UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Guidance for guiding

Professionalization of guides in museums of art and history

Schep, M.

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Schep, M. (2019). Guidance for guiding: Professionalization of guides in museums of art and history.

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (http://dare.uva.nl)

Download date: 24 Oct 2019

CHAPTER 2

What students can learn and experience during a guided tour in museums for art and history

Chapter 2 is based on: Schep, M., Van Boxtel, C., & Noordegraaf, J. (2018). What students can learn and experience during a guided tour in museums for art and history. Submitted for review.
Part of this chapter has been published as: Schep, M. Van Boxtel, C., & Noordegraaf, J. (2015). Wat je kunt leren van een educatieve museumrondleiding. *Cultuur+Educatie*, 42, 33–54.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine learning outcomes that can be worked towards with school groups during guided tours of art and history museums. A specification of these outcomes can guide museum professionals when they want to complement or support the school curriculum and decide upon appropriate ways to convey information about objects and the questions that will be asked. Following a literature study, an expert meeting *(n = 10)*, and a questionnaire for Dutch educators, museum guides, and teacher educators *(n = 23)* two lists of learning outcomes were formulated; this resulted in 20 outcomes for art museums and 12 outcomes for history museums. Four of them were validated for both types of museums and thus were not specific to one type of museum. The learning outcomes were grouped into five categories: (a) affective, (b) attitudes and values, (c) identity, (d) knowledge and understanding, and (e) skills.

INTRODUCTION

A museum tour at the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam sets – among other things – out to make sure that, after their visit, students can identify which techniques the artists used. Consequently, the museum guide[1] starts the tour by telling them that this is what they aim at. She begins with questions about painting, etching, spot welding, charcoal, iMovie; what techniques can be used to create an artwork? The guide chooses artworks that were each made using a different technique, and encourages the students to look closely. How can you spot a certain material: can you see woodgrain, the lustre of marble? How do you recognize a technique: do you see a welded seam, nails, or glue? (Schep & Kintz, 2017). This is only one example of how a museum guide aims at particular outcomes, in this case, to develop students' knowledge about the techniques that can be used to create an artwork.

Over the last decades, more and more education has become a priority for museums (Hooper-Greenhill, 2007). As a setting for education, museums are often considered as places where free-choice learning can occur (Falk & Dierking, 2013) or as informal learning environments (Lord, 2007a). In the museum students have more freedom of movement and thus control over the content than they have in a classroom setting (Falk & Dierking, 2000; Marcus, Woodward, & Stoddard, 2012). Museums, however, also try to connect their educational programs to the school curriculum, in consequently formulating the learning outcomes they aim for during the educational activities. Guided tours that aim to complement or support the school curriculum, outreach sessions in schools, project-based work with schools, and loan boxes are examples of *formal* learning programs that many museums offer.

In this study, we focused on learning outcomes that can be worked towards in the context of guided tours for school

1. In the field of museum education, several terms are used to describe the 'facilitators' of a museum visit, for example, *museum docents, tour guides, museum educators, gallery educators, interpreters, facilitators and museum guides*. In this study, we use the term (museum) *guide* to refer to persons who are paid to engage in daily face-to-face interactions with a group and lead a group through the museum.

groups in art museums and history museums. In order to support the learning processes of the students, museums often deploy museum guides to facilitate the visit (e.g. Best, 2012). The museum guide, tries to connect the visiting students to the collection and help the students to create meaning from all their impressions (Burnham & Kai-Kee, 2011; Wetzl-Fairchild, 1995).

Talking about learning outcomes, we must note that the educational function of museums is a contested issue (e.g. Kristinsdóttir, 2017). The last decades, acknowledging the active role of visitors in the construction of interpretations, learning in a museum has been conceptualized as situated transformative experiences that contribute to the development of understandings, attitudes and interests (e.g., Burnham & Kai-Kee, 2011; Falk & Dierking, 2013; Hooper-Greenhill, 2007; Twomey Fosnot, 1998). In the context of the "new museology movement", museums were encouraged to become active agents of societal change and empowerment, responding to new challenges of a diverse society (Sandell, 1998). In this contribution, we depart from the socio-constructivist notion that learning is both personal and socially situated. We are aware of the research that shows that the learning, memory, and enjoyment of each child in the museum is often highly individual, even when all students partake in the same program (Anderson, Piscitelli, Weier, Everett, & Taylor, 2002). And, although some scholars (e.g. Hussey & Smith, 2002) argue that learning outcomes have been misappropriated for managerial purposes, we depart from the idea that specification of learning outcomes can help museum guides decide upon appropriate ways to convey information about objects and the questions that will be asked. Furthermore, it is important for the designers of educational programs, because teaching is more effective when it is directed by clear goals (Burnham & Kai-Kee, 2011), and for teachers, who have to realize the meaningful integration of the museum visit in the curriculum of the students. Last, clearly defined learning outcomes are needed to conduct research on the effects of guided tours on students' learning.

Drawing on the work of Allan (1996), we use the term "learning outcome" to describe what can be learned during a guided tour in a museum. Allan concludes that "the use of outcomes emphasizes student achievement and affirms that curriculum planning should begin with what is learnt rather than what is taught" (1996, p.104). Based on a review of the

literature, which is presented below, we defined learning outcomes as the affects, attitudes, values, identity, knowledge, understanding, and skills students can develop when engaged in a guided tour in art museums and history museums.

According to Falk and Dierking (2000), the type of museum influences the learning process, and museum educators should consider the specific character of a museum when specifying the learning outcomes they aim to achieve. There are some similarities and differences between art museums and history museums. For example, they both exhibit objects that are the product of human culture. However, in art museums the objects are regarded as works of art, whereas in history museums the objects are used as a reflection of a certain period of time. This distinction is not always this evident: artworks are often a product of history and art museums also pay attention to the historical context in which the artworks emerged. A comparison between learning outcomes in art museums and history museums may be valuable because it provides insight into the extent to which learning outcomes are specific to one type of museum, or are more generic and applicable to both types of museums. Most studies of learning in the museum focus on science museums and centers; fewer studies focus on learning in art museums and history museums (Andre, Durksen, & Volman, 2017; Falk & Dierking, 1992; Hooper-Greenhill & Moussouri, 2000). Additionally, Falk and Dierking (1992, 2013) indicate that school groups are much less researched than family groups, while for many children school field trips are their first encounter with museums.

The above leads to the following research question: *Which learning outcomes are considered suitable to work towards during a guided tour with a school group in art museums and history museums?*

METHOD

This mixed methods research consists of three steps: (1) a review of the literature, (2) an expert panel meeting, and (3) a validation through a questionnaire. First, based on the literature on learning in the museum, particularly the literature on learning in art museums and history museums, we identified learning outcomes. Next, the learning outcomes were discussed during an expert panel meeting, which mainly resulted in the rephrasing and subdivision of the learning outcomes.

Finally, in an online questionnaire, other experts were asked to rate the learning outcomes. Based on the results of this questionnaire we defined two final lists of learning outcomes that are suitable to work towards with students during guided tours. Below we will further discuss the specifics of the three research steps.

We want to note that the learning outcomes that we define for art and for history museums are not necessarily all relevant or achievable for every guided tour. They are meant as a scaffold for museum educators and guides to select and further specify their own set of learning outcomes that suits the specific collection, exhibition and mission of the museum.

Categorization of the Learning Outcomes

In the literature on learning outcomes and learning goals, several classifications are used. For example, Bloom's taxonomy, as well as the revised version of his taxonomy by Anderson and Kratwohl et al. (2001), and the Generic Learning Outcomes (GLOs) (Research Centre for Museums and Galleries, 2003). We organized the learning outcomes in five categories: (a) affective, (b) attitudes and values, (c) identity, (d) knowledge and understanding, and (e) skills.

Our definition of the learning outcomes categories closely resemble the GLOs, but we decided to add the categories Affective and Identity. Affective, a category in Bloom's taxonomy, more or less replaces the GLO category of Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity. In Bloom's taxonomy the Affective domain also consist of attitudes; however, consistent with the GLOs, we created a separate category for attitudes. Creativity was separated from the category of Enjoyment because we rather categorize creative thinking as a skill (Van De Kamp, Admiraal, Van Drie, & Rijlaarsdam, 2015). We use Identity as a single category because learning outcomes related to identity formation are often mentioned in the literature on learning in art and history museums (e.g., Greene, Kisida, & Bowen, 2014; Grever & Van Boxtel, 2014).

Context of this Study

This study is part of a larger project on teaching and learning in the context of guided tours for school groups in art and history museums, a collaborative project of the Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam, the Van Gogh

Museum, and the University of Amsterdam, all based in the Netherlands. The Rijksmuseum combines art and history; the Stedelijk Museum and Van Gogh Museum are both art museums. The project focuses on the role of the museum guide as facilitator of the museum visit for school groups. In order to get a grasp of what the museum guides' role entails, understanding of the particularities of museums as a learning environment, and insights in the possible learning outcomes are essential.

Step 1. Qualitative Literature Review

In our search for literature we focused on empirical studies, however, such studies are limited in the context of learning during guided tours in art and history museums. Therefore, we looked into the broader literature on museum education searching for learning outcomes that are mentioned in these books and articles. We used, among other sources, the much quoted works of Hein (1998), Hooper-Greenhill (1995, 1999, 2007a), Falk and Dierking (1992, 2000, 2013), Burnham and Kai-Kee (2010), and Marcus et al. (2012), and journals that include many articles on learning in museums, such as *Journal of Museum Education*, *Visitor Studies*, and *Museum Management and Curatorship*. The lists of references of these publications were used to find additional literature.

Step 2. Expert Panel Meeting

A convenience sample was used to select six educators from the partnering museums and four teacher educators in art education and history education from different institutes in the Netherlands. We selected museum educators, because they have to think about what students can and are expected to learn during guided tours, and teacher educators because they are experts in formulating learning outcomes that are characteristic of and attainable for the domain of art and history.

First, the experts wrote down which learning outcomes they consider suitable to aim for during guided tours in art museums and history museums. Next, learning outcomes of the literature study were presented to the experts, which was followed by a group discussion. The experts discussed whether there are specific goals for these types of museums, about the formulation of the outcomes, and about suggestions

for additional learning outcomes. The group discussion was transcribed and the written contributions of the experts were collected. Based on the input of the experts the preliminary lists were adjusted.

Step 3. Questionnaire

An online questionnaire was used to validate the two lists of learning outcomes. When experts are used for validation, five experts are the minimum; when aiming for higher reliability, ten experts are advisable (Lynn, 1986). The group of experts consisted of museum educators, teacher educators, and museum guides. We aimed to recruit ten participants for each type of museum.

Based on recommendations by educators of the partnering museums, we invited ten museum educators for each type of museum, across the Netherlands. Furthermore, ten teacher educators in art and ten teacher educators in history were asked to participate, all recommended by teacher educators at the University of Amsterdam. All experts that agreed to participate received a link to the questionnaire. Two participants (one teacher educator and one educator) filled in the questionnaire for both types of museums because of their dual expertise. Three of them filled in the questionnaire, but their answers were not processed due to technical failure. Instead of asking other teacher educators or museum educators, we decided to invite three museum guides to broaden the expertise of our sample.

In the questionnaire, we asked the experts to rate the learning outcomes on a four-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*very*). Three criteria were used: (1) suitable, "do you think this learning outcome is suitable to work towards during a guided tour of an art museum/a history museum?", (2) achievable, "do you think this learning outcome is achievable during a guided tour of an art museum/a history museum?", and (3) clearness, "do you think the formulation of the learning outcome is clear?" Most learning outcomes on the list were not empirically researched in the context of a guided tour, but mentioned in the literature on museum education. We asked the experts to estimate the achievability of the learning outcome, in order to get a better understanding of what experts think are realistic goals for guided tours. Following these questions about the learning outcomes, the experts had the opportunity to make remarks and offer suggestions for

improvement. Last, the participants were asked whether any learning outcomes were missing from the questionnaire.

The content validity index (CVI) of each item was calculated based on the experts' ratings. Consistent with other studies (see Hyrkäs, Appelqvist-Schmidlechner, & Oksa, 2003), the CVI score was computed by summing the number of experts who rated an item with a "3" or "4" and dividing the result by the total number of raters. Items were considered adequate if there was more than 79 percent agreement, questionable if there was between 70–79 percent agreement, and unacceptable if there was less than 70 percent agreement. Learning outcomes that were poorly formulated but judged suitable and achievable were adjusted using the comments and suggestions of the experts. Based on the CVI scores two final lists of learning outcomes were drawn up.

RESULTS

First, the review of the literature will be discussed, next the outcomes of the expert panel meeting, and last the results of the validation through the questionnaire.

Learning Outcomes of a Guided Museum Visit

Museum visits provide students the one-off experience of learning with (authentic) objects. The historian Huizinga (1950) coined the term "historical sensation" to describe the unique capacity of authentic historical objects to evoke the past. A similar argument can be found in literature about art museums. When confronted with art, people can be totally absorbed by the artwork, or a sudden fascination can arise. Csikszentimihalyi and Hermanson (1999) argue that, under the right conditions, a museum exhibition or particular objects can induce a "flow experience", a state of completely focused motivation. Several researchers argue that the engagement evoked by objects can be used in education. Museum objects can attract the attention of students, can create an affective response, are anchors to remember information, and can arouse curiosity and explorative behavior, such as asking questions and physically exploring objects (Grever & Van Boxtel, 2014; Hargreaves, 1995; Leder, Belke, Oeberts, & Augustin, 2004; Leder, Gerger, Dressler, & Schabmann, 2012; Marcus et al., 2012; Spock, 2010).

Learning in museums is characterized by storytelling, articulating experiences, looking at objects, and "learning by doing". Activities in museums are often hands-on and directed at interaction, playing, and bodily engagement; during guided tours, students have to draw, touch, portray or smell something, and make meaning of all these sensory experiences (Hargreaves, 1995; Hooper-Greenhill, 1999; Knutson, Crowley, Russell, & Steiner, 2011; Marcus et al., 2012; Piscitelli & Weier, 2002; Spock, 2010; Stoddard, Marcus, Squire, & Martin, 2015). Education in museums has also been called "the art of asking questions" (Wartna in Grondman, De Vreede, Laarakker, & Reydon, 2010, p. 389). By asking questions, museum guides start a dialogue with students and help them to engage in meaningful learning activities, such as reflecting, activating their knowledge, emotions, interest, and experience, empathizing with others, and looking at things from different perspectives (Dysthe, Bernhardt, & Esbjørn, 2013; Hubard, 2015).

A shared idea in the field of museum education is that museums are not the best places to learn new facts and concepts (DeWitt & Storksdieck, 2008; Hein, 1998; Hooper-Greenhill, 2007). Nonetheless, several studies show that a museum visit can have a positive influence on the acquisition of factual knowledge and learning of new concepts (DeWitt & Storksdieck, 2008; Greene et al., 2014). Research shows that highly structured visits, which guided tours can be, appeared to result in greater cognitive learning, while less structured visits appeared to produce more positive attitudes (Falk & Dierking, 1992, 2013).

Most scholars in the field of museum education consider learning outcomes related to attitudes, identity, and affective outcomes as the more obvious results of a museum visit than cognitive ones (e.g., Greene et al., 2014; Lord, 2007b). Learning in the museum can be a transformative experience during which people can develop new attitudes, interests, preferences, beliefs, values, and motivation for a return visit (Falk & Dierking, 2013; Barry Lord, 2007). Falk and Dierking (1992), however, also note that for children the museum visit can, besides fun, be frightening because of the physical settings of museums. Pre-visit preparation, to become more familiar with the setting, can reduce these feelings of anxiety and nervous behavior. Several authors argue that a museum visit can enhance people's self-esteem, can contribute to the development of people's individual and group identity, and can alter how people look at their own environment and the world

(Anderson, 2003; Chen, 2007; Foreman-Peck & Travers, 2013; Hein, 1998; Hooper-Greenhill, 2007b; Leinhardt & Crowley, 2002; Leinhardt, Tittle, & Knutson, 2002; Luke & Adams, 2007; Ritchhart, 2007).

In addition to the abovementioned learning outcomes that more or less suit both art museums and history museums, there are learning outcomes that are specific to each type of museum. These museum specific outcomes mainly concern skills and specific types of knowledge.

Learning outcomes in history museums

Empirical studies of learning outcomes in history museums are scarce (Savenije, Van Boxtel, & Grever, 2015). However, many publications examine learning in history museums in a broader sense (e.g., Grever & Van Boxtel, 2014; Marcus, et al., 2012; McRainey & Russick, 2010). In these publications, historical understanding and thinking skills are often named as learning outcomes of a museum visit.

Several researchers argue that authentic objects in museums show students the “proof of history” and can therefore contribute to their understanding that “it really happened” (Castle, 2002; Filene, 2010; Taylor & Twiss Houting, 2010). Storytelling plays an important role in museums. Stories can evoke emotions that lead to the activation of memories; furthermore, information presented in stories is better processed and remembered by students (Bedford, 2001, 2010; Falk & Dierking, 2000; Spock, 2010). When objects and the stories connected to the objects are placed in a historical context, a guided tour can also contribute to the acquisition of historical knowledge and a rich image of historical events and periods from the past. Museums can be a suitable place for this because they can make history personal and imaginable (Grever & Van Boxtel, 2014; Marcus et al., 2012). A concept related to this is "historical empathy", the skill to imagine oneself in a certain historical situation or as an historical figure in order to understand how life was for people in different times and places (Marcus et al., 2012).

Jones (2016) reasons that the *experience of authenticity* in the case of historic objects is related to the ability of “old things” to provide a sense of continuity and connection with the past, and to mediate networks of relations across time and space. Identification of change and continuity are considered key aspects of historical thinking. In a dialogue about

the objects with a museum guide, students can learn about change and continuity, and about differences and commonalities between the past and the present (Chen, 2007; Grever & Van Boxtel, 2014; Marcus et al., 2012; Savenije & De Bruijn, 2017;Taylor & Twiss Houting, 2010).

Furthermore, the current dynamic approach of culture and heritage (Frijhoff, 2007; Smith, 2006) emphasizes that museums should not present an essentialist story about the meaning of a specific art or historical object; they should instead keep in mind and work with the awareness that there is a continuous and social process of meaning making, multiple perspectives, and visitors who use the space to actively create their own meaning (Burnham & Kai-Kee, 2011; Grever & Van Boxtel, 2014). In a similar way, Rogoff (Nollert, Rogoff, De Baere, Dziewior, & Esche, 2007) argues that art museums should move beyond acting as a vehicle of established values, and need to be a place of dialogue. Museums make conscious decisions regarding which objects they display and which objects they do not display. Artist Wilson noted that "what they put on view says a lot about a museum, but what they don't put on view says even more" (Fusco, 1994, p. 148). When a museum guide discusses the choices that are made when constructing an exhibition, students can develop insight into the fact that historical narratives are not "found" but constructed and that there are multiple perspectives (Castle, 2002; Grever & Van Boxtel, 2014; Marcus et al., 2012; Stoddard et al., 2015; White, 1987).

Learning outcomes in art museums

Authors who write about learning in art museums see the value of these museums in the opportunity they give for experiencing art in its real physical manifestation, an emotional and aesthetic experience, and the further development of skills and attitudes (e.g. Greene et al., 2014; Luke & Adams, 2007). In their review study about learning in art museums Luke and Adams (2006) clustered learning outcomes in the following categories: learning about content, learning about ourselves and others, learning how to engage in aesthetic perception, and learning how to learn. Key learning outcomes of a museum visit appear to be skills, such as "learning how to look", (creative) thinking skills, and appreciation of art and the craftsmanship or artist.

Activities in art museums regularly focus on carefully looking at art, discussing specific objects, and reflecting on

the emotions these objects evoke (Durant, 1996; Hubard, 2014; Piscitelli & Weier, 2002; Weier, 2002). Greene et al. (2014) performed one of the few empirical studies of learning outcomes of a guided tour with students in an art museum. In this study the students participated in a one-time guided tour with a museum guide who facilitated the student-led discussion; the guide provided extra information on request. Both the work of Greene et al. (2014), and a three-year quasi-experimental study by Burchenal and Grohe (2007), in which Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS) were used, showed learning effects for critical thinking. Greene et al. (2014) found that the students who got a museum tour showed more instances of observation, interpretation, association, comparison, flexible thinking, and evidence. Therefore, talking about art in the context of a guided tour is one of the ways to further develop these critical thinking skills or to practice it. Creative thinking skills are explained as the skill to develop different solutions and consider different possibilities for solving a problem (Cottrell, 2011). Other skills that are often mentioned are looking skills or "visual literacy" (Burchenal & Grohe, 2007; Csikszentimihalyi & Robinson, 1990; Luke & Adams, 2007). Visual literacy, a term coined by Debes in 1968, refers to the skill to discriminate, interpret, and analyze visible actions, objects, images, and symbols (Avgerinou & Ericson, 1997).

Furthermore, Greene et al. (2014) found evidence that children can develop historical empathy and tolerance, explaining that these outcomes suit art museums because art museums show a diversity of ideas, peoples, places and time periods. In art museums, students have the opportunity to experience art and imagine how life was for people, for example the artist, in different times.

Expert Panel Meeting

The input of the experts closely resembled the two lists that were formulated based on the review of the literature. For example, consistent with Greene et al. (2014), the panel considered art museums as places where students become aware of personal, societal, and moral issues, gain insight into the role of the artist in society, and can develop more tolerance. Moreover, the experts emphasized that enjoyment and curiosity are two of the most important goals of a museum visit, and that reaching these goals can help to reach other goals. For instance, according to the expert panel,

curiosity and interest can cause students to ask questions. These questions can be basic, such as “what is this?”, or “is this real?”, but they can also lead to more complex questions about art and history. Furthermore, the panel suggested adding two more metacognitive learning outcomes to both lists: “the student learns which strategies you can use to learn in a museum,” and “the student learns to work together and learn from each other.”

However, most changes to the initial list were caused by the experts’ feedback on the formulation of the learning outcomes; they argued that the formulated outcomes of the preliminary list were too comprehensive. Therefore we rephrased and subdivided some of the learning outcomes which resulted in 22 learning outcomes for art museums and 18 learning outcomes for history museums.

Questionnaire

Out of the list of learning outcomes comprised after the expert panel meeting, 12 learning outcomes were validated for history museums (see Table 1) and 20 were validated for art museums (see Table 2). Four learning outcomes can be found in both lists, for example, “a pleasurable experience” and “develops curiosity and interest” were unanimously confirmed for both types of museums.

The criterion *suitable* was decisive to determine which learning outcomes were included in the lists. For example, when experts expressed their doubts about the achievability of an outcome, but scores indicated that the outcome was evaluated as suitable, the learning outcome was approved for the list. One of the arguments put forward ty the experts was that some of the learning outcomes are too ambitious for a guided tour, or in the best case only possible with students of upper secondary education. Another argument the experts used was that these outcomes are more appropriate to address in the classroom. For example, “learns to critically analyze representations and stories of the past.”

In some cases learning outcomes were rephrased, subdivided, or merged because low CVI-scores, mostly because the experts indicated that the formulation was too extensive, vague, or not distinctive enough. For example, the learning outcome “acquires insights in the ways the past has meaning in the present” became “acquires insight into the ways in which people in the present address the past.”

For both types of museums two learning outcomes related to identity were merged into one, because experts argued that they were too much alike. In two cases a learning outcomes was rephrased, submitted for approval to three of the experts, and validated thereafter. For history museums, three learning outcomes were rejected and removed from the list, whereas only one learning outcome for art museums was directly rejected by the experts. For both museums "the student develops learning strategies for learning in the museum" was disapproved. For history museums, the learning outcomes "learns to work together with and to learn from others", and "learns to give a reasoned opinion about past" were rejected. The latter was not validated. One of the experts argued that it should never be the goal of history education to learn students to have an opinion about history.

TABLE 1 Suitable learning outcomes of a guided tour in history museums

CATEGORY	LEARNING OUTCOME
	The student…
Affective	1. has a pleasurable experience during the guided tour*
Attitudes and Values	2. develops curiosity about and interest in history* 3. develops tolerance towards other perspectives, cultures and times*
Identity	4. learns about himself, others and the world*
Knowledge and Under-standing	5. develops the awareness that there is evidence of historical events 6. acquires knowledge of historical facts, concepts, people, developments, and events 7. acquires insight into the ways in which people in the present address the past*
Skills	8. develops historical empathy 9. learns to critically analyze representations and stories of the past 10. learns to ask historical questions 11. learns to place objects and events in a historical context 12. learns to connect the past, the present and the future

Note. Learning outcomes with a * are validated for both history museums as art museums.

TABLE 2 Suitable learning outcomes of a guided tour in art museums

CATEGORY	LEARNING OUTCOME
	The student…
Affective	1. has a pleasurable experience during the guided tour*
Attitudes and Values	2. develops curiosity about art and interest in art* 3. develops appreciation for art 4. develops tolerance towards other perspectives, cultures and times* 5. gains confidence to express himself
Identity	6. learns about himself, others and the world*
Knowledge and Under-standing	7. learns to understand that art is a subjective expression 8. learns to understand that sensory experiences and knowledge about art contribute to a better understanding and appreciation of art 9. acquires knowledge about concepts, artists, techniques and the historical and social context 10. develops awareness of personal, social and moral issues 11. acquires insight into the beliefs of the artist and the role of the artist in art and society 12. acquires insight into the ways people in the present address the past*
Skills	13. learns to situate the emotions, the thinking and the acts of an artist in an art-historical, historical and social context 14. learns to empathize with an artist and understand why an artist decides to make a certain work of art 15. develops critical and analytical thinking skills 16. learns to express an opinion about art 17. learns to ask questions about art 18. develops creative thinking skills 19. develops visual literacy 20. learns to work together with and to learn from others

Note. Learning outcomes with a * are validated for both history museums as art museums.

DISCUSSION

The lists of learning outcomes must be understood in the context of the type of learning environment that characterizes art museums and history museums. Authentic objects have a central role and distinguish museums from the classroom environment; children learn with, and about these objects. Whereas objects in art museums are often primarily used as aesthetic objects of contemplation, objects in history museums are predominantly used to tell stories about historical events, as an opening to a historical period, or for historical inquiry. This difference is reflected in the two lists of learning outcomes. The list for art museums indicates that these museums can be places where children learn to carefully look at art, express their opinion, and further develop skills, such as creative thinking and visual literacy. In contrast, in history museums, children can learn to contextualize objects, make comparisons between the past and the present, and critically analyze representations of the past.

In this study, four learning outcomes were found to be appropriate for both types of museums: a pleasurable experience, development of tolerance, learning about yourself, others and the world, and insight into the way people in the present deal with the past. An explanation for these shared outcomes may lie in the fact that art museums and history museums sometimes have similar collections. In these museums students come into contact with art and authentic objects that are the product of human culture, and the learning activities and learning outcomes reflect this. Students acquire knowledge through conversations and stories about objects. They carefully look, contemplate, compare, contextualize, and analyze objects. Nevertheless, although there are some similarities, especially learning outcomes related to knowledge have to be further specified by each museum, based on their own collection and exhibitions.

A difference between the two lists is the disparity in the number of learning outcomes: 20 for art museums and 12 for history museums. This can partly be explained by the fact that as a result of the validation some of the learning outcomes for history museums have been compressed, for instance, five learning outcomes were merged into two, whereas for art museums two learning outcomes were split into four. Furthermore, while the categories “knowledge and understanding” and “skills” for art museums contain several learning out-

comes that are also on the list for history museums, they also contain outcomes related to the artist and creativity, topics that do not figure as prominently in history museums. Consequently, the list for art museums is characterized by a larger variety of types of knowledge and skills.

Several learning outcomes were evaluated as suitable but had lower scores on the achievable criterion. A number of times the experts remarked that learning outcomes were more appropriate to address in the classroom; for example, "learns to critically analyze representations and stories of the past." There could be several explanations for this. The experts think that there is not enough time to go in depth into a case, museum educators and museum guides lack expertise in teaching this skill in a museum context, or exhibitions do not facilitate such an approach. However, such outcomes are stressed in the recent literature on pedagogy in history education. Another recurring remark by the experts is that they think a single visit probably is not enough to expect (large) learning effects. This is related to a point made by Falk and Dierking (1992), who explain that the intended goals of the museum often are not reached, because of the complexity of the visitors' museum experience. And, as noted above, the outcomes of a museum visit are often highly individual (Anderson et al., 2002). Nevertheless, there is some evidence, however, that a single visit results in several learning outcomes that are included in our lists (e.g., Greene et al., 2014), for example, a pleasurable experience, curiosity and interest, development of tolerance, acquiring of knowledge, critical thinking skills, and historical empathy. We agree with Falk and Dierking (2013) that learning is a cumulative process that does not begin or end in the museum. Furthermore, with our lists of learning outcomes we do not want to say that these outcomes need to be assessed during or after the guided tour. Some outcomes can be achieved in a short term, whereas others, for example the outcomes related to identity or awareness of moral issues, are for a longer term. Other researchers suggest that learning outcomes improve when the museum visit is well embedded in the curriculum (Burchenal & Grohe, 2007; Wright-Maley, Grenier, & Marcus, 2013). Therefore, collaboration between schools and museums is essential in order to optimize children's learning. The learning experience in the museum should build upon prior knowledge and experiences, which is a continual process that goes back and forth.

This study has its limitations. Even though according to the literature five to ten participants are considered sufficient for a validation by experts (Lynn, 1986), it can be noted that the number and nationality of the participants in this in study is not representative of the diversity (for example, differences in size, collection, vision) of art museums and history museums in general. Although the identification of potential learning outcomes was based upon international literature and categories that are used internationally, knowledge of the Dutch curricula for history and art education may have shaped the response and suggestions for revisions from the professionals that participated in the study. A broader problem in this field of research is the lack of available empirical studies that show which learning outcomes are really achievable in particular contexts. Hooper-Greenhill and Moussouri (2000) stated that it is possible that there is research on this topic – for example, conducted by museums themselves – but that it is typically not published. It appears that this situation has not changed.

CONCLUSIONS

The two lists offer an overview of learning outcomes that have been evaluated by museum guides, museum educators, and teacher educators as suitable to work towards during a guided tour of art museums and history museums. The results of this study can be used to design follow-up studies that, like Greene et al. (2014), examine whether the learning outcomes can be supported by empirical evidence. The presented learning outcomes can also support museums and teachers in the design and evaluation of their museum tours and particular approaches. Depending on the collection, the exhibition, the museum, and the preferences of the teacher and the group, choices can be made to aim for one or more learning outcomes – further specified according to level of the group– during a guided tour.

Moreover, this study sheds more light on the role of museum guides as facilitators of the learning processes of students. For example, if the goal is to work towards learning outcomes such as “critically analyze representations of the past”, “critical and analytical thinking skills”, and “insights in the ways people in the present deal with the past”, the museum guide should be capable of stimulating students to engage in learning activities that help to reach this goal. The guide

has to support them to explore the object, contextualize and compare objects, and ask them thought-provoking questions. In our next research these insights will be used to create a profile of competencies for museum guides.

The two lists with learning outcomes are meant to supply a scaffold for museum guides, museum educators, and teachers. They are not meant to become a cage that strengthens the authoritative guidance of students that visit a museum. The development of affects, attitudes, values, identity, knowledge, understanding and skills in the context of a guided tour should be a dialogic process between the museum guide and the students in which meanings are negotiated and co-constructed.