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Towards hybridity: dance, tourism and cultural heritage

Introduction

This article considers the many layered and multi-faceted questions of hybridity as interdisciplinary encounter through the lens of a central case study – the EU-funded research project CultureMoves (2018-2020) on which the Centre for Dance Research (C-DaRE) at Coventry University was a collaborating partner.\[note\]1 With Europeana principles as a backdrop for the re-use of cultural heritage content,\[note\]2 CultureMoves developed a series of digital tools to enable new forms of touristic engagement and dance educational resources primarily for higher education and professional dance artists and practitioners, contributing to a MOOC entitled ‘Creating a Digital Heritage Community’ exploring innovative practices for user engagement.\[note\]3 In such ways, the project’s aim was to explore the diverse potential intersections between dance, cultural heritage, tourism and education. With reference to the broader field of ‘Creative Tourism’ (Richards and Raymond 2000; Richard and Marques 2012), this article investigates how CultureMoves is a project marked by hybridity on a multiplicity of levels: in its very interdisciplinarity, in the expanded sense of the coming together of dancer and cultural heritage site, and in the meeting of the digital (Europeana’s collection) and the material (the body of the dancer) through its development of an online toolkit. Moreover, the article explores hybridity as a framework for examining the project and reflects on a series of workshops (LabDays)
that enabled us to identify key questions and assumptions underlying existing and potential collaborations between the dance research/education, digital technology and tourism sectors, and that, in turn, prepared the terrain for the toolkit development. The article also provides a close examination of experiments in the project that intend to awaken dormant histories through new experiences of space and place, by bringing dancing bodies into relation with the built environment and digital technologies as an intervention into creative and cultural tourism. Marked by the intersection of the human and non-human, and the differing expectations of stakeholders and audiences, the discussion also considers where experiments fail, to offer a view of what that tells us about the limits of hybridity in performance.

**CultureMoves through the lens of Creative Tourism**

A starting framework for looking at hybridity within the CultureMoves project can involve the lens of ‘creative tourism’, a term coined by Richards and Raymond (2000) as an extension of cultural tourism. This perspective asks whether creative experiences can ‘act as an alternative to more “traditional” tourism development strategies’ (Richards and Marques 2012: 2), responding to the need for the industry to reinvent itself and to the desire of tourists for more meaningful experiences. This in turn corresponds to a rise in popularity of creative practices such as dance (e.g. Cultural Alliance 2010) at the same time as cities are increasingly wishing to present themselves as creative destinations. As Castells (1996) notes, there is thus a growing intertwining of creativity, tourism and new media in the contemporary network society. In this context, creativity can become a tool for the regeneration and revitalization of cultural resources as well as a means of developing more sustainable models of tourism.

According to Richards and Marques, creative tourism encompasses a wide range of experiences in which content is either foregrounded or used as a ‘creative backdrop’ (2012: 4). It can be witnessed in numerous situations where visitors and the local community influence each other through new synergies, primarily the physical co-presence of creative practice:
Creative tourism, because of the bilateral relationship it poses between producer and consumer, is a means of increasing social and relational capital, both for tourists and (local) providers. Creative tourism can also be a way of developing very specific relational links related to the interests of the individuals involved. This is also interesting because it often represents a physical manifestation of virtual networks – people travel to meet people who they encounter in online communities, and come together because the embedded skills and practices in many creative activities cannot be exchanged without physical co-presence. (Richards and Marques 2012: 5)

In terms of our focus on hybridity within the CultureMoves project, this latter point – the co-presence of the creative act, through both the virtual and the physical and a meeting of the two – is particularly significant. It is clear that creative tourism extends a definition of cultural tourism through a focus on process and through co-creative participation and engagement between tourists, artists and citizens (cf. Prahalad and Ramaswamy 2004). More significantly, as Richards and Marques put it:

this co-creative act increasingly centres around the intangible and symbolic, and situates itself in the sphere of the emotional and spiritual, where the individual looks actively [at] ways to follow a certain lifestyle in a specific creative atmosphere. Places become in this sense a result of co-creation, acquiring more and differentiated meanings, both for service providers, local communities and visitors. (Richards and Marques 2012: 9)

So, the first salient point is to recognise the importance of the ‘co-creative’ encounter between artist, tourist and the local community in ascribing meaning to a place’s history and heritage.

**Co-creative encounters I: the meeting of dancer and cultural heritage site**

Intangible Cultural Heritage, which includes many dance genres, may therefore create new and meaningful experiences when combined with tourism and cultural heritage
landmarks. Heavily populated spaces like airports and other touristic spaces such as museums or national landmarks were beginning, pre-COVID-19, to use dance as a way to enhance the individual’s experience or first encounter with the space, venue or exhibited object. Countries like Hawaii, for example, are repurposing and reusing traditional Hula dance to greet visitors as they arrive in the country. While such an activity may have larger implications and bring up heavily charged questions around traditional and authentic dances in their natural environments, the point we explore through CultureMoves is to reimagine the way dance can both augment the tourist experience and encourage dancers to develop their creativity (as the tourist site may serve as an opportunity for the performer to experiment and engage with different audiences and settings). How can dance content be used to promote a destination and how can dance create new forms of engagement to spread the knowledge of cultural heritage and the history of a territory? Dance opens up new ways of experiencing place and space, revealing more about dance’s role in shaping the built and natural environment.

While the wider field of site-based performance is well-documented (Hill and Paris [2006]; Wrights and Sites [2000]; Kaye [2000]; Pearson [2010]; Birch and Tompkins [2012]), the literature on site-based dance performance (that takes place outside of the traditional theatre setting) and its creative methods is relatively scant, with the exception of Kloetzel and Pavlik (2009), Hunter (2015) and Barbour, Hunter and Kloetzel (2019). Victoria Hunter’s work, in particular, has opened the debate beyond dance studies engaging not only site-dance practitioners and researchers, but also academics from a range of related fields including human geography, architectural and spatial theory, and digital performance (2015). Hunter raises an important question: ‘how can this type of practice inform wider discussions of embodiment, site, space, place and environment: what does it reveal?’ (Hunter 2015: 8). This question is a valid one for the CultureMoves project that explores the interconnections between dance, tourism, education and digital technology.

Hunter points to the clear development of an increasingly well-established ecology of site-dance in the UK over the last twenty years, supported by two central factors: 1) the
development of site-dance festivals (e.g. Greenwich and Docklands Festival, London, 1996; Salt Festival, Cornwall, 2016) and, 2) the increased funding for the UK-wide Cultural Olympiad Programme alongside the London 2012 Olympic Games, which afforded dance artists the opportunities to create and perform site-dance work, and often aimed to engage local communities. A survey of the literature, while often pointing to the links between site dance and community (and, by extension, education programmes), reveals a lack of in-depth enquiry, to date, into the relationship between dance and tourism. However, there is some attention given to connections between dance, site and tourism. There has, for example, been an acknowledgement of the relationship between a growth in site/outdoor dance in Australia alongside an increase in cultural tourism, sometimes connected with world heritage listings of significant sites (Stock in Hunter 2015: 387-406). Stock points out that cultural activity at these sites might contain ‘ethnically based[5] traditional dance groups’ (392), or light and sound spectacles designed to cater for the consumer demands of international tourism. Stock’s observation also alerts us to the potential for dance, when inserted into the touristic experience, to be a commodity for the tourist industry. A positive example of the relationship between site-dance and tourism is the choreographer April Nunes Tucker’s 2006 site-dance work within the prominent tourist site of La Pedrera in Barcelona, Spain. In a reflective account of this work, informed by phenomenological theory and ideas of inter-subjectivity, Nunes Tucker points to how this tourist site facilitated ‘a feeling of connectedness through a natural progression of shared experiences within space and place’ (Nunes Tucker in Hunter 2015: 454). There seems to be a clear relationship between site dance, (tourist) site and a sense of connection and community which merits further investigation. Again, we might read this as a re-iteration of the co-presence of the creative act.

It also seems apposite at this juncture to briefly introduce the notion of dance in public spaces such as museums, libraries and galleries, which are in themselves tourist destinations. In the UK and continental Europe there has been a recent increase in the amount of dance performance and engagement activity programmed in museum spaces. Select examples of dance in the art museum in the UK and in continental Europe over the last few years alone show the current scale of such activity and
include: Boris Charmatz’ Musée de la danse at Tate Modern, UK in 2015; Anna Teresa de Keersmaecker’s Work / Travail / Arbeid at Tate Modern, UK in 2016; Pablo Bronstein’s Historical Dances in an Antique Setting at Tate Britain, UK in 2016; Manuel Pelmus and Alexandra Pirici’s Public Collection at Tate Modern, UK in 2016, and the pan-European Dancing Museums project which ran from June 2015 to March 2017 involving Arte Sella, Italy; Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Netherlands; the Civic Museum in Bassano del Grappa, Italy; Gemäldegalerie der Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Austria; Le Louvre, France; MAC/VAL, France; and the National Gallery, UK. This last project in particular sought to question how to render a collection more public, and more accessible to visitors through the use of choreography and the dancers’ (and visitors’) bodies. The project was composed principally of week-long residencies in each of the institutions involved, and the research and development undertaken by choreographers, dance organisations and art education specialists aimed to ‘define and implement new methods to engage audiences and enhance the journeys which people make when walking through the rooms of historical artefacts and art spaces’ (Dancing Museums 2015: unpaginated). As such, audience engagement was at the very core of the ‘Dancing Museums’ project, with its key aim to highlight the role that live dance performance can play in enhancing public understanding and engagement in art history. Museums that took part in this project included the National Gallery (London, UK) and the Louvre (Paris, France), popular tourist destinations with high tourist visitor numbers. While much of this dance work has been happening in the art museum, other museums (historical, archaeological) are beginning to open their doors to dance performance as well. Here, dance is sometimes seen as a way of animating the museum collection: for example, Arts Council England describes The Imagination Museum (2014-2017) by British dance company Made by Katie Green as a work which ‘brings stories behind historical collections to life through contemporary dance’ (Arts Council England 2014: unpaginated). Again such spaces as museums of history are in and of themselves often popular tourist destinations, and there is a clear connection between tourist/visitor engagement with cultural heritage through dance.
Co-creative encounters II: a Coventry context

Closer to home for us, the context of Coventry’s successful research-led bid and preparations for City of Culture 2021 shows how such strategic cultural processes, whilst designed to promote economic investment and growth, can also shed light on the ways in which arts practices play a role in the manner a city lives, ‘breathes’ and grows. A core aim of the City of Culture enterprise is its focus on civic and community engagement, and the key role that the arts can play in coalescing communities. This prompted us to ask:

- What is the role for dance within this policy, economic, social and cultural environment?
- Can dance contribute to shifting socio-cultural expectations, while at the same time working with the role that capitalism has to play in the same environment?
- Will dance be able to benefit by investment in the city’s artists and its arts spaces and thus will dance be able to play a full role in enriching the city’s creative ecosystem, or will dance be no more than a transient, decorative spectacle, to be consumed and then forgotten?
- How do artists take to the city, breathe life into it, and help us to experience and sense it differently?
- As artists and producers, what are our responsibilities to the cities and the communities that become part of the work?

Such were some of the questions surrounding the CultureMoves project as we embarked on a series of CultureMoves workshops or ‘LabDays’ in Birmingham (UK), Coventry (UK) and Pisa (Italy), aiming to create a dialogue with artists, tourism operators, cultural institutes and archive owners. Through the inclusion of these diverse voices, the project consortium hoped to gain an increased understanding of the assumptions, limitations and intersections between the dance, tourism, cultural heritage and education sectors. Further key questions raised at the LabDays included how dance artists and students might engage with city planners and cultural policy-makers, and how dance artists might ‘claim’ tourism and the touristic gaze. While economically
driven agendas may have huge impact on culture and tourism, might dance — with its emphasis on flow and flux — be a valuable means of making connections in the fragmented cities in the UK’s current post-Brexit socio-political context?

Furthermore, during the LabDays, both artists and cultural heritage operators repeatedly pointed to the idea of community as a key theme in various cultural and ‘touristic’ interventions. This might be variously achieved: for example, through the development of community participation and engagement strands during large-scale arts festivals (such as in the case of the Birmingham International Dance Festival [UK], or the UK City of Culture venture in Coventry), which are significant to building and contributing to a city’s sense of identity. Such festivals can engage and consolidate new audiences for dance. At one of the project LabDays, artist and choreographer Rosemary Lee used the example of her dance work, *Square Dances* (2011), created for four central London squares, to describe how in producing outdoor and site-work, an artist has an audience from the moment he/she first sees the site, forming a relationship with passers-by who are, through their presence, immediately implicated in, and engaged with, the artistic process: ‘every rehearsal on site is a surprise, a gift, a conversation, despite the final work’ with an audience becoming a different kind of community. Lee also spoke of how, in the final work, as audiences moved between the four London squares where the performance was taking place, communities began to form between these sites. This again speaks back to Richards and Marques’ notion of the ‘co-creative’ encounter between artist, tourist and the local community in ascribing meaning to a place’s history and heritage.

**CultureMoves: the meeting of the digital and the material**

As discussed, CultureMoves is marked by hybridity in various ways, yet there is another hybrid encounter that merits further exploration here, and that is the meeting of the digital (Europeana’s online collection) and the material (the body of the dancer) through the project’s development of its online toolkit (MovesCollect, Moves Scrapbook and MotionNotes). Taken together, the three tools become a meeting place where the user
is invited to simultaneously consider the archival, the digital and the material. The tools allow users to select content of interest, build personal collections with Europeana materials, and enrich them with additional digital annotations. Users can also mix their own content in digital scrapbooks and use new forms of storytelling to share curated views of their interests. The web-based video annotator, MotionNotes, which was previously developed for dancers and choreographers, has been expanded to cater for the needs of more diversified users, such as tourists, teachers and any individual wishing to share their personal annotations over video clips in their own storytelling processes. The toolkit is therefore an opportunity for artists, dancers, choreographers, and audiences to reflect on different forms of collaboration. Primarily designed for building and curating digital storytelling collections, it prompts reflections on how we archive, how we remember the past and how we might engage the live body in such a curation.

In addition to the toolkit, the project included several experiments that intended to awaken dormant histories and generate new experiences of space and place by bringing dancing bodies into relation with the built environment and digital technologies, and to serve as an intervention into creative (and cultural) tourism. One of these was the video-mapping installation Dance (Algo) Rhythms by digital artists Studio RF. It was presented at the international Internet Festival in Pisa (Italy), in October 2019, as a hybrid experiment in demonstrating how archival content reuse, digital technology and dance can be deployed to promote a lesser-known tourist destination. In order to attract potential tourists and the general public, the installation was sited in an urban area of Pisa in a lesser-known public venue, the Manifatture Digitali Cinema, a former stables and slaughterhouse, now used as a cinema venue. Based on generative art technique, the installation used programmed algorithms and artificial intelligence to handle large amounts of archival content and (re)compose this material into a new artwork as a digital scenography for live dance performance. As such, the video installation was designed as a human-computer interaction project in which the user/spectator (or indeed dancer) could interact with the visual content. Due to the generative art techniques underlying its design (and a sensor camera recording the movement and changing the generated content accordingly and in real time), spectators
and dancers could enter into a relationship with the digital content, and by their movements, modify it. This part of the experiment explored the coming together (and not simply the co-existing) of the material body and the digital, giving rise to new artistic works. In terms of hybridity therefore, so far, so successful. From a creative tourism perspective, the inclusion of live dance was essential to the experiment in evoking the intangible cultural heritage of a place and as a means to tell the ‘story’ of that place.

At a special evening event during the Festival, the video installation was further ‘animated’ by a live performance by three dancers, who had each created a short solo to perform in line with three digital stories of place presented in the video installation. It is this specific event, presented as a culmination of the project, which we turn to now, acknowledging that we reflect on our own position as members of the audience but with insider knowledge, as stakeholders and members of the project team, of the various stages towards the performance. Each of the audiovisual stories – designed to dialogue with the three live dance solos – referred to a different geographical feature of the Apuan Riviera: the coast, the mountains and the marble quarries. Each of the geographical aspects was associated with a different style of dance (ballet, hip-hop and historical Renaissance dance). The coast ‘story’, composed of specifically generated content with the form of variations of blues and bubbles, was associated with the classical ballet solo to convey fluidity; the craggy mountain landscape, digitally composed of hard-edged white, green, brown and purple squares, was associated with hip-hop dance; and the marble ‘story’, with its digital variations of yellow splinters, was associated with historical dance, presumably to evoke the historical traditions of marble quarrying in this area. The aim here was the combination of the digital world and historical dance (emphasised also by the dancer’s Renaissance costume) as a particularly significant aspect in representing the link between the past and the future, as well as suggesting the digital transformation of cultural heritage.

It is important here to reflect on the work of film and cultural studies theorist Daniel Strutt, who has discussed the interrelation of image, the digital and the moving body within cinematography. He suggests that the digital gives the viewer a further dimension of a ‘heightened fluidity and complexity’ (2019: 144) and has built on cultural theorist
Angela Ndalianis’ (1999) work on the ‘digital neo-baroque’. To Ndalianis (1999) the neo-baroque digital image provides optical models of perception with the central focus in constant flux. In that neo-baroque situation, the viewer remains the constant centre that is stable and, in many ways, fixed. Strutt reflects on this term and described video-mapping as a neo-baroque trend in digital visual culture. He posits that the best use of this digital technique is within marketing contexts and live large-scale music and club visuals (2019:150). Strutt goes on to identify that the cultural market and smaller creative sectors are also incorporating video-mapping techniques into their remit. With this backdrop we suggest that the CultureMoves video-mapping installation was an example of a neo-baroque encounter where the screen and dancer had polycentric centres that were in constant flux and the audience remained static.

However, the co-existence of dance and the digital installation during the live performance appeared somewhat superficial. Despite the generative techniques described above which formed the basis of the installation during the daytime exhibit (whereby the archival projections responded in real time to viewers’ bodily motion), for the evening live performance, neither the digital projections nor the choreography interacted in real time. Rather, the dance solos took place in front of ‘pre-set’ projections that did not respond to the dancer’s movements. Dance and digital video projections seemed to simply co-exist side-by-side with the installation simply acting as a ‘backdrop’ for the choreographed dance. As such, the dance and video elements did not appear to be fully in dialogue with each other. The corporeal closeness of the dancer to the screen and the audience could have led to a kinetic dynamism but the triangulation between the three was not as impactful as it might have been.

The proximity allowed for intimacy but the missing dynamic tension and interaction somehow kept the performance in a 2D plane rather than achieving a 3D sculptural depth. Dance artefact and video artefact may have been exhibited side by side, part of the same collection, but they remained separate items within it. Here the experiment to achieve hybridity failed: but, in itself, that failure might tell us something important about the limits of hybridity in live performance. Each dancer performed their own solo dance, representative of a particular dance genre and choreographed in response to a theme.
The digital screen became a backdrop. In layering one in front of the other, each retained its own distinctive properties. There was no merging of dance and media, no rendering of dance motion or the dancing body into a new form, no new digital process because of the presence of the dancing body.

By adopting a presentational form, with each dancer performing for the audience in a setting removed for the tourist site, the engagement was closer to a form of travelogue, at best encouraging the audience to imagine the site through another medium rather than unlocking new experiences in situ. This is not to say that a work which simply uses digital material as a scenographic background is necessarily less effective than one which works in a 3D manner: here, however, the ‘interaction’ between the archival digital footage of the installation and the choreography of three dance solos missed the mark. Hybridity was compromised by each element (dance, digital installation) retaining ‘distance’ from each other. Rather than being a moment where the different artistic practices cross-fertilised each other and continued to evolve as they were experienced (what Eze-Orji and Nwosu [2016: 2] claim as ‘the fluidity, flexibility, and permeability of culture [which] does not allow it to be static’), during the performance, the pre-arranged organisation of the screen, juxtaposed against the preset choreography of the dance, undermined the focus on hybridity that informed the wider project.

The video-mapping installation was based on the three grounding concepts of the CultureMoves project: the creative reuse of audio and visual archival material, the interaction of digital storytelling with dance, and its scope for tourism promotion for the Apuan Riviera area. Interestingly, however, a key word for the installation whilst still in development was synergy, rather than hybridity, which highlights a sense of the co-existence of human and non-human elements, of dance and video art, of image, sound, body and text. Indeed, the installation’s focus was on synergetic co-existence, rather than the interweaving fusion of elements to make something new (as notions of hybridity suggest). This focus may be a reason why insufficient time was given to thinking through and fully developing the impact of the integration of the live performers. If hybridity was going to be achieved, then more time would have been
needed to integrate the live performance material with the visual, digital material. What actually happened in the performance was that through its staging and removal of the elements of interaction, the separation between art forms was unintentionally reinforced. This may go some way to explain the ‘failure’ of the experiment as a wholly successful example of hybridity in performance practice.

Conclusion

We have argued that CultureMoves was marked by hybridity on a multiplicity of levels: in its interdisciplinarity, in the expanded sense of the coming together of dancer and cultural heritage site and, potentially, in the meeting of the digital (Europeana’s collection) and the material (the body of the dancer). As such, the project’s relationship with hybridity is multi-faceted and complex. The project toolkit clearly offers hybrid applications that encompass the material and the digital and where users can curate their own experiences of cultural heritage, whether that be by exploring Europeana’s archives or by translating a direct experience of a place. Furthermore, using the lens of creative tourism, we have attempted to demonstrate how, through its emphasis on dance and the co-creative encounters that dance can produce, the CultureMoves project sought new and imaginative ways of telling the stories of places and heritage sites. Those co-creative encounters are themselves hybrid meetings: meetings fusing dance practices, locations, histories and identities, as well as meetings between artists, tourists and citizens engaged together in creating new ways of viewing and experiencing places and sites. In the hands of artists, tourist visitors and citizens together, new stories emerge so that ‘places’ continue to grow and change. This is one of several readings of hybridity within the project: the combination of various elements to create something new which would not otherwise arise.

However, sometimes, as evidenced by our focus on one of the digital storytelling experiments that took place throughout the project’s lifetime, reaching hybridity has its own limits. While the generative aspects of the video installation (responding in real time to movement) aimed towards achieving a hybrid interaction of body and digital, the live
performance event deferred to a synergetic co-existence between the dancer’s body and the digital archival content. Synergy between dance and video art, and between image, sound, body and text, is not the same thing as hybridity. The focus on synergy may have meant losing sight of how to convey the project’s emphasis on hybridity in the live performance event in Pisa. During the live event, to paraphrase leading theorist on cultural hybridity, Homi K. Bhabha, the ‘spaces between’ the body and the digital remained too wide to fully connect. The dancing body shifted in front of the digital screen, but did not fully interact with it. The project’s aim to draw links between tourism and dance may have constrained hybridity by seeking to retain the ‘tourist gaze’ (Urry and Larsen: 2011) in the performance whereby the viewer is offered an ‘authentic’ experience of heritage. As hybridity exposes the ways in which different components are entangled and give rise to new variants, in this instance, the desire to keep ‘authentic’ visual material led to a synergetic co-existence rather than a intermingling of the several elements.

Space and travel can be real or imagined and while the virtual tourist space – or a mediated one which includes live performance – can provide opportunities for hybridization, there needs to be a willingness to let go of ‘authentic’ elements and allow them to merge together. This is not to say that there is necessarily any inherent incompatibility between creative tourism and hybridity, but there needs at the outset to be a common understanding by all the parties involved (e.g. tourist organisations, artists, dancers) that the final performance experiment should aim to produce something ‘new’ (from merging the different elements involved rather than simply positioning them side-by-side). Placing a focus on the whole experience rather than the various, disparate components may facilitate hybridity, but within the CultureMoves video-mapping installation, Dance (Algo) Rhythms, the work’s disconnected elements disharmonized the performance. We acknowledge that set within a wider project with broader concerns about hybridity, our view of its limits may well have been located in our own expectations for the potential of an intermedial performance to elicit new connections between tourism and dance. However, despite the perceived ‘failure’ of the Pisa performance experiment, through its wider engagement with different cultural, artistic and touristic practices, the CultureMoves project opened up a space for moving
towards hybridity and reflecting upon how that movement can, in turn, inform new perspectives on how we view and experience place and cultural heritage.

Notes

1 For information on CultureMoves see https://culturemoves.eu. Alongside C-DaRE, collaborating project partners include IN2-Digital Innovations (DE), Fondazione Sistema Toscana (FST) (IT) and Universidade NOVA de Lisboa (UNL) (PT). The online kit features three digital tools: a plug-in, MovesCollect; a digital scrapbook, MovesScrapbook; and an online annotator, MotionNotes.

2 Europeana (www.europeana.eu) is the EU’s digital platform for cultural heritage and has over 50 million digitised items ranging from books, music, artworks and many other items.

3 See further, https://www.edx.org/course/creating-a-digital-cultural-heritage-community. The CultureMoves team produced the MOOC in collaboration with KU Leuven and EU-funded Kaleidoscope project (https://fifties.withculture.eu/home). Covering topics such as museums, photography and dance, learners can acquire knowledge about user engagement theory, how to apply these ideas to cultural heritage contexts and how to use digital collections to create new ways of engaging and inspiring audiences.


5 Stock employs this term in the context of the growth of festival culture in Australia (through several major annual arts international festivals featuring dance and physical theatre, as well as smaller festivals) in parallel to the growth of cultural tourism, often in world heritage sites. The use of the term is significant as it can refer to the need to
include traditional dance on an ethical basis, given the relatively recent concern to respect the cultures of indigenous communities in Australia.

6 The Internet Festival is the largest Italian event dedicated to the world wide web and digital innovation.

7 The chosen tourist destination was the Apuan Riviera, the northern coastal area of the Tuscany region (the province of Massa-Carrara), because it is a challenging context to work in. Its peripheral position in the Tuscany region, as well as the complex historical, cultural and social characterisations of its strong identity, are very different from the classical tourist image of Tuscany.

8 This was sourced from Europeana and from two local archives, the EX APT photographic archive – Provincial Archive of Massa-Carrara, and the historical archive of the Private Marble Railway – Municipality of Carrara

9 For example, the work of 1927 Productions can be seen to more successfully use interaction between live performance and digitally animated backdrop, as can UK choreographer Akram Khan’s dance work DESH (2011).

10 For useful distinctions on hybridity and synergy in other fields, see further Quammen interviewed in Dobrin and Keller (2005) and Jeremiah (2013) following Corning (1995). For Jeremiah, writing on cultural hybridity, a synergetic perspective may be pertinent as it allows for fruitful, co-existing multiplicities and makes recourse to “co-operative effects” […] produced by things that “operate together” to make significant impacts, rather than trying to ‘produce a third space which which carries the best or worst of both worlds’ (2013: 165).
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