

[Changing] Heritage

Trocchianesi, Raffaella^a; Franzato, Carlo^b; Maffei Rodolfo^{a*}; Mason, Marco^c

^a Department of Design, Politecnico di Milano, Milan, Italy

^b Department of Arts & Design, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

^c School of Design at Northumbria University, Newcastle, United Kingdom

* rodolfo.maffei@polimi.it

doi.org/10.21606/iasdr.2023.896

Can design research offer new approaches to the knowledge, preservation, and cultural experience of Cultural Heritage? And can it also help to activate participation dynamics to reintegrate relevant portions of the Cultural Heritage that have remained excluded from the current development paradigm? In this challenging time, we are coping with continuous and impetuous changes. New instability marks social and political structures, while technological growth affects them deeply. Dramatic changes related to the impact of human activities on the planet are urgently emerging as consequence of the development paradigm we have adopted until now. Large portions of the Cultural Heritage also suffer from increasing erosion and modification. And great artistic masterpieces are being communicated and shared in new ways to suit global audiences and multiculturalism. In this context, museums and cultural sites should rethink their role, mission, and paradigm of the cultural experience. They should be open to “new” forms of museography and museology (i.e., museums and: digital transformation, post-digitality, human-centred design practices, social inclusion...). The topic Changing Heritage aims to stimulate the community of scholars dealing with the challenges global change poses to Cultural Heritage in different fields: tangible and intangible heritage; museums; arts; cultural experience; design & humanities. The paper deals with changing processes of the cultural heritage through different perspectives: how the power of the change can be recognized both in the historic art masters approach and in their representations? How these historic art masters have triggered iconographic and conceptual agents of innovation? How Design for Cultural Heritage can envision new sustainable scenarios taking into account sociopolitical, cultural and climatic changes? In this complex context and age, what are new models of cultural experiences? What is the role of digital in museums transformation? Herein we will explore new definitions of contemporary museology and museography, like the digitally mature museum. According to these perspectives the conference sessions are: Changing Design and Cultural Experiences where new forms of mediation and fruition of cultural heritage, new services and co-design essences are pinpointed; Changing Digital Dimension where one explores AI potentialities as well as the design possibility of reframing participatory approaches and reshaping relationships among visitors; Changing Landscapes where the scale of the territory is the main context to enhance tangible and intangible heritage; and finally Changing Signs where new graphic communication registers and design expressions represent interesting fields of investigation.

Keywords: *design for cultural heritage; museum; arts; digital*



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International Licence](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

1 Facing change: Leonardo da Vinci

The urgent changes debated in the current conference—and which we discuss in this panel with a focus on cultural heritage—appear to us to be unprecedented and highly topical, looming over the near future, and they may discourage observation from a historical perspective.

However, on closer inspection, these are conditions that were not unknown to thinkers and artists of the past.

We know that the golden age which saw the creation of Botticelli's *Venus* lasted but a handful of years, and was followed by Savonarola's "bonfire of the vanities" on which Botticelli himself allegedly would hurl his paintings at the height of a spiritual crisis (and police censorship). In some sense, Botticelli was an artist who crystallized a moment of socio-cultural apex through the perfection of an aesthetic paradigm, and who failed to address the crisis of the system within which that image was produced.

Far different was coeval Leonardo da Vinci's approach to the systemic instability of the society and value system he lived and worked in. Facing conditions of extreme impermanence—today we would say "precariousness"—and of continually distorted horizons, Leonardo was a champion of resilience, and he himself became an agent of epochal change by embedding in his work notions of mutability, transformation and multiplicity (Galluzzi 2006; Marani 2015).

Subsequent sections of this paper discuss terms such as multifunctionality and metaphor in reference to the future of cultural heritage, or the endiads of concepts of transition and sustainability, restoration and transformation, and the priority of the cultural change over the technological change.

All of these issues can be echoed in the artistic theory and practice of Leonardo, whose polymorphism and irreducible freethinking is still today a source of inspiration for academic research in approaching complex questions.

Indeed Leonardo—unlike painters such as Botticelli who just aimed at shaping an aesthetic canon which could mirror the intellectual ambitions of a social élite—conceived his art with the "universal" purpose of relentlessly investigating the observable world in order to discover its inherent mechanisms (Marani 1999; Marani and Fiorio 2015).

A century before the advent of Galilean experimental science, he employed drawing and painting as instruments with which the painter's extremely keen gaze took charge of inquiring the incessant flow of natural phenomena, which are subjected by unknown forces to continuous changes (Frosini and Nova, 2015).

It was not simply a matter of studying and reproducing the possibilities of movement of the human anatomy—which fell under the "classical" tasks of painters—rather that particular biological activity that animates all aspects of nature, from animals and plants to the winds and the transformative flow of water.

Leonardo perceives that change/transformation/metamorphosis is inherent in the life cycle of the world, that the world is not static but undergoes a perpetual process of movement and thus of change (Kemp 2006).

With Leonardo, the artist becomes a hunter of change: the mark of the pencil chasing the swirls of the wave, the motion of the planets, the rhythm of the flaps of the garment, the turning of the gaze. The resulting drawing takes into account not only the shape of the object, but its shape in transformation, that is, how it changes under the solicitation of multiple interconnected forces.

Hence, already in the youthful *Annunciation*, 1473-1474 (Florence, The Uffizi Gallery, inv. 1890 no. 1618) the pages of the book open on the Virgin's lectern flip through the air, the angel's shadow on the meadow stretches over the flowers whose petals quiver like reptilian tails, and mists veil the mountains in the background with blue, blurring their masses in the distance. A continuous vibration permeates the depiction, suggesting an imperceptible but perennial modification of the natural scenery that encompasses the human and the nonhuman.

Similarly, he articulates the arrangement and attitudes of the apostles of the *Last Supper*, 1495-1498 (Milan, Santa Maria delle Grazie) by applying his studies of fluid dynamics to the "motions of the soul" of the apostles, who are affected by the announcement of Judas' betrayal as the stone thrown into the pond affects the surface of the water causing concentric circles (Marani 2001). A sudden and shocking event results in a distortion of the emotional and compositional texture of the scene, with a range of differentiated responses.

The interest in rendering radical alterations of a pre-existing condition became more and more vivid over the years, and in the extreme works it became dominant, as can be seen in the late and dramatic drawings of the "floods" at Windsor Castle, The Royal Collections (i.e. no. 12378 recto, datable to around 1515).

Leonardo has here moved beyond the "geometric" kind of landscape representation derived from the Flemish style and based on a delimited horizon, converging lines of sight, and details clearly arranged in sloping space. The sign here becomes circular, swirling, almost becoming a graphic equivalence of the vector of motion (Fehrenbach 1997).

Based on dreamlike and prophetic material, the "floods" prefigure inundations, collapses and catastrophes of cosmic proportions, where a radical change in the shape of the world takes place. A change that is not yet underway, but to visualize which the artist expands his strategies of representation (Gombrich 1969).

For us, it is rather self-evident that Design, that is, the culture of the project but, etymologically and technically, also the "drawing" as a tool for describing and reshaping reality, is precisely meant to generate new interpretations thereof. And yet Leonardo da Vinci is at the roots of this conception.

Even his most sensational experimentations, such as when he designs the structure that should enable human flight, were not fantasies untethered from the urgency of the present. As Paul Valéry has noted, he imagines that the flying man could reach the top of the Alps during the blazing days of summer to bring snow to the city with which to cool the inhabitants (Valéry 1848, ed. 2007).

Whether questioning or designing, Leonardo always has a problem to solve, and his problems really don't seem that different from ours.

2 [Changing] Design culture

The call for papers for the 2023 edition of the IASDR Congress is certainly timely and appropriately provocative, but it also carries a certain tragic undertone. Its urgency and doubtfulness could evoke the thought of Günther Anders about the condition of humanity in an epoch in which technique becomes the actual subject of the history. The author claims that “it is not enough to change the world. That is all we have ever done. That happens even without us. We also have to interpret this change. And precisely in order to change it. So that the world will not go on changing without us. And so that it is not changed in the end into a world without us” (Anders, 2002, p. 5).

Faced with pandemics, as well as the climate crisis and its violent manifestations, or the Russian-Ukrainian war and the tangible possibility of a global conflict, the call for papers emphasizes that “humanity is at a crossroads between restoration and change, deciding what it is worth to be saved and what we can and should forget”. Therefore, it questions: “what is the role of design in these transformation processes? And how is design renewing and transforming itself?”.

Indeed, the relationship between restoration and change is crucial in the debate surrounding design for cultural heritage. The advancements in this field of design study could greatly contribute to the quest for answers to such questions. A starting contribution is the consciousness that it is a tricky ambition to designate what has to be saved and what should be forgotten. Even more frequently, sadly, we are not able to preserve what truly is worthy, while our errors and mistakes leave irreparable marks on us and the environment.

The [Changing] Heritage thematic tracks, alerts that “dramatic changes related to the impact of human activities on the planet are urgently emerging as consequence of the development paradigm we have adopted until now”. In this direction, there is a theoretical connection between design for cultural heritage and design for sustainability. If design preferentially works for changing, they work for both restoring and changing (Celaschi, Trocchianesi, 2004; Wahl, 2016). This connection becomes evident empirically when the two design approaches engage in convergent themes, such as landscape and territory.

Design for cultural heritage and design for sustainability suggest the need for recognizing that all acts of design demand moves along with the line of time, encompassing a retrospective perspective, in addition to a prospective one, besides an attentive look for our surroundings (Celaschi, Formia, Franzato, 2018). When we design, even when we are envisioning scenarios far into the future, we are always reminiscing the past and observing the present. Imagination is a kaleidoscopic collection and interweaving of images gathered from our individual and collective memories, and the environment.

Suggesting that the future is only one among the possible time operators for design, the proposal is to avoid the anxiety and eagerness that characterize design, thus unreflective ways of design and, finally, yet another futuristic drift in the search for a change (Haraway, 2016; Krenak, 2022). In other words, the proposal is to avoid the path that have brought us to this urgent situation.

Perhaps, an important lesson and cautionary note of design for cultural heritage and design for sustainability is the paramount significance of care (Brugère, 2011; Boff, 1999). Designing for care stands as a valuable principle in shaping an alternative paradigm of development and, more expansively, in shaping other modes of existence and inhabiting the world (Latour, 2018).

Actually, before beginning to design, we should positioning ourselves as designers in the sociocultural milieu and in the world, and then carefully qualify the pretended change, as well as the way to pursuit it. What change are we seeking? Fifteen years after the Changing the Change Turin Conference (Cipolla, Peruccio, 2008), as we attempt to answer such questions, we still suffer from a kind of aphasia.

When we use words such as 'change', but also 'transformation', 'transition', or 'innovation', we should take the time to first understand and then gently explain to ourselves and all those involved the characteristics of the sociocultural and environmental configuration that we intend to achieve.

"Who devises courses of action aimed at changing existing situations into preferred ones" (Simon, 1999, p. 111), as is commonly agreed within the pragmatic tradition of design, should explicitly outline the processes for evaluating what is preferable, along with the corresponding criteria.

It could be noticed that, once again, on the horizon of the dominant, technocratic discourse, the main, if not the only criterion is the technical one. Retrieving Anders' thought, however, we should focus first and foremost on the great challenge of interpreting change. Operating in this manner, we would understand that what is at stake is the elaboration of a change that is primarily cultural rather than technical.

This represents a challenging endeavour for design, as it entails a significant change in design culture. Indeed, the congress organizers inquire correctly about the role of design in the transformative processes between restoration and change, and, above all, about how design itself is undergoing renewal and transformation to consciously collaborate along with a very well-qualified process of change. In this direction, it seems essential to restore a dialogue with the arts and the humanities.

3 [Changing] Role of museums and models of cultural experiences

The global process of changing certainly influences our way to enjoy culture in different contexts. The role of museums is changing: they are not just places able to collect works of art, but multifunctional reference points for tourists and local communities.

In 2021, an interesting project, by Jeffrey Schnapp, called *Museo Futuro* tried to envision nine metaphors representing new models of museum in the near future. The project was developed with Daniele Ledda (xycomm Milan) and Elisabetta Terragni (CUNY, Studio Terragni Architetti, Como), together with the team from Museo Madre // Fondazione Donnaregina in Naples. *MuseoFuturo* ("Future Museum") is an experiment in museum-based education that reaches out not to museum professionals, but rather to young professionals in a range of creative and technical fields, inviting them to participate in the development of nine alternative visions – expressed by metaphors – of future museums, while bringing the Madre's own permanent collection –which, as is the case with most art museums, is mostly in storage– into public conversation. The metaphors in *MuseoFuturo* are: *Museum as a Microscope* (a "lens" on several levels of narratives about only one piece of artwork, like a in depth study); *Museum as a Telescope* (a "landscape" of several artworks collected according to different associations, like a wide exploration); *Museum as a Stage* (the spectacularization of the culture); *Museum as a Warehouse* (a relationship between backstage and on-stage, to extend the visit beyond the "traditional" museum paths valorising and highlighting the hidden collections); *Museum as a Place of travel* (an occasion to explore culture worldwide through different "windows" able to open minds and perspectives. Artworks transport visitors through space and time; museums

themselves are travel destinations); *Museum as a Toy* (a playful interaction where the multisensorial approach is the key of the cultural experience); *Museum as a Public Square* (from the museum as a close place able to preserve and defend collections to an open museum able to go beyond the walls and become a cultural forum); *Museum as a Laboratory* (not only a place where visitors get in touch with the collection, but a research laboratory which asks questions more than give answers and generates new knowledges); and *Museum as a Computer* (an informative system able to rethink its models to access, preserve, stock, restore and valorise through new technologies creating multiple connection with other reality in a multidimensional way). An exhibition, made up of nine nodes distributed within the Madre's architecturally complex exhibition spaces, translated the strongest of the collectively elaborated curatorial interventions into an innovative experience for museum visitors. The aim was to create a laboratory in which nine concepts of how future museums will be. The concepts were not only explored but also instanced by means of curatorial interventions developed in small groups working with 18 objects from the Madre collections. The ninth experiment involved working with the collections of a partner institution: the National Archeological Museum of Naples¹. We mention this project because it well represents the idea to envisions new roles and vocations of museums spurred by new cultural attitudes and trends. It is undeniable that the museum increasingly opens up to new forms of use and cultural experience, also in terms of social functions.

In 2018 many Canadian, English and Belgian studies in the medical field promoted museums as therapies that improve psychological and physical conditions in case of stress. This trend (together with the need of financial funding) is leading to redesigning multifunctional spaces in museum facilities, in order to have more rooms available for shared activities devoted to well-being. To confirm this one may quote the experimental projects in two museums in Milan: The Museum of Natural History and The Gallery of Modern Art. This project is called *ASBA* (Anxiety, Stress, Brain-friendly museum, Approach), designed and coordinated by The Study Center on the History of Biomedical Thought (CESPEB) of University Milano-Bicocca. This is an interdisciplinary programme based on the idea of promoting the collections and imagining museums as spaces of choice where collective well-being is stimulated through forms of art therapy, Visual Thinking Strategies e Art Up.

Therefore, museums as social and emotional spaces, where the dialogue between art and science is at the service of the community of "new" users thus generating new forms of cultural experience. The new paradigms of fruition envisage museums also as rehabilitation facilities or - in the most extreme cases - as shelters. In any case, after preservation and exhibition the main function of contemporary museums is research. Chiefly research on social transformation. In fact it is on this issue that museums are investing to understand the challenge in terms of "designing for alterity": first of all, trying to understand what is meant by identity, alterity, diversity (cultural, gender, sexual orientation, physical ability...), as new forms of representation and interpretation, but first and foremost, how can museums be the mirrors of the change in society through research, the updating of the heritage, education?² It is necessary for museums to become bearers of new methodologies of research and

¹ <https://jeffreyschnapp.com/2021/01/20/experimental-museology/>

² The educational project *Museums and Social Transformations* (September-November 2023) curated by Maria Chiara Ciaccheri, Anna Chiara Cimoli e Nicole Moolhuijsen, in collaboration with Viviana Gravano, aims at tackling different

analysis and use them to create a network challenging problems that are due to social change which go beyond the museums specific collection. Surely overcoming the stereotypes and accessibility (at many levels) are crucial issues for which new tools and forms of design must be found. According to these changes, roles and functions, it is necessary to rethink narratives, communication registers and exhibit systems in order to renovate cultural experiences in museums and cultural contexts. The design discipline can play an important role in this process both in terms of envisioning new scenarios and cultural models, and shaping new spaces, artifacts and services.

4 [Changing] Designing for museum digital transformation

Museums under a process of digital transformation are not just adopting new technology, but rather they are embedding digital – thinking, capability and skills, and tools – in their vision and strategy, organisational working practices and skills sets, and ways of thinking and decision making (OBO-UKRI 2020). This is a process of digital transformation that the pandemic has accelerated as the lockdown forced many museums to adopt quickly.

Design is important because this transformation given rise to new challenges (and changes) design practices (Mason 2022) that can be effectively tackled through the application of design thinking (Brown 2010; Liedtka, 2011) as it brings into the organisational practices new mindsets, capabilities, and practices that help museums to embrace and deliver change, and pursue digital transformation.

4.1 Museum digital transformation and the changing nature of design practices

Museums are in a moment of transition and change, in which the sector has been moving beyond the digital technology revolution. In his seminal article, Parry (2013) described this emerging condition with the concept of the “post-digital museum” – also referred to as “the digitally mature museum” (terms that is often used interchangeably) – explained as a transformation that sees digitality acquiring a normative presence and penetrating into museums' missions, structures, practices and organisational mindsets. According to Dziekan and Proctor (2019) the digitally mature museum can be defined as a response to the entanglements of media, approaching the process, experiences, and actuations of digital as indistinct from other, non-digital aspects of museum practices. Also, it is a change that (inevitably) affects visitor experience as it seamlessly blends the digital experience with the overall museum (physical) experience, blurring any distinction between physical and digital realms (Vermeeren et al. 2018). According to the recent research conducted by Culture24 and Europeana (Finnis and Kennedy 2020, p. 7), "digital transformation is the act of adopting digital technology or digital thinking to significantly transform an organisation's operation, and/or the reframing of the organisation to be inherently digital in its purpose."

Over the past decade, the emerging post-digital condition has opened a series of changes (and opportunities) that I would like to outline. Firstly, museums have shifted into *visitor-centred* institutions (Samis & Michaelson 2017) as result of the ‘new museology’ discourse around the social-political roles of museums (McCall and Gray 2014). This transition departs from the conventional view

of museums as "cultural authorities," centered around objects, collections, and physical structures. Instead, museums are presently adopting novel means of interaction and connection with their visitors and local communities integrating, for example, human needs, emotions, and motivations as crucial elements while devising programmes and shaping strategies. While museums have been designing considering visitors, they may not, necessarily, be taking a human-centred approach to their design, including the design of services and strategies. MacLeod (2018) pointed out that there is still criticism within the museum design community on the existing conventions and commercial formality of museums that limit the role and focus of design for visitor experience "around objects in cases and the communication of curatorial knowledge [to the visitors]" (MacLeod, 2018, p. 3). Human-centred design practices – that consider human perspectives throughout the design process – are increasingly adopted to foster visitor engagement, social interaction and entertainment in society.

Secondly, in line with visitor-centrism, a growing number of museums are now thinking in terms of *visitor experience* and *service-based experiences*, which considers the holistic visitor experience intertwining physical, digital, and organizational dimensions (Hornecker and Ciolfi, 2019;). Rather than viewing museum visitors as interacting primarily with/through a technology, they emphasize engagement through an experiential lens (Mason 2020c). The experience itself serves as the intermediary that shapes the connections between the visitor(s) and the museum. For example, the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum Boston that used visitor journey map to, initially, redesign of the museum's website – but, then, this approach "yielded insights into all aspects of the visitor experience" (Grohe and Mann 2019). What was initially a design tool for that specific project (the website) has since become a service design approach that integrated into the museum's internal practices (Grohe and Mann 2019).

A third shift concern refocusing design's purpose from problem-solving to problem-framing, to deal with entangled problems museums are facing from different challenges. Mittrof Silvers (2018) warns us that in her long experience as a museum professionals and design thinking consultant she has seen how on many occasions museum team felt "in love with the latest [technological] solution" because "it's hard to step back and consider alternatives." The expertise and way of thinking human-centred design are brought in at the start of the design process in order to frame the problems properly, identify design opportunities, and generate ideas; rather than focusing right away on a specific technology, product or system as the "right" solutions for a meaningful visitor experience.

Fourthly, a notable transformation has occurred in the objectives of the design process within museums, adapting to various "orders of design" (Buchanan 2007) when it comes to outcomes. These outcomes have evolved from infographics, labels, and displays to encompass interactives, digital systems, and extend to the creation of service-oriented experiences (e.g. Villaespesa and Álvarez 2020) and even engagement at a strategic level. For example, Mason (2020a, b) showed a working example of how Derby Museums Trust adopted human-centred design thinking as an effective approach to embedding museum vision and core values, as well as audience, museum staff, and internal/external stakeholders, needs and practices, into strategic decisions for the Derby Museums online presence.

Fifthly, the digitally mature museum has to be responsive to change and navigating a digital landscape that is rapidly evolving and ask for experimentation of and constant creative adaptation to newly introduced platforms and technologies. It is widely recognised how design-driven innovation have been gaining popularity as an organisational strategic approach towards tackling today's innovation

challenges (Liedtka 2018) and being responsive to rapid change of the digital transformation (Magistretti, Tu Anh Pham, and Dell'Era, 2021).

Finally, as shift that is profoundly related to all the others, projects in post-digital museum increasingly involve collaboration across *multidisciplinary teams* and departments – including museum partners – working together in a purposefully reflective way and skills to produce innovations. In the museum literature, collaboration is portrayed as an essential activity of museum practice (Mason 2015; Olesen 2015;). Significantly, Knudsen and Olesen (2019) frame collaboration within post-digital museums as a “complex work process” and explain how collaborative design practices (such as Human-Centred Design) are effective to manage the complexity of current design problems. In parallel, as part of the kind of collaboration involving visitors, the digital age has contributed to the idea of museums as sites for participation and cultural citizenship (Pruulmann & Runnel 2019), involving a larger, more diverse, and demanding public (Bautista & Balsamo 2016). Digital technologies such as social media and web platforms inspire new types of exchange and participatory (design) practices between museums and their communities, renegotiating conventional museum practices (Bagessen & Haldrup 2019).

4.2 The role of design thinking practice in the digitally mature museum

As a result of what outlined above, a human-centred design paradigm is spreading in museums in response to emerging contexts and change. As Press (2021) stresses, museum digital transformation involves a thorough (re)examination of existing practice and “how the organization works instead of just forcing technology on existing processes and traditional ways of doing things.” Significantly, according to Mason and Vavoula (2020), design [thinking] practices are “both shaping and shaped by the integration of the digital *within* museum practices and, therefore, inevitably results in and emerges out of the organizational change that ensues” (pag. 408). The authors describe how digital cultural heritage design practices is essentially formed by a set of collaborative (design) activities – as part of everyday, routine museum work –and has a social dimension as it is the network of everyday (inter)actions among individuals within an organisation, across departments, and with external stakeholders.

What is crucial (and different nowadays) it is that design is no longer the exclusive or privileged domain of ‘design specialists’ (such as exhibition designers or graphic designers). Rather, interpretation curators, educators, community and visitor service officers are also ‘design practitioners’ who contribute, through design practices, to cultivate the *digitally-mature museum*. Viewed in this way, design is considered according to what Johansson and Woodilla (2013) describe as “design thinking” (lowercase) discourse – differentiating it from “designerly thinking” discourse which sees design as the exclusive domain of design specialist – as a construct referring to a “discourse where design practice and competence are used beyond the design context, for and with people without a scholarly background in design, particularly in management.” (p.123). In other words, designerly thinking and tools, as well as “designers’ sensibility” (Fulton Suri and Hendrix, 2010) are adopted by non-designers to address not only specifically design issues but also new and complex challenges like those emerging from museum digital transformation.

The “design thinking” discourse and underlined its significance as it opens up to a new perspective (and opportunities for researchers) that consider a new “social context” that is a central aspect of a more recent discourse that sees design beyond the field of design. As a result, there is growing demand within the design research communities for studies on design as practice. Vavoula and Mason

have recently suggested that a paradigm shift in Digital Cultural Heritage Design research is necessary, because how museums see digital has changed and, as a result, museum design practices are undergoing a significant shift. For examples, they proposed a conceptual framework as a set of lenses to explore the practice of designing digital cultural heritage, structured around the elements of activity, tool mediation, and knowledge production. Mason and Dziekan, in their upcoming book (Routledge book, in press) show how a growing number of museums adopting design to leverage organisational change by describing the intricate interconnected functions of design social practice as the consequence of intricate relationships between different actors (expert and not-expert designers) involved in the design practices, tools and methodologies, and social processes that are enacted during practices. They present emerging design thinking practices (in museum sector) as a collection of integrated tools, methods, capabilities, and mindsets that go beyond a process for creating tangible outcomes like exhibitions., instead it can facilitate social processes within an organization because operates at a human level, addressing emotions and interactions in social practices. It equips individuals within an organization with methods and techniques from the social sphere to frame and tackle problems, take action, and encourage collaborative practices.

5 Conclusions

The article dealt with changes in the cultural heritage field from different perspectives and scales of intervention: from 'landscape' (in a broad sense) to museums passing through the lens of the digital dimension and taking advantage of the historical and artistic approach as a special way to re-interpret the change in the contemporary age.

In the previous dissertations we touched several topics related to the cultural dimension and the design approach. Herein we can synthesize some variable which are able to trigger change processes:

- *Elements of discontinuity in the context*: when a signal of discontinuity interrupts the linearity of a process, an innovative element emerges disrupting the context. Today, in the cultural heritage field, this kind of discontinuity is recognisable in several aspects: for instance questioning the mere approach to digital in museums and cultural institutions in favour of an 'analogue' attitude to digital.
- *Context alterations*: unexpected, devastating, and impactful events force us to rethink and remodel the role of the culture starting from conditions like impermanence, precariousness, and fragility. According to this trend also the places of the culture change, as well as the participative role of communities which can intervene in the production process reshaping the cultural experience.

Finally, herein, words like 'transformation', 'transition', 'innovation' (already mentioned in a previous paragraph) assume multifaced meanings to the point where we can talk about transformation of places, contents, design attitudes, and visitor behaviours in enjoying the culture; transition from a structured model of fruition of the culture to a multivocal and phygital cultural experience where the person is in the centre of the space; innovation in an age in which technique becomes the actual subject of the history.

References

- Anders, G. (2002). *Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen, Band 2: Über die Zerstörung des Lebens im Zeitalter der dritten industriellen Revolution*. Munich: Beck.
- Baggesen, R.H. & Haldrup, M. (2019). Accessed 10th January 2020: <http://ourmuseum.dk/projects/programme-projects/participatory-and-professional-interchange/>
- Bautista, S. & Balsamo, A. (2016). Understanding the distributed museum: Mapping the spaces of museology in contemporary culture. In *Museums and Higher Education Working Together* (pp. 55-70). Routledge.
- Boff, L. (1999). *Saber Cuidar: Ética do humano - Compaixão pela Terra*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Vozes.
- Brown, T. (2010). *Change by design*. Lian Jing/Tsai Fong Books.
- Brugère, F. (2011). *L'éthique du « care »*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Buchanan, R. (2007). The Four Orders of design. In *The 32nd International Design Management Conference*.
- Celaschi, F., Formia, E., Franzato, C. (2018) Back to the Future. Time and futures studies in the contemporary, design-driven approach to innovation. *diid | disegno industriale industrial design*, 16, 126-133, 2018. https://www.academia.edu/38192119/Back_to_the_Future_Time_and_futures_studies_in_the_contemporary_design_driven_approach_to_innovation.
- Celaschi, F., Trocchianesi, R. (2004). *Design & Beni Culturali. La cultura del progetto nella valorizzazione del bene culturale*. Milano: Edizioni Poli.Design.
- Cipolla, C. Peruccio, P. P. (eds.). (2008). *Changing the Change. Design, Visions, Proposals and Tools*. Torino: Allemandi.
- Dziekan, V.; Proctor, N. (2019). From elsewhere to everywhere: Evolving the distributed museum into the pervasive museum. In *The Routledge Handbook of Museums, Media and Communication*; Drotner, K., Dziekan, V., Parry, R., Schrøder, K., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2019; pp. 177–192
- Fehrenbach F., *Licht und Wasser. Zur Dynamik naturphilosophischer Leitbilder im Werk Leonardo da Vincis*, Tübingen 1997.
- Finnis, J. and Kennedy A. (2020). *The Digital Transformation Agenda and GLAMs A Quick Scan Report for Europeana*. Accessed 9th July 2022: <https://digipathways.co.uk/resources/the-digital-transformation-agenda-and-glams> (accessed on 20th May 2022).
- Frosini F. and A. Nova (ed. by), *Leonardo da Vinci on Nature: Knowledge and Representation*, Venezia, 2015.
- Fry, T., Nocek, A. (2020). *Design in Crisis: New Worlds, Philosophies and Practices*. London: Routledge.
- Fulton Suri, J., and Hendrix M. (2010). *Developing Design Sensibility*. Rotman Magazine Spring. Accessed 13th July 2023: <http://5a5f89b8e10a225a44accbed124c38c4f7a3066210c073e7d55.r9.cf1.rackcdn.com/files/pdfs/DevelopingDesignSensibilities.pdf>
- Galluzzi P. (ed. by), *La mente di Leonardo. Nello studio del genio universale*, Firenze 2006.
- Gombrich E.H., *The Form of Movement in Water and Air, in Leonardo's Legacy. An international Symposium*, edited by C. O'Malley, Los Angeles 1969, pp. 131-204.
- Grohe and Mann. (2019). Accessed July 24th 2023: <https://mw19.mwconf.org/paper/walking-in-the-shoes-of-our-visitors-human-centered-design-and-organizational-change-at-the-isabella-stewart-gardner-museum/index.html>
- Haraway, D. H. (2016). *Staying with the Trouble. Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, London: Duke University Press.
- Kemp M., *Leonardo da Vinci. The Marvellous Works of Nature and Man*, New York 2006.
- Krenak, A. (2022). *Futuro ancestral*. São Paulo: Companhia das letras.
- Knudsen, L. V., & Olesen, A. R. (2018). Complexities of collaborating: Understanding and managing differences in collaborative design of museum communication. In *The Routledge Handbook of Museums, Media and Communication*, Drotner, K., Dziekan, V., Parry, R., & Schrøder, K. (Eds.), Routledge: 205-218.
- Hornecker, E. and Ciolfi, L. (2019). Human-computer interactions in museums. *Synthesis lectures on human-centered informatics*, 12(2), pp.i-171.
- Johansson-Sköldberg, U., Woodilla, J., & Çetinkaya, M. (2013). Design thinking: Past, present and possible futures. *Creativity and innovation management*, 22(2), 121-146.
- Latour, B. (2018). *An Inquiry into Modes of Existence. An Anthropology of the Moderns*. Cambridge: Harvard University press.
- Liedtka J, Ogilvie T (2011) *Designing for growth: a design thinking tool kit for managers*. Columbia

- University Press, New York.
- Liedtka, J., 2018. Exploring the Impact of Design Thinking in Action. University of Virginia Darden School of Business.
- MacLeod, S., Austin, T., Hale, J. and Hing-Kay, O.H. (2018). The future of museum and gallery design. Routledge.
- Magistretti, S., C. Tu Anh Pham, and Dell'Era C. (2021). "Enlightening the dynamic capabilities of design thinking in fostering digital transformation." *Industrial Marketing Management* 97, 59-70.
- Marani P.C. (ed. by), *Il Genio e le Passioni. Leonardo e il Cenacolo. Precedenti, innovazioni, riflessi di un capolavoro*, exh. cat., Ginevra-Milano 2001.
- Marani P.C. (ed. by), *La mente di Leonardo. Disegni di Leonardo dal Codice Atlantico*, exh. cat., Milano-Novara 2015.
- Marani P.C., *Leonardo: una carriera di pittore*, Milano 1999.
- Marani P.C. and Fiorio M.T. (ed. by), *Leonardo da Vinci 1452-1519. Il disegno del mondo*, exh. cat., Ginevra-Milano 2015.
- Mason, M., 2015. Prototyping practices supporting interdisciplinary collaboration in digital media design for museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 30(5), pp.394-426.
- Mason, M. (2017). Visitor Experience Design, in "The Manual of Digital Museum Planning", Ali Hossaini (ed.), Rowman & Littlefield, MA, USA – Lord Cultural Resources (LCR).
- Mason, M. (2020a). People first: visioning Derby Museums' online presence (Part I and II). In *Culture 24: Digital Pathways*. Accessed 8th June 2023: <https://digipathways.co.uk/resources/people-first-visioning-derby-museums-online-presence/>
- Mason, M. (2020b). Visioning in the digitally mature museum. In *Culture 24: Digital Pathways*. Accessed 8th June 2023: <https://digipathways.co.uk/resources/visioning-in-the-digitally-mature-museum/>
- Mason, M. (2020c). The elements of visitor experience in post-digital museum design. *Design Principles and Practices*, 14(1), pp.1-14.
- Mason, M. (2022). The Contribution of Design Thinking to Museum Digital Transformation in Post-Pandemic Times. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 6(9), p.79.
- McCall, V.; Gray, C. (2014). Museums and the 'new museology': Theory, practice and organisational change. *Mus. Manag. Curatorship*, 29, 19–35
- Mitroff choi, D. (2018). Minimizing the Einstellung Effect in Design Thinking: How to Arrive at Innovative Solutions by Diminishing Cognitive Bias. Accessed 25th May 2023: <https://designthinkingformuseums.net/2018/08/01/einstellung-effect-in-design-thinking/>
- OBO-UKRI (2020). <https://one-by-one.uk/2021/08/17/project-1-summary/>
- Olesen, A. R. (2015). Co-designing Digital Museum Communication: An Exploration of Digital Museum Communication as it Emerges in Collaborative Design Interaction Between Museum Staff and Digital Designers. Doctoral School of Communication, Business and Information Technologies, Roskilde U. Press G. (2021). The Next Stage In The Digital Transformation Of Museums. *Forbe Online Magazine*. Accessed 3rd July 2023: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/gilpress/2021/12/06/the-next-stage-in-the-digital-transformation-of-museums/?sh=2c30258a2e0f>
- Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, P., & Runnel, P. (2019). The Museum as an arena for cultural Citizenship, in *The Routledge Handbook of Museums, Media and Communication*; Drotner, K., Dziekan, V., Parry, R., Schrøder, K., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2019; pp. 143-158
- Samis, P., and M. Michaelson. (2017). *Creating the Visitor-centered Museum*. London: Routledge.
- Simon, H. A. (1996). *The Sciences of the Artificial*. Cambridge, London: The MIT Press.
- Valéry P., *Introduzione al metodo di Leonardo da Vinci*, Milano 2007.
- Vermeeren, A.P., Calvi, L., Sabiescu, A., Trocchianesi, R., Stuedahl, D., Giaccardi, E. and Radice, S. (2018). *Future museum experience design: crowds, ecosystems and novel technologies* (pp. 1-16). Springer International Publishing.
- Villaespesa, E., & Álvarez, A. (2020). Visitor journey mapping at the Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza: bringing cross-departmental collaboration to build a holistic and integrated visitor experience. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 35(2), 125-142.
- Wahl, D. C.; (2016). *Designing Regenerative Cultures*. Dorset: Triarchy Press.

About the Authors:

Carlo Franzato: He is an associate professor in the Department of Arts & Design at the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio). He leads the socio-environmental design laboratory "Ecotopias". He has experience in design for cultural heritage.

Rodolfo Maffei: Associate Professor of History of Art at the Politecnico di Milano, he specializes in early modern art, with a focus on Renaissance and Baroque Italian painting. His researches mainly address Florentine artists and their connections with the broader context of literary and scientific culture of the 16- and 17- centuries. His research interests also include the work of Leonardo da Vinci: notably the master's writings on astronomy and his strategies of visualization of celestial bodies.

Marco Mason: He is an associate professor at the School of Design, Northumbria University. His research is at the intersection of Digital Cultural Heritage, Design, and Social Sciences for the study of digital design and its practices in museums. He has been researching and teaching in leading research centres such as Luav ITA, MIT US; School of Museum Studies Leicester, U. of Cambridge, and now Northumbria School of Design UK.

Raffaella Trocchianesi: She is an architect and associate professor at Department of Design, Politecnico di Milano, she teaches Interior Design Studio and Exhibit Design Studio at the School of Design.

Director of the specialization Master *IDEA_Exhibition Design*, she mainly deals with Design for Cultural Heritage in terms of museography and exhibition design, communication and enhancement of local areas, new models and narratives of cultural experiences, the relationship among design, Humanities and arts.

Acknowledgement: Mason's contribution is informed by and drawn from a decade's worth of research engagement through my direct involvement in different research programmes: (2021-2024) Principal Investigator AHRC-funded project (UKRI – £249,793), titled *Designing in the Digitally Mature Museum: Refocusing Design From Technology To Human Practice*; (2019-2020) Digital Fellow in a AHRC-funded major project, titled: *One by One: Building Digital Confident Museums* (School of Museum Studies Leicester; PI: Professor Ross Parry); (2016-2018) Marie Skłodowska Curie Individual Fellowship (H2020 -- €195,454), Principal Investigator at the University of Leicester (School of Museum Studies) and University of Cambridge (Fitzwilliam Museum), titled *Design Thinking for Digital Heritage*; (2012-2015) Marie Curie Individual Fellowship (FP7 – €271,943), Principal Investigator at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT Science Technology Society Program) and the University of Leicester (School of Museum Studies), titled *Digital Media for Heritage: Refocusing Design from the Technology to the Visitor Experience*.

Acknowledgement: Carlo Franzato thanks the Brazilian National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) for the Research Productivity Scholarship. He also receives funding from the Carlos Chagas Filho Foundation for Research Support of the State of Rio de Janeiro (FAPERJ) for the Gávea Lab project (process number E-26/210.079/2023).

Authorship attributions: The paper is the result of a shared reflection. Nevertheless, the Abstract/Introduction, the paragraph 3, and the paragraph 5 (Conclusions) were edited by Raffaella Trocchianesi, the paragraph 1 was edited by Rodolfo Maffei, the paragraph 2 by Carlo Franzato, and the paragraph 4 by Marco Mason.