

The Role of Tourist Guides in the Multi-vocal Presentation of Heritage

Veronica Barbara
v.c.barbara@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/ijtgr>

 Part of the [Geography Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [Tourism Commons](#), and the [Tourism and Travel Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barbara, Veronica () "The Role of Tourist Guides in the Multi-vocal Presentation of Heritage," *International Journal of Tour Guiding Research*: Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 6.

Available at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/ijtgr/vol1/iss1/6>

This Academic Paper is brought to you for free and open access by ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Tour Guiding Research by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact yvonne.desmond@tudublin.ie, arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, brian.widdis@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 License](#)

The Role of Tourist Guides in the Multi-vocal Presentation of Heritage

Veronica Barbara

v.c.barbara@gmail.com

People tend to think of heritage sites as places for education and entertainment. In reality, visitors also seek sites for other reasons, often more personal in nature. This is due to the different voices within the heritage experience which make sites not only highly contested areas but also sensitive spaces to interpret and present.

Based on the qualitative research done for an MA dissertation entitled ‘Are we being multi-vocal? The case of presenting Archaeological Heritage in Malta’, the author explores the different values that artefacts and sites have for different people and how the visiting experience can lead from the tangible to the intangible. By researching the relationship between heritage and individuals and communities, the author’s goal is to present a multi-vocal model for the presentation of heritage (mainly archaeological but not exclusively), and outline the role of the tourist guide as the mediator in the heritage experience. This aspect of the tourist guide’s work is to be observed not simply in their own right as the front-liner of the explanation on site but also in synergy with the work and practice of heritage managers, contributing in community-based projects and other cultural heritage initiatives.

Key Words: heritage presentation, heritage interpretation, visiting experience, multi-vocality, diversity

Introduction

Heritage is composed of a myriad of elements which are sometimes overshadowed by the more established notions of education and entertainment. In reality, there are many different voices within the heritage experience and visitors seek sites also for personal, spiritual, emotional and therapeutic reasons (Timothy, 2014). Sites in themselves are not static in the value they possess but are as alive and ever-changing as the people who visit them. They are also often the focus of conflict, controversy and politics. Tourist guides have a duty to understand these different layers. As Jameson and Baugher (2017:7) stress:

It is important for those of us who manage, study, and present the past to be aware of how the past is understood within the context of socioeconomic and political agendas and how that influences what is taught, and how it is valued, protected, authenticated, and used.

When one observes the dynamics of the presentation and interpretation of heritage, one realises that there is a very complex relationship between heritage and the public. There are multiple voices which emanate from our heritage and in the 1980s these started to be recognised, so much so that the term ‘multi-vocality’ emerged.

This paper highlights the concept of multi-vocality, starting with an emphasis on archaeological heritage with a case-study from the Maltese context, and then moving on to a case-study from Australia. By exploring the different levels of assimilation with heritage, the aim of this paper is to evaluate further the role of the tourist guide in mediating the different voices encountered at heritage sites and to suggest ways in which this role can be more fully exploited for the benefit of both people and material remains.

What is Multi-Vocality?

The plurality which exists in society and the multiple voices that ‘surround’ any heritage site has been the subject of numerous debates and, throughout the 20th century, scholars and heritage managers dealt with these voices in a variety of ways. This evolution parallels the development of archaeological thinking, moving away from so-called traditional archaeology to the New Archaeology of the 1960s. Ultimately, in the 1970s and 1980s, this development led to the formation of the processual school of thought with the scientific method at its heart, and the post-processual school with its focus on a variety of interpretations which recognises the subjectivity of interpreters.

The school of thought which engaged most with non-archaeological voices was the post-processual school. One of its advocates, Ian Hodder, coined the term ‘multi-vocality’ which involves allowing space for multiple interpretations, even those interpretations which are put forth by non-professionals (Hodder, 1986). However, one has to pay attention and understand what this concept is *not*. Multi-vocality does not imply complete relativism, where anything goes and any conclusion holds, and where the studies and expertise of professionals have no special value in society. Nor is it simply going back to the audience and asking people what they think about the interpretations and presentations created by professionals.

Multi-vocality ultimately draws one’s attention to the fact that interpreting and presenting heritage has different levels and does not simply provide understandings about the past inferred from documents and material remains. Visitors’ experiences of sites need also to be explored in terms of social bonding, self-realisation, self-esteem, and therapy, widening our view from the simple and erroneous idea that people visit heritage sites only for educational or recreational purposes. Tourist guides need to be aware of this and analyse the role which they play within this context.

The Tourist Guide

To understand the role of the tourist guide, one needs first to understand what kind of creature the tourist guide is. The World Federation of Tourist Guide Associations defines the tourist guide as

[a] person who guides visitors in the language of their choice and interprets the cultural and natural heritage of an area’ generally possessing ‘an area-specific qualification usually issued and/or recognised by the appropriate authority (WFTGA, 2013).

The European Federation of Tourist Guide Associations also adds that the guide’s work should be based on the following two fundamental principles:

respect for our visitors as representatives of their own particular cultural traditions, and respect for our specific part of the common European cultural heritage (FEG, 2020).

What do tourist guides actually do, then, and what are the aims which they strive for? I believe these two quotes perfectly sum up the major components of a guide’s work:

Through an early understanding of the human continuum and condition, youth learns reverence, respect and responsibility, to wonder, to be sensitive, to feel important, and to hope (Navajo Musician, Silent Witness Videotape, National Park Foundation - Jameson and Baugher 2017:3)

The venues for these activities can include visiting an excavation, a reconstructed site, stabilized ruins, museum exhibits, or a site treated as an open-air museum (Jameson and Baugher 2017:3).

The first quote is listing some of the main things that a professional tourist guide strives for. Through interpretation and presentation of a site, the guide can induce the visitor to show respect towards the place, to feel responsible for its preservation, to wonder at its beauty and importance in the history of the country, to foster sensitivity towards the concerns of the community

around it, to hope that our ancestors' achievements might be reflected in our achievements today and to feel proud of what our people were once capable of despite their limited knowledge and technological advancements. If this seems far-fetched, one simply needs to turn to Zimmermann's (2006) experience. During an excavation in Mexico, Zimmerman went to the National Anthropology Museum in Mexico City with a group of local workers employed at the dig, all of whom had never been there before. He found one of them crying in front of the Aztec stone calendar, perhaps the most famous item on display at this museum. Asked what was the matter, the worker replied: 'I never realised how great my people once were' (Zimmerman, 2006:42). Often we find it difficult to understand such feelings since we tend to underestimate 'the strength of the urge of men to associate themselves with the historic past' (Tilden 1977: 12).

The second quote taken from Jameson and Baugher, explains why the goals of tourist guides are sometimes very difficult to reach. Guides deal with a number of different sites, unlike a curator who is generally stationed in one place. On the same day a guide might be asked to take clients to all the sites mentioned above. Since each site has its own characteristics, each one has to be treated, interpreted and presented in a different manner. Apart from that, each site has an unlimited variety of facets to it. Tourist guides might wish to encompass all but is this possible? Should they try or should they succumb to their bias, selecting what they feel best represents the site and what the clients can actually connect to?

The responsibility in making this decision is much greater than what we might think. In fact, studies have shown that in many cases the guide's interpretation is 'the most important factor in making a meaningful heritage experience' (Ababneh 2018:258). The guide is the most relatable link between the site and the visitor, not simply giving information but interpreting it and interacting during its delivery, thus breathing life into heritage material. This is often the only way for the visitor to connect the tangible with the

intangible, especially in sites where there is lack of didactic and interpretive media. In most cases, the performance of a tourist guide is what makes the difference between a simple visit and an experience and so guides need to understand the concepts that have governed the presentation of heritage through time in order to better analyse not only their work but also the consequences of their job performance.

Heritage and the Public

Drawing an example from archaeological theoretical discourse, one can identify two approaches *vis-à-vis* the relationship between heritage and the public (Merriman, 2004:5). The first is the Deficit Model, which considers 'the public' as an uneducated mass of people who need professionals to give them 'the science' behind the heritage material. The ultimate aim in this model is to make people support the field (ex: archaeology and archaeologists) and, as a consequence, it ignores debate and conflict.

The second approach is commonly referred to as the Multiple Perspective Model. Here the focus is not on the field and its professionals but rather on the people interacting with the heritage material, who are considered as individuals and not a homogenous group. The main aim of this approach is to enrich the people and not the material record and so it does not oppose any debates. Instead, it stimulates reflection and creativity. Phrases from Tilden spring to mind in this context: '[the visitor] does not so much wish to be talked *at* as to be talked *with*' (1977:12) and '[t]he chief aim of Interpretation is not instruction, but provocation' (1977:32).

The question, however, need not be whether presentation and interpretation are artefact-oriented or people-oriented because both approaches are intrinsically linked to each other. Using the example of possessing an heirloom necklace, Smith explains this beautifully:

The real sense of heritage, the real moment of heritage when our emotions and sense of self are truly engaged, is not so much in the possession of the necklace, but in the act of

Cave of Ghar Dalam, Triq Ghar Dalam



https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/2/23/Malta_-_Birzebbuga_-_Triq_Ghar_Dalam_-_Ghar_Dalam_-_cave_05_ies.jpg

passing on and receiving memories and knowledge ... when we use, reshape and recreate those memories and knowledge to help us make sense of and understand not only who we are but also who we want to be (2006:2).

Thus an artefact or site is important not because it *exists* but because it *means* something to people *now*. The tourist guide is there to elicit this value and this meaning.

Case-Study 1: Ghar Dalam, Malta

One of the many roles of a tourist guide is to interpret museum spaces and displays, identifying what might be of particular interest to the audience and ensuring that the artefacts and props provided by the museum are properly presented to facilitate understanding and appreciation. Sometimes museum displays are a bit trickier to interpret and might have various levels to them, levels which

might not be immediately detectable. The first case-study deals with such a situation and focuses on the site of Ghar Dalam, a cave in the locality of Birzebbuga, situated in the southern part of Malta, a small archipelago in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea.

An extremely interesting paleontological and archaeological site, Ghar Dalam (Figure 1) was created by water action during the so-called 'Pluvial Age' which dominated the area in the last Ice Age. Apart from an enormous amount of Pleistocene animal remains of species that cannot be found in Malta anymore, such as dwarf elephants, archaeological excavations at Ghar Dalam also uncovered layers of human occupation which archaeologists date back to what they consider as the very first securely dated period in Maltese prehistory, thus named the Ghar Dalam Phase.

One of the most significant features of Għar Dalam is the discovery of a series of stratigraphic layers which provide researchers with a sequence of remains covering parts of the Pleistocene period and the Holocene. These layers are still visible to all visitors, thanks to a pillar of deposits and a baulk left untouched by the excavators. One can thus consider Għar Dalam as the only Maltese site which allows tourist guides an authentic visual aid when explaining the Maltese geological and prehistoric past (Barbara 2013: 72).

The site of Għar Dalam is currently managed by Heritage Malta, the national agency for the protection and presentation of national sites and museums. Since the setting up of an on-site museum in the 1930s, the complex is not composed only of the cave itself. Tourist guides often start their tour with the didactic hall inaugurated in 2002, which presents the islands' geological history and the history of the site itself (Zammit, 2002:6). The tour then proceeds to the next hall, where the previous museum set up in the 1930s has been left untouched. The display of the old museum hall was intended to present the remains by bone type and might not make a lot of sense to a regular contemporary museum visitor used to didactic displays. This hall is, however, an important part of museum development and the juxtaposition of old and modern displays helps guides provide a better understanding of the changing attitudes in museology and explain the leap from information to interpretation.

The guide then walks the group through a terraced garden with endemic Maltese flora, where one can also spot a pair of cart-ruts and enjoy uninterrupted views of the surrounding area until the actual cave is reached, an elongated space of more than 210 metres with only the first 80 metres accessible to the public, due to safety precautions (Fabri, 2007).

Given the diverse nature of the site – cave, garden and museums - it is important for a multitude of aspects. It is of immense archaeological importance, and has speleological, ecological and historical significance too. The spotlight for this case-study is, however, a particular showcase

situated in the didactic part of the museum, devoted to the so-called 'cultural layers', particularly the bottom part of the display which deals with the possibility of a Neanderthal presence in Malta.

To understand what led to this display one needs to go back to 29th December 1996 and an article published in the *Malta Independent on Sunday*, entitled 'Maltese history may be rewritten', presenting the theories of three medical doctors (Anton Mifsud, Simon Mifsud, and Charles Savona Ventura) arguing for Neanderthal presence in Malta. The argument was based on a number of points, amongst them two 'taurodontic' teeth said to have been found at Għar Dalam in 1917.

Following the publication of the above-mentioned article, a newspaper debate sparked off in 1997 between Anton Mifsud and John Samut-Tagliaferro, an archaeologist and consultant paleo-pathologist. The main disagreement between them was not so much on the possibility of Neanderthal presence in Malta but rather the validity of the evidence being put forth in support of the theory. In the case of the teeth, their taurodontic feature was extremely significant. A term coined by Arthur Keith, the eminent anatomist and anthropologist, in layman's terms, taurodontism means that the tooth would not have separate roots but rather one single root and the pulp cavity extends from root to tip (Keith, 1924:252). Although Keith believed at the time that taurodontism, especially severe cases, was a distinctive feature of Neanderthals and went on to classify two of the teeth discovered at Għar Dalam as 'belong[ing] to those strange species of man' (Keith, 1924:251-3), the condition was diagnosed in modern humans in the 1960s, even in its severe manifestation (Mangion, 1962; Bharti *et al.*, 2009). This means that the argument that if a tooth is taurodontic it must belong to a Neanderthal skeleton is not determinative. Scientific tests to determine date are an important tool in adding evidence to a theory, and tests had been carried out on the teeth by Kenneth P. Oakley from the British Museum in 1963. These tests indicated that the teeth were not earlier than the Neolithic period, therefore, being much later in

date, could not have belonged to a Neanderthal. Mifsud did not feel that this fact should lead to the crumbling of his theory since he argued that these results had been altered, or in other words, forged.

The newspaper debate ended in the middle of summer of the same year, in a rather inconclusive way especially because of the conspiracy theory being put forth which was very difficult to prove or disprove. In spite of this, the theory still found its way into the Għar Dalam display alongside the bust of a Neanderthal and a timeline of publications related to the issue.

The consequences of this display are of significant note. During my research (precisely on 30th May 2012), the *Times of Malta* published a letter written by Giles Oakley (Kenneth P. Oakley's son) where he expressed his disappointment to find in one of the displays at Għar Dalam that his father had been accused of forgery, considering the reference as a 'shameful smear' on his professional reputation. He said that people might think it does not matter but 'it's very simply about fair play and decency. My father was no forger and no reputable museum should give the impression he was.' He also asked for the removal of this reference. After a letter in support was written by Anthony Bonanno, an imminent Maltese archaeologist, and a reply letter appeared by Anton Mifsud, the display was changed and the offending sentence removed, as explained by Kenneth Gambin, chief curator at Heritage Malta, in a letter to the *Times of Malta* dated 16th June 2013.

This case-study explains the connotations and consequences of a multi-vocal approach and how one can mitigate the conflicting voices for a more ethical and sensitive presentation and interpretation of heritage sites and museums. There is a fine line between a multi-vocal interpretation and an interpretive mistake. Although the matter might seem strictly the remit of museum staff, as explained above, it is often the tourist guide who brings the museum interpretation to visitors and one has to note that guides had been presenting this showcase to tourists for years. One wonders how they had been

interpreting the issue and how they would have reacted had Oakley's son been a member of one of their groups.

Case-Study 2: Migration Museum, Adelaide, Australia

Political and social message also find their way into many cultural heritage museums and sites. Once again, different voices may be presented, while others may be left out but still make their presence felt precisely through their silence. Tourist guides are often placed in challenging positions when they are to interpret conflicting stories or controversial historical periods to their audiences, especially given the often diverse backgrounds of the individuals within the groups they would be interpreting to. One such challenging site for guides is the Migration Museum in Adelaide.

The Migration Museum was established in the late 1980s, as the first migration museum in Australia, and on a site which had its own part to play within the story of migration and the voices of the unheard (Whitlock, 2017:431). The original building on the site served as a boarding school for Aboriginal children, who were separated from their parents and taught English and occupational skills. By the early 1850s it was turned into the Destitute Asylum, housing the homeless and the poor. In the 1870s its spaces were also used as a maternity hospital for unmarried pregnant women. One might say that the voices and experiences of the people who spent time in this building can still be felt today, even though they were ignored voices in the past.

The aim of the Migration Museum is

to document, collect, preserve and present the evidence of South Australia's migration history [and] to create a greater awareness of the cultural traditions that survive and now contribute to the rich cultural diversity of the State (Szekers, 2002:142).

This aim proved to be a struggle for the museum staff for a number of reasons. First of all, migration has always created uneasy situations,

Front Entrance of the Migration Museum of Adelaide, Australia



https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/0/09/Migration_Museum_front_gate.jpg

especially due to the mental, physical and social consequences that are part and parcel of moving from one's 'home' to a new 'home'.

Additionally, the museum staff had to deal with their own cultural baggage as well as with the fact that they were working for what is, in part, a state-funded government organisation. Some might feel that a state-museum cannot take a stance in favour or against a particular episode or issue so interpreting such a controversial topic proved to be rather challenging. One such instance was during the exhibition entitled *The Federation Roadshow: A history, a mystery, a bird's eye view* which ran from 2000 to 2002. The themes and topics dealt with throughout the exhibition did not focus solely on the glorious aspects of the Federation, which were in fact minor elements of the exhibition. The displays were intended instead to assess the true

impact of the Federation, especially on the groups it excluded. The curators were aware that many would not agree with the arguments being presented and the way they were being interpreted but that was the whole point – to give a perspective which was different and which contested established notions, offering space to previously unheard voices (Layman *et al.*, 2001:349).

As Allen *et al.* (2004) state, ethnic diversity is part and parcel of the fabric of this museum. And when one considers that there are more than 150 ethnic groups in Australia, the task of bringing different elements and perspectives together becomes even more serious and laden with responsibility. The museum team had to deal with issues of voice, identity and who was speaking on whose behalf. How would a guide behave within such a space?

What are the challenges one may encounter in such a setting?

First of all, the guide has to find a way to interpret diversity but without reinforcing existing stereotypes and divisive differences. The guide has to be cautious as it is very easy to interpret a display with the aim of bringing together the different communities in a society and instead end up exacerbating the conflict between them, especially if members of a particular community are present in the group.

Ethical considerations also come into play here, such as how to present competing versions of history amongst communities and how to present what might be very private or sacred to an ethnic group. As Catling (2019:61) explains, learning the significance of objects is very important and helps guides to avoid referring to an important object as a 'trinket' when it is sacred or of ritual value to a community.

When we analyse the situation we realise that elements of both the deficit model and the multiple perspective model are present in this case study. On the one hand, the displays at the Migration Museum in Adelaide have been set up by the museum staff in a way they thought best (with the involvement of local communities and also with the creation of the so-called 'Forum' space where communities set up their own temporary exhibitions). On the other hand, the interpretation of the guide can go beyond and perhaps also include elements which might have been left out. Indeed, the museum acknowledges that whilst trying to tell a larger story, this will never be a whole or a true story but rather a mosaic of different interpretations. After all, the museum has as an objective the representation and promotion of diversity (Szekers, 2002:144). A comprehensive history of migration is considered secondary to this stronger message.

Szekers (2002:145) also says that the Migration Museum found support because it allowed the possibility to view critically that which had not really been contested before, in this case migration policies in Australia and the history of racism and

intolerance. Although a tourist guide has to tread carefully here, there is the opportunity for encouraging participation from the audience which can lead to interesting discussions within the group.

The Migration museum has another crucial element that has led to its success - the fact that it deals with personal stories as opposed to political rhetoric. A very strong example was shown during the 2003/2004 exhibition entitled *Every stitch tells a story*, where through the presentation and interpretation of sewing, the Migration Museum managed to link personal stories with political events in a way which allowed visitors strong emotional assimilation (Allen *et al.*, 2004).

Guides know very well how important emotional assimilation is if one wants to achieve a true visiting experience, so, when possible, they should complement museum displays with this personal component, even perhaps adding their own experience where relevant. By way of example, the Migration Museum has an interactive display which allows the visitor to select a character and participate in a virtual interview which used to be carried out with all those who applied for immigration to Australia in the beginning of the 1900s. The visitors tend to select a character whose profile is nearest to theirs and through this exercise they place themselves in the shoes of past migrant applicants, receiving at the end of the interview the result – whether their application has been accepted or rejected. Basically, the display shows who was permitted to come to Australia under the Immigration Restriction Act of 1901. A tourist guide could make a wonderful interpretation using this display as a starting point, then moving on to experiences of individuals or even mentioning personal stories. The result will probably be to engage the visitor and elicit a reaction from the heart (Whitlock, 2017:432) appealing to the emotions and a deeper understanding (Tilden, 1977:27) which adds value to the visiting experience.

Multi-vocality has a prominent role in this case study, but, as explained previously, this important approach to interpretation and presentation should

be dealt with cautiously and analysed carefully before being deployed, to ensure its successful application. One has also to keep in mind that tourist guides 'are not apolitical, unbiased and a-cultural' (Weiler & Black, 2015:39). By acknowledging their cultural baggage and integrating it in an ethical manner in their interpretation and approach, they can both enhance their professional performance as well as find a suitable way to communicate about socially and politically sensitive topics. Ultimately as Weiler and Black explain, a guide

can play a key part in either affirming or potentially challenging traditional or current perspectives on controversial issues like climate change, slavery or apartheid (2015:39).

Conclusion

When one considers all the different voices surrounding our heritage and the controversies which arise from its interpretation and the assignation of value, one understands that neither the deficit model nor the multiple perspective on their own can be effective in order to fulfil the true potential of heritage, especially in the tourism sector. Thus I am proposing a different model (Barbara, 2013:165-166) which stands on the following three pillars:

Accessible Knowledge. This is mainly the remit of academics and researchers but tourist guides are crucial in bridging the gap between academia and community knowledge, thus becoming an important asset in safeguarding and enhancing intangible heritage. This means that tourist guides not only have a duty to their clients, and also to their own self, to keep updated with the latest available information and discoveries, but also play an active role in the creation of knowledge and its dissemination to a wider public;

Relationships. It is important for the guide to form the correct alliances and approach the right people, in the right way. It is crucial to develop real relationships - not obligatory business transactions between sectors but

intense sharing of experiences between individuals. Although this is primarily seen as the role of curators, guides can be a lynch-pin here. Since guides are always on the move and meet, often informally, with individuals coming from different sectors, they are able to act as the missing link. That is why guides should exploit every possibility for networking and to create relationships, as well as bring together members of their audience(s) and heritage professionals if this could lead to the creation of more networks and potential initiatives and projects. What is being suggested here is that the tourist guide goes beyond simply interpreting heritage and its various meaning to clients but goes a step forward, trying to bond with individuals and bring them closer to other key-players in the heritage sector, such as museum staff, curators and other heritage interpreters;

Interest and commitment from individuals.

This can only be achieved if the first two pillars have been established. Once again, guides have a crucial role, as they are the ones who, as explained earlier, can give a soul to what might seem soulless for many and engage those who might not have thought they could actually be interested in particular heritage, remains or aspects. Tourist guides, either on their own, in small groups or through their associations and unions, can also participate in community-based projects and even come up with initiatives that foster more interest in areas which might be easily sidelined by academia and the establishment, such as aspects of intangible heritage. Such perspectives of tourist guiding deserve further research, moving away from looking at the tourist guide only as an asset in the tourism industry, and looking instead at the relevance of the tourist guide in other sectors and aspects of life where guides can give a valuable contribution.

Guides can be much more than simply interpreters for tourists during holiday excursions. Building upon studies that consider guides as 'quintessential intercultural mediators of the

tourism industry' (Weiler & Black, 2015:33), one of the key points highlighted here is that by a show of commitment from their part to engage in multi-vocal approaches, guides can encourage other professionals from the heritage sector to follow their lead. Ultimately an awakening of interest and declaration of commitment will generate more opportunities for adding knowledge as well as for forging new relationships.

I believe that the tourist guide has a pivotal role in this cycle and hope that further studies will better analyse the role of the tourist guide within a broader perspective, which includes not only tourists but also host communities and other heritage professionals.

Tourist guides are key players in the heritage experience and their relevance within the sector is constantly being changed and enhanced, especially in contexts where multi-vocality is playing a stronger part in the stories of our past. As Klamer (2014:64) succinctly explains, 'a museum tells the story of the past' but 'brings it alive in the present'. And who better than the tourist guide to bring it to life?

Bibliography:

- Ababneh, A. (2018) Tour guides and heritage interpretation: guides' interpretation of the past at the archaeological site of Jarash, Jordan, *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 13(3), 257-272.
- Allen, M., Bulbeck, C., Hicks, M. (2004) Exhibitions, *Australia Historical Studies*, 36 (124), 383-386.
- Barbara, V. (2013) *Are we being multi-vocal? The case of presenting archaeological heritage in Malta*, Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Malta.
- Bharti, R., Chandra, A., Tikku, A.P., Wadhvani, K.K. (2009) 'Taurodontism' an endodontic challenge: a case report, *Journal of Oral Science*, Vol. 51, 417-474.
- Catling, C. (2019) Collections, copies and conservation, *World Archaeology Magazine*, Vol. 93, 60-61.
- Fabri, N. (2007) *Għar Dalam: the cave, the museum and the garden*, Malta: Heritage Books.
- FEG (European Federation of Tour Guide Associations (2020) *Quality Charter*, [available online at https://www.feg-touristguides.com/quality_charter.php]
- Hodder, I. (1986) *Reading the Past – Current approaches to interpretation in archaeology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Jameson, J.H. & Baghaur, S. (2007) Public Interpretation, Outreach, and Partnering: An Introduction, in Jameson, J.H & Baghaur, S. (eds.) *Past Meets Present: Archaeologists Partnering with Museum Curators, Teachers, and Community Groups*, Springer, New York, 3-17.
- Layman, L., Young, L., Clark, J., Saunders, K., Darian Smith, K. (2001) Exhibitions, *Australian Historical Studies*, 32(117), 343-353.
- Mangion, J.J. (1962) Two cases of taurodontism in modern human jaws, *British Dental Journal*, Vol. 113, 309-31.
- Merriman, N. (2004) Introduction: Diversity and dissonance in public archaeology, in Merriman, N. (ed.) *Public Archaeology*, Routledge, New York, 1-17.

- Keith, A. (1924) Neanderthal Man in Malta, *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 54, 251-260.
- Klamer, A. (2014) The Values of Archaeological and Heritage Sites, *Public Archaeology*, Vol. 13, 59-70.
- Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge, New York.
- Szekers, V. (2002) Representing diversity and challenging racism: The Migration Museum, in Sandell R. (ed.) *Museums, Society and Inequality*, Routledge, London, 142-152.
- Tilden, F. (1977) *Interpreting our Heritage*, The University of North Carolina Press.
- Timothy, D. (2014) Contemporary Cultural heritage and Tourism: Development Issues and Emerging Trends, *Public Archaeology*, Vol. 13, 30-47.
- Weiler, B. and Black, R. (2015) *Tour Guiding Research*, Channel View Publications, Bristol.
- WFTGA (World Federation of Tour Guide Associations) (2013) *What is a Tourist Guide?* [Available online at: <http://www.wftga.org/tourist-guiding/what-tourist-guide>].
- Whitlock, G. (2017) Salvage: Locating Lives in the Migration Museum, *Life Writing*, 14(4), 427-440
- Zammit, R. (2002) New wing at Għar Dalam Museum, *Times of Malta*, 24th May:6.
- Zimmerman, L.J. (2006) Consulting Stakeholders, in Balme, J. & Paterson, A. (eds) *Archaeology in Practice*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 39-58.