MAT02555

DISRUPTING NOTIONS OF COLLABORATION:

THE PROBLEMATIC ENGAGEMENT OF MUSEUMS AND SCHOOLS

Donna Mathewson

Doctoral Candidate: School of Art Education

UNSW College of Fine Arts

donnam@lisp.com.au

and

Penny McKeon

Senior Lecturer: School of Art Education

UNSW College of Fine Arts

In investigating relationships between museums and schools, this presentation examines what is concealed within public discourse through an exploration of how implicit forms of power operate to create, maintain and silence barriers to engagement on the part of school-based educators. In the analysis extant research from the museum and education fields will be drawn upon and pertinent readings will be extracted to illuminate different conceptions of how interactions between museums and schools enact, construct, enable and constrain educational opportunities. Based on this analysis, suggestions are made for approaches to the development of museum/school relationships that make explicit the determining nature of social practices and increase the visibility of previously under-represented school-based perspectives.

Introduction

"Those who talk of equality of opportunity forget that social games...are not "fair games"." (Bourdieu 2000, 214-215).

Museums and schools are public institutions that are linked in the public mind by their common educational orientation. It is generally assumed that this educational focus constitutes the basis of a natural association that is educationally beneficial. However, emerging research provides evidence that disputes this assumption, suggesting that relationships between the museum and school fields are tenuous and that, from a school-based perspective, the educational value of engagement with museums is questionable. The burgeoning awareness of the problematic nature of museum/school relationships resulting from such research, has led to propositions that advance notions of collaboration as a means of positive transformation. However, in conceiving museums and schools as equal partners, predisposed to cohesive and cooperative relations, given appropriate opportunities, such idealistic notions demonstrate a misrecognition of the social relations of power that operate between the two fields. Misrecognition enables the reproduction of relations in which museums are dominant and in which school-based educators have an ill-defined and often educationally ineffective pedagogical role.

In this paper I will explore practices that are characteristic of engagements between museums and schools to show how social relations operate to enable and constrain the realization of museum-based learning opportunities. The ways in which the use and acceptance of implicit and concealed forms of power, create and maintain a social hierarchy that constitutes a barrier to the authentic engagement of school-based educators, will be specifically examined through interrogation of existing research. Based on this analysis a number of propositions will be advanced for a fundamental reconstruction of museum/school relationships that makes explicit the determining nature of social practices and increases the visibility of previously under-represented school-based perspectives.

The body of research informing the analysis has been drawn from both the museum and school-based education fields and reflects both a general educational focus and a specific secondary art educational perspective that is focused on secondary school aged audiences in the context of NSW syllabus reforms. While much of this research has been generated from outside of Australia, where possible Australian examples have been referenced. The relative absence of Australian-based research in this area and the undeveloped nature of that research, particularly emanating from the school-based educational perspective, is a testimony to the lack of critical attention given to the utilization of museums as resources for school-based education. The social basis of museum/school relationships have remained largely unexamined and poorly conceptualized, particularly within the school-based education field.

In investigating the issues identified the author will test the propositions that:

- Interactions between museums and schools are determined by hierarchical power relations in which museums are dominant
- Domination in the museum setting significantly inhibits the ability of school-based educators' to represent themselves or participate robustly within the museum field
- Social relations inhibit the ability of school-based educators to utilize museums in ways that authentically support and enhance classroom learning
- Misrecognition enables these power relations to be legitimated and reproduced

For the sake of clarity the term 'art museums' is used to refer to all types of museums and galleries that primarily exhibit visual arts.

The Significance of Engagement Between Museums and Schools

In the New South Wales context, recent and emergent curriculum reforms in the Visual Arts, drawing on significant research, recognize that the visual arts exist within a network of relations that incorporate the artwork, the artist, the audience and the world (NSW Board Of Studies 1999). This recognition reinforces recent shifts within the wider art education field from the dominance of studio-based artmaking practices to acknowledgment of the broader context of the visual arts and increased emphasis on historical and critical practices. Curriculum directives and discourse within the field promote the importance of providing students with exemplars of, and experiences with, the existence of art within the wider world. Developments also acknowledge that the provision of experiences related to participation as audiences contributes to the capacity for student participants to engage in autonomous cultural practice beyond the school context. Considering that art museums provide a significant venue for cultural participation, such developments recognize the link between school-based art education and art museums. Furthermore, the implementation of curriculum directives compels art educators to utilize art museums as resources for modeling cultural practice. As the majority of students will not continue studio practice after they finish school, providing students with an ability to engage with art as an audience beyond the school years is a significant educational objective.

For museums, a significant aspect of their educational imperative involves addressing and facilitating the participation of school audiences. While it appears that many museums measure their success in this endeavour by numbers through the door, of more importance are the long-term benefits of school-based museum utilization in the development of future audiences. Positive museum experiences among school audiences potentially provide a means of increasing museum visitation among segments of the community most unlikely to visit as adults (Macdonald and Alsford 1991, Anderson 1997, Adams 1990). Throughout the Western world, museum audiences have been consistently shown to be more highly educated and of a higher social status than the general population (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991, Merriman 1990, Dimaggio and Useem 1978, Bennett 1994, Bennett and Frow 1991). This dominance is particularly pronounced in relation to art museums. The investigation of museological literature indicates that addressing social inequalities in museum audiences through the development of future audiences has been a recurrent concern within the museum field. However, while efforts have been made to address the issue at discussion level and through various, widely dispersed initiatives, social inequalities among audiences remain a dilemma that has not been effectively resolved. This can, in part, be attributed to the continued debate and dissension within the museum field itself regarding the desirability of attracting audiences more reflective of the general population

The Characteristic Engagement of School-Based Educators with Museums

While it is undisputed that school-based educators do value and utilize museums in ways that express a commitment to educational purposes, studies indicate that they have been unable to exploit the distinctive learning environment and opportunities provided by museums in optimal ways (Grinder and McCoy 1985, Eisner and Dobbs 1986, Griffin 1999, Stone 1992a, 1992b, 1993, Berry 1998, Hooper-Greenhill 1991, Mathewson 1994). The nature of engagement is evident in research that suggests that museum utilization by school-based educators is characterized by:

- a minimal investment of effort (Stone 1992a,1993)
- general use that is not specifically tailored to curricular needs (Stone 1992a, 1993)
- an inability to integrate museum experiences into classroom learning (Stone 1992a, 1993, Hooper-Greenhill 1991, Griffin 1999)

- a focus on the acquisition of information rather than the development of processes of learning (Griffin 1999, Hooper-Greenhill 1991)
- ill-defined educational objectives (Hooper-Greenhill 1991, Griffin 1999, Harrison and Naef 1985)
- a concentration on enrichment and social interaction (Brigham and Robinson 1992, Gottfried 1980, Laetsch, Diamond, Gottfried and Rosenfeld 1980, Griffin 1999)
- learning that is incidental to any desired outcomes (Harrison and Naef 1985)
- a 'consumer like' stance (Stone 1992b)
- passivity (Liu 2000, Stone 1992b)
- lack of mutuality and an absence of dialogue (Stone 1992b, Eisner and Dobbs 1986, Grinder and McCoy 1985, National Research Center for the Arts 1975, Newsom and Silver 1978, Commission on Museums for a New Century 1984, Mathewson 1994).
- a lack of self-recognition (Stone 1992a, 1993, Mathewson 1994)

Further consideration of what these characteristics reveal about the ways in which schools interact with museums suggests that underpinning these approaches are a number of assumptions, beliefs and expectations. The characteristics of museum utilization suggest that school-based educators:

- assume that museums will initiate and maintain relationships with schools
- believe that the museum environment will provide the conditions necessary for learning
- expect the museum experience to be inherently and unquestionably of value
- assume that the actions of school-based educators have minimal impact on the realization or value of museum experiences

The Problematic Pedagogical Role of School-Based Educators

The identification of underlying assumptions, beliefs and expectations exposes a number of conundrums within museum/school relationships which are operating to undermine the ability of school-based educators to utilize museums effectively as educational resources.

The practices of school-based educators suggest a relationship between museums and schools in which museums are assumed to control and determine the nature of engagement. School-based educators appear to have an uncertain concept of how their skills and experience contribute to museum utilization and communicate a mystical notion of how museum experiences can enhance the learning of their students. By assuming that museums will provide appropriate resources and communicate with respect to learning opportunities, and in the absence of very specifically targeted museum efforts, many school-based educators remain largely unaware of the diversity and nature of opportunities available. Furthermore, by relying on museums to enact and construct experiences as an end in themselves, school-based educators who have a knowledge of curriculum, an understanding of classroom learning and familiarity with student's needs, deny their powerful ability to develop those experiences into integrated, meaningful and relevant learning.

The passive approach reported within the literature appears contradictory to the professional practice of school-based educators. While school-based educators are deeply invested in, and critical of, learning opportunities provided in the school context, their utilization of museums suggests a 'hands-off' approach that uncritically expects the museum experience to be inherently positive. Within their own narratives about museum experiences, school-based educators rarely acknowledge their intentional presence, their capacity to facilitate museum utilization or their influence on the performances of their students, as significant. This inability to attribute themselves a contributory role runs counter to research that consistently shows the potential of school-based educators to enhance learning in museums

to be considerable (Newsom and Silver 1978, Stone 1986, Housen and Duke 1998, Griffin 1999). Studies directed by Abigail Housen at the Museum of Modern Art provide particularly convincing evidence that school-based educators can produce significant growth in their students, exceeding that provided by trained museum educators (Housen and Duke 1998: 96).

This reality challenges the publicly declared narratives of art education and suggests adherence to traditional child-centred notions of creativity within the museum setting. Literature in the field of art education shows that the subject has moved away from naturalist conceptions of innate creativity to increasingly emphasize the intellectual and cognitive basis of the subject. Elliot Eisner's (1972) advocacy of interventionist perspectives has been particularly influential in facilitating this shift and transforming the foundations of art education. He has argued that the complex cognitive-perceptual abilities necessary for the creation and appreciation of the visual arts develop through experience rather than being the result of maturation. Effective art education instruction is viewed as making students more receptive to diversity and change in the visual arts, as able to facilitate more complex and refined perceptual and cognitive differentiation and as able to assist students in using and extending the frames of reference that influence perception. Eisner has asserted that the disciplines of thought involved in these developments do not emerge automatically but are contingent on experience and instruction.

In recent times, in an effort to gain more scholastic respect and provide an education that more authentically represents the nature of the visual arts field, increased emphasis has been placed on perceptual, historical and critical studies. Unlike earlier models that focused on engagement in the visual arts through art making, contemporary art education, particularly in NSW, reconceptualizes engagement with the visual arts field to emphasize the importance of skilled and knowledgeable viewing. In proposing that the associated skills and knowledge can only be gained through systematic instructional intervention such approaches reflect the increasing acceptance of models that acknowledge that artistic development does not necessarily occur naturally. Also evident in current approaches that incorporate Postmodernism is the recognition of the social situatedness of learning and the various forces that contribute to the extent to which students can 'naturally' develop their abilities.

The notion that intervention is necessary to facilitate learning is now widely promoted within art education literature and is reported to be deeply embedded in classroom teaching practices. However the evidence suggests that such practices are not enacted in the museum context. This contradiction highlights a disjunction between the school-based pedagogical role of teachers and their educational engagements with museums. The reasons for this disjunction have not been explored and current literature offers little by way of explanation of this conundrum.

A Theoretical Framework for Understanding Contradictory Practices

This investigation is being undertaken from a school-based art education perspective that is cogniscent of research emanating from the museum field. However, conventional approaches originating from these respective fields have been judged theoretically insufficient as a means of examining social aspects of museum/school relationships and their impact on museum utilization. Consequently, in an effort to interrogate and expose the social logic that is implicitly guiding actions that are characteristic of museum/school engagements, selected sociological concepts of Pierre Bourdieu in relation to his theory of practice will be used as a theoretical framework. The application of these concepts provides a unique perspective on identified problems and will be used as a method for revisiting and critiquing previous research.

In Bourdieu's work the concepts of field, capital and habitus inter-relate in complex ways to form a theory of human action that proposes that agency and structure are connected in a dialectical relationship. In opposing conceptualizations that view human action as a direct, unmediated response to external factors or attribute action to internal factors such as conscious intention or calculation, Bourdieu argues that practices are simultaneously conscious and unconscious. People do think and act in strategic ways and try to use the 'rules of the game' operating within the particular field to their advantage, but at the same time they are influenced by the values and expectations of habitus and the determining structures of the field. Though they may be conscious of making moves and acting strategically, they are unaware that their motives, goals and aspirations are not spontaneous or natural. To illustrate how his concepts relate to explain practice Bourdieu offers this formula:[(habitus)(capital)] + field = practice (1984: 101).

Bourdieu uses the term 'capital' to refer to the possession and accumulation of resources that are material or non-material in form. Resources are seen as capital when they become objects of struggle as valued resources and function as a 'social relation of power' (Bourdieu 1989: 375). The most significant aspect of Bourdieu's conception of capital, in relation to this research, is the acknowledgment that power can be non-materialist in form. The notions of cultural capital, social capital and symbolic capital extend the logic of self-interest beyond the material sphere, and acknowledge that valued resources from this non-material sphere can be accumulated, exchanged and invested in ways that profit individuals. However it is important to understand that capital only has value in fields that recognize and share this value.

Bourdieu conceptualizes social space as an array of relatively autonomous but structurally homologous fields in which specific forms of capital are produced, invested, exchanged, accumulated and consumed. Fields are not real or concrete spaces, but exist as a metaphor for a social site where people and institutions engage in particular activities. They are the site of possibilities, particular strategies, particular forms of capital, particular narratives and regulatory and coercive discourses. The distribution of capital within particular fields and the dominance of specific forms of capital reflects a hierarchical set of power relations among individuals within that field. The social rank and specific power agents are assigned in a particular field depends largely on the amount and type of capital they can mobilize and positions are continually negotiated according to the 'hierarchy of capitals' in play. Those in power have the advantage of designating what is 'authentic' capital.

Every field involves action and contestation that is viewed as a way of being that is embodied and intuitive. This action is termed 'playing the game'. Playing the game presupposes and produces a particular type of 'illusio', which is defined as a belief or acceptance in the worth of the game of a field (Bourdieu 1990: 76-78). Covert contestation also occurs between fields as they compete for higher placement in the hierarchy of fields.

The idea that actors are practical strategists is linked to social structure through the concept of habitus. Bourdieu argues that practices cannot be understood simply in terms of the narratives, rules, values, discourses and ideologies of a field, or in terms of individual, uncontextualised decision making. Rather a person acquires a habitus, which strongly influences all subsequent actions and beliefs. Habitus can be understood as the generally durable and transposable values and dispositions acquired from an individual's cultural history, which develops through formative contexts such as family and education. Likened to a law of direction and movement, the habitus constitutes a mental structure which, having been inculcated into all minds socialized in a particular way, is both individual and collective. However, the habitus functions such that individuals normally think that the possibilities from which they choose are necessities stem from commonsense or are natural and inevitable. Bourdieu has explained that "*the schemes of the habitus, the primary form of classification,*

*owe their specific efficacy to the fact that they function below the level of consciousness and
language, beyond the reach of introspective scrutiny or control by the will*" (1984: 466).

The logic of specific fields is established in the form of a specific habitus that can be viewed
as a sense of the game that enables agents to feel "*like a fish in water* ' (Bourdieu 1992:
127). The development of the specific habitus takes place gradually and for the most part
unnoticed, and is practically never explicitly set out or imposed. This action of the habitus is
stratifying in that it conveys an embodied sense of place that induces agents to adhere to
the relations of social order (Bourdieu 1984:471)

Through the concept of the habitus and the notion that the individual is not the sole
originator of practice, Bourdieu challenges models of rational action. The habitus points to a
theory of action that is practical and pre-reflective, embodied and cognitive, durable though
adaptive, reproductive though generative and inventive, and the product of particular social
conditions (Swartz 1997: 101). It is constituted in practice and is always brought out when a
set of dispositions meets a particular problem, choice or context. As Bourdieu states:

> "*The agent engaged in practice knows the world...takes it for granted,
> precisely because he is caught up in it, bound up with it; he inhabits it like a
> garment...he feels at home in the world because the world is also in him, in
> the form of the habitus*" (2000: 142-143).

Power and legitimation are at the heart of the functioning and structure of habitus because
the relation of what is possible is a relation to power that means that not all social worlds are
equally available to everyone (Bourdieu 1990: 4). In his analyses of power Bourdieu
distances himself from Marxist thought by emphasizing the role of symbolic forms of
domination. He asserts that the degree of domination agents experience significantly affects
their ability to act or represent themselves within a given field. The more dominated a group
or individual may be, the less likely that they will feel able, or in fact be able, to participate
robustly in the domain in which they are dominated.

In his research Bourdieu has repeatedly shown that people from dominated groups often just
accept that the way things are is the way they should be or have always been. He uses the
term 'doxa' to explain the practice of accepting things, even when it causes suffering, without
realizing that one is being oppressed or that there are any alternatives to the status quo
(1984: 471). The 'doxic attitude' Bourdieu identifies means a form of bodily, unconscious
submission to the relations of order that makes certain courses of action unthinkable.
According to this theory, while submission may appear without conflict, it may be
accompanied by internalized tension.

It is asserted that the reproduction of hierarchies of domination is based on the
'misrecognition' of their essentially oppressive basis. Misrecognition is conceived as
occurring within all social life as a fundamental dimension of the struggle for social
recognition and as a necessary condition for the exercise of power. It is a form of forgetting
about the socially determined nature of practices.

The Subtextual Dimensions of Engagement that Constrain Optimal Utilization

The problems that this examination has identified and explored have been previously
identified within the research literature. However, examination of existing research on this
subject reveals that critical questioning of museum/school relationships has given little
recognition to the social origins of prevailing problems. In addition, both the museum and
school-based education fields rarely broach the subtextual, unexamined or unintended
dimensions of exchanges and are less motivated to do so in the demanding, economic

rationalist climate of current institutional agendas. Consequently, the application of Bourdieu's theory of action and his interrelated concepts of capital, field, habitus and domination provides a unique, and up to this point, largely absent, perspective on the problematic features of engagement between museums and schools.

If school-based education and museums are considered as distinctive fields co-existing within social space, the differences between the classroom practices of school-based educators and their practices in relation to museums can be attributed to their position in relation to the respective fields. School-based educators are firmly positioned within the school field and can be conceived as visitors in the museum field when they engage in museum utilization (Mathewson 2001). As visitors in the museum field, school-based educators conceive of the museum as a social site in which particular activities occur. In participating in these activities, school-based educators attempt to play the museum 'game', but do so at a distinct disadvantage because they are in a dominated position in the hierarchy of the museum field. Further analysis will show that this domination is the result of a lack of familiarity with the museum field, a lack of recognized capital in the museum field and the absence of a specific habitus that would enable school-based educators to play the game with embodied skill and confidence.

While the specific capital school-based educators possess is powerful within the school field, it is not recognized or valued in the museum field and therefore cannot necessarily be mobilized. The capital deficiency of school-based educators in the museum field is clearly demonstrated in the 'consumer-like' stance that has been identified. This characteristic suggests that the strategies of school-based educators are based on a belief that they have little of value to offer to museums but that museums have something of value to offer them. Scrutiny of museological literature and the stated policies of individual museums demonstrates that museum professionals do not intentionally seek to act in ways that engender this perception. Rather, public declarations and stated museum policy support the active involvement of school-based educators in museums and express a belief that schools have much to offer museums. However, despite this rhetoric of equality, the implicit communication of underlying and contradictory attitudes acts in a powerful manner to undermine stated intentions and maintain a hierarchy in which museum professionals are dominant. In a recent study, Wan-Chen Liu (2000) demonstrated the unexpressed desire of art museum educators to maintain the power of their perceived expertise. Results showed a reluctance among art museum educators to surrender their power to enable the more active involvement of school-based educators was based on a fundamental belief in the superiority of their own expertise.

The contradiction evident in the declarations and practices of museum professionals in this case can be further explained by inter-field contestation. As agents in the social world, museum educators are motivated to act in ways that improve or maintain their position. While working for the empowerment of school-based educators may improve the position of school-based educators in the museum field, it could result in subsequent loss of power and status for the museum educator themselves. Consequently it is in the interests of museum educator's to emphasize the symbolic value of the capital they possess and deny the value of the capital of school-based educators. Their higher position in the hierarchy of the museum field enables them to utilize their symbolic power to achieve this end.

The undefined nature of the school-based educator's role in the museum setting is also related to internal problems within the art education field itself. Penny McKeon (2001) has argued that while creative self-expression is still valorized within art education, the school subject is not constructed solely in terms of studio practice and creative products, but includes a significant academic component. This creates a disjunction and leads to tension as school-based art educators struggle to reconcile the creative and academic components

of the subject in terms of authentic teaching and learning experiences. McKeon's analysis suggests that, despite developments at theory and curriculum level, at the level of practice there remains significant contestation with respect to the structure of the subject and consequently, the pedagogical role of the school-based art educator. The lack of clear definition resulting from continued contestation significantly affects the capacity of school-based art educators to represent themselves and participate robustly and consistently within other fields. In the case of engagement with museums, in the absence of a strong sense of professional identity, the pedagogical role of school-based art educators in the museum field is omitted or mystified in the interests of the subjectivist narrative dominating the museum field.

While the field analysis thus far goes some way to explaining why the practices of school-based educators differ in the museum setting, action cannot be explained by field structure alone. The concept of habitus further demonstrates how the actions of school-based educators are also a product of particular social conditions and social conditioning. In this case the habitus becomes apparent when the dispositions of school-based educators and their social conditioning with respect to museums meet the particular museum field. Traditionally, aesthetic philosophies and authoritative methods of presentation and representation have prevailed within the museum field (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991, Duncan 1995, Heumann Gurian 1991, Hooper-Greenhill 1991, Horne 1984, Merriman 1991, Rice 1997, Roberts 1997). Despite educational theories that have disproved notions of transcendence and postmodern ideologies that question accepted viewpoints, such associations, and experiences with the traditional museum context, are powerfully retained within the public mind and are apparent in practices that reinforce and perpetuate the traditional museum structure and its authority. In this case, they are evident in practices that reinforce the unquestionable authority of museums and adhere to subjective notions of aesthetic experience. While such practices effectively contradict and undermine the more contemporary concerns of school-based education, and often contradict expressed intentions and beliefs, they continue because the action of the habitus is below the level of consciousness. The habitus functions such that school-based educators think that their action is necessary, common sense, natural or inevitable.

Museums would argue that contemporary museum experiences challenge the traditional perceptions outlined. However, the habitus that most current school-based educators developed during their formative years are based on experiences with the more traditional museum structure. While the habitus changes and adapts as life continues and new experiences are incorporated, the influence of experiences in formative years is particularly strong. The durability of the habitus and its ability to reject the contradictory information that contemporary museums may offer is clearly explained by Swartz (1997: 212). He reports that Bourdieu (1990: 60-61) speaks of "*avoidance strategies*" generated by the habitus "*to protect itself from crises and critical challenges*" by "*rejecting information capable of calling into question its accumulated information*" and by "*avoiding exposure to such information*" by tending to "*favour experiences likely to reinforce it*". In addition, investigation of museological literature reveals that there is still much debate and division about the appropriateness of traditional museum structures and traditional practices are still in evidence in museums throughout the world.

Thus far, analysis using the concepts of field, capital and habitus has provided a conceptual account of the reported actions of school-based educators with respect to museum utilization. The engagement of school-based educators has been shown to occur within hierarchical relationships that are dominated by museum professionals and the structure of the museum field. While this relation of power is not overtly recognized or manipulated, it has become accepted as the natural and logical order and the agents involved communicate an acceptance of their positions in their practical compliance with that order. In adopting

Paper Presented at the AARE Annual
Conference, Brisbane, 2002
Australian Association
for Research in Education

practices that accept and legitimate their own domination, school-based educators have adopted a doxic attitude that is based on misrecognition of the oppressive basis of the symbolic power exercised by museums. However, while misrecognition enables the reproduction of the hierarchy of domination without any overt sense of conflict, submission to the accepted order can be seen to lead to an internalized tension. This internalized tension has clearly been demonstrated in the contradictory practices that have been identified among school-based educators with respect to their use of museums.

The Role of Research in Reinforcing Misrecognition

This analysis is not unique in its identification of the problematic features of engagements between museums and schools. However, in attempting to address those problems, existing research has tended to promote idealistic notions that do not take into account the social situatedness of practices. As such idealisations have the power to inform meaning-making and the strategic action of both museum professionals and school-based educators they act to conceal the social origins of identified problems and ultimately contribute to the reproduction of the status quo.

Research has suggested that the inactive stance of school-based educators is symptomatic of a lack of knowledge about how to incorporate the use of museums into classroom activities (Stone 1992b, Mathewson 1994), a lack of confidence and experience in the museum environment (Walsh Piper 1989, Newsom and Silver 1978, Griffin 1999, Zeller 1983) and an absence of appropriate education (Zeller 1983, Griffin 1999, Stone 1993). Based on such information, many researchers have promoted the importance of training as a means of enabling school-based educators to realize the full potential of museum-based learning (Ramsey 1938, Stone 1992a, 1993, Paine 1989, Anderson 1997, Griffin 1999, Zeller 1983, O'Connell 1992, Newsom and Silver 1978, Liu 2000). Training has also been supported in theory by school-based educators who express a desire to participate in such programs (Mathewson 1994, Whitty 2001, Stone 1992b). However, attempts by museums to provide school-based educators with instruction on how to utilize museums have been unsuccessful in generating interest and involvement (Stone 1992a, 1992b, 1993, Mathewson 1994, Whitty 2001). The analysis thus far, provides an explanation for this, in suggesting that attempts by museums to provide such instruction have been addressing only the symptoms of the problem rather than its social origins.

School-based educators are not activating opportunities because they lack a sense of agency and thus do not perceive their inadequacies as having a significant impact on museum utilization. The misrecognition of agency and the doxic attitude demonstrated means that while school-based educators may concede that they lack knowledge, confidence and skill in the museum setting, they see these inadequacies as natural and inevitable. Thus, while they may support the notion of training they see it as having little direct relevance to themselves. Opportunities are also not being activated because of the context in which training is being provided. Instruction has generally been museum-driven and consequently has been undertaken within the museum context and on the specified terms of the museum field. It has been guided by the intentions and perceptions of museum professionals and has been predicated on the idea that school-based educators would benefit from instruction based on the constructed meanings of the museum field. While aimed at empowering individuals from outside the museum field, such instruction actually reinforces the domination of museums. Participation implicitly acknowledges systems of stratification and consequential disempowerment, legitimates the domination and authority of the museum field and forces school-based educators into an unfamiliar field in which the worth of their capital is unacknowledged or questioned and in which they are unable to maintain or improve their social position.

Despite the rarity of successful instances, collaboration is consistently proposed as the optimal means of promoting successful relationships between museums and schools (Berry 1998, Eisner and Dobbs 1986, Grinder and McCoy 1985, Harrison and Naef 1985). Such propositions indicate a prevailing misrecognition as they fail to recognize that the conditions necessary for collaboration do not exist. They assume that museums and schools are equal partners, predisposed to cohesive and cooperative relations. Analysis has disproved this assumption and shown that, in reality, museums and schools occupy polarized and hierarchically structured positions.

A continuing focus on collaboration as the panacea for problems related to museum/school relationships is in fact preventing the possibility of transformation, by reinforcing and consequently, reproducing, the misrecognition identified. Belief in the rhetoric of collaboration, leads to the assumption that relations between museums and schools are equal and in doing so, prevents recognition of the hierarchical relations that constrain the optimal utilization of museums. Likewise, continued focus on training as a means of enabling utilization misrecognises the social logic determining practices and in failing to address the fundamental origins of problems, acts to conceal and ultimately reproduce contradictory social practices.

Creating Opportunities for Transformation

This research is predicated on the notion that art education should act as an advocate for equity within cultural practice and the belief that the inculcation of cultural practice is a significant educational objective. While recent curriculum reforms and discourse within the education field and museum fields acknowledge the importance of this ideal, research has shown that practices often diverge from this intent. In seeking explanations for contradictory practices, this research has deconstructed the practices of school-based educators to reveal how implicit and concealed forms of power create and maintain a social hierarchy that constitutes a barrier to the authentic engagement of school-based educators. This analysis has indicated that optimal museum utilization requires a reconstruction of relationships to enable the more equal representation of school-based perspectives.

The ongoing research, of which this study is a part, is attempting to develop a model for learning in the museum setting that reconceives museum/school relationships in ways that enable school-based educators to advance alternative ideas and interests and ultimately enact change. While this research clearly indicates that school-based educators have an integral role to play in enacting change in the museum setting, conceptualisation of that role has yet to be fully resolved. This aspect of the research is still in formation and will be explicated at a later date. However, some initial propositions can be advanced.

1. Social relations between museums and schools must be exposed and acknowledged.

    Any attempt to create opportunities for transformation within museum/school relationships must first attempt to render explicit what is taken for granted and provide an objective sociological account of how the two fields operate within social space, such as this analysis has presented. As Bourdieu asserts, the ability of individuals to "*un-make*" or "*re-make*" the social world depends on "*realistic knowledge of what it is and what they can do with it from the position they occupy within it*" *(*1985: 734). He further states that the existence, form and direction of change depends both on the possibilities the system offers and on the balance of forces between social agents.

2. Transformations of relations that advantage school-based educators must be initiated by the school field

    Using the information gained from sociological analysis, the places and spaces through which agents can act to further alternative ideas, agendas and interests can be identified. The research has thus far shown that school-based educators have been constructing and legitimating their own exclusion and domination by entering into a field and a 'game' that is controlled and manipulated by those whose interests are focused on their position in the museum field. The empowerment of school-based educators in the museum setting requires that they be able to engage in a game that they are familiar and skillful in playing. While museums have made efforts to provide familiarity and skills related to the museum field, analysis has demonstrated that such efforts are undermined by the dominant position of museums and actions that inevitably involve a degree of self-interest. Considering this, efforts to empower school-based educators must be initiated by those whose interests such advancement would serve.

3. Art education should incorporate the study of the museum field as an aspect of artworld practice

    As the relation of what is possible is a relation to power, equalizing relationships between museums and schools would provide increased opportunities and possibilities with respect to museum utilization. While it is impossible to equalize relationships by changing social structure or providing school-based educators with the embodied specific habitus related to the museum field, it is possible to provide compensation at a cognitive level. Making the museum field an object of scrutiny would enable school-based educators and their students to gain an awareness and understanding that would effectively demystify the museum field and provide an understanding of how the museum game functions. This knowledge would enable them to participate more robustly in the game and conceive of ways in which they can engage with the museums to achieve educational objectives.

4. A 'critical museum pedagogy' would enable school-based educators to achieve educational relevance and provide democratizing experiences

Eilean Hooper-Greenhill (1999:4) refers to a critical museum pedagogy as "*an educational approach that reviews and develops its methods, strategies and provisions with regard both to educational excellence and to working towards the democratization of the museum*". She bases this notion on the concept of critical pedagogy as used by Henry Giroux to name "*the contradiction between what schools claim to do and what they actually do*" (Giroux 1992: 151). Giroux's critical pedagogy is concerned with the ways students construct meaning, what those categories of meaning are, and what beliefs and values students bring to their encounters. It recognizes that people 'write' meaning rather than just encounter or receive it (1992: 153).

Application of the concept of a critical museum pedagogy to school-based museum utilization, denies the viability of passivity and demands that students be provided with opportunities that allow them to actively construct meaning. It requires an approach that legitimates differences, increases the visibility of previously marginal interests, questions authoritative meta-narratives and dominant perspectives and allows for the negotiation of meaning.

The focus on learners actively constructing meaning within the concept of a critical museum pedagogy is reflected in contemporary educational theory and has been encompassed

within models emerging from the museum field (Griffin 1999, Hein 1998, Roberts 1997, Silverman 1995, Worts 1995). These models have much to offer school-based educators as they attempt to renegotiate their educational engagements with museums.

References:

Adams, J. (1990). "Art museums: meanings and models". In *Extending Parameters - Papers from the Extending Parameters Forum.* Sydney, Australia Council, 11-16

Anderson, D. (1997). *A Common Wealth: Museums and Learning in the United Kingdom. A Report to the Department of National Heritage*. London: The Department of National Heritage.

Board of Studies NSW, (1999). *Stage 6 Syllabus Visual Arts- Preliminary and HSC Courses*. Sydney: Board of Studies.

Bennett, T. (1994). *The Reluctant Museum Visitor*. Sydney: Australia Council

Bennett, T. & Frow, J. (1991). *Art Galleries: Who Goes?* Sydney: Australia Council.

Berry, N. (1998). "A focus on art museum/school collaborations". *Art Education*, 51 (2), 8-14.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of Taste*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, P. (1985). "Social space and the genesis of groups". *Theory and Society.* 14 (6). 723-744.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). *La Noblesse D'etat. Grande Ecoles et Esprit de Corps*. Paris: Les Edition de Minuit.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations.* Cambridge: Polity Press

Bourdieu, P. and Darbel, A. (1991). *The Love of Art*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Brigham, D. & Robinson, J. (1992). "From the guest editors". *Journal of Museum Education,* 17 (2), 3.

Commission on Museums for a New Century (1984). *Museums for a New Century*. Washington DC: American Association of Museums.

Dimaggio, P. & Useem M. (1978). "Social class and arts consumption". *Theory and Society*, 5, 141-161.

Duncan, C. (1995). *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. London: Routledge.

Eisner, E. (1972). *Educating Artistic Vision*. New York: Macmillan.

Eisner, E. and Dobbs, S. (1986). *The Uncertain Profession: Observations on the State of Museum Education in Twenty American Art Museums*. Los Angeles: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

Giroux, H. (1992). *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education.* New York and London: Routledge.

Gottfried, J.L. (1980). "Do children learn on school field trips?" *Curator*, 23 (3), 165-174.

Griffin, J. (1999). *An Exploration of Learning in Informal Settings*. Paper presented at National Association for Research in Science Teaching Annual Conference, Boston, March 28-31.

Grinder, A. and McCoy, E. (1985). *The Good Guide: A Sourcebook for Interpreters, Docents and Tour Guides*. Scottsdale (USA): Ironwood Publishing

Harrison, M. & Naef, B. (1985). "Toward a partnership: developing the museum-school relationship". *Journal of Museum Education*, 10 (4), 9-12.

Hein, G. (1998). *Learning in the Museum*. London: Routledge

Heumann Gurian, E. (1991) "Noodling around with exhibition opportunities". In Karp, I. and Levine S.D. *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display.* (pp.176-189). Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (1991). *Museums and Gallery Education*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (1999). *The Educational Role of the Museum (Second Edition).* New York and London: Routledge.

Horne, D. (1984). *The Great Museum: The Re-presentation of History*. Leichardt: Pluto Press.

Housen, A. & Duke, L. (1998). "Responding to Alper: Re-presenting the MoMA studies on visual literacy and aesthetic development". *Visual Arts Research*, 24 (1), 92-102.

Laetsch W.M., Diamond, J., Gottfried, J.L., & Rosenfeld, S. (1980). "Children and family groups in science centres". *Science and Children*, 17 (6), 14-17.

Liu, W. (2000). "Art museum educators attitude toward the role of the teacher in art museum-elementary school collaboration". *Visual Arts Research*, 26 (1), 75-84.

Macdonald, G. & Alsford, S. (1991). "Museums towards tomorrow: serving the future public". In A. Moritz, M. Birtley & N. McGillivray (eds.) *Museums Toward Tomorrow: Serving the Future Public- The Record of the National Conference of the Museums Association of Australia,* Melbourne: Museums Association of Australia, 1-5.

Mathewson, D. (2001). *Museums and schools: an analysis of the educational "game"*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Fremantle, Western Australia, December 2- 6.

Mathewson, D. (1994). *The Queen Victoria Museum and Art Gallery: A Resource for Secondary Teachers.* Unpublished Honours dissertation. University of Tasmania.

McKeon, P. (2001) *"Doing" art history in the secondary school years: in search of authenticity*. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Fremantle, Western Australia, December 2- 6.

Merriman, N. (1991). *Beyond the Glass Case.* Great Britain: Leicester University Press.

Newsom, B.Y. and Silver, A.Z. (eds.) (1978). *The Art Museum as Educator: A Collection of Studies as Guides to Practice and Policy*. Berkeley (USA): University of California Press.

O'Connell, P.S. (1992). "Decentralizing interpretation: Developing museum education materials with and for schools". In *Patterns in Practice: Selections from the Journal of Museum Education* (pp.251-261). Washington DC: Museum Education Roundtable.

Paine, S. (1989). "Museums as resources in the education and training of teachers". In E. Hooper-Greenhill (ed.), *Initiatives in Museum Education* (pp.28-29), Leicester: University of Leicester.

Ramsey, G.F. (1938). *Educational Work in Museums of the United States*. New York: H.W. Wilson.

Rice, D. (1997). "Modern art: making people mad". *Museum News.* May/June, 76 (3).

Roberts, L. C. (1997). *From Knowledge to Narrative: Educators and the Changing Museum.* Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Silverman, L. H. (1995). "Visitor meaning making in museums for a new age"*, Curator*. 38 (3): 161-170.

Stone, D. L. (1986). *The Development of a Model to Guide Cooperative Relationships Between Art Museums and Schools*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. The Florida State University.

Stone, D. L. (1992a). "Elementary art specialists' utilization of the art museum: a survey". *Visual Arts Research,* 18/1, 72-81.

Stone, D. L. (1992b). "A descriptive study of the art museum relative to schools"*. Visual Arts Research*, 18/2, 51-61.

Stone, D.L. (1993). "The secondary art specialist and the art museum". *Studies in Art Education*, 35/1, 45-54.

Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press.

Walsh-Piper, K. (1989). "Teachers and Resource Centers". In Berry, N and Mayer, S. (eds.). *Museum Education: History, Theory and Practice*. (pp.194-203). Reston: National Art Education Association.

Whitty, H (2001).excerpts from an interview undertaken with the researcher on January 25th, 2001 at the Powerhouse Museum, Sydney..

Worts, D. (1995). "Extending the frame: forging a new partnership with the public" In S. Pearce (ed.) *Art in Museums*. (pp.164-191) London: Athlone Press.

Zeller, T. (1983). "Let's teach art with originals". *Art Education*, 36/1, 43-46.