

## Showing the “General Results of Learning” (GLO) and the “Social Results of Learning” (GSO) in an Inclusive Museum

*Ioakimidis Panagiotis*

*(Ionian University, Corfu, Greece)*

**Abstract:** All cultural places, especially museums, form a unique educational field that provides learning experiences connected with entertainment, participation and active engagement in the exhibit’s interpretation.

If a museum wants to manage the participation, the personnel need to be in a position to plan experiences that cause the active participation of the public. The engagement has the biggest impact when those in charge can design and increase the chances for interactivity for all visitors.

Lately, many museums have used a total of different steps that are called GLO’s (Generic Learning Outcomes) to evaluate the impact of their work in learning. Since then, the development of another valuable tool came forth, that of “General Social Outcomes”. The GSO’s were designed to count the social benefits that result from a museum visit, such as the level of interaction between the visitors as a result of commitment with an object or a historic place (Chatterjee H. J., 2013).

Museums have the social responsibility and the ability to affect positively the lives of those who interact and contribute meaningfully in social integration (Dodd J. & Sandell R., 2001).

**Key words:** participation, learning, interactivity, museum

### 1. Introduction

The inclusion refers to the fair and equal participation of all people in all fields of their lives. It may be in school, in society, in the labor market, in a variety of institutions, in programs and services but with no regards to age, sex, ethnic, racial, social, geographic position, language, or economic state (ARC resource pack, 2009).

Inclusion is oriented to creating bonds between people, on all issues over time. It is about an extensive and continuous frame of interaction that uses opportunities so that it takes action in specific fields of public sector as a means to a deliberate creation of a society that participates in a continuous flow of topics (Quick K. S. & Feldman M. S., 2011).

In Greece at the moment, there is a need for redefining purposes and goals at schools and institutes and in Greek society in general. The rise of economic instability, immigration, marginalization of specific population and doubting of values are some of the issues Greek school and Greek society faces and is responsible for handling seriously. The inclusive school that Greek society seeks for is the one that a democratic leader manages, while at the same time the inclusive museum is managed by a capable leader that visions inclusion and will be consisted

by personnel that seeks training and further education, and promotes cooperation and teamwork in the museum and out in society.

The unsuccessful inclusion and the lack of participation can lead people to social exclusion. The promotion of integration demands the analysis and confrontation of all those factors that lower, isolate or exclude humans. These barriers can be different types containing the use of language, social structures, infrastructure and lack of access to services (Bromell D. & Hyland M., 2007).

## **2. Goals and Pursuits**

In an effort of tracking goals and pursuits of GSOs, social results of learning demonstrate indicative ways in which art institutions and cultural organizations affect the broader social life and help on counting and registration of the more widely uses of art and cultural activities. This happens by (Arts Council, n.d.):

- Demonstrating the way in which institutes defend the broader society's benefits.
- Displaying contribution to social cohesion, health and prosperity.
- Proving the connection with widely local and ethnic priorities.

The displaying of the results is in the center of designing and improvement of services. GSO's help also:

- To design, to set up goals and honor the tradition.
- To develop better practices along with aligning with common good for local people and for the priorities of broader politics.
- To develop reflector professionals.
- To encourage cooperation through common priorities.

GSO's assist institutions in describing the impact of their work in different fields of a wide output that are related with the public sector's priorities with (Arts Council, n.d.):

- Stronger and safer communities with improvement of dialog and understanding between teams.
- Support of cultural diversity and identification.
- Encouragement of family bonds and relations while at the same time confrontation of fear for delinquency and antisocial behavior.
- Contribution in preventing and lowering crime rate and reinforcement of public life.
- Stimulating and supporting awareness and participation in local decision making and broader civilian's participation.
- Creation of voluntary and community teams that provide safe and credible public spaces with no exclusions.
- Activation of empowering society through realization of one's rights, benefits and services.
- Improvement of reciprocation of services in local society's needs including other interested.
- Encouragement for a healthy way of living and contribution to mental and body wellness.
- Support caring and reintegration in society.
- Support in elderly care so that their lives are more independent.
- Assisting children and youth enjoying life and contributing positively.

The national frame GSO's developed because the art institutes and cultural hubs must be in a position to prove the benefits of services to governmental and all other concerned. GSO's don't form a tool for cooperation with communities, but instead a tool of designing and measurement of the cooperation with communities (Arts

Council, n.d.).

Through this environment MLA funded a research about possible social impact of museums in the development of cultural participation. The result was the creation of 3 GSO's: stronger and safer community, enhancement of public life, health and prosperity. Each one of these is subdivided in an ensemble of social outcome (MLA, n.d.)

In 2008 MLA North East and North East Regional Museums Hub commissioned CHE Associates to plan and develop a total of indicators that will support the personnel in using frame in programming, output and evaluation of services. These indicators offer guidance, based in real practice that would be (MLA, n.d.):

- Informing the process of programming and the process of review and evaluation.
- Activates museums in recording the difference that make in people's lives as far as stronger and safer communities, health and prosperity and enhancement in public life.

Indicators can be used from an organization in different fields of activity, such as learning, promotion, collections and exhibitions. Furthermore, they contain general questions that can be used as a guide of evaluation for the publication of results. Activities in museums that promote behavior change (personal or societal) involve necessarily learning (active participation and awareness). The field benefits persons and communities creating opportunities for learning. Museums have the ability of helping humans understand better who they are and where they come from. If learning is an integral part of social change, none of the indicators concentrates in official learning or development of specialties (MLA, n. d.).

Health, quality of life and wellness have become the most important priorities for people, communities and governments around the world and have direct effect in shaping politics in a big part of the development world. An important sum of evidence and numerous societal instructions recognize the important role that culture plays and access to cultural heritage, such as civilian's active participation, societal involvement, and the improvement of wellness and satisfaction of life.

Cultural heritage field has the opportunity of getting involved tighter with this broad at zenta and in exchange of benefiting from its power. Museums have impact in wellness though the educational programs, access and promotion. The challenge as in learning is the measurement of special and important contribution of museums in personal and societal wellness (Chatterjee H. J., 2013).

Studies have found that activities that focus in art can lead to low use of drugs, lower level of stay in hospitals, better mental health, societal integration and rising of empathy in professionals in fields of health and mental health (Chatterjee H. J., 2013).

### **3. Research Methodology**

The methodology used in this research, comprised basically of a development in a strategic research and planning. The accurate definition of the research, meaning that educators and museologists know very well the meanings of inclusion, social results of learning and general results of learning along with techniques of inclusion, formed the greatest factors for success in this research. Having as a guide the clear question that arose, special and side goals were identified. The side goals were timely established, countable and qualitative and used strictly for the needs of the research. According to the goals, research methodology was formed and was comprised by questionnaires, by observation and personal contact. The gathering of evidence came from interviews, through e-mailing and by analyzing the answers to the questionnaires. The exact timing of the research was specific: 3

months. In these 3 months both parts of the research were conducted: the primary and the secondary research. In the primary research, success was defined as three out of four main modes were met (Chisnal, 1986):

- Use of questionnaires (questionnaire survey);
- In depth interviews with educators and museologists (depth interview);
- The method of observation (observation);
- Experimentation.

At this point, it has to be remarked another crucial element that is connected directly with the research method that was followed: The way of communicating with the population that was under the research and the maximization of the correspondence to the research. It was made compulsory for the successful outcome of the research that all three ways of communicating with the public to be met:

- Personal Interviews;
- Sending questionnaires by e-mail (mail questionnaires);
- Telephone questionnaires.

In secondary research that took part, the researcher was based on collecting evidence that already existed in and out of schools and museums. The rapid development of new technologies and data processing, had as a result that the information needed by the researcher to handle, to come easy and quick.

#### **4. Conclusion of Research-propositions**

Evaluating the results of the research, the researcher came to expected results. It should be clarified that the place of research was an island of Greece, Corfu with relatively small research sample (102 questioned) but representative of a small town. 69% of educators and 63% of museologists don't know the meanings that were researched. 70% of all who know the meanings and have read similar researches and articles don't know techniques and ways of inclusiveness and how to show the social results of learning. They would however want to get training in new ways of education that seems to be forming very soon. Moreover, 90% of those asked, agreed that no educator or museologist can carry all the weight and the responsibility for personalized teaching in a class, or in a museum with students of different gnostic, mental, language level, and interests. One should be equipped with further knowledge. Obviously, it is made clear in the research that there a need for cooperation of services. This cooperation of schools with different public services (ex.K.E.D.D.Y.) may be enriched with specific private institutes that have more experience in the inclusion. The need for further education and training is obvious and desired.

In conclusion, the ideal and constructive way of communication between school and museum is the cooperative; as it promotes knowledge, and leads to optimization of programs though the feedback that museum take from students. Also, it suggests an alternative way of learning that enhances rather than interfering with learning at school and with the right update for inclusion, all involved sectors would be contented (educators, museologists, students).

Recent years, many museums have used a total of actions that are called GLO's (Generic Learning Outcomes) to evaluate the impact of work in learning. Learning outcomes are the formalities of all those that the visitor acknowledges, understands and can use after the completion of a learning process or museum tour. To continue, GSO's were designed to count the societal benefits that result after a museum visit, such as the level of interactivity with visitors as a result of commitment with an object or historical place (Chatterjee H. J., 2013).

The definition as well as the contribution of cultural heritage sector along with the enhancement of health and prosperity is crucial for the domain, as for the broader society including similar domains such as health care and volunteering. The research has the ability to affect the ways in which museums evaluate community programs of internal range and exterior and mostly to adjust these programs based on the visitors needs (Chatterjee H. J., 2013).

Visitors underline the need for information on works of art during their museum visit. Moreover, they prefer to be informed on the history of art, such as the historic and social frame or the position in the movements in art. Even though visitors are against extensive information, the potential role of educational tools is not doubted and research founding has shown that museums should use them. The respondents stressed that they prefer to have the museum texts next to the artwork. Some visitors mentioned that they don't watch videos or audio interviews due to lack of control on specific educational tools. Some participants would want to watch those videos in their homes or through the internet. Another reason why a visitor omits audio interviews and videos is lack of time. Three out of four visitors didn't choose to watch, because they would need more time (Backer F. D. et al., 2015).

Naturally, the way visitors are experiencing the museum, and therefore what they learn, is affected by a broad range of factors (Nikonanou N., 2006).

The first factor is the personal, which is referred to the person, the visitor and his or her unique and special characteristics, knowledge and experience, to the conditions and the reasons for which makes the museum visit. Furthermore, it refers to the visitors' interests, the personal criteria, the motives, and the ways of communicating and learning. It consists of a special combination of personal experience, interests and knowledge for every single visitor.

Second factor is the social or societal-cultural as is later called, and has to do with communication and social interaction of a visitor with other visitors or others like museum educators, museum staff etc. The museum visitors usually communicate with the museum staff, with their accompanying people or with stranger visitors depending always on the facilities offered and the demonstration, the space and generally the conditions of their visit. All of the above constitute communicative processes in the field of some educational activity or some informal forms of communication.

Finally, the third factor is the natural, which is referred to the material background of the visit, the conceptual organization of space and the function of amplifying events and experiences out of the museum. Apart from the exhibition, which is confronted as a means of communication in the museum with its audience, important role plays the capabilities of the space that offer comfort to the visitor, the chance for isolation from the rest of the visitors, along with the communication with other people in the process of social interaction.

However, Falk and Dierking (2000), talk of a fourth factor, time, as a necessary factor for the learning process to be complete. According to the overall model of Falk and Dierking (2000), the above four factors have direct affect in the visitors personal experience, in the image that will be created by visitors in the specific museum, in their behavior and in the kind of knowledge they will obtain. After a brief review of these theories, it turns out that learning in the museum can be achieved as long as the museum administration realizes and understands its audience and its needs so that exhibitions are created and activities planned in which visitors can interact with the exhibits. They can also observe record, compare, seek and conclude. This way they are given the chance, in a social texture, to cultivate their abilities in the science processes, to develop skills, to confirm, to broaden, restructure their cognitive models and realize meaning, foundations, and rules in their own rhythm and unique way.

Museums of 21st century operate as educational institutes that are formed from the characteristics of a society, reflect its real values, show its identity and architectural value. Modern man is not an observant and passive in the exhibits and in places that demonstrate these, but rather interacts in a way that enhances the link of the museum and society. Modern art museums aim to minimize and even to abolish exclusion that is created in society and that art could soothe (Karayilanoglu G. & Arabacioglu B. C., 2016).

The growth of technologies in social fabric in the midst of the decade of 2000, transformed the participation from something limited and rare to something wide, anytime for anyone and anywhere. More and more cultural places open up and offer to the public their material. They invite people, share and interact. Especially for the cultural institutes that have the order to use their collections publicly, the digitization and the accessibility of the content is made a priority. Furthermore there are chances for the cultural institutes to get distinguished, encouraging the public's participation in the environment of the museum, the library or art centers. Those institutes have something that the internet cannot provide: natural places, authentic items and experienced personnel of a real world. In order for an institute to handle the participation, the personnel should be in a position to create experiences that challenge the active participation of an audience. The participation has the biggest impact, when the people in charge can raise the chances for interactivity in all visitors. That means that every visitor is responsible for contributing in the institution, connect with other people and feel like a devoted and respectable participant. As long as it interests them, this is feasible. However, there are always visitors who don't want to interact, who prefer to avoid signs, who will complain if they are asked to share their story or talk to a stranger. There will always be though visitors who enjoy displayed collections who impart knowledge, who enjoy interactive programs, that allow them to try this knowledge and have a chance to use their voice to continuous talk about knowledge presented (Simon N., 2010).

Participatory techniques are tools that can be used for the confrontation of specific institutional issues so that museums become related, pluralistic, dynamic and sensitive social places. The interactive techniques are additive methods that complete the traditional demonstration of a teaching context. Interactive exhibits, when are implemented with success, promote learning experiences that are unique and specific in the two-way nature and design. Even though there are institutions that have as primary goal the interaction with the exhibits, there are other institutions that interaction comes second and has a supporting role (Simon N., 2010).

Whatever role museums play, the participatory elements should be well planned so that they are useful. The best participatory practices create a whole new value for the institution and its participants and attract the nonparticipants too. The arrangement between the institution and its participants as far as the management of copyright, the results of the techniques and the feedback from the participants, should be met by them. Even if some tools need to be changed during an exhibition, the personnel should always be in a position to submit what is offered with clarity and kindness. In this way, respect is shown for the participants time consumed and abilities. The research by John Falk shows that visitors choose and enjoy museum experiences based on their perceptive ability to reflect and enhance their special ideas (Simon N., 2010).

## **5. Example of Participatory Practice**

The results of participation can be as different as are the goals of an institution in total. These results contain: the attracting of new visitors, the collection and the conservation of content that comes from visitors, the provision of educational experiences to visitors, the producer of attractive methods of marketing, the exhibition of

demonstrations related with the local level and creation of a platform for discussion (Simon N., 2010).

Haarlem Oost for example, a sub-library in Holland wanted to find a way to invite readers to put labels on the books they read. Describing books with phrases as “great for kids”, “boring” or “funny” the readers could contribute to the catalog system, while at the same time they offer recommendations and opinions to future readers. This participatory practice would offer benefits to the institute as well as the public. The challenge was the way of designing this activity with labels. The library created a line of books for each one of the predefined positions. There were build new shelves in the library for the individual labels. When citizens returned books, they would place them in the shelves or the exact positions that were described by the books. The labels were electronic connected with the books in the catalog and new views were made accessible to on-line visitors. There were just a few obstacles like expenses or support. It worked because it was a smart, simple application in the basic idea of labeling. The procedure of an activity of sorting is an extensive way of participation, but that does not mean that it lowers the ability to be of use (Simon N., 2010).

## 6. Conclusions

Taking account of this research, the conclusion that arises is that new ideas are born, offering exciting chances, so that museums can redefine their social role. There are sometimes however, important confusion, misunderstanding and hesitation. The situation is getting worse from the fact that the definitions of social exclusion and social inclusion are wide and developing. Museums have social responsibility and the chance to affect positively the lives of those who interact and contribute to social integration (Dodd J. & Sandell R., 2001).

The ones responsible for the inclusion of new means should think carefully the way electronic devices are used from different people and different teams in society. The web, for example, can be dealt as “global” but its use in reality can differ all over the world. It may be misleading to refer to “internet” as the generalizing of issues as is “disability” or “culture” (Dodd J. & Sandell R., 2001).

The inclusion of new technology with a thoughtful and effective way, can play important part in goal setting in social integration, as far as developments are taken in account in technology, the standards and culture, meaning what can someone do and how. Similarly, it is important to recognize the dynamic of new means, apart from their ability to make easy access through web technology. For example, the internet technologies offer experiences for starters in the field of information and access to learning TPE (in places that could be in museums) from people that are in a disadvantaged position or live in disadvantaged areas. Furthermore, the feedback to the new environment TPE has to do with more that the on-line collections. The design and content of websites, the structure and the positioning of the interactive articles, the language and the flexibility of web collections, must be a part of the web culture they contain. The rising access to collections can raise the participation, fact that will contribute in encouraging of personal creativity and love of learning. In order to achieve this common goal, it must be understandable that the important interactions in reality don’t happen with a fiber optic cable. Instead, they come between the visitors and objects, civilians and communities, persons and their personal view. As long as this idea is voluntarily adopted, the new means will be one of the most important ways of mediation to social change (Dodd J. & Sandell R., 2001).

## References

Arts Council England (n.d.). Ανάκτηση στις 25/7/2019, available online at: <https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/measuring-outcomes/generic-social-outcomes/origins-gsos>.

- Backer F. D., Peeters J., Kindekens A., Brosens D., Elias W. and Lombaerts K. (2015). “Adult visitors in museum learning environments”, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 191, pp. 152–162.
- Bromell D. and Hyland M. (03/2007). *Social Inclusion and Participation: A Guide for Policy and Planning*, Social Inclusion and Participation Group. New Zealand: Ministry of Social Development.
- Chatterjee H. J. (05/2013). “Developing a heritage focused wellbeing measure from generic social outcomes to generic wellbeing outcomes”, University College London, Ανάκτηση στις 30/7/2019, available online at: <https://gtr.ukri.org/projects?ref=AH%2FJ008524%2F1>.
- Dodd J. and Sandell R. (2001). *Including Museums: perspectives on Museums, Galleries and Social Inclusion*, Leicester: Research Centre for Museums and Galleries.
- Falk J. and Dierking L. (2000). *Learning from Museums: Visitors Experience and the Making of Meaning*, USA: Altamira Press.
- Karayilanoglu G. and Arabacioglu B. C. (2016). “The ‘new’ museum comprehension: ‘Inclusive museum’”, in: *International Conference on New Trends in Architecture and Interior Design*.
- MLA (n.d.). “Generic social outcomes. Indicator Bank for museums, libraries and archives”, Ανάκτηση στις 30/7/2019, available online at: [https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/S3D29\\_GSO\\_Indicator\\_Bank.pdf](https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/S3D29_GSO_Indicator_Bank.pdf).
- Quick K. S. and Feldman M. S. (08/2011). “Distinguishing participation and inclusion”, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 272–290.
- Simon N. (2010). *The Participatory Museum*, California: Museum 20.
- Nikonanou N. (2006). “Exhibit and visitor: Forms of communication in cultural sites”, in: Papageorgiou D., Boubaris N. & Mirivili, E. (Ed.), *Cultural Representation*, Athens: Review, pp. 165–185.