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Abstract
For school-based education, museums provide important learning opportunities that potentially bridge the gap between the classroom and the world beyond, enabling education to fulfil its aim of preparing students for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life. However, little research has specifically addressed the pedagogical demands and challenges of school-based teaching and learning in the specific context of art museums. This paper reports on a doctoral study that engaged the previously largely unrepresented voices of school-based educators and student audiences, in an investigation of interactions between schools and museums, with a specific focus on art educators and art museums. A pedagogical model is proposed that addresses the structural characteristics of art museum contexts while also exploring how approaches to teaching and learning can engage individual subjectivities, to make the invisible determinants of action visible, and to activate the possibilities of agency. The organising structure of the model extends the pedagogical repertoire of school-based educators, equipping them with approaches that allow for the development of purposeful and integrated educational experiences. In the provision of theoretical positions and strategies for inter-and intra-field interactions, the model ultimately identifies art museums as distinctive sites for transformative and inclusive school-based pedagogies that potentially provide a foundation for future cultural practice.

Introduction: Museums as Problematic Pedagogical Sites

Pedagogy is a term that references the varying and divergent elements that underpin teaching practice (Hayes, Mills, Christie and Lingard, 2006). Recent interest in pedagogy has led to the development of models such as Authentic Pedagogy (Newmann et al, 1996), Productive Pedagogies (Education Queensland, 2001; Hayes et al, 2006) and the Quality Teaching Framework (NSW DET, 2003), which have effectively attempted to identify general classroom teaching practices that will improve and enhance student learning. However, little focus has been placed on how conceptualizations of pedagogy, in relation to school-based learning, can be applied outside of the classroom environment. This is significant given that school-based excursions are an accepted and valued part of most school curriculums. In the relative absence of research that addresses alternative pedagogical sites, this paper will present a model for teaching and learning in art museum settings. The aim of the model is to provide a schema within which intentional pedagogical action that integrates art museum experiences with classroom-based learning, can be facilitated.

As venues for school excursions, museums have traditionally been used as pedagogical sites. This is supported by widespread agreement that relationships between museums and schools are educationally valuable (Anderson, 1997; Bennett, 1994; Fredette, 1982; Gardner 1990; Hooper-Greenhill, 1991; Marsh, 2004; Millar, 1989; Mitchell, 1996; Moffat, 1989; Newsom and Silver, 1978; Stone, 1993; Vallance, 2007; Zeller, 1987). As cultural and educational institutions, museums offer distinctive learning environments and learning opportunities that differ from those available in schools. Focused on objects, their interpretation and their preservation, museums offer open, visually-oriented physical spaces that vary in structure, formality, comfort and welcome (Vallance, 2007) and are moved through by participants (Harrison and Naef, 1985). The characteristic qualities of museum learning have been observed as being: focused on
subject matter connected to collections (Vallance, 2007); self paced and self directed (Heumann Gurian, 1991; Hughes, Jackson and Kidd, 2007), based on participative, exploratory, activity based encounters (Xanthoudaki, 1998; Beer, 1992); and characterized by social interaction (Griffin, 1998, 1999b; McManus, 1987, 1988; Silverman, 1995; Xanthoudaki, 1998; Zeller, 1985). Griffin (1999b, p. 8) identifies the unique learning opportunities offered by museums as: opportunities to closely examine objects or specimens; opportunities for comparison that allow trends and patterns to be deciphered; natural learning processes that incorporate the sharing and communication of ideas and the raising of questions; and opportunities to develop perceptual skills that teach how to gather information from objects and experiences.

In terms of the school-based use of museums as venues for accessing these identified learning opportunities, the active role of teachers in enhancing learning in museums is viewed as crucial (Griffin, 1999b; Housen and Duke, 1998; Newsom and Silver, 1978; Pitman-Gelles, 1982; Stone, 1986). However, studies indicate that teachers have experienced difficulties in exploiting those learning opportunities in optimal ways. The problematic nature of engagement is evident in research that demonstrates that museum utilization by teachers is characterized by:

- a minimal investment of effort (Mathewson, 1994; Stone, 1992a, 1993)
- general use that is not specifically tailored to curricular needs (Griffin, 1998; Stone, 1992a, 1993)
- an inability to integrate museum experiences into classroom learning (Griffin, 1998, 1999b; Hooper-Greenhill, 1991; Stone, 1992a, 1993)
- a focus on the acquisition of information rather than the development of processes of learning (Griffin, 1998, 1999b; Hooper-Greenhill, 1991)
- ill-defined educational objectives (Griffin, 1998, 1999b; Hooper-Greenhill, 1991)
- a concentration on enrichment and social interaction (Brigham and Robinson, 1992; Gottfried, 1980; Laetsch, Diamond, Gottfried and Rosenfeld, 1980)
- a passive, ‘consumer like’ stance (Eisner and Dobbs, 1986; Griffin, 1998; Liu, 2000; Stone, 1992b)
- lack of mutuality and an absence of dialogue (Commission on Museums for New Century, 1984; Eisner and Dobbs, 1986; Grinder and McCoy, 1985; Mathewson, 1994; National Research Center for the Arts, 1975; Newsom and Silver, 1978; Stone, 1992b)
- a lack of self-recognition (Griffin, 1998; Stone, 1992a, 1993; Mathewson, 1994)

These observed characteristics indicate an absence of intentional pedagogical intervention in the museum setting that has been attributed to: a lack of knowledge about how to incorporate the use of museums into classroom activities (Mathewson, 1994; Stone, 1992b); a lack of confidence and experience in the museum environment (Griffin, 1999b; Newsom and Silver, 1978; Walsh Piper, 1989; Zeller, 1983); and, the absence of appropriate education (Griffin, 1999b; Stone, 1993; Zeller, 1983). The
training of teachers in the use of museums is overwhelmingly suggested as a means of increasing involvement (Anderson, 1997; Griffin, 1998, 1999b; Liu, 2000; Moffat, 1989; Newsom and Silver, 1978; O’Connell, 1992; Paine, 1989; Ramsey, 1938; Stone, 1992a, 1993; Walsh Piper, 1989; Zeller, 1983). Such proposals, considered in concert with literature on “museum literacy” (Stapp, 1984), acknowledge that teaching in the museum setting requires a different set of skills, knowledge and experiences than teachers have traditionally possessed. Museum literacy is a notion that implies “genuine and full visitor access to the museum by virtue of mastery of the language of museum objects and familiarity with the museum as an institution” (Stapp, 1984; p. 112). In coining the term Stapp (1984) initially identified schools as failing to provide students with adequate development of museum literacy, attributing this inability to the misunderstood notion that a command of the museum language is spontaneous and innate. Given that the current generation of teachers are products of the kind of schooling that Stapp was commenting on, it is therefore not surprising that the practices of teachers continue to assume universal access to the skills of museum learning.

A Theoretical Framework for Conceptualising Situated Pedagogy in Art Museums

It is acknowledged that the research cited thus far is relatively dated. However, review of the literature evidences a dearth of more recent examinations. The absence of more recent research, is in itself indicative of the lack of attention being given to issues of learning and pedagogy in museum settings. While the last two decades has seen the development of a number of models of learning in museum settings (Bicknell, 1995; Bourdon Caston, 1989; Falk and Dierking, 1992; Gardner and Davis, 1993; Griffin, 1998; McManus, 1991; Worts, 1995), it is significant that few of these models have addressed museum-based learning from the perspective of schools. The theoretical research from which this paper is drawn, focused on the development of a model for learning that considered the pedagogical challenges of situated learning and teaching particularly in relation to regional areas. While it is not possible to articulate the research design, methodology and theoretical framework in its entirety in the scope of this paper, the following section provides a brief overview.

Within the research, a conceptual framework based on the social theories of Pierre Bourdieu was used as a means of examining art museum visiting as a cultural practice in relation to educational practice. This sociological approach enabled the author to engage with the largely unexamined issues that impact upon the ability of teachers to optimally utilize art museum-based learning opportunities. Use of the social theories of Pierre Bourdieu as conceptual framework also enabled activation of the implicated issues of place, social dynamics, time, flow, structures, subjectivities, personal histories, connections, resources and ideas.

According to Bourdieu, social space is an array of relatively autonomous but structurally homologous ‘fields’ in which specific forms of capital are produced, invested, exchanged, accumulated and consumed (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Fields are not real or concrete spaces, but exist as a metaphor for a social site where
people and institutions engage in particular activities. The term ‘capital’ is used to refer to the possession and accumulation of resources. Resources are seen as capital when they become objects of struggle as valued resources and function as a “social relation of power” (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 375). Individuals or groups are distributed in social space and are thus located in the space of social relations according to their position based on the two basic principles of differentiation: “economic capital” and “cultural capital” (Bourdieu, 1998, pp. 5-6; 1984, p. 110). The space of social positions is retranslated into a space of position-takings through the mediation of the space of dispositions (or habitus) (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 7). Likened to a law of direction, the ‘habitus’ an acquired system of preferences, principles of vision and division and a system of durable cognitive structures and schemes of action, that orient the perception of the situation and the appropriate response, allowing distinctions to be made between what is good and bad, what is distinguished and vulgar and so on (Bourdieu, 1998, pp. 8-9).

Two methodological constructs, derived from the social theories of Pierre Bourdieu allowed investigation of cultural practice and education, in relation to school-based museum utilization. The first theoretical construct was a descriptive matrix used as an organizing structure into which specific data obtained from Bourdieu’s study of cultural practice were exhaustively evaluated and sorted. The nine-cell structure of the matrix contained propositional statements derived from Bourdieu’s illustrations of museum utilization as a cultural practice (Bourdieu and Darbel, 1991). The second construct was based on the formula \((\text{habitus})(\text{capital}) + \text{field} = \text{practice}\) (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 101). This formula provided an explanatory framework to explain and articulate the practices of teachers in museums. The interaction of Bourdieu’s key theories within the formula provides an illustration of the relational ways in which the sociological concepts operate, conceptualizing action as determined by the relations between the habitus and capital of individual agents in the fields in which the action is undertaken. Examination of the formula occurred through the application of three propositions derived from each aspect of the formula. These three explanatory propositions, were derived from Bourdieu’s explicit procedures for analyzing fields (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, pp. 104-107). Each proposition referred explicitly to one element of the equation, with connections between the propositions allowing the researcher to connect the dispositions of individuals with the structures imminent in the site, to explain evidently contradictory practices. The three propositions were:

- Interactions between art education and art museums are influenced by structural differences between the two sub-fields;
- Interactions between art education and art museums are influenced by hierarchies of social relations based on forms of capital;
- Interactions between art education and art museums are influenced by dispositions toward learning that are incorporated within the habitus.

Application of the three propositions to the analysis of textual data enabled the study to trace the historical development of art museums and art education, and investigate the significant points of convergence that are implicated in school-based art museum utilization. Areas of field intersection, related to schools, art education,
museums, museum education, and learning, provided the basis for identification of areas of contribution, contest and contradiction. This analysis then enabled the Bourdieuan descriptive map of cultural practice to be revisited, with the derived propositions regarding cultural practice revised, and contextualized in relation to insights from art education and art museums. The final synthesis resulted in a socio-cognitive model for school-based learning in art museums (Mathewson, 2006). The model is presented in Figure 1. In recognition of the social and cognitive aspects of cultural practice that were addressed within the larger research, the term ‘socio-cognitive’ was applied to describe the foundation of the developed model. The term defines the transaction between the social aspects of situated cultural practice and the acts of mind that occur in the art museum setting, contributing to, and determining, the learning experience.

A Model for Learning in Art Museums

As it is the basic structure and implementation of the model that is of pedagogical significance, the original model has been translated and interpreted in terms of pedagogical action in Figure 2. This interpretation is not exhaustive, and does not reflect the conceptual density of the original model (see Mathewson, 2006). However, in focusing on pedagogical objectives, the revised model presents a focused snapshot of the model in practice that illustrates its flexibility and adaptability. Further interpretive development is currently being undertaken to explore other possibilities for adaptation, within and beyond, the museum context.

The Structure of the Model

The model is articulated as a nine cell matrix, the configuration of which ensures that all elements can be inclusively engaged and related. The matrix structure was chosen, as it represents an engaged form for constructing and relating concepts, which is coherent with Bourdieu’s belief that the relational method is the basic tool for imposing the necessary epistemological breaks with both subjectivist and objectivist forms of knowledge. Matrices are structurally stable, while allowing for interactivity and dynamism. They avoid linear modes of thinking, facilitate exploration in any direction, and allow assimilation of knowledge to facilitate relational understandings. The structure of a matrix applies this mode of thinking by considering individual facts within broader sets of relations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OBJECTIVE STRUCTURES</strong></th>
<th><strong>The Visual Arts</strong></th>
<th><strong>Art Museums</strong></th>
<th><strong>Representation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artworks</strong></td>
<td>1.1 The visual arts is a cultural field with an established structure and meaning system, in which artworks are produced. Artworks are visual expressions in a range of physical forms that have symbolic meanings and functions.</td>
<td>2.1 Art museums present artworks to audiences according to an established but contested system. The presentation of artworks in art museums alters their meaning and restricts their accessibility.</td>
<td>3.1 Artworks are represented in art museums according to an institutional classification system. Institutional representations in art museums mediate relationships between individuals and artworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience</strong></td>
<td>1.2 Attitudes and preferences in the visual arts are linked to sustained cultural access gained through family and education. Sustained contact with original works of art establishes a relationship to the visual arts.</td>
<td>2.2 Access to art museums is unevenly distributed. Art museum participation is dependent on recognition of and familiarity with the systems of the art museum sub-field.</td>
<td>3.2 Practice in the visual arts is represented as requiring specialized skills and knowledge. Institutional representations in art museums symbolize worthiness and signal audiences to adopt a reverential approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Competence</strong></td>
<td>1.3 The visual arts require the application of interpretative frameworks of varying sophistication and complexity, to disclose culturally competent meanings. Individuals experience and understand the visual arts differentially through the application of interpretative frameworks.</td>
<td>2.3 Interpretation and appreciation of the meanings of artworks in art museums requires cultural competence. Regular art museum audiences have internalized the cultural competence to decipher and appreciate the meaning of art museum exhibitions.</td>
<td>3.3 Institutional representations of the visual arts in art museums assume prior knowledge and experience. Cultural competence is a field specific disposition that allows representations to be integrated with previous experiences, knowledge and understandings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. A socio-cognitive model for secondary art educational learning in art museums*
**OBJECTIVE STRUCTURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artworks</th>
<th>The Visual Arts</th>
<th>Art Museums</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Establish the structure of the visual arts field.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Establish the nature of the presentation of artworks in art museums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore the nature of artworks as products of the visual arts field that can be interpreted differently</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore the effects of presentation on meaning and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Establish how representations of artworks are constructed</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Explore the mediating operation of representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Establish how representations of artworks are constructed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>The Visual Arts</th>
<th>Art Museums</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Establish different attitudes to, and preferences in, visual arts.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Establish the structure and social situatedness of art museums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore how experiences with visual arts impacts on the development of cultural capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore who goes to art museums, why and the nature of experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Establish the structure and social situatedness of art museums.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Establish the representation of professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore who goes to art museums, why and the nature of experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore approaches to representation/s through practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Establish the representation of professional practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Competence</th>
<th>The Visual Arts</th>
<th>Art Museums</th>
<th>Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Establish the differential requirements of engagement in the visual arts.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Establish the differential requirements of engagement in art museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore existing and new frameworks for interpretation of the visual arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore existing and new frameworks for interpreting and negotiating art museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Establish the differential requirements of engagement in art museums</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Establish how representations are institutionally organised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore existing and new frameworks for interpreting and negotiating art museums</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explore how representations can be related to existing and new knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Establish how representations are institutionally organised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2.* Pedagogical objectives as embedded in a socio-cognitive model for secondary art educational learning in art museums
The structure of the model, with three organizing categories along the horizontal axis and three categories along the vertical axis, recognizes that both objective structures and subjective experiences, contribute to art museum-based learning in ways that cannot be separated. These elements combine within each cell, with the propositions in each cell including two linked statements. Each statement is drawn from the horizontal axis and the vertical axis, respectively. The two statements considered together thus place the individual sense of agency within a structural framework.

The Horizontal Axis

The three components of the visual arts, art museums and representation are placed along the horizontal axis. These components constitute the objective structures implicated in art museum utilization by art education that have been identified within the literature. The three categories are structures, which tend to act according to universal principles derived from associated fields. They are based around specific forms of capital and strategies of relevance to those fields. As each category placed along this axis incorporates outwardly identifiable narratives, notions, histories, discourses, objects, institutions and agents, they represent structures that are collective and thus present a macro-approach.

The first component of the visual arts is considered as a central concern of both art museums and art education and provides a significant area of convergence. The second component of art museums refers to the structure and context in which art museum utilization occurs. It defines art museums as buildings and institutions that present objects to publics according to an established but contested system. The final component of representation recognizes that the organization of culture and the existence of codes within culture are historically and institutionally organized, constituted and implemented by legitimate authorities.

The Vertical Axis

The three components placed along the vertical axis are artworks, art museum audiences and cultural competence. These categories refer to aspects of the cultural practice of museum utilization that are experienced at a subjective level. As such they present a micro-approach that allows consideration of intentionality and individuality.

The category of artworks refers to the cultural objects of artworks, which are the focus of visits to art museums. It conceives artworks as both social artefacts that have a physical existence, and symbolic objects that utilize codes and express meanings that are diferentially recognized and experienced at a subjective level. The second category of audience refers to the individual and social encounter with works of art. It embodies a notion of social involvement and participation as an opportunity that is diferentially realized according to a particular disposition. It further views audience participation as involving an unstated but expected and orthodox way of being. The third category of cultural competence relates to the strategies that agents employ in their negotiation of the cultural space of art museums. While to some degree it is a technical capacity, it is also a proficiency that is internalized and utilized without conscious planning or awareness.
Propositions

The matrix includes three definitional propositions (1.1, 2.2, 3.3) and three pairs of relational cells (1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2). The definitional cells define the organizing categories, while the relational cells enrich the detail and generate more particular investigations. The numbering system has been used to enable ready reference to individual cells.

Each proposition includes two linked statements. The statements outline an instructional objective and an expressive objective (Eisner, 1997), respectively related to the objective structures and subjective aspects of experience placed along the horizontal and vertical axes. These linked statements provide scope for instructional and expressive kinds of activities that enable learners to develop a repertoire of knowledge and skills, while allowing them to create meaning, articulate responses and elaborate on their experiences.

The Model in Practice: An Illustration of Pedagogical Approaches

The propositions, represented in the complete nine-cell matrix of the model are conceptual tools that can be approached in a variety of ways to facilitate the development of experiences that address a variety of needs and allow for engagement at different and particularized levels. The scope, depth and particularization of engagement can be systematically and strategically structured in terms of one cell, a number of cells or all of the nine cells. In practice a number of different paths may be tracked in the interest of generating relevant learning experiences. For example, an initial experience may be constructed using only the definitional cells of the model (cells 1.1; 2.2; 3.3). A more extended focus may be placed on certain components of the model by tracking a path using a particular column or row. Alternatively, more sustained and sophisticated explorations may use a descriptive set, combining five cells, where column and row intersect, to provide a more expansive approach. The model also enables the sequencing of activities. It can be applied in its entirety within a lengthy experience, or can be used across a number of museum visits within a particular time period. Use of the model within the school context, before a visit, or after a visit, can also enable sequenced and related integration into pre- and post-visit classroom-based activities.

To illustrate the integrative possibilities of the model, examples of its application to a well-known, contemporary example will be provided. For this purpose, the international exhibition Monet and the Impressionists will be focused on. Monet and the Impressionists has been exhibited at the Art Gallery of NSW from 11th October 2008 to the 26th January 2009. It is an exhibition of Impressionist artwork that has been drawn from the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston. The blockbuster status of the exhibition attracts many school groups.

The definitional cells are cells 1.1, 2.2 and 3.3. The use of the definitional cells alone provides a foundational introduction to the basic elements of the museum visit. For some students the application of one single definitional cell alone is satisfactory for an initial experience. For example, the use of cell 1.1 would allow students who have
little or no experience of art and artworks to develop a foundational understanding of the visual arts in relation to art museums, and the production of artworks as the focus of art museums. It would be of particular value to students who have not visited an art museum previously, or who had little experience of the visual arts in general. The aim of the cell would be achieved through use of the instructional objective, to focus on examination of the agents and agencies involved in the production of art and its inclusion in art museums, including identification of the artists featured, the artworks they have produced, the role of the audience in interacting with the artworks and the roles of galleries and museums in presenting the artworks. In exploring artworks in this context, use of the expressive objective would focus on exploring the physical and symbolic nature of an artwork, or artworks. Activities would enable students to recognize material qualities of artworks and develop their abilities to interpret symbolic aspects of artworks. Activities using this cell would also enable students to interpret meaning based on their personal experience of artworks, as related to their individual subjectivities. An emphasis on expression would seek and provide an avenue for students to communicate information such as: what the artwork is; who made it; what the artwork is made of; how big the artwork is; what I think it is about; what others think it is about; why we agree or disagree. In the context of Monet and the Impressionist examination could focus on the artworks generally, and thus identify the characteristics of Impressionist artworks and the approach of the Impressionist period, or limit attention to a specific artwork such as Monet’s *Haystacks*, as an exemplar.

Investigations using columns enable emphasis to be placed on the structures involved in art museum experiences. Thus it is considered a means of structuring art museum experiences from an objective starting point. Use of a single column enables focus to be placed on one structure. For example, use of column one, requires the visual arts to be considered in an integrated relation to artworks, audiences and cultural competence. While initially this would involve articulation of the visual arts as a field involving agents and agencies, the examination would be extended by consideration of: artworks as products of the visual arts that have symbolic dimensions that can be experienced and interpreted in various ways; audiences as having varying preferences in, and attitudes to, the visual arts, depending on experience and opportunity; cultural competence as a differing ability to participate in visual arts that is based on the possession of interpretive frameworks.

Application of the first column in *Monet and the Impressionists* would involve initial identification of aspects of the visual arts field as evident in the exhibition. Thus, as explained, it would require identification of the Impressionist artists featured and articulation of the kinds of artworks included in the exhibition. The physical form of the artworks would be identified and the means of expression discussed. Such exploration could identify characteristics of the size of the artworks, the mediums used and the ways in which mediums have been applied. Exploration would further identify the subject matter of the artworks and their relationship to the artists and the world in which they were produced. This could then lead to a general discussion of the role of audiences in accessing and interpreting such artworks. The composition of audiences of the visual arts generally and in relation to *Monet and the Impressionists* should be identified and
different forms of participation, at the time of their production, and in the actual exhibition, observed. Motives for participation could be proposed and considered. The personal participation of learners can also be discussed to establish existing attitudes and preferences and enable strategies aiming at developing relationships. This can involve consideration of the experience of other Impressionist paintings, or painting in general. The discussion of audience motives can then be linked to the requirements being made of audiences by the visual arts and by the artworks presented in *Monet and the Impressionists*. Such discussion can identify the level of sophistication and complexity that characterizes the artwork, and the supporting material found in the exhibition, including labels and catalogues. After first examining initial, experiential responses using existing frameworks of understanding, the symbolic nature of communication can be explored and other interpretive frameworks can be modeled to guide students in accessing a range of meanings.

Investigations using rows enable emphasis to be placed on the subjective ways individuals experience artworks. It is considered a means of introducing art museum experiences to learners who are operating at a largely subjective level. While personal experiences are used as a starting point, attention to the entire proposition requires subjective responses be extended, elaborated and contextualized in relation to structures, systems and shared meanings. For example, the use of the second row would focus on art museum audiences, in relation to the visual arts, art museums and representation. While the investigation would centre on personal aspects of art museum audiences, teaching and learning would objectify the experience of being an audience and the perception of audiences by considering: the relationship of art museum audiences to the art world; how audiences are related to art museums as institutions; and, art museum audiences construct and relate to forms of representation.

Application of the second row during a visit to *Monet and the Impressionists* would initially involve an investigation of the relationships the learners have already established with the visual arts through the experiences they have had as audiences. Explanations of the visual arts field should articulate roles and relationships in ways that provide a foundational understanding of the role and practices of audiences in the visual arts. The experience should then focus more closely on the actual context. Differential levels of familiarity with the presentation of historical European artworks, in a traditional art museum, should first be identified and areas of uncertainty examined. Attitudinal issues can be addressed through the affirmation of different degrees of knowledge and familiarity with the artworks and the nature of display, and a valuing of opportunities to explore things that are not understood or recognizable. This may then lead to a discussion of levels of familiarity with large museums, and with questions of who regularly visits. Audience participation could be related to the historical development of museums and the social roles they have fulfilled, particularly in relation to Impressionist artwork. This examination can also focus on the roles that international blockbusters have had in attracting a mass audience. The final part of the experience would focus on questions of how to approach the representation of the work of the Impressionists. Personal responses would investigate issues of the perception of the value of the artworks and the appropriate ways to approach and look at the artworks.
The question of who determines what the audience see and how they see it would lead the investigation to consider the roles of professionals in communicating those ideas and the practices of audiences in engaging with those representations. In this case, decisions regarding the selection of artists and the representation of a particular view of Impressionism could be focused on. The skills and knowledge of the curator responsible and the featured artists could be objectified and articulated through activities involving dialogue with the living professionals and research related to specific artists.

Significantly, the model, and the approaches outlined above, do not prescribe particular kinds of activities, but instead allow for the development of a range of relevant activities that enable meaningful engagement with the content of the cells. Importantly it provides pathways through an experience that allow for emergent approaches that can be adapted to the developmental needs of the learners involved. The model is thus designed so that teachers could continue to engage in activities that are already part of educational practice in museums. This may include: the recording of immediate encounters; the development of explanations; the use of secondary sources; involvement in discussions; and more innovative approaches such as the use of role play. For example, students can gain a rich understanding of the role of Impressionist artists, their relationship to French audiences of the time and the role of the academies in presenting artists and determining audience reaction, through role-play based on the interpretation of historical accounts. Applied within such activities, the propositions focus attention, constituting statements, or as presented in here, objectives, that require consideration, questioning and contextualization in terms of physical place, relationship to classroom learning, and individual experiences. Focus can be simplified, extended or complexified, through the integration of cells.

**Pedagogical Implications: Environment, Knowledge Integration and Inclusivity**

The pedagogical implications of the approaches, briefly described above, and the content of the cells, can be initially identified in relation to the museum environment, knowledge integration and inclusivity. Reference to these three aspects situate the museum experience within the particular museum environment, recognize the need to link the experience with classroom learning, and enable consideration of the social and cultural aspects of museum learning, as related to the personal experiences of students.

The relational structure of the model allows for flexibility and the development of emergent approaches that are adaptable to different museum environments, while placing art museum experiences in a wider context of relevance. In explicitly addressing subjectivities, the model further acknowledges different social relationships to museums and the museum environment, enabling and facilitating the development of feelings of comfort and competence. In addition, the exploration of a framework that focuses on objects in context, and as presented and represented, acknowledges the constructed and contested nature of the museum environment. It further facilitates the development of new frameworks for understanding.
In addressing the relationship between subject, knowledge and object, significant links are created between visual arts, school-based curriculum and art museums. Higher order thinking is promoted through the integration of elements of the model, and its focused use provides for the development of deep knowledge and deep understanding. The focus made possible by the application of discrete cells further enables the model to potentially achieve the essential goal “to capture attention and hold it for as long as possible, allowing for a new or deeper understanding of some aspect of art” (Hughes, Jackson and Kidd, 2007, p. 686).

The inclusive structure of the model allows a developmental perspective that addresses individuals at different levels. The cell statements clearly value different viewpoints and experiences, while acknowledging that meaning making is central to the museum experience and that all individuals construct meaning in different ways. In addressing subjectivities, the model further facilitates the development of a narrative of the self in public (Chakrabarty, 2001), connecting with, and building on previous knowledge and experience, and anticipating and facilitating future engagement. Development from simple, subjective responses based on immediate feelings, and experiences to the more sophisticated and complex construction of narrative that incorporates the use of framing concepts, awareness of relationships, increased autonomy and the recognition of alternative interpretations is further enabled, through the structure of the model and the linking of propositions within each cell.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the pedagogical action of teachers in museums has been limited by a lack of specific knowledge and skills, and pedagogical models, to purposefully and intentionally utilize the distinctive learning opportunities of museums. The model that has been outlined potentially addresses this difficulty by providing teachers with a flexible schema within which content may be structured and teaching and learning experiences developed. In considering the broader physical, social and intellectual spaces in which engagement is situated, the model provides intentional pedagogical strategies and framed curriculum foci that aim to assist teachers in orienting activities and learner participation in a manner that is consistent with, and inextricably linked to, the principles, philosophies and practices of contemporary education, while integrating current and emerging knowledge from the museum field. In addressing the social issues of museum visiting and providing a cognitive framework for approaching learning, past experiences and perceptions are recognized, connections are made with prior learning, and areas of wider significance addressed. Such empowerment and demystification potentially provides the foundation for transformative relations that enable segments of the population, who have previously felt uncomfortable and unfamiliar with museums, with the opportunity to engage in meaningful learning that encourages ongoing cultural practice. More broadly the research suggests the potential for the further extension of school-based approaches to pedagogy to acknowledge the abundance of rich and accessible pedagogical sites beyond the classroom and the need for the development of frameworks for pedagogy that address the particular teaching and learning requirements of such sites, and their potential in relation to school-based learning.
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