



Instagram and the museum experience: Theorising the connection through aesthetics, space and sharing

Journal:	<i>Museum Management and Curatorship</i>
Manuscript ID	RMMC-2022-0018.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	art gallery, museum, aesthetics, sharing, space, Instagram

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Instagram and the museum experience: Theorising the connection through aesthetics, space and sharing

Abstract

Many museum or art gallery visitors record their experience through social media platforms. Instagram is a case in point. Instagram is an application for mobile devices where people post images and comments, sharing their experiences in different places, with different people. This paper shares data from a project exploring people's art gallery visitations and how they engage with Instagram in such spaces. The research aimed to answer the following research questions: What are the current practices of art gallery visitors using Instagram? and why do visitors use Instagram to experience the art gallery? Findings showed people use Instagram in art galleries for a range of reasons and these include to extend and evolve their aesthetic experience, to share their experience, and to mediate gallery space. The significance of these findings may influence decisions made by gallery curators to enhance visitor experience as well as people's expressive response to artworks.

Keywords: art gallery, museum, aesthetic experience, Instagram, sharing, space

Introduction

When people visit museums or art galleries, they often record their experiences of art through a range of social media platforms (Author 1 2020). One such platform is Instagram as it is an application for mobile devices where people post images and comments. People's responses to art are important as it means they have engaged with exhibitions through the expression of their thoughts and feelings. When curatorial design is well considered this kind of engagement can be

1
2
3 enhanced (Budge, 2017). As such, it is important to know how visitors to art galleries use Instagram
4 as part of this engagement with art. Also, it is vital we know why people use Instagram as this can
5 inform future development of exhibition spaces and programs.
6
7
8
9

10 This paper shares data from a project exploring people's art gallery or museum visitations
11 and how they engage with Instagram in such spaces. The research aimed to answer the following
12 research questions: What are the current practices of art gallery visitors using Instagram? and why
13 do visitors use Instagram to experience the art gallery? Without such knowledge there could be a
14 risk that people have limited engagement with art and that exhibitions have lessened impact on
15 people's aesthetic experience, hence transformation from viewing art both personally and socially.
16 The significance of investigating people's practices and reasons for using Instagram during and after
17 their art gallery visit includes assisting gallery curators' decisions to enhance visitor experience as
18 well as people's expressive response to artworks.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Review of the literature**

35 *Aesthetic Experience*

36 An aesthetic experience involves some form of affect and appreciation of something that is
37 inherently beautiful, consequently representing fullness of experience (Dewey 1934). Aesthetic
38 experience often occurs when we interact with art and can influence us behaviourally and
39 cognitively (Author 2 and colleague 2022/in press). It can be self-satisfying, the act in itself is
40 worthwhile or has value as learning or knowing something new is intrinsically rewarding
41 (Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson 1999). Learning and knowledge are deeply connected parts of the
42 aesthetic experience, for individuals the aesthetic experience can be understood as the "complex
43 and multifaceted experience of knowledge" (Consoli 2015b, 2).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Epistemologically, a number of scholars have argued that the goal of the aesthetic
56 experience is *knowing* (Burton 1997; Consoli 2014; Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson 1990; Custodero
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 et al. 2005; Hubard 2007; Yenawine 2002). Knowing is fundamentally a lived experience in that it
4
5 relies on feelings and thoughts (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2000; Consoli 2015a). For most people, an
6
7 aesthetic experience is how we improve our knowledge and how we understand our world; the
8
9 visualised representation of interpreted reality (Consoli 2014).
10

11
12 To understand is to know, and the way to know something is achieved by the human mind in
13
14 several ways (Hubard 2015). The aesthetic experience helps us learn how to know things to be true
15
16 or real (Pierroux et al. 2011). When faced with art uncovering or constructing a meaning may not be
17
18 something we can be told to know, we must experience it for ourselves. Our goal of an aesthetic
19
20 experience may be as simple as our emotional response or feeling, yet that is an oversimplification
21
22 as emotional responses are “complex, multi-layered and varied” (Hubard 2015, 96).
23
24

25
26 Further, the *object* plays a central role in an aesthetic experience’s formation. The object
27
28 and the viewer form a dialectical relationship in that the viewer investigates the object seeking to
29
30 elicit and separate the truth from illusion. Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson (1990) outlined the
31
32 aesthetic experience dimensions that they considered existed between visitors and objects in art
33
34 galleries. These dimensions are: the perceptual, being the experience that stems from the character
35
36 or quality of the aesthetic object; emotional (see also Hubard [2015] on this dimension), feelings or
37
38 affective responses; intellectual, the experience of knowledge or reflection against the aesthetic
39
40 object; and communication, the dialogue that exists between the aesthetic object and viewer.
41
42

43 *How aesthetic experience relates to gallery visits*

44
45 It could be argued that there is a connection between aesthetic experience and Instagramming
46
47 when visiting an art gallery (Author 1 2015). Instagram is an aesthetic platform, it is the perceptual,
48
49 perpetual, and repetitive photographic representation of what we see in the physical world (Hjorth
50
51 and Pink 2014). The art gallery is a site of aesthetic stimulation (Budge 2017), and visitors to the
52
53 gallery are encouraged to have a visual experience (Consoli 2014). Pekarik et al. (1999) researched
54
55 visitors’ experience in museums and found the most satisfying experiences reported by their
56
57 participants were object and cognitive experiences (36% respectively); followed by introspective
58
59
60

1
2
3 (20%) and social (8%) experiences. Age was a notable difference in their sample, with younger
4 audiences (under 44 years of age) preferring social experiences over object experiences. Object
5 experiences are associated with experiencing “the real thing” (1999, 157) whilst cognitive
6 experiences are the “interpretive or intellectual aspects of the experience” (1999, 157). This
7 highlights a link between object, visitor, and their experience satisfaction level. This is logically why
8 galleries seek to guide and inform their visitors through an aesthetic experience, either through
9 pedagogical interventions (such as didactics like wall labels), or through the enabling of a social
10 experience.

11
12 The time spent by individuals viewing an object also influences a visitor’s aesthetic
13 experience. Longer viewing time is linked to the perception of having a deeper aesthetic experience
14 (Carbon 2017). Burnham (1994) similarly supports the viewer to “look longer and to slow down”
15 (533) linking this to an evolving experience seeking to increase revelation and awareness in the
16 aesthetic experience. In short, objects and the aesthetic experience in an art gallery context are
17 inextricably linked.

18
19 An art gallery visitor’s aesthetic experience creates value for the individual, work of art,
20 artist, and gallery (Dewey 1934; Edmonds et al. 2009). Dewey’s (1934) historical work researching
21 the arts was considered seminal in identifying the arts as experiential (Heilig et al. 2010). Objects of
22 art placed in the gallery are encoded with meaning and the viewer’s aesthetic experience
23 determines how meaning is decoded and subjective meaning constructed (Winget 2009). Stecker
24 (1994) supports the idea of subjective meaning within the aesthetic experience, arguing that a
25 single, objective understanding of an art object may never be possible. Single, authoritative
26 interpretation of art is highly influenced by a scientific, positivistic approach to knowledge (Langridge
27 1989). Even if the artist’s intention is a single interpretation, individuals will determine an
28 interpretation subjectively (Winget 2009). Meaning will “emerge from the interaction of viewers and
29 artworks” (Hubard 2015, 104). This is where I see Instagram being of value, it allows us to view
30 multiple interactions and experiences that otherwise may never be observed. We are provided with
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a window into visitors' aesthetic experience that will allow us to know more about the aesthetic
4
5 experience in the context of the art gallery.
6

7 Art galleries want their visitors to have a deep and meaningful experience (Burnham 1994).
8
9 Instagram, through its photography function, gives the visitor the power to deepen their experience
10
11 through examining art objects. Visitors can be drawn to the object's aesthetics or meaning and make
12
13 judgments or control how their experience unfolds (Budge 2017). They may also photograph
14
15 themselves, others, or the environment they are in, or some other thing they have observed that is
16
17 meaningful to them. This process from seeing to sharing we could argue, has given us more of the
18
19 aesthetic experience to observe. It allows us to consider whether the aesthetic experience has
20
21 evolved through Instagramming. Art galleries should consider how an aesthetic experience
22
23 continues to evolve over time, and what role they may play in helping the visitor to return to their
24
25 experience.
26
27
28

29 *Sharing*

30
31 Why people share an art gallery visit on Instagram is not clear (Author 1 2015). In this section, the
32
33 literature as it relates to what we share on Instagram, hashtags and their relationship to sharing, and
34
35 how the imagined audience influences individual sharing practices is examined. Russo et al. (2006,
36
37 2008), through pre-Instagram social media research, highlighted a museum's role as a sharing
38
39 network where visitors may share "images, information, and experiences throughout communities"
40
41 (2008, 28). In the past 20 years, the rapid growth in social media has seen the term sharing become
42
43 popularised and widely used to categorise many behaviours and concepts online. Even though
44
45 sharing is broadly used to define many social media behaviours, as a concept it is under-theorised
46
47 and the term overloaded (John 2013).
48
49
50

51
52 Many people use the term sharing without understanding what they mean. The
53
54 distributional view of sharing is that I have something, I share it with you, and I am left with less than
55
56 what I started with (John 2017). This understanding, when placed in the context of Instagram, is not
57
58 concomitant (Kennedy 2016). On Instagram, one shares an image and/or text or comments and/or
59
60

1
2
3 likes another user's image. This type of sharing does not result in one being left with less and the
4
5 other more but is a form of sharing that is far more complex and imagined. The technology of
6
7 Instagram allows us to observe visitor sharing practices, which is a largely unseen practice. Being
8
9 able to observe sharing provides a valuable opportunity to understand more about the visitor and
10
11 their expectations (Chlebus-Grudzień 2018; Kiiler 2011).
12
13

14 Sharing is used broadly and understood generally when connected to Instagram and is a
15
16 popular practice when connected to the art gallery (Budge 2017). In Stylianou-Lambert's (2017)
17
18 research into visitor photography within the art gallery, sharing was cited by participants as the
19
20 second highest reason for taking photographs. Sharing was framed as a way of stimulating
21
22 conversation, sustaining communication between loved ones and close friends, and a public way of
23
24 asserting a sense of identity.
25
26

27 This way of understanding sharing aligns with the Instagram business model, that every time
28
29 a user shares something on Instagram they participate in a continuous socially constructed narrative
30
31 (Vivienne and Burgess 2013). A user posting an image, is sharing a re-contextualised moment of their
32
33 reality for community consumption (Thurlow and Jaworski 2011). The seven community guidelines
34
35 on Instagram reference sharing twelve times, guiding users in what to share and what not to share
36
37 (Instagram 2018). In short, sharing, whatever meaning it has to an individual user, is central to
38
39 participation on Instagram and a major part of its popularity (Marwick and boyd 2014).
40
41
42

43 44 *Instagramming, space and the visitor*

45
46 Space is an important focus in a study on Instagram and visitor experience in the art gallery, yet the
47
48 spatial characteristics of the art gallery visitor experience are largely neglected in the literature
49
50 (Schorch 2014). Roppola (2013) argues that any examination of visitor experience cannot be
51
52 adequately done without addressing the spatial conditions of the gallery. Everything that happens to
53
54 a visitor at the gallery happens in a physical space (Falk and Dierking 2000). A gallery space that is
55
56 easy for visitors to navigate and move around in helps them achieve their experience objectives (Falk
57
58 and Dierking 1992). In this section, the relationship between Instagram, spatial conditions,
59
60

1
2
3 visitor/gallery spatial practices, spatial theories, and movement is discussed. Spatial conditions
4
5 addressed in this section are physical, social, and digital; each affecting a visitor's experience
6
7
8 (Roppola 2013; Tröndle 2014).

9
10 *Spatial Conditions and the Aesthetic Experience.*

11
12 The gallery space has been found to enhance our aesthetic experience, highlighting the
13
14 environmental or spatial power of the gallery in an aesthetic experience (Specker et al. 2017). Biehl-
15
16 Missal and vom Lehn (2015) highlighted the Jewish Museum in Berlin as an example of this, claiming
17
18 that its synaesthetic atmosphere is created through its concrete walls and chilly air creating an
19
20 affective environmental space. Psarra (2005) supports this view, acknowledging that an effective
21
22 power of space for galleries is essential to enable them to meet their social and aesthetic objectives.
23
24 The literature has addressed various physical spatial conditions on visitor experience including noise
25
26 (Tröndle et al. 2012), spatial zones of art objects (Tröndle and Tschacher 2012), curatorial
27
28 arrangement (Tröndle et al. 2014), the presence of others (vom Lehn et al. 2001), design (Falk and
29
30 Dierking 2000), lighting (Bitgood et al. 1987), movement (Psarra 2005) and labels (Bourdeau and
31
32 Chebat 2001; Falk and Dierking 1992; Wurtzler 1993). While physical spatial conditions have been
33
34 examined in the literature, examination into digital spatial conditions is limited.
35
36
37
38

39
40 Studies into the human experience and physical spatial conditions have included bike
41
42 messenger practice (Kidder 2009), parkour (Kidder 2012), skateboarding (Borden 2001) and riding
43
44 the subway (Ocejo and Tonnelat 2014). There is little research into the spatial practices of art gallery
45
46 visitors, taking into account the mediation of smart device technology and Instagram. New
47
48 knowledge from this study will help address this gap in the visitor experience (Hooper-Greenhill
49
50 2007; Roppola 2013). Specifically, the gap in the literature is how visitors mediate space whilst
51
52 Instagramming at the gallery; or more so what does a visitor do differently spatially as a result of
53
54 using Instagram as part of their experience. It is expected this knowledge could help gallery
55
56 professionals create greater value for their institutions and their visitors, and arts educators for their
57
58 students.
59
60

Visitor Spatial Practices

It was stated earlier that Instagramming in the gallery is popular and that it forms part of some visitors' experience (Budge 2017; R. Smith 2015; Author 1 2015). We know little about this form of engagement, especially the effect that it has on the spatial practices of visitors. The gallery is experienced spatially and the use of Instagram forms part of that space. Positioning a photograph, mediating a post, scrolling, and searching through Instagram are all activities that require a negotiation of the space around us. My study addresses the concept of space in the setting of an art gallery, seen through visitor use of Instagram. We need to understand more about the changing dynamic in the ways people are knowing, learning, and experiencing the world around them through technology (Gunther and van Leeuwen 2006; Papacharissi and Easton 2013).

An individual Instagramming in a public space creates a contained personal space where their focus and attention become centred on their device; reducing awareness of their surroundings (Adkins et al. 2006). DuGay et al. (1997) in their pre-smart device research into Sony Walkman™ use, highlighted a similar spatial practice when they found wearing headphones was a method of creating a micro private space whilst within a public space.

The use of Instagram may also be framed as a multi-spatial practice. An Instagram user mediates more than one presence, being in personal, physical, social, and virtual spaces all at once (Quan-Haase and Martin 2013; Tzortzi 2017; Wilson 2009). A visitor using Instagram in the art gallery simultaneously experiences space offline and online (Hjorth and Pink 2014), connecting with Holloway-Attaway's (2014) concept of "being here and there" (60). One function of Instagram is the ability to live stream video from the user's device direct to any users watching within Instagram. Take for example a live music concert, a user live streams the concert from their device through Instagram. They are not experiencing only being in the physical space of the concert but also the virtual space of Instagram simultaneously (Tzortzi 2017).

Gallery Spatial Practices

1
2
3 Instagramming is influenced by the spatial conditions at the gallery. The spatial conditions at the
4 gallery are highly mediated, both socially and pedagogically (Eisner and Dobbs 1988; Witcomb 2014),
5
6 and the degree to which this spatially mediates behaviour may be implicit or explicit. Take for
7
8 example a gallery sign that reads *no photography allowed*, this will mediate the behaviour of visitors
9
10 and staff (Falk and Dierking 1992), and generally would be expected to reduce the motivation for
11
12 visitors to use Instagram. In a spatial context, the physical environment of the gallery will be affected
13
14 as the sign will be likely posted somewhere visible to everyone. For an individual, it will mediate
15
16 their use of space by limiting their photography or attempting to circumvent the rule by taking
17
18 photographs away out of sight of the gallery service personnel.
19
20
21
22

23 This idea of individuals appropriating space in contravention of a set system of rules was
24
25 observed by Kidder (2009) when he observed bike messengers running through red traffic lights and
26
27 riding down pedestrian stairs. Conversely, we may consider a gallery that encourages photography,
28
29 or social media and Instagram specifically. This may also be done through signage, a gallery didactic
30
31 for example promoting a hashtag to share any photographs that are taken. In both these
32
33 circumstances we conceptually illustrate how the gallery is not a neutral space, but decisions made
34
35 by the gallery within the environment may mediate visitors' spatial practices (Mills and Comber
36
37
38 2015).
39
40
41
42

43 **Research design**

44 *Methodology and methods*

45
46 Interpretivism was the chosen theoretical field; sharing, aesthetic experience, and space the
47
48 theoretical frameworks; ethnography (visual)-grounded theory was the methodology; participant
49
50 observations, Instagram posts, and semi-structured interviews were the research methods; and
51
52 grounded theory was the analytical framework for the study.
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 *Participants*

1
2
3 Participants and their recruitment were managed into this study by creating three identifiable
4 groups. Participant Groups One and Two were visitors to the exhibition who had posted to
5 Instagram. Participant Group Three were staff from the Gallery involved in the planning and
6 management of the exhibition.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 *Analytical approach: Spatial theory*
14

15 Henri Lefebvre's book *The Production of Space* (1991) is a monumental academic work in theorising
16 space in the context of social relations (Gottdiener 1993). Lefebvre (1991) posited a triadic model of
17 spatial production, the perceived, conceived, and lived cohesion of space. He argued the user's
18 space is lived not perceived or conceived (Colleague and Author 2 2014). Instagramming is an
19 example of a lived spatial experience as it is the result of the perceived and conceived space that is
20 Instagram, experienced by its users.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 An example of a study into lived experience is Kidder's (2009) research into bicycle messengers. He
30 highlighted that individuals determined how space will be lived through their material interaction
31 within it, regardless of how use of that space was planned in its design. If we consider Lefebvre's
32 (1991) model against visitor Instagram use in the gallery, we are observing the lived space of visitors.
33 The engineers, designers, artists, and programmers of the Instagram software and smart devices,
34 and the artists, architects, curators, and professionals of the art gallery all had conceptualisations of
35 how a visitor will use space. Yet it is only when it is lived that we will see the culmination of
36 Lefebvre's (1991) model. The participant data gathered in this study provided further insight into
37 Lefebvre's (1991) spatial theory in action.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 A further example of the role of spatial theory in the visitors' experience in the art gallery
50 can be found in Tröndle's (2014) discussion on the idea of positive and negative valence; a concept
51 that was developed from the work of Lewin (1936). A positive valence occurs when an object
52 attracts people into a space, and conversely a negative valence drives them away from a space. If we
53 consider an example relevant to an art gallery, the position of an art object or didactic may create
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 positive valence, a space that invites people in. Whereas an area of the gallery that may be under
4
5 reconstruction (with *do not enter* signage) to set up for a new exhibition would have a negative
6
7 valence, pushing people away from that space.
8
9

10 The concept of valence is a powerful tool for a curator as it allows them to consider spatially
11
12 the sight lines, spatial logics (Krukar 2014), and spatial forces that will affect visitor movement
13
14 throughout the exhibition. Gibson (1977) provides an alternative understanding to valence with his
15
16 term *affordance*. Greeno (1994, 338) explains “the term affordance refers to whatever it is about the
17
18 environment that contributes to the kind of interaction that occurs” in that environment. If we place
19
20 the term affordances into an art gallery context, a gallery information counter affords an individual
21
22 seeking a map a space that enables their interaction with the environment that is relational to their
23
24 situational needs.
25
26

27 Affordances are not without social and cultural context. A perceived affordance may exist,
28
29 for example I can touch that painting to feel what it is like, but it is not a real affordance as I would
30
31 likely be confronted by gallery security for touching paintings given “cultural constraints influence
32
33 what is considered appropriate behavior” (Stylianou-Lambert 2017, 117). An aesthetically pleasing
34
35 object of art, or artistic space, could be framed to an Instagram user as an affordance, as they are
36
37 looking for something to photograph and use as a post to Instagram.
38
39
40

41 The negotiation of space by art gallery visitors using Instagram is also highlighted by the
42
43 distance observed by some users created between them and the objects that are the subject matter
44
45 of their photograph. Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) discuss the spatial characteristics between close-
46
47 up, medium, and long photographic shots. Close-up shots may be used to centre an object into the
48
49 frame of the image, such as Budge’s (2017) research where visitors to a shoe exhibition placed shoes
50
51 at a distance where the viewer could feel they reach out and grab the objects (Kress and van
52
53 Leeuwen 1996). In previous research I completed I found some visitors went in for extreme close up
54
55 in photographs to highlight intricate detail in the art object; in this case close ups of cracks and splits
56
57 in a large-felled eucalyptus tree (Author 1 2015). Long shots on the other hand may be taken to
58
59
60

1
2
3 highlight the entire space of an exhibition. This links to the idea expressed by Tzortzi (2017) that
4 engagement in the art gallery happens through looking at art objects and spatially recognising
5 oneself as being in an art environment; “the sense of being engulfed by the materiality of the
6 physical space” (497). This materiality includes any objects within the space, such as tickets,
7 pamphlets, and entry stamps (Wood and Latham 2013).
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Research findings and discussion**

18 *Question 1: What are the current practices of art gallery visitors using Instagram*

19
20
21
22
23 The study found that art gallery visitors used Instagram during their visits in a number of ways. Such
24 diversity shows that Instagram can be a powerful tool to express responses to art as well as
25 maintaining a record of activities.
26
27
28
29

30
31 Box 1 outlines what the current practices are of art gallery visitors in using Instagram.

- 32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- archive their visit, record details and information about what they saw and experienced
 - express affinity for the artworks, artist, and gallery
 - signal authenticity to their chosen identity and manage others' impressions of them
 - engage with art in a contemporary way, intersecting technology with orthodox forms of art appreciation and interpretation
 - evolve and/or extend their aesthetic experience
 - create photographic images that are personal and/or aesthetically pleasing
 - promote, create awareness, and influence others to the artworks, artist, and gallery experience
 - amplify their social experience by sharing it with an identified and/or imagined audience;
 - and
 - mediate their movement through gallery space.

Box 1: What art gallery visitors use Instagram for

It is important to know about the different ways people use Instagram during art gallery visits as this can impact on the ways in which art gallery staff display work, engage and end-users and promote exhibitions. Further, use of Instagram can influence people's emotive responses to art and assist in socialising with others. we will now turn to answering research question two.

Question 2: Why do visitors use Instagram to experience the art gallery?

This study found that there are three main reasons why visitors use Instagram when they visit an art gallery. These are: to extend and evolve their aesthetic experience, to share their experience, and to mediate gallery space. Further explanation of each of these three reasons is presented below.

Evolving and extending the aesthetic experience

A reason that visitors use Instagram is to extend and/or evolve their aesthetic experience. Extending and/or evolving an aesthetic experience helps a visitor to know more about their experience of art. This is important as the goal of an aesthetic experience is knowing (Consoli, 2014). Through using Instagram, a visitor may build knowledge, understanding, and make sense of art on their own terms. Extending an aesthetic experience means starting it earlier and/or finishing it later. An example of an experience starting earlier is a visitor who checks out an exhibition on Instagram before they visit. In addition, someone who reflects on what to post to Instagram, or who engages with others about their post after they have visited, extends their experience.

Evolving an aesthetic experience means "increased revelation and awareness" (Burnham 1994, 523). By using Instagram, a visitor may be more observant and attentive to detail because they are looking for a moment or experience to capture. Digital photography (Lemon 2010) and reflective writing (Consoli 2014) have both been found to evolve an aesthetic experience. In this study, Instagram-centred activities that led to an evolved aesthetic experience were photography, image editing, writing, reflective thinking, sharing, socialising, posing, increased awareness and

1
2
3 observation. In short, visitors use Instagram in the gallery because it complements, aligns, and
4
5 amplifies their experience of art.
6
7

8 **Sharing experience through Instagram**

9

10
11 The second reason visitors use Instagram at the gallery is that it aligns with their sharing objectives.
12
13 Visitors want to share their experiences with others or themselves and Instagram provides them
14
15 with a modern way to do this. Sharing an art experience on Instagram can be a social act (Falk 2011,
16
17 2016; Sintas et al. 2014; vom Lehn et al. 2001), and/or a highly personalised journaling or
18
19 memorialising practice.
20
21

22
23 In this study, the understanding of sharing on Instagram was framed as a two-way practice; I
24
25 share images with others for them to view, and I share in the images of others by viewing them.
26
27 Visitors' Instagram sharing practices can be understood through the imagined audience, structured
28
29 affinity, and influencing. Imagining an audience is a key practice for gallery Instagram users (Litt
30
31 2012). Visitors imagine what their gallery experience would look like to an audience on Instagram.
32
33 Sharing with an imagined audience invites others into two-way communication and further dialogue
34
35 both on Instagram and offline.
36
37

38
39 The content that a visitor shares can be explained as stance-taking (Thurlow and Jaworski
40
41 2011) or broadcasting. The visitor is literally or figuratively saying something about themselves and
42
43 the way they think or signalling authenticity to their chosen identity. The important point is that
44
45 whomever the user thinks that they are sharing with, however nuanced, shapes the content and
46
47 reason for sharing.
48
49

50
51 Another reason why visitors share their gallery experience through Instagram is to structure
52
53 affinity. The visitor uses Instagram as a channel to communicate affinity for the artworks, artist,
54
55 and/or gallery. In the case of expressions of affinity for the artist these are para-social acts or forms
56
57 of bonding. In the literature review, it was identified how Instagram in the music industry was used
58
59 to imagine para-social relationships between fans and the musical artist (Morris 2014; Salo et al.
60

1
2
3 2013). Para-sociality in a social media context signifies the existence of an illusory or imagined
4 relationship between two people (Horton and Wohl 1956; Usher 2018). It is similar to the concept of
5 the imagined audience as the user cannot be sure whom they communicating to, or whether their
6 affinity has any effect. It signifies a social practice that some visitors engage with regardless of any
7 outcome. It is a means rather than an ends. Structuring affinity is a sharing practice that is
8 emotionally loaded and is an important practice for galleries that seek to strengthen and deepen
9 connections into the community.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Influencing is the final practice that explains why visitors use Instagram to share their
20 experience. Visitors use Instagram to directly influence others to see the exhibition for themselves
21 or apply implicit influence by amplifying the imagined positive aspects of their experience. As
22 mentioned in the literature review, influencing is typically associated with Instagram users who have
23 larger than average numbers of followers. However, this precondition is arbitrary. Influence can be
24 practiced regardless of the number of followers and similar to structuring affinity, it may only be
25 practised as a means to an end; the user having the belief that it will work. Influencing signifies a real
26 or imagined relationship of trust. The visitor posting the content wants to be seen as an authority
27 and be trusted for their opinion. There are cues that indicate engagement with the content; likes,
28 comments, and offline dialogue. However, the visitor may never know if their attempts to influence
29 others has worked beyond this.

43 44 45 **Instagram and mediating gallery space**

46
47 Visitors use Instagram at the gallery as it helps them to move through and mediate gallery space.
48 The best way to explain this is to refer to spatial theory. In particular, Lewin's (1936) concept of
49 valence, Gibson's (1977) affordances, and Lefebvre's (1991) triadic model. Each of these theories is
50 explained in detail in Chapter 2: Literature Review (Suess 2020).

51
52
53
54
55
56
57 Instagram visitors reported looking for opportunities to capture at the exhibition. These
58 opportunities were not limited to photographs even though every Instagram post contained an
59
60

1
2
3 image. Visitors looked for objects, experiences, moments, and spaces that they imagined would be
4 appropriate for Instagram. In that way, their movement through the gallery space was affected by
5 valence (Lewin 1936). Whether that was positive valence, being drawn into a space or location seen
6 as Instagrammable or negative valence, being pushed out or turned away from a space. An example
7 of this was in the tapestry artworks (Richter 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d). The rich detail and
8 aesthetic appeal in these objects drew visitors in for a close-up photograph to capture the material
9 qualities of the artwork; this is what is classified by Budge (2017) as an object-oriented post. As a
10 result of this the gallery had to install some physical barriers to ensure that visitors kept their
11 distance and did not get too close when interacting with the works.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Gibson's (1977) affordances also explain why visitors used Instagram. Affordances inform
25 visitors' movements (Tröndle 2014). The hashtag engagement activity didactic could be described as
26 an Instagram affordance. Visitors that were Instagram users were drawn into the space where the
27 didactic was displayed; the front entrance outside the exhibition space. The reason the didactic was
28 an affordance was that it met a situational need of the visitor to use Instagram (Gibson 1977).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Finally, Lefebvre's (1991) triadic model of space helps us to understand why visitors use
37 Instagram in the gallery. Even though certain images are recurrent on Instagram due in part to the
38 hermeneutic cycle (Urry 1990), visitors are not necessarily looking to be directed in their Instagram
39 practices. Visitors may appropriate space in order to fulfill their Instagram objectives. An example of
40 this was again the hashtag engagement activity. The gallery staff reported conceptualising the
41 activity with a certain purpose/outcome in mind. Gallery participants reported being surprised at
42 how, despite their engineered learning design, it was the visitors who finally decided who would
43 respond to the activity. This is an example of Lefebvre's (1991) perceived, conceived, and lived
44 experience model in action. What we observe on Instagram are visitors who live in the space of the
45 gallery on their own terms and use it in unique and complex ways.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 **Conclusion and key takeaways**

60

1
2
3 This article has focused on a close examination of visitor and gallery use of Instagram at an art
4
5 exhibition. Further, it has presented an overview of the research in this area and identified key
6
7 findings. The discussion presented the foundations of a critical understanding of Instagram use in
8
9 the museum space. It is recommended that museum management and curators consider the
10
11 research findings of this study when designing future museum experiences as it has potential to
12
13 improve visitor experience.
14
15

16
17 This study has three key takeaways for museum management and curators, that is sharing,
18
19 aesthetic experience, and the mediation of space. The pro-social sharing dynamic of Instagram offers
20
21 museums a way to cooperate with visitors to promote and raise awareness of the content and
22
23 experiences they offer. Experience sharing is a powerful visitor practice and facilitates peer-to-peer
24
25 influencing and nurtures affinity towards the museum. Instagram use offers curators a way to
26
27 further understand spatial awareness and visitor mediation of museum spaces. The considered use
28
29 of sight lines, valence, affordances, atmosphere, and movement may lead to higher visitor
30
31 engagement on Instagram.
32
33

34
35 By embedding a pedagogy and understanding visitor Instagram practices a museum can help
36
37 make the use of space appear less abstract and more meaningful. Instagram use also extends and
38
39 evolves the aesthetic experience. It may extend an aesthetic experience by making it start earlier
40
41 and finish later, allowing for periods of reflection. It also may evolve the aesthetic experience by
42
43 helping the visitor to reveal more about their experience, through increased awareness, imagination,
44
45 revelation, and reflection. As aesthetic experiences are essential for learning, this is a compelling
46
47 finding for museums seeking to create more educational value for visitors. Instagramming is a
48
49 popular practice for many visitors to museums and galleries, staff should be energised by this and
50
51 look for further creative and meaningful ways to channel its popularity alongside the museum's
52
53 objectives.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

We thank the Queensland Art Gallery, Gallery of Modern Art, Brisbane, Australia, for providing access to the team involved in the Gerhard Richter exhibition *The Life of Images*.

References

Author 1, 2015

Author 1, 2020

Author 2 and colleague, 2022/in press

Colleague and Author 2, 2014

Adkins, B., D. Smith, K. Barnett, and E. Grant. 2006. "Public space as 'context' in assistive information and communication technologies for people with cognitive impairment." *Information, Communication & Society* 9(3), 355-372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180600751330>.

Alvesson, M., and K. Sköldbberg. 2000. *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London: SAGE Publications.

Biehl-Missal, B., and D. vom Lehn. 2015. "Aesthetics and atmosphere in museums: A critical marketing perspective." In *The international handbooks of museum studies: Museum media*, edited by Henning, M., 235–258. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bitgood, S., M. Pierce, G. Nichols, and D. Patterson. 1987. "Formative evaluation of a cave exhibit." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 30(1), 31-39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.1987.tb00644.x>.

Borden, I. M. 2001. *Skateboarding, space and the city: Architecture and the body*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Bourdeau, L., and J. C. Chebat. 2001. "An empirical study of the effects of the design of the display galleries of an art gallery on the movement of visitors." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 19(1), 63-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647770100601901>.

1
2
3
4
5 Budge, K. 2017. "Objects in focus: Museum visitors and Instagram." *Curator: The Museum Journal*
6 60(1), 67-85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cura.12183>.
7

8
9
10 Burnham, R. 1994. "If you don't stop, you don't see anything." *Teachers College Record* 95(4), 520–
11 525. <http://lakeoswegoartliteracy.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/If-You-Dont-Stop-You-Dont-See-Anything.pdf>.
12
13
14

15
16
17 Burton, J. 1997. *Developing minds: Meaning and value in responding to works of art*. New York:
18 Teachers College.
19

20
21
22 Carbon, C. C. 2017. "Art perception in the museum: How we spend time and space in art
23 exhibitions." *i-Perception* 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041669517694184>.
24
25

26
27 Chlebus-Grudzień, P. 2018. "Selfie at a museum: Defining a paradigm for an analysis of taking (self-
28 portrait) photographs at museum exhibitions." *Turyzm* 28(1), 7-13. <https://doi.org/10.18778/0867-5856.28.1.0>.
29
30
31

32
33
34 Consoli, G. 2014. "The emergence of the modern mind: An evolutionary perspective on aesthetic
35 experience." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 72(1), 37-55.
36 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jaac.12059>.
37
38

39
40
41 Consoli, G. 2015a. "Creativity and aesthetic evaluation. Two proposals to improve the model of
42 aesthetic dis/fluency." *Frontiers in Psychology* 5, 1520. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01520>.
43
44

45
46 Consoli, G. 2015b. "From beauty to knowledge: A new frame for the neuropsychological approach to
47 aesthetics." *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 9, 290. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00290>.
48
49

50
51 Csikszentmihalyi, M., and K. Hermanson. 1999. "Intrinsic motivation in museums: Why does one
52 want to learn?" In *Public institutions for personal learning: Establishing a research agenda*, edited by
53 Falk, J. H., and L. D. Dierking, 67-78. Arlington: American Association of Museums.
54
55

56
57 Csikszentmihalyi, M. and R. E. Robinson. 1990. *The art of seeing. An interpretation of the aesthetic*
58 *encounter*. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Custodero, L. A., D. T. Hansen, A. Neumann, and D. Kerdeman. 2005. "Symposium: Aesthetic lives:
6 Teaching and learning as creative work." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 39(5), 33-96.
7
8 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3527404>.
9

10
11 Dewey, J. 1934. *Art as experience*. New York: Minton, Balch & Company.
12
13

14
15 DuGay, P., S. Hall, L. Janes, H. Mackay, and K. Negus. 1997. *Doing cultural studies: The story of the*
16 *Sony Walkman*. London: SAGE Publications.
17
18

19
20 Edmonds, E., Z. Bilda, and L. Muller. 2009. "Artist, evaluator and curator: Three viewpoints on
21 interactive art, evaluation and audience experience." *Digital Creativity* 20(3), 141-151.
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14626260903083579>.
24
25

26
27 Eisner, E. W., and S. M. Dobbs. 1988. "Silent pedagogy: How museums help visitors experience
28 exhibitions." *Art Education* 41(4), 6-15. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3193116>.
29
30

31
32 Falk, J. H., and L. D. Dierking. 2000. *Learning from museums: Visitor experiences and the making of*
33 *meaning*. Lanham: Altamira Press.
34
35

36
37 Falk, J. H., and L. D. Dierking. 1992. *The museum experience*. Washington: Whalesback Books.
38
39

40
41 Falk, J. 2011. "Contextualizing Falk's identity-related visitor motivation model." *Visitor Studies* 14(2),
42 141-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10645578.2011.608002>.
43
44

45
46 Falk, J. 2016. "Museum audiences: A visitor-centered perspective." *Society and Leisure* 39(3), 357-
47 370. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07053436.2016.1243830>.
48
49

50
51 Gibson, J. J. 1977. "The theory of affordances." In *Perceiving, acting, and knowing: Toward an*
52 *ecological psychology*, edited by Shaw, R., and J. Bransford, 67-82. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
53
54

55
56 Gottdiener, M. 1993. "A Marx for our time: Henri Lefebvre and the production of space."
57 *Sociological Theory* 11(1), 129-134. <https://doi.org/10.2307/201984>.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Greeno, G. J. 1994. "Gibson's affordances." *Psychological Review* 101(2), 336–342.

4
5 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.101.2.336>.

6
7
8 Gunther, K., and T. van Leeuwen. 2006. *Reading images: The grammar of visual*. London: Routledge.

9
10
11 Heilig, J. V., H. Cole, and A. Aguilar. 2010. "From Dewey to No Child Left Behind: The evolution and
12 devolution of public arts education." *Arts Education Policy Review* 111(4), 136-145.

13
14
15 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2010.490776>.

16
17
18 Hjorth, L., and S. Pink. 2014. "New visualities and the digital wayfarer: Reconceptualizing camera
19 phone photography and locative media.: *Mobile Media & Communication* 2(1), 40-57.

20
21
22 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2050157913505257>.

23
24
25 Holloway-Attaway, L. 2014. "Performing materialities: Exploring mixed media reality and Moby-
26 Dick." *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 20(1), 55-
27 68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856513514337>.

28
29
30
31 Hooper-Greenhill, E. 2007. Studying visitors. In *A companion to museum studies*, edited by S.
32 Macdonald, 362-376. London: Blackwell Publishing.

33
34
35
36
37 Horton, D., and R. R. Wohl. 1956. "Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on
38 intimacy at a distance." *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes* 19, 215–229.

39
40
41 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1956.11023049>.

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Hubard, O. M. 2007. "Complete engagement: Embodied response in art museum education." *Art
Education* 60(6), 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.2007.11651133>.

Hubard, O. M. 2015. "How does this artwork make you feel? A" no-no" question in art museum
education?" *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* 49(2), 82-98.

<https://doi.org/10.5406/jaesteduc.49.2.0082>.

Instagram. 2018. "Community guidelines." Instagram. Accessed April 19 2018.

<https://help.instagram.com/477434105621119>

- 1
2
3 John, N. A. 2013. "Sharing and web 2.0: The emergence of a keyword." *New Media & Society* 15(2),
4 167-182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812450684>.
5
6
7
8 John, N. A. 2017. *The age of sharing*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
9
10
11 Kennedy, J. 2016. "Conceptual boundaries of sharing." *Information, Communication & Society* 19(4),
12 461-474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1046894>.
13
14
15
16 Kidder, J. L. 2009. "Appropriating the city: space, theory, and bike messengers." *Theory and Society*,
17 38(3), 307-328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-008-9079-8>.
18
19
20
21
22 Kidder, J. L. 2012. "Parkour, the affective appropriation of urban space, and the real/virtual
23 dialectic." *City & Community* 11(3), 229-253. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6040.2012.01406.x>.
24
25
26
27 Kiiler, E. 2011. "Circulation of museum visitors' photographs: from art museums to collaborative
28 archives." *Spaces of Creation* 15(Nov), 58-66. [https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-](https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=175441)
29 [detail?id=175441](https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=175441).
30
31
32
33
34 Kress, G. R., and T. van Leeuwen. 1996. *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Hove:
35 Psychology Press.
36
37
38
39 Krukar, J. 2014. "Walk, look, remember: The influence of the gallery's spatial layout on human
40 memory for an art exhibition." *Behavioural Sciences* 4, 181-201. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs4030181>.
41
42
43
44 Langridge, D. W. 1989. *Subject analysis: Principles and procedures*. East Grinstead: Bowker- Saur.
45
46
47
48 Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The production of space*. London: Blackwell
49
50
51
52 Lemon, N. 2010. "Young children as digital photographers - possibilities for using the digital camera
53 in the primary classroom." *Australia Art Education* 33(2), 59-79.
54 <https://researchbank.rmit.edu.au/view/rmit:10755>.
55
56
57
58 Lewin, K. 1936. *Principles of topological psychology*. London: McGraw-Hill.
59
60

1
2
3 Litt, E. 2012. "Knock, knock. Who's there? The imagined audience." *Journal of Broadcasting &*
4 *Electronic Media* 56(3), 330-345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.705195>.

6
7
8 Marwick, A. E., and d. boyd. 2014. "Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social
9 media." *New Media & Society* 16(7), 1051-1067. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543995>.

11
12
13 Mills, K. A., and B. Comber. 2015. "Socio-spatial approaches to literacy studies: Rethinking the social
14 constitution and politics of space." In *Handbook of literacy studies*, edited by Pahl K., and J. Rowsell,
15 91-103. London: Routledge.

17
18
19 Morris, J. W. 2014. "Artists as entrepreneurs, fans as workers." *Popular Music and Society* 37(3),
20 273-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03007766.2013.778534>.

22
23
24 Ocejo, R. E., and S. Tonnelat. 2014. "Subway diaries: How people experience and practice riding the
25 train." *Ethnography* 15(4), 493-515. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24467154>.

27
28
29 Papacharissi, Z., and E. Easton. 2013. "In the habitus of the new: Structure, agency, and the social
30 media habitus." In *A companion to new media dynamics*, edited by Hartley, J., J. Burgess, and A.
31 Bruns, 167-184. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

32
33
34 Pekarik, A. J., Z. D. Doering, and D. Karns. 1999. "Exploring satisfying experiences in museums."
35 *Curator: The Museum Journal* 42(2), 152-173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.1999.tb01137.x>.

37
38
39 Pierroux, P., I. Krange, and I. Sem. 2011. "Bridging contexts and interpretations: Mobile blogging on
40 art museum field trips." *MedieKultur: Journal of Media and Communication Research* 27(50), 18.
41 <https://doi.org/10.7146/mediekultur.v27i50.2997>.

42
43
44 Psarra, S. 2005. "Spatial culture, way-finding and the educational message: The impact of layout on
45 the spatial, social and educational experiences of visitors to museums and galleries." In *Reshaping*
46 *museum space*, edited by Macleod, S., 78-94. London: Routledge.

47
48
49 Quan-Haase, A., and K. Martin. 2013. "Digital curation and the networked audience of urban events:
50 Expanding La Fiesta de Santo Tomás from the physical to the virtual environment." *International*
51 *Communication Gazette* 75(5-6). <https://doi.org/521-537.10.1177/1748048513491910>.

1
2
3
4
5 Richter, G. 2009a. *Abdu*, CR: 144. Olbricht Collection. Essen, Germany.
6
7

8 Richter, G. 2009b. *Iblan*, CR: 143. Olbricht Collection. Essen, Germany.
9
10

11 Richter, G. 2009c. *Musa*, CR: 141. Olbricht Collection. Essen, Germany.
12
13

14 Richter, G. 2009d. *Yusuf*, CR: 142. Olbricht Collection. Essen, Germany.
15
16

17 Roppola, T. 2013. *Designing for the museum visitor experience*. London: Routledge.
18
19

20 Russo, A., J. Watkins, L. Kelly, and S. Chan. 2006. "How will social media affect museum
21 communication?" Paper presented at the Nordic Digital Excellence in Museums (NODEM 06)
22 Conference, Oslo, Norway. December 7-9.
23
24
25
26

27 Russo, A., J. Watkins, L. Kelly, and S. Chan. 2008. "Participatory communication with social media."
28 *Curator: The Museum Journal* 51(1), 21– 31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2008.tb00292.x>.
29
30
31
32

33 Salo, J., M. Lankinen, and M. Mäntymäki. 2013. "The use of social media for artist marketing: Music
34 industry perspectives and consumer motivations." *International Journal on Media Management*
35 15(1), 23-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14241277.2012.755682>.
36
37
38
39

40 Schorch, P. 2014. "The experience of a museum space." *Museum Management and Curatorship*
41 28(2), 193-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2013.776797>.
42
43
44

45 Sintas, J. L., E. G. Álvarez, and E. P. Rubiales. 2014. "Art museum visitors: Interaction strategies for
46 sharing experiences." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 29(3), 241-259.
47
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2014.919175>.
50
51

52 Smith, R. 2015. "Seeing the light: Using visual ethnography in family business settings." *Family*
53 *Business Review* 28(1), 76-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486513504585>.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Specker, E., P. P. Tinio, and M. van Elk. 2017. "Do you see what I see? An investigation of the
4 aesthetic experience in the laboratory and museum." *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the*
5 *Arts* 11(3), 265-275. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000107>.

6
7
8
9
10 Stecker, R. 1994. "Art interpretation." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 52(2), 193-206.
11 <https://doi.org/10.2307/431166>.

12
13
14
15 Stylianou-Lambert, T. 2017. "Photographing in the art museum: Visitor attitudes and motivations."
16 *Visitor Studies* 20(2), 114-137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10645578.2017.1404345>.

17
18
19
20
21
22 Thurlow, C., and A. Jaworski. 2011. "Banal globalization? Embodied actions and mediated practices
23 in tourists' online photo-sharing." In *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*, edited by
24 Thurlow, C., and K. Mroczek, 220-250. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

25
26
27
28
29 Tröndle, M. 2014. "Space, movement and attention: Affordances of the museum environment."
30 *International Journal of Arts Management* 17(1), 4-17.

31
32
33
34 Tröndle, M., and W. Tschacher. 2012. "The physiology of phenomenology: The effects of artworks."
35 *Empirical Studies of the Arts* 30(1), 75-113. <https://doi.org/10.2190/EM.30.1.g>.

36
37
38
39 Tröndle, M., S. Greenwood, K. Bitterli, and K. van den Berg. 2014. "The effects of curatorial
40 arrangements." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 29(2), 140-173.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2014.88882>.

42
43
44
45
46 Tröndle, M., S. Wintzerith, R. Wäspe, and W. Tschacher. 2012. "A museum for the twenty-first
47 century: The influence of 'sociality' on art reception in museum space." *Museum Management and*
48 *Curatorship* 27(5), 461-486. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2012.737615>.

49
50
51
52
53 Tzortzi, K. 2017. "Museums architecture for embodied experience." *Museum Management and*
54 *Curatorship* 32(5), 491-508. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2017.1367258>.

55
56
57
58 Urry, J. 1990. *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: SAGE
59 Publications.
60

1
2
3
4
5 Usher, B. 2018. "Rethinking microcelebrity: Key points in practice, performance and purpose."
6 *Celebrity Studies*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2018.1536558>.

8
9
10 Vivienne, S., and J. Burgess. 2013. "The remediation of the personal photograph and the politics of
11 self-representation in digital storytelling." *Journal of Material Culture* 18, 279-298.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183513492080>.

13
14 vom Lehn, D., C. Heath, and J. Hindmarsh. 2001. "Exhibiting interaction: Conduct and collaboration
15 in museums and galleries." *Symbolic interaction* 24(2), 189-216.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1525/si.2001.24.2.189>.

17
18 Wilson, J. 2009. "Presence in social networks." In *Handbook of research on social software and*
19 *developing community ontologies*, edited by Hatzipanagos, S., and S. Warburton, 493-511. Hershey:
20 IGI Global.

21
22 Winget, M. 2009. "Describing art: An alternative approach to subject access and interpretation."
23 *Journal of Documentation* 65(6), 958-976. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410910998942>.

24
25 Witcomb, A. 2014. "'Look, listen and feel': The first peoples exhibition at the Bunjilaka Gallery,
26 Melbourne Museum." *Thema* 1, 49-62. <http://dro.deakin.edu.au/view/DU:30070290>.

27
28 Wood, E., and K. Latham. 2013. *The objects of experience: Transforming visitor-object encounters in*
29 *museums*. London: Routledge.

30
31 Wurtzler, S. 1993. "The space between the object and the label: Exhibiting restored vitaphone films
32 and technology." *Film History* 5(3), 275-288. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3815142>.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Yenawine, P. 2002. "Interactive learning in museums of art and design." Paper presented at
52 Interactive Learning in Museums, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, United Kingdom.
53 http://media.vam.ac.uk/media/documents/legacy_documents/file_upload/5756_file.pdf. May 17-
54 18.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Russo, A., J. Watkins, L. Kelly, and S. Chan. 2006. "How will social media affect museum
4 communication?" Paper presented at the Nordic Digital Excellence in Museums (NODEM 06)
5 Conference, Oslo, Norway. December 7-9.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3 **Instagram and the museum experience: Theorising the connection through aesthetics, space and**
4
5 **sharing**
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Abstract**
12

13
14 Many museum or art gallery visitors record their experience through social media platforms.
15
16 Instagram is a case in point. Instagram is an application for mobile devices where people
17
18 post images and comments, sharing their experiences in different places, with different
19
20 people. This paper shares data from a project exploring people's art gallery visitations and
21
22 how they engage with Instagram in such spaces. The research aimed to answer the following
23
24 research questions: What are the current practices of art gallery visitors using Instagram?
25
26 and why do visitors use Instagram to experience the art gallery? Findings showed people use
27
28 Instagram in art galleries for a range of reasons and these include to extend and evolve their
29
30 aesthetic experience, to share their experience, and to mediate gallery space. The
31
32 significance of these findings may influence decisions made by gallery curators to enhance
33
34 visitor experience as well as people's expressive response to artworks.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 **Keywords:** art gallery, museum, aesthetic experience, Instagram, sharing, space
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Introduction**
49

50
51 When people visit museums or art galleries, they often record their experiences of art through a
52
53 range of social media platforms (Author 1 2020). One such platform is Instagram as it is an
54
55 application for mobile devices where people post images and comments. People's responses to art
56
57 are important as it means they have engaged with exhibitions through the expression of their
58
59 thoughts and feelings. When curatorial design is well considered this kind of engagement can be
60

1
2
3 enhanced (Budge, 2017). As such, it is important to know how visitors to art galleries use Instagram
4
5 as part of this engagement with art. Also, it is vital we know why people use Instagram as this can
6
7 inform future development of exhibition spaces and programs.
8
9

10 This paper shares data from a project exploring people's art gallery or museum visitations
11
12 and how they engage with Instagram in such spaces. The research aimed to answer the following
13
14 research questions: What are the current practices of art gallery visitors using Instagram? and why
15
16 do visitors use Instagram to experience the art gallery? Without such knowledge there could be a
17
18 risk that people have limited engagement with art and that exhibitions have lessened impact on
19
20 people's aesthetic experience, hence transformation from viewing art both personally and socially.
21
22 The significance of investigating people's practices and reasons for using Instagram during and after
23
24 their art gallery visit includes assisting gallery curators' decisions to enhance visitor experience as
25
26 well as people's expressive response to artworks.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Review of the literature**

35 *Aesthetic Experience*

36
37 An aesthetic experience involves some form of affect and appreciation of something that is
38
39 inherently beautiful, consequently representing fullness of experience (Dewey 1934). Aesthetic
40
41 experience often occurs when we interact with art and can influence us behaviourally and
42
43 cognitively (Author 2 and colleague 2022/in press). It can be self-satisfying, the act in itself is
44
45 worthwhile or has value as learning or knowing something new is intrinsically rewarding
46
47 (Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson 1999). Learning and knowledge are deeply connected parts of the
48
49 aesthetic experience, for individuals the aesthetic experience can be understood as the "complex
50
51 and multifaceted experience of knowledge" (Consoli 2015b, 2).
52
53
54
55

56 Epistemologically, a number of scholars have argued that the goal of the aesthetic
57
58 experience is *knowing* (Burton 1997; Consoli 2014; Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson 1990; Custodero
59
60

1
2
3 et al. 2005; Hubard 2007; Yenawine 2002). Knowing is fundamentally a lived experience in that it
4
5 relies on feelings and thoughts (Alvesson and Skoldberg 2000; Consoli 2015a). For most people, an
6
7 aesthetic experience is how we improve our knowledge and how we understand our world; the
8
9 visualised representation of interpreted reality (Consoli 2014).
10

11
12 To understand is to know, and the way to know something is achieved by the human mind in
13
14 several ways (Hubard 2015). The aesthetic experience helps us learn how to know things to be true
15
16 or real (Pierroux et al. 2011). When faced with art uncovering or constructing a meaning may not be
17
18 something we can be told to know, we must experience it for ourselves. Our goal of an aesthetic
19
20 experience may be as simple as our emotional response or feeling, yet that is an oversimplification
21
22 as emotional responses are “complex, multi-layered and varied” (Hubard 2015, 96).
23
24

25
26 Further, the *object* plays a central role in an aesthetic experience’s formation. The object
27
28 and the viewer form a dialectical relationship in that the viewer investigates the object seeking to
29
30 elicit and separate the truth from illusion. Csikszentmihalyi and Robinson (1990) outlined the
31
32 aesthetic experience dimensions that they considered existed between visitors and objects in art
33
34 galleries. These dimensions are: the perceptual, being the experience that stems from the character
35
36 or quality of the aesthetic object; emotional (see also Hubard [2015] on this dimension), feelings or
37
38 affective responses; intellectual, the experience of knowledge or reflection against the aesthetic
39
40 object; and communication, the dialogue that exists between the aesthetic object and viewer.
41
42

43 *How aesthetic experience relates to gallery visits*

44
45 It could be argued that there is a connection between aesthetic experience and Instagramming
46
47 when visiting an art gallery (Author 1 2015). Instagram is an aesthetic platform, it is the perceptual,
48
49 perpetual, and repetitive photographic representation of what we see in the physical world (Hjorth
50
51 and Pink 2014). The art gallery is a site of aesthetic stimulation (Budge 2017), and visitors to the
52
53 gallery are encouraged to have a visual experience (Consoli 2014). Pekarik et al. (1999) researched
54
55 visitors’ experience in museums and found the most satisfying experiences reported by their
56
57 participants were object and cognitive experiences (36% respectively); followed by introspective
58
59
60

1
2
3 (20%) and social (8%) experiences. Age was a notable difference in their sample, with younger
4 audiences (under 44 years of age) preferring social experiences over object experiences. Object
5 experiences are associated with experiencing “the real thing” (1999, 157) whilst cognitive
6 experiences are the “interpretive or intellectual aspects of the experience” (1999, 157). This
7 highlights a link between object, visitor, and their experience satisfaction level. This is logically why
8 galleries seek to guide and inform their visitors through an aesthetic experience, either through
9 pedagogical interventions (such as didactics like wall labels), or through the enabling of a social
10 experience.

11
12 The time spent by individuals viewing an object also influences a visitor’s aesthetic
13 experience. Longer viewing time is linked to the perception of having a deeper aesthetic experience
14 (Carbon 2017). Burnham (1994) similarly supports the viewer to “look longer and to slow down”
15 (533) linking this to an evolving experience seeking to increase revelation and awareness in the
16 aesthetic experience. In short, objects and the aesthetic experience in an art gallery context are
17 inextricably linked.

18
19 An art gallery visitor’s aesthetic experience creates value for the individual, work of art,
20 artist, and gallery (Dewey 1934; Edmonds et al. 2009). Dewey’s (1934) historical work researching
21 the arts was considered seminal in identifying the arts as experiential (Heilig et al. 2010). Objects of
22 art placed in the gallery are encoded with meaning and the viewer’s aesthetic experience
23 determines how meaning is decoded and subjective meaning constructed (Winget 2009). Stecker
24 (1994) supports the idea of subjective meaning within the aesthetic experience, arguing that a
25 single, objective understanding of an art object may never be possible. Single, authoritative
26 interpretation of art is highly influenced by a scientific, positivistic approach to knowledge (Langridge
27 1989). Even if the artist’s intention is a single interpretation, individuals will determine an
28 interpretation subjectively (Winget 2009). Meaning will “emerge from the interaction of viewers and
29 artworks” (Hubard 2015, 104). This is where I see Instagram being of value, it allows us to view
30 multiple interactions and experiences that otherwise may never be observed. We are provided with
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a window into visitors' aesthetic experience that will allow us to know more about the aesthetic
4
5 experience in the context of the art gallery.
6

7 Art galleries want their visitors to have a deep and meaningful experience (Burnham 1994).
8
9 Indeed, research has introduced the idea of visitors' 'Quality of Experience [QoE] (Tsiropoulou, et al.,
10
11 2017) which investigates how humans participate in a loop between physical, personal and interest-
12
13 aware tours of gallery spaces. Tsiropoulou et al. (2017) argue that there are a number of influential
14
15 factors that determine the quality of a visitor's experience. Similarly, earlier research suggests that
16
17 the number of people visiting (Wright, 1989), how people move about the space (Eliseo and Martine
18
19 (1991) and the links between emotion and experience De Rojas and Camarero (2008). Specifically,
20
21 research has quantified the ways in which visitors engage in a museum space e.g., directions and
22
23 sequence of their movement in the hope that 'optimal touring' occurs (Yoshimura et al., 2014).
24
25 Despite this relatively new work, our study focused more on what visitors chose to do when using
26
27 Instagram when visiting a selected gallery space.
28
29
30
31

32 Instagram, through its photography function, gives the visitor the power to deepen their
33
34 experience through examining art objects. Visitors can be drawn to the object's aesthetics or
35
36 meaning and make judgments or control how their experience unfolds (Budge 2017). They may also
37
38 photograph themselves, others, or the environment they are in, or some other thing they have
39
40 observed that is meaningful to them. This process from seeing to sharing we could argue, has given
41
42 us more of the aesthetic experience to observe. It allows us to consider whether the aesthetic
43
44 experience has evolved through Instagramming. Art galleries should consider how an aesthetic
45
46 experience continues to evolve over time, and what role they may play in helping the visitor to
47
48 return to their experience.
49
50

51 *Sharing*

52 Why people share an art gallery visit on Instagram is not clear (Author 1 2015). In this section, the
53
54 literature as it relates to what we share on Instagram, hashtags and their relationship to sharing, and
55
56 how the imagined audience influences individual sharing practices is examined. Russo et al. (2006,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2008), through pre-Instagram social media research, highlighted a museum's role as a sharing
4 network where visitors may share "images, information, and experiences throughout communities"
5 (2008, 28). In the past 20 years, the rapid growth in social media has seen the term sharing become
6 popularised and widely used to categorise many behaviours and concepts online. Even though
7 sharing is broadly used to define many social media behaviours, as a concept it is under-theorised
8 and the term overloaded (John 2013).

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Many people use the term sharing without understanding what they mean. The
18 distributional view of sharing is that I have something, I share it with you, and I am left with less than
19 what I started with (John 2017). This understanding, when placed in the context of Instagram, is not
20 concomitant (Kennedy 2016). On Instagram, one shares an image and/or text or comments and/or
21 likes another user's image. This type of sharing does not result in one being left with less and the
22 other more but is a form of sharing that is far more complex and imagined. The technology of
23 Instagram allows us to observe visitor sharing practices, which is a largely unseen practice. Being
24 able to observe sharing provides a valuable opportunity to understand more about the visitor and
25 their expectations (Chlebus-Grudzień 2018; Kiiler 2011).

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 Sharing is used broadly and understood generally when connected to Instagram and is a
38 popular practice when connected to the art gallery (Budge 2017). In Stylianou-Lambert's (2017)
39 research into visitor photography within the art gallery, sharing was cited by participants as the
40 second highest reason for taking photographs. Sharing was framed as a way of stimulating
41 conversation, sustaining communication between loved ones and close friends, and a public way of
42 asserting a sense of identity.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50 This way of understanding sharing aligns with the Instagram business model, that every time
51 a user shares something on Instagram they participate in a continuous socially constructed narrative
52 (Vivienne and Burgess 2013). A user posting an image, is sharing a re-contextualised moment of their
53 reality for community consumption (Thurlow and Jaworski 2011). The seven community guidelines
54 on Instagram reference sharing twelve times, guiding users in what to share and what not to share
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Instagram 2018). In short, sharing, whatever meaning it has to an individual user, is central to
4 participation on Instagram and a major part of its popularity (Marwick and boyd 2014).
5
6

7
8 *Instagramming, space and the visitor*
9

10 **Despite emerging research exploring the interrelation between instagramming, space and visitors**
11 **very little is known about what types of activities people engage in and why they engage in them**
12 **when using Instagram in gallery spaces.** Space is an important focus in a study on Instagram and
13 visitor experience in the art gallery, yet the spatial characteristics of the art gallery visitor experience
14 are largely neglected in the literature (Schorch 2014). Roppola (2013) argues that any examination of
15 visitor experience cannot be adequately done without addressing the spatial conditions of the
16 gallery. Everything that happens to a visitor at the gallery happens in a physical space (Falk and
17 Dierking 2000). A gallery space that is easy for visitors to navigate and move around in helps them
18 achieve their experience objectives (Falk and Dierking 1992). In this section, the relationship
19 between Instagram, spatial conditions, visitor/gallery spatial practices, spatial theories, and
20 movement is discussed. Spatial conditions addressed in this section are physical, social, and digital;
21 each affecting a visitor's experience (Roppola 2013; Tröndle 2014).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 *Spatial Conditions and the Aesthetic Experience.*
38

39 The gallery space has been found to enhance our aesthetic experience, highlighting the
40 environmental or spatial power of the gallery in an aesthetic experience (Specker et al. 2017). Biehl-
41 Missal and vom Lehn (2015) highlighted the Jewish Museum in Berlin as an example of this, claiming
42 that its synaesthetic atmosphere is created through its concrete walls and chilly air creating an
43 affective environmental space. Psarra (2005) supports this view, acknowledging that an effective
44 power of space for galleries is essential to enable them to meet their social and aesthetic objectives.
45 The literature has addressed various physical spatial conditions on visitor experience including noise
46 (Tröndle et al. 2012), spatial zones of art objects (Tröndle and Tschacher 2012), curatorial
47 arrangement (Tröndle et al. 2014), the presence of others (vom Lehn et al. 2001), design (Falk and
48 Dierking 2000), lighting (Bitgood et al. 1987), movement (Psarra 2005) and labels (Bourdeau and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Chebat 2001; Falk and Dierking 1992; Wurtzler 1993). While physical spatial conditions have been
4
5 examined in the literature, examination into digital spatial conditions is limited.
6

7
8 Studies into the human experience and physical spatial conditions have included bike
9
10 messenger practice (Kidder 2009), parkour (Kidder 2012), skateboarding (Borden 2001) and riding
11
12 the subway (Ocejo and Tonnelat 2014). There is little research into the spatial practices of art gallery
13
14 visitors, taking into account the mediation of smart device technology and Instagram. New
15
16 knowledge from this study will help address this gap in the visitor experience (Hooper-Greenhill
17
18 2007; Roppola 2013). Specifically, the gap in the literature is how visitors mediate space whilst
19
20 Instagramming at the gallery; or more so what does a visitor do differently spatially as a result of
21
22 using Instagram as part of their experience. It is expected this knowledge could help gallery
23
24 professionals create greater value for their institutions and their visitors, and arts educators for their
25
26 students.
27
28

29 30 *Visitor Spatial Practices*

31
32 It was stated earlier that Instagramming in the gallery is popular and that it forms part of some
33
34 visitors' experience (Budge 2017; R. Smith 2015; Author 1 2015). We know little about this form of
35
36 engagement, especially the effect that it has on the spatial practices of visitors. The gallery is
37
38 experienced spatially and the use of Instagram forms part of that space. Positioning a photograph,
39
40 mediating a post, scrolling, and searching through Instagram are all activities that require a
41
42 negotiation of the space around us. My study addresses the concept of space in the setting of an art
43
44 gallery, seen through visitor use of Instagram. We need to understand more about the changing
45
46 dynamic in the ways people are knowing, learning, and experiencing the world around them through
47
48 technology (Gunther and van Leeuwen 2006; Papacharissi and Easton 2013).
49
50

51
52 An individual Instagramming in a public space creates a contained personal space where
53
54 their focus and attention become centred on their device; reducing awareness of their surroundings
55
56 (Adkins et al. 2006). DuGay et al. (1997) in their pre-smart device research into Sony Walkman™ use,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 highlighted a similar spatial practice when they found wearing headphones was a method of creating
4
5 a micro private space whilst within a public space.
6

7
8 The use of Instagram may also be framed as a multi-spatial practice. An Instagram user
9
10 mediates more than one presence, being in personal, physical, social, and virtual spaces all at once
11
12 (Quan-Haase and Martin 2013; Tzortzi 2017; Wilson 2009). A visitor using Instagram in the art gallery
13
14 simultaneously experiences space offline and online (Hjorth and Pink 2014), connecting with
15
16 Holloway-Attaway's (2014) concept of "being here and there" (60). One function of Instagram is the
17
18 ability to live stream video from the user's device direct to any users watching within Instagram.
19
20 Take for example a live music concert, a user live streams the concert from their device through
21
22 Instagram. They are not experiencing only being in the physical space of the concert but also the
23
24 virtual space of Instagram simultaneously (Tzortzi 2017).
25
26

27 28 *Gallery Spatial Practices*

29
30 Instagramming is influenced by the spatial conditions at the gallery. The spatial conditions at the
31
32 gallery are highly mediated, both socially and pedagogically (Eisner and Dobbs 1988; Witcomb 2014),
33
34 and the degree to which this spatially mediates behaviour may be implicit or explicit. Take for
35
36 example a gallery sign that reads *no photography allowed*, this will mediate the behaviour of visitors
37
38 and staff (Falk and Dierking 1992), and generally would be expected to reduce the motivation for
39
40 visitors to use Instagram. In a spatial context, the physical environment of the gallery will be affected
41
42 as the sign will be likely posted somewhere visible to everyone. For an individual, it will mediate
43
44 their use of space by limiting their photography or attempting to circumvent the rule by taking
45
46 photographs away out of sight of the gallery service personnel.
47
48
49

50
51 This idea of individuals appropriating space in contravention of a set system of rules was
52
53 observed by Kidder (2009) when he observed bike messengers running through red traffic lights and
54
55 riding down pedestrian stairs. Conversely, we may consider a gallery that encourages photography,
56
57 or social media and Instagram specifically. This may also be done through signage, a gallery didactic
58
59 for example promoting a hashtag to share any photographs that are taken. In both these
60

1
2
3 circumstances we conceptually illustrate how the gallery is not a neutral space, but decisions made
4
5 by the gallery within the environment may mediate visitors' spatial practices (Mills and Comber
6
7 2015).

10 *Visitor Instagram Practices*

11
12 The research into art gallery visitors' use of Instagram is developing (Budge, 2017). Previous
13
14 research at museums and galleries has found visitors used Instagram to re-curate exhibitions, and
15
16 extend dialogue beyond the physical setting (Weilenmann, Hillman, & Jungselius, 2013), engage with
17
18 exhibition objects (Budge, 2017), and assert visitor agency and authority (Budge & Burness, 2017).
19
20 The four areas of focus in this study coalesce as the gap within the research literature: visitor
21
22 Instagram practices, sharing, aesthetic experience, and space. Literature that examined specifically
23
24 these areas together was unable to be located, and an objective of this study was to analyse the
25
26 participant data against this grouping of concepts that would lead to new knowledge for arts
27
28 practitioners, gallery professionals, and visitors.
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Research design**

37 *Methodology and methods*

38
39
40 Interpretivism was the chosen theoretical field; sharing, aesthetic experience, and space the
41
42 theoretical frameworks; ethnography (visual)-grounded theory was the methodology; participant
43
44 observations, Instagram posts, and semi-structured interviews were the research methods; and
45
46 grounded theory was the analytical framework for the study. A summary of the steps taken in this
47
48 research are provided in Table 1.
49
50

52 **Table 1: Steps taken in the overarching research study**

Steps	Research Activity
1	Observation of 550 Instagram posts obtained through a hash/geo-tag search.
2	550 observation field notes generated using visual ethnography. Field notes coded and observations stopped when saturation had been reached.
3	17 visitor participants (a subset from within the 550 Instagram posts from Step 1) recruited into the study through random selection.
4	Images from the 17 visitor participants' posts converted to text using visual ethnography.
5	Interviews conducted with the same 17 visitor participants in Step 4, responses and image text coded and compared with earlier codes, and categories formed.
6	4 Gallery participants (a separate group to either of the above) who had worked on the exhibition recruited into the study and interviewed.
7	Gallery participants' interview responses coded and categorised.
8	Core code categories which represents the grounded theory developed across all participant groups.
9	Writing up of the results

Participants

Participants and their recruitment were managed into this study by creating three identifiable groups. Participant Groups One and Two were visitors to the exhibition who had posted to Instagram. Participant Group Three were staff from the Gallery involved in the planning and management of the exhibition.

Analytical approach: Spatial theory

Henri Lefebvre's book *The Production of Space* (1991) is a monumental academic work in theorising space in the context of social relations (Gottdiener 1993). Lefebvre (1991) posited a triadic model of spatial production, the perceived, conceived, and lived cohesion of space. He argued the user's space is lived not perceived or conceived (Colleague and Author 2 2014). Instagramming is an example of a lived spatial experience as it is the result of the perceived and conceived space that is Instagram, experienced by its users.

1
2
3 An example of a study into lived experience is Kidder's (2009) research into bicycle messengers. He
4 highlighted that individuals determined how space will be lived through their material interaction
5 within it, regardless of how use of that space was planned in its design. If we consider Lefebvre's
6 (1991) model against visitor Instagram use in the gallery, we are observing the lived space of visitors.
7
8 The engineers, designers, artists, and programmers of the Instagram software and smart devices,
9 and the artists, architects, curators, and professionals of the art gallery all had conceptualisations of
10 how a visitor will use space. Yet it is only when it is lived that we will see the culmination of
11 Lefebvre's (1991) model. The participant data gathered in this study provided further insight into
12 Lefebvre's (1991) spatial theory in action.

13
14 A further example of the role of spatial theory in the visitors' experience in the art gallery
15 can be found in Tröndle's (2014) discussion on the idea of positive and negative valence; a concept
16 that was developed from the work of Lewin (1936). A positive valence occurs when an object
17 attracts people into a space, and conversely a negative valence drives them away from a space. If we
18 consider an example relevant to an art gallery, the position of an art object or didactic may create
19 positive valence, a space that invites people in. Whereas an area of the gallery that may be under
20 reconstruction (with *do not enter* signage) to set up for a new exhibition would have a negative
21 valence, pushing people away from that space.

22
23 The concept of valence is a powerful tool for a curator as it allows them to consider spatially
24 the sight lines, spatial logics (Krukar 2014), and spatial forces that will affect visitor movement
25 throughout the exhibition. Gibson (1977) provides an alternative understanding to valence with his
26 term *affordance*. Greeno (1994, 338) explains "the term affordance refers to whatever it is about the
27 environment that contributes to the kind of interaction that occurs" in that environment. If we place
28 the term affordances into an art gallery context, a gallery information counter affords an individual
29 seeking a map a space that enables their interaction with the environment that is relational to their
30 situational needs.

1
2
3 Affordances are not without social and cultural context. A perceived affordance may exist,
4
5 for example I can touch that painting to feel what it is like, but it is not a real affordance as I would
6
7 likely be confronted by gallery security for touching paintings given “cultural constraints influence
8
9 what is considered appropriate behavior” (Stylianou-Lambert 2017, 117). An aesthetically pleasing
10
11 object of art, or artistic space, could be framed to an Instagram user as an affordance, as they are
12
13 looking for something to photograph and use as a post to Instagram.
14
15

16
17 The negotiation of space by art gallery visitors using Instagram is also highlighted by the
18
19 distance observed by some users created between them and the objects that are the subject matter
20
21 of their photograph. Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) discuss the spatial characteristics between close-
22
23 up, medium, and long photographic shots. Close-up shots may be used to centre an object into the
24
25 frame of the image, such as Budge’s (2017) research where visitors to a shoe exhibition placed shoes
26
27 at a distance where the viewer could feel they reach out and grab the objects (Kress and van
28
29 Leeuwen 1996). In previous research I completed I found some visitors went in for extreme close up
30
31 in photographs to highlight intricate detail in the art object; in this case close ups of cracks and splits
32
33 in a large-felled eucalyptus tree (Author 1 2015). Long shots on the other hand may be taken to
34
35 highlight the entire space of an exhibition. This links to the idea expressed by Tzortzi (2017) that
36
37 engagement in the art gallery happens through looking at art objects and spatially recognising
38
39 oneself as being in an art environment; “the sense of being engulfed by the materiality of the
40
41 physical space” (497). This materiality includes any objects within the space, such as tickets,
42
43 pamphlets, and entry stamps (Wood and Latham 2013).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Research findings and discussion**

52
53
54 *Question 1: What are the current practices of art gallery visitors using Instagram*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The study found that art gallery visitors used Instagram during their visits in a number of ways. Such
4
5 diversity shows that Instagram can be a powerful tool to express responses to art as well as
6
7 maintaining a record of activities.
8
9

10 Box 1 outlines what the current practices are of art gallery visitors in using Instagram.
11
12

- 13 • archive their visit, record details and information about what they saw and experienced
- 14
- 15 • express affinity for the artworks, artist, and gallery
- 16
- 17 • signal authenticity to their chosen identity and manage others' impressions of them
- 18
- 19 • engage with art in a contemporary way, intersecting technology with orthodox forms of art
- 20
- 21 appreciation and interpretation
- 22
- 23 • evolve and/or extend their aesthetic experience
- 24
- 25 • create photographic images that are personal and/or aesthetically pleasing
- 26
- 27 • promote, create awareness, and influence others to the artworks, artist, and gallery
- 28
- 29 experience
- 30
- 31 • amplify their social experience by sharing it with an identified and/or imagined audience;
- 32
- 33 and
- 34
- 35 • mediate their movement through gallery space.
- 36
37
38
39
40

41
42 **Box 1: What art gallery visitors use Instagram for**
43

44 It is important to know about the different ways people use Instagram during art gallery visits as this
45
46 can impact on the ways in which art gallery staff display work, engage and end-users and promote
47
48 exhibitions. Further, use of Instagram can influence people's emotive responses to art and assist in
49
50 socialising with others. we will now turn to answering research question two.
51
52

53
54 *Question 2: Why do visitors use Instagram to experience the art gallery?*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This study found that there are three main reasons why visitors use Instagram when they visit an art
4 gallery. These are: to extend and evolve their aesthetic experience, to share their experience, and to
5 mediate gallery space. Further explanation of each of these three reasons is presented below.
6
7
8
9

10 **Evolving and extending the aesthetic experience**

11
12
13 A reason that visitors use Instagram is to extend and/or evolve their aesthetic experience. Extending
14 and/or evolving an aesthetic experience helps a visitor to know more about their experience of art.
15
16 This is important as the goal of an aesthetic experience is knowing (Consoli, 2014). Through using
17 Instagram, a visitor may build knowledge, understanding, and make sense of art on their own terms.
18
19 Extending an aesthetic experience means starting it earlier and/or finishing it later. An example of an
20 experience starting earlier is a visitor who checks out an exhibition on Instagram before they visit. In
21 addition, someone who reflects on what to post to Instagram, or who engages with others about
22 their post after they have visited, extends their experience.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Evolving an aesthetic experience means “increased revelation and awareness” (Burnham
33 1994, 523). By using Instagram, a visitor may be more observant and attentive to detail because they
34 are looking for a moment or experience to capture. Digital photography (Lemon 2010) and reflective
35 writing (Consoli 2014) have both been found to evolve an aesthetic experience. In this study,
36 Instagram-centred activities that led to an evolved aesthetic experience were photography, image
37 editing, writing, reflective thinking, sharing, socialising, posing, increased awareness and
38 observation. In short, visitors use Instagram in the gallery because it complements, aligns, and
39 amplifies their experience of art.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Sharing experience through Instagram**

51
52
53 The second reason visitors use Instagram at the gallery is that it aligns with their sharing objectives.
54
55 Visitors want to share their experiences with others or themselves and Instagram provides them
56 with a modern way to do this. Sharing an art experience on Instagram can be a social act (Falk 2011,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2016; Sintas et al. 2014; vom Lehn et al. 2001), and/or a highly personalised journaling or
4
5 memorialising practice.
6
7

8 In this study, the understanding of sharing on Instagram was framed as a two-way practice; I
9
10 share images with others for them to view, and I share in the images of others by viewing them.
11
12 Visitors' Instagram sharing practices can be understood through the imagined audience, structured
13
14 affinity, and influencing. Imagining an audience is a key practice for gallery Instagram users (Litt
15
16 2012). Visitors imagine what their gallery experience would look like to an audience on Instagram.
17
18 Sharing with an imagined audience invites others into two-way communication and further dialogue
19
20 both on Instagram and offline.
21
22

23
24 The content that a visitor shares can be explained as stance-taking (Thurlow and Jaworski
25
26 2011) or broadcasting. The visitor is literally or figuratively saying something about themselves and
27
28 the way they think or signalling authenticity to their chosen identity. The important point is that
29
30 whomever the user thinks that they are sharing with, however nuanced, shapes the content and
31
32 reason for sharing.
33
34

35
36 Another reason why visitors share their gallery experience through Instagram is to structure
37
38 affinity. The visitor uses Instagram as a channel to communicate affinity for the artworks, artist,
39
40 and/or gallery. In the case of expressions of affinity for the artist these are para-social acts or forms
41
42 of bonding. In the literature review, it was identified how Instagram in the music industry was used
43
44 to imagine para-social relationships between fans and the musical artist (Morris 2014; Salo et al.
45
46 2013). Para-sociality in a social media context signifies the existence of an illusory or imagined
47
48 relationship between two people (Horton and Wohl 1956; Usher 2018). It is similar to the concept of
49
50 the imagined audience as the user cannot be sure whom they communicating to, or whether their
51
52 affinity has any effect. It signifies a social practice that some visitors engage with regardless of any
53
54 outcome. It is a means rather than an ends. Structuring affinity is a sharing practice that is
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 emotionally loaded and is an important practice for galleries that seek to strengthen and deepen
4
5 connections into the community.
6
7

8 Influencing is the final practice that explains why visitors use Instagram to share their
9
10 experience. Visitors use Instagram to directly influence others to see the exhibition for themselves
11
12 or apply implicit influence by amplifying the imagined positive aspects of their experience. As
13
14 mentioned in the literature review, influencing is typically associated with Instagram users who have
15
16 larger than average numbers of followers. However, this precondition is arbitrary. Influence can be
17
18 practiced regardless of the number of followers and similar to structuring affinity, it may only be
19
20 practised as a means to an end; the user having the belief that it will work. Influencing signifies a real
21
22 or imagined relationship of trust. The visitor posting the content wants to be seen as an authority
23
24 and be trusted for their opinion. There are cues that indicate engagement with the content; likes,
25
26 comments, and offline dialogue. However, the visitor may never know if their attempts to influence
27
28 others has worked beyond this.
29
30
31

32 33 **Instagram and mediating gallery space**

34
35
36 Visitors use Instagram at the gallery as it helps them to move through and mediate gallery space.
37
38 The best way to explain this is to refer to spatial theory. In particular, Lewin's (1936) concept of
39
40 valence, Gibson's (1977) affordances, and Lefebvre's (1991) triadic model.
41
42

43
44 Instagram visitors reported looking for opportunities to capture at the exhibition. These
45
46 opportunities were not limited to photographs even though every Instagram post contained an
47
48 image. Visitors looked for objects, experiences, moments, and spaces that they imagined would be
49
50 appropriate for Instagram. In that way, their movement through the gallery space was affected by
51
52 valence (Lewin 1936). Whether that was positive valence, being drawn into a space or location seen
53
54 as Instagrammable or negative valence, being pushed out or turned away from a space. An example
55
56 of this was in the tapestry artworks (Richter 2009a, 2009b, 2009c, 2009d). The rich detail and
57
58 aesthetic appeal in these objects drew visitors in for a close-up photograph to capture the material
59
60

1
2
3 qualities of the artwork; this is what is classified by Budge (2017) as an object-oriented post. As a
4
5 result of this the gallery had to install some physical barriers to ensure that visitors kept their
6
7 distance and did not get too close when interacting with the works.
8
9

10 Gibson's (1977) affordances also explain why visitors used Instagram. Affordances inform
11
12 visitors' movements (Tröndle 2014). The hashtag engagement activity didactic could be described as
13
14 an Instagram affordance. Visitors that were Instagram users were drawn into the space where the
15
16 didactic was displayed; the front entrance outside the exhibition space. The reason the didactic was
17
18 an affordance was that it met a situational need of the visitor to use Instagram (Gibson 1977).
19
20
21

22 Finally, Lefebvre's (1991) triadic model of space helps us to understand why visitors use
23
24 Instagram in the gallery. Even though certain images are recurrent on Instagram due in part to the
25
26 hermeneutic cycle (Urry 1990), visitors are not necessarily looking to be directed in their Instagram
27
28 practices. Visitors may appropriate space in order to fulfill their Instagram objectives. An example of
29
30 this was again the hashtag engagement activity. The gallery staff reported conceptualising the
31
32 activity with a certain purpose/outcome in mind. Gallery participants reported being surprised at
33
34 how, despite their engineered learning design, it was the visitors who finally decided who would
35
36 respond to the activity. This is an example of Lefebvre's (1991) perceived, conceived, and lived
37
38 experience model in action. What we observe on Instagram are visitors who live in the space of the
39
40 gallery on their own terms and use it in unique and complex ways.
41
42
43
44

45 **Conclusion and key takeaways**

46
47
48 This article has focused on a close examination of visitor and gallery use of Instagram at an art
49
50 exhibition. Further, it has presented an overview of the research in this area and identified key
51
52 findings. The discussion presented the foundations of a critical understanding of Instagram use in
53
54 the museum space. It is recommended that museum management and curators consider the
55
56 research findings of this study when designing future museum experiences as it has potential to
57
58 improve visitor experience.
59
60

1
2
3 This study has three key takeaways for museum management and curators, that is sharing,
4 aesthetic experience, and the mediation of space. The pro-social sharing dynamic of Instagram offers
5 museums a way to cooperate with visitors to promote and raise awareness of the content and
6 experiences they offer. Experience sharing is a powerful visitor practice and facilitates peer-to-peer
7 influencing and nurtures affinity towards the museum. Instagram use offers curators a way to
8 further understand spatial awareness and visitor mediation of museum spaces. The considered use
9 of sight lines, valence, affordances, atmosphere, and movement may lead to higher visitor
10 engagement on Instagram.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 By embedding a pedagogy and understanding visitor Instagram practices a museum can help
22 make the use of space appear less abstract and more meaningful. Instagram use also extends and
23 evolves the aesthetic experience. It may extend an aesthetic experience by making it start earlier
24 and finish later, allowing for periods of reflection. It also may evolve the aesthetic experience by
25 helping the visitor to reveal more about their experience, through increased awareness, imagination,
26 revelation, and reflection. As aesthetic experiences are essential for learning, this is a compelling
27 finding for museums seeking to create more educational value for visitors. Instagramming is a
28 popular practice for many visitors to museums and galleries, staff should be energised by this and
29 look for further creative and meaningful ways to channel its popularity alongside the museum's
30 objectives.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Acknowledgements**

49
50 We thank the Queensland Art Gallery, Gallery of Modern Art, Brisbane, Australia, for providing
51 access to the team involved in the Gerhard Richter exhibition *The Life of Images*.
52
53
54

57 **References**

58
59 Author 1, 2015
60

1
2
3
4
5 Author 1, 2020
6
7

8 Author 2 and colleague, 2022/in press
9

10
11 Colleague and Author 2, 2014
12
13

14
15 Adkins, B., D. Smith, K. Barnett, and E. Grant. 2006. "Public space as 'context' in assistive information
16 and communication technologies for people with cognitive impairment." *Information,*
17 *Communication & Society* 9(3), 355-372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180600751330>.
18
19

20
21 Alvesson, M., and K. Sköldbberg. 2000. *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*.
22 London: SAGE Publications.
23
24

25
26 Biehl-Missal, B., and D. vom Lehn. 2015. "Aesthetics and atmosphere in museums: A critical
27 marketing perspective." In *The international handbooks of museum studies: Museum media*, edited
28 by Henning, M., 235–258. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
29
30

31
32
33 Bitgood, S., M. Pierce, G. Nichols, and D. Patterson. 1987. "Formative evaluation of a cave exhibit."
34 *Curator: The Museum Journal* 30(1), 31-39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.1987.tb00644.x>.
35
36

37
38 Borden, I. M. 2001. *Skateboarding, space and the city: Architecture and the body*. Oxford: Berg
39 Publishers.
40
41

42
43 Bourdeau, L., and J. C. Chebat. 2001. "An empirical study of the effects of the design of the display
44 galleries of an art gallery on the movement of visitors." *Museum Management and Curatorship*
45 19(1), 63-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647770100601901>.
46
47
48

49
50 Budge, K. 2017. "Objects in focus: Museum visitors and Instagram." *Curator: The Museum Journal*
51 60(1), 67-85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cura.12183>.
52
53

54
55 Burnham, R. 1994. "If you don't stop, you don't see anything." *Teachers College Record* 95(4), 520–
56 525. <http://lakeoswegoartliteracy.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/If-You-Dont-Stop-You-Dont-See-Anything.pdf>.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Burton, J. 1997. *Developing minds: Meaning and value in responding to works of art*. New York:
6 Teachers College.

7
8
9
10 Carbon, C. C. 2017. "Art perception in the museum: How we spend time and space in art
11 exhibitions." *i-Perception* 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041669517694184>.

12
13
14
15 Chlebus-Grudzień, P. 2018. "Selfie at a museum: Defining a paradigm for an analysis of taking (self-
16 portrait) photographs at museum exhibitions." *Turyzm* 28(1), 7-13. [https://doi.org/10.18778/0867-
17 5856.28.1.0](https://doi.org/10.18778/0867-5856.28.1.0).

18
19
20
21 Consoli, G. 2014. "The emergence of the modern mind: An evolutionary perspective on aesthetic
22 experience." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 72(1), 37-55.
23
24 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jaac.12059>.

25
26
27
28 Consoli, G. 2015a. "Creativity and aesthetic evaluation. Two proposals to improve the model of
29 aesthetic dis/fluency." *Frontiers in Psychology* 5, 1520. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01520>.

30
31
32
33 Consoli, G. 2015b. "From beauty to knowledge: A new frame for the neuropsychological approach to
34 aesthetics." *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 9, 290. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2015.00290>.

35
36
37
38 Csikszentmihalyi, M., and K. Hermanson. 1999. "Intrinsic motivation in museums: Why does one
39 want to learn?" In *Public institutions for personal learning: Establishing a research agenda*, edited by
40 Falk, J. H., and L. D. Dierking, 67-78. Arlington: American Association of Museums.

41
42
43
44 Csikszentmihalyi, M. and R. E. Robinson. 1990. *The art of seeing. An interpretation of the aesthetic
45 encounter*. Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum.

46
47
48
49 Custodero, L. A., D. T. Hansen, A. Neumann, and D. Kerdeman. 2005. "Symposium: Aesthetic lives:
50 Teaching and learning as creative work." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 39(5), 33-96.
51
52 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3527404>.

53
54
55 De Rojas C, Camarero C (2008) Visitors' experience, mood and satisfaction in a heritage context:
56 evidence from an interpretation center. *Tour Manag* 29(3):525–537
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Dewey, J. 1934. *Art as experience*. New York: Minton, Balch & Company.
4
5

6 DuGay, P., S. Hall, L. Janes, H. Mackay, and K. Negus. 1997. *Doing cultural studies: The story of the*
7 *Sony Walkman*. London: SAGE Publications.
8
9

10
11 Edmonds, E., Z. Bilda, and L. Muller. 2009. "Artist, evaluator and curator: Three viewpoints on
12 interactive art, evaluation and audience experience." *Digital Creativity* 20(3), 141-151.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14626260903083579>.
15
16

17
18 Eisner, E. W., and S. M. Dobbs. 1988. "Silent pedagogy: How museums help visitors experience
19 exhibitions." *Art Education* 41(4), 6-15. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3193116>.
20
21

22
23 Eliseo V, Martine L (1991) *Ethnographie de l'exposition. Études et recherche, Centre Georges*
24 *Pompidou, Bibliothèque publique d'information*
25
26

27
28
29 Falk, J. H., and L. D. Dierking. 2000. *Learning from museums: Visitor experiences and the making of*
30 *meaning*. Lanham: Altamira Press.
31
32

33
34 Falk, J. H., and L. D. Dierking. 1992. *The museum experience*. Washington: Whalesback Books.
35
36

37
38 Falk, J. 2011. "Contextualizing Falk's identity-related visitor motivation model." *Visitor Studies* 14(2),
39 141-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10645578.2011.608002>.
40
41

42
43 Falk, J. 2016. "Museum audiences: A visitor-centered perspective." *Society and Leisure* 39(3), 357-
44 370. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07053436.2016.1243830>.
45
46

47
48 Gibson, J. J. 1977. "The theory of affordances." In *Perceiving, acting, and knowing: Toward an*
49 *ecological psychology*, edited by Shaw, R., and J. Bransford, 67-82. Mahwah: Erlbaum.
50
51

52
53 Gottdiener, M. 1993. "A Marx for our time: Henri Lefebvre and the production of space." *Sociological Theory* 11(1), 129-134. <https://doi.org/10.2307/201984>.
54
55

56
57
58 Greeno, G. J. 1994. "Gibson's affordances." *Psychological Review* 101(2), 336-342.
59 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.101.2.336>.
60

1
2
3
4
5 Gunther, K., and T. van Leeuwen. 2006. *Reading images: The grammar of visual*. London: Routledge.

6
7
8 Heilig, J. V., H. Cole, and A. Aguilar. 2010. "From Dewey to No Child Left Behind: The evolution and
9 devolution of public arts education." *Arts Education Policy Review* 111(4), 136-145.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2010.490776>.

11
12
13
14
15 Hjorth, L., and S. Pink. 2014. "New visualities and the digital wayfarer: Reconceptualizing camera
16 phone photography and locative media." *Mobile Media & Communication* 2(1), 40-57.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1177/2050157913505257>.

18
19
20
21
22 Holloway-Attaway, L. 2014. "Performing materialities: Exploring mixed media reality and Moby-
23 Dick." *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 20(1), 55-
24 68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856513514337>.

25
26
27
28 Hooper-Greenhill, E. 2007. Studying visitors. In *A companion to museum studies*, edited by S.
29 Macdonald, 362-376. London: Blackwell Publishing.

30
31
32
33 Horton, D., and R. R. Wohl. 1956. "Mass communication and para-social interaction: Observations on
34 intimacy at a distance." *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes* 19, 215-229.
35 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1956.11023049>.

36
37
38
39
40 Hubard, O. M. 2007. "Complete engagement: Embodied response in art museum education." *Art*
41 *Education* 60(6), 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043125.2007.11651133>.

42
43
44
45 Hubard, O. M. 2015. "How does this artwork make you feel? A" no-no" question in art museum
46 education?" *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* 49(2), 82-98.
47 <https://doi.org/10.5406/jaesteduc.49.2.0082>.

48
49
50
51
52 Instagram. 2018. "Community guidelines." Instagram. Accessed April 19 2018.
53 <https://help.instagram.com/477434105621119>

54
55
56
57 John, N. A. 2013. "Sharing and web 2.0: The emergence of a keyword." *New Media & Society* 15(2),
58 167-182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812450684>.

1
2
3
4
5 John, N. A. 2017. *The age of sharing*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
6
7

8 Kennedy, J. 2016. "Conceptual boundaries of sharing." *Information, Communication & Society* 19(4),
9 461-474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1046894>.
10
11

12
13 Kidder, J. L. 2009. "Appropriating the city: space, theory, and bike messengers." *Theory and Society*,
14 38(3), 307-328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-008-9079-8>.
15
16

17
18 Kidder, J. L. 2012. "Parkour, the affective appropriation of urban space, and the real/virtual
19 dialectic." *City & Community* 11(3), 229-253. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6040.2012.01406.x>.
20
21

22
23 Kiiler, E. 2011. "Circulation of museum visitors' photographs: from art museums to collaborative
24 archives." *Spaces of Creation* 15(Nov), 58-66. [https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-](https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=175441)
25 [detail?id=175441](https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=175441).
26
27

28
29 Kress, G. R., and T. van Leeuwen. 1996. *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Hove:
30 Psychology Press.
31
32

33
34 Krukar, J. 2014. "Walk, look, remember: The influence of the gallery's spatial layout on human
35 memory for an art exhibition." *Behavioural Sciences* 4, 181-201. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs4030181>.
36
37

38
39 Langridge, D. W. 1989. *Subject analysis: Principles and procedures*. East Grinstead: Bowker- Saur.
40
41

42
43 Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The production of space*. London: Blackwell
44
45

46
47 Lemon, N. 2010. "Young children as digital photographers - possibilities for using the digital camera
48 in the primary classroom." *Australia Art Education* 33(2), 59-79.
49 <https://researchbank.rmit.edu.au/view/rmit:10755>.
50
51

52
53 Lewin, K. 1936. *Principles of topological psychology*. London: McGraw-Hill.
54
55

56
57 Litt, E. 2012. "Knock, knock. Who's there? The imagined audience." *Journal of Broadcasting &*
58 *Electronic Media* 56(3), 330-345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.705195>.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Marwick, A. E., and d. boyd. 2014. "Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social
6 media." *New Media & Society* 16(7), 1051-1067. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543995>.

8
9
10 Mills, K. A., and B. Comber. 2015. "Socio-spatial approaches to literacy studies: Rethinking the social
11 constitution and politics of space." In *Handbook of literacy studies*, edited by Pahl K., and J. Rowsell,
12 91-103. London: Routledge.

13
14
15
16
17 Morris, J. W. 2014. "Artists as entrepreneurs, fans as workers." *Popular Music and Society* 37(3),
18 273-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03007766.2013.778534>.

19
20
21
22 Oejo, R. E., and S. Tonnelat. 2014. "Subway diaries: How people experience and practice riding the
23 train." *Ethnography* 15(4), 493-515. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24467154>.

24
25
26
27 Papacharissi, Z., and E. Easton. 2013. "In the habitus of the new: Structure, agency, and the social
28 media habitus." In *A companion to new media dynamics*, edited by Hartley, J., J. Burgess, and A.
29 Bruns, 167-184. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

30
31
32
33
34 Pekarik, A. J., Z. D. Doering, and D. Karns. 1999. "Exploring satisfying experiences in museums."
35 *Curator: The Museum Journal* 42(2), 152-173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.1999.tb01137.x>.

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Richter, G. 2009a. *Abdu, CR: 144*. Olbricht Collection. Essen, Germany.

1
2
3
4
5 Richter, G. 2009b. *Iblan*, CR: 143. Olbricht Collection. Essen, Germany.

6
7
8 Richter, G. 2009c. *Musa*, CR: 141. Olbricht Collection. Essen, Germany.

9
10
11 Richter, G. 2009d. *Yusuf*, CR: 142. Olbricht Collection. Essen, Germany.

12
13
14
15 Roppola, T. 2013. *Designing for the museum visitor experience*. London: Routledge.

16
17
18 Russo, A., J. Watkins, L. Kelly, and S. Chan. 2006. "How will social media affect museum
19 communication?" Paper presented at the Nordic Digital Excellence in Museums (NODEM 06)
20 Conference, Oslo, Norway. December 7-9.

21
22
23
24
25 Russo, A., J. Watkins, L. Kelly, and S. Chan. 2008. "Participatory communication with social media."
26 *Curator: The Museum Journal* 51(1), 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2008.tb00292.x>.

27
28
29
30 Salo, J., M. Lankinen, and M. Mäntymäki. 2013. "The use of social media for artist marketing: Music
31 industry perspectives and consumer motivations." *International Journal on Media Management*
32 15(1), 23-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14241277.2012.755682>.

33
34
35
36
37 Schorch, P. 2014. "The experience of a museum space." *Museum Management and Curatorship*
38 28(2), 193-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2013.776797>.

39
40
41
42 Sintas, J. L., E. G. Álvarez, and E. P. Rubiales. 2014. "Art museum visitors: Interaction strategies for
43 sharing experiences." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 29(3), 241-259.
44 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2014.919175>.

45
46
47
48
49 Smith, R. 2015. "Seeing the light: Using visual ethnography in family business settings." *Family*
50 *Business Review* 28(1), 76-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894486513504585>.

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60 Specker, E., P. P. Tinio, and M. van Elk. 2017. "Do you see what I see? An investigation of the
aesthetic experience in the laboratory and museum." *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the*
Arts 11(3), 265-275. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000107>.

1
2
3 Stecker, R. 1994. "Art interpretation." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 52(2), 193-206.
4 <https://doi.org/10.2307/431166>.

6
7
8 Stylianou-Lambert, T. 2017. "Photographing in the art museum: Visitor attitudes and motivations."
9 *Visitor Studies* 20(2), 114-137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10645578.2017.1404345>.

11
12
13 Thurlow, C., and A. Jaworski. 2011. "Banal globalization? Embodied actions and mediated practices
14 in tourists' online photo-sharing." In *Digital discourse: Language in the new media*, edited by
15 Thurlow, C., and K. Mroczek, 220-250. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

17
18
19 Tröndle, M. 2014. "Space, movement and attention: Affordances of the museum environment."
20 *International Journal of Arts Management* 17(1), 4-17.

21
22
23 Tröndle, M., and W. Tschacher. 2012. "The physiology of phenomenology: The effects of artworks."
24 *Empirical Studies of the Arts* 30(1), 75-113. <https://doi.org/10.2190/EM.30.1.g>.

25
26
27 Tröndle, M., S. Greenwood, K. Bitterli, and K. van den Berg. 2014. "The effects of curatorial
28 arrangements." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 29(2), 140-173.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2014.88882>.

30
31
32 Tröndle, M., S. Wintzerith, R. Wäspe, and W. Tschacher. 2012. "A museum for the twenty-first
33 century: The influence of 'sociality' on art reception in museum space." *Museum Management and*
34 *Curatorship* 27(5), 461-486. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2012.737615>.

35
36
37 Tzortzi, K. 2017. "Museums architecture for embodied experience." *Museum Management and*
38 *Curatorship* 32(5), 491-508. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2017.1367258>.

39
40
41 Urry, J. 1990. *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: SAGE
42 Publications.

43
44
45 Usher, B. 2018. "Rethinking microcelebrity: Key points in practice, performance and purpose."
46 *Celebrity Studies*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2018.1536558>.

1
2
3 Vivienne, S., and J. Burgess. 2013. "The remediation of the personal photograph and the politics of
4 self-representation in digital storytelling." *Journal of Material Culture* 18, 279-298.

5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183513492080>.

7
8
9 vom Lehn, D., C. Heath, and J. Hindmarsh. 2001. "Exhibiting interaction: Conduct and collaboration
10 in museums and galleries." *Symbolic interaction* 24(2), 189-216.

11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1525/si.2001.24.2.189>.

13
14
15
16 Wilson, J. 2009. "Presence in social networks." In *Handbook of research on social software and*
17 *developing community ontologies*, edited by Hatzipanagos, S., and S. Warburton, 493-511. Hershey:
18 IGI Global.

19
20
21
22
23 Winget, M. 2009. "Describing art: An alternative approach to subject access and interpretation."

24
25 *Journal of Documentation* 65(6), 958-976. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00220410910998942>.

26
27
28
29 Witcomb, A. 2014. "'Look, listen and feel': The first peoples exhibition at the Bunjilaka Gallery,
30 Melbourne Museum." *Thema* 1, 49-62. <http://dro.deakin.edu.au/view/DU:30070290>.

31
32
33
34 Wood, E., and K. Latham. 2013. *The objects of experience: Transforming visitor-object encounters in*
35 *museums*. London: Routledge.

36
37
38
39 **Wright P (1989) The quality of visitors' experiences in art museums. In: Vergo P (ed) The new**
40 **museology. Reaktion Books, London, pp 119-148**

41
42
43
44
45 Wurtzler, S. 1993. "The space between the object and the label: Exhibiting restored vitaphone films
46 and technology." *Film History* 5(3), 275-288. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3815142>.

47
48
49
50 Yenawine, P. 2002. "Interactive learning in museums of art and design." Paper presented at
51 Interactive Learning in Museums, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, United Kingdom.
52 http://media.vam.ac.uk/media/documents/legacy_documents/file_upload/5756_file.pdf. May 17-
53 18.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Yoshimura Y, Sobolevsky S, Ratti C, Girardin F, Carrascal JP, Blat J, Sinatra R (2014) An analysis of
4 visitors' behavior in the Louvre Museum: a study using Bluetooth data. *Environ Plan* 41(6):1113–
5 1131
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Thank you for your time in reviewing our paper. It is greatly appreciated. We have addressed all feedback as per below.

Reviewer's comments	Author responses
Initially, in section 1 and 2, the authors should present a provided related work by using more summative language in order to better clarify the research contributions of the existing literature and what is the research gap that they try to address.	We have added more information about the purpose of this study and the gaps in the research literature throughout the paper.
In Section 2, the authors should discuss existing quality of experience approaches that have been introduced in the literature, such as "Quality of Experience-based museum touring: A human in the loop approach." Social Network Analysis and Mining 7.1 (2017): 1-13, in order to quantify the visitors experience in cultural spaces where the social and physical characteristics of the visitors are exploited.	We have added some relevant literature on the QoE research. as our research didn't aim to 'quantify' a visitor's experience we didn't dwell too much of this section of the research paper mentioned. WE have however, added in relevant selections to support the work we present. We hope this is to the reviewer's satisfaction.
In section 3, the authors should provide a block diagram of the methodology that has been followed in order to design the proposed research. This will help the reader to easily grasp the main steps that have been followed in this qualitative and quantitative based approach.	We have now placed a table on page 10 that explains the steps taken in the overarching research study.
In Section 4, the authors should discuss some research findings in a comparative manner to the state of the art in order to clarify their main contributions and novelty. Finally, the overall manuscript should be checked for typos, syntax, and grammar errors in order to improve the quality of its presentation.	We have added some more discussion in the conclusion outlining the main contributions to knowledge. A final edit has also been carried out.

Further positive comments:

Towards this direction, the authors performed a study within an art gallery by considering the corresponding visitors that they use Instagram in order to share content, experience, and information from the gallery space.

The examined research topic is of great interest to the research literature as very few research works have been introduced that deal with quantifying the visitors experience in cultural spaces.

The provided analysis of the performed study is detailed and the authors have provided all the intermediate steps in order to realize their proposed research. The authors should consider the following suggestions provided by the reviewer in order to improve the scientific depth of their manuscript, as well as they need to address the following comments in order to improve the quality of presentation of their manuscript.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only