artworks have become more mobile and travel easily between different platforms. The images in Tate’s database can easily be distributed on social media and other webpages. This enables interactions around the artworks such as discussions and sharing. By becoming an imaginary and virtual museum, seen in the
light of Battro’s (2010) theories, Tate has redefined what counts as an art collection and how the audience can interact with it. However, even though Tate Modern makes the collection available to the world, the world’s many voices are not really included in the creation of meaning. Tate has full authority on the webpage, in the galleries, on the mobile application and the multimedia guide. Tate chooses which audience generated material to display or to hide away. On social media, Tate very rarely acknowledges the input made by the social media users. Tate is posting questions to the audience but doesn’t seem to care much about the answers since they rarely acknowledge them. Considering, Tate’s stated aim at meeting the audience’s wish to participate more appears somewhat cosmetic. Tate’s social media posts mostly serve as pin boards where the audience can ventilate their experiences and sometimes engage in discussions with each other. Therefore, this might be the aspect where the difference between policy and practice is the greatest.

When looking at Tate’s practices regarding digital technologies and audience engagement in light of Hooper-Greenhill’s (2000) idea of the post-museum, it becomes clear that the audience isn’t distinctly co-creators nor mere recipients. When regarding the multimedia guide, the timeline of modern art and the mobile application, the users cannot do anything besides to choose which content to consume. However, when considering the webpage, the user can create content in personal albums. The albums made publically accessible on the webpage are chosen by Tate. So even though the audience created material can get featured on the webpage, Tate keeps the authority and decides whether it fits into the Tate narrative. In terms of the webpage, the audience could be considered conditional co-creators.

On Facebook, the audience is invited to add their thoughts and experiences in the comment fields connected to Tate’s posts. However, Tate doesn’t engage in or follow up on the vast majority of the comments. Only two comments got a response from Tate, that is 0.2% of the total amount of comments on Tate’s posts related to the art collection. The two comments that got responses from Tate did however not affect the content in the original Tate post. This makes it hard to define the Facebook audience as co-creators since their participations are overall not recognised.

When it comes to Twitter, no visible acknowledgements of the audience were made during February; neither discussions nor retweets. However, on Instagram, Tate did post a regram of a user’s photograph from one of the Tate display galleries. This is a clear example of when the audience is invited to participate as co-creators of meaning in Hooper-Greenhill’s sense. Aside from this example, Tate did not acknowledge any other user generated comments or posts on Instagram on their feed. However, in one of the display galleries, a curated
Instagram feed with the hashtag #TateStudio was displayed with chosen Instagram posts created by the audience. These two examples from Instagram supports the idea of the audience as participants and co-creators.

If Tate Modern would wish to take the strategy regarding audience participation and digital technologies to the next level, the institution would have to obtain a more inclusive and accommodating approach towards the audience. Even though Tate Modern is considered as ahead other museums regarding digital technologies, the institution has a long way to go before becoming a post-museum, if Tate Modern would choose that aim.

However, in light of Smith Bautista’s (2014) discussion on new museology, one could argue that the visitors are given more agency in their learning and museum experience, due to the digital technologies offering information on demand. Nevertheless, even though the audience has been encouraged to move towards a more active role, understanding them as participants through digital technologies would be a stretch except in the two unique cases mentioned above.
8. **Conclusions**

Tate Modern is ambitious when it comes to digital strategy. Digital is intended to be a dimension of everything and a way to increase audience participation. However, when examining the affordances of the digital technologies, they do not offer the audience much of a chance to participate. There is a difference between digital policies and actual practices.

The most interactive forum for the audience is on social media where the audience can comment on Tate’s posts without Tate making selections. But of course, if Tate would wish to, comments could be erased afterwards. However, Tate hardly engage with user generated comments at all. Only 0.02% of the comments on Facebook got a response from Tate, even when questions were posted to Tate regarding for example the collection.

Tate Modern can be regarded an imaginary museum in Malraux sense, and even a virtual museum in Battro’s logic (2010). This is due to the extent through which Tate’s collection has been made available by digital means. The digital collection is more accessible than the physical collection ever could be. This is due to the digital collection being shared, presented and circulated online, while the physical collection is too big to ever be exhibited at once in the current exhibition galleries. Tate Modern must therefore be regarded, not merely an exhibitor of objects, but a set for art experiences, both online and onsite. However, Tate’s authority is just as strong online as onsite in terms of audience participation.

Tate Modern’s digital technologies onsite are all offering a rather low degree of human machine interaction including participation. The same goes for the mobile application. The interactive and participatory opportunities made available online are higher and the audience is invited to create their own content on the webpage and on social media. However, defining Tate Modern as post-museum in Hooper-Greenhill’s sense would be a stretch. The audience’s participatory possibilities are overall too cosmetic for the audience to be regarded as genuine co-creators of meaning in relation to the art collection. If Tate Modern truly wishes to have a participatory audience, the institution would have to acknowledge and build upon more of the existing engagement and integrate it into the existing exhibitions to get a truly participatory culture at the museum. As seen in the findings, the audience is already willing to contribute and requests participation. However, Tate Modern would have to make some sacrifices regarding controlling the narrative to achieve this change. Some of the digital technologies, i.e. Tate Modern’s social media platforms and some parts of the webpage, have the affordances for genuine participation, but the actual embrace of the audience’s contributions is weak.
8.1. Implications
This thesis would have gained from semi-structured interview with gatekeepers at Tate Modern. Primary sources data from gatekeepers would have added to the observations onsite and online regarding the use of digital technologies. User statistics from the digital technologies would have been especially useful in examining the extent of their use. However, the use of interview data from secondary sources proved most useful in gaining a reliable picture of Tate Modern’s approach towards digital technologies and audience interaction and participation.

Another limitation that must be highlighted is the one mentioned in the methodology chapter. The sample made for this study is too small to be representable for Tate Modern’s overall digital presence online. This especially applies to Tate’s presence on social media where content can differ from day to day. The other digital technologies (including the webpage) are more static in their nature. Nevertheless, the trend is clear regarding Tate’s approach towards the user generated content, but the thesis would have gained from further substantiation before making too general conclusions. However, this thesis offers a glimpse into the practices of one of the world’s forerunners within the museum industry when it comes to digital technologies, but also the unexploited potential in bringing forward audience participation and interaction further.

8.2. Further research
Conducting semi-structured interviews with gatekeepers where relevant questions could be asked to fill the gaps were mere observations doesn’t provide the whole picture, i.e. regarding the extent of the use of some of the digital tools would be a great further development of the thesis. Another idea would be to spend more time onsite to get more insights into the audience’s actual use of the digital tools. However, getting the statistics from Tate Modern would have been necessary to get an idea of the extent of i.e. the mobile application use. One way to do that, without semi-structured interviews, would be to get behind the scenes and i.e. do an internship to get insights into the use of digital technologies.

It would also be interesting to do interviews with the visitors onsite to explore their view of the multimedia guide, mobile application and the other digital technologies used onsite. This kind of study would also prove most useful for Tate Modern when developing the digital technologies offered to the audience.

Another study could benefit from strictly focus on the content on social media. One interesting angle would be to investigate the sharing and storytelling around art experiences that occurs in relation to the questions posted by Tate. That could become a beautiful study on
collective sharing of memories of art experiences. One alternative study on social media would be to investigate the content created by the audience using hashtags such as #TateModern. This hashtag is used on Instagram without Tate Modern controlling the narrative which could prove most interesting in terms of identifying the organic engagement that evolves from the audience.
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Appendix

Table 1. Tate’s Facebook posts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication date</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Data gathering date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 17</td>
<td>Tate asks the audience “When was the last time you were filled with wonder?”, followed by a call to action to sign up for Tate email with incredible art. The image shows Cornelia Parker’s work <em>Cold Dark Matter: An Exploded View</em> from the Tate collection.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>9300 likes, 1277 shares, 140 comments. The comments consisted of praise and comments on the artwork, stories about personal art experiences, questions about the artwork (not answered by Tate), tagging and discussing with friends, promotion of personal art projects, recommending links for further reading, a photo of another artwork by Parker, one emoji, an art link, two unrelated comments and comments regarding whether it is art or not.</td>
<td>2 Feb 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Feb. 17</td>
<td>Artwork of the week, detailed information about the artistic process behind an artwork (<em>Small Touching Squares Painting</em>) of Peter Davies in Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>151 likes, 14 shares, 1 comment containing an unclear message (“------- --- ----”).</td>
<td>2 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb. 17</td>
<td>“Tate Weather” comments on the weather and asks the audience to hold on to their hats due to the wind. This is followed by the name of a photograph by Jeff Wall from the Tate Collection portraying people in a windy landscape.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>2100 likes, 269 shares, 23 comments; mostly on the photography, tagging of friends, the photographer and the audiences’ personal relation to him.</td>
<td>4 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb. 17</td>
<td>Tate asks the audience “If you could ask #Turner any question, what would it be?” and gives a call to see <em>Norham Castle, Sunrise</em> and the rest of the Turner collection at Tate Britain. The post ends with a link to Tate’s webpage. The image contains a painting by Turner.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>3900 likes, 488 shares, 98 comments; almost exclusively questions to Turner, but also some praise of the artwork.</td>
<td>4 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Shares</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb. 17</td>
<td>A call to back Tate’s campaign to save an artwork by Arthur Melville. The image contains the artwork in the Tate collection that needs restoration before it can be exhibited. The post ends with a link to the webpage where one can donate money.</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Feb. 17</td>
<td>This week’s art word “Significant form”, coined by art critic Clive Bell in 1914, is explained. The inserted image contains Roger Fry’s painting <em>River with Poplars</em> from Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Feb. 17</td>
<td>A call to celebrate the art in Tate’s collection created and influenced by immigrants by joining a tour at Tate Modern or Tate Britain. The inserted image is Josef Herman’s artwork <em>Three Miners</em>. The link leads to Tate’s website and more information about the event.</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Feb. 17</td>
<td>A call to join February’s Uniqlo Lates about women in the arts and more specifically in Tate’s art collection. The image is an artwork by Lorna Simpson, <em>Five Day Forecast</em>. Link to a Facebook event with more information.</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Feb. 17</td>
<td>A call to use Tate’s art exam help containing art themes that can be explored in detail through Tate’s art collection. The image contains Bernard Cohen’s artwork <em>Matter of Identity III – The Trace</em> from Tate’s Collection. The link leads to the exam help page on Tate’s website.</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Content Description</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feb. 17</td>
<td>This post is a valentine’s greeting with a call to visit a future exhibition at Tate Britain celebrating queer British art. The exhibition does not strictly contain artworks from the Tate collection but is however promoted with the painting depicting Sappho and Erinna by Simeon Solomon from Tate’s collection. The link leads to the exhibition page on Tate website.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feb. 17</td>
<td>The art word of the week is presented and explained: “solarisation”. The image in this post, <em>Corridors</em>, contains the phenomena and is taken by Catherine Yass and is in Tate’s collection. The link leads to a page at Tate’s website with more information about the artwork.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb. 17</td>
<td>A call to come to Uniqlo Tate Lates and celebrate women in Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + inserted event (image + text. The image contains a DJ.)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Feb. 17</td>
<td>Tate asks the audience: “Has an artwork ever stopped you in your tracks?” together with the artwork <em>The Tree</em> by Philip Surron from the Tate collection.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>1309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Feb. 17</td>
<td>This post contains the “work of the week” from Tate’s collection: <em>Greer and Robert on the bed</em> by Nan Goldin. The post has a Goldin quote on the artwork and the artwork itself is included in the post.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Feb. 17</td>
<td>This post contains the “artwork of the week”: <em>Meet the people</em> by Sir Eduardo Paolozzi. The post also explains this artwork’s place in an art series of ten collages and the artist’s fascination with pop culture. The artwork itself is included in the post.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23 Feb. 17  This post promotes the TateShots initiative’s 10-year anniversary. The post has a link to TateShots’ YouTube page were Tate publish videos about artists, artworks and artistic practices related to the Tate collection and other related content. In this post, there’s an inserted promotion video for the temporary Kusama exhibition that was held in 2012 (not part of the Tate collection).  Text + link + video.  477 likes, 85 shares and 8 comments; mainly praise of the artist and tagging of friends.  24 Feb. 17

24 Feb. 17  This post contains the art word “Destruction” together with an explanation of the word. The image inserted in the post is Third person by John Stezaker from the Tate collection as an example of this technique.  Text + image.  902 likes, 152 shares and 23 comments; two of them contains discussions about the art word, the rest were tagging of friends and artworks and comments of the artwork by Stezaker.  25 Feb. 17

25 Feb. 17  This post contains a question to the audience: “Has an artwork ever changed the way you see the world?” and the artwork Azalea Garden by Patrick Heron from the Tate collection.  Text + image.  5800 likes, 627 shares, 100 comments; mainly shared experiences of art and discussions about emotions evolved from art experiences. Some have shared images of art related to their art experiences, and others have tagged their friends to engage them in the discussions.  26 Feb. 17

Table 2. Tate’s Twitter posts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication date:</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Data gathering date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb. 17</td>
<td>#WorkOfTheWeek, information about the artistic process behind an artwork (<em>Small Touching Squares Painting</em>) of Peter Davies in Tate’s collection. The post ends with a link to Tate’s webpage with more information about the artwork.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>25 retweets and 88 likes.</td>
<td>2 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb. 17</td>
<td>A call to back Tate’s campaign to save an artwork by Arthur Melville in Tate’s collection. The image contains the artwork that needs saving. The post ends with a link to the webpage where one can donate money.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>25 retweets, 63 likes and 1 response (of unknown nature).</td>
<td>5 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Retweets</td>
<td>Likes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Feb. 17</td>
<td>Tate asks the audience “If you could ask #Turner any question, what would it be?” and gives a call to see the Turner collection at Tate Britain. The post ends with a link to Tate’s webpage. The image is a painting by Turner from the collection.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Feb. 17</td>
<td>#ArtWord: ‘Significant form’ is explained followed by a link to the webpage with more information about the artwork in the post by Roger Fry that is in Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Feb. 17</td>
<td>#Tour: a call to celebrate art in the Tate collection created and influenced by migrants. The image contains Herman’s 3 Miners. A link to @1daywithoutus and a link to Tate’s webpage.</td>
<td>Text + image + links.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Feb. 17</td>
<td>A call to celebrate women in the arts at TateLates. This post has a link to the Facebook event and an inserted image containing Lorna Simpson’s work <em>Five Day forecast</em> from Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Feb. 17</td>
<td>#Flashfiction challenge. This post contains a challenge to write a story about the artwork inserted as image. The link gives more information about the artwork in Tate’s collection by Jonathan Leaman.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feb. 17</td>
<td>A valentine greeting with an inserted image of Sappho and Erinna from the Tate collection. The link leads to Tate Britain’s upcoming exhibition page on Queer British art. The painting of Sappho and Erinna is from Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Feb. 17</td>
<td>#WorkOfTheWeek: <em>Corridors</em> by Catherine Yass is presented with an image and some of the colours in the photograph are explained. The link leads to Tate’s webpage with more information about the artwork that is a part of Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Feb. 17</td>
<td>This post contains the question: “Has an artwork ever stopped you in your tracks?” together with the artwork <em>The Three</em> by Philip Sutton.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This post links to a press release about some new research on the artwork *The Great Salisbury* by John Constable in Tate’s collection. The post contains the most important part of the research; namely that Constable added a rainbow to the artwork to mark the death of a friend. The image contains the artwork.

24 Feb. 17

A #TateWeather post on great weather and an inserted image from the Tate collection: *Gunhills, Windley* by Douglas Percy Bliss and a link to the very same image.

24 Feb. 17

This post contains a birthday wish to TateShots and an inserted link to YouTube with a promo video for an old Kusama exhibition.

26 Feb. 17

This post contains a question to the audience “has an artwork ever changed the way you see the world?” together with the work *Azalea Garden* by Patrick Heron from the Tate collection.

Table 3. Tate’s YouTube posts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication date</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Data gathering date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb. 17</td>
<td><em>Picasso’s Nude Woman in a Red Armchair</em></td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>2875 views, 128 thumbs up, 1 thumb down and 16 comments; mainly commenting on the artwork and Tate’s content.</td>
<td>4 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Tate’s Google+ posts

No posts were made during February.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication date</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Data gathering date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb. 17</td>
<td>#TateWeather comments on the weather and asks the audience to hold on to their hats due to the wind. This is followed by the name of a photograph by Jeff Wall from the Tate Collection portraying people in a windy landscape. The post offers information about the composition and process of the photography and how it was inspired by the Japanese artist Katsushika Hokusai.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>17144 likes, 94 comments; mainly on the artwork, how it is to see it IRL, tagging of friends and positive emojis (hearts, thumbs up etc.).</td>
<td>4 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Feb. 17</td>
<td>A repost of a photo taken by a visitor of Yayoi Kusama’s <em>The Passing Winter</em> at Tate Modern’s <em>Between Object and Architecture</em> display. The visitors text is also reposted and comments on his relationship to selfies and a thank to @Tate and @Bloombergdotcom for hosting the event followed by hashtags.</td>
<td>Text + repost (image + text)</td>
<td>12599 likes, 64 comments; mainly containing emojis, comments on the picture and the artwork and tagging of friends with personal comments.</td>
<td>4 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Feb. 17</td>
<td>This week’s #artword “Significant form”, coined by art critic Clive Bell in 1914, is explained. The inserted image contains Roger Fry’s painting <em>River with Poplars</em> from Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + image</td>
<td>17 870 likes and 79 comments; mainly tagging of friends, comments on the artwork, the word and emojis. One user posts a question regarding Tate’s explanation of the word but doesn’t get a reply. The same thing happens to a user disagreeing with Tate’s explanation.</td>
<td>13 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Feb. 17</td>
<td>#WorkOfTheWeek: Tim Head’s <em>Ambidextrous</em> is presented by an image and an introduction to the artwork in Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>9080 likes, 52 comments; mainly emojis, tagging of friends and praise of the artwork.</td>
<td>13 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Feb. 17</td>
<td>The art word of the week is presented and explained: “solarisation”. The image in this post, <em>Corridors</em>, contains the phenomena and is taken by Catherine Yass and is in Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + image.</td>
<td>10359 likes, 51 comments; mainly emojis, praise and comments on the artwork and artist, comments on the technique and on Lee Miller (who also used this technique).</td>
<td>13 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Feb. 17</td>
<td>Dante Gabriel Rossetti’s <em>Roman de la Rose</em> from the Tate Collection is presented to gain interest for the Tate Membership.</td>
<td>Text + image + link.</td>
<td>11496 likes, 60 comments; mainly emojis, praise, tagging of friends and Valentine greetings.</td>
<td>14 Feb. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Interaction Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Feb. 17</td>
<td>Simeon Solomon’s painting of Sappho and Erinna from Tate’s collection is posted to wish the followers a happy Valentine’s day.</td>
<td>Text + image + link. 11 052 likes, 66 comments; mainly tagging of friends and praise of Sappho and Tate Modern for showing an LGBT-picture on Valentine’s day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Feb. 17</td>
<td>Josef Herman’s <em>Three Miners</em> from the Tate Collection is posted to shed light on the initiative <em>One Day Without Us</em> (a national day to celebrate the contributions of migrants to the UK) and the art tour at Tate connected to this day.</td>
<td>Image + text + link to the webpage with more information about the art tour. 8357 likes, 30 comments; mainly praise of the post, the artist and emojis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Feb. 17</td>
<td>#WorkOfTheWeek: Nan Goldin’s <em>Greer and Robert on the bed, NYC</em> from the Tate collection is posted as an image together with a quote by Nan Goldin about relationships.</td>
<td>Text + image. 15679 likes, 90 comments; mainly containing praise of the artist, tagging of friends, thoughts about the quote and emojis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Feb. 17</td>
<td>Tate asks the followers to tell them about a time that an artwork stopped them in their tracks together with Philip Sutton’s <em>The Tree</em> from Tate’s collection.</td>
<td>Text + image. 24 492 likes, 294 comments; mainly containing art experiences (hardly none of them evolves into a conversation on art experiences, only two of them), emojis, tagging of friends and praise of the artist and the post itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Feb. 17</td>
<td>This post contains the <em>art word</em> “Destruction” together with an explanation of the word. The image inserted in the post is <em>Third person</em> by John Stezaker from the Tate collection as an example of this technique, his name is however not mentioned in the post.</td>
<td>Text + image. 13912 likes, 93 comments; mainly praise of the artwork, emojis, comments of the word, complaints about the lack of the artist’s name in the post and tagging of friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Tate’s Pinterest boards
No pins or boards were made during February.

Table 7. Tate’s Tumblr posts
No posts related to the collection were made during February.