



UNIVERSITÀ
DI TORINO

AI COMPASS FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE:

Reflections for the Responsible
Adoption of Generative AI



Sineglossa

Alessia Tripaldi (Sineglossa), Simone Natale and Luca Befera (University of Turin)

© The Author(s) 2026



Suggested citation:

Tripaldi, A., Natale, S., Befera, L. (2026). *AI compass for cultural heritage: Reflections for the responsible adoption of generative AI*. Research report, University of Turin, Italy.

Research lead: Simone Natale, University of Turin, Italy
In collaboration with Sineglossa ETS

International Board of Advisors:

Rachel Boon, Science Museum, London, United Kingdom
Rossana Damiano, University of Turin, Italy
Natalie Kane, V&A, London, United Kingdom
Melanie Lenz, V&A, London, United Kingdom
Anna Maria Marras, University of Turin, Italy and AVICOM ICOM
Enrico Natale, infoclio.ch, Switzerland
Ross Parry, Institute for Digital Culture, University of Leicester, United Kingdom
Antonio Pizzo, University of Turin, Italy
Marc Weber, Computer History Museum, United States
Martin Weiss, Technoseum, Mannheim, Germany

International Partners:

AVICOM ICOM International Committee for Audiovisual, New Technologies and Social Media
infoclio.ch, The Swiss Portal for Historical Sciences, Switzerland

English translation review: Simone Schmid

Funded through Project PE 0000020 CHANGES - CUP Università degli Studi di Torino: D53C22002530006, NRP Mission 4 Component 2 Investment 1.3,
Funded by the European Union – NextGenerationEU, 2024-26.

Introduction **_4**

Part I.

‘Digital transformation’ or ‘spectacularization’?

Expectations, resistance, challenges **_6**

1. Audiences in the digital age **_7**
2. Digitalization of cultural heritage **_8**
3. AI and cultural heritage: Expectations **_10**
4. AI and cultural heritage: Resistance **_11**
5. Summary: Part I **_14**

Part II.

Real-world applications: Analysis of case studies **_15**

1. AI in cultural institutions: Key drivers **_18**
2. Co-creation in AI-based Projects **_20**
3. The impact of AI applications **_22**
4. Relaunches and future potential **_23**
5. Summary: Part II **_26**

Summary of key recommendations **_27**

List of interviews **_29**

Appendix 1. Glossary **_30**

Appendix 2. Interview outline **_32**

Appendix 3. Suggested readings **_35**

Introduction

Generative AI is a type of artificial intelligence (AI) capable of producing new content, such as conversations, texts, images, videos and music. It is being applied in a wide variety of fields, from journalism to marketing and design. Institutions linked to cultural heritage – museums, archives and libraries – have also begun experimenting with different uses, such as interactive guides, chatbots and catalogue query systems.

While these tools offer the possibility of improving the experience of users and visitors and enriching cultural heritage, **their application also involves a number of obstacles and challenges.** Based on research and analysis of 17 interviews conducted with professionals in the cultural sector, this AI Compass provides support to cultural institutions that are considering or already implementing these technologies. It is not intended to be a guidebook on the use of AI, but rather **a tool to guide the cultural sector in reflecting on where we are today, where we are heading and, above all, the future relationships between AI and cultural heritage.**

The research focuses on the world of GLAM (Galleries, Libraries, Archives, Museums) – with a special focus on **museums and archives** – and the relationship between GLAM and digital technologies, in particular **Large Language Models (LLMs)** (see *Glossary*) such as ChatGPT, Gemini and Claude. The decision to focus on museums and archives stems from their central role in the processes of knowledge production, preservation and interpretation, as well as their crucial position in the debate on authenticity, source authority and cultural mediation. These are institutions that, more than others, embody the tension between the creative dimension of generative AI and the need to ensure accuracy, contextualization and reliability of content.

At the same time, the **focus on LLMs reflects their growing relevance in the contemporary cultural context.** LLMs are the technologies that best represent the “conversational shift” in AI and enable new forms of public engagement, from educational mediation to the semantic exploration of digital collections and archives. The use of LLMs also raises critical questions related to data provenance and quality, transparency and sustainability, which can help identify key dynamics in the relationship between AI and cultural heritage.

The **first part of the report focuses on the present**, through the voices of 11 professionals active in the cultural sector who recount their daily relationship with digitization

and digitalization, audiences and AI, including their expectations, hopes, doubts and reservations.

The **second part** looks to the future, via the experiences of six **institutions that have already implemented AI-based tools**. This section aims to compare expectations and reality, identify the strengths and weaknesses of the processes in place, and reflect on future possibilities.

A set of key recommendations is provided at the end of the report, summarizing its main findings.

Methodology

The research was carried out through semi-structured interviews, based on a set of guiding questions (see Appendix 2) but open to spontaneous developments and insights, so as to encourage the sharing of personal reflections and perspectives. Interviewees were selected based on a convenience sample, according to the availability and accessibility of interlocutors from Italian cultural institutions, with a specific focus on archives and museums. The quotations in the text correspond faithfully to the statements of the interviewees. In most cases, however, the quotations are not attributed to specific individuals, or institutions: testimonies were anonymized in order to ensure greater freedom of expression and reduce any conditioning, leaving the interviewees free to express doubts, critical issues, and personal opinions. In the second part of the report, however, we have retained some specific references to key aspects of the case studies, attributing the testimonies to those who reported them, in order to acknowledge the intellectual and technical work that shaped the selected projects. The list of interviewees is available at the end of the report. To facilitate understanding of the technological aspects addressed in the document, a Glossary is available in the Appendix.

The data collected for this report is part of the research conducted for the 'Chatbot for Cultural Heritage' project led by the University of Turin, in collaboration with Sineglossa. The three-year project, part of the wider NRRP-funded Extended Partnership project 'CHANGES: Cultural Heritage Innovation for Next-Gen Sustainable Society', included an initial survey of existing chatbots, the creation of a chatbot prototype based on Large Language Models for Museo Nazionale del Cinema, as well as other activities mentioned in this report (interviews, document drafting, revision).

PART I.

‘Digital transformation’ or ‘spectacularization’? Expectations, resistance, challenges

“The issue cannot be ignored,” was the near unanimous opinion of professionals from cultural institutions interviewed regarding the **impact of new technologies – particularly AI¹ – on the enrichment of cultural heritage.** Their reflections place AI among the most significant technological changes, such as the arrival of the internet, e-mail and apps, which have radically transformed the way people and institutions navigate information and the world.

However, views differed. Some recognized the need to act proactively, stating that **“ignoring them would mean condemning ourselves to failure,”** while denouncing a certain “resistance to change” on the part of the cultural world, which “tends to be late to the game”. Others seemed to accept the inevitability of the transformation with a more cautious attitude: “we will have to learn how to live with it.” In this first part of the report, both views are represented.

¹ Since the research covers generative AI – with a focus on LLMs – the interviews centred on this specific application of AI. Therefore, in both this paragraph and the next, when we refer to AI, we are referring primarily to generative AI.

1 | Audiences in the digital age

When asked what the role of museums and archives is today, one word recurred persistently among those interviewed: **“mediation.”** Institutions see themselves as a **“meeting point”** between a collection, a historical period, a significant figure in our cultural landscape, and the public.

The digital dimension is becoming part of this configuration. **Audiences – especially younger ones – are increasingly accustomed to using new technologies**, and for many institutions digital tools have become necessary for connecting with younger generations. The Covid-19 pandemic has further accelerated the adoption of these tools, forcing audiences to enjoy heritage remotely, and institutions to reorganize accordingly. As per one of the interviewees: **“in the long run, ignoring digital technology would mean losing public support.”**

But what do audiences really expect from digital tools applied to cultural heritage? The answer is not simple, partly because **audience measurement tools are often limited**: in many cases, there is a lack of both human and financial resources to set up and implement tools for the systematic collection and analysis of qualitative data. Audience information is usually limited to quantitative data, such as the number of visitors, or demographics, such as geographical origin, age and gender.

Considering the available data, one of the most obvious elements that cultural institutions have in common – even those that are very different from each other in terms of subject matter – is their **strong focus on education**. For many of the institutions interviewed, schools account for more than half of visitors and users. Almost every institution, regardless of size, has specific professional figures focused on education. It is surprising, in this sense, that **although education is central to the identity of many cultural institutions, few imagine applying AI for educational purposes, and very few have experimented with AI tools designed explicitly for educational purposes**. This suggests scope for reflection on possible future directions and opportunities, to which we return later in the report.

In addition to the world of education and to researchers, interviewees stressed the importance of **another kind of audience: occasional visitors, often represented by tourists**. According to several interviewees, this is the audience that **wants to “do something more dynamic than just stare at an object”** and that expects “an experience” from a visit to a museum or an exploration of an archive.

AI is perceived as a natural ally in responding to these new expectations, leveraging tools that are now familiar to the public and thus helping to avoid the alienation of certain groups feared by some. As one interviewee explained: **“technologies can help retain audiences even before attracting new ones.”**

2 | Digitalization of cultural heritage

Before delving into the possible applications of AI, it is useful to take a step back and take a closer look at the state of digitization of cultural heritage. It is important to consider that, **for many institutions, creating a true digital heritage – beyond traditional cataloging systems – is still a distant and costly goal.**

Despite public funding, many institutions have digitized only a limited part of their collection: some, for example, have digitized half of their exhibits, and only 3% of those in storage. **The main obstacles? The length of the process, the need for specific equipment and the lack of internal digital skills.**

In other words, digitization requires resources – both human and financial – that are often lacking.

Another major issue is that implementation costs are compounded by **maintenance costs**: technology evolves rapidly, and the widespread perception among various institutions is that it is not always possible to recoup the initial investment before it becomes obsolete.

In recent years, most of the resources allocated to digital technologies have been focused on tools aimed at improving **accessibility² and public engagement**: audio content via NFC technology (see *Glossary*), reader pens, and audio guides supported by multilingual platforms.

Alongside tools aimed at accessibility, it is interesting to note **recent investments in the redesign or creation of websites**: as one interviewee explained, the fact that some institutions do not yet have a website, or do not have one that supports new technological possibilities, “gives you an idea of how much still needs to be done before we can talk about digital heritage.”

On the subject of investment, it is important to mention the **“strategic difficulty”** mentioned by several institutions: overwhelmed by day-to-day operations and scarce resources, many are unable to plan for the long term. **Digital investments often arise in response to an opportunity**, such as a call for tenders, **or an emergency**, rather than as a result of strategic thinking based on the specific needs and measurable goals. Very few institutions mentioned a Digital Innovation Strategy as a guide for investments in the coming years.

This strategic difficulty is exacerbated by the “resistance to change” mentioned in the

² This document refers to the concept of accessibility to cultural heritage as a condition whereby different people, in different contexts, can learn about, understand, enjoy and participate meaningfully in cultural heritage, without physical, sensory, cognitive, linguistic, economic, social, technological or geographical barriers

introduction, often linked to generational factors, especially when it comes to introducing new technologies.

As mentioned in the section on audiences, part of the investment in new technologies in recent years has been allocated to the development of **tools aimed at audience engagement**: augmented reality for the animation of works of art, projection mapping for the creation of immersive environments, virtual tours for remote visits to museums, and apps for self-guided tours. Digitization processes have also led to the development of digital libraries that enrich the visitor experience, offering the opportunity to enjoy works that are not on display or to better experience works that are difficult to access. These are accompanied by investments in interactive activities and in activities accompanying the visit – themed guided tours, podcasts, escape rooms – which confirm the **desire to provide “dynamic”** experiences to visitors.

The greatest concern regarding such experiences is the **“digital obsolescence” of the technologies tested**: from VR headsets to touch screens, various technologies have become obsolete after only a few years, failing to return the initial investment and confirming institutions’ fear that maintenance costs are unsustainable, especially for small and medium-sized organizations.

Narrowing the focus from digital technologies to AI, **one of the most appreciated applications of AI today concerns research processes and inventory management**, i.e. for its ability to quickly analyze complex data, connect information and identify patterns. AI enables more effective archival searches, thanks to the use of keywords and data cross-referencing, although some interviewees emphasized that human oversight is still essential to ensure the accuracy of the information obtained. **The greatest use that cultural institutions make of AI today is behind the scenes**. Among the most frequently cited areas of use are: automatic cataloging; OCR (Optical Character Recognition) for manuscripts, ancient documents or complex typographical sources; HTR (Handwritten Text Recognition) for handwritten letters, diaries and registers; transcription and indexing of archival audio and video; support for writing fact sheets, critical apparatus, chronologies (drafts, comparisons, summaries); translations; development of communication content. Various organizations appreciate the ability to “connect different texts” or to rewrite existing content with these tools, while reiterating the importance of manual review.

3 | AI and cultural heritage: Expectations

As mentioned above, many cultural institutions have intensified their reflection on the role of digital technologies in reaching “remote” audiences following the Covid-19 pandemic, which according to one interviewee, marked the beginning of the “digital transformation of museums.” The next step in this process seems to be the **use of new technologies not only to extend reach, but also to “improve visitor experiences,”** offering greater engagement that organizations perceive as central to their audience. Various institutions highlighted their role as mediators between cultural heritage and the public, contemplating how AI can enhance this function. In this context **the word “dynamic” – referring to the user experience** – was mentioned repeatedly, often accompanied by the idea that AI may prove to be the right tool to “revitalize heritage.” A recurring expectation among those interviewed therefore concerned the **ability of AI to personalize interaction with audiences**, offering content tailored to visitors’ interests and tastes. Some imagined, for example, a “personalized audio guide” capable of adapting in real time to a visitor’s profile and behavior. In this regard, there is a desire to integrate AI with user-friendly interfaces that facilitate interaction and improve engagement. AI was also mentioned as a possible tool to attract younger age groups, despite the resistance that will be discussed in the next paragraph.

Further, a smaller number of interviewees suggested **using AI as a monitoring tool** to fill the resource gap mentioned above, for example by analyzing visitor behavior within an exhibition space – such as the time spent in front of a specific art work – or by collecting unstructured feedback in an automated way.

However, the most frequently mentioned potential applications of AI focused on **two areas in particular**, in line with the existing uses described above: **accessibility and research**.

AI has a wide range of potential applications to improve **accessibility – a major issue affecting the institutions interviewed** – from overcoming language barriers to real-time subtitling and automatic translation into sign languages. Some interviewees also suggested more extensive uses, such as the possibility of transferring museum content to other contexts, for example hospitals. It is interesting to note that accessibility was often mentioned even by those who do not yet have a specific idea of the possible applications of AI in this area, confirming the centrality of the issue.

Straddling accessibility and mediation, some institutions suggested a possible role for AI as an **“active historical memory,”** i.e. a tool capable of preserving testimonies and

narratives once it is no longer possible to interact with direct witnesses of historical events. In this sense, AI is seen not only as an archive, but as an agent capable of stimulating interaction and developing non-material heritage in the long term.

On the **research** front, expectations diverged. Some reiterated the usefulness of AI in making **document consultation faster and more accurate** and in creating connections between heterogeneous information, for example by cross-referencing data between objects or sources. Others hoped that AI will evolve towards a more proactive role, capable of **stimulating new interpretations of heritage**, generating new connections and linking different types of heritage.

It should be noted, however, that while some of the interviewees said they were curious to explore the capabilities of technology to produce its own visions and to generate new connections, most of them expressed strong skepticism about the reliability of the results produced by AI.

4 | AI and cultural heritage: Resistance

While expectations for future applications of AI revealed a wide range of visions and desires, the resistance expressed by the interviewees concerned **two areas: the quality of content generated by AI and its reliability**.

In terms of quality, one interviewee effectively summarized a common concern: the **need to distinguish between “entertainment and in-depth knowledge”**. In other words, AI can certainly be a useful tool for entertaining audiences during a visit, but it is not yet regarded as a reliable source of knowledge. The recurring fear is that AI-generated content is ‘superficial’ and that the widespread adoption of these tools could lead to a standardization of cultural offerings, where **“everyone ends up doing the same thing,”** resulting in a flattening of narratives.

In this context, the interviewees often referred to **“spectacularization,”** fearing a proliferation of digital products that do not add real value to the visitor experience, but merely generate a “wow factor” that is destined to wear off quickly, especially given the public’s increasing familiarity with digital technologies.

According to some interviewees, the problem of content impoverishment is exacerbated by the fact that the introduction of generative AI chatbots **risks diverting visitors’ attention**, reducing interaction with the exhibition piece by shifting focus to the device. In other cases, there are fears of information overload due to the coexistence of several tools – such as audio guides, panels and brochures – to which new AI interfaces would be added, or even a complete **shift of the experience from the real world to the digital realm**.

It is important to note that not all respondents rejected AI. Many interviewees compared this phase to the advent of the internet or mobile apps: **a phase of “necessary transition” that is expected to lead to a new balance.** From this perspective, many institutions recognized the potential of AI in enriching heritage, provided that “complexity is not sacrificed” and “the identity of the institution is not distorted.”

One solution that was mentioned several times was the **creation of cross-functional teams**, made up of professionals from both the cultural and technological sectors. In this scenario, AI would not be “imposed from above” through standard packages, but tailored to the identity of the specific institutions. As one interviewee observed: **“the project must be guided by heritage objects rather than by technology.”**

As detailed in the second part of this report, effective coordination between the technological and cultural domains is a key condition for the success of AI-based projects. In this regard, **mutual training between professionals from the cultural and technological sectors** is considered key to building a common basis of understanding to effectively collaborate on developing projects.

The issue of training is essential to overcome the obstacles of AI adoption. The cultural sector is still largely unfamiliar with AI, which “raises more questions than answers.” In several cases, few key figures within an institution show the greatest resistance due to a lack of technological literacy and difficulty imagining a conscious and strategic application of digital tools. At the same time, some testimonials emphasized the **need to “first train audiences”** to interact actively with AI, in order to prevent a passive experience where the user merely consumes content.

While greater mistrust of AI is linked to content quality, one of the main concerns in the cultural sector is the **reliability of the content itself**. Generativity – i.e. the ability to produce original content based on received prompts from users – was described as “a risk rather than an opportunity” or “a problem rather than an added value,” as it can lead to the creation of incorrect or completely fabricated information, known as **hallucinations** (see *Glossary*).

All interviewees expressed **concern about the risk of public misinformation**, especially in relation to the sources that feed AI. In mainstream LLMs such as ChatGPT, Gemini or Claude – whose training is based on large amounts of data from the internet – sources are not always traceable or reliable, they often incorporate cognitive and cultural biases (see *Glossary*), and may lead to ethical and legal issues, such as copyright compliance. It is precisely this risk of misinformation that is probably the reason why, despite the strong educational focus of many institutions, the adoption of AI tools for educational purposes is still extremely limited. Hallucinations, biases and, more generally, the absence of critical thinking in generative models still represent an insurmountable obstacle to entrusting them with an educational function.

Alongside these aspects related to the quality and accuracy of content, a smaller number of interviewees highlighted **AI’s lack of humanity** as a cause of concern. Some referred to

the difficulty of machines replicating human sociality, such as the relationship between visitors and museum guides. Others expressed concern about **“digital saturation,”** i.e. a rejection that the public might develop towards constant and pervasive interaction with technology.

The second part of the report will examine whether, and how, existing experiences with adopting these technologies have helped overcome this resistance.

Summary: Part I

- ✦ To date, **cultural institutions have mainly used AI to carry out activities “behind the scenes,”** from reviewing and translating texts to consulting archives.
- ✦ The largest digital investments are currently aimed at **improving the accessibility** of cultural heritage.
- ✦ Despite the strong educational focus of many institutions, the **adoption of AI tools for educational purposes is still extremely limited.**
- ✦ Cultural institutions increasingly see themselves as **mediators between heritage and the public, with digital mediation as a new and essential dimension** for “not losing public support.”
- ✦ Cultural institutions believe that the occasional visitors (tourists, recreational visitors) expect to “do something more dynamic than just look at an object” and that AI can be a useful tool to respond to this demand, but:
 - for many institutions, **the digitization process is still expected to be long and costly**, as it is difficult to reflect on how to enrich digital heritage when there is a lack of human and financial resources to do so;
 - **AI & cultural heritage** projects are more likely to have an effective impact if they are part of a **medium- to long-term strategic vision, which many institutions are unable to develop or apply**;
 - there is still widespread mistrust among cultural institutions towards content produced by AI, both in terms of quality and reliability;
 - this mistrust stems in part from **limited digital literacy in the cultural sector**, and in part from the objective limitations of generative AI in producing reliable content (see hallucinations);
 - at the same time, **software engineers’ ignorance of the cultural sector** increases the mistrust of institutions and the feeling that AI-based projects are “an end in themselves”;
 - given this lack of mutual understanding, institutions are calling for **cross-training initiatives** including software engineers and professionals in the cultural sector, ideally also involving the public.



PART II.

Real-world applications: Analysis of case studies

The first part of the report showed how internal attitudes toward AI in the cultural heritage sector are characterized by both expectations and fears. To what extent is this tension transferred to the application of these technologies? The analysis of a series of case studies allows us to examine the outcomes, successes and difficulties encountered ‘in the field’ by cultural institutions that have developed AI projects.

As in the first part of the report, the case studies are presented in a comparative manner, identifying the points of convergence between these experiences with the aim of **stimulating reflection that may prove useful for other cultural institutions.**

As specific aspects of some projects cannot be ignored, the contents of the case studies are briefly presented in the table below. Although this report focuses mainly on LLM chatbots, we have chosen to compile a broader overview of case studies in terms of both application context and AI models used.

Chat Game Case Museo di Milano (2016-2017)

(created by InvisibleStudio for Case Museo di Milano)

An interactive game to discover the four museums in the network. Users interact via Facebook Messenger with a virtual character that uses clues hidden in the Case Museo to help them defeat a mysterious Renaissance wizard, inspired by a real historical figure.

Unlike in most of the other projects, this chatbot is not based on an LLM, but on a predictive AI question/answer model.

AMA Gramsci (2024)

(created by Dot Beyond for Fondazione Istituto piemontese Antonio Gramsci onlus)

A chatbot that offers a new way of accessing the heritage of Fondazione Gramsci di Torino by using its narrative capacity to present the content of the foundation's website.

The tool uses the LLM Gemini, trained with approximately 100 different sources, including physical documents, photographs, audiovisual and multimedia material. The training material was selected based on the Ezio Bosso's work.

Talk to Einaudi (2023)

(created by Reply for Fondazione Luigi Einaudi)

A "digital human" available on the foundation's website, which reproduces Luigi Einaudi's physiognomy and, through voice or text, answers questions in a manner consistent with the historical figure's thinking.

The dialogue feature was created using a specialized conversational AI model based on the MLFRAME Reply framework, and a corpus of over 250,000 words from Einaudi's original volumes and collections.

Game App Codes of Time (“I codici del tempo”) (2024)

(created by Sistema Museale Piceno in collaboration with Studio Logico)

An app-based game where visitors solve a mystery linked to the history of the museum and its precious manuscripts, with the help of AI-generated characters. In addition, 12 video guides help visitors discover interesting facts about the history of San Giacomo della Marca. The characters and video guides were generated using AI models.

Avatars of Alfred Wallace and Michele Lessona (2024)

(created by Logosnet for Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali di Torino)

Avatars of 19th-century scientists Alfred Wallace and Michele Lessona, installed in the museum to answer visitors' questions about natural sciences.

The two avatars were created with an AI model based on a retrieval system and a LLM. Both rely on verified online sources.

p_IA_net

(project in progress for Palazzo Pianetti)

An online LLM-based chatbot that reproduces the physiognomy of Giuseppe Pianetti, trained with the cultural heritage collected by Pianetti as well as his own writings. The project aims to interactively restore both material and nonmaterial culture linked to this historical figure.

1 | AI in cultural institutions:

Key drivers

What drives a museum or foundation to invest in AI?

In recent years, many institutions have received regional and national funding to invest in technological upgrades (new websites, audio guides, virtual tours) and in the digitization of their collection. New technologies have both improved accessibility (e.g. Braille, LIS tools) and enhanced public engagement (e.g. video mapping, VR headsets). The analysis of case studies revealed a **recurring need to bring the public closer to heritage by finding new communication tools**. Hence, the key driver for such projects is mediation, with AI as a possible aid in developing new forms of access that include synthetic content (*for a definition of synthetic heritage, see Glossary*).

In the case of Fondazione Luigi Einaudi, one of the initial objectives was to “recover Einaudi’s voice” in order to “bring him closer to a contemporary audience,” in line with the general need to revitalize cultural heritage mentioned above. The project was conceived as **“an initiative of democratization”** that “transformed Einaudi’s texts into verbal expressions to enable a dialogue with him.” In this way, even a lay audience can question Einaudi’s thinking, interacting with otherwise inaccessible content: **“We have made material accessible that would otherwise have been left to gather dust**, to be completely abandoned: it is a way of bringing something to life that is actually still alive.” Similarly, Fondazione Gramsci identified the need for “mediation” between its archives and the public, pinpointing AI as a useful tool to empower the archive to “tell its story to a wider audience.”

The project currently in development for Palazzo Pianetti aims to create a conversational agent capable of restoring both material and non-material heritage, i.e. the intellectual legacy of Giuseppe Pianetti. The goal, in the words of the interviewee, is to “democratize heritage.”

This **recurrence of the term “democracy”** – used by several interviewees – clearly expresses the **intention to open up access to knowledge**, with the aid of tools and languages capable of simplifying without trivializing. In this context, AI is configured as an enabling technology for greater cultural inclusiveness.

This inclusive mindset can be directly associated with the aforementioned **educational** objectives, which in several cases represent the original purpose of the projects.

In the case of Museo dei Codici di San Giacomo della Marca, “schools represent the target audience: the aim [of the game app] is to influence the perception of young people, their awareness of this figure who was so important and so closely linked to their local identity.” With this objective in mind, it is interesting to note that digital communication channels were chosen to engage with younger audiences, and more generally, that a web app was created for “the most complicated museum [within the Sistema Museale

Piceno], due to the type of artefacts it presents [namely manuscript volumes].” Here, too, technology facilitates accessibility, responding to the complexity of the museum itself. Education is also the objective of the Chat Game, which has been attracting teenagers to the Case Museo di Milano for several years now. Here, the **combination of chatbot interface and gamification “shifts the focus from conversation to a common goal between humans and AI,”** promoting a dynamic of co-intelligence, where the AI-based tool stimulates the engagement of younger audiences in exploring heritage. Similarly, the narrative approach of Fondazione Gramsci’s chatbot was designed “with schools in mind,” in line with the institution’s mission.

Despite the educational potential of these tools, there is a certain difficulty in integrating them into traditional school curricula, often due to the rigidity of programs that force the alignment of extra-curricular and curricular activities. Added to this, as mentioned above, is a certain cultural and methodological mistrust regarding AI use, motivated in part by limited AI literacy among many teachers.

With public engagement and education in mind, the Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali di Torino chose to use AI to enhance its relationship with visitors with a more dynamic and appealing offer, aiming to counteract the perception of exhibitions as static: “Beyond outstanding institutions such as the Guggenheim, the Louvre and the Egyptian Museum, **museums as static places have now lost their appeal to the public.** [...] We need to focus on people’s interests, on developing curiosity, beauty and entertainment. Digital aspects and applications that can lead the public to interact more directly with what they see are essential to ensure that museum visitors can engage with the narrative in a different way.”

The conversational avatars introduced in the museum allow for a personalized experience and user-tailored insights: “**What they add is the ability to transform the curiosity instilled by the exhibits into knowledge,** to take that extra step that allows you to satisfy your curiosity. You can decide to spend thirty seconds or five minutes, to ask one or ten questions, and this is much more on demand, even compared to an audio guide, which has a predefined route and does not allow you to ask questions.”

Hence, the driving force behind AI applications in the cultural sector is the public, in other words the desire to “democratize” heritage and encourage new forms of participation. AI is applied to enrich the enjoyment of cultural heritage with a narrative and interactive component.

2 | Co-creation in AI-based Projects

The first step in creating an AI-based project is the **encounter between the technological and cultural domains**. This convergence takes shape in different ways. In some cases, it is a creative extension of a previous collaboration, such as the digitization of an archive. In other cases, it arises from a project proposal put forward by either the IT service provider or the cultural institution, which then evolves into something else, often very different from the initial idea.

This happens, for example, when the cultural institution is in need of a tool to meet its goals (such as those of mediation or public engagement mentioned in the previous paragraph); or, conversely, when the IT service provider reconfigures an existing product to the specificities of the cultural institution.

In the first part of this report, some testimonials called for the creation of multidisciplinary teams in cultural innovation projects. In practice, **what makes AI-based application effective is precisely the ability to bring together different skills** in a balance that one IT service provider interviewed defined as: **“halfway between mathematics and technicality on the one hand and art and writing on the other.”**

But what allows this combination to work? First of all, the **working method**: a method based on **“constant dialogue” between the parties**. In other words, it is not about acquiring a “turnkey” digital product, but about building a tool collaboratively based on a shared vision, through joint brainstorming, content development and continuous scientific validation of the material generated. The **cultural institution takes on an active role, participating in the design of the tool** according to its own objectives and language.

Another crucial aspect for the success of the union between culture and technology is the **understanding of each other’s languages, with the aim of mutual learning**. According to Reply, Fondazione Einaudi’s IT partner: “The working groups had different skills and languages. Bringing them together was fascinating from an intellectual point of view. In the end, this is the recipe for success. The foundation was not familiar with some of the details of generative models and we did not know Einaudi well, so we all learned something from each other. It was very important to see it not only as a technical project, but as something that had a cultural impact.”

In some cases, “learning each other’s language” took the form of a structured training program. For example, Fondazione Gramsci’s IT partner, DotBeyond, created an AI literacy program for the staff. The goal was for them to **“be able to speak the same language** and understand how the chatbot would develop.” The training program not only created a common vocabulary, but also provided the staff with new AI tools to support their daily tasks. The transversal framework included the institution’s library and communication departments in addition to the archive. The result of the training can be summarized as greater awareness of AI, to the extent that the foundation would

advise other institutions to conduct a similar project “only if you have made efforts to understand what you expect from a project involving a chatbot that engages with your archives,” confirming the importance of preparation before introducing digital technology into a cultural institution.

Several case studies demonstrated that training is an increasingly central element. Yet what emerged most strongly from the interviews is the **importance of the attitude with which cultural institutions approach these projects**. As InvisibleStudio stated: **“Open-mindedness is more important than extensive technical knowledge.”**

For Museo dei Codici di San Giacomo della Marca, ‘*opening up* to certain tools’ was the key to effective collaboration, as it was for Fondazione Gramsci in Turin: “I recommend it [the experience of creating a chatbot] if you have an open-minded attitude to new tools and practices.” Fondazione Einaudi further highlighted the need for an unbiased approach in this regard: “One of the most interesting aspects of the project was the absence of prejudice and mistrust on both sides. When a historian is faced with a request to innovate their language, they are resistant, but then I realized that it was not about reproducing written texts, but about creating a dialogue, which was something else entirely.”

Looking at the design process as a whole, **the first step is to develop an idea that is consistent with the needs and goals of the institution**.

For Case Museo di Milano and Museo dei Codici, the decision to create a game arose from the need to engage a young audience in a playful way, without becoming an obstacle to the actual engagement with the exhibition space.

At this stage, several interviewees emphasized **the choice of the right technology** as critical to avoid failure, either in terms of obsolescence, as seen in the first part of the report, or in terms of feasibility and sustainability, e.g. in the application of solutions based on virtual reality, where institutions can often afford to purchase very few headsets for thousands of monthly visitors.

Moving from the initial idea, the project enters the **co-development phase, characterized by the dialogical approach** mentioned above. In the case of chatbots, for example, this is when the conversational agent is characterized. Its content and identity traits are provided by the cultural institution, which are then translated by the IT partners into machine-readable language.

The final step is testing, essential to all the cases analyzed. This generally takes place in two distinct phases: **an initial phase of internal scientific validation**, in which the content is verified by experts from the cultural institution to ensure its accuracy; and a **second phase of testing with a group similar to the project’s target audience**, aimed at evaluating the user experience. In several cases, testing proved to be fundamental in perfecting the digital tool both from a technical point of view, e.g. with regard to Wi-Fi coverage or the usability of the interface, and in terms of content, e.g. refining the tone of voice of the chatbot.

In summary, the key ingredients for effective collaboration between the technical and cultural domains seem to be: a collaborative and open approach that rejects the concept of the “finished product” and thrives on continuous co-creation, and an open-minded attitude on the part of cultural institutions, which can and must be reinforced by training and AI literacy programs.

3 | The impact of AI applications

Measuring the impact of cultural heritage projects using AI is not always easy. First, some of these projects are still very new. Second, while it is easier to obtain numerical data and indicators for online tools such as chatbots accessible from institutional websites (e.g. the number of visits or the average time spent by users on the site), for other resources it is more complex to identify specific indicators beside questionnaires administered to visitors. Furthermore, as pointed out in the first part of the report, designing and implementing tools for qualitative monitoring of audiences requires human and financial resource investments that institutions are often unable to sustain. The same difficulties apply to the evaluation of new digital tools.

Nevertheless, some of the institutions interviewed reported **significant results, especially in quantitative terms**. There have been significant percentage increases in the number of visits to websites hosting chatbots, as well as an increase in the average time spent by users on these sites. In other cases, the adoption of AI-based tools coincided with an increase in sales of products or services related to their use, such as the Case Museo di Milano card – a pass to enter all four houses in the network – which is required to access the Chat Game.

From a qualitative point of view, it is interesting to share the reflection of Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali, according to which **the audience that interacts most with the avatars installed in the museum is under the age of 25**, thus confirming the effectiveness of these tools in engaging younger audiences.

With regard to the resistance mentioned in the first part of the report, **one of the most obvious results for those who curated the content or validated its accuracy is the quality of the output produced by AI** – and, more generally, the ability of the tools to maintain the complexity of knowledge without trivializing it. According to Fondazione Einaudi: **“The project that was carried out did not trivialize anything, it did not remove the complexity** but made the texts accessible to the greater public.” This was made possible by the quality of the dialogue between the IT service provider and the cultural institution, striking a balance between accuracy and accessibility. Reply, the foundation’s IT partner, spoke of a compromise to “allow [AI] to reinterpret, in a sense, Einaudi’s writings, without pushing too far towards something he could not or would

not have said,” achieving a result that is “very meticulous in content,” as confirmed by the foundation itself.

Fondazione Gramsci also reported a positive outcome in terms of content: “As a [cultural] professional, it was very useful for me to think about language. When talking to a machine that does not understand our overly long and complex reasoning, **we start to speak in simpler language, but without trivializing the content**. The paradigm shift was fundamental to moving this project forward.”

This “**paradigm shift**” – echoing the aforementioned statement by Fondazione Einaudi: “[with regard to initial resistance] I then realized that it was something else” – is, in the authors’ view, one of the most significant impacts of these projects. Being part of a collaborative AI development process has allowed organizations to experience first-hand the active and conscious use of these tools, stimulating an **empirical understanding of emerging technologies and their potential application in the cultural sector**, even among those who have not undertaken specific training. At a time when **AI literacy** (see *Glossary*) represents a significant competitive advantage – as recognized by the institutions interviewed – these experiences have had a positive impact within organizations, stimulating a proactive attitude and an increasing ability to adapt to digital technologies.

4 | Relaunches and future potential

In view of the processes implemented and the results achieved, all the institutions interviewed with a digital tool still in operation are considering possible relaunches or further implementations. Some intend to improve the accessibility of their chatbot, e.g. by integrating verbal with written and read interaction, or vice versa. Some are working on developments in terms of functionality, e.g. enriching the conversational AI model with a gamification mechanism. Others are expanding the scope of application of their project, e.g. by transforming a chatbot into a teaching tool for a university course. For institutions that are satisfied with the results of their projects, the **digital tool represents a starting point for new projects and applications** aimed at enriching heritage and expanding audiences.

Despite the general level of satisfaction, some institutions are **concerned about the maintenance costs of AI tools**, which are unsustainable in the long term unless they find additional sources of funding. One interviewee cautioned those who wish to acquire a similar tool not to do so just because “it is fashionable,” as it is a “costly process in many respects” that should only be undertaken if necessary.

In this regard, **a relaunch envisaged by one of the organizations is the development of tools for the qualitative measurement of impact** on audiences, to assess the feasibility of the investment in the medium to long term. This approach triggers an important reflection on the aspects to be considered *after* the adoption of digital technology.

Before drawing final conclusions, however, it is important to revisit **the views of cultural institutions on the future of digital transformation**, based on testimonies from those who have applied AI.

Some institutions still expressed concerns about specific aspects of AI. First, it is important to consider that, in some cases, the intrinsic limitations of the technology and the specific needs of an organization or project may discourage the adoption of AI-based tools. One case that emerged during this research, for example, highlighted the importance of not taking the possibility of adoption for granted.

Second, there are ethical and reliability concerns about the data used by AI, as addressed in Part I of this report. Some hoped, for example, that in the future museums will use local models – Small Language Models or SLMs (see *Glossary*) – so as not to “lose control over content.” In this sense, an interesting reflection shared by InvisibleStudio is that **“it is the public that is digitizing, not the museum.”** People will have more and more tools at their disposal to access information on cultural heritage independently, so **a future challenge for museums will be how to manage and control this information.** This is why digital literacy in cultural institutions is not only a competitive advantage, but also key to interpreting changes in the relationship with the public.

Another fear about a future in which AI will be increasingly present in cultural institutions was that **“the focus may shift from the object of valorization – the museum, the single work, the collection – to the experience,”** with the risk of diverting the visitor’s attention. However, the same institution that expressed this concern recognized that “the world is moving fast, and visitors are changing, so it is necessary to embark on a path of this kind.”

This awareness of the **need to “exist in the digital world”** was shared by all the interviewees, with different nuances related to their direct experience with AI.

Fondazione Gramsci, which supported its chatbot project with an AI literacy program, stressed not only the impact on its relationship with the public, but also within the institution, offering an interesting perspective: **the “creative” component that some attribute to AI may instead become a prerogative of cultural institutions.**

“Perhaps I am being overly optimistic, but I think AI has freed up time for other activities. AI does the repetitive work, so instead of transcribing a document, you can have it transcribed while you look for meaning in that document, e.g. the connections with other documents.”

According to Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali, AI is “an essential step” in offering the public a dynamic visit, thanks in part to the **ability of AI-based tools to transform the stories contained in cultural heritage into knowledge:** “Every artefact has a story to tell, because they come from great 18th and 19th century explorations. There is a whole narrative about how they arrived here in Turin, about the scientific personalities who have come and gone over time, who studied and collected these artefacts. The

beauty [of the artefacts] generates curiosity, and curiosity is transformed into knowledge through the use of new technologies.”

Fondazione Einaudi underlined the **role of AI in preserving and passing on memory, in order to better understand the past and, consequently, better interpret the present:**

“We cannot ignore [AI] altogether, because we risk impoverishing ourselves instead of enriching ourselves. These tools allow us to keep our heritage intact and bring it to life, making it useful in helping people understand that the world did not begin with us. The world has great precedents that are worth recovering in order to better understand the present.”

The future of AI is therefore open, with room for the different perspectives, expectations, languages and needs that the cultural institutions interviewed shared.

The reflections in this compass serve as a foundation to inform future applications.

Summary: Part II

- ✦ Cultural institutions are experimenting with AI to make cultural heritage more accessible, inclusive and participatory. In this context, **AI is seen as a tool for the “democratization of knowledge”** that makes archives and collections accessible to wider audiences, promoting inclusion.
- ✦ The main **objectives** driving AI applications are **audience engagement** through play or immersion (gamification, avatars, chatbots) and **education**, especially for young people and school children.
- ✦ AI-based projects are all the more effective when they are based on active collaboration between technological and cultural expertise. This approach positions **AI not as a “technical asset” but as a shared cultural process**.
- ✦ Practical experience shows that AI-based projects work best when there is a **mutual training process**, in which institutions learn the technical language and IT partners learn the cultural specificity of the content. From this perspective, **AI literacy becomes a strategic skill for the cultural sector** and a condition for the sustainability of projects.
- ✦ **The main results** observed by institutions are **qualitative in nature**: clearer language that is more accessible to audiences without losing complexity (“simplifying without trivializing”) and greater awareness of digital technology on the part of the institution. To a lesser extent, quantitative results have also been identified: increased site traffic, longer average visit duration, and greater interest from audiences under 25.
- ✦ Ongoing and/or retrospective analysis of projects identify **critical issues**:
 - **maintenance costs**, especially for small and medium-sized institutions;
 - **difficulties in integrating teaching into traditional school curricula**, partly due to the lack of digital literacy among educational staff;
 - **cultural resistance** and mistrust still present in institutions;
 - **lack of tools and resources to assess the impact** of projects on audiences.
- ✦ Looking ahead, all institutions recognize the **need to “exist in the digital world”**: the challenge for cultural institutions is **to maintain their focus on the cultural object** and not just on the technological experience.

Summary of key recommendations:



A strategic vision for the effective use of AI

The “digital transformation” of a cultural institution can only be achieved if it emerges from a strategic vision geared towards long-term growth, rather than as a response to an urgent need or a sudden opportunity. This is especially true for institutions where the digitization of heritage is a long and costly process. The strategic choice of an AI application or model is part of a bigger plan to help the institution identify which content to digitize, thus rationalizing resources and directing them toward a concrete goal. A Digital Innovation Strategy or a Digital Curator can offer valuable support in the design, implementation and monitoring of strategies.



The goal comes before the tool

In line with the first point, every technological choice should respond to a specific need of the institution, not a generic aspiration for innovation. Establishing a clear and defined objective not only helps to identify the most suitable tool, but also facilitates dialogue with the IT partner and sets evaluation and monitoring parameters consistent with the goals of the project.



Co-design with multidisciplinary teams

There is a substantial difference between a supplier and an IT partner, and this difference often determines the success of an AI-based project. Turnkey solutions are often inadequate because they do not interact with the specific cultural institution. For this reason, it is important that the IT partner is open to a collaborative approach tailored to the cultural context, with the aim of adapting and modelling the technological tool to the needs of the institution.



Fostering digital and AI literacy

Investing in internal digital training makes the institution more capable of actively participating in the development of tools, approaching digital technology with the openness necessary to foster dialogue with its technological counterpart, and reacting promptly to rapid changes in the behavior and needs of audiences. Involving a diverse range of roles in these processes – from curation to education, from communication to management – helps to embed innovation across the board, contributing to widespread and informed digital development.



Sustainability and impact assessment

Just as an AI-based project does not begin with the development of the tool but with the identification of the underlying need, the launch of the tool does not mark the end of the journey, but the beginning of its active life cycle. In order for this phase to be profitable for the institution, it is essential to define the costs of maintaining and updating the tool from the outset, so as to avoid having to seek new funding on short notice. The same applies to monitoring tools that assess the impact on the institution and the public, in order to course-correct and improve over time.



Ethical implications of AI

To address legitimate concerns about the risk of AI misinformation, cultural institutions should oversee the development of their digital tools, monitoring the data used for training, the openness and comprehensibility of models, and the cultural implications of the content generated. In this sense, digital literacy courses strengthen an institution's ability to take responsibility for the tools developed. At the same time, sharing these aspects with the public is important both to foster a relationship of trust based on transparency and to promote the digital awareness of the public, reaffirming the educational role of cultural institutions.

List of interviews

We would like to express our sincere thanks to all those interviewed for generously sharing their time and experiences.

Their names and those of the institutions they represent are listed below in alphabetical order.

- **Paola Asproni** – Archivist and Project Manager, AMA Gramsci and **Matteo D'Ambrosio** – Director, **Fondazione Istituto piemontese Antonio Gramsci Onlus** (Turin)
- **Monica Bernacchia** - Head of Communications, **Museo Tattile Statale Omero** (Ancona)
- **Alessandro Bollo** – Director, **Museo Nazionale del Risorgimento Italiano** (Turin)
- **Simona Cardinali** - Head of **Ufficio Musei Comune di Jesi** (Jesi, Ancona)
- **Claudia De Benedetti** – Director, **Complesso Museale Ebraico di Casale Monferrato** (Casale Monferrato, Alessandria)
- **Matteo Delle Donne** – President, **Sistema Museale di Ateneo dell'Università di Napoli L'Orientale** (Naples)
- **Concetta Ferrara** – Director, **Sistema Museale Piceno** (Ascoli Piceno)
- **Ilaria Ferretti** - Head of Archive, **Fondazione Home Movies – Archivio Nazionale dei Film di Famiglia** (Bologna)
- **Marco Fino** – Director, **Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali di Torino** (Turin)
- **Giuliano Gaia** - Co-founder of InvisibleStudio, for **Case Museo Milano** (Milan)
- **Francesca Gobbo** - Head of Marketing & Communication, **Museo Nazionale del Cinema** (Turin)
- **Daniela Muraca** - Director, **Centro Internazionale di Studi Primo Levi** (Turin)
- **Luigi Petruzzellis** - Head of **Circuito Museale “Infinito Recanati”** (Recanati, Macerata)
- **Romina Quarchioni** – Councilor Regional Coordination ICOM Marche e Elevata Qualificazione del **Servizio Attività Culturali, Biblioteca, Musei e Turismo del Comune di Jesi** (Jesi, Ancona)
- **Paolo Soddu** - Professor of Contemporary History and History of Political Parties and Movements, Università di Torino and **Federico Pugliese**, AI Architect at Machine Learning Reply at the time of the project's implementation, for **Fondazione Luigi Einaudi** (Torino)
- **Diego Voltolini** – Director, **Museo Archeologico Nazionale delle Marche e dell'Anfiteatro romano** di Ancona (Ancona)
- **Marc Weber** - Director and Curator at the Internet History Program, **Computer History Museum** (Mountain View, CA)

Glossary

- **AI Literacy:** the knowledge, skills and awareness that enable people to understand, use, critically evaluate and interact responsibly with AI systems in everyday life, at work and in society.
- **Hallucinations:** outputs generated by an AI system – particularly a language model – that appear plausible and well-formulated, but are factually incorrect, unverifiable or invented. Hallucinations are a consequence of how generative models work – predicting probable language sequences without verifying their truth – and are often generated in the absence of adequate support of available data or sources.
- **Bias:** systematic distortion in the way information, data or decisions are selected, interpreted or produced, leading to partial, non-neutral or unfair results. In the context of AI, bias is a distortion embedded in an algorithmic system that arises primarily from unrepresentative or historically biased training data and from unforeseen or uncontrolled contexts of use. These biases can cause AI to reproduce or amplify existing inequalities, presenting them as objective or 'neutral'.
- **LLMs and SLMs:** **LLMs** (Large Language Models) are AI language models trained on huge amounts of diverse text, with billions (or hundreds of billions) of parameters, designed to be generalists. **SLMs** (Small Language Models) are smaller language models, with millions or a few billion parameters, designed to be more specialized, efficient and controllable.

Key characteristics of LLMs:

- Extensive linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge
- High capacity for generalization
- Suitable for a wide range of tasks (e.g. writing, translation, summarization, reasoning)
- Require large computational resources, both for training and use

Key characteristics of SLMs:

- Trained on specific domains or targeted tasks
- Lower resource consumption (energy, costs, latency)
- Easier to deploy locally (on-premise or edge)

- Greater transparency and governability
- Competitive performance when assigned to well-defined tasks
- **NFC:** *Near Field Communication* is a technology that allows information to be exchanged between devices at short distances (a few centimeters). It is often used in museums to activate digital content – such as audio or video – simply by placing a smartphone near a tag positioned close to a work of art or object.
- **Synthetic Heritage:** a set of practices, artefacts and memories that present themselves as cultural heritage (or collective memory) but are produced, reconstructed or amplified through digital technologies, such as AI, algorithmic processes and web platforms, rather than emerging exclusively from traditions, communities or direct historical contexts.

In short, synthetic heritage can be seen as:

- a 'mixed' heritage, partly real and partly digitally constructed
- a heritage that interposes technology (algorithms, AI generation) between communities and their memory or history
- a heritage that raises ethical questions about what to consider authentic, what role platforms play and what agency individuals/ communities have.

See Nieto McAvoy, E., & Kidd, J. (2024). Synthetic Heritage: Online platforms, deceptive genealogy and the ethics of algorithmically generated memory. *Memory, Mind & Media*, 3, e12.

- **Techno-Solutionism:** a tendency to believe that complex social, economic, political or environmental problems can be solved quickly and easily, mainly – if not solely – through technological solutions, often without addressing their structural, cultural or ethical causes.
- See Siffels, L. E., & Sharon, T. (2024). Where technology leads, the problems follow. Technosolutionism and the Dutch contact tracing app. *Philosophy & Technology*, 37(4), 125.0

Interview outline

As mentioned in the Introduction, the interviews conducted for this report were semi-structured, i.e. based on a set of guiding questions, open to spontaneous reflections. The interview outline for the two main areas: expectations and resistance to AI and case study analysis, is provided below in order to clarify the aspects investigated in relation to the research objectives.



Interview outline for professionals in the cultural sector

1. Description of cultural offerings and audiences

(the purpose of this first section is to frame the cultural offering in relation to the target audience, in order to analyze the relationship between audience/visitor types and the subsequent themes)

1.1 Introduction to the institution and its cultural offering

(Back-up questions: How do you think your institution contributes to the promotion of cultural heritage? What aspects of cultural heritage are promoted by your institution?)

1.2 Starting question (Q): Who is presently the museum's primary audience?

(Draw up a profile of the museum's visitors, especially in terms of: age/geographical origin – national, international, local/ reason for interest in the cultural offering, e.g. students on a school trip, enthusiasts, etc.)

1.3 Q: How does the primary audience enjoy the collection?

(Define the museum visit experience from a qualitative point of view: quick visit, in-depth visit, recurring visit, e.g. visitors who regularly participate in extra initiatives, etc.)

2. Relationship between new technologies and visitors

(The purpose of the second section is to introduce a reflection on new technologies, investigating how they affect the relationship with visitors, both in terms of communication and experience)

2.1 Q: How has the relationship with the public changed/is changing?

2.2 Q: How much has the advent of new media and new technologies influenced this change?

2.3 Q: Thinking about the relationship with visitors, in what ways have new media and new technologies proved to be beneficial?

2.4 Q: In what ways have they proved to be an obstacle?

(Explore question 4 in terms of advantages and challenges)

3. Relationship with AI

(The purpose of the third block is to narrow the focus on AI in terms of confidence levels, expectations and resistance)

3.1 Q: Regarding new technologies, can you think of any use of AI for the enrichment of cultural heritage by another museum/institution that you found particularly interesting?

(Understand the interviewee's relationship with AI in terms of engagement and suggestions/possibilities – recommender systems, chatbots, etc. – in order to activate the imagination for the next questions)

3.2 Q: Has AI ever been used in your museum to enrich cultural heritage (relationship with the public or heritage conservation)?

3.3 If yes: in what context/what was the stimulus/with what results?

3.4 If not: have you ever considered it? What, if anything, is stopping you from doing so?

3.5 Q: In your opinion, how could the use of AI for the enrichment of cultural heritage be an opportunity in the future?

3.6 Q: In what ways could it be a risk?

3.7 Q: Limiting the application of AI to chatbots, what do you think would be the ideal use of chatbots for the enrichment of cultural heritage?

(It is very likely that this question could be integrated into one of the previous questions, either in block 9 or block 12).



Interview outline for case studies

1. Reconstructing the process of creating the AI tool together with the interviewee, going through all the stages:

1.1 Origin of the project

Was it an initiative of the museum or an external proposal that the museum agreed to? In the first case: what prompted the initiative? In the second: what was the attractive element?

1.2 Development of the project

Who within the museum oversaw its development? To what extent and how was the museum involved in the design and development of the tool?

1.3 Technological aspects

If the interviewee was involved in the technological development or is able to answer questions about the technological development, explore the following aspects:

- Model adopted (open source, etc.).
- Use of infrastructure (external, e.g. API, or internal)
- Architecture and purpose (chatbot via RAG, chatbot with fine-tuning, etc.)
- Data used (historical documents or data collected from users)

1.4 Impact of the project

What has been/is the result of the project to date? If it arose from a need of the museum, has it satisfied that need? What has been/is its greatest impact on the enrichment of heritage?

(investigate how the impact was assessed/measured, in terms of audience segments involved, survey tools, methodology adopted)

2. Q: Based on your experience, in what ways do you think the use of AI for the enrichment of cultural heritage could be an opportunity in the future?

2.1. Q: In what ways could it be a risk?

3. What advice would you give to other museums/institutions wishing to undertake a similar project?

Suggested readings

- Hicks, M. T., Humphries, J., & Slater, J. (2024). ChatGPT is Bullshit. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 26(38), 1–10.
- Jaillant, L., Warwick, C., Gooding, P., Aske, K., Layne-Worthey, G., & Downie, J. S. (eds.) (2025). *Navigating artificial intelligence for cultural heritage organisations*. UCL Press.
- Matei, Ș. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence and collective remembering: The technological mediation of mnemotechnic values. *Journal of Human-Technology Relations*, 2.1: 1-22.
- Morozov, E. (2014). To Save Everything, Click Here: *The Folly of Technological Solutionism*. New York, US: Public Affairs.
- Munn L, Magee L and Arora V (2024) Truth machines: synthesizing veracity in AI language models. *AI & Society* 39(6): 2759–2773.
- Natale, S., Surace, B., Mensa, E., & Befera, L. (2025). ChatGPT for Cultural Heritage and the Customization of Generative AI: A Talkthrough Analysis of the Luigi Einaudi Chatbot. *New Media & Society*, 1–26.
- Nieto McAvoy, E, & Jenny K. (2024). Synthetic Heritage: Online Platforms, Deceptive Genealogy and the Ethics of Algorithmically Generated Memory. *Memory, Mind & Media* 3 (e12), 1–18.
- Parry, R. (2007). Recoding the Museum: *Digital Heritage and the Technologies of Change*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Pizzo, A., Lombardo, V., & Damiano, R. (2024). *Interactive Storytelling: A Cross-Media Approach to Writing, Producing and Editing with AI*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schuh, J. (2024). AI As Artificial Memory: A Global Reconfiguration of Our Collective Memory Practices? *Memory Studies Review*, 1, 231-55.
- Smit, R., Smits, T., & Merrill, S. (2024). Stochastic Remembering and Distributed Mnemonic Agency. *Memory Studies Review*, 1–22.
- Thiel, S., & Bernhardt J.C., (eds). (2024). *AI in Museums: Reflections, Perspectives and Applications*. Bielefeld, DE: transcript.



UNIVERSITÀ
DI TORINO



Sineglossa