An Interdisciplinary Examination of the Interpretation and Delivery of Social Inclusion in the Arts

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of
the University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in
Philosophy

by

Victoria Catherine Durrer

December 2008

ABSTRACT

Britain's current Labour government has tied the arts to its broader agenda of promoting social inclusion (DCMS 1998; DCMS 2000). This thesis takes this policy shift as a starting point and critically interprets the nature of the collective and individual understandings of culture it makes evident. Informed by the work of Arnold (2003 [1867-69]) and Williams (1958), it considers how such apparently contradictory schools of thought are implied not only in Labour's cultural policy for inclusion, but also in its delivery within the arts, a field perceived to have its own inherent issues of exclusivity and inclusivity (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991). Employing methodologies from art history and the social sciences, the thesis takes an interdisciplinary approach to contextualise the development and practice of the social inclusion agenda within the arts (Silver 1998; Hooper-Greenhill 2000a; Bevir and Rhodes 2003). In this way, the research aims to add two key areas of consideration to the debate on social inclusion and the arts: the community or the 'field' of the arts and the individual practices within that field (Bourdieu 2000). The thesis looks at case study projects in three art galleries in Liverpool: the Bluecoat, Tate Liverpool, and the Walker Art Gallery. By contextualising the historical developments of each organisation, the thesis examines how each gallery, its staff and its local public may be interpreting the policy of social inclusion in 'real' terms (Bevir and Rhodes 2003). Through semi-structured interviews with both practitioners and participants involved in the interpretation and subsequent delivery of policy and through the participant observation of particular projects, this research examines the interpretation of social inclusion within practice. The provision of access to art galleries for individuals labeled 'socially excluded' is not necessarily deemed vital to practitioners or even all participants; rather it is provision of access for individuals who may not feel comfortable in an arts setting. The perception of art's exclusivity is seen to change via the different capacities in which both the arts organisations and the individuals working within them may allow perceived boundaries of exclusion to be negotiated. Opposed views on the value of culture are actually conjoined to promote forms of inclusion that are mediated and shaped by 'interpretive communities' (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a). By highlighting the negotiated nature of exclusion as a process of learning (Wenger 1998), this study aims to contribute to the construction of a more reflective practice in the arena of social inclusion and the arts.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

GLOSSARY

AB	Upper middle and middle class category of social class
ACE	Arts Council England
ACGB	Arts Council Great Britain
ACENW	Arts Council England Northwest
ANON	Anonymous
BC	The Bluecoat
CACI	Britain-based marketing research company
CEMA	Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts
DCMS	Department of Culture, Media, and Sport
DE	Working class and low-level subsistence category of social class
DH	Department of Health
ECOC	European Capital of Culture
EEC	European Economic Community
ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
EU	European Union
FACT	Foundation for Art and Creative Technology
GLLAM	Group for Large Local Authority Museums
LARC	Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium
LCC	Liverpool City Council
MAA	Merseyside Arts Association

MCC	Merseyside County Council
MDC	Merseyside Development Corporation
Mencap	UK Charity for people with learning disabilities
MORI	Market and Opinion Research International
MTF	Merseyside Task Force
NHS	National Health Service
NMGM	National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside
NML	National Museums Liverpool
RMTF	Regional Museums Task Force
SETF	Social Exclusion Task Force
SEU	Social Exclusion Unit

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In a sociological study of visitors and non-visitors to European art galleries in the 1960s, Bourdieu and Darbel (1991: 112) state, "Museums...true function...is to reinforce for some the feeling of belonging and for others the feeling of exclusion." Based on interviews conducted during their study, they explained,

> "...These sacred places of art ..., to which the nineteenth century added imposing edifices, often in the Graeco-Roman style of civic sanctuaries, [and] where bourgeois society [has] deposited relics inherited from a past which is not its own, everything leads to the conclusion that the world of art opposes itself to the world of everyday life just as the sacred does to the profane..." (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991: 112).

These comments encapsulate the dualistic concerns with which this thesis grapples in examining the response of the arts to the UK Labour government's promotion of social inclusion via cultural policy since 1999. The government's attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy has given the arts the responsibility of advancing all aspects of social inclusion, an aim to help those shut out from participation in mainstream society economically, socially, politically and culturally (DCMS 1999; 2000). Yet since British cultural policy emerged in the nineteenth century (Appleton 2004) art galleries have continually faced their own conflicts of promoting both exclusion and inclusion and of being simultaneously symbolic of the sacred, yet deeply connected to the public (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991). The tensions caused by this challenge lie at the heart of this thesis.

The above conflicts are not only centred on the cultural objects galleries hold and thus the artistic practices they *up*hold, but also on the ways in which galleries engage individuals in those objects and processes (Hooper-Greenhill 1998; Bourriaud 2002a). First, being publicly funded, art galleries are argued to belong to and represent the culture of us all (Williams 1958). This accountability to a wide public can be problematic, especially when taking into consideration the fact that many gallery collections were initially established in the nineteenth century from the holdings of a wealthy elite whose habits, customs and lifestyles did not necessarily mirror that of the masses (Macdonald 1998). As a result, presentations and thus understandings of culture become connected to the context in which they are situated (Duncan 1995). Second, public funding not only determines that galleries must engage us all in order to fully justify their financial support, but via the state's cultural policy such support also subjects art institutions to presupposed ways of and/or reasons for doing so. These methods often involve the linkage of changing ideologies and approaches in public service provision to that of the arts (Belfiore 2004). The status of art galleries as 'public services' can create problems, especially for a field that must find ways to marry issues of social service to those more elusive ones of aesthetics and cultural ideals (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]; Scott 2006).

To complicate the situation further, art galleries are simultaneously argued to be elitist institutions 'truly' accessible to only those people who hold the proper social, cultural, and economic capital with which to engage in the cultural ideals they hold (Bourdieu 2000). This creates a form of exclusion that is often linked in academic discussion to the physical and organisational structure of art galleries themselves and the ways in which they stand as politically sanctioned institutions of cultural authority (Hooper-Greenhill 1998; Bennett 1998b; Fleming 2002). As a

result, such institutions are often interpreted as dictating not only what culture is, but also what cultural forms should be viewed and appreciated as the 'representative best' (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]). Academic literature explains that these decisions are often made by a culturally elite group of people in the form of the art world, rather than by the public for whom such institutions are intended to serve (Harris 2006). These conflicts present a number of tensions with which practitioners and even participants of the arts must continually contend. These tensions consist of issues of inclusion and exclusion or belonging and un-belonging as Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) point out; tensions that are only further confounded by the government's recent social inclusion agenda and its marriage of the opposing interpretations of culture presented above (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]; Williams 1958).

Typically, the field of the arts, or the art world, is understood as being made up of the "entirety, interconnectedness, and distinctiveness of all the elements and relationships within visual art's *production*, its commercial exchange, exhibition, and critical interpretation" (Harris 2006: 25; emphasis added). As a field of practice, the arts are often understood as being made up of the relational differences in the position of the social agents involved within it (Bourdieu 1980; 2000; Kirchberg 2007). Many discussions of the arts tend to prioritise any consideration of those agents as those that "make up the contemporary economic market for art: artists, dealers, auctioneers, accountants and lawyers, critics, buyers, and museum and gallery professionals" as well as the "academics teaching and researching art and art history and their academic institutions" (Harris 2006: 25). Understanding the art world solely through the producers, the exhibitors, the interpreters, the marketers, and the financially interested ignores the involvement of the audiences of and those engaging in the arts, such as visitors to a gallery or viewers of

public art. Such an interpretation limits more wide-ranging understandings of culture and risks confining any consideration of the role of practitioners and participants in arts projects to being representative of more abstract concepts, such as capital, class or institution (Bourdieu 1980; 2000). This restriction predetermines one's existence in a field as a continuous struggle to maintain authority over others, thus limiting the means through which we may investigate people's beliefs, interests, or actions (Bevir and Rhodes 2005; Kirchberg 2007). Further, it predetermines a hierarchical and regimented consideration of inclusion and exclusion (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991; Duncan 1995) and neglects the possibility for a more dynamic consideration of the arts. Such a foundation on which to base this study did not seem entirely appropriate. While it is acknowledged in this thesis that forms of capital may indeed be part and parcel for status within a field (Bourdieu 2000), my own experience within the arts has led me to perceive the potential for more fluid positions. As a result, agents within the arts are interpreted in this study not only as the galleries but also the practitioners and participants who engage within and through them. In this manner, the thesis makes some room toward investigating *how* individuals may coexist within the field, potentially remaking boundaries as they negotiate through them (Lamont 1989; Kirchberg 2007).

My personal experience as an arts administrator with a background in art history embarking on this sociological research project had already made apparent to me the nature of the above tensions as well as the fact that the ambition for the arts to promote inclusion was no small task. The challenges to accomplishing such a goal are not only evident in the inherent exclusivity of the arts (Duncan 1995), or even market interests (Harris 2004), but also in the arguably burdensome responsibility given to such an exclusive field to encourage inclusion on a societal level

(DCMS 2000). At the same time however, within the arts specifically, a goal of inclusion did not appear to me to be entirely unachievable. This viewpoint had much to do with my own perception, informed by my artistic education and work experience, of what 'social inclusion' and its interpretation might potentially mean within and for the practices of the arts themselves. As a result, the aim of this thesis has been to take Labour's attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy (Belfiore 2004) as a starting point from which to examine contemporary issues of the interpretation and practice of inclusion within the arts specifically.

It is necessary to acknowledge that the preconceived notions regarding inclusion and the arts mentioned above informed the research method that shaped the development of this thesis. My initial understanding of social inclusion came from having been exposed to the arts, both visual and performance, as a student in school, to then studying art history in university and eventually taking up a career as a community programmes coordinator in art centres and galleries in the United States, China, and more recently Ireland. My aim in pursuing such a career has always been to facilitate others in engaging in what I had experienced to be opportunities to explore one's own imagination and creativity while also coming to appreciate the same in others, regardless of class, culture, colour or creed. For me, the arts, and the personally perceived risk-taking involved not only in their creation but also even in the sharing of one's opinion about them, presents numerous opportunities for self and societal exploration. Inclusion with respect to the arts, then, was about inclusion within the arts themselves. As a young person in school, the arts offered me something that traditional academic subjects did not. Where I faltered in my studies, I thrived in stage production and in the interpretation of artworks. Subsequently, I discovered in the field of art history a way in

5

which I could engage in academic pursuits. Through the examination and socio-historical study of art works (Silver 1986), I felt as if I was able to reach a better and more engaging understanding of broader social and political issues of past and contemporary times while feeling that I was also engaging in their complex yet more personal nature.

While I had found a field of study in which I could belong, I also had a feeling that I sat outside it in some ways. Inclusion with respect to the arts has not actually been so straightforward. My own family and socio-economic background and later experiences in working in the arts made me quite aware of the fact that I was engaging in a field that was not necessarily perceived to be open to all. From a personal perspective, my family afforded me the chance to attend the kinds of schools that they themselves did not. I was provided with academic and cultural opportunities of which they had little knowledge. Consequently, their reaction to my choice of study was met with both pride and confusion. They were impressed by my ability to engage in a topic they felt so elusive. Further, my art historical education had informed me that art has typically been commissioned, patronised, exhibited, and thus controlled by an often elite, knowledgeable, and wealthy group of people, whether that is the church, the state, the private, market-driven sector, or professionals of galleries and academia (Harris 2004). Put in a simplified way, neither my family nor I have perceived ourselves to be such types of people, but it could be perceived that I had gained the appropriate level of cultural capital or knowledge (Bourdieu 2000) to understand the workings and the language of such a field and thus could exist within it.

When I began to work in the arts promoting gallery-based projects, I discovered that other individuals felt much like my family and me. While many were intrigued by the arts, it took much encouragement on my part to make them feel that they could take part. This encouragement has been

described by gallery professionals and museological and sociological academics as promoting access (Sandell 1998; Kawashima 2006) and in my work it sometimes took the form of audience development or of outreach projects, going out into communities and developing projects in partnership with community groups; hoping to encourage them to feel more comfortable accessing the gallery or the arts as a whole themselves. Such initiatives were often driven by my own and my collaborators' motivation to conceive of and deliver them. Yet, because they were costly for the institutions involved in both finances and staff time, these initiatives were inevitably simultaneously shaped by the benefits, or not, they were perceived to have not only for the gallery as a whole, but for the partnering organisations as well. While these constraints were frustrating at times, they were mediated by the close collaboration of individuals. I thus had begun to feel that my partial inclusion in the arts could potentially promote a deterioration of its exclusive boundaries.

While art is often supported by and dependent upon powerful establishments, it has sometimes questioned those structures (Miles 2005) in ways I did not necessarily feel other fields had. As a result, I have always perceived the arts to be not only full of but also representative of potential in both a broader and more personal sense; potential for seeing the ways in which we may illustrate yet simultaneously question the power structures in which we work as a society. As a consequence, this thesis does not presuppose that the boundaries present in the arts are distinct, fixed, or clear-cut. Instead, this thesis seeks to tease out what complexities may result from the existing conflicts the social inclusion policy may be making more evident with respect to the arts. As such, there are two key aspects to the research method employed within this thesis. They involve an interdisciplinary approach that incorporates

techniques and understandings of both sociology and art, specifically historical and interpretive approaches.

Informed by the cultural theories of Matthew Arnold (2003 [1867-69]) and Raymond Williams (1958), Chapter 2 sets the scene for the thesis' critical interpretation of the nature of the collective and individual understandings of culture that the social inclusion agenda makes apparent. More specifically, it examines the manifestation of that policy within the cultural realm as surfacing, in part, from changing political uses of art galleries in Britain since the emergence of cultural policy in the nineteenth century (Bennett 1998b; Appleton 2004). This emergence is much discussed in academic literature on the subject. In applying art historical knowledge, however, this thesis augments that research base. The thesis considers changes in artistic and gallery practices that have arisen concurrently to changes in cultural policy. It investigates the often-intermittent ways in which policy and practice respond to one another. Consideration of such issues strengthens the foundation from which the meaning and practice of the social inclusion agenda within the arts are examined in this project.

The study reflects on my own bias as a researcher by privileging the viewpoints and experiences of art practitioners and participants and by examining the specificities involved in social inclusion and the arts at a more micro-level. Ideas found in interpretivism (Taylor 1971), which emphasise that meaning and practice are not only constituted within a field and an institutional or organisational context, but also by the manner in which individuals interpret and work within those structures, are employed in three case studies of art activities couched under practitioner and institutional descriptions of 'social inclusion projects' at different art galleries in Liverpool. Applying the interpretive theory to understandings of the art world and considering individuals' meanings and practices in

relation to others within that world grounds this research (Garrick 1999). The approach frees understandings of individuals' roles from any preconceived notions regarding structural powers; in turn allowing for enhanced comprehension of the roles of those structural powers in relation to the individuals working within them. These methodological issues are considered in Chapter 3.

Liverpool is an ideal city in which to conduct case studies regarding the attachment of the social inclusion agenda to the arts. Liverpool has moved from being the 'second city' of the Victorian Empire at the height of its economic, political, social and cultural power to one in the midst of mass depopulation and unemployment in the mid to late twentieth century (Belchem 2007). At this time, Liverpool was no longer a celebrated city but rather a testing ground for numerous regeneration and social funds (Couch 2003). Today, those two opposing aspects of Liverpool's history come together as it is a city under major regeneration currently celebrating its status as European Capital of Culture 2008. Throughout all three of these periods of changing political, social and economic circumstances, Liverpool's art, both establishment and grassroots, has maintained an interesting relationship to and involvement in local society. As a result, Chapter 4 examines the rationale behind the emergence of the social inclusion agenda specifically within Liverpool and considers it as a 'testing ground' for academic theory against the backdrop of the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. Chapter 4 similarly investigates Liverpool's cultural development alongside, rather than solely due to, political and social issues.

The case studies presented in this thesis involve three arts institutions in the city, the Bluecoat, Tate Liverpool, and the Walker Art Gallery, which share broader and more local significance. They are firmly established cultural institutions within the city; the key developments of which have

occurred alongside the aforementioned critical periods in Liverpool's history. At the same time, as widely recognised organisations in the broader contemporary arts scene, they represent some of the ways in which the art establishment is more generally engaging in the social inclusion agenda. Each institution's physical and organisational situation within a broader and localised arts context as well as its evolving relationship to the local public and the city's politics are considered in the discussion in Chapter 4. Such a consideration places and explores the development of these institutions in the context of Liverpool's historical political, social, and economic as well as artistic and cultural development and keeps with the interdisciplinary approach set out in Chapter 2. By doing so, each case study project may then be more fully examined from the basis of their specific institutional backgrounds and those institutions' working interpretations of culture without ignoring the wider as well as more localised social and artistic contexts in which they sit.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 explore one project in each institution designed under practitioners' interpretation of the terminology of 'social inclusion'. These case studies are a means by which to investigate our collective and individual understandings of culture made evident by the social inclusion agenda. Through methods of participant observation of projects and semi-structured interviews with staff and participants, these chapters investigate how the processes by which these projects address inclusion may not only be shaped by individuals working within these institutional contexts, but also by the placement of those institutions within their locality as well as the broader context of the arts. Through this micro-level approach, much attention is given to the role of the individuals involved, both staff and participants, and the ways in which individuals' roles relate to and/or depend on one another. For, it is in

those roles and the relations of them in practice, where much of how we interpret culture and thus negotiate its exclusive boundaries are revealed.

The concluding chapter considers the comparative individual capacities and interrelated significance of the specific individuals and organisations and the art field under investigation in disseminating government policy's apparently contradictory cultural ideals. It raises some of the conflicts that the case studies and supporting interviews make apparent for both practitioners and participants in attempting to address any form of inclusion through the methods, structures, and tools of a field such as the arts. As a result, the chapter reveals the processes by which those capacities and relationships may be perpetuating or dissolving boundaries of inclusion and exclusion within that field. The chapter takes the contextualised understandings of those roles and places them in the thesis' wider discussion of the rationale behind the emergence of the social inclusion agenda *within the cultural realm* specifically. Finally, the final chapter returns to a consideration of my role as a researcher in the project and a presentation of the limitations of the research as well as potential areas for further study.

By way of summation, this thesis aims to take Labour's attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy (Belfiore 2004) as a starting point from which to examine how that policy and its apparently contradictory notions of culture (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]; Williams 1958) may actually make evident the arts' potential to promote the negotiation of its inherent boundaries of exclusion and inclusion (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991). There are thus five key objectives of this research. First, to examine the historical development in Britain of the social inclusion agenda within cultural policy and the ways in which that historical development may reveal changing ideological understandings of culture and its role in society. Second, to similarly and concurrently examine

those ideological understandings of culture in both artistic and gallery-based practice in order to ascertain any level of autonomy regarding attempts toward inclusion within the field of the arts itself. Third, to examine that autonomy on the ground by studying specific Liverpool-based case studies; namely how contemporary arts practitioners and participants interpret the term 'social inclusion' in meaning and carry out that meaning in their gallery-based practices. Fourth and based on those specific interpretations and practices, the thesis assesses the forms of inclusion attempting to be achieved in the arts as well as the processes involved. Fifth, the thesis examines whether or not perceptions of inclusion may be solely related to the context, for example field or institutional, in which they are delivered. The thesis sets out to untangle what is actually rather than ideologically occurring within the arts by way of the social inclusion agenda (Francis 2004). By unpicking specific situational occurrences, it is hoped that this thesis presents a base from which to encourage more reflective practices toward inclusion in the field itself.

Chapter 2

UNDERSTANDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *ARTS FOR SOCIAL INCLUSION*

Cultural policy directives under Britain's Labour government such as those presented by the DCMS (1999; 2000) state that increased access to involvement in the arts for a wide public help 'combat social exclusion.' Involvement in the arts, such as in the discussion or creation of works in art galleries and art centres, is argued to have the potential to boost a person's self-confidence and self-esteem, improve one's quality of life, build more cohesive communities, and promote learning, which may in turn assist socially excluded individuals in achieving greater chances of employment, educational attainment, social networks, and life enjoyment (DCMS 1999; DCMS 2000). This chapter considers the current academic and policy-based literature on arts and social inclusion, which is felt to largely ignore the specificities of the field of practice in question. It situates this thesis as a critique of that dominant literature by considering changes in artistic and gallery practices alongside those in policy. The chapter traces the evolution of the social inclusion agenda not only from developments in British cultural policy (Belfiore 2004; Tlili *et al.* 2007), but also through considering concurrent developments within the arts themselves, particularly during the latter half of the twentieth century. In its historical exploration, this chapter takes the mid-nineteenth century Victorian era as a starting point because it is widely agreed that it is that time when the growth of art galleries across Britain greatly increased and the development of British cultural policy began (Appleton 2004).

Through a socio-historical approach taken from the field of art history (Silver 1986), the chapter brings to light that the ideological understandings of culture described by Arnold (1993 [1867-69]) and

Williams (1958) underpin much cultural policy and practice since the nineteenth century. By means of this theoretical framework, two key considerations are presented here. First, the chapter takes a historical approach to examining the political, social, and economic rationalities underpinning the attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy since the nineteenth century and combines those with a consideration of changes in artistic and gallery practice. Second, the chapter examines the terminology and policy of social exclusion and inclusion more specifically and considers those welfare policy issues in direct relation to gallery practice for promoting social inclusion.

Within the British context, changing conceptions of art's relationship to the social are best theoretically represented in the ideas of Arnold (1993 [1867-69]) and Williams (1958) as their notions of culture are not only reflected in the discourses on art within Britain's cultural policy (Stevenson 2004; Bennett 200) and referenced in government policy directives (Labour 1997; Selwood 1998), but also in the evolving impressions within the art world of its engagement with society (Harding 1995). Arnold's (1993 [1867-69]) inherently elitist view of culture, which privileges the role of cultural elites in promoting the betterment of society, and Williams' (1958) anthropological interpretation, which is more embracing of popular culture and aspects of daily life, appear to be contradictory notions that represent and reflect key ideological turns in British cultural thought (Appleton 2004). In current Labour government's policy on social inclusion the ideologies are brought together in order to promote aesthetic, economic and social aims. These traditions of thought reflect a number of tensions with which practitioners of and participants in visual arts programmes for social inclusion have to contend. These tensions revolve around the simultaneous views that the arts are an

inherently exclusive field of practice (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991) that can (nevertheless) promote social inclusion.

A Theoretical Framework based on 'Culture'

Before one may consider the evolution of the social inclusion agenda within the arts alongside changing developments in engaging with the social within artistic and gallery practice, it is necessary to gain a better understanding of the way the term has been interpreted. Here, art, with a focus on visual art, is understood as an aspect of culture. The varying interpretations of the term exist within a social, political, and economic context. In his publication, *Culture and Anarchy* (1867-69) the English cultural critic and poet, Matthew Arnold (1993 [1867-69]: 62), described culture as "a study of perfection... which consists in becoming something rather than having something, in an inward condition of the mind and the spirit, not in an outward set of circumstances." It is "the best that has been thought and said" (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]: 63). Arnold was arguing that high culture represented the best ideals of mankind. He advanced the idea that culture has the power to heal the ills of society (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]). Perhaps seen in a political way, it could be used to 'elevate' society and the masses to the level of perfection for which, according to Arnold, culture or high culture stood.

Influenced by his study on the French education system, in 1861 Arnold wrote an essay entitled *Democracy* in which he set out to discuss a key problem he saw existing in England. He argued that cultural values had declined since the eighteenth century and it was these that needed to remain in the highest order to promote a democratic society. In his view, the government could play a larger role in promoting these cultural ideals (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]). Arnold's writing did not focus on the English working classes specifically, but rather first, on the development of

English society's antagonism toward the ability of the state to promote
high cultural ideals and second, on the middle classes' role in
determining the future of the country (Collini 1994). In this essay and in
Culture and Anarchy, he critiqued what he saw as the English middle
classes' narrow intellectualism, small-minded qualities of aesthetics, and
its complacency. Arnold was concerned with the way in which the state
could represent and put forth ideals of high reason and serve as a
disseminator of intelligence and praiseworthy instincts by representing
the 'best' of what has been thought and said (Bennett 2005).

Arnold's (1993 [1867-69]) view of culture is somewhat problematic in its
restrictiveness of excluding aspects of daily life, such as language,
common traditions, and popular culture and as such can be accused as
being elitist (Gallagher 1992). To Arnold, culture cannot be possessed
(Bennett 2005) but represents a *pursuit* of "perfection" (Arnold 1993
[1867-69]: 62). Arnold (1993 [1867-69]: 79) argued that culture should
not be taught "down to the level of inferior classes"; rather standards
must be adhered to so that the best knowledge could be more widespread
and "make all men live in an atmosphere of sweetness and light" (Arnold
1993 [1867-69]: 79). In the promotion of standards of excellence as well
as access (DCMS 2001), one interpretation is that the government itself
privileges certain forms of art and cultural participation in order to
advance state-sanctioned roles of citizenship and civic engagement as
well as involvement in the economy (DCMS 2005a). Further, the Labour
government has augmented the role of the state, an elite few, within the
arts in disseminating high cultural ideals for the aims of creating a more
democratic and equal society via the social inclusion agenda (Arnold
1993 [1867-69]; DCMS 2005a).

While the Labour government's policies do suggest a level of Arnoldian
understanding of culture, it must also be acknowledged that through a

more anthropological understanding of culture, Labour policies have promoted wider access and participation (DCMS 2005a). Stevenson (2004) states that in doing so Labour has operationalised Raymond Williams' (1989a: 6) anthropological understanding of culture, an understanding that has underpinned much cultural policy and planning within the Labour party over the past thirty years (Stevenson 2004). Unlike Arnold (1993 [1867-69]) who felt that culture should be created and protected by the higher echelons, Williams (1958) argued that popular culture should be embraced. Culture, and perhaps more specifically literature, was not something that was or should be solely sacred as Arnold (1993 [1867-69]) suggested, but instead also revealed the everyday grind of time and place. Culture was about and reflective of society and the processes and relationships that occur within it (Williams 1979). Williams welcomed the idea that traditional culture might change as its audience widened. In 1958, Williams (1989a: 6) defined the term culture in its more ordinary sense, explaining that "We use the word culture in these two senses: to mean a whole way of life: the common meanings; [and] to mean the arts and learning: the special processes of discovery and creative effort." Williams (1989a) combined these two aspects of culture to examine a context of personal meanings concluding, "Culture is ordinary, in every society and in every mind" (Williams 1989a: 6).

This thesis argues that the tension existing between the two approaches presented above underpin the historical, political, artistic, and economic perspectives that culminate in today's social inclusion agenda within the arts. What is of specific interest to this thesis is the question inherent in both interpretations: to whose culture is being referred, represented, included, shared, and communicated. Such questions are inevitably tied up with issues of culture and power or status in society as well as

inclusion (Adorno and Horkheimer 1944; Bourdieu 2000). An examination of the foundation and development of arts institutions demonstrates how these interpretations of culture have been implied and expressed within government policy toward those institutions. Such a study also shows how those interpretations are enacted via the practice of arts organisations. These cultural theories themselves and the way in which they have been illustrated in both policy and practice point out the conflicts of inclusion and exclusion that are inherent in the arts (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991) as well as in the idea of 'arts for social inclusion' (Miles 2005). These conflicts will be further explored in this chapter as well as within the thesis as a whole.

The Foundation of Labour's Cultural Policy for Social Inclusion

The inclusion policies set out by the current Labour government have their origins in the Victorian era (Bennett 1998b; Selwood 1998; Bennett 2005), not only in early policies toward art galleries but also in the theoretical perspectives of Matthew Arnold (1993 [1867-69]), which evolved alongside those developments (Bennett 2005). The very foundations of public institutions after the period of the French Revolution, and particularly those of the arts, were established and organised by people whose previously private art and anthropological collections were obtained for the founding of public museums and galleries (Macdonald 1998). European museums and galleries, presenting the 'best' art of society or exotic artefacts collected from 'other' societies, stood as representations of national power and pride as well as political virtue (Graham *et al.* 2000). Duncan (1995) has explained that during that time public art galleries were products of a government that claimed it provided the right things for its people. Those in power who possessed enough cultural capital and distinctive taste to 'truly' appreciate art

(Bourdieu and Darbel 1991; Bourdieu 2000) implied that art galleries could express the goodness of a state or the civic-mindedness of its chief citizens who donated objects or funds toward their construction (Moore 2004). In turn, it was argued that through the passive consumption of the objects, or the objectified ideals held within these institutions, the masses would benefit socially and morally (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]; Cole 1884). Newman and McLean (2004a) argue that the government's encouragement of using museums and galleries in this way can be seen as both an altruistic and coercive use of culture. According to Appleton (2004) at this time it was believed that exposure to high art could lessen the harshness of everyday life in a capitalist industrial society for the working classes, while appeasing their demands for better welfare services. These ideas are similar to the critiques Francis (2004) and Belfiore (2004) make of the current Labour government's attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy today.

The dichotomised relationship of galleries as national or local elitist status symbols as well as public institutions has inevitably created a debate as to how open the public's access can be to the objects held within them. This debate has been ongoing since their founding. Even as far back as the eighteenth century, Sir Joshua Reynolds, one of the most influential painters of the period as well as the first President of the Royal Academy in Britain, argued that the mechanical work labour classes undertook lessened their ability to acquire the intellect required for becoming more civic minded through exposure to art (Bennett 1998a). Despite Reynolds lack of confidence in the working class, by the nineteenth century, elites claimed that history and natural history museums and art galleries helped the Caucasian European male understand his hierarchical place in the historical and the natural world (Bennett 1998b).

Art galleries were believed to have the capacity to endow visitors with better taste and morals through their presentation of fine or 'high' art (Weil 1997). Collini (1994: 5) has explained that at this time Matthew Arnold (1901) had been greatly concerned with the "spirit" of people and often referenced a state of mind that is simultaneously emotionally, intellectually, and psychologically possessing of one's experiences and way of life. In a similar vein, during this time of economic and social change and increased industrialisation and population growth, key gallery staff saw their institutions as being able to contribute to the betterment of society. The effect that high art or culture was argued to have on the state of mind Arnold described, particularly for the working classes, can be seen in a number of statements made in Parliament at the time. For example, when Lord Palmerston, Prime Minister in 1856, made the case to Parliament for the establishment of a National Portrait Gallery, he explained that gallery visitors who viewed portraits of noble and respected individuals would be led to replicate their "noble actions" (Cited in Hooper-Greenhill 1988: 224). In viewing these objects depicting politically sanctioned individuals, thus becoming politically sanctioned objects themselves, visitors might somehow walk away with an inspired feeling to commit (politically/socially) 'worthy' actions. From statements made in parliamentary sessions at the time (Select Committee para. 808: 730), it can be deduced that many government officials viewed the art gallery as a vehicle through which they could affect social behaviour, lessening the working man's desire to commit sins (Weil 1997) and keeping him away from the "gin palace" (Cole 1884: 363), as well as improve the economy and promote accepted forms of democratic participation through self-education and improvement (Physick 1982; Bennett 1998b). Similar claims are made in current DCMS (2000; 2005a) policies regarding social inclusion.

Developing a Cultural Policy that Provides Access to High Cultural Ideals

The difficulties of making or proving high culture to be more relevant in everyday life can be seen in the three key periods of the development of cultural policy since the creation of the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB, now Arts Council England or ACE). These periods are the mid-1940s; the era of the Thatcher administration, 1979-1997; and that of the Labour administration, 1997 to the present. Eckersley (2008) has explained that since World War II, UK cultural policy appears to have developed in a cyclical pattern: from a 'material cultural policy' in the 1940s-60s, to 'economic' in the 1980s to 1997, to a 'social cultural policy' under the Labour government post 1997 and in 2007/08 back towards a 'material cultural policy' (McMaster 2008). Eckersley has based her interpretation of cultural policy on the three forms of cultural value identified by Holden (2004): intrinsic, instrumental and institutional, which he argues have underlined varying approaches to British cultural policy. While Eckersley's (2008) assessment of the developments of cultural policy will be applied here as a useful way in which to structure an understanding of the differing values underlying them, it is acknowledged that the ways in which her discussion focuses on the political neglects a consideration of the changing practices of the arts: both artistically and museologically.

At the establishment of the ACGB post World War II, the Council espoused the preservation, collection, research and exhibition of material culture (Eckersley 2008). Based on Arnoldian notions of the intrinsic value of culture that relate to an individual's subjective, emotional, and aesthetic experience (Holden 2004), a principle of 'arms-length' funding was applied. The state would 'enable' the arts to flourish by not interfering in them (Belfiore 2004). Despite this ideology, Raymond

Williams (1989b: 141) once pointed out the "deep-rooted inconsistencies" and "contradictions" present in the ACBG definitions of and intentions for 'the arts' at the Council's founding. Williams (1989b) discussed the ways in which the founding of the Arts Council had enacted state patronage of the arts as well as varying ways in which the arts may be defined. He highlighted the fact that the very nature of public funding of the arts tends to privilege certain art forms over others and thus the culture of certain people over others. According to Mulgan and Warpole (1986) that sense of privileging was the point. In fact, the founding ethos of the ACGB was based on supporting excellence and professionalism in a manner to encourage high standards across cultural activity (Mulgan and Warpole 1986). In addition, the ACGB adhered to the liberal humanist idea that the maintenance of these standards promoted the potential of the arts to encourage self-improvement (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]). At its founding, the Arts Council maintained the Romantic notion of the artist and set such individuals as "quasi-religious" figures who could be seen as being able to establish the ideals for which the public should all strive (Francis 2004: 148). In being funded by the state, the art gallery could remain, as it did in the nineteenth century as a vehicle through which the public may be exposed to those ideals.

Engaging the 'Ordinary' in the Arts

During the 1960s 'access' became a key term in government policy toward the arts, however the concept can be traced back to the nineteenth century (Kawashima 2000) when politicians and gallery officials (Cole 1884) bolstered the moral, social and refining benefits of the arts to the working classes. Further, access has been an aspect of Arts Council agenda since even CEMA (Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts), the predecessor of the Arts Council, was established.

Kawashima (2000; 2006) explains that within cultural policy the term 'access' suggests there is something of value to which everyone has a right. The notion is also largely based on the assumption that individuals are probably interested in engaging in the arts (Francis 2004). During the 1960s and 1970s access to the arts was centred around more democratic and social issues (McGuigan 1996: 54) that encouraged a form of democratic participation through the means of not only including new kinds of audiences, but art forms as well (Braden 1978).

In 1967 the ACGB's Royal Charter emphasised the organisation's duty to increase the accessibility of 'arts' to the public across regional and class boundaries (Belfiore 2002). During this time, increasing access had often taken place in the form of funding touring exhibitions and performances in areas with less 'high' cultural offering and providing transport to artistic venues for atypical audiences. It was a mid-century approach to addressing what is now seen as the physical, social and economic issues of social exclusion: the geographical, financial and social barriers to accessing arts and cultural events (Kawashima 2006). As during the Victorian era, at this time there was a strong moral purpose to promoting the arts. Lord Goodman, Chairman of the ACGB, explained the arts could help in reconstructing the moral good of the country:

> "...There is a crucial state in the country at this moment. I believe that young people lack values, lack certainties, lack guidance; that they need something to turn to [desperately]...I do not say that the Arts will furnish a total solution, but I believe that the Arts will furnish some solution" (Goodman quoted in Pearson 1982: 81).

Goodman may have been reacting to the strong youth culture in Britain at the time as well as the social changes brought by a growth in consumerism, pop culture, pop music, and the emerging feminist and civil rights movements. Yet his vision illustrates how state funded

cultural bodies, like the Arts Council, became more than establishment bodies which 'enabled' the arts. Publicly funded arts organisations also stood as state institutions that elevated the field's status in society to the higher moral purposes apparent in the nineteenth century. Interestingly, even anti-establishment arts and gallery practice at the time can be seen to represent similar notions of social responsibility.

Arts and gallery practice that stood in opposition to the establishment became a place in which larger social issues, such as those in the feminist and civil rights movement, were addressed or at least highlighted. Collini (1994) has stated that during the mid-twentieth century the traditional Arnoldian concept of culture came into question. Recruitment to institutions of higher education widened and traditional understandings of 'high culture' were seen to be reflective of the unjust relations between the sexes, classes, and races (Collini 1994). Harris (2004: 25) has explained that during this time art became more 'self-reflexive'. Beginning in the 1960s, the ways in which art galleries as well as dealers and critics had been mediating social engagement with art came under particular scrutiny within artistic practice and the theorisation of it. The Romantic notions of artistic genius were scrutinised and critiques of galleries developed overtly in the production of works of art (Harris 2004). Pop Art emerged and represented a culture deliberately against the traditional English establishment and conservative taste represented in many art gallery collections (Harris 2006). New grassroots art galleries with exhibitions that were intended to be more representative of society were founded (Nochlin 1971; Kawashima 1997; Moreno 2004). In addition, the discipline of art history began looking to the social contexts in which historical art was produced rather than solely privileging the object in the form of connoisseurship (Silver 1986; Harris 2006). This mingling of high culture and the ordinary was also reflected in concurrent

cultural policies that focused more on "social access" (ACGB 1977; McGuigan 1996: 54; Belfiore 2002).

At the time, the emergence of Pop Art (Hewison 1995) and Community Art (Harding 1995) blurred the separation of traditional high arts and learning with that of the 'ordinary'. These two movements can be seen to reflect changing ideas regarding art's social role and art's role within the field itself (Cork 1979); ideas which challenged the traditional 'keepers' of high culture through art forms that questioned the very notion of culture. These changes revolve around the ways in which these art forms had attempted to address or include aspects of everyday culture and ordinary people in new ways within the realm of high arts; the former largely through subject, form, composition and presentation (Harris 2006) and the latter through process (Harding 1995; Miles 1997).

Pop Art referenced a direct linkage to popular culture, such as entertainment, advertising, and commodity branding and inverted the culture debate (Hewison 1995). The movement was described at the time as:

> "... A resistance movement: a classless commando, which was directed against the Establishment in general and the Art Establishment in particular. ...Pop in England was ...a facet of the class struggle, real or imagined..." (Russell and Gablik 1969: 31-32).

Oddly, along with the market success of Pop Art (Cork 1979), this statement in response to its presentation in an Arts Council funded exhibition at the Hayward Gallery in London, solidified the fact that this 'anti-establishment' style had become officially accepted into the art history canon. As a result, the appropriation of popular culture into high art may have altered forms of what was deemed popular into something

deemed elitist. Nonetheless, the statement above shows that the connection which 'elite' artists may have been making to popular culture reveals art's potential to reflect power struggles within society.

Like Pop Art, the ways in which the marginal position of Community Art became threatened shows the links that artistic practice and policy potentially hold. Community Arts practice relies upon the direct engagement of people, non-artists, in the production of work (Harding 1995; Miles 1997). Harding (1995) and Allen (1995) have explained that many Community Art artists working in the 1960s and 1970s actually wished to remain outside the establishment. However, when Roy Shaw, Secretary General of the ACGB (1977: 2), gave the art form an officially sanctioned definition in the ACGB's *Annual Report of 1976/77*, it was not the definition, per say, that was significant but the fact that it had been assigned at all. According to Harding (1995) Shaw's definition (ACGB 1977) demonstrated the Council's belief that Community Art was a democratisation of legitimised culture, asserting a safeguarding of excellence by incorporating specific kinds of acknowledgement of Community Art. Further, once Community Art became a practice defined by a state-influenced art establishment, it was no longer fully positioned as a form 'outside' and thus became subject to such establishment standards of quality (Allen 1995). The threat to Community Art's marginality within the field reveals the capability of elites in maintaining a role in preserving and upholding establishment sanctioned standards and the market value of culture.

The difficulties met in Pop and Community Art's challenges to the field's exclusivity demonstrates that art practice itself was in fact addressing issues of participation and inclusion alongside that of policy. Further, these attempts also intimate some of the tensions raised through the attachment of the social inclusion agenda on the arts. As art historian and

theorist, Julian Stallabrass (2004: 187), has explained, art that exists within conventional art world structures is then limited by those structures in the ways it can critique them; such work "contains self-evident contradictions that weaken their likely power." Nevertheless, Pop Art and Community Art demonstrate the ways in which the conflation of two seemingly opposed traditions of thought may evoke a dialogue of opposites, which could be seen to foster what Miles (2005: 895) refers to as "creative tension within difference". The arts' 'self-reflexivity' (Harris 2004: 25) demonstrated by these two styles draws attention to issues regarding broader social issues of equality and inclusion by questioning the ways in which those ideologies may or may not have been addressed within the cultural realm itself. The ways in which the state may become involved in mediating these cultural expressions can be seen to play a role again in the attachment of the social inclusion agenda to the arts. This involvement, particularly through the imposition of predetermined and targeted project outcomes, potentially hinders what Stevenson (2004: 125) describes as the "dynamic, flexible, and situational" aspects of culture. These issues will come under investigation within the case study projects.

'Giving in' to Consumption: An Instrumental Turn in Cultural Policy

Despite the efforts by policy and the arts to engage people, UK government statistics from the late 1970s revealed that most of the individuals visiting a museum and/or gallery at this time came from higher income brackets, not in fact from the working class incomes that gallery officials, politicians, and elite classes had been arguing galleries might benefit (Hooper-Greenhill 1988). Access that was bolstered by a promotion of participation came to be emphasised in consumerist terms,

rather than the more democratic terms of the 1960s and 1970s
(McGuigan 1996). Facing an economic recession, the Arts Council had to
address two issues: a crisis of the relevance and purpose of arts funding
during a period of economic difficulty and a Conservative government
under Thatcher that brought market reasoning and public sector reforms
into the cultural sector. The ways in which this development occurred
will be seen to have influenced Labour's current cultural policy. Belfiore
(2004: 187) has explained that the link of social inclusion to the arts and
culture has been part of the "instrumental turn" UK cultural policy has
taken since the early 1980s. This instrumental turn has emerged from the
"attachment" of cultural policy, viewed as a "traditionally 'weak' policy
area" to what may be seen as more "influential" policy concerns of
"economic development, urban regeneration, and social inclusion" (Gray
2002: 80; Belfiore 2004: 188). This change coincided with a turn toward
a 'new public management' style of conducting public services that has
trickled into the cultural policy sector and still remains today (Selwood
2002; Belfiore 2004).

Beginning during the Thatcher era, cultural institutions have not only had
to deliver their own policy aims, but also the aims of the more influential
policy to which they were connected. Further, they became obliged to
evidence performance indicators, the outputs, outcomes, and impacts of
these attached policies, such as economic self-sufficiency in the 1980s or
social inclusion more recently (Selwood 2002; Befliore 2004). These
moves can be seen in documents produced by the Arts Council and the
Policy Study Institute (ACGB 1985; Myerscough 1988), which made
more explicit links between the arts and its potential economic benefits to
society. In fact, the Policy Study Institute's report, authored by
Myerscough, attempted to demonstrate how the cultural sector might
actually evidence such benefits (Myerscough 1988). The study marked a

significant progression to linking culture to other policy areas and more specifically on evidencing the impact of that. Reeves (2002: 8) has explained, [Myerscough's study] set the stage for a generation of impact studies... which sought to document and argue the case for the role of the arts and creative industries as important agents for economic development and urban renewal, and begin to measure this impact in quantitative terms." Reeves (2002) own review of these studies is a significant examination of the ways various arms of the cultural sector, including the arts, heritage, and cultural industries, have attempted to demonstrate not only the economic but later the social impacts of the arts to fit policy agendas. Her study also details how cultural policy makers championed these attempts, emphasising the economic impacts in the 1980s and the additional social ones in the mid to late 1990s (see Landry *et al.* 1996). However, the level of performance evaluation that these studies have attempted to address and current cultural policy still demands puts weight on quantifiable results, which as Scott (2006) has more recently explained was intended to prove accountability for funding under Thatcher but under the Labour administration additionally calls for accountability to the public at large.

In establishing the Arts Council, the arts became part of the state's public services and as a result, were linked early on to issues related to the welfare state (Francis 2004). Kawashima (1997) has explained that the introduction of managerialism to public and civil sectors in the 1980s greatly affected galleries (Kawashima 1997; Pollitt 1990), which re-imagined visitors as consumers in the market economy (Eckersley 2008). This development reveals how culture could simultaneously stand separate from society while being able to remain an important aspect of everyday, and in this case economic, activity (ACGB 1989; Mulgan and Warpole 1986; Hewison 1995; Lorente 1996a; 1996;b; 1996c;

Kawashima 1997). For example, in 1984 the Arts Council bolstered the potential leisure services arts organisations could offer the visitor as 'consumer' by funding new gallery education posts (Allen 1995). As Allen (1995) has pointed out, provision of education and interpretation facilities could increase access to galleries while continuing to safeguard standards of excellence.

Government funds were earmarked to promote private sponsoring of the arts as well as enhance marketing, and museums and galleries were encouraged to present their exhibits in more 'entertaining' ways (Audit Commission 1991a; 1991b; Kawashima 2000). As a result, the period of the 1980s and early 1990s can be viewed as an augmentation of arts marketing for, and new forms of communication with, audiences. What resulted was a further call to promote access, though in a very different way than in earlier periods. Passive consumption made way for 'experiential' consumption. Visitor surveys were further taken up; gallery cafés, blockbuster exhibitions, and gift shops were introduced as well as major promotion of exhibitions (Kawashima 1997). Galleries were becoming more oriented to free enterprise strategies to gain income from attendance fees and retail in shops and cafés. The art gallery moved from offering cabinet curios and treasure troves of delicate, scholarly-appreciated objects to offering an interactive and enjoyable place for leisure activities (See Harrison 1993: n. 7). Galleries were to focus on the ways in which they communicate with their visitors and improve that communication by presenting 'products' or aesthetic objects in a more enjoyable and interpretive way, such as via interactive exhibits (Audit Commission 1991a; Barry 1998). Some scholars have viewed this move as a new kind of "edutainment", binding cultural and educational activities with the commerce and technology of entertainment (Hannigan 1998). In responding to the changing economic and social developments

at the time, Hannigan (1998) suggests that galleries were under greater pressure to mount blockbuster exhibitions with spectacular interactive educational programmes as amusement parks and shopping malls had become increasingly popular (Deleuze and Guattari 1988; Featherstone 1991; Prior 2003). Such developments could be argued to be a policy-based encouragement of a 'post-modern' merging of high and popular culture.

Whether or not this new tactic to attract audiences has more to do with the changing ideologies of the profession, the new opportunities (and competition) that technology provides, or pressures from government policy, the change in the way that art institutions have marketed themselves to new audiences is apparent. In fact museum and gallery practice itself during the 1970s, prior to the policy of 'new public management' had been emphasising more direct engagement with the public. Highly respected museum and gallery officials had previously been explaining that these institutions should be less rigid, take more risks, and strive for equality of cultural opportunity. It was argued within the field itself that society would no longer accept institutions that served only a small portion of elite individuals (Cameron 1971; Hudson 1977). The Gallery Director of Laing Art Gallery in Newcastle referred to some of these changes in his own institution as the "beginning of the revolution of the 'humanisation' of art museums" (Whitehead 2005: 97-98), suggesting a positive reaction within the field to the possibility of broadening the audiences for art. In both policy and practice the increased choices in the ways people could access high art objects linked popular culture approaches to new ways of disseminating high cultural ideals. This 'humanisation' of art museums (Whitehead 2005) was coupled with the increasing importance of marketing in the arts profession itself since the 1980s. During this time there was a proliferation of publications and

academic studies of arts marketing strategies that focused on customer value (Boorsma 2006). This period has antecedents for what Labour's government would later strongly support as 'audience development' (Kawashima 2000). McCann (1998) has differentiated between arts marketing and audience development explaining that arts marketing concerns encouraging people who are *already* interested in the arts to actually attend a gallery or art event. In contrast, audience development is more about convincing people who may not initially be part of that core market to in fact opt into a gallery-going audience. Kawashima (2000) explains that the individuals who exist outside this core market may be grouped into different strata: they may be 'lapsed' art gallery attendees or individuals that have never in fact visited an art gallery. This strata of different 'types' of potential audiences recalls concerns expressed by nineteenth-century painters Sir Joshua Reynolds and John Barry regarding 'dumbing down' (Bennett 1998a) and highlights issues of exclusion inherent within the arts. Further, it implies a requirement of cultural capital (Bourdieu 2000) for accessing the arts and intimates that different types of potential visitors that are labelled 'socially excluded' will require individualised approaches.

Embracing the Social Aspects of the Arts

As Reeves (2002) has demonstrated, during the 1990s the cultural sector took a turn toward emphasising additional social benefits of the arts. She has explained that the sector became wary of over stressing the job creation and economic output potential of the arts over social impact, such as community development (Landry *et al.* 1996). Academics and policy researchers highlighted the stimulation of creativity and discussion that occurs amongst individuals as a result of participation in the arts (Landry *et al.* 1996). At the same time, within the arts the self-reflexive

nature of artistic practice brought to the fore during the 1960s was reinvigorated in the 1990s. That more recent practice has raised additional questions regarding established forms of communication existing within traditional arts practice and its relationship to everyday culture and practice. More specifically, such practice considers artistic production as a form of language and meaning construction, where the consumption of artworks is in fact a communicative and interpretive act. In addition and perhaps as a result, it is strongly linked to what have become Labour's policies of urban regeneration, social cohesion and social inclusion. Kester (2004) has agued that understanding of this practice cannot be achieved without close examination of the processes it entails. The privileging of the communicative or dialogical processes involved in the creation of art has also become more prevalent within considerations of the consumption of art objects within galleries (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a; 2000b). Academic studies investigating the development of such social policies within the cultural realm largely ignore consideration of these more recent artistic and gallery practices, which are argued here to have developed off the back of the practices that existed before, such as those discussed above. This thesis aims to augment that academic discussion by demonstrating how the field of the arts itself has developed belief systems similar to those underpinning social inclusion.

Work by artists such as Rikrit Tiravanija since the 1990s figuratively and literally appear to privilege social interaction as art over the creation of any particular object (Bourriaud 2002a; Kester 2002). In addition, 'new genre public art' (see Lacy 1995), developed in the 1990s and influenced by Community Art continues today as a process through which an artist works directly with people, a community, acting as a "catalyst for other people's creativity [and] political imagination" (Miles 1997: 8). Such art

forms can be seen not only as reactions against the proliferation of art as comodified objects but also as a "rejection of the self-contained aesthetic of modernism" (Miles 1997: 12). Instead they place the artist as someone who, as Miles (1997: 12, emphasis added) explains, "acts for and *with* others in reclaiming responsibility for their futures." Art works or performances created often revolve around social and political issues that serve to empower or provide voices for the non-artists involved (Lacy 1995). Setting aside the inherent power structures that may be problematic in such a description (Kester 1995), the co-creation of artwork between artist, member of the elite world of 'high' art, and non-artist, promotes a process of unity and difference that may be partaken in and acknowledged by the individuals involved (Lacy 1995). Miles (1997) has discussed these issues and the history of these artistic practices with respect to contemporary public art practice especially in the context of the regeneration of urban areas. Considering this practice alongside changes in policy making is critical as it demonstrates how the apparent ethereal aspects of the arts may be utilised within social policy agendas. The ability of the arts to stimulate dialogue and creativity amongst individuals included 'non-artists' had an impact on policy makers and the publication of Matarasso's 1997 report *Use or Ornament? The Social Impact of Participation in Arts Programmes* during the year the Labour government was elected is not insignificant (Reeves 2002). Though he was not directly addressing the artistic practices of Lacy and Tiravanija, Matarasso's 1997 study established a model for examining and evidencing the social impact of the arts in which artistic practices such as those described above were engaging. It is difficult to imagine, then, that these art practices may not in some way have influenced cultural politicians in re-considering the placement of art as a vehicle for social cohesion, social inclusion and urban regeneration today.

Returning to a focus on the presentation of art as objects Duncan (1995), Bennett (1998a; 1998b), Mason (2004), and Whitehead (2005) have highlighted the importance of communication and interpretation, even implicitly, by means of art objects and galleries. More specifically, Hooper-Greenhill (2000a; 2000b) has discussed the ways in which art objects are interpreted by visitors not only by their personal experiences and knowledge-bases but by also via the medium of presentation within the context of a gallery. She has described the dialogical process of making sense of a painting, for example, linking issues of cultural capital with the everyday experiences one may bring to any examination of or 'looking at' a work of art. For Hooper-Greenhill (2000a; 2000b) the meaning one gathers about an object from such an experience is based then in a knowledge, as well as a social context. As a result, the meaning and in a sense perceived value of an artwork only emerges via an interpretive process. This interpretive process is developed personally. With respect to the context of a gallery, that process also develops via the limitations and facilitation that context may provide or implicitly communicate (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a: 142). Thus, as Boorsma (2006: 76) explains, even in relation to art objects "the audience takes part in the 'co-production' of artistic value", which may involve hedonistic, social and symbolic, and intellectual, but also aesthetic benefits. This theory on audiences recalls Williams' (1981) argument that traditional perceptions of art may change as its audiences do. Further, changing audiences may influence the making of new art (Williams 1981). The way in which art engages in the social via artistic and gallery practice is thus inextricably linked to perceptions of inclusion and exclusion. These comments above indicate that welcoming new, atypical audiences into the arts may affect change within the field.

In examining artistic and gallery practices over time within their socio-historical contexts, these practices can be argued to have long involved negotiating the boundary between exclusion and inclusion sometimes in response to, but more importantly also alongside and in anticipation of policy (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991; Bourriaud 2002a; Kester 2004). Yet, the government's involvement in encouraging such a policy could be argued to challenge the nature in which the arts may already be engaging with its ideology. In order to understand the implications the government's social inclusion policy may have for the field of the arts, it is necessary to examine its design. Closer study of the social inclusion policy itself makes more evident the difficulties facing the field in promoting inclusion.

Social Inclusion: A Policy Open to Interpretation

In coming to power in 1997, the Labour government linked the cultural realm to many areas of social and urban policy and the setting up of the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU, now Social Exclusion Task Force) was no different. The SEU and SETF were established to address growing poverty and social tensions in the country. They have been part of the government's 'Third Way' agenda (Blair 1998; Giddens 1998), which delivers policy reforms via speak emphasising 'aspiration' and 'opportunity' (DCMS 2005a; SEU 2005) as well as issues regarding the responsibilities and the rights of citizens (Blair 1998; Powell 2000). With regards to the welfare state, Labour has stressed four main areas, as described by Powell (2000: 43): "the linking of economic and social policy; an active, preventive welfare state; the centrality of work; and the distribution of opportunities rather than income." Miles and Paddison (2005) have considered the rationalities behind the Labour government's strong links between these policy reforms and the cultural sphere, with

the emphasis being on the economic potential of culture for the regeneration of declining urban areas amidst rapid globalisation through tourism, new iconic cultural buildings (Plaza 1999; Garcia 2004b; 2005) urban branding (Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2004), cultivating a 'creative class' for the knowledge economy (Florida 2002) and the promotion of social cohesion; all of which show their roots in the ideologies of previous cultural policies described thus far.

With respect to social exclusion in particular, the term itself is as problematic (Levitas 2005) as the term 'culture' and even more so when the two are considered concurrently. The term 'social exclusion' originated in France in 1974 to describe an underclass that fell outside the state's social insurance policies. The idea entered the UK a few years later in 1979 with Peter Townsend's publication *Poverty in the United Kingdom*. Where a focus on questions of social justice would address a lack of material resources, such as income, that aids one's participation in society, *social exclusion* is generally argued to be a more thorough definition of a process of being kept out, whether fully or in part, of the political, social, economic, and cultural structures that govern one's integration into society (Walker 1997; SETF 2007).

A number of studies have demonstrated the varied interpretation of both the terms social exclusion and social inclusion in wider sociological and political debates (Silver 1994; Byrne 1999; Bates 2002; Jahnukainen and Jarvinen 2005; Levitas 2005; Levitas *et al.* 2007). Social exclusion is typically and variously defined by identifying social problems that are often delineated into areas that are political, economic, social, or cultural (Sandell 1998; Levitas *et al.* 2007). Silver (1994) and Levitas (2005) have made strong contributions to any discussion on social exclusion as they have not only identified areas of understanding (Silver 1994), but also these interpretations' implications of social and individual morality

(Levitas 2005). Levitas (2005) has identified three discourses, which are oft-cited: RED, the 'redistributionist' discourse, which focuses on a need to redistribute power and wealth in order to combat exclusion; MUD, the 'moral underclass' discourse, which focuses on exclusion as barriers to freedom but also excluded individuals' roles in perpetuating their situation of state welfare dependency; and SID, the 'social integrationist discourse', which emphasises that social integration is primarily dependent upon paid employment.

Social exclusion, as the discourse around it appears to demonstrate, is not a linear process, but a cyclical and contextual one that can be passed through generations (Blair 2006; SETF 2006). The issue of process is inherent in government and academic descriptions of social exclusion (Walker and Walker 1997; Levitas *et al.* 2007). More specifically, it is often seen as a breakdown between individual, society, and the state (Levitas 2005). Some people may be socially excluded in one way, and not in others, and each individual has a unique experience of exclusion (Newman *et al.* 2005). The use of the term is argued to account for individuals' inability to carry out their social roles. These roles could be any number of social roles: that of parent, producer, or even consumer, but put in this way, social exclusion implies a fear on the part of the included, or those who view themselves as participating in society, that something might happen to society if not everyone can fully take part. A number of scholars argue that this fear is closely linked to the need for a successful market economy (Levitas 2005) and dependent on consumption (Saunders 1993; Bauman 2005) and/or participation (Townsend 1979) as a key role of citizenship, which is argued to be achieved via the mechanisms of education (Wagner 2007) and paid work (Lister 1998). These ideas of consumption as key to promoting an economically successful and potentially cohesive society are implied in

the cultural policies of the previous decades. Ultimately the discourse around social inclusion implies that it is the individual's responsibility to repair such a situation through accessing 'appropriate' forms of social participation (Townsend 1979; Levitas 2005) and it is the role of government to encourage public services to provide the 'opportunities' for engaging in those forms of social participation (Blair 2006). Via Labour's cultural policy, the cultural realm is required to be a public service that provides such opportunities.

Social inclusion seems to have most often been defined and applied as policy in terms of attempting to eliminate or lessen the barriers that create social exclusion in the first place so that individuals' roles can be fulfilled; this is not only seen with respect to museums and galleries (Sandell 2002a), but also in areas of youth work, social care (DH 2001), employment and education (Kenway and Palmer 2006; SETF 2006). However, a recent study commissioned by the Department for Communities and Local Government demonstrated that the causes of exclusion as yet remain unclear (Levitas *et al*. 2007). The varying ways in which social exclusion can be interpreted demonstrates what O'Reilly (2005) explains as the current Labour government's relatively open approach to identifying exclusion. In other words, the government's failure to set out a clear-cut definition of exclusion leaves the policy open to a variety of interpretations within different social and cultural sectors.

Cultural policy as set forth by DCMS and distributed by the ACE upholds an interpretation of social ex- and inclusion that follows Labour's notions of the promotion of 'opportunity' and 'aspiration' for excluded individuals (SEU 1998; DCMS 2005a: 10; SEU 2005). As a result, through the 'attachment' of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy, cultural institutions have become embroiled in welfare reforms that are argued to represent a more active form of welfare that does not encourage

dependency on the state (Lister 1998). In the report for PAT 10, part of the SEU's eighteen Policy Action Teams (PATs) to devise policies for the problems of exclusion, the DCMS considered the possible role of museums and galleries in tackling issues of social exclusion (SEU 2001). The general idea is that one can become socially included if able to overcome those factors that made one originally excluded, by, for example, gaining economic (training and employment), cultural (education), and social capital (networks) (Putnam 1993; 2000; Bourdieu 2000; DCMS 2005a). The ways in which DCMS directives encourage the arts and gallery sectors to promote inclusion implies a move toward a new form of arts management; one that follows on from the 'new public management' that began in the 1980s (Selwood, 2002; Belfiore, 2004) to one that emphasises opportunity via a method of "personalisation through participation" (Leadbeater, 2004: 57; DCMS, 2007a). The ways in which cultural policy as well as practice has thus far been seen to address these circumstances is underpinned by the traditions of cultural thought scrutinised within this chapter.

Ideological Challenges in the Arts as a Public Service for Social Inclusion

In attempting to address matters of social exclusion and then promote social inclusion, the DCMS and ACE have encouraged acceptance of wider cultural forms of expression while simultaneously keeping hold of high cultural ideals. The DCMS's *Centres for Social Change: Museums, Galleries and Archives for All* (DCMS 2000) set out objectives for promoting social inclusion, such as mainstreaming social inclusion; promoting wider access via use of the Internet and outreach projects; forming partnerships and developing inclusion projects with outside organisations; acquiring collections more reflective of the diverse public;

and further developing the role of galleries, museums, and archives as "agents of social change" (DCMS 2000: 5). Similar to policies in previous decades, such objectives are suggested to be carried out by targeting (socially excluded) groups and promoting their access to these institutions via marketing (DCMS 2000). These methods are the same as those presented by Kawashima (2006) with regards to access and audience development and support his argument that access and audience development are inextricably linked to social inclusion policy for galleries and museums. The case studies will explore how this link may play into the interpretation of social inclusion policy within practice. They will also explore whether or not those interpretations may maintain cultural ideals while also attempting to widen cultural offering. Current discussions on that policy in practice have only touched on the ways in which such a marriage poses difficulties for those institutions and individuals working within the arts (Belfiore 2004).

Acknowledging the inherent exclusivity of the arts seems to allow for a potentiality to open them up to a broader public (Prior 2003; Rice 2003). In the same document discussed above, the DCMS (2000: 8) recognises (as was the case in the 1970s) that the intrinsic barriers to inclusion the arts themselves hold must be overcome in order to implement any aspect of the social inclusion policy. The directive explains, for example, "Recent research carried out by MORI shows that only 23% of people from social classes DE visited museums and galleries, compared with 56% of people from classes AB." Academics explain this phenomenon by pointing out the lack of cultural capital many working class individuals are believed to possess (Bourdieu 2000; Mason 2005; Whitehead 2005). They also explain that the physical structure and policing of gallery buildings themselves emphasise one's lack of capital as well as the institutions' high levels of political and cultural authority

(Hooper-Greenhill 1988; Duncan 1995). The DCMS (1999: 5) has directly attempted to address this perception of exclusivity, explaining "arts ... bodies which receive public funds *should* be accessible to everyone [and] actively engage those who have been excluded in the past" (emphasis added). The DCMS (2000: 9) further states, "We believe that cultural activity can be enjoyed by everyone in society" and "to achieve these goals [of social inclusion], museums, galleries and archives must be seen to be relevant." The new focus of demonstrating this relevance is not overtly on methods of marketing, but follows recent developments in artistic and gallery practice that attempts to promote new forms of 'communication' between gallery and potential visitor. Mason (2005: 210) proposes, "The fault [in audiences feeling galleries are not for them] ...does not necessarily lie with... the artist, the artwork, or the individual beholder, but in the breakdown of communication between them." It is to be a kind of centre of communication, discourse, and dialogue where the current theory of gallery/museum studies (Weil 1997; Rice 2003) and the arts (Bourriaud 2002a, 2002b; Kester 1995; 2004), as well as governmental policy towards such institutions (DCMS 1999; 2000; Resource 2001; ACE 2002; DCMS 2004) is focused today. This focus on communication and the stress on promoting a provision of it, puts the onus on the field of the arts to alter highly ingrained notions of exclusion within society; notions that may not necessarily overtly address social issues of poverty but may address the institutions which have come to symbolise that exclusion (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991).

Cursory exploration of the efforts being made by the DCMS and ACE to promote participation and to be more inclusive of individuals' culture and individuals in cultural activity demonstrates the problematic nature of marrying the concepts of culture as simultaneously representative of the profane as well as high ideals. In the consultation paper *Understanding*

the Future: Museums and 21st *Century Life* (2005a), the DCMS asserted that museum collections should be more reflective of diverse communities and play a larger role in citizenship and identity. PAT 10 (DCMS 1999: 10) called for the incorporation of more "small-scale community initiatives" in funding streams. In addressing wider aspects of culture, the DCMS has also recently commissioned the first national research into participation in voluntary arts activity, which will occur through the joint effort of the DCMS and ACE (DCMS 2007a). As during the 1960s and 1970s, such a research project shows that the DCMS and ACE are taking an interest in the kind of cultural pursuits that may not be mainstream or directly provided by the state. The fact that the government is beginning to consider such activities more seriously perhaps illustrates the government's move to be more inclusive in supporting cultural offering (Williams 1958; Stevenson 2004).

The ACE has also promoted a broader understanding of culture and widening participation within the arts, not only in its recently held *Arts Debate* online (ACE 2007), but also in its investigation of more socially-engaged and participatory art projects regarding social inclusion conducted by Jermyn (2001; 2004). Further, the DCMS (2000; 2005a) has upheld galleries and museums as centres for dialogue which may lead to increased social cohesion as well as places in which volunteering, education, and training can occur (DCMS 2000). While these are economic aspects of social inclusion rooted in the policies of the 1980s, they are also argued to promote citizenship as well as the improvement of one's quality of life through increased social networks and lifelong learning (DCMS 2007c). These issues adhere to the social inclusion driven opportunity agenda by government which, at the same time, stresses the more equal, democratic society the Victorians (Cole 1884; Arnold 1993 [1867-69]) argued was attainable through culture.

Government bodies' attention to varied and less institutionalised aspects of culture also implies the state's interest in maintaining a role in those activities. As a result, the imposition of the social inclusion agenda on the arts has augmented the role of the state in determining not only the types of cultural activities in which people should participate, but also how and why. Such an involvement denies the 'arm's-length' principle of control on which the Arts Council was founded and risks challenging any autonomy that art may have in actually being able to effect social, or more simply artistic, change (Francis 2004; Stallabrass 2004). While policy literature shows government support for increasing the opportunities for participation and involvement in creative activity (DCMS 1999; 2000; 2005a), this support actually utilises culture as a means of civilising society. Furthermore, the ways in which the state expects arts organisations to prove these more social outcomes via the performance indicator measurements of the 1980s, places new challenges on the field of the arts (Scott 2006).

Labour's recent bolstering of the importance of maintaining standards of excellence (Eckersley 2008; McMaster 2008) further supports the notion that culture can help civilise society, however the emphasis has turned, as Eckersley (2008) suggests, toward emphasising subsidy for supporting excellence in the arts, rather than on "achieving simplistic targets" (McMaster 2008: 5). The report, *Supporting Excellence in the Arts* written by Brian McMaster and published in early 2008, set out to investigate how such an emphasis may be reached. The report suggests a marriage of wide access to and participation in the best of cultural offering. As the former Secretary of State for Culture, Media, and Sport who commissioned the report, James Purnell (2007) stated, "We want our art to be the best, our museums and collections to be the greatest ...everyone should have the chance to get a taste for the best, to expect

the best, to engage in the best way they can." It is implied that excellence or high ideals can make the culture of the country "world class" (Purnell 2007), which can then create a truly democratic society. Cultural policy, according to Purnell (2007) is established through a pyramid and hierarchical form: participation is at the foundation, followed by education, and at the peak is excellence. As Arnold ([1867-69] 1993: 79) argued against "teaching down to the level of inferior classes" stating "ordinary popular literature is an example of this way of working on the masses," Labour policies contend that a level of standards must be preserved and disseminated amongst and via the arts and culture. The nation's "world-class" status cannot be achieved without providing access to the "best" (Purnell 2007) arts for everyone, bringing high culture "outside the clique of the cultivated and learned" so that the "social idea" of democracy and equality may be achieved (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]: 79; Williams 1958). Ironically, while the social inclusion policy appears to encourage openness within the arts, the insistence of the policy may limit creativity and the opportunity for openness. The policy itself runs the risk of policing the arts by supporting only those art forms, projects, and institutions deemed to fit the agendas of a state that is not necessarily addressing inclusion through the welfare services originally established for that end.

Interpreting Social Inclusion within the Arts

These very debates regarding 1) the opening of arts institutions to a wider public and including their culture in gallery collections and exhibitions and 2) maintaining field-constructed standards of excellence are argued here to be concurrently occurring within the field itself (Harrison 1993; Weil 1997; Whitehead 2005). There is an apparent struggle between two camps within the arts: a struggle to protect the intrinsic value of culture

and keep arts institutions as scholarly, research and conservation-style organisations that attempt not to interpret historical or artistic objects, but to present them for appreciation; and the group of 'others' who desire a more inclusive, rather than a white male Christian and Western intellectual reflection of the world (Harrison 1993: 40) that welcomes emotional responses (Hudson 1977). This conflict and its continued debate within the field itself is argued to stem from over a century of theoretical interpretations as well as political, social, and economic uses of the arts and its institutions. This situation further problematices the interpretations of the social inclusion policy in practice within the arts today (Resource 2000; Mason 2004; West and Smith 2005; DCMS 2007b: 11).

Inconsistencies in interpreting social inclusion into practice do not only result from the difficulties for an exclusive field to promote wider social inclusion, but also from that field's deciphering of the Labour government's open method of defining exclusion (Sennett 2005; O'Reilly 2005). It is argued in a number of policy documents that fostering social inclusion is seen as equal to combating social exclusion (West and Smith 2005). Evaluations and academic studies have demonstrated that social ex- and inclusion are sometimes understood as interchangeable and/or dependent upon one another (Sandell 1998). In some cases it is about the "social inclusion outcomes of arts participation" (Hacking *et al.* 2006: 121). In other cases, such as concluded by the Group for Large Local Authority Museums (GLLAM 2000), it is difficult for arts professionals to separate the idea of social inclusion from that of improved access to the arts. It is often argued that social inclusion work is about connecting with or targeting specific audiences who have explicit, classifiable problems (West and Smith 2005) and promoting their cultural inclusion and/or access to culture (Mason 2004).

A look at studies highlighting the ambiguity of the interpretation of inclusion within the arts demonstrates that collective and individual understandings of culture can affect the delivery of that policy on the ground. This lack of common understanding of social inclusion within the cultural sector demonstrates the importance, first and foremost, of gaining an understanding of how practitioners and participants interpret social inclusion within their specific institutional contexts. The constructions of practitioners and participants' interpretation of social inclusion constitute the belief systems on which the design and delivery of a social inclusion project are based (Bevir and Rhodes 2003). Yet, a number of studies (Belfiore 2004; Mason 2004; Long and Bramham 2006) contain very few approaches to investigating the meanings that practitioners and participants attach to social inclusion and even fewer when considering such meaning in relation to the arts (GLLAM, 2000; Jermyn, 2001). The belief system at work within the arts and cultural policy are seen to involve a conjoining of the notions of provision of access with the maintenance of high cultural standards. This ideological marriage, while illustrated in the theorisation of inclusion and the arts is also seen to create tensions in relation to Labour's welfare policy notions of opportunity and participation in delivery. O'Reilly (2005) explains that examining the ways in which exclusion is attempting to be combated, or inclusion is attempting to be encouraged, can only be successfully achieved by considering specific contexts of policy interpretation and delivery.

Neglecting the Specificity of the Field of Practice
There appears to be a presumption in the studies investigated here that arts practitioners are forced and not desiring to break down exclusive barriers in the arts (Appleton 2004: 4). This conclusion is typically

reached because academic discussions tend to focus on the imposition of performance indicator measurement policies, which are argued to challenge the risk taking, flexibility and experimentation inherent in creative projects (Jermyn 2001; Scherer 2002; Selwood 2002: 76; Tranter and Palin 2004). Belfiore's (2004) explanation of the growing audit culture in cultural policy highlights what is crucially lacking in these evaluations and academic studies of art projects for social inclusion. She raises the concern that an instrumental use of the arts does not overtly appear to gel with 'excellence' or quality of the arts, because, while it is emphasised in cultural policy (Purnell 2007), it is not explicitly "codified" by the ACE (Belfiore 2004: 197). She goes on to explain that a "bone of contention" exists between funding bodies, like the ACE and community arts groups, where quality of product may not be as valuable or overtly imbued with quality as the process. She does not fully acknowledge, however, that within the arts itself this contention of inclusion of differing cultural forms exists. Some art forms have a higher hierarchical standing than others at specific periods of time (Williams 1958; 1989); which is dependent on practices, perceptions, and individuals (Harding 1995; Bourriaud 2002a; Kester 2004).

While calling for the need to consider developments in cultural policy alongside those in the British welfare state, Belfiore (2004) does not fully address the arts and its own wider context and system of regulation with institutions at the macro level and individuals, gallery administrators, artists, and audiences at the micro level. Kawashima's studies (1997; 2000; 2006) are incredibly useful as they put cultural policy more into the context of gallery practice. Kawashima's work places practice into a discussion of practical and more business-oriented approaches, such as access and audience development. However, while examining the social policy constraints that may be put on such institutions in the form of

cultural policy, it is felt that Kawashima's investigations lack an examination of the meanings and interpretations, the belief systems of practitioners working within individual institutional contexts, including history and ethos, as well as a consideration of the issues centred around artistic value (Boorsma 2006). Similarly to Bourdieu (2000), Kawashima (2006) tends to view art galleries as places that hold art works, objects produced by artists for public consumption (in order to justify public funds). Such views tend to support the nineteenth-century liberal humanist and Romantic view (Lee 2005; Boorsma 2006) of art objects as autonomous, separated from everyday life, yet fully able to affect it socially, morally and economically. Nonetheless, they neglect in-depth investigation of the everyday, namely those individuals that engage with art, its processes and its objects.

Current literature, while referencing anecdotal evidence on the potential of the arts to effect change (DCMS 2007c), has a paucity of in-depth case studies on the individuals and groups involved in arts projects, such as adults with learning disabilities, offenders, and youth groups, and stakeholders such as care workers and service providers. Many studies only briefly list descriptions of project types rather than the individual needs and involvement of people (GLLAM 2000; West and Smith 2005). As each individual's experience of exclusion (or inclusion) is argued to be different (Morris 2001; MacDonald *et al.* 2005; Newman *et al.* 2005) and any experience is also process-based (SEU 2001), there is a need for more thorough examination of the processes underpinning project delivery (Butterfoss 2006), particularly within a field that has its own issues of exclusion (Delin 2002). Sandell (2003) and GLLAM (2000) have acknowledged that more research on delivery needs to be conducted to further illuminate ways in which social inclusion policy is being engaged within the cultural sector. This thesis adheres to those

suggestions and also argues that such consideration should additionally include the views of the 'excluded' for whom the policy is designed.

Conclusions

This chapter has focused on two key aspects relating to the development of 'arts for social inclusion' under the current Labour government. In taking a historical approach, the chapter began by examining the political, social, and economic rationalities underpinning issues of social inclusion within cultural policy since the nineteenth century. In addition, the chapter linked that discussion to changes in artistic and gallery practice. The chapter also assessed the terminology and policy of social exclusion and inclusion more specifically and considered welfare policy issues in direct relation to gallery practice for promoting social inclusion. The chapter has demonstrated the ways in which artistic and gallery practice has made attempts to engage with wider, even non-traditional, art audiences in new ways *alongside* and not necessarily because of, state-encouraged methods of targeting 'types' of individuals for the consumption of cultural offering, audience development and utilising art as a means for urban regeneration. Throughout this discussion, the implications of the social inclusion agenda for the arts were seen to relate to all of these issues.

The chapter has also showed that the lack of a clear delivery strategy for social inclusion policy in general, due largely to the open nature of the definitions of social exclusion and inclusion (Levitas 2005; O'Reilly 2005), situates the arts amongst the welfare sector as also being supposedly able to address social inclusion. It appears that the ways in which the arts are seen to be relevant to social inclusion targets are a result of some of the positive links they have been argued to have with respect to economic, social and urban development (Matarasso 1997;

Garcia 2004b; Miles and Paddison 2005) from both a policy and a field perspective (Demos 2003). Government may be acknowledging a broader role for the arts in society. At the same time, the ways in which the state may be encouraging such a role subjects the arts to having to 'prove' performance indicators and outcomes for it that are not necessarily conducive to the ways in which the field conducts its practice (Selwood 2002; Belfiore 2004; Scott 2006).

Current discussions regarding social inclusion and the arts tend to focus on two areas: the lack of clear or common understanding of the terminology involved (GLLAM 2000) and the difficulty in measuring impact (Newman 2001). Further, much of the literature traces the historical evolution of social inclusion policy within the arts from a political and social perspective (Belfiore and Bennett 2007). These discussions tend to emphasise the ways in which the agenda's attachment to cultural policy is part of a lineage of the British state's instrumental use of the arts for the economic and social betterment of society since the Victorian era (Selwood 2002; Belfiore 2004; Mason 2004). Other literature examines the situation in the context of the museum and gallery as institutions more generally, posing broader questions as to their roles in society at large (Sandell 2002b). Any academic mention of practice tends to emphasise a lack of consistent approach in designing, delivering, and evaluating projects (West and Smith 2005).

Policy mention of practice has recently begun to focus on some of the common approaches taken in delivering social inclusion projects via the arts and culture (GLLAM 2000; Jermyn 2001; DCMS 2007b: 10). These discussions particularly highlight those practices that echo government attempts at promoting more 'personalised' or client-needs-driven approaches to the delivery of welfare services (Leadbeater 2005). The DCMS (2007b) explains that the delivery of such projects requires

sensitivity, vision and determination as well as the ability for cultural practitioners to connect and negotiate with people situated outside that practice. In early discussions regarding project delivery, the DCMS has acknowledged that institutional and local contexts must be taken into consideration in order to "develop their own policies" (DCMS 2000: 3). Such emphasis on localised contexts and individualised approaches require a much more in-depth examination of arts projects for social inclusion.

Inherent in this engagement are fluctuating understandings not only of what culture or art is, but also what is its role in society. Adding consideration of these changing notions within artistic and gallery practice to the discussion on Labour's current cultural policy illuminates the tensions that exist politically and socially for contemporary art, its organisations and their practice (Miles 2005). In addition, examining the arts in *relation to* policy rather than *because of it* demonstrates that rather than policy purely 'imposing' (Appleton 2004) ideas of access and inclusion onto the arts and arts organisations, these changes have also emerged from within the art world itself. As a result, both the arts and cultural policy could be seen to have influenced incremental change within one another's field. This investigation therefore considers the wider argument that in order to understand the implications of policy agendas like that of social inclusion on the arts, it is of critical importance to examine the ways in which individuals and organisations interpret the practice of what they do, why and how (Bevir and Rhodes 2005).

The role of the state is crucial in helping us understand the way in which we engage with cultural forms. Culture is at once of and for everyone and in the state's specific encouragement of socially excluded individuals' engagement with the culture selected for public funding, a better society is argued to be made available, not only in terms of quality of life, but

arguably economically and socially as well. While this thesis as a whole does not seek to question public funding for culture, per say, this chapter inevitably does raise the question as to what may occur when the state insists on certain kinds of engagement with culture. The insistence of strict adherence to performance indicators, so apparent and problematic with respect to the social inclusion policy, may restrict our understanding of the dynamic possibilities for which creative artistic endeavours may naturally allow (Stallabrass 2004). Engagement with such a policy may produce or simply provide designs for alternative practices within which questions of inclusion and even inclusion specifically with regards to the arts may be raised. Chapters 5 to 8 of this thesis will investigate what occurs on the ground within specific art galleries as a result of such a policy. Chapters 3 and 4 present the methodological and local foundations upon which such case studies are introduced.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY AND INTERPRETIVE APPROACH

Chapter 2 raised questions regarding engagement within the arts with the social inclusion agenda. The first is whether or not the involvement of individuals in projects designed for inclusion is in fact an imposition (Appleton 2004) or a wish (Hudson 1977). The second is how individuals within the field carry out 'inclusion' when thus far any attempts to measure or understand engagement with the agenda have proved largely ineffective (Merli 2002). Underlying both of these questions is the issue of culture itself. Inherent in the development of a social inclusion agenda within the arts are conjoined yet seemingly opposed ideologies from the standpoints of both policy and practice. These ideologies regard the ways in which high culture may be representative of high moral ideals that are employed to promote an effective economy and social cohesion for the common good (Matarasso 1997; Sandell 1998; DCMS 2007c). Academic studies, while attempting to critique the effects of policy on practice, actually lack in-depth consideration of the practice itself. Such consideration is important because these intrinsic and instrumentalist cultural ideals create friction between the boundaries with which practitioners for and participants in art projects designed for social inclusion contend.

Within the wider research project, it is not the purpose to further investigate the government uses of the term social inclusion within cultural policy. Such investigation has served thus far only as a backdrop for investigating practice in so much as the research aims to gain a better understanding of the engagement of arts practitioners and participants with the practice of that terminology, specifically within the field of the

arts. In particular, this thesis argues that it is crucial to consider the specificities of field and organisational contexts in which projects for social inclusion are being delivered: this includes meaning and practice on the part of the individuals involved (Bevir and Rhodes 2005). This investigation aims to reveal how the social inclusion agenda may highlight debates on the intrinsic and instrumental uses of culture that have long existed within the field itself. Further, it seeks to examine whether or not the processes by which this debate is carried out, namely by means of 'social inclusion' projects, may potentially encourage further demarcation or conjoining of these apparently conflicting views of culture.

Framing the Research Question

Most literature and qualitative studies demonstrate a lack of agreed meaning of the term social inclusion among arts administrators (Sandell 1998; 2002b; 2003; Newman and McLean 1998; 2004a; GLLAM 2000; Mason 2004; West and Smith 2005; Hacking *et al.* 2006). Yet, the contextual situation of the arts field and its inherent contradictions of how culture itself is interpreted and promulgated have not been considered alongside these meanings in depth. Further, while there are studies available that present interpretations and meanings given to the museum/gallery/art centre visit by attenders and non attenders alike, they do not fully investigate the issue of inclusion (Moore 1998; Harland *et al.* 1995; Fyfe and Ross 1996). Not only do these studies not address the issue of social inclusion with the individuals to whom the label of 'excluded' is given, but also, according to Prior (2003), a number of these studies often gloss over how different social groups, and in this case 'socially excluded groups', read museums/galleries/art centres. He argues that audiences are often characterised as "mass" which "…fails to capture

the sociological coordinates of the viewing public as well as the complex motivations behind the museum visit" (Prior 2003: 58). He advises, "Any analysis of the art museum must move beyond cursory dismissals of the audience as an undifferentiated aggregate in order to grasp the meanings and agendas that shape the visit" (Prior 2003: 58).

Artists who are often employed by galleries and art centres to directly deliver social inclusion projects also have a limited voice in any of these studies (Harding 1995; Lacy 1995). It is only within art criticism (Lacy 1995; Gablik 1995; Kester 1995, 2004) where the relationship of artist to excluded groups, though that specific term is not applied, is discussed; even then, the discussion focuses on issues of power and aesthetics. There is a gap in the literature on investigating the meanings and roles of individuals in constructing, developing, delivering and engaging in arts projects 'for social inclusion', an understanding of which would illuminate how and more specifically what values of culture are propagated and disseminated by and within the field.

Both Chapters 1 and 2 touched on the significance of communication and interpretation in the arts. Aspects of communication and interpretation in that field have been described to occur in various forms. For instance, an art gallery as a physical structure communicates notions of authority and elitism (Duncan 1995), and the situation of a work of art in a geographical locality, an art gallery, and/or an exhibition space with accompanying interpretive materials or even staff communicates notions of art historical importance, aesthetics, and standards of excellence (Hooper-Greenhill 1988). At the same time, Hooper-Greenhill (2000a) has explained that these contexts do not alone create meaning, but are also dependent upon an individual's personal experience, prior knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs, all of which are brought to bear in attributing meaning to an artistic object or experience. Meaning-making

is not an individual process, but a social one. Hooper-Greenhill 2000a: 141) explains, "Our individual strategies for making sense of experience are enabled, limited and mediated through our place in the social world". Meaning, then, is dependent upon an interpretive process that is closely tied to experience and learning as well as context. Hooper-Greenhill (2000a) links these ideas of context to those beyond the historical and the socio-economic by referring to the notion of 'interpretive communities', originally a reference from literary theory (Fish 1980). She describes these communities as being "made up of those who share interpretive strategies for reading objects, for identifying their significance and for pointing out their salient features" (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a: 142). Essentially, interpretive strategies frame meaning and have implications for inclusion either via the community or in a field of practice or even in a broader social sense. Further, they are not stable but change as individuals move from one 'interpretive community' to another, demonstrating inherent issues of belonging and non-belonging, inclusion and exclusion. By discussing these issues with reference to art galleries in particular, Hooper-Greenhill (2000a) demonstrates the implicit significance of communication, interpretation, social interaction, and meaning-making within the field of the arts. Such areas have direct influence on the interconnected concerns of access, audience development and inclusion referred to by Kawashima (2006) and Sandell (1998).

The various methods by which art galleries have been attempting to engage wider audiences have all been dependent upon the way in which they have communicated ideas of art with visitors and non-visitors. This communication may be by means of marketing to targeted audiences as well as by developing and delivering interpretive materials, exhibitions, and programmes (Kawashima 2006). Within an art gallery setting

interpretation typically appears to be something done "for you or to you" (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a: 143). The implicit manner in which galleries 'communicate' to audiences and interpret objects for them is often seen to perpetuate their exclusivity (Duncan 1995). These more traditional forms of communication appear to be under direct challenge via an implementation of social inclusion policy (Sandell 1998; 2002b; DCMS 2007b). Yet, despite acknowledging that processes of communication and interpretation are of great significance to engagement with *any* audience, even more a socially excluded one, prior academic studies and the DCMS have done little to develop an understanding of these processes and thus the potential of them to promote inclusion.

Taking an Interdisciplinary and Interpretive Approach

This research is first concerned with the meanings that arts practitioners and artists attach to the work they do for social inclusion as well as how those meanings are interpreted by socially excluded individuals for whom these projects are designed. Second, the research considers how those meanings are enacted through practice. In order to understand the processes of communication and interpretation that occur amongst individuals in their specific organisational and field contexts in the development and delivery of projects for social inclusion, it has been necessary to develop a methodology applicable to considerations of both social science and gallery-based arts practice. As explained in Chapter 1, the whole of this research project is very much informed by my own knowledge of and experience within the arts. From the start, then, this research has been informed by theories of museological historians, such as Duncan (1995) and Hooper-Greenhill (1988; 2000a) as well as by art historians and critics, Kester (1995; 2004) and Bourriaud (2002a), who have pioneered discussions of art in reference to social interaction. The

research is also influenced by socio-historical approaches for understanding the history of artistic and gallery practice (Silver 1986). This approach places an understanding of arts for social inclusion into a more informed context with regards to artistic practice and the display, interpretation and collection of that practice in galleries and art centres. This art historical consideration further complements the interpretive approaches garnered from the field of the social sciences (Bevir and Rhodes 2005).

The interpretive approach fosters an understanding of the meanings underpinning the practice of arts for social inclusion from the standpoint of the individuals involved within the context of the field and the organisations in which they occur (Bevir and Rhodes 2005). It allows for a concentration on "meanings, beliefs, and discourses" and privileges meanings as a way to "grasp actions" (Bevir and Rhodes 2005: 4). Taylor (1971) has explained that meanings, understandings and beliefs have a forming relationship to actions. Beliefs and actions cannot be separated. According to Hooper-Greenhill (2000a: 138) with respect to the arts, "attitudes and beliefs also affect the interpretation of what is seen and known." Bevir and Rhodes (2005: 4) explain the notion with respect to practice, "Practices could not exist if people did not have the appropriate beliefs; beliefs or meanings would not make sense without the practices to which they refer."

The "appropriate beliefs" to which Bevir and Rhodes refer (2005: 4) are understood here as being related to the field of practice (Bourdieu 2000) of the arts. In order to understand the rationale behind and the delivery of arts projects designed for socially excluded groups, it is essential to understand how *all* those actors involved in these projects interpret the term social inclusion (DCMS 1998; 2000) and thus may negotiate the boundaries the term implies in relation to culture. Bourdieu (1980; 2000)

has theorised that agents become socialised into fields not through norms, but cognitively by a process of internalising the social structure of the field itself. In other words, agents transpose the properties of a field, such as the hierarchy of positions, traditions, history, and institutions into frameworks that then condition the ways the field is perceived, grasped and understood by those agents as well as by others. These issues are believed here to be part of the ways in which 'interpretive communities' could be seen to either constrain or enable meaning-making within their situated context (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a). For Kirchberg (2007) such a theory allows for the consideration of autonomous people in upholding and altering structures within fields; thus making some room toward investigating how individuals may coexist within fields, potentially remaking boundaries as they negotiate through them (Lamont 1989). The interpretive approach argues for the fact that individuals "are not merely passive vehicles in social, political and historical affairs, but have certain inner capabilities which can allow for individual judgments, perceptions and decision-making" (Garrick 1999: 149).

The interpretive approach is closely linked with context as it argues that meanings or beliefs are holistic. Bevir and Rhodes (2005: 4) explain, "We can make sense of someone's beliefs only by locating them in the wider web of other beliefs that provide the reasons for their holding them." This "wider web of other beliefs" is interpreted here as context: the art world or field (Bourdieu 2000; Harris 2006) including specific organisations as well as broader political, economic, social and local concerns. Individuals working within the arts are not only affected by the historical context of their time, but of their field as well. Gallagher (1992) has argued that literature is not only rooted in social practices, but is itself a social practice as well. This idea is certainly applicable to visual art. Raymond Williams (1989b: 151) has explained that one "cannot

understand an intellectual or artistic project without also understanding its formation."

Formation here is not only understood to reference a socio-historical context, but also the process through which a particular artistic project is formed. As demonstrated in Chapter 2, process is not only intrinsic in government and academic descriptions of social exclusion (SEU 2001), but is also a key aspect of contemporary socially-engaged artistic practice (Bourriaud 2002a; Kester 2004). Kester (2004) and Bourriaud (2002a) have stressed the emphasis that many artists have placed on social encounters and interactivity. Kester (2004) has explained that within the field of art history, there is a lack of established language in discussing work of this nature. As a result, he suggests the need to observe the development and making of such work to truly grasp its intention and meaning (Kester 2004). Hooper-Greenhill (2000a) has pointed out similar problems in examinations of gallery practice. Definitions and descriptions of practice are not enough to develop an understanding of project delivery. Process is then critical to both issues of exclusion and art projects that may be developed to combat exclusion. The interpretive approach focuses on investigating the way in which practices are shaped, sustained, and altered through the interaction and contest of the beliefs rooted in that activity (Bevir and Rhodes 2005). Garrick (1999) has pointed out that interpretive approaches are problematic because they do not always account for the specificities of practice: whether that is historical, social, or workplace related. This study argues that the interplay of beliefs emphasised within an interpretive approach can best be examined, not only with a consideration of context, but also through a consideration of process and interaction within practice.

In light of the above concerns, this thesis combines methods of semi-structured interviews with participant observation of three specific

projects held in three different arts institutions. It is hoped that this combination of methods brings to light not only the impressions individuals involved in social inclusion projects have of their practice, but also what is occurring on-the-ground during the practice itself as framed and shaped not only by those individuals involved, but also by the organisations in which they are situated. It is felt that by doing so the thesis may promote more reflection on the practice itself. With numerous studies having so far pointed out the inability to directly pinpoint outcomes for such projects (Selwood 2002), it is believed that this thesis will provide a more direct examination of the kinds of tensions which these individuals face and thus the boundary negotiations in which they engage.

Rationale

This research does not attempt to make generalisations, but to discover what people think, what occurs and how those occurrences emerge. Unlike in a positivist approach in studies of exclusion where generic indicators may be used which do not necessarily account for individual experiences of exclusion or inclusion nor account for context or interaction in those experiences (Burchardt *et al.* 1999; Richardson and Le Grand 2002; O'Reilly 2005), the approach employed here correlates with the idea that "people respond to specific situations as they see them and they make value-led choices" (Arskey and Knight 1999: 10). In order to gain insight into the research objectives and account for meaning, context, process and interaction, the thesis combines historical and sociological approaches that include desk-based historical research and interpretive research via semi-structured interviews and the participant observation of three case study projects in three different arts institutions within Liverpool. Denzin (1989), Arskey and Knight (1999), and Robson

(1993) have all noted that combinations of research methods may strengthen research findings and reduce uncertainties. In particular, such approaches allow for more in-depth investigations (Arskey and Knight 1999). As this research privileges the specificities of context, local, organisational, and field as perceived by individuals, such an approach here is appropriate.

Historical Research

In developing a study that focuses specifically on social inclusion projects situated within arts organisations in Liverpool, it is felt that initial documentary research presented in Chapter 2 helped to develop an understanding of the broader national rationale for, and thus implications of, the attachment of the social inclusion agenda to the arts within England. Such research has also served as a framework from which to examine the historical, social, political and economic uses of the arts in Liverpool. Based on an understanding of this broader history, documentary research on the development of arts organisations in the city during the nineteenth century was undertaken in order to understand the locality's founding ideologies on art's relationship to the public and its changing role in relation to societal, economic, and political concerns.

Liverpool is a suitable city in which to consider the changing social role of the arts toward today's implementation of social inclusion policies. Liverpool has moved from a great Empire city of the nineteenth century to one of mass depopulation and unemployment toward the mid to late twentieth century to finally a city establishing itself as European Capital of Culture 2008 while under major regeneration in the twenty-first century. Throughout these three key periods, Liverpool's history of visual art and its relationship to and role in such a changing local society has been little considered. This lack is curious in light of the major consideration academic and political literature has given to the broader

notions of culture as a means for civilising and regenerating urban areas within British politics and society (Bennett 1998a; McGuigan 1996). In order to create a more context-specific understanding of these developments semi-structured interviews were conducted with key figures in the development of arts institutions within Liverpool. Chapter 4 establishes a social history of the arts within that city focusing more specifically on the mid-twentieth century until the present.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key figures in the development of arts institutions within the city to develop historically-based understanding of the social history of the arts in Liverpool. Chapter 4 investigates Liverpool's visual arts development with relation to political, social, and economic changes in the city in order to gauge how the specific visual arts institutions involved in the case studies have related to the local public and how those relations have culminated in today's attachment of the social inclusion agenda to gallery and artistic practices there.

Semi-Structured Interviews on Interpretation

Semi-structured interviews were also carried out to account for how practitioners and participants describe and interpret the practice of 'social inclusion' within the arts. Understanding individuals' interpretation of the term 'social inclusion' and how it is delivered, as informed by their personal experience and beliefs regarding their field of practice helps us to unpick their individual perceptions of culture, which has been discussed to underpin the tensions resulting from the attachment of the social inclusion agenda to the arts. In order to address these objectives, the research has involved semi-structured interviews with a series of main questions providing a framework or guide for the interview, but also allowing for improvisation and further exploration of discussion in certain areas (Arskey and Knight 1999). Semi-structured interviews are

useful for the interpretive approach (Ruane 2005: 150). As Arskey and Knight (1999: 3) have explained, "perception, memory, emotion, and understanding are human constructs" that take place within cultural and sub-cultural settings, which provide a strong framework for meaning making. Interviewing allows for the exploration of "broad cultural consensus," or in this case understandings within the field of the arts, and at the same time, people's more personal, private and particular understandings of that consensus (Arskey and Knight 1999: 3).

Less structured interviewing gives the respondent more control over the pace and direction of the interview (Ruane 2005). Further, such interviews allow for respondents to stumble onto memories that would not be so easily retrievable under more structured questioning (Ruane 2005: 150). These memories or personal stories are felt to be critical to developing an understanding of the value individuals place on culture and its relationship to the issue of inclusion. Semi-structured interviews also permit deeper investigation of the meanings participants and practitioners attach to the term social inclusion. Further, they allow for individuals to give descriptions of that practice. Interviews examine the "context of thought, feeling, and action and can be a way of exploring relationships between different aspects of a situation. ...[They are] a powerful way of helping people to make explicit things that have hitherto been implicit— to articulate their tacit perceptions, feelings and understandings" (Arskey and Knight 1999: 33). They are a way to explore and uncover the meanings that underpin people's lives, routines, behaviours, feelings, and actions (Rubin and Rubin 1995).

Case Study Approach

The case study approach has proven common in studies of social exclusion (Jahnukainen and Jarvinen 2005; McDonald *et al.* 2005; West and Smith 2005). Current studies show that the scope of activity is

impressively wide (Hacking *et al.* 2006), though the breadth of practice is not always unpicked in the literature (West and Smith 2005). As a result, projects selected for case study were chosen in order to explore different types of arts activities couched under the terminology of social inclusion, while also addressing different perceived criteria for social inclusion. A number of factors affected the selection of these case studies, such as availability and the comfort of gatekeepers (Ruane 2005) and participants in having a researcher involved. Scheduling was also a factor not only in terms of the ability to attend projects at their earliest stages of delivery but also in terms of maximum chance to attend as many events/meetings as possible. Awareness of the kinds of projects existing in Liverpool developed out of interviews with practitioners, which additionally assisted in providing a contextual understanding for developing socially inclusive arts practice in that locality. Interviews with participants could not be conducted until knowledge and then observation of the projects was gained.

The selection of projects for case study evolved from discussion shared during the semi-structured interviews. The projects chosen were based on the fact that the practitioner(s) directly involved in its delivery and the organisation in which it was situated described the project to be addressing exclusion. This approach was taken in order to initially investigate the various ways in which the government's use of the term social inclusion may be interpreted within the field. Consequently, the case studies chosen are intended to explore two issues: first, the beliefs underpinning the development of such projects and second, the ways in which those beliefs and the resulting practices are shaped by the types of value specific organisations and individuals attach to the ideological relationship of culture and 'inclusion'. In order to investigate varied approaches to inclusion and keep a level of comparability among them,

the case studies chosen are from three different, yet similar, arts organisations in Liverpool. Each, the Walker Art Gallery, the Bluecoat, and Tate Liverpool, are highly regarded institutions in the field of the arts with respected international reputations. At the same time, they differ in key ways. Each has a different historical development in, and thus relationship to, the city, which is discussed in Chapter 4. This historical and local context has affected the manner in which each organisation attempts to relate to or engage the local public in its programming and exhibitions, which in turn affect the forms of inclusion they may promote. The collection and exhibitions at the Walker are more historical in nature, while the Tate and the Bluecoat are more modern and contemporary. While the Walker and the Tate are more traditional in their structure, both having permanent national collections of art with accompanying exhibitions and educational and outreach programming, the Bluecoat does not have a permanent collection. It does however have educational and outreach programming to coincide with its temporary exhibitions and performances and other programmes. As a result, the actual physical buildings in which these organisations are situated are a crucial aspect of the ways they engage and are received and perceived by the public (Hooper-Greenhill 1988). It is felt that the overlapping similarities and dissimilarities between the organisations provide a good basis from which to compare the findings from the case study projects in Chapter 8. The projects, the organisations in which they are held, the targeted 'excluded group' involved and the time frame of participant observation undertaken are detailed in the table on the next page.

Table 1: Case Study Projects

Institution	Project Title	Targeted 'Excluded Group'	Project Description	Time Frame
The Bluecoat: contemporary art, design and live art. No permanent collection	Blue Room	Adults with Learning Disabilities	Training core group of 5 adults with learning disabilities to assist artists delivering workshops in Resource Centres across Liverpool leading up to opening of Blue Room in Bluecoat Arts Centre in 2008.	10/06 – 8/07
TATE Liverpool: modern and contemporary art gallery with permanent collection	Opening Doors Course	Social and health care workers and their service users	Course training care workers to use gallery-based activities for the promotion of communication with service users and as a kind of therapy	9/07 – 11/07
Walker Art Gallery: traditional, largely 15th century to 19th century permanent collection with some contemporary art	Parent and Baby sessions in Big Art	Families	Activities specially designed for families with babies in a children's gallery	9/07 – 12/07

68

The Blue Room project at the Bluecoat involves training adults with learning disabilities, who consider themselves to be artists, to assist in delivering art workshops with a 'professional artist' to other adults with learning disabilities. The project is delivered in close collaboration with support workers and various Resource Centres for adults with learning disabilities around Liverpool. This project not only targets a group that is labelled as socially excluded in local and central government literature (DH 2001), but also contains an aspect of training, which addresses an economic feature of social inclusion. In fact, the aims for the project are to expand audiences for the Bluecoat and train artists who might otherwise not have the opportunity to get artistic training. Participant observation began in the midst of Phase 1 of the project, which included 'taster' sessions for new users. This time frame allowed for an observation of the final developments of training techniques as well as a study of the delivery of those techniques to new audiences. Because of the long-term nature of the project itself, a period of eleven months was spent with the group in order to gain a familiarity with the engagement that may occur over such a period of time.

The Opening Doors course is a programme designed for individuals working in the caring and health professions held annually since 2000 at Tate Gallery Liverpool. For the sake of anonymity, the individuals' specific organisations will not be explored in greater detail. The broad aims of the course are to encourage critical engagement with modern and contemporary art through discussion and to encourage the learning of techniques to empower and enable others to engage in dialogue through art (Tate Liverpool 2007). In order to receive accreditation for the course, participants must facilitate a group visit for their service users to the Tate. Participant observation took place throughout the duration of the course. The service users who visited the

Tate as part of the participants' course requirements were not interviewed for this research because course participants desired to protect the privacy of their service users and in particular, their care provision and affiliated organisations.

The Big Art space, formally called Big Art for Little Artists, is described as the new national children's gallery located within the Walker Art Gallery, part of National Museums Liverpool, a central-government funded body. The Parent and Baby Sessions, held on Monday mornings, consist of specially designed activities geared to parents and their babies. Study of the sessions was undertaken because gallery staff described this particular audience as being socially excluded from the Walker's main audience base. The Parent and Baby Sessions were also articulated as addressing DCMS (2000) policy regarding inclusion. Participant observation began just after the Walker had completed a major review of the Big Art space and was carried out over a three and a half month period, the length of one academic term, in order to fit with the lifestyles of many attending families. Parents and carers as participants were the focus of the case study, rather than the young children. This approach follows studies by Sterry and Beaumont (2006), which have explained that parents and carers still largely influence the activities in which children of such age groups participate.

Each case study contains a characteristic that is key to the aims of the arts organisation while addressing aspects practitioners within those institutions described to be of social exclusion. While each study may address some features of West and Smith's (2005) criteria of identifying a social inclusion project, such as a collaborative and multi-agency approach and/or focus on a specific community group, they do not fit neatly into those criteria. In fact, as there is no agreed upon or required approach to developing and delivering

such projects (Resource 2000; Sandell 2002b), it would be difficult to find three such studies that could represent all the various types of inclusion projects in existence. It is felt, however, that these case studies do present a varied approach in the use of the terminology of 'arts for social inclusion'. As a result, these case studies illuminate areas of arts/social inclusion studies that are still unclear, such as the individual and organisational rationale for their specific development.

Participant Observation

While interviews allow for the search for meanings and impressions, observation of art projects for/with socially excluded groups accounts for the interactions and ranges of experience, or the relational dynamics, that are described as occurring in these projects (Rubin and Rubin 1995; Mason 2004). *Participant* observation allows for the researcher to be fully involved with the group or setting while remaining completely open and ethical about the research agenda (Ruane 2005). Such an approach minimises disruption to the 'naturalness' of the setting being researched as well as lessens any uneasiness amongst research subjects (Ruane 2005). Participation in the projects observed involved myself, the researcher, acting not only as such, but also as a volunteer for the specific project. Initially, it was felt that the 'volunteer' approach might present a methodological problem in that serving as a volunteer might appear to align myself, the researcher, with the arts organisation, which may be seen to possess authority over the participants in the project. In actual fact, participants, those individuals labelled socially excluded involved in the arts activities, appeared to be more open and comfortable discussing any problems that arose in the course of the project. It seems that the alignment of the research with that of myself and the University of Liverpool helped participants to understand the study was in

fact being conducted by an individual outside the given arts organisation. In addition, my own past work experience in the arts, allowed arts administrators and artists to feel comfortable discussing issues openly with me, as it was implied that I had familiarity with the situations in which they worked (Hill 2006).

The Sample

This study as a whole is additionally informed by contextual interviews with arts administrators from six major visual arts institutions (Liverpool Biennial, FACT, the Walker Art Gallery, Bluecoat, Tate Liverpool, and Open Eye Gallery) largely within the metropolitan area of Liverpool as well as six grassroots organisations (The Blackie, Arts in Regeneration Granby, The Yellow House, Bootle Art in Action, Hope Street Limited and METAL) totalling 12 organisations. By gathering empirical evidence from individuals working in different types of organisations, it is hoped that the information collected will be more rounded as to the practice that is actually being implemented. In doing so, these interviews have also assisted me in removing my own impressions of the research topic. The arts administrators interviewed here as well as for the case studies consisted of organisation directors and at least one administrator whose role it is to conduct social inclusion projects. In the cases where organisations had more than one individual in such a position, all were interviewed. In total, 13 administrators and 12 organisation directors were interviewed. These interviews were exploratory as case studies were chosen from discussions conducted within these interviews. The reason for interviewing both 'types' of respondents was in order to investigate whether or not individuals who work directly with excluded groups had differing impressions of the terminology of social inclusion and the practice of it from those individuals

in senior positions. In addition, comparison of these two types of interviews in the situation of the case studies help create an understanding not only of the organisational standpoint on the issue of social inclusion, but also whether or not that standpoint was more widely shared in the hierarchy of the organisation. This approach helps gauge whether or not individuals charged with this work are conducting a practice that may be perceived to be 'imposed' by policy (Appleton 2004) on the organisation or one that the organisation itself adheres to by way of the people who work within it.

The voices of the participants, individuals labelled 'excluded', and the artists are heard via the case studies. Yet allowance for this voice varies depending on the type of project studied. For instance, five artists are involved in the case study of the Bluecoat's Blue Room, but not in the other two case studies as the Tate and Walker projects did not involve artists. Initially, the research set out to interview other artists working with similar projects in the city, however, this plan was abandoned as it was felt that focusing on artists' impressions of a project actually observed would yield more consistent and less generalising findings. Also in the case of the Blue Room study, only five participants and four social workers are involved in the project and on a consistent, week-by-week basis. As a result, all of those individuals were easily accessible for interviews, not only logistically, but also because those individuals felt comfortable with me, the researcher, as a familiar face regularly attending the project. While support workers were interviewed individually, a focus group method was selected for interviewing the service users involved in the project. Previous research with adults with learning disabilities seems to agree that focus groups are good ways in which to approach discussion with such individuals. They are seen to provide a supportive environment and to lessen the potential of 'compliance' that may

occur in one-to-one interviews between adults with learning disabilities and the researcher (Hall 2004). Further, in conducting such a focus group, the support workers were asked not to attend, as this may have hindered replies given by the group (Beart *et al.* 2001). In addition, each of the two Bluecoat staff charged with delivery of the project were also separately interviewed.

Participants of the Walker's Parent and Baby sessions consisted of very young children/babies under the age of five and their parents and/or carers, however the research sample has focused solely on the parents and carers, rather than the children. This focus is for two reasons. First, Sterry and Beaumont (2006: 234) have explained that parents with young children under the age of five are more likely to be "unyielding about certain aspects of their children's behaviour and requests." It is therefore the parents and carers who decide whether or not these young children will visit an art gallery together. Second, it is the parents and carers perceived barriers for themselves and their young children that staff have explained directly affect inclusion for families into the Walker Art Gallery. As a result, those parents and carers who were regular attenders (seven) of the sessions were approached for interviews. Two members of staff charged with delivering the projects were also interviewed.

Finally, in the study of the Tate's Opening Doors course, having attended all the course sessions bar one, individual participants saw me as a familiar face. However, due to the sensitive nature of the care work they carry out, not everyone was comfortable discussing these issues in a research setting. With 12 individuals on the course, five were interviewed. In addition, all the course leaders (three, one of which was a Tate employee) were interviewed. Unless otherwise specified all interviews conducted for this thesis occurred face-to-face and were voice recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Finally, with respect to investigating the social history of Liverpool's visual art, a sample of 16 individuals who had previously lived and worked in that scene in Liverpool were also interviewed. These included the only interviews conducted via telephone (two). In addition, some individuals interviewed in the wider aspect of 'practitioner-perception' also shared information regarding this history, augmenting the sample number listed above.

Reflexivity

It is important to note that because this research has been conducted by an individual who has six years experience working as an arts administrator, delivering various artistic programmes for galleries and art centres for what would be considered 'excluded' individuals, it is undeniable that some assumptions regarding 'arts for social inclusion' practice have informed this research. These assumptions involve a familiarity of some of the structural and creative requirements, restraints and possibilities involved in developing and delivering such projects. Approaching individuals for interviews and case studies met relative ease because they perceived me to have an understanding regarding artistic and gallery practice for social inclusion. This situation has caused my role as a researcher to be that of a legitimate insider as well as a relatively objective outsider (Hill 2006). Such a situation helps affirm a reflexive approach to the research and supports its validity.

My past role as an arts practitioner undoubtedly made establishing relationships with interview subjects and gatekeepers much easier. However, this previous experience may also have affected the data collected for this research. Garrick (1999: 149) has stated that interpretive research requires "interrogation" of the assumptions that accompany such research. Hill (2006)

has also explained that without consideration of one's role as a researcher or as an 'empathetic' researcher early on in the collection of data, the data may be jeopardised. In order to alleviate any such circumstance, throughout the research project I reiterated my role as a researcher. In conducting interviews for this research, all interviews were recorded with permission of research participants and transcribed. This lessened some of the danger of "specific" listening (Hill 2006: 927). During the process of participant observation as well as in revisiting transcripts, the voice-centred relational method was applied (Brown and Gilligan 1992). This method of data analysis involves three readings of interview text and in this case, observation notes. The readings have reflexive elements in which the researcher 1) reads for herself in the text, placing herself, her background, history and experiences in relation to the respondent, 2) reads the narrative on her own terms and 3) considers how she is responding emotionally and intellectually to the person or situation (Mauthner and Doucet 2003: 419). By employing this method during the data analysis period, the research is accountable to issues of subjectivity. As Mauthner and Doucet (2003) have pointed out, however, issues of reflexivity do not simply apply to the collection and examination of empirical data. The way in which we, as researchers, interpret texts are not necessarily neutral, but also depend on one's social location, perception, or work environment, such as research for a university degree, with or without funding, or for private consultation. These issues must be taken under consideration. As such, this research is admittedly informed by experience in and study of the arts. Yet, as discussed above, coupled with a sociological approach, it is felt that this adds to, rather than takes from, a study of arts for social inclusion.

Ethics

Beyond reflexivity, however, is the great importance of respecting one's
research subjects by conducting research in a safe environment and manner
(Ruane 2005). This research has followed the Ethical Guidelines presented
by the ESRC (ESRC 2006). During this study, three issues surrounding
privacy were continually considered: the sensitivity of the information being
gathered, the setting or location where the research was conducted, and the
disclosure of the study's findings (Ruane 2005). The anonymity of
participants in the research project was maintained at all times. This does not
only pertain to protection of one's name, but also the organisation in which
one works (Ruane 2005). One way to do this is to omit self-identifiers during
data collection (Ruane 2005) and this practice was instituted throughout the
process of this research. With respect to individual's participating in
particular case studies, where issues of self-identifying may be more
relevant, research subjects were consulted regarding direct quotations or
responses before any information was shared in the thesis and additional
publications (Durrer 2008b; Durrer and Miles 2009). It should be noted that
some research participants stated that they did not need to review quotations
used within the thesis.

Informed consent was a crucial aspect to this research and all aspects were
considered and instituted during the process of the study (Ruane 2005: 19).
This consent includes the right to be fully informed of all aspects of the
research project, which might influence one's decision to participate, such as
the possibility of publishing findings in the future. Informed consent forms
also reminded respondents that they have the right to withdraw consent at
any point in the study (Ruane 2005). Informed consent was of particular
importance as a number of the research subjects involved are labelled

'socially excluded' and thus may be perceived to be vulnerable. However, as Ruane (2005) has pointed out informed consent consists of four separate elements: "the assumptions of competence, voluntarism, full information, and comprehension" (Reynolds 1979 in Ruane 2005: 19). Assumption of competence is the idea that informed consent can only be given by individuals deemed as capable of deciding for themselves if participation in a study is in their best interest. Voluntarism is meant to insure that research subjects were not coerced into participating in the research (Ruane 2005). Some might argue that research conducted in an organisational setting, such as schools, hospitals, prisons, and in this case, galleries and art centres has the potential to violate voluntarism because institutional settings "entail authority relationships that are inconsistent with true voluntarism" (Ruane 2005: 20). For this reason, this research project ensured that research participants were aware of their rights. Participants were given all the relevant information they needed to make an informed choice about participating in the research. (Ruane 2005). Some researchers contend that withholding select information is necessary in order to maintain the integrity of the study (Ruane 2005: 21). This is not necessary, nor deemed ethical in the case of this research.

Because this study has been conducted with groups that are labelled 'socially excluded' and thus presumably stripped of power in certain situations, the approach taken in conducting research with these individuals has been very sensitive. The 'insider approach' (Petrie et al. 2006) has been employed, which requires that a substantial amount of time be spent with the group being researched, as in the situation with the case studies, in order to establish more equitable and honest relationships with those individuals. This approach allows for a degree of participation and power in the study on the

part of research participants (Petrie *et al.* 2006). Further, in preparation of all consent forms and interview materials, consultation was sought. For example, in preparing information materials, consent forms and other research related information for the group of adults with learning disabilities who participated in the research, the Moving on With Life and Learning (MOWLL) group at the University of Liverpool was consulted. This group of adults with learning disabilities often consult organisations and individuals who want to learn more about the issues individuals with this disability face. MOWLL worked with the research materials to make them more accessible for other adults with learning disabilities. Consent from these individuals in the case of the Blue Room project was gathered in close consultation with individuals' support workers.

Conclusions

This thesis asserts that rather than search for measurable impacts, an examination of the delivery of social inclusion programmes in real time may become a source of learning and therefore provide the basis for a more reflective practice and thus more effective policy making. Project delivery cannot be understood without grasping the meanings and processes involved (Bevir and Rhodes 2005). In order to unpick the meanings and actions that underpin practice for social inclusion, an interdisciplinary approach combining techniques from art history and the social sciences has been employed. Socio-historical methods taken from the field of art history describe and investigate the context in which meaning and practice (both field and organisational as well as political, economic, social, and local) is formed within arts projects for social inclusion. Grasping context is crucial to such understandings not only in relation to the interpretive approach taken

from the field of sociology (Bevir and Rhodes 2005), but in researching the implementation of social inclusion policy as well (O'Reilly 2005). As a result, information has been gathered via literature review as well as interviews to establish the historical context of socially inclusive arts practice within Liverpool and the specific organisations, the Bluecoat, the Walker, and the Tate, in which case studies were conducted. This historically-based examination sets a strong foundation from which to consider how social inclusion projects may be shaped by the context in which they are situated.

The interpretive approach, taken from the field of the social sciences (Bevir and Rhodes 2005) has allowed for deeper understanding of the individual rationalities underpinning developments for inclusion in the case study projects. The use of semi-structured interviews accounts for the belief systems practitioners and participants attach to the social inclusion agenda within the arts (Arskey and Knight 1999; Bevir and Rhodes 2005). Participant observation more closely investigates the processes that such individuals describe in real-time, including the methods and relationships involved (Ruane 2005). Due to the possible influence of my own experience and education in the arts in carrying out such studies, ethical approaches and a high level of reflexivity has been maintained throughout conducting this research (Brown and Gilligan 1992; Hill 2006; Petrie *et al.* 2006).

The case study chapters are narrative in intention. They unpack individuals' meanings behind, and the types of practices and interactions involved in, attempting to promote inclusion through the arts. Each of Chapters 5, 6, and 7 begin by discussing practitioners' interpretations of social inclusion and the relationship they perceive such an agenda has to the arts. Descriptions of such understandings present the belief systems regarding culture to which individual practitioners attach themselves as they conduct the work that they

do (Bevir and Rhodes 2005). Further, because practitioners discussed these impressions along with descriptions of the organisations within which they work during the actual interviews, such personal belief systems are investigated alongside individual descriptions of those cultural institutions. This form of analysis allows for considering the ways in which practitioners' descriptions of their beliefs may or may not match the perceived missions of the institutions in which they work. In turn, it becomes possible to consider the ways in which practitioners may work within their organisational structures to conduct 'inclusionary' practices. These descriptions are the basis from which the practice of each of the three projects is approached and thus understood. In addition, participants' opinions of inclusion and exclusion are described. Considerations of these thoughts are weaved into those of the practitioners. The analysis is presented in this way in order to describe the project at the starting point from which both practitioners and participants began within the timeframe of this research project. Further consideration is given to these impressions later in each of the case study chapters as it was in the delivery of the actual projects where some of the tensions of addressing inclusion via the arts began to unfold more overtly. It is in the narration of those projects where these tensions are initially unpacked. Before these tensions are considered, it is appropriate to take into account in the next chapter the local context in which they emerge.

Chapter 4

A SOCIAL HISTORY OF ART IN LIVERPOOL: UNDERSTANDING LOCAL CONTEXT

This chapter explores conclusions reached in Chapter 2 more specifically within the context of Liverpool, the city in which case studies for this research project have been undertaken. There are two aims presented here. For one, the chapter contextualises the case study investigations presented in Chapters 5, 6, and 7 by investigating the socio-historical and political developments of Liverpool's visual arts since the nineteenth century. This chapter builds on the proposition that understanding specificity of context can help to inform our understanding of broader issues. Secondly, it attempts to show that the broader conflicts of cultural interpretation argued in Chapter 2 to be inherent in the employment of the arts for social inclusion are also illustrated in the gallery and artistic practice that has evolved in Liverpool. Most significant in this discussion is the ways in which the individuals and individual organisations in Liverpool have shaped the role the arts are argued to play in contributing to the betterment of society and its citizens. This point furthers the notion that individuals and organisations, not simply policy, profoundly influence perceptions of inclusion within cultural ideologies.

The chapter is divided into three main sections. The first begins by investigating the historical circumstances in which each organisation under study, the Bluecoat, the Walker Art Gallery and Tate Liverpool, developed. As each evolved within the three critical periods of socio-economic and political as well as cultural change within the city, this section also investigates the changing attachments of political, social, economic and

cultural concerns toward the arts with respect to those galleries. The section describes the founding missions of these institutions in order to investigate how they may or may not have changed over time. The levels of change under study here are argued to directly affect the ways in which social inclusion is interpreted by the organisations and their practitioners today. The second section takes those socio-historic concerns and opens them outwards to consider broader changes within the city's artistic practice, particularly during the mid to late twentieth century. It investigates the ways in which that practice may illustrate changing ideologies of culture and its relationship to society. The final section examines the specific developments related to the emergence of a cultural policy in Liverpool from the 1960s. In keeping with the argument presented in Chapter 2, this section seeks to demonstrate the ways in which the field of artistic and gallery practice have significantly shaped the locality's political agendas regarding instrumental uses of the arts. This argument supports the case for the importance of examining the situational circumstances of meaning and practice (Stevenson 2004; Bevir and Rhodes 2005) as influencing the ways in which ideas of cultural value are propagated and disseminated.

A Socio-Historical Examination of Liverpool's Galleries

This section contextualises the establishment of three of Liverpool's key arts organisations under investigation in this research project: the Walker Art Gallery, the Bluecoat, and Tate Liverpool. It illustrates the similarities and dissimilarities of these institutions by describing their early missions and methods of working. In so doing, this discussion shows how the Walker, Tate and Bluecoat have addressed the public and public perceptions not only about art, but of their individual institutions as well. Such a discussion

reveals some of the inherent contradictions in promoting the artistic, social, economic, and political aims of the arts. Further it sets the foundation for considering the case study projects discussed in Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

The broader ideas set out by Hooper-Greenhill (1988), Duncan (1995) and Bennett (1998b) that arts institutions were founded on the collection and ideas of an elite few is visible in the developments of these three galleries. Further, this notion alongside each gallery's attempt to engage with a wide public will be seen in Chapters 5, 6, and 7 to illustrate the tensions inherent in the more direct attachment of the social inclusion agenda to the arts. Each institution was founded in a different era: The Walker in the mid to late nineteenth century, The Bluecoat in the early twentieth, and Tate Liverpool in the late twentieth century. Despite the different political, social and economic issues apparent during these periods, each institution was founded on similar goals: to promote the advancement of fine art; to promote the image of the city; to encourage civic pride amongst Liverpudlians, and to encourage local people to access and engage in the 'fine arts', often for self- and social betterment (Moore 2004; Willett 2007 [1967]). Each institution, as a different kind of gallery, has approached these common goals in distinct ways. The distinction amongst these galleries is related to their collecting and programming practices. Also of significance is the ways in which the different galleries are funded. The Walker Art Gallery is part of National Museums Liverpool (NML), a body of art galleries and museums within the Merseyside region that are directly funded from central government. As part of this system, the Walker is also directed by and responsible for answering to Parliamentary-selected Trustees. Tate Liverpool is also a national gallery and thus funded directly from central government. Their situation is unlike the Bluecoat, which is not a national organisation. The Bluecoat receives

funding from the Arts Council England, Northwest (ACENW) as well as from local bodies. These circumstances will be seen to play a part not only in the ways in which the different galleries have related to their local public, but also in the ways in which they have structured their programming for that public.

Establishing the Walker Art Gallery: Marking Liverpool as a Cultural City

The Walker Art Gallery is a neoclassical style building housing a historical collection of paintings and sculpture from medieval times. It also holds a number of decorative art items as well as fashion from the seventeenth century to present day and occasionally presents special exhibitions of contemporary art. Like many regional galleries, the Walker Art Gallery was founded in the nineteenth century after the development of what is now known as Liverpool's World Museum (Moore 2004). Funded by and founded on the personal collection of the Thirteenth Earl of Derby, the World Museum as well as St. George's Hall and eventually the Walker Art Gallery, the Picton Reading Room and Hornby Library, represents an early move by Liverpool's elites to use art and culture as a means of urban renewal (Sudbury and Forrester 1996); an approach that is now more overtly being utilised in European Union and British Labour policy at the turn of the twenty-first century (Garcia 2004a; Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2004; Miles and Paddison 2005). All of these institutions are located in the city's former Shaw's Brow area, which had been converted from limekilns, potteries and windmills to soap works and coachbuilders' businesses to finally a cultural quarter (Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2007). All in neoclassical style, these buildings grouped together stood, and still do, as an aesthetic symbol of traditional authority and cultural power (Hooper-Greenhill 1988).

Around the time when the Walker Art Gallery was founded in the 1870s, Liverpool was at a height of financial prosperity as a "major global seaport and commercial city" (Belchem 2007: 15). Belchem (2007: 16) has argued that with this success also came new interest in both cultural and public approval and an attempt at branding the city as the 'Florence of the North'. St. George's Hall and the other civic and cultural buildings constructed in the city, such as the Walker Art Gallery, were classical references to a new cultural Renaissance of Liverpool. The city was in the process of throwing aside its 'debased' support of the slave trade, on which its economic success as a seaport had largely been built, for civilising humanistic and cultural pursuits. Its city council was among the first to set up a public library and museum during the nineteenth century (Belchem 2007). In an attempt to mark their own philanthropic positions in the city and "reverse its philistine image" (Belchem 2007: 17), Liverpool's upper classes followed an Arnoldian model (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]) and founded voluntary literary and arts clubs and organisations to educate and recreate its middle classes.

Literature from the time shows that the public did not necessarily welcome the foundation of the Walker Art Gallery, as it was not felt to be relevant to the lives of the working classes. Critics argued that an art gallery would be "almost exclusively used by the upper classes" and "should therefore be provided by the wealthy men who would frequent it" rather than publicly funded (ANONa 7 August 1873, Quoted in Moore 2004: 71). In fact, the opening of the Walker Art Gallery was met with public protesters scrawling incendiary comments on the exterior walls of the gallery (Moore 2004). The *Liberal Review* newspaper described the Walker as "A magnificent home for pictures and none but miserable hovels for poor frail human beings, is, indeed a deep satire upon our boasted civilisation" (ANONb 26 September

1874). Such comments counter much of the accounted opinions of individuals like Henry Cole (1884) and Matthew Arnold (1993 |1867-69|) who argued that art and culture could in fact improve the economy and/or civilise society.

Local gallery officials and civic leaders felt that art symbolised the greatness of a locality, and by collecting, preserving, and displaying artistic objects it could have positive effects on that locality's public. They attempted to quell criticism by those who felt the institution too elitist and too costly in order to demonstrate its significance to and intentions to serve the Liverpool community and imprint it onto the nation's cultural scene (Moore 2004). Like Lord Palmerston who spoke a few years before of the significance a National Portrait Gallery could hold for inspiring morality in the public mind (Physick 1982), B. H. Grindley of the Walker Art Gallery committee explained that the adult population needed, "not so much education, as cultivation" and the Walker's art collection could help provide that (Grindley 1875: 5). In addition, Philip Henry Rathbone, another prominent municipal leader who was a key figure in developing the collection at the Walker, articulated a strong belief that a municipal art gallery could imprint the city onto the national scene (Rathbone 1875: 8).

The way in which the collection at the Walker was initially developed further illustrates interconnected rationalities of excellence and common good, which are at the heart of the establishment of art galleries (Bennett 1998b) as well as the attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy (DCMS 2000). During the 1880s Rathbone oversaw the development of the gallery's collection, often acquiring works of 'high art' that showed the city's connection to the circle of Pre-Raphaelite artists and critic John Ruskin as well as images of historic scenes, such as the now well-known painting

Death of Nelson by Benjamin West. While avant-garde at the time, the collection of such works established the Walker as a contemporary and modern gallery of fine art (Moore 2004). The presence of such works in the Walker collection places it now as one of the most esteemed collections of high British art in the world. In addition, the Walker's early collecting practices also show a strong desire to link such respected works of fine art to the 'common' man. For example, Liverpool's Arts Advisor at the time, E. R. Dibdin, claimed that many paintings were acquired with subject matter that would appeal to the uninformed art audience as they contained images of children or animals as well as landscapes. Dibdin explained, "children and animals, beloved of all but the utterly debased, are the surest baits for wide popular appreciation" (Dibdin 1889: 50). The way in which the Walker has historically and continues presently to negotiate its aims to represent and disseminate high standards of artistic excellence with insuring a relevant and connected relationship to the local public will be described as problematic later in this chapter.

The Bluecoat: Preserving the City's Cultural Reputation

Like the Walker Art Gallery, the historical development of the Bluecoat as an arts centre is closely linked to a desire to place the city in high cultural standing in relation not only to the rest of the nation, but the broader field of arts as well. These aspects can be seen in issues surrounding the significance of the building in which the arts centre is housed as well as the ways in which its mission has developed. Today, the Bluecoat embraces a wide variety of culture, housing artists' studios, exhibition and performance spaces, displays of crafts and jewelry design, workshops, retail spaces, and a café. Its initial establishment in the early twentieth century, however, shows that this intermingling was not necessarily at the centre of its original ethos.

It is not until the latter part of the twentieth century when the Bluecoat begins to turn toward a more direct cultural engagement with the public.

Built in Queen Anne style architecture beginning in approximately 1717, the Bluecoat building is the oldest Grade 1 listed building in the city centre. It was initially established as the Blue Coat School, an Anglican school for orphaned boys and later girls; part of the popular philanthropic practice mentioned with respect to the Walker, and what Longmore (2007) sees as the mercantile class' innovative earlier practice of philanthropy in Liverpool. When the school moved leaving the building vacant in 1906, a group of artists, known as the Sandon Studios Society moved in a year later (MacCunn 1956). Their work, with the help of a city elite, Mrs James Calder (Fanny Dove Hamel Calder), led to the formation of the Bluecoat Society of Arts. Their purchase and subsequent maintenance of the building as an arts centre proves to be significant as it demonstrates the importance of individuals in re-establishing and maintaining the building's standing in Liverpool's public mind (MacCunn 1956); a standing which is relevant to its relationship with the city today (Biggs 2007b).

The social, rather than artistic status of Mrs. James Calder and the other members of the Sandon Studios Society made it possible for them to consider retaining the Bluecoat building with the support of other elites in the city (MacCunn 1956). The Society approached Lord Leverhulme who was renting spaces in the building in 1909 to cultural groups to fully restore and establish it solely as an arts centre in the control of a body of Trustees with a Trust Deed (MacCunn 1956: 3-4). As in the earlier establishment of public museums and galleries, the proposed Trustees at the time included the city's civic-minded elites (MacCunn 1956; Duncan 1995). The aim was for the building to be a "free Art Centre" (MacCunn 1956: 7) with arts "in the

widest sense to include, in addition to the graphic and plastic arts, the arts of music literature and drama" (MacCunn 1956: 78). This embracing of all forms of art, both fine and practical as well as popular, would have offered something very different to the city than the fine art held in the Walker Art Gallery. Yet, the public was not necessarily what this early committee had in mind. While the Deed makes references to the building being a place of "art and public" (MacCunn 1956: 78) little actual reference is made to the public, but rather to the development of artists working within the building and the wider city.

The possibility of the building's public auction due to the death of Lord Leverhulme after World War I (MacCunn 1956) brought the site into the public mind. What ensued demonstrates the Society's first step to addressing the importance of the building itself, and as an arts centre specifically, in a more public matter. The Bluecoat began to engage wider public notice of the arts; yet the purposes were not for social betterment as much as they were for civic pride. The issue of the building's sale led a local newspaper, the *Liverpool Daily Post*, for instance, to call for the building to be preserved and purchased by the Corporation of Liverpool. The local civic pride attached to the superficial appearance of the building and the lineage of historical value that appearance represents can be seen in an appeal made in October 1926 by a number of the most elite in the city, including Sir Ernest Tate (of the major manufacturing company, Tate and Lyle sugar) and the Lord Mayor.

> "[The former Blue Coat School] is incomparably the most beautiful example of antiquity in the City. ...The building is of importance as being by the universal consent of all qualified to judge one of the best examples of the architecture of its period. ... It is historically of great

90

value as the first of the long line of buildings ... that have marked the
rise of Liverpool to greatness. ...There would be a certain grim irony
in the situation if an ornament to the City, coeval with its first dock,
should disappear at the moment when Liverpool is embarking on its
greatest civic enterprise of the twentieth century, the Mersey Tunnel"
(quoted in MacCunn 1956: 89-90).

This and other appeals for public support of the building as an arts centre not
only emphasises the part that this building shares in the lineage of 'great'
British architecture, but also that this 'greatness' is known by "all those who
are qualified to judge", those great apostles of culture who may know better
than the public of a heritage that must be protected (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]).
Further, in referencing the potential use of the building as an arts centre in
public appeals the possibility of the city gaining a greater reputation cultural,
enhancing its civic pride was highlighted (MacCunn 1956: 93). Despite
looking for public financial support to save the building, however, appeals
explained that once saved, the centre would be financially self-sustaining and
in no further need of public support. Downplaying any potential further cost
to the public lessened any subsequent responsibility that the Society may
have to the public, as may not be the case with a public art gallery (Hooper-
Greenhill 1988). Further, such a plan stood in direct opposition to the earlier
public criticism of the establishment of the Walker Art Gallery. This
approach elevated the role of culture in a material, rather than in an
instrumental way (Holden 2004). The intense social responsibility that was
emphasised by late nineteenth century elites (Cole 1884) did not hold the
same responsibility with the Bluecoat. This situation would come to change.
This lack of interest on the part of the Society in directly engaging with the
public is later seen as an interesting historical counter to the Bluecoat's

present day activities with respect to changes in artistic practice and the eventual attachment of the social inclusion agenda to the arts. These changes are argued to be in part a result of changing socio-political situations within the city as well as to the interests of new individuals working within the organisation (Biggs 2007b).

Establishing Tate Liverpool: Convincing Liverpool of its Local Relevance

Opening much later than the Walker and the Bluecoat in May 1988, Tate Gallery Liverpool is located near the National Museums of Liverpool's Maritime Museum, an earlier regeneration scheme (1982) on the Albert Dock, home of Britain's largest complex of Grade 1 listed buildings. The gallery is housed in the world's first enclosed dock warehouse made entirely out of cast iron, brick and granite, which was the centre for shipments from Asia and the slave trade (Lorente 1996a); thus marking the building as a symbol not only of Liverpool's height of economic and cultural power, but also of the city's reinvention. Closed in 1972 due to declining industry, the building lay "disused and rotting... It was a very visible reminder of the deprivation of the surrounding inner city..." (Tate Liverpool 2008). The refurbishment of the building for Tate Liverpool was intended to set the stage for another cultural revitalisation of the city (Boseley and Dunn 1985; Belchem 2007). Tate Gallery Liverpool holds part of the national collection of modern art in care of the wider Tate Gallery system in Britain. This system includes four Tate galleries of modern art, additionally Tate St. Ives, Tate Modern and Tate Britain. As with the opening of the Walker, the establishment of a Tate in Liverpool in the 1980s was met with much local public criticism. However, this context as well as the organisational structure of the gallery has promoted and allowed for a more visitor-focused approach to exhibition and public programming (Jackson 2000).

Criticism of Tate Gallery Liverpool was largely centred on economic and social concerns. When Tate Liverpool opened, the city was viewed in national press as "the epitome for many of all that is wrong with cities" (Knight 1988). An international recession had greatly affected Liverpool during the 1970s and 1980s and unemployment rose to the highest in England (Murden 2007). Fifteen percent of property in Liverpool city was either derelict or vacant by the end of the 1970s and between March 1978 and March 1979 16,000 jobs were lost (Murden 2007). What is referred to as the 'Toxteth riots', a civil disturbance and social protest that occurred in Liverpool in 1981, put the city's economic decline in the mind's eye of the nation. Though the decision to build a Tate Gallery there was an attempt to boost the city's economy through tourism (Boseley and Dunn 1985), the gallery's association with the namesake of Tate and Lyle Sugar Company, formerly one of the biggest sugar companies in the world with a long history in the city, was a particularly sore point among local citizens. The company's recent closure had greatly contributed to the city's high unemployment (Belchem 2007). The connection the building and the Tate and Lyle Company had to the slave trade was also a sensitive issue, especially since social and racial tensions were high after the 'Toxteth riots' (Lorente 1996b).

The establishment of the Tate Gallery was additionally perceived as a signpost of central government's ignorance of the city's economic and social struggles (Lorente 1996a). Even in the wider arts scene beyond Liverpool the Tate was criticised for being "plonked down...in [the city]...without any discussion with the local authority, the [Regional Arts Association] or the local education authority" (Davison 1988). Commentators such as Williams (2004) have since singled the Albert Dock out as symptomatic of the aestheticization of the urban problem that characterises regeneration in

England. It was common rumour back in the 1980s that the Merseyside Development Corporation (MDC), a central government funded body with considerable resources and planning powers, sought a highly visible regeneration project in the establishment of Tate Liverpool for two reasons. One was to mask the city's social and economic unrest and the other was to upset its Militant Labour dominated Council, which central government perceived as ineffective and confrontational (Belchem 2007). As a result, Tate Liverpool was described in local commentary as a "trojan horse" by which central government could keep a 'watchful eye' on the city's social, political, and economic turmoil while doing very little to address it (Lorente 1996a: 3). These reactions, the local one to the gallery and the national one to the city, have influenced the way in which Tate Liverpool has addressed its local public and its national standing. The ensuing relationship the gallery has had to its local public will be argued to also affect the current social inclusion programme within Tate Liverpool under study in Chapter 7.

Since its inception, Liverpool's Tate has hosted the twentieth-century collection of the wider Tate system particularly of the last 50 years and held shows of smaller exhibitions throughout the year, most of which would be generated in London and internationally, with only some in Liverpool (Dunn 1985). While Tate Liverpool has begun to develop its own major exhibitions, this earlier arrangement with the wider Tate circuit as well as the manner in which the gallery was received in Liverpool, very much frames its approach to the public. Richard Francis, the first planned curator of Tate Liverpool described the gallery's founding ethos for its Education Programme:

> "It's extremely important that we're seen as a part of the everyday way of life. We mustn't appear to be selling something too exclusive to be understood. I want to involve everyone from schools and youth

clubs to factories ...It's a very depressed area and we want to help do something about it...[Among our staff]... we'll have a number of teachers who will have a van of video and audio equipment to go round and show people what we are doing and make it interesting to those who might instinctively be put off by an art gallery" (Francis quoted in Beckett 1987).

Tate Liverpool's approach to public programming illustrates how the gallery planned to maintain aesthetic standards but also promote a sense of common good for the locality. Besides travelling out and making face-to-face connections with communities throughout Merseyside via the Mobile Art Van, within the gallery walls Information Assistants, perhaps the first of their kind in a major UK art gallery, were introduced. These Assistants are available in the exhibition galleries to answer any questions visitors might have (Jackson 2000). In addition, since its formation, there have been gallery-based activities at the Tate that encourage audiences to participate in some ways with the current exhibitions on display, mingling high culture with references to everyday life (Horlock 2000; Jackson 2000).

The methods of public programming employed by Tate Liverpool evoke current policy discussion on social inclusion (DCMS 2007b). Within the Tate, issues of access, audience development, and outreach (Kawashima 2006) were crucial to its founding ethos. Toby Jackson (2000: 25), the gallery's former Head of Education, has explained that the Tate took a "marketing approach to visitors, targeting specific groups with rolling programmes" to "show that the gallery wanted to work with community organisations and would welcome and provide services to all sectors of the community (to counter the view that the Tate Liverpool was only interested in the art world audience)". The aim was not only to "integrate Tate Gallery

Liverpool into the locality", but also "to demonstrate that the Modern Collection was a unique resource that could contribute" to the community, benefiting its social needs (Jackson 2000: 25). As in current DCMS policy (DCMS 2007b), central to the founding ethos of Tate Liverpool was the intention to make high culture 'truly' available to the public and emphasise it as a potentially significant part of people's everyday lives.

In many ways the whole ethos of the institution is informed by its relationship with the local public, or more specifically its ability to engage that public in a relationship with art. One current senior staff member has explained the significance of the historical context of Tate Liverpool and its shaping of that gallery's practice:

> "When Tate Liverpool was set up, the idea was very much to root the organisation in the community which of course is especially important if you are a national gallery ... realised by national funding, by a national government which [was] very much... opposed to the local government ... of the city at the time.... But I think it was more than that. It was really trying to think about ... how do you engage people, how do you create a sense of ownership, and I think that's been one of the key achievements of Tate Liverpool... It does have a very different relationship to its public [than other arts organisations in the city]. It's in my opinion... a more engag[ing] relationship."

Unlike the Walker and the Bluecoat, which were locally rooted symbols of civic pride; the Tate was viewed publically, rightly or wrongly, as an imposition from the outside. As a result, Tate Liverpool attempted to address issues of cultural inclusion early on in its evolution. As an institution much

younger than the other two, this context has changed little since the Tate's foundation. In the discussion of artistic practice and the developments of cultural policy in the city to follow, the Walker and the Bluecoat will be seen to have continued making new attempts to engage the public since those implied in their earlier missions. Discussion of these attempts alongside changes in Liverpool's artistic practice helps demonstrate the types of challenges these organisations face in addressing the social inclusion agenda.

Liverpool's Art Scene: Challenging the Conventional for the Everyday
Having established the context in which the Bluecoat, the Walker and the Tate emerged, I will now consider broader parallel changes in artistic practice in Liverpool during the twentieth century. These changes in artistic practice are argued here to have affected the ways in which local art organisations have engaged local people. This engagement will be seen to conjoin issues of culture as being able to affect society positively while doing so in ways that relate high culture to everyday life. The approaches discussed here constitute early moves toward the ideologies of culture and inclusion under investigation in the wider thesis. This section explores the relationship between marginal or anti-establishment art practices with those of the larger and more established institutions, such as the Walker and the Bluecoat. Both institutions in the mid to late twentieth century began engaging in new media and performance practices popular at the time, literally engaging in media and practice that was considered more popular than high culture. The discussion demonstrates that Liverpool's art scene has long been engaging questions about the relationship high art may have to everyday life.

Liverpool's Artistic Practice: Embracing the Everyday

It is acknowledged that in a sense challenging the establishment is in fact part of artistic practice throughout the history of art, particularly since the nineteenth century (Harris 2006). Recognising those challenges often comes, however, after-the-fact and is demonstrative of the ways in which the field of the arts often subsumes practices into the field (Bourdieu 2000). This situation is similar in Liverpool and an investigation of it with respect to visual arts reveals some of the tensions inherent between the engagements of the arts with the social. The Liverpool of the late 1960s and 1970s shows a plethora of art activities that were specifically engaging of local non-art audiences. This practice was part of a movement within the arts, reflected in both Pop and Community Art, which attempted to confront the field's elitism and promote more popular notions of and engagement in culture (Williams 1958; Harding 1995).

During this time and into the 1980s and 1990s, Liverpool appears to have not only engaged with (non-establishment) new media and practice, such as Community Arts, photography and film, and Artistic Happenings, but also to have done so with a very mindful involvement of local people. Gathercole (2007: 146) explains that artists living and making art in Liverpool at this time were "negotiating a position in relation to reality," and in fact "the terms of the 'given' reality (and the 'given' culture) were regarded as suspect" (Gathercole 2007: 146). It may be said that in Liverpool there was a strong underlying notion amongst artists as well as grassroots and more established arts organisations to cross the boundaries of cultural conventionality, challenging notions of 'high art' by bringing them face to face with the realities of everyday life. In so doing, Liverpool appears to

have openly embraced those forms of art that were new and not yet fully accepted into the establishment.

The above attempts can be seen, for example, not only in the emergence of programming approaches taken by Tate Liverpool (Jackson 2000), but also in the Artistic Happenings and the establishment of Liverpool Art festivals in the 1960s and new arts organisations with close connections to the community in the 1970s and 1980s, such as Moviola (now FACT, Foundation for Art and Creative Technology). Liverpool had become well known for its alternative music and culture, notably Eric's Club and the Matthew Street music scene of the late 1970s (Belchem 2007), but the example of the Mersey Poets, Adrian Henri, Roger McGough and Brian Patton, shows the ways in which culture of all forms was combined at that time in order to engage people with it in new ways. The Mersey Poets have been argued to have shown at the time a concern for audiences not exhibited elsewhere in British poetry, representing a new anti-establishment literary and performance movement emerging specifically in the city (Bowen 1999). The group held poetry readings of spoken word and music that embraced audience involvement and as a result they became 'heroes' to new young artists. They are described as being instrumental influences in founding grassroots or 'home-grown' events, such as the Merseyside Arts Festival, which began in the 1960s based on the South Liverpool Festival of Art (Bowen 1999). Phil Bowen (1999: 67) explains that the poets were part of a generation of artists who made work out of their own lives, where "the boundaries between life and art gradually became eroded."

Adrian Henri, also a visual artist who was influenced by the American artist Allan Kaprow, organised Artistic Happenings, such as *A Cultural Bingo Show* (Willett 2007 [1967]; Bowen 1999; Gathercole 2007). In this event a

'happening' or performance was made out of a bingo night regularly held for local mothers. High and low cultural forms intermingled as artists performed when their designated number was called and the audience or bingo players became involved (Gathercole 2007). The barriers between artist and audience, producer and consumer were broken down during such occasions (Murden 2007). The event was held at The Great Georges Community Arts Project (now known as The Blackie), a grass roots community arts space formed in 1968, which is said to have marked the first founding of a community arts centre in Britain, even before the ACGB acknowledged the medium within its definition of ' Community Arts' (Allen 1995). At this time, The Blackie was holding (and still holds) mixed-media shows, workshops, dances, and performances. Gathercole (2007) explains that in 1970 The Blackie put out a communiqué declaring that democracy was not possible without a common language, which was still lacking. The Blackie has intended to serve as a bridge across the gaps in this common language, which its staff argue usually exist in divisions of class, gender, money, and culture to name a few, by hosting projects involving the "collaboration of artists and vandals, toddlers and businessmen, arts lab youngsters and local mothers, students and unemployed, those interested in the arts and…in fighting" (Gathercole 2007: 141).

"Fighting" for social causes was also part of the earlier ethos of the Open Eye Gallery at its formation in the 1970s. The gallery, which now presents fine photography, was initially focused on supporting local emerging photographers, but also on encouraging local people to take up the camera as a form of documentation, activism, and expression (Page 2003). Open Eye's early support of Bootle Art in Action, a social-activist photography group, demonstrates this mission. The aim of the Blackie and Open Eye as well as

other visiting artists, like Mark Boyle and Joan Hills who came to Liverpool and performed at the Bluecoat, was to disturb cultural conventions (Gathercole 2007). Gathercole (2007) has explained that such events hosted by Boyle and Hills, which critics in other English cities viewed as insulting to conventional taste, are said to have been eagerly accepted in Liverpool's art scene. Like on the national arts scene, in Liverpool at this time culture was a means by which social activism could be fostered. This potential was believed to be reached via the mixing of the notions of high culture with that of the everyday. Such notions can be argued to further raise the position of the arts in society as being able to better it. These issues are at the heart of the social inclusion debate within the projects presented in Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

The Bluecoat: A Changing Ethos

It is noticeable after the 'Toxteth riots' in 1981, which were reflective of the social, economic, and political turmoil of the city at the time, that the Bluecoat began to consider relating more directly to its local public, thus reshaping the organisation's initial ethos. The Bluecoat, which also hosted some of Henri's 'happenings', began to present exhibitions that questioned the norm of the art world in accordance with wider movements in the 1960s and 1970s that questioned equal representation within the art historical canon (Nochlin 1971). These exhibitions challenged the art world's white-male dominated hierarchy and highlighted instead the work of female artists and black artists in exhibitions such as *Black Skin/Bluecoat* (1985) and *Women's Images of Men* (1981) on tour from the Institute of Contemporary Art in London. Staff present at the time who participated in this research project have explained that these exhibitions were criticised both locally and within

the broader field of the arts as being too didactic, emphasising politics at the expense of art.

In a sense, this turning point in the history of the Bluecoat contributed to dispelling its previous reputation as an "elitist" institution, seeming much more grounded in local issues than the Walker was perceived to be. This grounding, perhaps coupled with the influence of changes in cultural policy that encouraged arts organisations to promote the arts more as a leisure activity (Kawashima 1997), may have led the Bluecoat to present programming in brochures that stated "Not Just a Pretty Façade" with more festival style activities not only aimed at raising further funds to maintain the building, but also to "promote and foster a broad spectrum of artistic activities all the year round..." (BC Archives 1981). Courses and workshops were also held, "open to anyone interested in learning more about contemporary ...techniques" (BC Archives 1982). In addition, the Bluecoat shop with an information point, sales area and small café overlooking the garden opened in 1982 with the hope that it would "become a central meeting place encouraging more people to visit the Bluecoat regularly" (BC Archives 1983). These changes coincided with what was happening with museums and galleries more widely, linking art to entertainment and consumption (Harrison 1993; Hannigan 1998). Yet, as a centre with a history dominated by internal concerns, this new and different consideration of the public and the placement of the Bluecoat as a "meeting place" with exhibitions reflecting political and social considerations of the time, shows the institution's new focus on external and more everyday concerns, which could be argued to have situated the institution more comfortably than at its initial standing to address social policies like social inclusion.

The above concerns culminate in the centre's Connect participation programme, of which one project, the Blue Room, is presented for study in Chapter 5. Connect, set up in 1999 initially with funding through the Arts Council's Grants for the Arts and additional support from other trusts and sponsors, is the Bluecoat's participatory art programme. The programme officially established the organisation's new links to the social services sector, which it had shied away from in the early twentieth century (MacCunn 1956: 39). It stresses participatory arts activities as key ways for engaging audiences with the Bluecoat's work on display and audiences involved often include school groups as well as are those that are labelled in government policy as 'socially excluded'.

The Walker: Reaching out to the Public's Culture

Despite its standing as a conventional arts establishment, the Walker Art Gallery also became involved in less traditional and contemporary arts practice. During the late 1950s, the Walker began hosting the John Moores painting prize exhibition. This prize exhibition has helped put Liverpool on the map nationally as a centre for presenting contemporary painting. In addition, with the appointment of Timothy Stevens, new Director in 1971, the gallery began to embrace new media. In 1973, the *Filmaktion* residency was established at the Walker as a series of projects based on experimental video-making that showed a much riskier and more contemporary side of the traditional gallery (Pih and Knifton 2007: 242-243). Such examples show the Walker's struggle to maintain its collection of nationally treasured masterpieces while attempting to remain in touch with the new high cultural ideals of contemporary times; changes, which Pih and Knifton (2007) have argued are in large part due to the ambitions of individual staff members, rather than full organisational change.

Despite the Walker's efforts to embrace contemporary practices, the gallery could not avoid the effects of its conventional and establishment status. In 1964 and 1966 the Walker hosted exhibitions, *Liverpool: People and Places* and *Liverpool Today and Tomorrow* respectively, of work created by local people who were not necessarily artists for the South Liverpool Festival of Art. The festivals have been described as coronation-style street parties and were initially established by Reverend J. Keir Murren of the Domestic Mission. Inspired by the John Moores exhibition at the Walker, Murren based the festivals on the idea that art was a means of recording the life and character of neighbourhoods as well as a socially cohesive force (Willettt 2007 [1967]); early indications of the connections individuals in Liverpool were making to the social use of art pre-Labour cultural policy today.

Individuals involved in the arts who participated in this research project and were present at the time explained that once the festival entered the realm of the Walker Art Gallery, the social role important to Murren became less prevalent. The festivals' connection to conventional arts via the Walker's exhibition of the work created began to overshadow the initial aims of the festivals. One respondent explained the problem:

> "The idea came that in future they could all exhibit at the Walker, collectively. So that was their death. Inevitably. They were made up. They were privileged. They were delighted. But the Walker doesn't organise events like coronation street parties and it's a journey and what happened once it was taken over professionally, was that um, people phoned the local schools in their area and said look we're having a neighbourhood arts festival could you get your classes to produce some paintings. And of course the children produced the paintings and all the original madness of knocking on people's doors,

and saying you'll be surprised to see me, and you may not have painted [in years]... but I've come to ask you to paint a picture, all of that madness disappeared and it became professionalised."

Once the Walker Art Gallery began exhibiting the work created for the festivals, the nature of those events changed. The attachment of the arts establishment to these events appears to have literally dampened their alternative spirit, similar to the ways in which the ACGB's defining of 'Community Arts' (Allen 1995) has been argued to have altered its position of marginality and thus its potential as a changing agent (Stallabrass 2004).

Despite the Walker's earlier efforts in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to make fine art and gallery programmes accessible to a wider public, the art held within the gallery was still perceived to lack relevance to its local population (Willett 2007 [1967]). At the same time, however, the now long history of the gallery within the city had established it as a point of civic pride, as was initially intended (Moore 2004). Willett in his cultural study of Liverpool, *Art in a City* (2007 [1967]), acknowledged the oddity of the gallery's link with the city's pride yet disconnection to the public. He explained,

> "Despite the [gallery] director's complaints that the city is largely unaware of the treasures it owns a surprising number of the [local] people whom I myself [interviewed], ...at least knew that the Gallery was a proper subject for interest, even for pride (Willett 2007 [1967]: 116).

The gallery director's frustration with the city's lack of awareness of what "treasures it owns" is noteworthy. Such a statement shows that the onus had been put on the public to be more knowledgeable about art and in some ways

it was their failure that they were not. This idea was in line with much museological literature from the time and the perceived viewpoints of authority within more traditional galleries (Hooper-Greenhill 1988, Duncan 1995). Willett goes on to explain:

> "A feeling of this sort is perfectly compatible with a failure ever to visit the [Walker], and what people get out of the collection and what it actually contains are two very different matters." (Willett 2007 [1967]: 116)

While the people of Liverpool appeared to be 'proud' that they had a local historical art gallery, it did not necessarily appear to be a place many of them were interested in visiting. Willett (2006 [1967]) concluded that the gallery had not made enough of a connection to the contemporary opinions of its public or its city, instead privileging traditional practices over contemporary ones.

The issues raised above demonstrate that though the Walker had attempted to embrace some of the anti-establishment cultural activities occurring in the city, the fact remained that the organisation itself symbolised the establishment. In many ways, the manner in which the Walker conducts its business helps to perpetuate that reputation. Willett (2007 [1967]: 86-87) has explained the difficulties a gallery like the Walker faces:

> "...The success of a gallery like the Walker is judged increasingly by the impression it makes in the wider field of art scholarship, international exhibitions and so forth—a field to which more and more attention is being paid by government, universities and the Press—rather than by any evidence of the satisfaction which it gives to the citizens."

This statement recalls Chapter 2's discussion of some of the conflicts inherent for the cultural sector in addressing social inclusion aims. Willett may not have known what was to come. In the current policy climate, Chapter 2 has shown that the state, via cultural policy, has increasingly encouraged galleries to raise the 'satisfaction' they provide local citizens. However, the forms of measurement the state imposes for such 'satisfaction' are difficult to prove (Scott 2006). At the same time, in order to maintain its status, reputation, and worth within the field, the Walker must address that field's aesthetic and formal judgments. By doing so, the organisation may risk alienating the interests of its local public and thus its purposes as a *public* art gallery. These tensions are further explored in the Walker case study in Chapter 6 as they lie at the heart of how a traditional organisation like the Walker Art Gallery might be placed to address social inclusion.

The Role of Arts Organisations and Professionals in Shaping Local Cultural Policy

Having outlined the key moments in the development of Liverpool's artistic practice and how they relate to the three case studies presented in this thesis, this section will consider the role of arts organisations and professionals over that of government in establishing cultural policy in the city. The ways in which individuals and arts organisations have attempted to shape a local cultural policy can be seen back in the 1960s when the Bluecoat Society of Arts, which today is simply the Bluecoat, commissioned John Willett (2007 [1967]) to conduct a study, entitled *Art in a City*, on art's relationship to the city of Liverpool. Willett's work was the first in its time to examine the ways in which culture could work with and for the people of a city. David Piper, writing for the *Guardian* in 1967 explained that the publication posed

"fundamental questions rarely asked about the motives of local patronage, and [was] a challenging first step towards discovering what art does socially for and to people." As a result, the Bluecoat's commissioning of the study demonstrates its new focus on the social and political role art could play in local society as well as a move to concentrate on its own involvement within that role. This shift is argued to resituate the Bluecoat as an organisation that has been more structurally prepared than previously to address the current issues of social inclusion.

Willett's (2007 [1967]) findings in the 1960s will be seen to have remained incredibly relevant throughout the remainder of the twentieth century. At the time, Willett found that Liverpool did not utilise culture to its full potential for promoting education, civic pride, or cultural status. Though he did not support art as a 'civilising force', he expressed the idea that art is fundamental to being human and the gap he perceived between art and everyday life in the city from the perspective of local government-led initiatives had to be rectified. His recommendations seemed to anticipate current DCMS (2000: 10) policy regarding the need to make art organisations relevant to the public for the purposes of affecting social change (Willett 2007: 240). Further, his study is argued to have highlighted the significant role local arts organisations and professionals could play themselves in affecting that change (Biggs 2007b). This role became critical in the city during the 1980s.

Despite Willett's findings and the Bluecoat's endeavours to encourage debate and discussion on his recommendations with both local citizens and city officials, Bryan Biggs (2007b) explains that Willett's practical suggestions for making art more relevant to Liverpool society did not go forward. It appears that the city's local authority, while continuing to fund its

local arts organisations, lacked the vision necessary to implement Willett's ideas at the time. In addition, later changes in local government structure, such as the establishment of the Merseyside County Council (MCC) in 1974 actually limited the role that the more local Liverpool City Council might play in the arts and culture, as the MCC was charged with administering arts and cultural provision for the entire county over the other smaller local authorities in the region. Bryan Biggs (2007b) has explained that this lack of foresight on the part of local government or government-funded bodies (such as the Merseyside Arts Association, which mainly served to devolve ACGB funding rather than engage in strategic cultural planning) did not prevent, however, local arts organisations or professionals from taking up the baton themselves. He explains, "Willett's vision for art to move closer to and engage with the life of the city found an echo elsewhere, within the emerging community arts movement where the initiatives such as ...the Blackie sought a different, more grassroots engagement with local people, without comprising its commitment to working with artists of the avant-garde" (Biggs, 2007b: xii).

Interviews and documentary evidence reflects that the work of the local arts sector in shaping cultural strategy in the city appears to have largely depended on the initiatives of individual people (Biggs 2007a). What Bryan Biggs (2007b) described with respect to the Blackie continued into the 1970s with the formation of the Open Eye Gallery and Bootle Art in Action and in the 1980s with the establishment of a number of grassroots arts organisations, such as The Yellow House and First Take, often from the drive of individuals who felt that the city needed to better engage with the ideas of relating art and life and in ways that promoted social and economic change (Thompson 1996; First Take 2007; Hope Street Limited 2007;

Murden 2007; Yellow House 2007). In fact, individuals working within more established arts organisations were also attempting to address similar issues (Jackson 2000; Biggs 2004; Biggs 2007a).

Perhaps the reason that local arts organisations became more involved in developing the social role of art in Liverpool during the 1970s and 1980s was due to the city's critical political and economic concerns. Fundamental changes in international transportation modes, trade links, and new developments in container shipping combined with a rise in the importance of the European Economic Community (EEC, now the European Union (EU)) and de-industralisation greatly affected the city and contributed to an increase in unemployment (Murden 2007). The 'Toxteth riots' in 1981 represented a culmination of these effects and the additional problems they highlighted regarding racial and social cohesion (Murden 2007). Further, Evans (1996) has explained that the local government's lack of support to the private sector led to an exodus of those industries and their professionals from the city centre, thus promoting its further decline. Bianchini and Parkinson (1993: 156) have explained that Liverpool's "weak and divided coalition government" of Liberals and Conservatives lacked clear political or administrative leadership at this time. Local government priorities were given to issues of local taxation and public housing; there was little attention paid to any possible contribution that cultural policy might give to economic regeneration (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993), much less to the positive standing of and experience culture may have in the city more generally. In Bianchini and Parkinson's (1993) view, any perceptions within local government of the potential of growing cultural infrastructure and the promotion of retail and tourism for the economy was regarded as 'middle class' and suspect. These ideas coalesce with the initial sceptical and

negative local response to the foundation of the Tate Gallery in Liverpool (Jackson 2000).

The lack of political attention on cultural pursuits within Liverpool's politics demonstrates the ways in which culture, at least from the standpoint of key politicians, was not seen as an aspect or (necessary) right of everyday life. An example can be seen when in 1986, the Thatcher government abolished the County Council schemes, including the Merseyside County Council, (Parkinson 1985). Merseyside was the only area that did not obtain a Section 48 agreement, which would allow funding for the administering of grants to voluntary groups and the maintenance of administrative cultural provision. This 'miss' can be argued to have contributed to a lack of strategic cultural planning and further demonstrates the disinterest Liverpool's local Militant Labour government at that time had in cultural provision (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993).

The fact that central government continued to focus on culture as a means of regeneration for the city, with the cultural 'reinvention' of the Albert Dock, over issues of housing and industrial-based employment met scepticism at this time in Liverpool's history thus additionally contributing to local government's disinterest in the strategic development of cultural policy. A critical illustration of this is the International Garden Festival of 1984. When central government established the Merseyside Task Force (MTF) in 1981 to address the social and economic problems in the city through 'innovative' approaches (Murden 2007), the MTF adopted cultural and tourism strategies. Hosting the International Garden Festival in Liverpool in 1984 was viewed as an opportunity to employ culture for the city's economic gain, yet this potential was never fully realised. Despite the fact that transformation of one hundred hectares of polluted land along the Mersey River into a display of

gardens, a water park and a Festival Hall had attracted over 3.4 million visitors, Murden (2007) argues that the city's Militant Labour Council did not take advantage of the potential to redevelop the riverside section of the site once the event ended. More recently in 2003 the *Guardian* newspaper recalled this moment in the lead up to 2008, when Liverpool became the European Capital of Culture. The newspaper referred to the still unused festival site as a remaining symbol of Liverpool government's previous lack of forethought regarding cultural development and policy: "a decaying monument to another grand cultural project that was meant to bring economic regeneration in its wake...a cautionary tale to show what happens when politicians fail to think beyond the brief shelf-life of an ambitious project" (ANONc 2003).

After the 'disqualification' and expulsion of Liverpool's Labour councillors from office as well as from the Labour Party in 1987, new leadership did appear to adopt new models of cultural strategy and regeneration, perhaps as a result of the successful opening attendance figures of Tate Liverpool in the late 1980s (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993; Evans 1996: 10). Further Myerscough had produced the study, *The Economic Importance of the Arts on Merseyside*, in 1986 demonstrating the links between cultural offering and potential employment. At this time, Liverpool City Council produced three strategy documents that seem to show a shift toward cultural planning as a means of rebuilding the city: the *City Centre Strategy Review*, the *Tourism Policy*, and the *Arts and Cultural Industries Policy* (Green 1996). The *City Centre Strategy Review* acknowledged the role of tourism and arts and cultural industries in the rebuilding of the city centre. Festivals such as the Festival of Comedy, the Mersey River Festival and the Brouhaha Festival of youth theatre were established. In addition, attempts to reinvigorate the city's

112

music industry were investigated, as were attempts to promote film, video, and broadcasting in the city (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993).

The efforts to develop an instrumentalist cultural policy proved difficult, however. Britain on the whole was in the midst of a major recession, which affected private businesses, property developers and the Arts Council, with little capital available to develop more broad-reaching plans to establish schools of music and media centres in the city (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993). In addition, Liverpool itself was still facing major economic and social problems that had been plaguing the city for at least two decades by the 1990s. Community cohesion had become a major problem in the area in part as a result of the ways in which local government had carried out new housing strategies in the 1960s and 1970s, often pulling people from homes in neighbourhoods they had lived in all their lives and redirecting them into tower blocks or out into new areas in communities and with neighbours with whom they were not familiar (Murden 2007). The implementation of national and European Union strategies for alleviating poverty, promoting development, and increasing welfare provision over the past two decades had not successfully addressed the city's problems (Couch 2003). In 2003, the CACI Wealth of the Nation Survey showed that Liverpool and Merseyside had major increases in wealth, yet, in the same survey a year later it was revealed that "5 out of 18 postcode sectors in the UK with the highest percentage of households with income under £10,000 per year were located in Merseyside" (Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2004: 347).

Any previous efforts to promote a cultural policy within the city discussed here have been closely aligned with economic issues such as strengthening the city's cultural infrastructure and promoting tourism for the purposes of increasing employment, rather than the additional social ones implied by any

attachment of a social inclusion policy to the arts. In fact Jones and Wilks-Heeg (2004: 346) have argued that these changes have actually "eschewed attempts to tackle social deprivation in inner-city areas and peripheral estates in favour of the promotion of business growth in the city centre." In contrast, with some support of social funds, efforts in the 1980s amongst local arts organisations demonstrate that the possible economic and social gains of the arts were already in place on the ground via projects that linked participation in the arts to addressing substance abuse, for example, and the employment of artists for such projects and the growth of artist's studios in rundown parts of the city centre to increase the opportunity for artists to have spaces in which to work and improve local areas (Hope Street Limited 2007). In fact, Murden (2007: 463) has explained, "in the midst of economic meltdown, social malaise, and political controversy... Liverpool remained at the cutting edge of popular culture in the 1970s and 1980s." It appears that it was in the strength and drive of local arts initiatives where the potential of a grassroots cultural strategy was burgeoning.

The European Union's Objective One funding, awarded to Merseyside because it was below 75% of GDP per head of population beginning in 1994 – 1999 and again in 2000 – 2006, provided a new source of funding to voluntary and cultural groups (Couch 2003). This new financial support has actually hampered some of the earlier support social funds gave to the burgeoning grassroots organisations, like the Yellow House, in the 1980s (Yellow House 2007). Today, such funds have supported several capital projects for cultural organisations such as FACT and the Bluecoat. Aimed at improving the economic stability of the area, Objective One funding can be argued to have played a part, namely a financial boost, in Liverpool's 2002 bid for Capital of Culture status. Interviews conducted for this research have

reflected on the roles of individuals, rather than any real local political strategy, in 'seizing' the opportunities the funding provided in developing a new and potentially more cohesive cultural strategy (Davies 1999).

In 2002, Liverpool City Council published a *Cultural Strategy for Liverpool* in which they stated, "the quality of life for people within Liverpool is greatly affected by the level of cultural activity that they have access to" (Liverpool City Council 2002: 2). This document, which finally showed the local government's direct linking of the economic and social benefits of the arts in strategising urban development, was critical to Liverpool's bid to be European Capital of Culture (ECOC) 2008 (Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2004: 346). Interviews with individuals involved with the bid demonstrate that it weighed heavily on the success of local, grassroots cultural initiatives; initiatives which showed that despite Liverpool's previous lack of strategic cultural policy and its history of economic and social disadvantage, the city was incredibly strong in its cultural offering and the public's engagement in it. The bid document itself and the strategy for implementation of ECOC events that have ensued reflect a strong connection to and dependence on local arts initiatives, such as through organisations like the Bluecoat, The Yellow House and Arts in Regeneration Speke (now Arts in Regeneration Granby).

While the aim of the ECOC strategy was not only to promote economic growth but also to celebrate grassroots culture that has not necessarily been the case. Interviews reflect much criticism of the running of the strategy by the Liverpool Culture Company, a local government affiliated body charged with planning and delivering festival events, regarding the Company's neglect in continuing to support some of those initial organisations that

bolstered the bid as locally grown. It appears that even with a more focused cultural policy that joins cultural initiatives with those of the social and economic via the city's European Capital of Culture status, local government may be neglecting the very organisations that had planted its seeds. Such a conclusion begs the question as to whether or not Liverpool's local arts organisations will continue, as they did in the past, to move culture into the public realm via their own mechanisms, rather than necessarily due to policy influences. As a result, there is the matter of whether or not the policy-based social inclusion agenda (DCMS 2000) imposed on the Bluecoat, Tate and the Walker under study here, reflect political concerns more so than the long-established concerns Liverpool's art scene has already had with respect to its local society. In fact, the recent establishment of Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium (LARC) amongst the largest cultural organisations in the city, including the Walker Art Gallery (as part of NML), the Bluecoat and Tate Liverpool, demonstrates how arts organisations continue today to directly shape cultural policy in their locality. The vision of LARC is to strengthen their ability, together, for reinforcing the belief that strong support of art and culture is crucial to a city's economic and social success (Kidd 2008). Such a vision, not only recalls what Willett's (2007 [1967]) study was encouraging for the city's arts organisations in the 1960s, but is also closely aligned with Labour's cultural policy for social inclusion today.

Conclusions

This chapter has demonstrated that conflicts of cultural interpretation evident in the attachment of the social inclusion agenda to the arts are also illustrated in the gallery and artistic practice that has evolved in Liverpool. Such a consideration of the engagement of gallery and artistic practice with the

citizens of Liverpool is particularly relevant because of the inconsistent and intermittent ways in which a strategic cultural policy has developed in the city. Despite this lack of clear local policy development, local arts organisations in particular have engaged in the economic, social, and political role of the arts in society. This engagement has occurred prior to any direction from central government policy. Such a finding demonstrates the importance of considering not only the context of the relationship of art and society in the city more generally, but in the organisations more specifically.

Bryan Biggs (2007b: xiii) has pointed out that developments in the city over time have encouraged art to become "more commonly accepted as part of the fabric of daily life." As there has been a lack of a sustained strategic cultural policy development within the city, it is argued that Liverpool's "pioneering approaches to innovative arts participation" (Biggs 2007b: xiii) are largely responsible. Despite the scepticism for a socially and economically engaged cultural policy in the 1980s, the varied growth of grassroots organisations such as Moviola (now FACT) and The Yellow House, shows that local arts initiatives have been some of the strongest developments in the city's art scene. The efforts of the Walker, the Bluecoat and the Tate to reach out more locally seem to indicate that these institutions were beginning to understand that. Discussion here of Liverpool's more recent art policies in the 1990s into the initiatives of the European Capital of Culture 08 programme further demonstrate the conflicts of linking locally based grassroots initiatives with established arts organisations and the city council agenda for the city's regeneration.

Liverpool's lack of a strong, strategic cultural policy has demonstrated that key arts organisation in the city, such as the Walker, the Bluecoat and the

Tate, have most certainly responded to changing artistic and gallery practices to further encourage their engagement with local people in the midst of changing political, social, and economic conditions. These organisations have responded to these conditions in varying ways, depending upon their remits and missions as particular art galleries working within the field of the arts. The ways in which this response has occurred furthers the argument that examining any arts projects, designed for socially excluded groups, needs to be considered in their specific contexts, both locally and institutionally. The discussion of these galleries' developments within their urban context has raised questions as to how and how much an established 'high' culture organisation can actually promote inclusion not only within society, but also within the arts and as such how these situations might frame, communicate, and/or engage in interpretation with socially excluded audiences. The case studies presented in the subsequent chapters investigate these issues by considering specific projects designed 'for social inclusion'.

Chapter 5

CASE STUDY 1: THE BLUE ROOM PROJECT AT THE BLUECOAT

This chapter presents the Blue Room programme based at the Bluecoat, an arts centre located in Liverpool's city centre. This project of contemporary arts participation is a partnership between the Bluecoat and the Liverpool City Council's Supported Living Department (LCCSLD) and specifically targets 'adults with learning disabilities' via the development of training workshops conducted by professionally trained artists within the Bluecoat for the targeted group, along with their support workers. In developing a structure from which to examine the findings gathered from researching the Blue Room, it has been necessary to review the models presented in the literature review as well as the methodological considerations described in Chapter 3.

The thesis has thus far stressed the significance communication, interpretation, social interaction, and meaning making plays within the field of artistic and gallery practice (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a; 2000b; Kester 2004). However, the methods investigated in Chapter 2 for understanding gallery-based arts projects designed for social inclusion have largely emphasised the promotion of access and audience development (Kawashima 2000). These considerations are largely developed from the perspectives of the arts organisations and administrators involved in such projects and are also usually generalising approaches to understanding gallery practice; they are only one-way directions of investigation that neglect consideration of the ways in which the artists and participants involved in projects may

potentially frame interactions within a specific project (Prior 2003). Further, such constructions do not fully allow for an untangling of the interpersonal relations, actions, and negotiations occurring amongst all the individuals in the project's delivery. As a result, in seeking a framework from which to structure a discussion of the Blue Room, it was required that the thesis turn outside the realm of art historical and museological research to widen what has thus far been a relatively narrow consideration of arts and inclusion projects within a specific gallery context.

In contrast to studies that emphasise the impressions of arts administrators and galleries as 'constructors' of visiting experiences, it is felt that Wenger's (1998) theory of 'communities of practice' presents an appropriate framework for better describing the interactive nature of the Blue Room project for the individuals involved (see also Wenger and McDermott 2002; Barton and Tusting 2005). Applying this theory is dependent on understanding the specificity of place and time as critical to practice. The theory allows for the consideration of context that this thesis argues is vital to understanding any delivery of social inclusion policy in practice (O'Reilly 2005). Wenger's (1998) theory is based on the idea of participation. Participation is defined here as "not just ... local events of engagement in certain activities with certain people, but ... a more encompassing process of being active participants in the practices of social communities and constructing identities in relation to these communities" (Wenger 1998: 4). Identity in this sense is here understood as an aspect of 'belonging' to a specific group, an issue that Bourdieu and Darbel (1991) and Francis (2004) have demonstrated is inherent to the discussion of exclusion and inclusion and particularly in relation to the arts. Moreover, it is belonging that is dependent upon individuals having a role in determining the actions taken in

shaping a practice (Wenger 1998). Further, the theory's emphasis on practice and its consideration of the implicit and explicit forms of communication, understanding, interpretation and social interaction inherent in that, capture the issues of 'interpretive communities' that Hooper-Greenhill (2000) has described with respect to the arts. As a result, the analysis of the Blue Room is presented in a structure framed by Wenger's description of a 'community of practice' without ignoring appropriate attention to the inevitable links inclusion may have to access and audience development. The aim is to discuss what the Blue Room *does* do, while also bringing to light what it is *seen* to be doing but may not actually be (Francis 2004).

This chapter sets out by describing the Blue Room project itself. In the section that follows that description, broader issues concerning the 'social' exclusion of adults with learning disabilities are considered, though particular attention to the group's exclusion from the arts is given. As the thesis has thus far argued that exclusion and inclusion is an individually based and perceived experience (Morris 2001), such a discussion only helps to situate the understandings of inclusion expressed by individuals involved in the development and delivery of the Blue Room project. As a whole, this chapter illuminates the dynamic relationships and subsequent engagement that occurs as a result of these personal constructions of meaning and how that plays out in the delivery of the Blue Room. This description sets the scene for how the mediation of inclusion and exclusion (belonging and non-belonging) occurs in practice. What is revealed in this discussion is the effect of field and institutional constraints on the project. The way those constraints are negotiated by the individuals involved shape the circumstances of inclusion the Blue Room may actually be promoting while revealing the inherent conflicts of cultural understanding it may uphold.

The Blue Room Project

The Blue Room project exists within the Bluecoat's larger programming stream, the Connect Programme, described in Chapter 4. That programme centres on individuals' engagement in participatory arts. Connect emphasises the development of artistic projects relating to the Bluecoat's exhibitions and performances based on the cultivation of long-term relationships with the Centre and its staff. The Blue Room group consists of five service users, four support workers, and five professionally trained artists. The group of service users were selected in part from a previous and still continuing arts group of individuals with learning disabilities from two Resource Centres that participate in Bluecoat activities. Other service users and support workers were selected from a different Resource Centre in the area that has a strong visual arts programme, but had not previously been involved with the Bluecoat. The selection process consisted of support workers approaching individual service users they knew to have an interest in the arts and inquiring as to whether or not they were interested in participating in the Blue Room.

The Blue Room project is a long-term project, for which the Bluecoat aims to seek funding over the next several years. Over its initial year and a half, the Blue Room has consisted of a development phase for training these five key service users, who have a strong interest in the arts, and their support workers. These individuals are being trained to deliver workshops in the Bluecoat space for service users new to the project prior to the completed refurbishment of the building. The Blue Room has three main aims as articulated in the Bluecoat's own documentation:

- "To provide a regular and ongoing programme of contemporary arts participation opportunities for adults with learning disabilities, based at the Bluecoat and linked with the Bluecoat's artistic programme;
- To support independent access to this activity wherever possible;
- To encourage progression along pathways offered through this programme, other participatory programmes, volunteering opportunities and work experience at the Bluecoat" (BC Archives 2006).

The Blue Room project has thus far been funded through ACE's Grants for the Arts, a scheme which aims to "help" more people take part in the arts; involve artists and the arts in creating vibrant communities; improve the performance of the arts sector; and help the development of artists, arts organisations and the creative economy (ACE 2006). The grant thus demonstrates the Arts Council's attempts to link:

- Excellence, by promoting the development of artists with
- The economy by promoting the "creative economy" with
- Access and participation through encouraging more people to take part; and
- Social cohesion through encouraging vibrant communities.

The project is considered by staff to have a social inclusion agenda, which can be seen in its aim to support independent access to the activity as well as encourage pathways to other projects at the centre for the targeted group. Though these aspects were not described explicitly as such in interviews, they have links to audience development for the Bluecoat (Kawashima 2006) as the project is also strongly linked to existing contemporary arts activity,

exhibition or otherwise, at the centre. All of these appear to attend to what the DCMS (2000) and ACE (Jermyn 2001) call for in addressing social inclusion.

The Blue Room began in September 2005 with a two-year development phase. This phase has involved identifying the team of service users and support workers for the Blue Room and providing them with training opportunities in the contemporary arts as well as for delivering effective support roles in a creative environment. This training has involved visits to area galleries discussing art works as well as making visual and live art in the form of workshops delivered by five different professional artists hired for the project. More widely, training for the five service users and their support workers has also consisted of developing skills for the service users to take a role in workshop planning and leadership in the project once it is rolled out to other service users through workshops to be held in the newly refurbished Bluecoat building in April 2008.

This phase has also included 'taster' sessions, which were held in the area's eight Resource Centres. The 'taster sessions' consisted of one professional artist going out to a Resource Centre with a few of the service users and their support workers to deliver workshops. The aim has been to expose new service users to the Blue Room and encourage them to attend the Blue Room themselves when it is launched to new users. In addition, the 'taster sessions' aimed to give the five trainee service users and support workers an opportunity to experience the planning and delivery of the workshops, in which they will have a larger role once new participants join.

The five service users being trained to deliver these workshops will occasionally be referred to as 'trainees' in order to differentiate them in the

discussion from new service users who will access the Blue Room in the coming phase of the project.

Socio-Political Constructions of Exclusion and Inclusion

Adults with learning disabilities are defined in central government policy as individuals who have "impaired intelligence", i.e. "significantly reduced ability to understand new or complex information and/or to learn new skills" and "impaired social functioning, ... [or] a reduced ability to cope independently [both of] which started before adulthood, with a lasting effect on development" (DH 2001: 14). In emphasising these individuals' 'reduced ability' to engage in mainstream societal activities, such an understanding of learning disability marks these individuals as socially excluded. Exclusion is also implied in the way that state policy towards adults with learning disabilities further stresses these individuals' impairments in engaging in societal activities as well as stresses society's ineffectiveness in providing the 'right' activities in which they may engage (DH 2001).

Studies conducted on issues of exclusion for adults with learning disabilities have reflected a number of barriers that exist for such a group in accessing community provision and leisure activities, which the partnership between the Bluecoat and the LCCSLD attempts to address. Beart *et al.* (2001: 29) have reviewed literature on the subject explaining that barriers to participating in community activities or accessing community facilities for such groups are often described as being based on the following: a lack of leisure opportunities available for adults with learning disabilities; the "negative public perceptions of and attitudes towards people with learning disabilities"; and a lack of resources, such as those relating to transportation

costs and support in the form of support workers, available to such groups. Jahoda and Cattermole (1995) have demonstrated that individuals living in large care facilities have often had the least integrated leisure opportunities available to them, with those living in community-based residences being only slightly better off. Aside from the provision of leisure activities, studies such as the one conducted by the Foundation for People with Learning Disabilities in 2001, have shown that individuals with learning disabilities have less chances for employment, fewer choices in education and also experience discrimination, abuse, and a lack of ownership over important decisions that affect their lives. The central government's White Paper, *Valuing People* (DH 2001), has attempted to address these aspects of exclusion in its promotion of 'person-centred planning', where 'Person-Centred Planners' are assigned to work specifically with one service user in order to develop a programme of activities and a structure that involves family input, but overall the interests and needs reflected by the service users themselves. Though the implementation of this particular policy has been criticised, its effort to provide more personalised social services has been praised within the social care sector (Boddy 2003).

A related issue to societal exclusion is the exclusion that adults with learning disabilities face in terms of social presence. Hall (2004: 301) has explained that for adults with learning disabilities "a clear social geography of social absence and presence is produced by processes of othering and the separation or abjection of the 'out of place'...from mainstream society." In fact for many "there is a 'social life' of physical presence within communities and simultaneous social absence from mainstream networks" (Hall 2004: 302). Delin (2002) has demonstrated the above case with respect to the arts. However, the broader issues that Delin (2002) raises shed light on matters

regarding the focus, or not, on disability and the exclusion of individuals based on that categorisation, within the arts in particular. This form of exclusion is an issue that findings of the Blue Room case study will raise with respect to adults with learning disabilities. Delin (2002) has considered the presence or absence of individuals with physical disabilities in museum and art historical gallery displays and argues that a history of disabled artists is often ignored in the canon. She finds this neglect often occurring in two ways. First, there is a lack of imagery of disabled people displayed in gallery settings, which she argues, denies affirmation that historically, disabled people "worked, created great art, wore clothes, were loved, or esteemed" (Delin 2002: 85). Second, she highlights the fact that historical works of art do not typically indicate if the artist who made it was disabled, which she finds adds to a sense of 'hidden history' for such a group (Delin 2002). Laurence (1996: 3) has defined this term in the sense that groups who are now deemed to have been 'previously' marginalised, while gaining greater acknowledgement in historical account, have largely been hidden from history because "society has been unwilling to see them as a separate group with particular rights."

The issues inherent in this discussion are very much about inclusion and exclusion into the 'mainstream'. With respect to the arts, this issue of highlighting disability is a delicate matter. In one sense, the desire to highlight the accomplishments of individuals who are not deemed within the mainstream in turn highlights their 'difference', or as Hall (2004) terms it with respect to adults with learning disabilities, their 'otherness'. In another sense, by highlighting, acknowledging, or celebrating difference, the fact of exclusion from mainstream society is also highlighted and inclusion, then, becomes a null and void matter. However, Allan (2005) has discussed

'disability arts', which encompasses all forms of disability and has been seen to emerge as a separate genre, as a medium in which exclusionary barriers for individuals with disability can be exposed. The consideration she highlights is the fact that while one must not hold a "utopian vision of inclusion", highlighting difference within a field such as the arts ensures the voices of disabled artists are not "valorised at the margins" (Allan 2005: 31). Rather, these very issues incite debate about inclusion and exclusion, bringing the matters out in the open. However, it should be acknowledged that if what Allan (2005) praises is to truly be the case, the individuals involved must be in a situation of empowerment in order to engage in such a debate. In order to investigate such issues with respect to the Blue Room, it is necessary first to understand the ways in which the individuals involved in the project understand the forms of inclusion and exclusion that the project is supposedly addressing.

Interpreting and Describing Inclusion Practice through the Blue Room Lens

The wider considerations of exclusion and inclusion with regards to adults with learning disabilities described above are broader ideological issues, which serve to highlight the very individual constructions of meanings of inclusion expressed by the people involved in the Blue Room project; for it is via those interpretations and the ensuing actions where ideology is negotiated (Eagleton 1994; Bevir and Rhodes 2005). The meanings attached to the idea of social inclusion for the individuals involved in the Blue Room are connected with ideas of access; ideas which Kawashima (2006) has linked to notions DCMS (2000) proposes as aims for social inclusion. The fact that everyone involved in the Blue Room has highlighted access to

culture and participation in cultural activity as paramount in the design and delivery of the project, demonstrates in some ways that empowerment is not necessarily an initial requirement for engagement in the Blue Room, but rather an aim of its practice.

Almost all individuals including service users have communicated that in providing access to cultural offering the Blue Room helps encourage greater self-esteem, confidence and skill-building, all DCMS (2000) aims for social inclusion. The different ways in which these positive outcomes are expressed are understood in social science circles to reflect issues of cultural capital (Bourdieu 2000), which are in turn understood as marking the position in which the individuals are located within the structure of the project as well as the organisation of the Bluecoat and even the arts more broadly. Such understandings are linked to the notions of exclusion and inclusion discussed above (Delin 2002; Allan 2005).

As the drive to promote access is paramount to interpretations of the inclusion aims of the Blue Room, exclusion from the arts appears to also be understood as an unfortunate certainty. Bluecoat staff perceive art itself to be a challenge to promoting access to the Bluecoat organisation specifically and to cultural offering more generally. One staff member explains, "Contemporary art does have a fence around it." Despite this hindrance, the Bluecoat is felt to be uniquely placed to address this aspect of inclusion, based on its ethos and its programme. Some staff feel the Bluecoat offers activities representing all aspects of culture in order to help people feel more comfortable. Staff explain that the Bluecoat's combination of cultural offering allows for a variety of different "routes" to be taken to foster inclusion, such as by encouraging people to come in 'shop', 'relax' or 'join in' to its activities, as the new branding of the Bluecoat implies (BC 2007).

While access must first be achieved in order to promote inclusion, particularly for individuals excluded from mainstream society as well as from the arts (Kawashima 2006), projects like the Blue Room are felt, according to staff, to more specifically "give people who ... almost certainly wouldn't otherwise have the opportunity or chance ... an insight into the creative process in a fairly full way." Such ideas imply the ideology of 'opportunity' inherent in Labour policy (Blair 2006). The way in which this access is explained to occur is by groups "start[ing] from a very basic place with a very loose idea and [then going] through the whole...[creative] process with an artist." This process is argued to have greater aims beyond access and is seen as requiring risk-taking and experimentation, which is articulated as "the excitement of contemporary arts." These ideas link to what Tranter and Palin (2004) describe as the key aspects of arts projects that are often difficult to measure for policy-based indicators of social inclusion (Selwood 2002; Scott 2006). As one artist explained, "you need a lot of time to make mistakes, sling it out and then go on to something else" and according to all individuals involved, the Blue Room is felt to allow for this freedom in the long-term nature of its delivery, its aims and in the way individuals engage in the practice itself.

The artists involved in the project also seem to subscribe to or support what some academics have termed Labour's language of opportunity (Lister 1998; DCMS 2005a). They also tend to interpret social inclusion as 'access to culture' or as providing the opportunity to participate in the arts. These opportunities follow liberal humanist notions regarding art's ability to promote self-betterment (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]) as they are often seen by these artists to be automatically promoting self-esteem and well being, for example (DCMS 2000; Scott 2006). One artist explained, "Creativity most of

the time is woefully undervalued...I think people's lives are really bereft without the opportunity to express themselves, engage with their thoughts and feelings in that way. At its best, that's what social inclusion...via arts processes can be." At the same time, however, this artist is sceptical of initiatives that do not value the art in and of itself: "At its worst it's just like: 'oh, we've got a problem here. A bit of art, that will sort it out'." There is an acknowledgement that tokenistic arts provision exists, but none of the artists working in the project stated that the Blue Room is one of these projects. In fact, each artist has particularly highlighted the ways in which the Blue Room is more inclusive than other similar projects on which they have worked. Specifically, it is felt that the long-term nature of the Blue Room allows for deep involvement of and consultation with the service users in a way that promotes an exploratory and experimental practice, which again is felt to be crucial to developing contemporary arts practice. In its accessible approach it is about making the Bluecoat a place for adults with learning disabilities and their community "as much as [for] the art...people". In acknowledging a distinction between adults with learning disabilities and "the art people" the inherent exclusivity of the arts is reinforced. This differentiation is another issue illuminating some tensions within the practice of the Blue Room.

Support workers tend to interpret social inclusion with respect to the services they provide or feel should be provided for service users. As described above, literature on the subject of exclusion is often centred on perceived barriers, and most often lack of transport to and/or support (Beart *et al.* 2001; Morris 2001). Awareness of such a context appears to affect the ways in which support workers define social inclusion. They do so in varying but similar ways such as having "the margins rubbed away", giving adults with

learning disabilities the opportunity to access everyday activities and be accepted for who, not what, they are. Again, like the artists, they state that social inclusion is addressed by the project because of the fact that it gives 'opportunity' for accessing community services, developing social skills and greater access and inclusion to the arts. These opportunities are important for service users, support workers explain, because a number of people in Day or Resource Centres may have become institutionalised (Putnam 1993).

Support workers however, also interpret the way in which the project addresses inclusion to be doing so within the arts more specifically. One support worker feels that the Blue Room allows the service users pathways in which they could become "recognised as artists in their own right" through the "use of a community base where other artists work [and where they can] do...artwork like any other artist does". Further the Blue Room has allowed the service users to develop techniques in which they could train other individuals to increase their own artistic skills. The nature of the difficulties for individuals with learning disabilities to access the arts as artists has been discussed (Delin 2002; Allan 2005). Mencap, a UK charity which campaigns for equal rights for children and adults with learning disabilities, has recently supported individuals in accessing the arts as 'artists' through funding exhibitions and leading conferences on the issue of arts exclusion for such a group. In fact, during the course of this study the Blue Room participants themselves participated in one such conference, demonstrating one way in which the project could be seen to be engaging in wider issues of access to and inclusion in the arts for such groups. These efforts to draw attention to the exclusion of artists with disabilities from mainstream arts as well as exclusion from societal activities more generally

demonstrates the complexity of what may be involved in delivering inclusion via the Blue Room.

Participants also imply that the project addresses broader social issues of exclusion via a language of opportunity for adults with learning disabilities. They appear to have interpreted the Blue Room as an inclusive project in the way that it provides access to new cultural offering that they do not have by means of the Day Services. For example,

> C: We need the Blue Room.
>
> R[1]: Why do you need the Blue Room?
>
> C: Why do we need the Blue Room? To do art.
>
> B: Cause you got nowhere to go.
>
> A: ...
>
> C: If we didn't have no centre, right? And the place was only
>
> downtown, we could go to the Blue Room.

For the service users, the Blue Room is thus described as inclusive for two reasons. First, as it provides a place in which the group can 'do art', they are acknowledging an attempt to address circumstances of exclusion for such groups to the arts specifically. Second, if the group does not have access to a Resource or Day Centre, the Blue Room itself is a place in the city centre to which the group can go. This second aspect falls in line with the issues described by Beart *et al.* (2001) and detailed in *Valuing People* (DH 2001),

---

[1] R = Researcher

which proposes more use of services offered via community organisations and networks rather than repeating services through Day Centres.

Interpretations of inclusion expressed by individuals engaging in the Blue Room have emphasised first and foremost that the project serves to provide access to adults with learning disabilities. Access, which is also expressed as 'opportunity' (Lister 1998; DCMS 2005a) by those individuals, is carried out in two ways: first to promote greater choice and possibilities for adults with learning disabilities to 'get out' of their Day or Resource Centres and take part in activities in the community, and second, for the option of that activity to be specifically about the arts. These two ideas show an instrumental use of the arts as the opportunity to participate in them is a means by which to 'include' adults with learning disabilities into 'mainstream' social activities. Additionally, by emphasising the importance of participating in the arts for the sake of furthering the skill-base of these adults as artists, the intrinsic value of the arts is also upheld. In describing this notion of inclusion, support workers, artists and Bluecoat staff have acknowledged that the arts are not only *perceived* as exclusive, but the description of the arts is also implicitly *expressed* as exclusive. However, the way in which participants in the project state their understandings of it also indicates that the project itself helps alleviate some of these exclusionary concerns. Such agreement amongst the individuals involved demonstrates that they share a 'buy-in' for how and what the Blue Room project is intended to accomplish.

A 'Community of Practice': A Framework for Examining the Blue Room

The 'buy-in' that the participants involved in the Blue Room share is based on the common understandings of inclusion that they have expressed. This

common effort is not only the joint enterprise on which they embark in engaging in the practice of the Blue Room, but it is the 'interpretive community' in which they exist (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a). In addition, their positive expressions regarding the ways in which inclusion is promoted through the practice of the project indicates a sense of belonging or attachment to its aims, its practice, and the others with whom they engage in that practice. This finding describes what Wenger (1998) terms a 'community of practice,' which is understood to be dependent upon the mutual engagement of the individuals involved in a joint enterprise through a shared repertoire or practice (Wenger 1998).

During the course of the Blue Room project, it has been observed that the service users, artists, support workers, and Bluecoat administration staff have been developing relations of mutual engagement organised around the joint enterprise of making and exhibiting art work as well as planning workshops to be delivered to other service users. This engagement is carried out amongst the individuals involved through the following ways: the creation of a friendly and trusting atmosphere, a diversity of knowledge and experience amongst group members, and the establishment of interconnected relationships among those members.

The creation of a friendly and trusting atmosphere

The members of the Blue Room group have developed and maintain a sense of belonging and group cohesion and they cultivate this through conversation and sharing experiences every week during their workshops. The group meets every Thursday morning from 10am until 1pm. Some service users and support workers travel to the group's meeting place together and others come individually. Upon arrival, they prepare cups of tea and coffee and

catch up with one another about the happenings of the previous week. Jokes and stories are told in the midst of the training workshops. After the sessions are completed the group share lunch together and discuss what they worked on that day as well as any upcoming projects. This environment has influenced the service users to see the Blue Room as a relaxed and enjoyable "public place where people go...to do ...artwork" as well as a place to "meet" and "talk to people." All participants have explained that they are "genuinely committed" to the project. Wenger (1998) explains that what it takes for a 'community of practice' to enable engagement and develop a sense of belonging can be quite subtle and often less visible than more instrumental aspects of a group's practice, such as informative memos about project logistics. The friendly and trusting atmosphere observed in the Blue Room sessions are not a documented requirement of the project, nor even a listed aim, but rather a product of engagement as expressed and carried out by the individuals involved. It will be argued that it is this atmosphere that contributes to the ability of these individuals to continue to return to the project and participate, despite any restraints placed on the delivery of its practice.

A diversity of knowledge and experience

The varied knowledge and experience that the individuals involved in the Blue Room bring to the project is also necessary in order to sustain its development (Wenger 1998). While the individuals involved may share a common goal in the fact that they come together in order to develop an opportunity for adults with learning disabilities to become more involved in the arts as well as in an activity outside the Resource Centre, they also have diverse perspectives on what they do, why and how (Wenger 1998).

The desire to encourage new service users to "get out" of the Resource Centres is particularly important to the trainees who feel that there is often limited opportunity to participate in activities outside those Centres. As such, these individuals see their role as being trained to "help" new service users in participating in the Blue Room: encouraging them to attend having introduced the project via 'taster sessions' but also helping them once they have arrived, assisting new service users in whatever their needs may be to make artwork. The trainees consider their role largely as "artists" who are "committed" not only to making art work and visiting and participating in exhibitions but also to the Blue Room and to providing new avenues into the arts for service users new to the project.

Like the trainee service users, the support workers bring to the project their knowledge of working with individuals with complex needs as well as the societal constraints often laid upon those individuals in having such needs (Beart *et al.* 2001; DH 2001). They largely feel their role to be one of "support" not only for the trainee service users, but also for those who will be new to the Blue Room. Further, they feel they support the artists in becoming more familiar with working with individuals who have learning difficulties. Of the utmost importance in their role, however, is supporting the existing service users to pursue a career in the arts. They express a desire to help encourage the arts community to see these individuals not as 'adults with learning disabilities' who make art, but as "artists in their own right".

The support workers have explained that the understanding of the Bluecoat staff has been "paramount" in making the Blue Room happen, particularly as it is sometimes felt that the institutional regulations of the LCCSLD often put constraints on the delivery of the project. Bluecoat staff themselves acknowledge their role as "facilitators" who "can speak the language" of the

different partners involved: LCCSLD managers, support workers, service users, and artists. These skills give them "sensitivity" to the different perspectives that may be brought to bear in such partnerships. This is a role that DCMS (2007b) has recently highlighted in their *Cultural Pathfinders* report, referenced in Chapter 2. Support workers perceptions of this role as carried out by staff helps maintain the trusting atmosphere of the Blue Room described above. This trust and understanding argued as shared between these two specific groups also generates the kind of 'personalised' approach (Leadbeater 2004) to delivering the project that was observed during research. This approach was witnessed not only in the casual and familiar manner in which people engage with one another, but in the mediation and negotiation of institutional and organisational constraints that affect the project.

Artists and service users feel that Bluecoat staff's administration and organisation of the project is crucial. In addition, as individuals closely tied into the art world, Bluecoat staff have explained that they are able to give "a behind-the-scenes" look into the arts and an opportunity to participate in and experience "the creative process from start to finish". Their role is to promote the Bluecoat via the Blue Room so that "people [can] feel comfortable coming to the Bluecoat and accessing all areas of it and not feeling that because of anything about themselves that they can't". Their interpretation of their own roles within the project as well as within the Bluecoat as an organisation is perceived by them to be one of encouraging "inclusion". This role can also be understood within both Sandell's (1998) and Kawashima's (2006) frameworks for inclusion and audience development respectively. Specifically with respect to the Blue Room, it could be seen as a role in marketing (Lee 2005). By making a key group of

service users feel 'comfortable' accessing the Bluecoat and thus promoting it as a comfortable and accessible place to other service users via the 'taster sessions', the Bluecoat is able to further develop its audience base and promote itself as inclusive of 'other types' of visitors. Such descriptions of projects like the Blue Room are often couched in derogatory terms, indicating that individuals involved in this style of marketing are somehow out to promote a false product: the elitist arts as inclusive (Belfiore 2004; Kawashima 2006). This view may largely be held because of the ways in which positive social outcomes from projects are so difficult to prove (Scott 2002; 2006). Yet, in examining the roles of individuals in the Blue Room, this chapter will be seen to challenge this limited view of what is entailed in such a targeted form of marketing (Lee 2005).

The role of artists involved in the Blue Room is as individuals who are affiliated with but do not necessarily fit directly within, the context of the Bluecoat. As artists, they represent a different set of opinions and ideas regarding, as well as pathways into, the art world. It could be perceived from an outside perspective that the 'professional' artists on the project are there to teach service users and support workers the skills to deliver creative art making workshops. In fact, the delivery of "skills" has been mentioned by support workers in relation to what the artists do, however, at no time has anyone in the project described the artists as 'teachers'. The artists themselves have acknowledged that the support workers provide support in delivering sessions to service users. The artists articulate their own roles to be as "facilitators" in generating ideas and vision for developing creativity. One artist explained, "I think going in as an artist, you're not a teacher, you're not a carer, you've got a completely different role...I think [the service users] respond to you in a completely different way, so I think it's

139

important you go in and you say, 'I'm an artist', even though you might be doing the same thing in helping, you've just got that overall kind of vision and they look to you for that." Another artist explained that in working together in workshops they, the artist, support workers, and service users, become a "group [that] functions as an arts organism". This notion of 'group' and 'organism' indicates that the interaction that occurs amongst the group is not only collective, but complex with interdependent as well as subordinate properties; properties determined by their function in the sum of its parts.

These notions of subordinates and interdependence are illustrated in the ways in which some of the artists do not perceive the trainee service users as having the skills or experience to be considered "artists" in their own right as of yet. In some ways, perhaps, to perceive the trainee service users as artists would challenge the artists' own senses of identity as 'an artist' or their social location within the field of the arts. Yural-Davis (2006: 199) has explained that notions of belonging are in part dependent upon the positionality of categories of social location along an axis of power, higher or lower than other such categories. At the same time, Yural-Davis (2006: 200) explains that such locations "even in their most stable format, are virtually never constructed along one power axis of difference." As a result, there is a simultaneous sense of hierarchical and non-hierarchical structure to the Blue Room group. In working together as the Blue Room, the group is on equal footing in that they all need each other in order for the project to work. At the same time, however, they are continually negotiating their roles as individuals who bring their own perceptions and experiences to that group. These perceptions and experiences, while making the group function on the

level of social and/or organisational agendas can also hinder its ability to be truly inclusive within the arts.

The establishment of interconnected relationships

Negotiating the roles of individuals within the project involves mediating perceptions of social location and identity. In order to understand that negotiation it is critical to examine the relationships between those individuals (Bevir and Rhodes 2005), particularly with respect to trying to understand circumstances of belonging and/or inclusion (Yural-Davis 2006). Wenger (1998: 76) has explained that the maintenance of relationships created through a 'community of practice' can often connect individuals involved in ways that become deeper than simply "personal features or social categories". The relationships may be positive and nurturing or they may involve tension and conflict. The stories and experiences that are shared between the service users and support workers through the discussion and making of art is felt to develop a sense of "community" amongst the group as "memories" and "emotions" are "stirred." It is explained, "an awful lot of inner feelings comes out." Through shared involvement with art and through participation in the project, support workers often "find out more than they ever knew" about the individuals who they support. Support workers have stated these discoveries are beneficial to their new roles as 'Person-Centred Planners', linking an outcome of the Blue Room project to aims of social welfare provision (DH 2001).

Partly through creating a friendly and supportive atmosphere, the artists help facilitate these closer relationships amongst the group as a whole in the way in which they lead their workshops. Through the process of teaching new art making techniques or working with the service users and support workers to

plan the delivery of a 'taster session' each artist in their own ways poses questions at the start of workshops about what the individuals in the group attach value to, how they define themselves, and how they have come to be the people that they are. The stories that are shared reflect fears from experiencing discrimination as well as humorous stories about family members and memories of past arts projects. These personal discussions not only help create the project's supportive environment, but are also the source for how the Blue Room carries out its practice.

Although the Bluecoat staff are not directly engaged in the weekly workshop sessions, they as well have become closely connected to the Blue Room group. Their commitment in negotiating the challenges that have arisen with regards to maintaining the buy-in of the LCCSLD is described by support workers as something that "makes you want to do [the Blue Room]." As a result, and despite any tensions or conflicts that may arise amongst the group, individuals involved in the Blue Room feel a deep sense of connection and allegiance to one another that is against the odds they face in the bureaucracy of the wider public service sector or even the field of the arts. These connections have formed friendships not only amongst the service users and support workers, but also with Bluecoat staff. Bluecoat staff, support workers, service users, and in some cases artists, attend each others performances or exhibitions, have lunch together and even, in one instance, travel abroad together as a result of, but not for the purposes of, the project.

The creation and maintenance of a friendly and trusting atmosphere, a diversity of knowledge and experience, and the establishment of interconnected relationships help to maintain the Blue Room group as a coherent whole while they negotiate their individual relationships and also

the constraints of the organisations that mandated the project. The ways in which the individuals involved go about these forms of negotiation adds to their sense of belonging to the Blue Room as a collective and their notions of mutual accountability despite any influences that may be beyond their control (Wenger 1998), such as hierarchical structures within the group and organisational rules.

In the course of this shared endeavour, the Blue Room has developed a set of resources for negotiating the meaning of what they do (Wenger 1998). These include the routine of the project, the location in which it takes place, the art objects viewed and the language used to discuss them, the tools for art making and workshop planning, the stories shared during training sessions, and the ways of doing things. These processes include the flexible manner in which the artists lead the training sessions, the ways in which support workers support not only the service users to participate in the sessions, but also the artists to deliver them, and the ways in which the Bluecoat administration staff coordinate the running of the project as a whole. Two of the key elements in this repertoire are flexibility and risk-taking, which have recently been raised in DCMS (2007b) reports as necessary for delivering projects designed for inclusion. This set of "shared resources" (Wenger 1998: 83) does not imply that Blue Room sessions are always harmonious, nor that there is no confusion at times; in fact at times some participants have felt uncomfortable with the flexible nature of workshop delivery and the risk-taking it entails, yet they continue to negotiate such approaches because it privileges process over outcome.

Examining the Blue Room as 'a community of practice' and a process of participation in which learning occurs and can be examined, brings the complexity of the Blue Room to light. Wenger (1998: 85) explains that as "a

locus of engagement in action, interpersonal relations, shared knowledge, and negotiation of enterprises" communities of practice like the Blue Room "hold the key" to the possibility of change that may be implied in its label as a social inclusion project. The dictates of cultural policy, the arts, the Bluecoat, and the LCCSLD and conditions of exclusion for adults with learning disabilities are no less significant; rather they are "mediated" via the processes of the Blue Room's practice (Wenger 1998: 85). The aspects inherent in that practice, mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire are not static, but they flex and change over time (Wenger 1998) via the processes involved in delivering the Blue Room. For Wenger (1998), this kind of social participation promotes learning. It is through that learning where the potential of change appears. An examination of types of learning regarding inclusion and the arts that may be achieved by studying the Blue Room project will be carried out in the sections below, which highlight two areas in particular. The process of mutual engagement undertaken in the Blue Room will be examined followed by a discussion of the group's struggle to reconcile the conflicts that evolve from their common interpretations of the enterprise.

Art and Social Work: Mediating Constraints of Organisations

The friendly and trusting atmosphere of the Blue Room that exists in each weekly session is part of the maintenance of the group's mutual engagement; maintenance which is necessary for sustaining the group's practice. However, mutual engagement must also be maintained at the institutional level (Wenger 1998). Bluecoat staff have explained that projects like the Blue Room, which consist of partnerships with public sector agencies, must be approached with the frames of reference and the objectives of that agency

144

in mind. This context typically includes the restrictions or allowances placed on a project by the partner organisation. The LCCSLD exists to promote independence among adults with learning disabilities by enabling service users to live as independently as possible and take part in 'valued' activities in the communities. The establishment of a partnership between the Bluecoat and LCCSLD for the Blue Room was actually a final step in solidifying collaboration between the two organisations. The Bluecoat had been working in partnership on projects with individual Resource Centres since at least the year 2000. The needs of the LCCSLD to address policy directives such as *Valuing People* (DH 2001) that call for the promotion of service users' independence and social inclusion matched the Bluecoat's own goals to increase access to and participation in the art centre's contemporary arts activity. Such a partnership demonstrates the ways in which the arts have become increasingly tied to other areas of public service provision (Belfiore 2004). For the Blue Room to happen, the LCCSLD provides support staff and funding as well as transportation for service users in some cases. The Bluecoat organises the logistics of the project and provides supplementary funding and the venue.

Mutual engagement at the institutional level affects the engagement of the Blue Room participants at the project level. At certain points in the period of research on this project, it became apparent that Bluecoat staff had to "maintain" (Wenger 1998) the support of the LCCSLD managers, managers that may be new to the organisation and thus not fully aware of the Blue Room project, its aims and its practice, for example. Difficulties have arisen in which some of the support workers on the project have been either taken off the project and shifted to new areas of the organisation or pressured to provide and/or organise certain transport for the service users with whom

they work. This situation has at times affected the positive feelings participants have about the Blue Room, oftentimes concluding that the key challenge to the project's success usually lies with negotiating institutional engagement with and understanding of it. As a result, during the course of workshops held for the Blue Room, support workers have been distracted and not fully engaged with discussions turning to complaints about the difficulties of the situation. At times, artists have had to be flexible and negotiate around these difficulties; in some instances allowing support workers the space to share their grievances and in other cases encouraging them to "get their minds off" those grievances by engaging in the tasks at hand. In addition, workshops have sometimes been cut short, due to the need of Bluecoat staff to discuss with service users, artists, and support workers recent developments in the institutional partnership.

Despite these challenges at the institutional level (or perhaps, because of them), the connection that individuals involved in the Blue Room share has been strengthened over time. Support workers have explained that they feel an "affinity" to the Bluecoat because of their continual support of the project, despite any institutional complications. Bluecoat staff have even remarked that in mediating these institutional relationships they feel that they have gone outside the remit of their jobs. They spend much of their time meeting with LCCSLD managers to negotiate how the project can best be delivered once it is rolled out to new service users, and support workers have invited managers along to the project to see for themselves what is happening there. Wenger (1998: 79) has explained, "even when [a community of practice] is profoundly shaped by conditions outside the control of its members, as it always is in some respect, its day to day reality is nevertheless produced by participants within the resources and constraints of their situations. It is their

146

response to their conditions and therefore their enterprise." As a result, the institutional hiccups that have occurred, while in instances hurting some of the project's delivery, has also strengthened the efforts to make the project happen because of the connections and mutual accountability the participants share with one another. These efforts may not lessen the control or requirements that the institution lays on the Blue Room project, but carried out by the 'community of practice' they mediate that control by the ways in which they respond to it.

Defining and Reconciling the Enterprise for Inclusion

Each participant generally articulates the enterprise of the Blue Room as encouraging service users to "get out" of the Resource Centres and feel confident and comfortable accessing the arts activity provided by the Bluecoat. This second aspect of inclusion is of particular importance to Bluecoat staff and has much to do with understanding inclusion in the context of their work environment. At the same time, however, the Blue Room project has broader aims for inclusion, which not only promote audience development for the Bluecoat and provide new activities for service users, but also encourage wider and varied engagement with the arts. The long-term aim of the Blue Room project is to promote 'inclusion' in its broader social sense via pathways to greater involvement in the community, such as through volunteering at the Bluecoat and/or participating in the development of individual arts projects through the Blue Room; all of these aspects of inclusion are mutually understood by all individuals involved in the project, though some aspects may weigh of greater importance to different individuals than others, depending on their unique perspectives.

For the five service users involved in the Blue Room, the long-term aim appears to be achievable as these service users have been closely involved with the design and delivery of the Blue Room, from making decisions on the hiring of professional artists to the design of the project's evaluation. Artists have explained how much they perceive the service users to be truly involved in the planning and delivery of Blue Room sessions. One stated, "I've never been in any other community situation where you actually plan with [the group] and they get...everyone gets time, chance to input..." As Wenger (1998: 74) has explained, "being included in what matters is a requirement for being engaged in a community's practice". As a result, the trainee group appears to have a clearly defined role and to be fully engaged or 'included' in the practice of the Blue Room. Discussions with the service users themselves also reflect feelings of general inclusion in decision-making about the running of the project.

When issues of artistic value are considered in relation to the Blue Room project, however, the 'inclusion' of the trainees becomes less clear and their identity as artists comes under question. Identity in this research project is defined as the "ability and inability of individuals to share the meanings that define their communities of practice and their forms of belonging to those communities" (Wenger 1998: 145). The trainees' involvement in the project highlights their identity and their role in the Blue Room as 'the excluded'. The consideration of the trainees as 'excluded' individuals becomes problematic when learning that the service users do not wish to highlight their difference (Edwards *et al.* 2001) so overtly, but rather wish to highlight their identity as artists. This idea is in contrast to Delin's (2002) call for more acknowledgement of disability amongst artists. When asked about whether or not the group considers themselves to have a learning disability,

statements shared included: "I'm not going to walk around...saying 'I've got a learning disability'...You put labels on jam jars; you don't put labels on people". Another respondent stated, "I think everyone's got a learning disability in some ways...you're a person at the end of it." With respect to the arts, the trainee service users in the group identified themselves as artists based on the fact that they are creative: "when I'm in my flat, I don't sit down. I always get pieces of paper and do like a collage or whatever. So I'm always doing something, so I am an artist in that way".

The association with the Blue Room is a crucial aspect for the participants to identify and present themselves as artists. First, the project's association with the Bluecoat is felt to give the project "quality" and "prestige". Interviews with support workers and service users demonstrate that this is as much tied up with the Bluecoat building and its history in the city centre as it is with its standing nationally and internationally as an arts centre; factors which were highlighted in Chapter 4. Second, involvement in the project has been felt to enable the five service users to "let people know what [they] do" as artists, not only because they can share their skills with other individuals from the Resource Centres who would be attending the Blue Room, but also because the Bluecoat has provided them the opportunity to exhibit and share their work. The service users themselves seem to most value the chance to "help" others develop the artistic skills they have learned; not only to share those skills, but also to highlight the fact that they are 'trained' artists.

The Blue Room's location within the wider context of the arts means that the construction of meanings inherent in that field comes to play within the practice of the project (Bourdieu 2000). Tensions arise for the project around reconciling the conflicting interpretations of what kind of inclusion the project is about as well as reconciling individual participants' roles and

identities in relation to that practice (Wenger 1998). While the service users participating in the Blue Room at the moment appear to be included into the decision making process of the 'practice', what they (and their support workers) appear to be striving for is acceptance and inclusion within the field of the arts as artists. These attachments highlight the significance of the intrinsic value of the arts to these individuals. Ironically, their association with the Blue Room helps them to identify themselves and have a sense of belonging to the arts as artists, yet simultaneously that association precludes them in some ways as being considered artists in their own right. So, whether or not they are perceived to 'belong' as artists to the field is another issue entirely.

Inclusion with Standards of 'Quality'

Tensions arise in the negotiation of status within the arts, which is often associated with perceptions of artistic quality and skill based on perceived 'acceptable' levels of training within the field of the arts. The trainees differentiate themselves from the artists who have been instructing them on developing skills to lead workshops for other service users. They have explained that the artists who train them are "more of an artist than us" and "more professional than us". One service user attached the artists' professional status to the fact that "they probably done training for it before we started doing [the Blue Room]." In contrast, according to one Bluecoat staff, "self-definition" is of the utmost importance in identifying oneself as an artist:

> "If people feel like an artist, then they are an artist. [If one individual in the Blue Room group] goes home and makes [art] you know in

[their] own time, then that's [their] artistic practice. And that's how [that] artistic practice is expressed. Who's to say that that's any less valid?"

According to staff members involved in the Blue Room project labelling oneself as an artist should be enough to be considered as such. However, at the same time the categorisations of "experience" are inherent in discussions of such labels and touch on the tensions implicit in such considerations. The staff member quoted above goes on to explain,

> "[Some of the individuals in the Blue Room have] had 7 years of
> experience of working on contemporary art projects with a range of
> different artists, and across different art forms. [They don't have] a
> degree in Fine Art, but you know [they have] built up a considerable
> amount of experience...but how people who are curators, for
> example, in the contemporary art world would view that, I don't
> know and I think that's always where the battle will lie."

Wenger (1998) has explained that equality of status is not a precursor to mutual engagement in a 'community of practice'. This acknowledgement of inequality corresponds with Yural-Davis's (2006) ideas about belonging relating across different alignments of social location. In fact, a lack of equality in status can contribute to the competence of the individuals in the group where they draw on the experiences and knowledge of one another in a way to further the practice. However, problems can arise when participants in a 'community of practice' are not mutually negotiating the meanings of their enterprise.

One participant in the project noted, "There's a difference between tolerance and acceptance and value." While staff engaged in the Blue Room project

may feel that participation in the project itself may provide an "alternative progression" to that of traditional training into the arts as a whole, support workers, staff, and artists alike all acknowledge that the arts have "standards" to adhere to. Tensions arise in the project in the negotiation of status within the arts, which is often associated with perceptions of artistic quality. One senior staff member of the Bluecoat who does not work directly on the project described the issue of 'quality':

> "A good arts centre or art venue should...not compromise the work, but ...find ways through interpretation, through participation ...[to] make it accessible. And the thing is you don't always get that right, but that's...you know... why shouldn't people from any background...have access to the best quality ideas, even if they're difficult and awkward and problematic? You know, why make it so easy that actually you bleach out the problematic of the work? There's always art that's going to be awkward and ambiguous and the meaning isn't as obvious."

For this senior staff, projects like the Blue Room emphasise engagement with the best arts. In a way, there is a desire to promote excellence in the arts but not to 'dumb them down', as the above senior staff member explained. Further, the same individual acknowledged the contradictions inherent in the arts with respect to inclusion and exclusion (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991) and what that entails regarding the social (not cultural) policy of social inclusion. The definition of inclusion provided here is a more all-encompassing view of culture, one that includes the elitist view (Williams 1958). Inclusion,

> "...in the context of working at the Bluecoat...is not about culture only being [something] you can get into as part of a club—elitist. It is

the whole spectrum, if you like. How you express the way you feel about where you are in the world. That can include the elitist position can't it? 'Cos that can include an individual artist who is perfectly entitled to make whatever work they like in whatever way they want."

Another staff member who works directly with the Blue Room explained it more specifically in terms of accessibility: we are "able to create projects ...or workshops upon [the Bluecoat programme]...and make that more accessible for people and people will perhaps be able to engage with [contemporary art], understand it or create their own understanding of it to a higher degree." Issues of attaining knowledge of contemporary art, or what Bourdieu (2000) would term cultural capital, are implied in such a statement. In addition, it is about ensuring that people are not excluded from what is offered at the Bluecoat, but also ensuring that the projects developed for that aim do "fit with the Bluecoat values...and vision." It is a desire to find a "good balance" without going against for what "the institution stands." According to staff at the Bluecoat, the job of the arts centre is to work with "quality artists" that have "quality ideas"; that quality is determined to be reflective of innovation, to have "a relationship to the world" as well as to "private concerns", but it is determined by the individuals who have the knowledge of the art world. The Bluecoat is felt by staff to fill "the gaps" of cultural offering in the city with respect to reflecting and considering or 'including' a diversity of cultures, even within small communities, but the 'quality of' or standards for creative ideas should not be compromised.

These tensions, the hierarchy of the arts and the contradictions that they may imply for issues of inclusion, were highlighted by a number of the artists

involved in the project. When asked whether or not social inclusion has a place within the arts, one artist explained,

> "Oh my god yes...there is that hierarchical thing and there's always going to be the celebrated Turner Prize, but the arts is much broader than that...It has to be much broader than that. It has to be. Art has such a positive effect on people....art is about reaching the wider populous, it isn't just about that celebrated person, celebrated individuals."

This artist acknowledges the hierarchy of 'great' art by referencing the Turner Prize, an establishment-recognised award for excellence in artistic practice, and almost appears to be reassuring herself that there is more to it than that, there "has to be". Another artist acknowledged the level of significance often attached to being an artist describing a dislike for what she feels is a sort of "patriarchal" aspect to the arts: "That's why sometimes when people ask what I do and I say, 'Oh I'm an artist.' It sounds like such a naff thing. You know it just sounds really pompous." A third artist discussed the separation that appears to exist between "Art" and "Community Art", a separation in which "Art" is seen as more "worthy" than "Community Art", yet according to this artist and academics (Miles 2005), nevertheless it is Community Art that has become shackled with outcomes and indicators for policies like social inclusion (Scott 2006).

By means of the Blue Room, the project is felt by artists to illustrate the instrumentalist affects that art can have on people as well as maintain a level of 'standards' in the way in which it is delivered and presented, particularly because the process is viewed as being inclusive: "It feels very much that what they're [the Bluecoat] wanting to do is to bring a high end arts activity

into the context of adults with learning disabilities because obviously in any sort of Day Centre or whatever there are arts activities, but in no way are all arts activities equal..."

One artist explained,

> "I think it's really, really apparent that the Blue Room arrange for something that's much more sophisticated and people can engage in a much more, uh, profound level with all parts of the process....They are literally dictating, dictating is the wrong word, you know they are, it's very much the sense that they are defining it as much as the artist. It's very much...a consultation process with the service users."

The value of the Blue Room is therefore related to individual and group involvement and achievement.

Contradictions in Identity Formations through Belonging to the Blue Room

The above standards make the inclusion of 'excluded' individuals more problematic, as it is the acknowledgement of their 'exclusion', which in a sense precludes their inclusion. Participation exhibitions do not always get priority in gallery spaces and when they do, they are often highlighted as 'participation' programme exhibitions rather than as 'art' exhibitions. Through the Blue Room project, Bluecoat staff and artists are seen to support the trainees' inclusion into the arts. This support happens during the sessions, where for instance one artist showed the artwork of a well-established artist and stated, "There's no reason why you can't do this kind of work too." In addition, Bluecoat staff have encouraged the trainee service users by

explaining that one does not need to make work that is exhibited in order for one to be considered 'an artist'. Despite this statement, which seems to indicate that 'anyone can be an artist', Bluecoat staff have continually encouraged and supported the group to exhibit their work in internationally recognised exhibitions such as the Liverpool Biennial. Yet, the service users have expressed a feeling of exclusion from the arts in the way that their work is displayed separate from that of other, non-disabled artists. Such issues have also been highlighted by Bluecoat staff on the project as problematic, in ways questioning whether or not the art world values such work as equivalent to 'art'. The following discussion with the trainee service users illustrates the point:

> **A:** "What I didn't like about it though, I was annoyed. They put [our art] in a little back street place where they should have put it with everyone else's...They put it there. And they put, um, [other disabled groups' works there] too. And I said to myself, '...They could have put it with other artists' work. Do you know what I mean? They just chucked it in a place there. ...I didn't know where it was going to be put...And I thought it was in a proper place, but it was just stuck in a back street place.
>
> **R:** A proper place like what?
>
> **B:** In an art gallery and that.
>
> **R:** It wasn't in an art gallery?
>
> **B:** No. It was like an empty building.
>
> **A:** When we do artwork, it's just shoved in a place for other people to go and see. ... It's not put with proper peoples.

In hearing this story, other Blue Room group participants responded:

C: Well, I think it should be because your artwork is good.

A: Yea.

C: Because, if it's shoved out the way, people aren't going to know it are they?

A: No.

C: ...That you done it.

A: I don't think many people went to that place, where it was put. Do you know what I mean?

B: It was like pure, um, pure empty.

A: It was in a poor place to me.

B: Like a dumpster place.

C: Did you complain?

A: I think it was degrading. In some ways, it was.

C: They should put...

A: I didn't [complain] but...

C: Well you should have done!

A: I said, 'fancy it being here.' And they said 'Well this is an artist's place.' But it wasn't. It wasn't a proper like gallery place. It was

just ours and the [the other group of adults with learning disabilities] and that was it.

D: Yea.

The dialogue above demonstrates potential barriers with respect to inclusion into the arts for the trainee service users. First, because Bluecoat staff and the artists encourage the service users in ways that reinforce an idea that 'anyone can be an artist', it actually prevents the service users from being fully aware of the kind of standards and skills required *within the art world* to be fully considered an artist. In addition, there is the notion that because the trainees' work was not exhibited in a traditional gallery space, they feel their work was not validated by the art world as anything other than 'different', recalling the sense of absence and presence that Hall (2004) remarked is often the case in societal dealings with adults with learning disabilities. Such a feeling illustrates that the trainees wish to be included within the exclusive standards the arts are believed to uphold. Staff have acknowledged that the trainee group have not come to understand that 'accepted' contemporary fine art exhibitions often occur in alternative gallery spaces. This misunderstanding demonstrates a lack of mutuality on the part of the group as a whole.

The second barrier, which is linked to the first, is the way in which the group's artwork is highlighted as 'different' from that of other artists. The group feels that their work should not be exhibited apart from that of non-disabled artists, which is further demonstrated by this statement, "I mean, alright, I know we've got a learning disability, but they could have put part of the learning disability's in with the others couldn't they?" Labelling the work as 'participation' work, in addition to that of the main Bluecoat exhibition

programme and exhibiting it separate from that of other mainstream artists is seen to promote exclusion rather than inclusion. In fact support workers also discussed this issue remarking that with regards to inclusion within the art world, there is still "a long way to go". One support worker further explained, "Because why is it that their work is not displayed in [major art galleries], what makes that of more value than what they produced, so you know is it acceptance [rather than value] to a point?"

The issue of acceptance also arose in some critiques of the way the Blue Room is delivered. It was felt by some participants that the Blue Room often emphasises building skills in art making over more conceptual considerations. Despite the level of standards that is adhered to in the Bluecoat's ethos more broadly and the Blue Room specifically some individuals involved felt that the service users were not taken through a 'true' process of contemporary art making. One individual stated,

> "Contemporary art to me is something that is... quite deep; that doesn't look like what it is until you dissect it a bit and it means something, it's a very personal thing. There are art forms which are skills based and you can produce something that looks nice and pretty, but isn't so profound, and I think there's a big place for that...there is value in looking at it, but for me the Bluecoat isn't about that so much...The Bluecoat is about developing a meaning to this creative work...it's very personal, it helps people to express something that's very deep within them and that to me is what...contemporary art is about. So we're talking about people with disabilities expressing themselves in that way—and I think that is sometimes difficult, certainly for people with more complex needs

because they're not thinking conceptually. They are thinking concretely, on a concrete level..."

This support worker feels that because the sessions emphasise skills, they may not necessarily be taking individuals through a cohesive process of developing a conceptual framework for approaching their own artistic creations. She explains,

"If you're going to be an arts project, if you're going to be a sort of (sighs) if you're going to use art in a contemporary way, I mean that is my understanding and that is my understanding of contemporary art, and if you're going to do it like that, then you can't pretend it's something else. 'Cause...that's not honest...we don't want our service users to be (sighs) to be something they're not and something they don't understand, because they've done that all their lives...."

There appears to be miscommunication between participants in and developers of the group regarding the placement of value: is it on the process involved in developing the project; on the building and sharing of skills; on accessing the arts; on encouraging independence through accessing arts provision in the city; or on becoming established artists and thus included into the artworld, for instance. This miscommunication is embedded in individual and organisational perceptions and communications of ideas about exclusion, inclusion, the arts, disability and how all of those are related to one another within the Blue Room project.

There are issues of oppression that support workers feel adults with learning disabilities have long suffered, a story that others (Delin 2002) feel has been omitted from the history of art. They explained that this omission has been a miscarriage of justice to adults with learning disabilities, many of who could

best share their stories through the arts. The way that the Bluecoat highlights its work with groups of 'socially excluded' individuals undoubtedly emphasises the Bluecoat as an 'inclusive' arts institution. In fact, the trainees have expressed feelings of "pride" in being a part of the Blue Room as they explain it is a "worthwhile" activity that gives them the opportunity to do something "outside the Day Centre", to "be a part of the Bluecoat", to "work with artists" and to "help others make art." Yet, this very underscoring of inclusion may actually be further excluding the Blue Room participants from the arts as a whole.

Public attitudes have been identified as being the greatest challenge to the development of services for people with learning disabilities, concluding that these attitudes and perceptions are being reinforced through the practices and procedures of public services, such as segregated clubs and activities (Russell 1995). With respect to the arts Allan (2005) sees that the attempt to include via segregation, such as in the categorisation of 'disability arts', leaves room for debate about exclusion. At the same time, however, such incitement of debate requires that the individuals engaged in it are mutually so (Vasey 1992). The service users participating in this particular project are not at a point of engaging in such a discussion. This inability is not because of an actual lack of ability, but rather a lack of mutual negotiation of the meanings of the Blue Room's enterprise.

Conclusions

Chapter 4 set the scene for the situation of the Blue Room within the Bluecoat by discussing the history and development of the organisation as an experimental live and contemporary as well as participatory arts space,

which houses artists' studios as well as commercial spaces. According to Bluecoat staff, negotiating these various aspects of the centre's engagement in culture fosters an atmosphere that privileges risk-taking and experimentation as well as the long-term development of the Bluecoat's programming. This organisational context within the arts and Liverpool frames the consideration of the Blue Room as a social inclusion project.

The Blue Room can be understood as a complex project. It involves two partner stakeholders, which have linking yet institutionally different aims, such as audience development and increased access to mainstream leisure activities. The project also involves a number of individual participants, who approach the project from their own individual perspectives, perceptions, and previous experiences. The Blue Room project materialises via these individuals' constructions of meanings and the way those meanings are carried out in practice. As a result, the chapter has examined the meanings that practitioners and participants attach to social inclusion work in order to establish a clear starting point from which to further consider their engagement in the 'action' of the Blue Room. Through the participant observation of the project's delivery, this chapter has considered the construction of these meanings not only within the group's shared experience of the Blue Room project specifically but also the situation of that project within the physical location of the Bluecoat as an arts organisation and the way in which that organisation has partnered with LCCSLD to deliver the project.

While the Blue Room project incorporates the components associated with an 'audience development' programme, it does not solely fit that mould. Rather, Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning helps us to understand the Blue Room project as a 'community of practice'. The framework has

allowed for examining the way in which social actors may be attempting to use practice to encourage inclusive change. This investigation is accomplished by the model's allowance for a deeper understanding of the continuum along which individuals involved in projects like the Blue Room travel in order to mutually engage in their common enterprise, mediating and negotiating the boundaries that exclusion implies. Further, the framework's focus on meaning, interpretation, and action allows for a closer look at the circumstances and perspectives that lead to particular project designs and delivery. The methodological approach employed has permitted an exploration of the dynamics of partnership working on-the-ground and, crucially, in real time, allowing for more space in which reflection on practice can occur

In gaining a better understanding of the meanings individuals attach to the endeavour of the Blue Room to promote inclusion, this chapter has analysed the relationships that evolve through the engagement in such an endeavour. The Blue Room project appears to constitute an 'interpretive community of practice' (Wenger 1998; Hooper-Greenhill, 2000a). It is an 'interpretive community' in the sense that within the Blue Room project, individuals construct meanings based on personal experiences and knowledge of exclusion. This construction is furthered by the mutual engagement of the group in the joint enterprise of promoting this target group's access to community activities as well as their involvement in the arts at the Bluecoat. This enterprise is carried out through a shared repertoire, thus making it a 'community of practice.' It is via these areas that the Blue Room is constructed in the aim to promote access, audience development, and inclusion (Kawashima 2006), specifically for adults with learning disabilities.

In addressing the 'inclusion' aims of public service provision as well as an arts organisation, the Blue Room represents the links between these two sectors explored in Chapter 2, as well as potentially illustrates some of the difficulties ensuing from such connections (Scott 2006). However, an examination of the Blue Room in this manner has shown that localised and personalised approaches can be seen to mediate institutional or organisational constraints to promote some circumstances of inclusion, specifically regarding cultural offering. Promoting inclusion within the arts itself proves difficult and in fact may further marginalise the trainees. What is unpicked by means of this examination is a series of tensions relating to the perceptions of one another's roles and statuses within the project, as well as issues of standards and value within the arts more broadly. Nevertheless, the very engagement of members of the group with one another allows the individuals involved to continue to work together to promote change despite perceptions, pressures and controls that come from outside the group. This engagement embraces experimentation and risk-taking and occurs through the deep connections and mutual accountability the group shares with one another. Exploring the project through this lens, one is able to more clearly see the learning processes under which individuals may be going, individually as well as collectively, as a project develops. Individuals may not always agree or fully understand one another, but it is in the relationships that develop via the engagement in the Blue Room, where such misunderstandings can begin to be unpicked and learning can occur.

Such relationships are argued to create a social space in which resistance to the kinds of social structures exclusion creates is possible (Allan 2005; Powell and Gilbert 2007). This resistance may only truly occur however, if practitioners and participants have the room in which to negotiate them.

Further, it is critical that the individuals involved in such an effort to promote inclusion are mutually negotiating the meanings of their enterprise (Wenger 1998; Allan 2005). Literature reviewed in Chapter 2 showed that the long-term nature of the Blue Room as an inclusion project is not necessarily typical (West and Smith 2005). As a result, the method of the project's delivery is felt to allow space and time for individuals involved to reflect on their endeavours and adjust them as needed. The findings presented here may indicate that a more in-depth, on-the-ground, and 'in-real-time' methodological approach to examining learning processes occurring during project development actually reveals outcomes of *learning* that are more tangible and potentially encouraging of inclusive practices. It is hoped that policy would encourage and support via time and money institutions, practitioners, and participants to engage in such reflection. Within the field of the arts, such support might promote the kinds of change which social inclusion policy purports to support.

Chapter 6

CASE STUDY 2: THE WALKER ART GALLERY'S PARENT AND BABY SESSIONS

This chapter considers a series of Parent and Baby sessions held in the Walker Art Gallery's children's gallery, the Big Art space. As with the Blue Room, this case study explores 1) the meanings both practitioners and participants attach to social inclusion and 2) the ways in which those meanings are communicated and implemented via the practice of the Parent and Baby sessions. Both of these issues are argued here to be closely connected with wider considerations of the potential role culture plays in society as well as how such considerations are acted out specifically within and in relation to the context of the Walker. The chapter begins by describing the Parent and Baby sessions: its target audience and activities. In targeting families with very young children, the Parent and Baby sessions address an audience often absent from art galleries (Sterry and Beaumont 2006) and who are thus interpreted by Walker staff to be 'excluded'. Consideration will be given to how this interpretation may be partially dependent upon the field as well as upon the institution, in which these individuals work. Even more specifically, these interpretations will be argued to be reliant upon how that institution has traditionally addressed broader 'public' audiences of art. In so doing, this chapter examines how the Parent and Baby sessions today may be upholding the social inclusion agenda's promotion of high culture as part of everyday life (Selwood 1998; DCMS 2000).

This investigation of the Parent and Baby sessions, like the study of the Blue Room, examines the social interaction and institutional forms of

communication that exist between participants and practitioners (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a; Fleming 2002; Bevir and Rhodes 2005). Yet, unlike the Blue Room project, the Parent and Baby sessions will not be seen to represent a 'community of practice' (Wenger 1998). The reasons underpinning this disassociation are centred on three issues: first, the location in which the sessions are delivered, the Big Art space in the Walker Art Gallery; second, the processes by which the sessions are delivered; and third, the engagement of the target audience with those processes and their location.

Through its consideration of all three of the above issues, the case study first unpicks how practitioners are able to rationalise their attachment of the social inclusion agenda to the project and how that justification is based on their own understandings of the agenda's relationship to art and culture, particularly with respect to the Walker Art Gallery. In addition, this study investigates participants' experiences of these understandings, based on the descriptions and observations of their activities within the Parent and Baby sessions. As a result of these matters concerning both practitioners and participants, the chapter will demonstrate the ways in which the context of the Walker affects the manners in which the Parent and Baby sessions offer, provide, communicate, present or even represent cultural activity.

In reflecting on the three key areas of process, location, and engagement, this study also considers the close links access, audience development and inclusion have within the cultural field (Sandell 1998; Kawashima 2006). As a result, academic literature on marketing within the arts is seen here to be relevant (Lee 2005). However, this chapter additionally attempts to tease out the forms of interaction that occur in the Parent and Baby sessions by considering how their potential promotion of access and audience

development for the Walker may be encouraging the formation of 'interpretive communities' (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b), rather than 'communities of practice' (Wenger 1998). The forms of belonging and thus potential inclusion that may result demonstrates how the sessions may simultaneously assist in demarcating as well as negotiating the boundaries of inclusion to and exclusion from cultural offering perceived for and by family audiences. Such a study augments understandings of the potential for such types of 'social inclusion' projects to affect change not only within the field of the arts but also regarding our own perceptions of culture.

The Big Art Space and its Parent and Baby Sessions

In contrast to the main galleries within the Walker, the Big Art space, located in the first room inside the building just to the left of the entrance, is more than visually different from that of any other space within the Walker. Catering to children aged eight and under, including babies, the space is described to offer, "children the chance to learn how to look at works of art and be inspired to become artists themselves" (Johnson 2007: 3). It contains three main areas: a storytelling area called 'storyzone'; a dressing-up area that has clothes in the style of individuals within paintings in the Walker's collection; and an art-making area. The space is brightly coloured and contains some artworks from the collection that are either also brightly coloured or contain images of children and animals, felt to be relevant to the target audience (Moore 2004). In addition, throughout the space there are other activities such as puppets, interactive computer games, and other educational activities.

The intentions of the Big Art space are reminiscent of changes in art gallery practices initiated in the 1980s and 1990s (Hannigan 1998). Formally called Big Art for Little Artists, the space is described as the new national children's gallery located within the Walker. The first of its kind in the UK, Big Art opened in March 2006 and has been funded by grants and donations from the JP Jacobs Charitable Trust, the DCMS/Wolfson Museums and Galleries Improvement Fund, the Rathbone family and Charles Eston. It represents a move on the part of the Walker to improve the building through capital funding and to more overtly target family audiences by providing a welcoming space specifically for them with informal and interactive learning environments. The space was developed from an earlier initiative called 'ARTBASE', a dedicated children's space in the foyer of the first floor of the Walker. The purpose of developing ARTBASE was "so that family visitors, children and young people [could] feel that being in an art gallery is enjoyable, [with] … lots for them to do …" (Walker Art Gallery 2006). Further, the space was intended to be a base from which young visitors could explore and enjoy the individual gallery exhibitions.

The Big Art space is a continuation and expansion of the original aims of ARTBASE. The aims of ARTBASE were more about encouraging access and a feeling of comfort within the gallery, while Big Art emphasises aspects of learning, or 'cultivating' audiences (Kawashima 2006). When it opened, the overall aim of the space "was to open doors to art and creativity in a fun and friendly way by talking, looking, listening, making and touching" (Johnson 2007: 3). In addition there are several main objectives:

- "To enable children to interact with collections;
- To enable children and adults to discuss art;
- To enable children to make their own art;

- To connect with the rest of the Walker;
- To enable children and adults to talk and play together;
- To enable visitors (new family audiences) to feel welcome and comfortable; [and]
- To attract new family audiences" (Source: Johnson 2007: 3).

These aims are linked to the Walker's desire to change and diversify its audience profile by attracting a "traditionally underrepresented audience... of families and children" (Johnson 2007: 4). The Parent and Baby sessions are one of the programmes intended to support these aims of the Big Art space as a whole. Since June 2006, they have been held on Mondays from 10am to 11:15 am. The sessions consist of specially designed activities geared to parents and their children under four years of age. These activities involve sing-a-longs, story telling, and rhyming sessions in Big Art's storyzone, led regularly by one staff member of the Walker Art Gallery. The sessions also include age-appropriate art and craft activities and free use of the Big Art space. No other events, such as school tours, are held during these sessions in order to allow for more availability of space for parents and their small children. Typically one or two other members of the Walker Art Gallery staff and volunteers are on hand in the Big Art space during the sessions to welcome visitors. The sessions allow for parents to bring along any of their other children with their babies. While there is a designated story- and rhyme-time, the sessions are structured in a manner that allows families to come and go and make use of the space as they please.

The Exclusion of Families from Art Galleries

What is argued to constitute a 'family' today is varied (Haskey 1995). Any discussion of a family could include cohabiting couples, same sex couples, single parent families, and bi-nuclear families, all of which might be considered socially-excluded in terms of their 'otherness' (Sterry and Beaumont 2006). Walker Art Gallery practitioners have noted these distinctions in their discussions of family audiences. However, the Parent and Baby sessions specifically target very young children and babies accompanied by their parents, carers, and/or grandparents, who, as a unit, are considered excluded from the Walker's visitor base. While young children have often been excluded from mainstream museum and gallery provision, they are not as a "generic" group usually considered in relation to wider issues of social exclusion (Kawashima 2006: 59). Kawashima (2006) argues that programmes targeting such an audience are more appropriately regarded as audience development initiatives. However, Sandell (1998) would couch such programmes as addressing the 'cultural dimension' of social exclusion, specifically the exclusion of certain groups from mainstream society's cultural provision.

By focusing on an audience of very young children, the Walker is addressing a current trend in art gallery provision to programme activities for the varied composition of today's family (Sterry and Beaumont 2006; Bunting *et al.* 2008). For example, "grandparents may visit with toddlers; divorced and separated fathers may bring visiting children; young couples may seek mutual interests; siblings of different ages may explore together" (Leichter *et al.* 1989; Sterry and Beaumont 2006: 231). Though such family 'types' are not overtly addressed in social exclusion policy (SETF 2006), they are within cultural policy. The ACE commissioned research called *The Taking Part*

171

Survey (Bunting *et al.* 2008), which asked a mixed sample of approximately 29,000 adults in England about their arts attendance. The findings showed that parents of young children, particularly up to four years of age, are less likely to attend arts activities. In most cases, parents and carers perceived art galleries to be unwelcoming to such audiences. The researchers thus concluded that ACE could encourage and support arts organisations to implement practical changes to further encourage and make it "easy" for such audiences to visit their spaces (Bunting *et al.* 2008: 7).

These findings above came two years after ACE's publication of another research report called, *The Family Friendly Toolkit* (Cogman 2006). Presented on both the main website of ACE as well as their designated audience development site (ACE 2008), the report is the result of a two-year partnership with Network, the national body for regional audience development in the UK, and offers suggestions for how arts organisations can make it "easier for families to take part in the arts, as audiences and participants" (Cogman 2006: 3). Based on research with families, the report details a number of obstacles that may keep families specifically from visiting art galleries, obstacles that were also reflected in interviews conducted with participants in the Parent and Baby sessions. These include:

- The journey to and from the venue;
- Feeling unwelcome;
- The price and offering of refreshments and merchandise;
- Perception of the safety of the environment;
- Perception of 'ad hoc' rather than consistent programming for families;
- A lack of opportunities for shared experience between parent/carer and child;
- A perception that the environment is too fragile and/or hostile to touch

- A perception that the environment of the gallery is meant for quiet contemplation and reflection rather than conversation;
- A lack of seating; and
- A lack of space to store pushchairs or strollers (Cogman 2006).

In addition, the report explains, "parents and carers are sometimes daunted by the prospect of having to explain things" (Cogman 2006: 13). This notion fits with academics' conclusions that visitors often feel they should already know something about the art exhibit that they are visiting (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991; Mason 2004; Whitehead 2005). For families in particular the belief is that the adults should be able to 'educate' or explain matters of artistic concern to their children (Cogman 2006).

The Walker's creation of the Big Art space will be seen to have followed many of the suggestions presented in the ACE's *Toolkit* for attracting family visitors. The *Toolkit* encourages professionals to ask themselves what they may be able to provide in order to enhance families' interpretation and understanding of objects, events, or activities and further, in a way that encourages fun, intergenerational engagement. Programmes need not overtly emphasise learning but encourage it through creativity and play (Cox *et al.* 2000). The ACE *Toolkit* (Cogman 2006) also suggests that the culture of arts organisations needs to change. Professionals should strive to be more "flexible" and possess the "ability to deal with unforeseen events or incidents" (Cogman 2006: 34). Finally, the report states that arts organisations need to create buildings or spaces that look physically and aesthetically welcoming to families (Cogman 2006). While a number of galleries have previously attempted to implement varieties on these suggestions for attracting families, with resulting positive outcomes (Adams

1999), *The Taking Part Survey* (Bunting *et al.* 2008) still highlights families with young children as lacking in visitor numbers as recently as 2007. It may therefore be supposed that arts organisations may still have some way to go toward addressing such an audience. Furthermore, addressing social inclusion may prove additionally challenging, particularly for more traditional galleries like the Walker.

First and Foremost: Rationalising the Social Inclusion Agenda

As part of National Museums Liverpool (NML), the Walker Art Gallery is directly and solely funded by and thus accountable to the policies of central government. However, this section argues that the responsibility the Walker holds for addressing Labour's social inclusion agenda is not solely based on required accountability to public funding (Belfiore 2004), but also on the personal beliefs that gallery practitioners hold to the role culture may play in bettering people's lives. Interviews with individuals working at the Walker Art Gallery as well as within NML, demonstrate that there is a strong personal belief system that closely adheres to the cultural ideology and language of opportunity underpinning Labour's attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy (DCMS 2000). Such a connection will be seen in the following section to promote staff's rationalisations for describing the Parent and Baby sessions as a socially inclusive programme.

Staff directly and indirectly involved with the Big Art space, and the Parent and Baby sessions specifically, hold to beliefs similarly evidenced in Labour cultural policy (DCMS 2000: 10; Purnell 2007) that culture "should" be perceived as relevant to the everyday lives of people. Staff stated that the Walker represents the 'best' (local) culture of Liverpudlians. As a respected

arts organisation in wider art circles but more importantly with a history in the city as its "local gallery", the Walker represents Liverpudlians' place in society more broadly:

> "The Walker is part of Liverpool's history and it's part of that local story of what Liverpool is and how rich the city was and what kind of society we had in Victorian times and all of that kind of legacy that is part of people's lives today and making those links directly to that I think...is relevant."

These practitioners espouse that the gallery provides the 'right thing' in which people should participate (Duncan 1995). The art objects held within the Walker are described as a "medium" from which the organisation can provide "messages" regarding individuals' local and collective pasts as well as their potential future as a society. One staff member explained the significance of "all the different themes and subjects and emotions and everything that is covered in all of those artworks... there obviously is a direct relevance with people's lives today." Another involved in the sessions stated, "[Art] inspires people...art galleries are a place to go where you can reflect and you can learn something new that can inspire you." The gallery is not only 'relevant' as a place for reflection and a symbol of the great and 'shared' artistic heritage of the city, but it is also as a place of learning, where people, especially those with less cultural capital (Bourdieu 2000), can come to better understand their own place in society (Bennett 1998b; Arnold 1993), thus potentially becoming included within it.

Practitioners' personal interpretations of the impact programmes may have on visitors is critical to rationalising the social inclusion agenda. One staff member directly engaged with the Parent and Baby sessions explained there

175

have been "a couple of instances where …you could just really see the impact of" the "different experience" participation in the art gallery could bring "for a child". She further explains the Parent and Baby sessions in relation to this perception of witnessing positive 'change' in children who engage in the arts:

> "It's just been amazing. Children just have such a wonderful time there. And it's not, I think the best thing about it, it's not just the numbers that are coming through, it's the feedback that you're getting from the children and from the adults about how great it is. And how much they've enjoyed it and seeing children getting totally absorbed in what they're doing…"

Staff imply that accessing the gallery will contribute to people's betterment. However, in line with DCMS (2000: 10) policy on social inclusion, they have acknowledged challenges to proving that the Walker is in fact incredibly pertinent to people. This staff member describes the importance of addressing disadvantaged individuals and the barriers culture may present for them:

> "Museums can be intimidating to people from a poor educational background and it's my job to remove that intimidation factor because I actually think that if you came from a poor educational background, museums are actually more important to you, or should be."

In acknowledging that the Walker as a symbol of physical and aesthetic authority may be a barrier to some visitors' accessing the gallery, they intimate Labour notions of the provision of 'opportunity' (Levitas 2005;

176

Blair 2006) as important to developing atypical and sometimes socially disadvantaged art audiences. A senior member of NML explained:

> "The museums of art, I think, are the scariest places of all. And a lot of that is to do with the way that curators are trained to do hangs and they do intimidating displays of…what might be very inaccessible work. And they go to…no real lengths to try and communicate with anybody other than people who already have a high level of understanding and appreciation. That's the problem that art galleries often have."

While this individual implies a level of fallibility in atypical 'flawed' consumers of art (Bauman 2005) by stating that it is difficult for some who lack cultural capital (Bourdieu 2000) to "understand" or "appreciate" art, he places the onus on galleries. The failure of atypical art audiences to realise the relevance of culture is based on a breakdown of communication between institution and public (Mason 2004). Galleries must address the lack of communication or education that they provide, and emphasis is made on the variety of experiences the Walker may offer audiences. Statements regarding the significance of art to people follow Arnoldian understandings of the role art galleries may play in disseminating high cultural ideals to the public (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]). Yet, the means for doing so revolve around relating to more common forms of culture (Williams 1958). One staff member illustrates the point in reference to the Big Art space:

> "If that means getting my young daughter…into the art gallery because she likes dressing up as Henry VIII and crayoning, well I think that's a valid thing to do. Because I'll tell you what: I'm never going to get her to say to me, 'Take me to the art gallery', if all that

happens to her there is [that] she sees a wall full of mystery colours that she doesn't have any comprehension of."

By means of the Big Art space the Walker Art Gallery has addressed a more encompassing understanding of culture; one that includes incorporating the culture of the audience that it targets. In doing so, they have not only increased attendance figures, but also made a visible "statement" about the kinds of audiences the Walker is attempting to include:

> "I think with the Walker it was always going to have to be something really big that made a difference...Programming I don't think would be enough 'cos we just weren't attracting the numbers in and I think that now that we've got the numbers in with something like Big Art, I just see it as a big massive statement about what we want, what we want to do here and who we want to come in, which is basically anyone, then that's when you've got the opportunity to change."

While changing the gallery's offering may increase attendance figures and therefore address the outputs required of national cultural policy, that is not the sole rationale behind the development of activities like those carried out in the Big Art space. The connections staff perceive activities like the Parent and Baby sessions make to the promotion of self-betterment (Arnold 1993 [1867-69] via the inclusion of family cultures into the gallery (Williams 1958) rationalise the buy-in to the social inclusion agenda. More detailed discussion of the Parent and Baby sessions below, and their correlation to these above concerns, further illustrate why practitioners may see the sessions to be addressing cultural policy for social inclusion, even if they do not overtly address that policy's matters of social justice, poverty, and/or disadvantage (Levitas 2005).

178

Interpreting Social Inclusion as Removing Barriers to Access

There are several difficulties that result from any initial attempt at addressing social inclusion within the situated context of the Walker Art Gallery. First, the Walker's standing as a national arts institution within National Museums Liverpool (NML) places it as a gallery that must serve as an exemplar of the best culture of the nation (Willett 2007 [1967]). Second, as described in Chapter 4, the Walker's affiliation with NML presents difficulties in being able to "satisfy" (Willett 2007 [1967]: 86-87) the cultural needs of citizens alongside those needs national policy perceives citizens to have (DCMS 2000). Establishing what these needs are, from perspectives of both policy and practice, may be directly linked to concerns regarding access, audience development, and inclusion and the relationship of all three to forms of marketing within the arts (Kawashima 2006). Yet, statements regarding the interpretation of inclusion by staff illustrate that the ability of these approaches to actually address 'inclusion' via or even within the arts are challenged by the traditional structures in which the gallery works. These structures are based on the placement of the Walker within the traditions of the field of art gallery practice. As one individual explained, "I mean art is a very elitist, status driven area of the cultural field." It is within this context that staff at the Walker Art Gallery and participants in the Parent and Baby sessions interpret social inclusion.

The structures and practices that predominate arts institutions are barriers to accessibility and thus to any promotion of social inclusion for those institutions (Fleming 2002). Current Director of NML, David Fleming (2002) has investigated these implications in an essay entitled, *Positioning the Museum for Social Inclusion*. Though he does not use the word 'access' directly, Fleming (2002) implies that because these barriers exist, social

inclusion cannot initially be about anything more than first addressing that inaccessibility. He highlights similar concerns raised by Hooper-Greenhill (2000a; 2000b) in her discussion on 'interpretive communities'; namely that inaccessibility results not only from the aesthetic of museum and gallery buildings, but also from visitor and staff perceptions that such spaces are static and not conducive to active engagement and participation. In addition, Fleming (2002) notes that traditional hierarchical organisational cultures that privilege the curator over the educator or marketer rather than privilege teamwork between all three are culpable in promoting exclusion from galleries themselves. The Big Art space and the Parent and Baby sessions are examples of how the Walker has attempted to address these concerns.

Galleries of art historical collections are believed to face additional challenges in addressing inclusion policy to those of heritage museums (Fleming 2002). Fleming (2002: 217) explains, "I have to say...I have more of an understanding of the difficulties confronting art curators than those in other disciplines". Fleming illustrates the difficulty by quoting Gilmour (1979: 121), who states,

> "Because art...has been socially constructed in such a way that while purporting to represent moral and spiritual values for every man...it is in fact used as aggressive propaganda for a particular notion of civilisation and to reinforce social division and actively uphold the status quo."

Gilmour's notion of art is much supported by the ideas presented in previous chapters, which illustrate some of the tensions inherent in the arts for promoting any form of inclusion (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991). Fleming's (2002: 218) emphasis of the field's elitist nature is his attempt to highlight

what he sees as a deep-seated "contempt for the masses" amongst art galleries in particular as well as the professionals, particularly the curators that work within them, an issue which will come to play in assessing how activities within the Big Art Space relate to the rest of the Walker Art Gallery. One staff member, in discussing the meaning of social inclusion, appears to support the notion that making art collections relevant to audiences is challenging: "The reach [of the Walker's audience] is not going to compare to something like, perhaps the International Slavery Museum or the New Museum of Liverpool...[They] will have a broader appeal anyway, naturally." In such a statement, this staff member appears to indicate that the ways in which the Walker may address audiences and those that are socially excluded, is in fact, limited by the art collection itself. Interpretations of culture as "governed" by its institutions (Miles 2005: 896) can be seen, then, to not only affect one's inclusion within cultural institutions but also the ability for such institutions to address inclusion. Fleming (2002) further illustrates this point by questioning traditional notions of preserving the 'best' artistic culture he perceives to exist within the field of the arts over preserving what is popular, explaining,

> "What kind of a system is it that will go into funding overdrive to save a multi-million pound foreign painting from being exported, but which fails conspicuously and consistently to provide cash, for example, to prevent the sale into private hands of local literary treasures out of our public libraries? The answer is, the same system that wishes museums to perpetuate their narrow appeal, that rejects notions of populism as vulgar: the essence of elitism" (Fleming 2002: 219).

Interpretations of social inclusion are dependent upon the barriers that Fleming details. These interpretations made by staff and participants coincide with those presented in the ACE's report (Cogman 2006) on obstacles presented for family visitors to art galleries. According to one staff member, inclusion is "positively removing the barriers that prevent people from using" the gallery. With respect to the Big Art space another staff member explained, "...introducing the family audience to the Walker is a really big part of that social inclusion agenda." It should be noted however that part of this particular interpretation of social inclusion does acknowledge issues of class-standing and economic capital inherent in some policy descriptions of social inclusion (SEU 2001). The same staff member continues by saying: "... it was just adults and adults from quite privileged upper middle class backgrounds [visiting the Walker], so I think in terms of bringing in a new audience that is something Big Art has done..." There appears to be an attempt, via the Big Art space to address what Fleming (2002: 219) refers to as the "narrow appeal" of art galleries by "broadening" the "traditional reach" of the Walker's audience and including their culture within that space, as one staff member explained.

Staff have remarked that people, and particularly families as well as individuals of lower income, are socially excluded from visiting the Walker because of their perception that the arts are elitist and not appropriate for them (Bourdieu 1980). As a result, Walker staff conclude that they can foster inclusion into the space of the gallery by supporting visitors to "trust [their] own judgment" of artworks. Exclusion is perceived to partially result from the physical nature of the space and the welcome (or not) that the space lends (Hooper-Greenhill 1988). One staff gave an example, "It's got a lot to do with the foyer and how the foyer's set up to be honest with you. I think

there's some work we need to do there in terms of welcome." With respect to the Big Art space, the ways in which this support for visitor's inclusion into the gallery may be given is first through creating a sense of welcome and a "dedicated" space in which families with babies may feel comfortable. This form of welcome follows ACE findings (Cogman 2006) and is directly related to access: "The fact that Big Art is so visually appealing and sort of just signposted that this is a place for families."

Visitors own understandings of exclusion and inclusion support those expressed by practitioners. Individuals participating in the Parent and Baby sessions in the Big Art space discussed the lack of welcome and thus inaccessibility of the gallery. They remarked that the Walker appears "stuffy", very "old and Victorian", "too posh" and "not family-friendly". One carer explained, "I came in one day, I [had been] shopping and I had a big bag with me and [the guards] said, 'You can't take that in.' I never came back after that..." In describing other visitors experiences, one non-senior level staff explained, "We hear teachers telling children to be quiet as soon as they come through the door and 'Oh you've got to remember you're in the art gallery now' and it's like 'Oh my god, it's not a library!' you know?"

The interpretations of inclusion shared by both Walker staff and session participants concern a sense of belonging the Walker may provide to the space of the building itself. As a physical structure, the gallery is perceived to stand as a symbol of antiquated authority, which fosters perceptions of the gallery as exclusive. As a result, the relationship the Parent and Baby sessions may have to social inclusion is centred on the physical and psychological access those sessions provide to the cultural 'opportunities' the Walker may offer. These physical and psychological barriers are in turn associated with the reputation that institution has within the city as well as

the broader field of the arts (Willett 2007 [1967]). Critical to these concerns is the ideas both participants and practitioners attach to the importance, or not, of the Walker's contribution to both local and high culture.

Practical Considerations and Resources for Promoting Inclusion

The approaches taken for tackling exclusion are based on the resources available in the Walker Art Gallery, physically and structurally. As a traditional gallery with a collection of art historical objects and managed through channels starting with a central government based Board of Trustees, the Walker Art Gallery's resources for addressing exclusion are largely tied up with the traditional hierarchical structures of the arts (Fleming 2002; Stallabrass 2004). At the same time, the approaches employed do complement the personal belief systems held by Walker staff. As a result, there are two main criteria for promoting social inclusion: first, addressing people who do not feel comfortable accessing the Walker and second, developing ways to demonstrate the gallery's relevance to them. In order to attend to these criteria, the Walker employs methods of targeted marketing. This approach involves identifying reasons underpinning exclusion, namely who is not visiting the gallery and why: "...the Walker previously did not attract a big family audience...if you were bringing a child to see the Walker before Big Art opened, you were probably somebody who was comfortable visiting art galleries and who perhaps knew a little bit about art and things." Additionally, it is necessary to assess whether or not it is cost-effective for the gallery to address those issues of exclusion:

> "I've often said in the past that the most difficult audience of all for a
> museum is teenagers... Once they get to the age of about 14, you

know they're not really that interested in this kind of stuff... Some people, therefore, in social inclusion terms, would want to include those teenagers and would spend a lot of money on trying to get them to come in and use the museum."

While staff may have strong personal beliefs for addressing social inclusion, the criterion for 'inclusion' is strongly influenced by the cost-effective performance indicators national policy requires. The particular audience of young children highlighted in the statement below underlines how the Big Art space and the Parent and Baby sessions may be viewed as a cost-effective and practical way for the Walker to address national inclusion policies. This staff member continues:

"My question is OK that's good, however you've spent a lot of money on those teenagers, there's an opportunity cost 'cos you could have spent that money elsewhere maybe you should have spent it on the easier audiences like the younger children—get them in greater numbers—or indeed older people—get them in greater numbers cause they're not quite so hard work. In other words, you know for every £100 you spend, I can get you 15 disaffected teenagers in or I can get you 250 seven-year olds, which are you going to go for? And that's you know, I'm not suggesting there's a right or wrong answer to that, but to me social inclusion involves looking at these kinds of issues."

The Parent and Baby sessions, by targeting children up to four years of age and their accompanying parent, grandparent or carer can be seen to directly address what this senior staff member describes as the "easier audiences". These audiences, once NML and the Walker spends money on targeting

them, may attend the gallery "in greater numbers", thus promoting the Walker's image as a gallery that is inclusive to a wider range of people. Further, in addressing young audiences it allows the Walker to change the perceptions of individuals at a young age, thus building audiences for the future; these are the "kinds of issues" involved in social inclusion: for NML and the Walker specifically. Addressing social inclusion is thus directly affected by having to acknowledge and prove 'successful' performance-indicator measurements, such as attendance figures (Selwood 2002: Belfiore 2004), in addition to addressing the exclusivity of the gallery itself (DCMS 2000: 10). Such articulations are different from those shared in the Blue Room study presented in Chapter 5.

The ways in which staff articulate how inclusion may be promoted is dependent upon changes to the institutional culture of the Walker Art Gallery. This cultural change is specifically focused on a growing trend within gallery practice for acknowledging the value of teamwork rather than hierarchical structures of decision-making (Fleming 2002; DCMS 2007b; Cogman 2006). This recognition of teamwork is seen in the Parent and Baby sessions as being directly related to the more recent call within arts organisations for implementing new forms of targeted marketing for individuals traditionally absent from gallery audiences (Lee 2005; Kawashima 2006; Boorsma 2006; DCMS 2007b). Marketing for the needs of the target audience of very young children and their parents and carers is a method within the Parent and Baby sessions that mediates the exclusive barriers existing for families (Cogman 2006).

Altering the Product: Facilitating the Needs of the Target Audience

The ways in which Walker Art Gallery staff explain they may be able to alter the organisation's elitist image and promote inclusivity implies a marketing strategy that privileges the needs of audiences over the "old values and practices" of the organisation (Lee 2005: 291). By creating a purpose-built space, the Big Art space, with an activity, the Parent and Baby sessions, that was especially designed with the safety of young children, opportunities for socialising, an encouragement of intergenerational creativity and play and over formal learning, and a flexibility of delivery approach in mind, the Walker could be seen to have developed a suitable 'product' for the needs of the family market. As a result, while the Parent and Baby sessions follow audience development initiatives in that they target an audience type, they do so in ways that "identify the kinds of benefits these non-regular attendees seek", rather than assuming the benefit is the art object itself (Kawashima 2006: 67). The methods employed in developing and delivering the Parent and Baby sessions widens the definition of the product (the collection) the gallery provides (Lee 2005). By means of the sessions held within the Big Art space, the product is not as much the art itself as it is the space of and experience it provides within the Walker Art Gallery. This approach challenges the gallery's traditional institutional culture and elitist reputation (Willett 2007 [1967]: 86-87), thus promoting its image as inclusive.

Staff explain that they must provide a welcome to and facilitation within the space of the gallery building in order to address the inclusion of families. One staff member described how the Big Art space provides this welcome and facilitation: Big Art is...

> "...a starting block ...to start exploring, and maybe gives [families] a comfort zone as well, so it's not an overwhelming big grand very,

what maybe feels to some people very overwhelming [space]. Instead they feel like, 'OK, I understand this space, I've seen spaces like this before and I can work with them and I understand what we're meant to do in here.' And then, with the costumes, with the jigsaws, with the storybooks, they can start making links to the collection upstairs and the collection in Big Art and start feeling more confident in exploring the rest of the space. So I do think it's a really good tool to get them exploring the rest of the gallery".

Encouraging audiences to engage with and within the Big Art space serves as "stepping stones" to the goal of inclusion. While this form of inclusion may be couched as audience development (Kawashima 2006), it can also be understood as having facilitated the development of 'interpretive communities' (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a) that foster new and positive viewpoints of the Walker Art Gallery as inclusive. As Hooper-Greenhill (2000b) has explained, people attach meaning to experiences based on their prior knowledge. The environment of the Big Art space is intended to engage the prior knowledge and experiences, social and cultural, of families: "[Participants see the Big Art space and think] I understand this space, I've seen spaces like this before and I can work with them." By relating a space within the Walker to the culture of the targeted participants, those participants are enabled to acquire new forms of meaning for the Walker via and with one another and that space. In fact, the storytelling, the arts activities and the social interaction are a large part of why participants say they attend. One participant explained, "Because when [the children] are at home, you know [they're] stuck with you all day...whereas here they're seeing the children and they're mixing, learning to share, aren't they?"

The delivery of the Parent and Baby sessions privilege flexible approaches and social interactions in ways that challenge our collective understanding of galleries as rigid structures that maintain a status quo of elitism (Duncan 1995; Bourdieu 2000; Fleming 2002). For example, parents and carers are pleased that the Parent and Baby sessions allow them and their young children to come and go as they wish during the sing-a-long and story telling sessions in 'storyzone'. One parent commented: "If [the children] get tired they can walk out and do something else. No one says anything about that. It's difficult to make [my child] concentrate for a long period. She likes to go around, so I think that's good in there." In addition, while the Parent and Baby sessions are geared to people who have young babies, staff have discovered that in terms of typical parent and baby groups offered in the city, parents often find sessions that are catered only for certain ages. So, if they have an older toddler or child, they cannot bring that child along to the group. One staff explained that this is "quite hard for [parents/carers] to balance. So that's why our [Parent and Baby session] is [for] under five's but if you've got a seven year old whose off of school that day as well you can bring him along." This again, gives parents a perception of having options and freedom to choose, in turn enhancing their opinion that the Walker is providing a less confining atmosphere in which to bring their children.

The relaxed atmosphere of the sessions and the fact that there are other choices of activities on offer in the wider Big Art space is also much appreciated and can be seen in the kind of learning parents and carers perceive it to offer. The provision of fun and engaging informal learning has been shown by the ACE reports (Cogman 2006; Bunting *et al.* 2008) and other academic studies (Sterry and Beaumont 2006) to be of greater importance to family visitors than structured learning provision. Structured

learning in an art gallery environment may be seen as a sense of "oligarchic condescension" (Willett 2007 [1967]: 85-86). Willett (2007 [1967]) particularly noted this perception had by local people in his study on the arts in Liverpool, referred to in Chapter 4. For parents the way in which the sessions provide options and imaginative choice for their children is appealing and felt to address their particular needs as a family. One parent explained,

"I wouldn't like [the space] to be like the Early Learning Centre because I have a problem with the Early Learning Centre because it's like 'Oh we teach your children. We have toys that are educational. Please give us £30 for this little thing.' I personally have [a] problem with that. I think [these sessions] are different, but um, because I think the Early Learning Centre, just you know, it's toys and they have the stamp of 'educational, but I think Big Art is really educational. To draw or to play with playdoh, or the dress up [activities], that is truly educational and you can actually do the same thing at home for very cheap [if you want]."

The Walker is not only responding to the market but is also addressing notions of personalisation within the public sector (Leadbeater 2004) by providing activities geared to the individual needs of families. The sessions appear to welcome participants to "trust their own judgment" by communicating visually that the Big Art space is an environment that welcomes participants to bring their own experiences and feel comfortable in doing so (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). As a result, the Parent and Baby sessions can be seen to potentially foster a future relationship for the visitor to the gallery. One staff member explains,

"[The Parent and Baby Sessions are] just a chance for people to meet other mums, and then starting thinking about how they can enjoy the artwork themselves and what they can do with the children at home and that sort of thing, so you know, an introduction to the art gallery not being a big scary place and uh, a chance to discover Big Art and what it will provide for their children as they grow up and a chance to meet other parents as well."

Unlike the prescribed structures and practices of art galleries that Fleming (2002) critiqued, the structures and practices of the Parent and Baby sessions provide various activities and opportunities for families to 'choose' in what they would like to take part. The manner in which the sessions are delivered creates a 'no pressure' atmosphere in which families can explore what they would like to explore about art. In some ways this flexible approach may be seen to allow parents and carers a chance to influence the culture of space within the Walker Art Gallery.

Reinterpreting the Gallery through Social Interaction

The ways in which the Big Art space and the Parent and Baby sessions invite new family audiences into the Walker shows the gallery's emphasis on new forms of marketing. However, as Hooper-Greenhill (2000b: 12) has pointed out, "it soon becomes clear that there is a need to go beyond marketing and to think more analytically about the experience that is offered to visitors. We need to consider the museum as a communicator." Once visitors are brought into the gallery via the marketing of spaces such as Big Art, how does the institution then continue to communicate with that visitor? Creating a sense of welcome for families by "signposting" a "dedicated" space for them and

making that space conducive to their needs appears to acknowledge and privilege the audience's needs over the organisation's traditional culture. Such an approach may actually benefit the gallery, challenging its inherent exclusivity. This challenge occurs via the social interactions taking place within and as a result of the Parent and Baby sessions (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b).

The ways in which Walker staff act as facilitators for the gallery help establish a connection between them and the session participants. This connection is of the utmost importance for building the 'interpretive communities' of that gallery, which may serve to increase access, improve audience development and promote what the staff perceive to be as inclusion. In observing sessions, there is a friendly atmosphere between staff and visitors where people ask after each other's families and show photographs of new grandchildren. It is not that these acts in and of themselves constitute or prove inclusion is being achieved. Rather, the occurrence of these exchanges demonstrates that acts of understanding are being reached on other levels beyond those between art object and viewer to instead between participants and staff (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). One staff member explained,

> "You build quite good relations and that's shown in the fact that we've got a family still visiting since the previous year...most families we see, maybe not every week, but we see them often and they are regular visitors to the sessions and I do think that's partly because we've built up a relationship [between them and] the members of staff who work in there."

The relationships that have built up between those attending the Parent and Baby sessions is also important and a number of parents see the sessions as a "social" experience, "a meeting place" for families with young children to interact with one another. These relationships can be argued to be necessary in such audience development, particularly as those involved in the Parent and Baby sessions are not directly encouraged, nor do they often visit, the collection exhibitions. These exchanges cannot be seen to make up a 'community of practice' because they do not consist of the level of mutual engagement in a joint enterprise that community requires (Wenger 1998). Nevertheless, the connection participants are slowly building to the gallery is based on the activities and relationships established in the Big Art space, as they gradually become comfortable in the Walker as a whole.

Along with the techniques employed in the sessions' delivery, the social interaction and relationship building that occurs via the sessions does appear to foster a sense of belonging to the Walker Art Gallery. However, it is not so much from the collection held within the gallery as the idea of the gallery itself from which this attachment arises. One staff member, who responded to a question regarding whether or not there was a perception that the participants feel connected to the gallery, stated: "I think most of the children understand that it's the art gallery and it means storytelling …They might not understand that there's paintings and sculptures in there but they know it's definitely a different sort of place than anywhere else they go." While staff have stated the importance of the collection to local people's lives, participants have altered that impression to be more about the space of the gallery itself (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). The staff member quoted above goes on to explain the story of one child who comes to the sessions:

"You know it's like a big grand building and [for this child], her mum always says that when they go past the [sculpture of the] lions she always starts shaking her feet [in excitement] because she knows it's... going past the lions outside of St. Georges Hall [next door to the Walker] is associated with attending Big Art and then the gallery because it's the first step to them getting there and its about the whole space being an enjoyable day out for them..."

Parents and carers who participated in the research shared similar comments: "We look for the fountain [just outside] and then she knows she's going to the gallery." Although the children may not appear old enough to be able to identify artworks, as such, they are aware that they are going to a 'special' place to do a different type of activity, and they have a sense of familiarity with the building, where it is located, and what they do there.

Despite a lack of links to the collection itself, coming to the Parent and Baby Sessions seems to have led participants to reconceptualise the role that the Walker and the arts more generally may have in their everyday lives. For instance, attending the sessions has created a greater sense of awareness of the Walker, both physically and with relation to its placement within Liverpool's cultural offering. First, parents and carers have a better grasp of the Walker Art Gallery and its location in the city. One parent explained, I now [feel more familiar] with where it all is because I didn't know where the central library was, the Georges Hall, the Walker Art Gallery...well I saw it from the outside obviously, but I never really knew this is what it was." Some parents also felt more familiar or connected to the activities in the wider offering of arts in Liverpool. By attending the sessions they have become more aware of other events at the Philharmonic (performance) Hall, for example. One parent explained, "Once you tap into [arts in the city], in

194

which ever way, I think they do all feed into each other quite nicely." By encouraging a connection to the 'place' of the Walker, audiences may then be developed not only for the Walker itself but also for other arts organisations in Liverpool. The way in which the cultural product is "communicated, presented and packaged" (Kolb 2000: 78-79) is not so much about the product but about the service the gallery that holds it can potentially provide for families via the Parent and Baby Sessions. These services have tangential effects that broaden individuals' knowledge of cultural offering and possibly increase their belief that art *is* relevant to them (Bourdieu 1980). Participants, then, even if individually, can be seen to be in a process of re-interpreting their previous understandings of the arts and the Walker Art Gallery (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b).

Renegotiating Perceptions of Belonging to the Walker Art Gallery

The means by which participants are permitted to engage with the location and delivery of the Parent and Baby sessions assist in developing 'interpretive communities' (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a); communities that will be seen to underpin the difficulties in promoting inclusion within the arts, while simultaneously promoting a sense of belonging for participants to its institutions. Participants in the Parent and Baby sessions are here argued to be active participants in the interpretation of their experience, even if it is constructed in some ways by the situation of the sessions, their marginalised position within the Walker Art Gallery itself, and the social interactions that occur there (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). It is not so much the idea that they do this collectively, but rather that it is occurring at all. The process by which all of this engagement occurs is the make up of the 'interpretive community' in which they are located. What results is participants' constructions of new

meanings regarding the Walker Art Gallery. One of the most interesting findings from this study of the Parent and Baby Sessions is the way in which attendance to it has cultivated a sense of "ownership" of the gallery amongst some of the parents and carers. Attending the Parent and Baby sessions has encouraged parents and carers to return to the Walker Art Gallery largely for the sessions, though one visitor has returned for other visits to the gallery itself. Another visitor invites friends to meet her at the gallery before going into town afterward, explaining, "This is *our* coffee shop and *our* public art space." A number of visitors to the Parent and Baby sessions stay afterward and have lunch or coffee in the café with other attendees or personal friends. This demonstrates not only a new connection to the Walker Art Gallery for these particular visitors, but a renegotiation of what the Walker may be for them. One parent stated:

> "I guess because of [attending] the Big Art space I now arrange to meet a lot of people here because of the coffee shop and the Big Art space whereas I wouldn't have even considered |it before]. In a way it's in town but it's not in the centre of town, but now we often meet here and go into town."

These statements contrast to participants' previous impressions of the Walker as "too posh" and "stuffy". In fact, the ways in which staff delivering the sessions have aimed to better understand the needs of family audiences and develop approaches perceived to be suitable for them has positively communicated to visitors a perceived cultural change on the part of the Walker. Parents and carers seem to support the notion that the sessions had promoted audience development, particularly in the ways that the reasons these individuals had for not previously visiting the Walker were weakened. Two individuals felt that the gallery initially appeared very imposing and not

suitable for family visitors. However, attending the sessions in the Big Art space has altered that perception. One parent explained, "[My impression of the Walker was that] it looked a bit Victorian or something. Very big, but I think if I had just walked by, I never would have imagined that there was a children's play room inside. So that was just random that we found it in a leaflet." So, it is not only in the advertising, but also the physical altering of the space that has helped to change people's perceptions of the gallery as 'unwelcoming' to families. One parent/carer stated that she now feels the Walker is very "family friendly [and]...family approachable." A carer explained the changes she perceives the Big Art space and the Parent and Baby sessions have instituted in the Walker:

> "I think [the Walker has] come more into the twenty-first century. They're really, they are trying to cross the divide, like with children. When I was a child we came here and we looked at the pictures. It was nothing like this. There was nothing to bring you in and get you interested at such a young age."

In this statement, this carer actually acknowledges a boundary, a "divide" that has been mediated via the Parent and Baby sessions. Further, the change to the institution itself is explained: "When I was a child we came here and we looked at the pictures. It was nothing like this." Based on her prior knowledge, this carer now interprets that the Walker has changed with the times, and attempted to engage people more on their own terms, particularly those with young children. It is not necessarily that the sessions may be seen to be addressing government policy dictates for social inclusion, but it is that participants feel included in socially individual ways.

Mediating the Communication of Field and Institutional Barriers

The challenges the Parent and Baby sessions raise to the traditional structures of the Walker Art Gallery are only relational to the mutual benefits that the Parent and Baby sessions offer for both participants and the Walker as an institution. NML Director David Fleming (2002) has acknowledged that privileging the needs of the audience over the product presents challenges to the stability and/or static-ness of the organisation. For staff involved, the Big Art space is felt to not only have increased visitor numbers and also altered the profile of visitors to the Walker, supporting their efforts to 'evidence' success for government departments, but it is also perceived to have changed the nature of the organisation:

> "The fact that [a change in visitors] was then picked up in the visitor profile [survey] I think really drives home what [Big Art's] been able to do for a venue like this—we're a very traditional venue.... I mean, I think it's something that we're all going to look back on and be really proud of because it has really transformed the venue."

The approaches taken in addressing the target audiences' needs, however, are only perceived and actively encouraged within the Big Art space itself. The traditional notions of the cultural product and the ideals attached to it are preserved. Lee (2005: 290) has explained that reconciling marketing as a "set of techniques" instituted to attract new visitors versus as "a management philosophy" highlights tensions between orienting programme provision to the customer's needs versus the maintenance of a Romantic view of artistic production. In a sense, these family participants and their culture as a group can be seen, at least in this stage of Big Art's development (Johnson 2007), to be allowed in, to be allowed to do what they want, but only 'in here', in 'this (Big Art) space'. These issues are apparent in staff's impressions of the

acceptance of the Big Art space and the Parent and Baby sessions within the organisation of the Walker. Staff have explained there are still challenges to truly promoting inclusion, or rather the acceptance of new and different 'types' of audiences, more widely across the institution. These challenges have a lot of to do with the kind of traditional institution, both physically and structurally, that the Walker is. Interviews with staff and with participants in the Parent and Baby sessions show that getting families out into the galleries themselves from the Big Art space proves to be difficult. All of the parents and carers who participated in this research stated that they did not feel comfortable bringing their child out into the gallery, noting that they felt it might not be "appropriate" for them to be in such spaces. In addition, one staff explained,

> "I still think there is a reluctance to leave Big Art that I've noticed....I think it's to do with the fact that Big Art is so visually appealing and sort of just signposted that this is a place for families and perhaps the rest of the building isn't. It's that contrast between what Big Art looks like and what the rest of the building looks like."

By creating a designated separate space for families, their exclusion from the Walker Art Gallery is highlighted and perhaps even perpetuated. Further, the Victorian-style galleries are perceived to be "very formal" and in terms of social inclusion some staff feel that because the permanent collection displays do not often change, there is a perception that the galleries are static spaces. As Fleming (2002) notes this may often be the case within such institutional cultures that must consider the constraints of maintaining and preserving a collection: environmental temperatures, resources, as well as programmes geared to schools and core visitors wanting to return to see their 'favourite pieces'. In addition, the fact that the Walker displays its work in a

traditional art historically chronological manner seems to restrain the organisation from altering its gallery spaces more. This insistence on a scholarly approach to art as well as marginalising the visitors it attempts to welcome within the Walker, restricts in many ways the forms of inclusion that are available in that particular organisation.

There appears to have been hesitancy on the part of the organisation more broadly to welcome the change the Big Art Space might bring. One staff member explains, when the Big Art Space opened it was "quite difficult for a lot of staff … Some people felt that it was a great thing but it wasn't for here, it shouldn't be here, it should be at the [World] Museum or somewhere where the kids are going wild all the time." This statement echoes Bourdieu's (1980) description that art galleries appear to be for certain 'types' of people. These traditional ideas have presented some difficulties for staff that would like to change the perceptions of the Walker as elitist and out of touch with the public. It has been explained that there has been a "reluctance … to engage with the audience that's coming through Big Art" much of which has to do with ideological issues around the arts and perhaps a lack of coherent approach with programming (Fleming 2002). Despite these issues, it is largely felt that individuals within the institution can foster change, as demonstrated by the opening of the Big Art space as well as change in staff within the wider body of NML, with David Fleming joining as Director in 2001, just one year prior to the publication of his essay, mentioned above, that critiques the exclusivity of cultural institutions (Fleming 2002). As a result, the Walker is becoming a more visitor-focused place for enjoyment rather than of "high brow" art. One staff member explained, "There's an awful lot of people here who are quite keen for change and who you know really want to see those changes come about and I

think it's just a matter of enabling people to do that now" via support and resources.

Much of these tensions have to do with perceptions of culture, notions of the market's interference with it, and the organisations that mediate these issues (Harris 2006). Steps taken within the Walker in establishing the Parent and Baby sessions in a designated capitally funded children's gallery demonstrate that the Walker is not only addressing the needs of the 'market,' or the public, specifically those families with young children, but is also embarking on a cultural change within the organisation. Staff interviews indicate that this change is a slow and challenging process. Fleming (2002) explains that in some ways art galleries may still be battling with traditional hierarchical structures which value the object over all else, such as individuals' engagement with it. Lee (2005) and Harris (2006) argue that this difficulty is in part due to residual Romantic notions of art; a belief in the elevated status of the artist as sensitive 'genius', who did not placate the market but commented on or against it. The tension results from marrying high culture to notions of popular culture.

Policy calls for organisations like the Walker to address not only the public that are considered 'typical' visitors, but those who are not (DCMS 2000; Kawashima 2006). In doing so, the organisation risks alienating itself from those who desire to keep the notions of culture elevated (Fleming 2002; Willett 2007 [1967]). Ironically however, visitors to the Parent and Baby sessions enjoy the kudos that attending such sessions at a 'high brow' art gallery provides. A number of the participants felt that the sessions offered something quite unique to other parent and baby sessions held in Liverpool and its surrounding area. The aspects of the sessions and the Big Art space felt to be unique are the venue itself, being held in an art gallery, as well as

the décor and the toys and activities on offer based on the Walker's collection. One parent explained, "people are very impressed when you say you come here." It is felt that the Parent and Baby sessions particularly at the Walker fosters "a very nice class of people" as "some of the groups [in other parent and baby sessions] can be a bit hit and miss." The Walker's exclusive nature, as was seen with respect to the Blue Room participants in Chapter 5, is in fact actually appealing to some attending the Parent and Baby sessions, even if they are new visitors to the gallery themselves. Such a desire to hold onto the gallery's exclusivity presents problems for its inclusion of family cultures.

Conclusions: A Good Day Out

The context of the Walker Art Gallery as an institution still very much steeped in traditional art historical approaches of preserving and displaying 'treasured' collections puts it at a very different starting point for addressing DCMS (1999; 2000; 2005a) aims for social inclusion. It is not a contemporary art space in the same vein as the Bluecoat. In addition, as the local 'National Gallery of the North' many individuals in the city see it as a point of pride, even though they may not visit it (Willett 2007 [1967]). As a result, institutional change to address the needs of audiences, much less the social welfare needs for social inclusion policies have been understandably slow to start. The Big Art space is seen to meet initial needs of providing new forms of access and pathways for developing audiences (Kawashima 2006) that may lead to further inclusion, but only with respect to the gallery and its collection itself. It may encourage people to access 'mainstream' activities. Ironically, staff have acknowledged that attending the Walker is not necessarily a mainstream social activity, but rather an elitist one, and it is

that which they hope to rectify. This matter is further complicated by the fact that those who attend the Parent and Baby sessions themselves actually enjoy the kudos that accompanies attending such a 'high brow' institution.

As explained in Chapters 2 and 5, academic studies often analyse social inclusion as access, the attraction of new audiences to arts organisations, and audience development (Sandell 1998; Kawashima 2006). The perceived barriers for parents and their young children to visiting the Walker as well as the ways in which the Walker has addressed these barriers through the Parent and Baby sessions within the Big Art space demonstrate that the project may be interpreted as an audience development initiative that is a 'first step' toward inclusion in cultural offering (Sandell 1998):

> "What we're finding is that we're succeeding in attracting a family audience um, independently to the museum but also that really broad range of people from all the social spectrum … It means that we can make the most of that audience and introduce them to new things, which is then building the core audience for us, it means that there is a change in programme whenever anybody comes in. It just is becoming, it's starting to have that snowball effect really, which is really positive."

Creating access through Big Art is perceived to promote audience development whilst stimulating greater change in the institution as a whole. The "snowball effect" for this staff member is based on her interpretation that it possibly provides greater inclusion because of the way the gallery alters its programming for those new audiences as Williams (1981) proposed should be the case. It is interesting to note that many of these visitors were already museum-visitors, that is they typically visited Liverpool's World

Museum located next door because, as staff explained, it has "something to offer families." As a result, the space and its programming have encouraged a new audience to attend the Walker, to visit an art gallery, but not necessarily an audience new to museums more generally.

The DCMS (2000) aims for social inclusion of promoting confidence and self-esteem via arts activities appear to only address building confidence and self-esteem with respect to becoming more comfortable with visiting arts institutions, and in the case of the Parent and Baby sessions only in as much as they serve a direct need of the visitor. Further, more economically rooted aims of providing training and skills development is not necessarily relevant to an activity such as the Parent and Baby sessions. Nevertheless, the Parent and Baby sessions largely facilitate an increasing level of comfort as regards accessing the gallery for atypical *art gallery* visitors, but not necessarily atypical visitors of cultural institutions more generally. The methods undertaken for this aim are closely linked to marketing techniques that also coincide with policy moves to promote personalisation of public service provision: such as meeting the needs of the targeted visitor; fostering relationships to establish and maintain the comfort level of the visitor so that s/he will return; and increasing a sense of belonging to the organisation, which creates the 'interpretive community' (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a) through which visitors may construct meanings and experiences in relation to the gallery itself.

The Parent and Baby sessions in the Walker Art Gallery could be argued to be steps in a form of "action-research" (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b: 12) which promote learning about what can happen when you invite audiences into the gallery, but keep them, at the same time, at bay once they are inside. Walker staff themselves, as well as participants, have acknowledged that a full

welcome to accessing art has not yet been achieved. In this chapter, the way in which the Walker's relationship to the public has been representative of civic pride as well as traditional notions of aesthetic and political authority has been argued to still be affecting the manner in which it offers cultural activity, even via the Parent and Baby sessions. The Walker's collection, exhibitions, and changing programmes have been ways through which, since its founding, the Walker has attempted to broaden its audience beyond the base of traditional gallery goers. At the same time, however, these practices and traditional structures of the gallery may also limit the ways in which staff at the Walker may interpret and promote inclusion.

This inability to achieve a full welcome to accessing the art within the Walker and the inclusion of families into the wider spaces of the building, however, does not necessarily result in a negative effect. Despite lacking the mutual engagement in a joint enterprise through a shared repertoire required of a 'community of practice', the Parent and Baby sessions may in fact be seen to mediate family audiences' barriers to accessing the Walker (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). Through the means of the personal and contextual understandings and the social relations required for creating a sense of belonging to an 'interpretive community' encouraged within the Parent and Baby sessions, participants are in turn communicating new understandings of and connections to the space of the gallery (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). While this attachment neglects a serious engagement with art objects themselves, it does contribute to greater access and thus a greater potential for inclusion than may have previously existed for that audience.

With respect to inclusion within the context of the arts, as it stands, activities like the Parent and Baby Sessions, while addressing the needs and everyday culture of families in Liverpool, are largely divorced from the 'high' art

within the gallery. Within the Walker Art Gallery, cultural ideals remain protected but they cannot fully benefit society from such a great distance. The aspects described in this case study may be seen as pathways to greater institutional change and inclusion, but with respect to the government's aims for social inclusion, there is no serious connection and in fact, one is caused to wonder whether or not the sessions simply provide a 'good day out', not an unimportant outcome in and of itself.

Chapter 7

CASE STUDY 3: THE OPENING DOORS COURSE AT TATE LIVERPOOL

This chapter explores Opening Doors, a course held annually at the Tate Gallery Liverpool. Designed specifically for social care professionals, the main objective of Opening Doors is to promote those professionals' engagement with the art objects on display at the Tate. The broad goals of Opening Doors are to assist care professionals in learning techniques for critically engaging with modern and contemporary art held within the Tate through discussion of it in the exhibition spaces, first amongst themselves and then through visits with their service users (Tate Liverpool 2007). The rationale is to promote the access to and audience development of the gallery for social care practitioners and their service users in ways closely linked to instrumentalist notions of art. The course implies that engagement with the arts will promote new methods of art therapy that may in turn promote social inclusion (DH 2001). As a result of these combined aims, this chapter unpicks how and why the Opening Doors course, by taking place in one of Britain's national galleries for modern art, may initially appear to substantiate Labour's attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy (DCMS 1999; DH 2001; SEU 2001).

In keeping with the broader arguments of this thesis, it is illustrated here that the beliefs both practitioners and participants have regarding the role modern art may play in social inclusion as they understand it, are directly informed by the institutional situations from which both groups approach the Opening Doors course in practice (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). After an initial

description of the programme, this study examines the beliefs that both course practitioners and participants hold regarding the role high culture can play in our everyday lives, as informed by the contexts of social care and gallery practice. In comparing these frameworks of interpretation, such a study considers whether or not the understandings of social inclusion both course participants and instructors have, may in fact be shared interpretations and how that alignment (Diani and Bison 2004) may affect the circumstances of inclusion the Opening Doors course allows. The chapter not only raises questions as to how the Tate actually carries out policy aims for social inclusion, but also how the methods employed for doing so may in fact challenge as well as uphold the institution's traditional structures for maintaining high cultural ideals.

The Opening Doors Course

Established in 1997, the Opening Doors course, formally called *Opening Doors: The Art Gallery as a Resource for Learning*, was initiated and developed in partnership by a former Community Programmes Curator at Tate Liverpool, and a social worker who develops and delivers training programmes for Liverpool City Council Social Services Department. Designed for professionals working in the caring and health professions, Opening Doors has been held since 2000 on site at Tate Liverpool and continues to be developed and delivered through direct partnership between gallery staff and individuals involved in social work. The 2007 course under study here took place from the 28th of September to the 23rd of November. Its twelve participants met with instructors every Friday from 10am until 4pm. The participants consisted of individuals who work for a range of social care organisations supporting service users who suffer from mental health issues, trauma, and/or substance abuse. The course took place in two main locations.

Class meetings were held in the Tate's education studio, located behind the main exhibition rooms on the first floor. Sessions were also held within the exhibition rooms themselves, where course participants broke into small groups to examine and discuss artworks held there. In addition, as part of the course, participants led one gallery visit each, in these spaces, for their own service user groups.

The delivery of the Opening Doors course consists of lectures, some creative drawing activities, and gallery based exploratory activities that encourage participants to access the Tate's collection and special exhibitions in ways that may be useful to the service they provide clients in the caring and health sector. Participants also have individual tutorial meetings with one of the three tutors on the course, who is assigned to them for the duration of its delivery. These meetings are opportunities for participants to discuss challenges they may be encountering as well as individual progress made. The specific topics covered in the 2007 module were as follows:

- Approaches to working in the gallery;
- Diversity and identity;
- An introduction to person centred expressive art therapy;
- Art and social inclusion and creative learning in the community;
- Childhood and trauma;
- Art, gender, and power

The Opening Doors course is a Level Three Accredited Course run in conjunction with Open College Network (Merseyside, Lancashire and Cheshire). It has the following aims and objectives, which are categorised below (Table 2) in terms of what type of outcome they may be seen to address: (Tate Liverpool 2007)

Table 2: Aims, Objectives and Suggested Outcomes of the 2007 Opening Doors Course

Aim	Objective	Outcome
• "To develop the individual professional and creatively" • "To give participants the confidence to be creative through the use of practical exercises" • "To encourage and promote critical debate and link to this professional practice"	• "Increasing self-awareness and understanding of the impact of gender, race, age and ability"	Learning
• "To develop Tate's National Collection of Modern Art as a resource for those working in the caring professions" • "To bring together people from a variety of backgrounds and professions"	• "To explore and break down perceived and actual barriers to using the gallery"	Access and Audience Development
• "To enable participants to develop strategies to facilitate exploration of the Gallery's exhibitions and displays in order to aid communication with client groups and colleagues" • "To develop Tate Liverpool's methodology and working practice as a tool for engaging participants and client groups, such as active looking and listening skills"	• "To use the gallery therapeutically to express feelings" • "To use modern art as an aid to communication and empowerment with client groups"	Increase perceived social value of art and Tate Liverpool

The Opening Doors Course was established prior to Labour's formation of the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) or any directives for that Unit in cultural policy (DCMS 1999; 2000). Interestingly, however, Tate documents on the course (Charnock and D'Silva 2003) link it directly, though not causally, to the time in which the Labour government began emphasising this policy. This connection to policy may be intended either to show forward thinking on the part of Tate Liverpool in considering the links of social care work and galleries in public welfare provision or to highlight the aims of Opening Doors more closely to funding streams. Nevertheless, the aims and objectives of the course are attached to three key areas: learning, promoting access and audience development, and an increasing perception of the social value of the arts as well as the Tate Gallery Liverpool. Inclusion itself is not an overt aim or objective of the programme, but can be seen to be linked to it, thus rationalising the course as one that directly addresses Labour's cultural policy for social inclusion (Charnock and D'Silva 2003).

The philosophy underpinning the course is that art and visual imagery can be used to "open doors to communication and aid...understanding of self and others" (Charnock and D'Silva 2003: 5). This philosophy is based on the influential work by author, artist, and psychotherapist Natalie Rogers (1993) as well as on the knowledge course instructors hold of both the caring profession and interpretive practices within art galleries (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). Similar to the ways in which the Walker's Parent and Baby Sessions appear to address the cultural dimension of inclusion (Sandell 1998), the Opening Doors course does so in its objective to "explore and break down perceived and actual barriers to using the gallery." The course is seen as a step toward including care professionals in the structuring of the Tate's

specific practices for inclusion. In more specific terms, previous studies of Opening Doors (Charnock and D'Silva 2003) imply that these care providers are gatekeepers to excluded audiences. The implication, which matches recent DCMS (2007b) investigations of practice, is that these individuals are uniquely placed to encourage their service users to visit the Tate. As a result, by promoting *care givers* access and inclusion in the gallery, the course is a means by which the Tate may not only promote socially excluded *service users'* access to the gallery, but by doing so also broaden and cultivate both audiences (Kawashima 2006).

With respect to social care provision, the means by which the course promotes service users' access to and audience development of the Tate is argued to encourage these individuals' participation in mainstream leisure activities, thus promoting their inclusion into broader society (DCMS 1999; Charnock and D'Silva 2003). In addition, the issues the course addresses, listed above, set out to introduce ways of working within a gallery space. Course delivery methods are seen to help care providers understand and begin to 'own' techniques of engaging with modern artwork. These methods attempt to demonstrate how such art objects, which may initially appear elusive, can actually be seen to illustrate or represent the very issues course participants may face in their everyday professional practices, such as exclusion, gendered power relations, and emotional trauma. Discussion of artworks that illustrate these issues, then, is argued to promote new methods of therapy for care provision.

Relating Social Care to Matters of Exclusion and Inclusion

While the Opening Doors course aims to improve the professional development of carers and involves those carers bringing in a client group, the course is not focused specifically on the clients. As a result, the study presented here examines the meanings attributed to and the practices enacted for inclusion within the course by the social carers, staff and instructors. It should be acknowledged that carers bring to the course their experiences from not only working in the social care profession, but also in engaging with clients (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a). Further, it is this work which the Opening Doors course is intended to support (Charnock and D'Silva 2003). As a result, the course addresses the engagement of art with several aspects of social care including those regarding people with substance abuse and mental health problems as well as issues of disability similar to those described in Chapter 5. It would be difficult to fully investigate the fine-grained concerns regarding each of these areas in relation to social exclusion and inclusion here. As a result, a discussion of matters relating to social care provision and exclusion and inclusion, and particularly in relation to the arts, will be presented in order to better frame the meanings arts practitioners and participants attach to the practice of the Opening Doors course.

Within social care practice the perceived reasons for social exclusion are varied (Craig *et al.* 2007). The promotion of inclusion for individuals living in care is argued by the government to be dependent upon individualised approaches (Blair 2006). In these terms, individualised methods are often seen as reliant upon joined-up thinking and cross-sector tactics which are intended to increase one's 'aspirations of opportunity' and access to opportunities for participation in mainstream society (Blair 2006). Different NHS programmes, such as the *Turning Point Social Inclusion Project* (NHS

213

2008), exist with the intention of bringing together therapy provision with a person-centred approach (DH 2001). Described in Chapter 5, a person-centred approach is aimed at developing programmes for people in care based on their individual needs. This provision is intended to provide support for service users' physical and mental health, including the development of life skills, housing provision, and opportunities to participate in leisure activities. With regards to the latter, much of the current academic literature and state policy on the exclusion of individuals in care reflects on a lack of participation in social activities as a key characteristic of exclusion (Craig *et al.* 2007).

Aside from being considered a leisure activity, art is also often seen as tool for social care provision (Miles 1994). Work carried out in art therapy, in community arts and in health organisations has resulted in claims that participation in the arts can play a significant role in "expressing the ill self, recovering from serious mental health problems, and achieving social inclusion" (Parr 2006: 150). Such use of the arts is an attempt at what Parr (2006: 150) calls "minimising difference." She explains the arts, "through helping to ensure communication, recovery and inclusion for those with serious mental health problems" (Parr 2006: 150), may highlight the similarities those excluded individuals have with those existing in mainstream society, thus promoting their inclusion in that society. Chapter 5 illustrated the ways in which such notions are intended to lessen the "otherness" of individuals in care, who are largely marginalised from wider society (Hall 2004: 301). The Opening Doors course addresses inclusion by welcoming service users into mainstream public places, such as the art gallery. It uses the media of art objects within the gallery to foster communication between 'mainstream' and 'excluded' individuals. The result

is designed to not only "express the ill-self", but to illustrate the connections these included and excluded individuals may share with one another (Parr 2006: 150). The argument is, as Probyn (1996) and more specifically Parr (2006) have pointed out, that such activities may encourage a sense of situated belonging, that is time, place, and people specific, rather than one that fosters inclusion more broadly.

While the government has now made the arts and culture a more key aspect of social welfare provision, hospitals and care facilities have actually been engaging in artistic practices for longer than Labour's cultural policy for social inclusion has existed. There are two ways in which this engagement has taken place. For one, the arts have been utilised as a form of decoration, improving the aesthetics of care facility environments. Additionally, the arts have often been employed as a form of therapy (Miles 1994) and it is into this remit that the Opening Doors course falls. Arts therapy exists in two main forms. The first entails clients actively creating artwork, which is seen to involve individuals in making choices, engaging in hand-eye coordination and developing a sense of satisfaction and self-worth in seeing the finished product (Miles 1994). The second is often used in pyschotherapy where clients engage in interpreting art objects, communicating ideas, expressing thoughts and giving carers insights into the problems clients feel they may be facing (Miles 1994). The Opening Doors course supports both approaches. It advocates methods of 'expressive arts therapy' espoused by Natalie Rogers (1993b: 28) who argues that engagement in creative processes allows one to express oneself, "let go...and release" while simultaneously providing carers the opportunity to study the "symbolic and metaphoric messages" demonstrated in any artwork created by service users (Rogers 1993b: 28). While the course consists of one session that solely focuses on expressive art

therapy and additionally utilises the making of drawings, for instance, in some of its method of delivery across all sessions, Opening Doors more overtly emphasises the advocacy of the consumption of art objects. More specifically, it stresses how service users' consumption of the arts may encourage them to communicate their feelings and emotions to social care givers. This emphasis is linked to what it is that the Tate Gallery as a publicly funded organisation has to offer: its collection.

These instrumental uses of the arts for promoting the inclusion of clients into mainstream society may also be seen, however, as further illustrating exclusion. Parr (2006: 150) has explained that the use of arts in matters surrounding mental health may demarcate "apparently fixed boundaries between madness and rationality" (Parr 2006: 150). In this way, the arts in therapy as with 'disability arts' may be a means of further illumintating the boundaries of exclusion and inclusion that exist between 'types' of people in society from those within the mainstream. Such notions came to light in the study of the Blue Room presented in Chapter 5. In contrast to that case study however, which focused largely on the service users as participants, this study of the Opening Doors course focuses on the participants of that course, the social care providers. Some of the reasons for this focus on carers, as explained in Chapter 3, relates to acknowledging and being sensitive to the issues of vulnerability social care providers feel is necessary for respecting their service users. In fact, very few studies actually consider the involvement, impressions, and practices engaged in by staff in arts and health related projects (Staricoff *et al.* 2003; Starricoff 2004). In order to examine how the course's targeting of social care workers may be seen to promote or hinder inclusion, it is necessary to understand the kinds of inclusion that participants, staff, and instructors feel the course may be addressing. This

chapter will also focus on how those impressions may be reflective of inclusion and exclusion matters with regard to the participant-base more specifically, rather than the clients. The rationale for examining the project in this way demonstrates that the inclusion that it may promote is not necessarily as clear-cut as the documented course aims and objectives may imply.

Interpreting Social Inclusion: Demonstrating a Collective Identity

Previous Tate staff as well as social workers (still present) have been involved in the design and delivery of the Opening Doors course. Such a partnership shows from the outset that the development of the module has involved the negotiation of both social care and gallery practices and the related and dissimilar concerns of those practices. As a result, Tate staff and instructors understand social inclusion from the conjoining perspectives of the fields in which they work, particularly as attending the course is a form of professional development for the participants. For these individuals social inclusion has a strong social aspect to it that has much to do with their clients "feeling accepted within society". Inclusion is also related to their service users having the opportunities as well as the ability to participate in "everyday activities". Via this context, social inclusion is linked very much to providing 'opportunity' to access modern art objects (Sandell 1998; Kawashima 2006) and the way that access may serve as a pathway to wider inclusion, not only within society but within the arts as well. These notions are closely aligned with Labour's cultural policy on social inclusion (DCMS 2000).

Most of the participants on the course appear to have joined because they have an interest and/or belief in the ways in which art is seen to promote communication, well-being, and self-expression, matching DCMS (2000) claims for the arts in promoting social inclusion as well as notions prevalent in arts therapy (Rogers 1993a). Some participants were encouraged to attend the course by their colleagues who had previously attended. These colleagues reported that the course is innovative, engaging and effective for understanding therapy provision. One participant explained, "Our sister agency...done this course and it was really successful...and [one colleague] was saying how much the clients got out of it...So, I felt, yea, our clients could do with a piece of that." Pre-course participation questionnaires show that some individuals enrolled because of a strong belief in the arts for promoting self-expression, communication, confidence and progress in therapy. In responding to the question "Please state why you are intersted in art as a resource", one individual stated her interest is due to "past experience, both in my own artwork and in working with groups (facilitating), show me the therapeutic and healing value of creating/using art. [Art is a] vital means for communicating difficult feelings/thoughts." This perspective was shared by the majority of course participants and is echoed in DCMS (2000; 2005a) policy: "Art is a vehicle for self-expression, building self-esteem and a way of getting certain views and perspectives on life across to others, irrespective of ability or disability." These similarities illustrate that most of the participants walked into the course on the first day with a buy-in to the belief system inherent in Labour's cultural policy (DCMS 2005a). Such connections emphasise instrumental, rather than intrinsic understandings of art's role in society.

The ways in which Tate staff appear to support the instrumental views of art described above demonstrate that both staff and course participants share a collective identity (Diani and Bison 2004) regarding the role of the arts in promoting social inclusion. In fact, these attachments for staff are related to the ways in which, described in Chapter 4, Tate Gallery Liverpool has historically addressed its local audiences. One senior staff member stated:

> "...There is a very important role for the arts to play ...[At the Tate] we've had ...incredible successes and really fantastic stories to tell of how really through the arts you can change behaviour, you can give people hope and encouragement to express themselves, to really have a more positive outlook on life..."

There is an implication in this statement that because this senior staff member feels she has witnessed positive outcomes on a local level that a rationale exists for marrying the arts to social aims. Another statement by a staff member directly connected to the delivery of the Opening Doors course illustrates the shared notions that staff and course participants have regarding culture's role in society. In fact, this staff member uses some of the same words as those given by participants, described above. She implies the ways in which art can be utilised for communication, which is in turn linked to Roger's (1993a; Merry 1997) notions of art therapy:

> "Art can communicate things that can't be spoken. ...Art can... transcend other boundaries: language barriers, cultural barriers...even ... physical barriers ... Art as that kind of communication is where its value is and I think in an ideal world that should be really used as a medium through which communities or individuals within

communities can find something in common but can also kind of…
find from that as well ways of communicating about themselves…"

Participants and staff appear to agree that the arts constitute a "universal
language" that crosses barriers to "communication" amongst people. Further,
this staff member links art directly to Parr's (2006: 150) notions of art's
ability to help people "express the ill-self" by citing a specific example of
impact:

> "We know this from projects that we've done. Somebody who's
> been bullied in school and it's kind of haunted them for the rest of
> their lives and who's never spoken about it has been here on a visit,
> seen a picture and then communicated that story and expressed
> something that they never would have told maybe if they hadn't just
> happened to see that one painting and…so, there [art] has a real
> potential to make actual change."

This staff member explains how art can, as Parr (2006: 150) described, help
"ensure communication, recovery and inclusion for those with serious mental
health problems"; ideas reiterated by social care professionals participating
in the course. As a result, discussions with all individuals participating in this
research demonstrate that social inclusion is tied to ideas regarding people's
ability and opportunity to communicate with each other. This chapter will
investigate the extent to which this collective identity may actually be
promoting, by means of the delivery of the Opening Doors course, what
Diani and Bison (2004: 283) call "collective action" to tackle the 'problem'
of social exclusion.

Reading Between the Lines: Conflicts in the Collectivity of Interpretation

Despite the fact that participants and staff appear to share similar ideas regarding the role the arts may play in promoting social inclusion, conflicts of interpretation amongst those individuals do emerge; conflicts which will be seen in the delivery of the course to fracture individuals from the structural practices of their respective institutions, while simultaneously reinforcing their common cause. Taking viewpoints of Tate staff and course instructors first, art is perceived to be able to 'make a difference' in people's lives but only if it is allowed to simply 'be art'. Impacts of social policy are seen to "strait jacket" the contemporary arts in ways that may limit standards of excellence and thus the effects it may have on people's everyday lives, recalling ideas suggested by Miles (2005) and Stallabrass (2004). This idea is particularly felt to be the case when state policies inform the ways in which galleries must carry forward and 'prove' the success of such work.

For staff at the Tate, the term social inclusion is in many ways viewed as controlling and is seen to not only challenge the autonomy of art but also limit the ways in which the gallery and individuals working within it can approach the public and address social aims. Perhaps in part, these impressions are due to the ways in which Tate Liverpool has been attempting to tackle these issues within Liverpool since its opening (Chapter 4). As a result, despite the instrumental use of art that is implied within the aims and objectives of the Opening Doors course, amongst Tate staff there is some discrepancy as to interpreting and addressing the term social inclusion within the gallery's programmes. This discrepancy is centred on the importance of safeguarding the autonomy of art from the imposition of government-driven policy aims, while simultaneously encourgaging local audiences to engage in

the arts for the aims of those policy initiatives. As a result, there initially appears to be some contradictions about the kinds of engagement with art that can or should be encouraged for socially excluded audiences. When asked whether or not the arts had a role to play in social inclusion, one senior staff member explained the difficulty of marrying notions of instrinsic value to government-sanctioned instrumental ones:

> "...Suddenly you have this sort of blanket solution to all of the country's problems by getting people engaged with the arts, which is of course an illusion ...there is an argument for ... certain independence um, especially if you deal with contemporary art, you have to have a certain liberty to really produce new work and work that quite often will be difficult to engage with, that will be provocative, that will be disturbing, and um, those works might be occasionally useful in getting people to address certain issues but on the other hand they might not be, and not every artist can be turned into a social worker, I mean that's not their responsibility."

Similar to the Bluecoat's senior staff views, this Tate senior staff member emphasises the importance of the autonomy of the arts and how it cannot be employed to solve societal problems, which they felt should be addressed in actual social, rather than cultural policy. As a result, the expression 'social inclusion' is not the preferred terminology at the Tate. Staff have explained,

> "we use the term diversity here, which is a really broad word ... and it's meant to refer to everybody and to acknowledge that everybody is different and that everybody is diverse and I think it looks at people as individuals as well, which is a much more useful model [than social inclusion]."

Social inclusion is interpreted within a framework of approaching people from their different viewpoints, on their own terms, and with their own starting points with art in mind; a tactic that has been at the heart of Tate Liverpool's work with local communities (Jackson 2000) and implies a necessity for personalised approaches (Leadbeater 2004; DCMS 2007b) that matches state-sanctioned provisions of 'opportunity' (Blair 2006). Interestingly, such approaches can be seen to uphold high cultural ideals, keeping art elevated to a status above that of everyday life. Art's elevated status is maintained by the very fact that the encouragement of certain 'types' of groups to access such art is carefully planned and targeted (Kawashima 2006). In a sense, these groups remain marginalised by the very means by which arts organisations are attempting to include them. One of the instructors on the course has explained the importance for the gallery to encourage people to access the space on their own terms: "[Social inclusion] means people actually having access to...I suppose having access and the opportunity to use things like public art collections in a way that is meaningful to them". Providing arts experiences that are "meaningful to *them*" (emphasis added), promotes the kind of "othering" that Hall (2004: 301) has warned maintains the exclusion of groups, particularly those service users engaging in social care provision. Nevertheless, Hooper-Greenhill (2000a) has explained that placing significance on the personal context for establishing meaning within art galleries is a means by which to generate 'interpretive communities' that may foster new ways in which to understand the role of galleries in society. For instance, approaches that welcome visitor's personal experiences as part of the interpretive process of gallery experiences may actually foster new forms of communication in galleries that emphasise two-way dialogues, rather than the traditional nineteenth century notions of galleries as communicating *to* visitors (Hooper-Greenhill

2000b). Two-way dialogues, if they are actually taken on board by individual galleries themselves, can then potentially influence changes that promote inclusion in gallery practice (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). A staff member explains, "Social inclusion is about including everybody or enabling everybody to participate in what you do whether that be just to come here and... go to the café, or whether that is to come here, go to an exhibition and stay for a symposium or to take part in an education project..." While such a statement may be seen to deemphasise individual's engagement with actual art objects, it could also be seen to encourage visitors to determine, in part, their own engagement themselves. Staff and instructors on the course believe it is people's "right" to access the Tate collection because it is a "national collection that holds everyone's art". As was evidenced by the case study presented in Chapter 6, the ways in which they do that, then, is up to the visitor, but only insofar as the gallery itself first takes on the responsibility to inform people that they can and should have that access.

Inclusion as Overcoming Barriers of Support

Inclusion is in part reliant on providing access (Kawashima 2006) by encouraging or helping people to see the gallery as a place that they can go for any of the various offerings that it has, even if that does not mean engaging directly with art. While it may initially appear that the autonomy of art is endangered, it is actually protected in the fact that individuals are encouraged to access it on the level at which they are most comfortable. The sovereignty of art is maintained while it is the spaces, which hold that art, that are altered. These conclusions are similar to those reached in the study of the Walker Art Gallery.

Inclusion, however, goes much further than a provision of access to the spaces that hold art, and it may be more difficult to achieve as it entails a change to institutional and field structures, a notion also touched on in the previous chapter. One Tate staff member explained, "True inclusion I think means getting people involved in decision making: in programming, in the managing council of the organisation. It's about looking at staff, it's about everything we do, not just about visitors and who we're bringing in." It is believed that encouraging people to access the gallery may promote a new awareness of potential audiences for the institution to consider accommodating, making 'true' inclusion within the institution more possible. The ways in which this change may potentially occur is via the networks that the Opening Doors course may form. For instance, by way of the sharing of personal stories that occurs within the sessions of the Opening Doors course, Tate staff are able to gain knowledge as to the needs of a particular audience type. As a result, they may be able to better tailor activities and programmes to the needs of that audience. In addition, participants on the course are intended to continue to bring their clients to the gallery once the course is completed. Those visits and the subsequent sharing of positive experiences by word of mouth may potentially promote or market Tate Liverpool as a more inclusive place to visit, creating networks that may foster inclusion. The Tate may be seen as inclusive, not solely because Tate staff and course instructors or participants 'believe' it to be, but also because, as the nature of the gallery's audience changes or grows, so does the nature of the gallery (Williams 1989a; Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). Investigation of the delivery of the Opening Doors course will illustrate, however, the difficulties this inclusion entails for the structures and practices of the Tate Gallery itself, as well as the cultural ideals it upholds.

There are initial difficulties to 'true inclusion' that foster conflict amidst the shared goals of course participants and instructors and Tate staff. These difficulties are centred on the barriers to access the gallery itself appears to uphold. These barriers are linked to the very autonomy of art the Tate as an arts institution attempts to preserve. As the DCMS (2000: 10) and the ACE (Cogman 2006) have acknowledged that the arts and culture do present barriers to people's participation, participants in the Opening Doors course have also acknowledged their own perceived barriers to accessing the arts and the gallery. Such recognition demonstrates that the ultimate aim to promote the social inclusion of service users cannot even be addressed until the perceptions of exclusion social care workers have are first tackled. The barriers social care workers have perceived with respect to the gallery revolve around issues of access, institutional support (from within their own organisations and from the Tate), and fear of a lack of training and cultural capital (Bourdieu 2000) in utilising the arts with service users. While some participants did feel comfortable accessing the arts and the Tate Gallery, they felt that the skills they might gain from the course would not be appreciated, accepted, or implemented back in their organisations. Further, others had concerns relating to their perceptions of the 'power' of the arts to evoke emotional responses in their clients. While they felt the arts would be useful in encouraging clients to express their emotions and share their experiences more, course participants felt unprepared or not sufficiently trained for the emotional responses that engagement in the arts might encourage from their service users.

Participants' perceived barriers to accessing the arts shows the complexity of obstacles the Opening Doors is actually addressing. For this group, inclusion is much more than accessing the gallery, gaining cultural capital, or

encouraging the use of art as a therapeutic tool, though these are necessary components for these participants. In addition, inclusion for these participants is also about being in an environment in which they feel supported to take chances outside the space of the gallery and back within their organisations to go and affect change in their service provision. These notions are aligned with DCMS (2007b: 9) policy for social inclusion that claims changes in public thinking about the value of culture in the provision of local welfare services, including for social inclusion, is in part dependent upon the ways in which the cultural sector can "tailor" and support that cross-sector work for service providers. This cross-sector working is clearly an objective of the Opening Doors course. Not only is that objective implied in the course description itself (Charnock and D'Silva 2003), but it is also apparent in the common beliefs that both gallery and social care practitioners share regarding the potential of the arts to promote progress in therapy and social inclusion. This instrumental use of the arts simultaneously challenges and upholds its idealisation and thus exclusivity. Further study of the Opening Doors course below will show how that Tate programme both reinforces and challenges these notions of exclusivity; thus promoting both consensual and conflictual processes of change regarding the possibility of inclusion within the arts (Diani and Bison 2004).

Interpretation into Practice: Support Networks

In the joining up of the arts with social services by means of the course, ways in which individuals may affect change within their particular fields and for their respective 'clients' (Powell and Gibson 2007) are made explicit. For the social caregivers, the course provides a support network of individuals who buy-in to the same belief system that art can promote a form of therapy. On

the course, they gain behind-the-scenes access to the Tate via staff and instructors and engage with other like-minded social care practitioners in learning to acquire the skills to be confident in their ability to deliver sessions in the exhibition galleries. In doing so, they have the potential to encourage new forms of communication from their clients as well as to elevate a position of the arts in the working methods of their organisations. Staff and instructors involved in the course are also provided with a support network of individuals who buy-in to the belief that the gallery has the potential to have a greater role in everyday lives. The ways in which the participants engage with staff and instructors on the course for these various ends, reveals processes of mutual engagement (Wenger 1998) that have fostered alliances in the establishment of support networks (Diani and Bison 2004) in the long-term, beyond the completion of the programme. For the Tate as an organisation, access and audience development may be promoted via those networks.

While Opening Doors happens over a specific time frame, with the aims and outcomes of an accredited module, the individuals involved depend, and continue to do so (as they continue to meet socially), upon one another's shared goals: on the one hand, the promotion of the use of the Tate Gallery for a new audience, and on the other hand the use of art as a form of therapy, both of which are perceived to be linked to social inclusion. According to Diani and Bison (2004: 283), individuals engaging in collective action do so "with clear conflictual orientations to specific social and political opponents, conducted in the context of dense inter-organisational networking, by actors linked by solidarities and shared identities that precede and survive any specific coalitions and campaigns." With respect to those involved in the Opening Doors course, individuals have identified social exclusion as the

social conflict they are addressing (Diani and Bison 2004). In addition, these individuals are also lobbying, in a sense, for their individual organisations, the Tate and the various institutions in which the course participants work, to see art as they have long seen it (Diani and Bison 2004): able to promote communication and self-expression for the promotion of dialogue and the progression of therapy. Observation of the delivery of Opening Doors makes evident the ways in which these shared goals are seen to challenge the "legitimacy" (Diani and Bison 2004: 283) of current structures in both gallery and social care practice.

By engaging collectively in presenting such challenges, the individuals involved in the course are further allied with one another, which increases their solidarity as a group (Diani and Bison 2004). These discoveries are revealed by means of the personal stories shared during the course sessions. As a result of this social interaction, meaning making about the potential use of not only art but the Tate as well, for both personal and institutional goals, unfold for all involved (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). A sense of belonging to this specific Opening Doors 'community', rather than the gallery (Probyn 1996; Parr 2006), thus emerges through their participation on the course. When the course is completed and these individuals return to their various workplaces, their solidarity and collective goals are sustained by means of the supportive network the course itself fostered amongst them (Diani and Bison 2004).

The ways in which the above processes emerge demonstrates the role of the course in fostering the development of a network, which while maintaining the autonomy of the individuals involved, allows for continued opportunities for those individuals to play an "independent role" (Diani and Bison 2004: 284) in furthering inclusion via the arts in ways that formal organisations,

such as the Tate, may not be able to. The sections below describe the ways in which this network evolves. While the Opening Doors course does not mould as clearly as the Blue Room does to the theory, Wenger's (1998) description of a 'community of practice' is, once again, viewed as a suitable framework in which to couch such a discussion. Even though individuals maintain independence as they return to their organisations to implement 'change' at the completion of the course, such an outline is viewed as appropriate. Its suitability is due to the observed development of a friendly and trusting atmosphere amongst individuals based on their diversity of knowledge and experiences during the sessions of the Opening Doors course. These aspects in turn are argued to have led to the acknowledgment of a common enterprise that has encouraged an alliance amongst all individuals involved to further their case for the role art may play in people's everyday lives (Diani and Bison 2004).

The creation of a friendly and trusting atmosphere

The Opening Doors course takes as a starting point that in order to encourage clients to engage in an open manner, the participants have to overcome any personal barriers to that engagement. These approaches are linked to a number of theories regarding group and individual therapy (Rogers 1993a; Parr 2006). As a result, each session is geared to enabling participants to relax, become comfortable, open up, and communicate not only with each other but also within the space of the 'exclusive' galleries. So, the manner of approaching visitors to the Tate takes their personal references, in this case the care and health profession and the issues that affect their clients, as a point from which to begin to address the issues of access and inclusion thus far examined within this chapter. The group met every Friday for several weeks and a friendly and jovial environment, similar to that of the Blue

Room, developed. In fact, some friendships were established from attending the course. One participant explained that a joy she had in attending the course was "the people." She stated, "I feel I have made one very special friend and many others as well. Each person had such great qualities and I enjoyed all the humour too."

The sessions were delivered in a flexible manner, which permitted participants to get more comfortable with one another. Further, work carried out in the exhibition rooms encouraged experimentation and risk-taking. Participants were able to explore their own creativity while ensuring that the tasks at hand were accomplished as needed and to schedule. Diani and Bison (2004: 284) have explained that such developments help foster a sense of collective identity even though the individuals involved may be from diverse backgrounds and experiences. One participant noted how much he had shared his personal thoughts and feelings during the course, explaining that he felt that was due to "the environment" of the course. He explained, "I've always been quite reserved...and that started me thinking why was [I sharing so much on the course], and I think it's very much about the fact that [the atmosphere of the course] feels non-threatening." These relationships are argued here to contribute to the ways in which individuals maintained a "sense of common purpose and shared commitment" (Diani and Bison 2004: 283) to the aims of the course, despite the challenges presented by the art and the Tate itself, in addition to the lack of support participants felt that they had back in their vocational organisations.

This development was not immediate however. Individuals had a sense of common purpose that was clear from the fact that they were all on the course together, but they did not necessarily "regard themselves as inextricably linked to [one another]", nor did they initially see each other as "identical"

(Diani and Bison 2004: 284). A number of participants felt "fear and trepidation" at first meeting one another over two issues: not seeming informed enough about modern art and about having to reveal personal information about themselves. Despite these fears, course members developed and continue to maintain a sense of group cohesion and thus belonging cultivated through the sharing of personal stories, reflections and experiences while discussing works of art. In other words, as Diani and Bison (2004: 284) have explained with respect to individuals from different organisations working together for collective social purposes, individuals involved in the Opening Doors course developed a sense of "compatibility" with one another.

In each session, participants were taken step by step through processes that helped establish a rapport with other individuals in the group first and then within the exhibition rooms themselves. These activities created a sense of shared experience, confirming claims stated in DCMS (2005a; 2005b) reports on the social role of museums and galleries. Developments over the duration of the course, however, reveal that it was not so much the gallery that had fostered impressions of being in a supportive environment. Participants felt more reliant on and comfortable with the other individuals on the course rather than to the Tate organisation itself. One participant emphasised the role of the group as opposed to the gallery in creating this atmosphere: "It's very much about the company we're in...the people who are here." Further study of the course shows that the close relationship the individuals developed with one another actually fostered an 'us and them' mentality regarding the institutions with which they were affiliated, specifically the Tate and the social care organisations (Diani and Bison 2004). These notions fostered the drawing of a boundary that actually more

closely aligned individuals within the group with one another, further strengthening their 'cause' to promote the use of the arts for social inclusion.

A diversity of knowledge and experience

Participants in the group came from various backgrounds and experiences in the health, caring and therapy professions, giving them diverse perspectives not only on issues of care and social work, but also in the ways in which art may be implemented in therapy. One participant remarked, "Everyone [on the course] was so different. Each brought something different to the course. Each helped and astounded me by their insights and knowledge." Participants were able to see one another as a support system. A number of participants expressed happiness at meeting 'likeminded' people on the course. Individuals on the course also saw the instructors as people who offered different resources from which individuals could pool in order to further their own aims to implement arts therapy within their individual organisations (Diani and Bison 2004). For instance, each of the three tutors on the course was felt to have brought different and complimentary approaches to its delivery. Expertise was in the arts as well as in youth and social work. The mix of knowledge amongst tutors created a level of engagement that was perceived to be at once informative and empathetic to the perceived rigid structures of current social care practices. Tutors were felt to be "knowledgeable", "enthusiastic" and "supportive" as well as "nurturing" and "accepting." It was expressed that the presence of all the tutors were necessary to the success of the course. The tutors were viewed as "facilitators" or "mediators" that gave participants a "kickstart" to thinking of ways to look at and use art in their services. They were able to speak the language of the participants involved, but they were also conversant in the language of the arts (DCMS 2007b).

A Common Enterprise

The significance of these relationships for furthering the institutional goals of audience development for the Tate and social welfare improvements for social care organisations is demonstrated in the ways in which relationships continued even after the course was completed. Via group emails, individuals continue to provide support, share ideas and even engage in joint funding applications to encourage the use of arts more widely in local public services. The close nature of the group has even led course tutors and participants to engage in planning regular 'catch up' sessions every few months. These catch-up sessions had not previously occurred at the completion of past courses, demonstrating the significance of the relationships developed amongst these specific people. These developments not only support government policy for joined-up approaches in welfare provision (Blair 2006), but also for culture (DCMS 2007b) as the subsequent 'catch-up' sessions allow for new means of cultivating the Tate audiences (Kawashima 2006). These sessions do not appear to have developed as a result of policy but proceed to match policy because of the great sense of support some individual participants felt they gained from the individuals involved in the course; support they did not feel they were getting from their organisations located outside the group. Social care providers in particular felt their organisations to be sceptical and thus unsupportive regarding the use of artistic techniques in therapy. As a result, the group has striven to maintain the alliances they developed. One participant explained,

> "What was nice was it felt like a lot of people there were in the same position as me; whereas they all knew that [art in social care] was meaningful, which was why they were on the course, but they haven't yet found a way at all to squeeze it into their daily

work...[Participants in the course] were doing [that] already in small ways, but it's like they haven't been given permission to do it yet or maybe they didn't have the know-how yet."

This empowerment through the understanding of others on the course helped participants feel supported in potentially implementing creative techniques in their organisations. Diani and Bison (2004) have discussed the significance of informal networks for promoting any form of social or even organisational change.

The creation and maintenance of a friendly and trusting atmosphere, a diversity of knowledge and experience, and the acknowledgement of a common enterprise have helped to maintain the endeavours of the group, despite the conclusion of the course. They support one another in negotiating their vision for art as a means of therapy to promote social inclusion in their own individual working environments. The institutional constraints they negotiate are therefore outside that arena. They work collectively to support each other in mediating those constraints in their localised contexts (Wenger 1998; Diani and Bison 2004). The resources participants use for that mediation was initially through meeting at the Tate and learning skills to employ gallery visits and techniques for looking at and encouraging the discussion of art. Flexibility and risk-taking constructed crucial ingredients for becoming comfortable with the setting and developing those skills (DCMS 2007b).

Challenging the Autonomy of the Field to Uphold It

The ways in which the group became closely aligned with one another to promote the use of the arts for therapy and inclusion was simultaneously

dependent upon challenging its elevated status for being able to do so. Throughout the delivery of the course, participants were assured that there was no 'right or wrong' answer with regards to sharing opinions and discussing or even sometimes making art; rather, the course emphasised the instrumental use of artwork. It was about utilising work as a starting point for communicating one's feelings, emotions, and experiences. Because of the ways in which participants had been encouraged to look and talk about art works, when they created small drawings in some of the activities, though they were nervous to share these with the group for "fear" of appearing unskilled, they had developed a sense of "no matter what is produced, that's a piece of art" because "it's unique". A drawing's uniqueness was felt to reflect the uniqueness of an individual and thus gave it merit as art. The value of the individual was attached to any discussion or any creation that came out of the sessions and thus value of the individual's expression, whether visually or verbally took precedence over the material value of the artwork. In fact, for the group it appears that the value of the artwork increased with the individual's depth of expression about it. This point raises issues about the value of consumption, a value that is often problematicised but could also be seen as the criterion by which "meaningful…metaphors" for artwork are "created" (Boorsma 2006: 76). Attributing value to the meanings individuals attach to works of art can thus be seen to have increased the shared value of and connection and belongingness to their group as an 'interpretive community' (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a).

Participants continually reiterated the notion that there was no 'right or wrong' idea throughout the course. One participant explained,

> "I soon discovered that my perspective was valid—it was my truth…I was even amazed to discover that I actually had a

236

perspective. Yeah, I had the capacity, however shallow and rudimentary, to interpret and elucidate the heavily encoded Modern Art."

Thus, in addition to strengthening the sense of community that had emerged amongst the group, encouraging expression of personal opinion over knowledge of modern art generated feelings of greater access to the artwork. Confidence came from the value placed on these personal opinions by the course tutors and fellow participants, rather than comparing thoughts with any text on an interpretive label in an exhibition space. The same participant explained,

"I found discussions within the gallery to be challenging, yet strangely satisfying. Interpretation by others in the group was often thoroughly dissecting and analytical. My own interpretations were sometimes a bit 'far-out', but people always seemed to respect this. This was the satisfying bit, feeling strangely liberated to freely express."

This comment is incredibly different from this individual's previous experience at the Tate Gallery: "The first time I went (three or four years ago) I felt largely indifferent, perhaps because I didn't quite have the capacity to be appreciative of this type of art." This participant places the blame on himself explaining that he may not have had the required prior knowledge in the past to appreciate art in the Tate Gallery, a notion that upholds ideas that it is largely cultural capital that is necessary for the appreciation of and attendance to galleries (Bourdieu 2000). At the same time however, his earlier lack of confidence in discussing art could have also been a result of the ways in which the gallery as an organisation may have

previously communicated ideas about art to this individual (Mason 2004). In contrast, via the Opening Doors course and the mutual engagement amongst staff, instructors and participants involved, the Tate is seen to communicate different notions of engagement with art that promote personal expressions, thus encouraging this participant to feel more comfortable accessing the gallery and furthering his perception of personal inclusion into the space of the Tate and in his broader understanding of the arts.

While established notions of art were challenged during the course, they were also upheld. The approaches employed for facilitating a close group dynamic and a comfort with art, while appearing to disregard criteria concerning the art history canon that an organisation like the Tate upholds, actually reinforced it. In encouraging individuals to share their own opinions about modern art works, regardless of existing art historical discussions of those objects, tutors and instructors actually employed respected traditional techniques of looking at art held within the field. One of these techniques directly referenced Berger's (1977) *Ways of Seeing*, which delineates approaches for deciphering the meaning behind the subject matter and composition of a work of art. Simultaneously encouraging individual opinions while teaching establishment-accepted art historical techniques for communicating those opinions has had significant effects on the group, leading them to feel more comfortable and confident in speaking openly about artworks in the exhibition spaces.

Participants appreciated gaining a degree of 'knowledge' or 'capital'. They enjoyed understanding the socio- and art historical information available about works of art. They felt that a new world had opened up to them in beginning to consider the background of the artist and the time in which a

work was made as part of the process of developing an understanding of it. For example, one participant explained,

> "I had been to the Tate and the Walker, but I never really understood [the art] or had no interest in it. If I saw a picture and I liked it, I liked it. I really didn't go into the artist or the background of the artist...[what's changed for me since being on the course is that] it's enhanced my knowledge about art and about how to look at art. It's not just static. It's what you perceive it to be. And it's not for entrepreneurs or for the upper class, it's for everyone. That's what it's done for me. But it's also enhanced my personal development...."

This participant does not necessarily privilege any existing knowledge of art over her own impressions, but she now appears to feel more equipped to make the argument for her own position regarding a work of art. Gaining a better understanding of the ways in which knowledge about art is constructed, via the 'interpretive community' of the course, she is more comfortable engaging in debates on the matter. While such a statement demonstrates that participants on the course may have a greater sense of inclusion to the arts due to their better understanding of the manner in which meaning is often constructed within the field, the statement simultaneously reinforces the existence of a boundary of exclusion by acknowledging the significance of understanding the established techniques for constructing meanings of or for art works.

Because course instructors continually validated all personal impressions and opinions of artworks, individual participants felt more comfortable looking at art and facilitating their service users to do the same. As a result of those alliances developed, the participants gained new perspectives on how to

address their own social care practices (Diani and Bison 2004). One participant explained the important implications this approach might have on using art in service provision and thus the potential of service users to engage in a space like the Tate Gallery:

> "The people I am working with are quite vulnerable and may find it difficult to express themselves, but once they know that the exercise isn't a set...[that it] doesn't matter what the responses are [and] there's no judgment, it's actually how you feel...[they will be liberated]."

The encouragement of 'anyone's opinion is valid' gave participants confidence in encouraging the same from their service users and thus supported them in promoting the accessibility of the gallery to their service users.

While the autonomy of art is protected by the institution in which it sits, it is the participants' engagement with debating that autonomy which has broadened. The skills taught on the course seemed to empower participants to openly discuss modern art works in the Tate Gallery exhibition rooms, furthering their impressions of personal accessibility to those spaces. Encouraging accessibility to art in this way shows that the Tate is still an authoritative institution, because it is the course held within that organisation that has allowed participants to value their own opinions. The authority given to their opinions by Tate staff and course instructors further sanctions the participants' perceived ability to impart those notions of value onto their clients. In doing so the participants themselves also uphold the sovereignty of art and the place of the Tate in protecting that, while helping to develop its audiences.

Developing and 'Cultivating' Audiences: Promoting a Sense of Inclusion

Through providing 'inside' access to the Tate Gallery, the development of skills and the support for bringing vulnerable groups into the Tate, the Opening Doors course went beyond providing 'access' to actually promoting participants' *sense* of inclusion within the arts. This inclusion, however, appears to be more about developing access to and comfort in looking at and discussing modern art within a space like Tate Liverpool, cultivating new audiences for the gallery (Kawashima 2006). Having attended the course every Friday for several weeks, participants began to feel quite at home in the Tate, specifically being familiar with the layout of the building and what programmes and exhibits it has to offer. One participant explained one of the joys she experienced on the course as "the feeling of owning the [gallery] space and feeling comfortable in it." One participant stated,

> "Now, knowing a bit more about it, I kind of feel as if I kinda get round [the gallery] a little bit more confidently and can stimulate that with [my clients, encouraging them to go onto different floors and meet back in other areas during our visit]...and kind of make it a bit more fun as well."

Learning more about the Tate building through visiting different exhibitions during the course gave participants confidence in accessing more than one exhibition in the gallery during any given visit. The course sessions were held in an Education studio 'behind-the-scenes' at the Tate. Unlike the situation of visiting the Big Art space, participants of the course literally had to journey through the exhibition rooms of the gallery to the back hallways behind those spaces to enter the classroom. Frequent visits to and from the

exhibition spaces occurred, giving participants a greater sense of physical familiarity and thus ownership of Tate Liverpool that has promoted it as a psychologically accessible place, furthering the development of that group as an audience.

In addition to having, literally, 'inside' knowledge of the actual Tate building, participants on the course felt they developed the skills to facilitate group visits for their service users. This impression came from the group visits they had to facilitate in order to receive course accreditation, but participants also explained that they would continue to conduct these visits after the course was completed. The skills participants developed were the means by which the gallery has been able to further their audience development. This result has occurred for two reasons: participants gained confidence and skills in facilitating group discussion of art work and they felt the outcomes gained from group visits to the gallery matched their own aims for promoting the social inclusion of their service users.

As one participant explained, gaining confidence in an art gallery or creative environment is necessary in order for someone to feel comfortable sharing their thoughts regarding art work; thoughts that may facilitate discussions about wider issues such as health and well being. Developing confidence was a positive outcome for a number of course participants. One explained, "It's weird because it wasn't until about two weeks before the end [of the course] that I realised how much it's developed my confidence." For participants, leading a visit for their service users in the gallery as well as giving presentations at the end of the course were moments in which they realised they had gained self-belief not only in talking in front of groups of people and in leading a group, but also in being comfortable in an art gallery.

Participants feel they have gained new skills and new methods in interacting with and encouraging service users to express themselves and share their viewpoints. One participant explained that the activities provided for service users in her organisation "don't work for everybody" and the gallery visits added a new technique to the repertoire. The opportunity that services in the community, such as art galleries, may allow for public service providers to promote social inclusion is directly indicated in cultural policy (DCMS 2000; 2007b). Seeing course participants make these links themselves makes it understandable why policy, though its implementation is problematic, is in many ways relevant to work conducted on the ground. Yet, it is in allowing for the flexibility to discover and develop these connections where policy can promote its applicability to practice.

Building Skills to Foster Collective Action against Exclusion in Social Care

The Opening Doors course demonstrates the importance of providing space for learning about the potential of cross-sector initiatives. Prior to attending, participants largely believed the arts and creativity to have useful application in their work, yet they lacked experience in how to apply creative techniques: "[When the course started] I...was a bit unconfident [about] how am I going to use what I am learning here. You know, how am I going to put it into practice... I didn't want to miss the point, I wasn't sure if I was going to get the point, but it suddenly all came together last week for me." The course was felt to give practical techniques for "how to use" creativity in social care as another participant explained the course "allowed me to think differently and be able to transfer that to service users", but it also gave this participant the space in which to develop those ideas herself.

243

As a result of the skills participants developed, these individuals felt 'strengthened' in their ability to use those experiences to 'change' their social care provision and potentially affect similar change in wider care service. Aside from the skills developed, a main outcome from the Opening Doors course was also new understanding or appreciation for the ways in which a gallery visit, and particularly to Tate Liverpool, could be utilised in working with service users. Participants felt "armed" to facilitate a more interactive social outing for his service users, explaining,

> "There's only so much you can do [for a social outing] so I think the more interactive it is, the more service users are allowed to express themselves. The likes of the Tate lends that, really."

The participant continues to explain,

> "This course now is kind of giving me more ideas for how to [facilitate a gallery visit] in a more structured way... The [course tutors] here have...given me more ideas about how it can be more accessible, more meaningful, and be able to get more out of [the service users. We can] bounce...ideas off each other."

The course has facilitated participants to share experiences with and learn more from their service users, fostering new alliances and thus networks for changing social care provision beyond those initiated on the course itself (Diani and Bison 2004). More specifically, in the case of one service user the experience of the gallery visit "opened up discussion within [later service] sessions", which have lead to "good developments" in individuals' therapy. The carer explained, "[The experience of our visit] still flashes back what it brought up for them." Some participants explained that their service users were discussing the gallery visits and making links between ideas and

artworks days and sometimes weeks after the initial visit.

Because participants and instructors on the course did agree that social inclusion was related to accessing everyday group activities and feeling comfortable doing so, it can be stated that a number of participants on the course felt that utilising Tate Liverpool in their services did (via initial gallery visits) and would continue to contribute to their own organisational aims of delivering social inclusion policy. This interpretation not only promotes the ways in which the Tate is able to further its audience development, but also the ways in which cultural policy for social inclusion may be applied (DCMS 2007b). One participant explained,

> "I'd used a gallery and other social environments to bring in social inclusion for people to show people that this is out there for you. [The gallery] is not just...for certain people, but I'd not thought about using the gallery actually as...your ... core activity..."

Facilitating visits to Tate Liverpool for service users has been perceived as extremely positive for service users. It is a kind of "stepping stone" that is felt to "normalise" their experience, encouraging service users to get out of the house thus "broadening" their experiences and bringing them into mainstream society by means of participating in mainstream leisure activities. In addition, a few course participants explained that encouraging service users to take the bus on their own and meet at the Tate helped encourage independence among service users, and thus inclusion in mainstream society:

> "Most of [the service users] thought it wasn't for them. They didn't really want to go to the art gallery, but it's opened up a lot for them and some actually—two actually are going on their own, going to visit art

galleries and trips to the theatre."

The gallery visits appear to create opportunities for social outings that lessen perceptions of marginalisation often attached to service users. As a result, the Opening Doors course addresses policy-based aims of social inclusion as well as audience development for the Tate.

The Limitations of Inclusion into the Arts

Despite the feeling that participants and their clients gained greater access to the Tate and a greater understanding of the arts, two key barriers that link to both of these issues remain, limiting the circumstances of inclusion the course may allow. These barriers include the way in which the Tate conducts its daily business and the structure in which the institution works, which is very much informed by its context as a gallery that collects, preserves, and exhibits a national collection of modern art. Both of these notions are centred on ideas about art, in particular its role in society and its autonomy to uphold standards of excellence. As a result, the ways in which the collective identity of the group fosters shared action to promoting inclusion is seen to be challenged by the apparent rigidity of the structure of the Tate and the field in which it sits. Two examples of this tension will be given here. The first relates to how the Tate as an organisation is seen to welcome (or not) the new groups it targets via the Opening Doors course. The second is related to the complexities of making high art more accessible while simultaneously safeguarding the standards it is seen to represent.

The Tate as a Barrier to its Self-Professed Inclusion

With regards to the practices of welcoming visitors to the Tate, contextual discussion of the gallery has explained that creating a sense of welcome has been a key aspect of the gallery's situation within the locality of Liverpool (Chapter 4). However, as Fleming (2002) notes with respect to art galleries in general, a sense of exclusivity or perhaps lack of understanding on the part of gallery officials outside those involved in education and marketing initiatives appears to remain. With respect to the Tate, one participant explained, " I didn't feel particularly welcomed by anyone [at the Tate] other than [who was] on the course." The same participant also stated that everyone on the course had to negotiate the structural constraints of the Tate: "[We had to do] what we needed to do in order to fit in and not be told off". In a sense, the closeness of the group helped to reinforce the collective action in which they were engaged; despite the constraints of the Tate's institutional structures in which that action became further fostered (Wenger 1998; Diani and Bison 2004).

While the course attempts to broaden the access of the Tate to vulnerable individuals involved in care services, a lack of understanding regarding how to approach and treat such audiences on the part of Tate staff outside those involved on the course was observed. A few individuals in particular felt that the Information Assistants had acted in ways that were not only insensitive to disability, but also aggressive in nature. This led one participant to feel incredibly uncomfortable at the thought of bringing her service users to the gallery. Course leaders were made aware of the situation at the time and the way in which they addressed it was perceived by participants to be appropriate and considerate, reinforcing their alliance with one another (Diani and Bison 2004). The occurrence, however, has brought attention to

the lack of a cohesive approach within the Tate organisation as to the purpose, aims and objectives underpinning Opening Doors and the kinds of new visitors it is intending to attract to the gallery. Aside from the incident mentioned above, two other participants had difficulties in bringing their groups to visit the Tate. There appeared to be a lack of awareness and sensitivity to what is involved when bringing a large number of physically disabled individuals to a venue on the physically inaccessible approach to the Albert Dock, much less to an art gallery.

These encounters draw attention to the significant role that Tate staff members play in mediating the space and structure of the gallery for visitors, particularly visitors with very specific and individual needs. Despite the frustration and anger that resulted from these experiences, never at any time was that anger directed at the staff member who served as a tutor on the course. In fact, the strong connections that all of the group shared with one another, allowed for a sense of sympathy for the individual as it was felt that she was in some ways fighting an uphill battle to promote true accessibility and thus inclusion into the Tate as an organisation (Diani and Bison 2004). She was the 'intermediary' (Featherstone 1991; Bourdieu 2000) who appeared to understand how to work within the structure and practices, the "bureaucracy" of the Tate, as well as someone who appears to appreciate the needs of the care workers and their service users and can provide them access to the arts as a useful tool in promoting therapy and social inclusion. For participants, it is not so much a belonging to the organisation of the Tate that had mattered. Instead, it was the 'interpretive community' in which they engaged on and subsequently continue to since the completion of the course. As Wenger (1998) has explained with respect to 'communities of practice', it is at the level of practice that these institutional barriers the Tate presents are

mediated, thus reinforcing the cohesion of the group on the course. Further, these experiences illustrate the fractures, as Diani and Bison (2004) refer to them, between individuals and institutions that appear to support causes like social inclusion. The evidence of these fractures can be seen to strengthen the networks developed by localised groups who engage in the furthering of a cause like social inclusion (Diani and Bison 2004).

The Barriers of Standards to Art's Accessibility

The exhibitions, particularly that of the Turner Prize 2007, which participants and their service users visited during the Opening Doors course further illustrates the difficulties inherent in marrying standards of excellence with inclusion. Despite the ways in which staff at the Tate worked to promote the accessibility of the gallery, they could not change the nature of the artwork on display. In many ways, no matter how much a personal opinion regarding an artwork can be validated by one's peers, it may not make the work fully accessible. The opinion expressed may also never completely change the physical nature or sovereignty of the work. The inherent exclusivity of the arts came very much to the fore during the course as the Turner Prize 2007 exhibition was on display during that time.

As local Liverpool press pointed out, the Turner Prize is already viewed by many within and without the artworld as one of the most prestigious and thus elitist, annual visual arts exhibitions in the country (Weston 2006). Organised by Tate Gallery Britain, the prize is named after a respected nineteenth century British painter J. M. W. Turner, and is presented annually to a British visual artist under the age of fifty years old. An exhibition of the, typically four, nominated artists takes place in Tate Britain, though in honor of Liverpool's 800th birthday and pending Capital of Culture year, it was held

for the first time in its history outside of London at Tate Liverpool. Since its founding in 1984 the Turner Prize has become the UK's most publicised and controversial art award. Due to the presence of the Turner Prize 2007 exhibition in Liverpool, much use of it was made during the course. Participants thought it was a "privilege" and of "great interest" to be able to see the exhibition in Liverpool as well as take their clients to see it. What transpired not only shows one of the crucial problems in 'true inclusion' into the arts, but also the ways in which the arts are able to demonstrate issues of inclusion and exclusion within society more broadly.

Two works of art in the 2007 Turner Prize exhibition at Tate Liverpool, each by one different nominated artist, presented severe issues of accessibility and thus exclusion with regards to the exhibition. One was a sculptural work by Nathan Coley. In two thresholds of one gallery space was a 4" x 4" plank of oak placed just at the base of the entrances and exits to the space. This presented problems for visitors who were in wheelchairs. While the Tate did have a ramp, they had only one, which required the Information Assistant to quickly remove the ramp once the visitor in the wheel chair had used it and rush across the space of the exhibition room to place it over the next plank of wood. Participants in the course explained that their clients felt made a spectacle of them and made them feel uncomfortable in some cases.

Another work in the Turner Prize that presented problems of accessibility was Mike Nelson's *Amnesiac Shrine*. The work is also heavily reliant on ideas of entrances and exists as Nelson had created a disorienting environment, to which once you entered you were not certain how to leave. The piece is a series of rooms that have no doors or windows, only small cut out holes into closed spaces through which visitors can glance in and find a small, almost magical, world. Peering in, one finds a place that seems to have

250

sand on the ground and stars in the form of lights in the sky. The scene appears to go on infinitum until one discovers that looking back at you is yourself. Mirrors create the illusion. The problems this work raised in terms of accessibility is that the spaces in which to manoeuvre around the rooms were too small for most wheelchairs. In addition, the holes in which one must peer to 'discover' this strange world were too high for individuals in wheelchairs. It was felt that these works made the Turner Prize an incredibly inaccessible exhibition, not only was it difficult to see Nelson's work, but Coley's contribution made the experience of the gallery visit in many cases uncomfortable not only for the physically disabled individual but those around him/her as well.

Many questions arise from the situation of exclusion that has occurred via the Turner Prize 2007 exhibition; questions that revolve around standards of art, artistic autonomy, the importance of the visitor and the visitor experience in the gallery, as well as the role of art in illustrating versus creating exclusion and inclusion. Coley's work appears to explore issues of power and how power can be inferred through architecture and space. He often aims to facilitate an increased physical and mental engagement with our environment through his work (Tate Gallery Liverpool 2007b). In a way, then, the oak boards made individuals aware of the power of art to exclude or at least highlight one's exclusion, as the individuals in wheelchairs were not able to step over the board. In addition, the work literally illustrates the role of gallery staff in facilitating a visitor's experience in the gallery, as an Information Assistant had to always be present. Further, though a number of people complained about the boards in the exhibition, they were never removed because they were in fact classed as 'art', not as a health and safety risk. Though the presence of this particular artwork created problems of

accessibility and thus inclusion, in many ways it very much included individuals into the experience of the art, but is inclusivity really the case if one does not have the cultural capital (Bourdieu 2000) to assess the tensions that underpin the work? The very nature of this work calls to question whether or not one's opinion of it actually does have more value than the work itself. In some ways because of the questions that arose from these particular visitors' experiences, Coley's work could be perceived as simultaneously both a success and a failure. The overarching issue that remains, however, is a question of standards. To remove the art, either that of Coley or Nelson, because it is not accessible threatens its autonomy to raise these questions, which are in fact wider questions about society as a whole. In addition, to remove it would be a form of censorship. Yet further, not to remove it, highlights the ways in which art is inherently exclusive. All of these questions return to the issue of whether or not it is art's responsibility to be more than art. When art is placed within a framework to effect "social change" (DCMS 2000), that political placement may limit its ability, in many ways, to actually do that (Stallabrass 2004).

Conclusions

Through activities such as the Opening Doors course, the Tate has reinforced Labour policy's language of 'opportunity' (Blair 2006) by providing an activity that allows for certain circumstances in which individuals in the care and health profession and their clients can better access modern and contemporary art. Through addressing the needs of the specific target group, care professionals and their clients, the course not only delivers a personalised activity that provides flexibility of approach and encourages the long-term nurturing of personal relationships (Leadbeater 2004), but also one

that fosters a potentially sustainable audience development initiative for the gallery itself via the networks that grow amongst the participants that attend the course (Hayes and Slater 2002). From such an approach a feeling of inclusion on the part of participants is gained, which in turn supports the wider political and ideological belief system for all individuals involved in the course that the arts can promote positive social outcomes on a local level.

Because the study here has focused on the perceptions of course participants and instructors as well as staff engaged in its delivery and more senior staff of the Tate Liverpool organisation, rather than the 'socially excluded' service users it aims to potentially address, it is unclear as to whether or not the Opening Doors course actually fully promotes broader social inclusion. However, it is possible to ascertain that the individuals directly engaging in the course developed a sense of shared strategy (Diani and Bison 2004) for using Tate visits as a means to encourage therapy. This result has led to a great sense of group cohesion that fosters a deep sense of belonging amongst those individuals that appears to continue long after the course completed. However, the questions raised at the end of the chapter regarding the autonomy of art and the capability of the Tate as an organisation within that field to actually address "true inclusion" leads one to wonder whether or not that belonging is not more directly situated in relation to the specific time, place, and individuals involved in the Opening Doors course (Probyn 1996; Parr 2006).

The context of the Tate Gallery Liverpool presented in Chapter 4 describes the gallery's aims as centred upon making connections with local communities in ways that promote those communities to engage in the offering of high culture. By marrying high art with the everyday concerns of social care professionals, the Opening Doors course continues to elevate the

status of the arts, yet via the relationships that develop and the social interactions that occur in the course, an 'interpretive community' (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a) can be seen to have developed in which the individuals involved share a strategy for mediating the boundaries of arts exclusivity that they may actually be reinforcing themselves.

Comments shared by staff in the wider Tate Liverpool organisation as well as course participants have demonstrated that cultural ideals may themselves be the barriers to such inclusion. Participants' discussions of the significance of learning establishment-accepted techniques for discussing art as well as staff admittance that the sovereignty of art needs to be protected (the Turner Prize 2007 exhibition illustrating that), actually reinforce the boundary of exclusion they may be attempting to dissolve. It privileges objects as representative of ideals creating barriers to further inclusion not only within the arts but in the organisation itself. Art, then, remains useful for social care practices, but only if it is allowed to remain removed from it in some ways.

The above findings reveal that the barriers the Tate presents as a high arts organisation indirectly enabled and perhaps strengthened the nature of the group's supportive atmosphere and cohesion. Through the 'interpretive community' (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a) that has emerged within the Opening Doors course, the participants and tutors on the course as well as the staff directly involved, provide support for one another in their individual drives to promote the arts as catalysts for change that encourage personal expression, alterations to organisational approaches to public delivery, and the fostering of inclusive practices. It is their collective endeavour (Diani and Bison 2004), however small or incremental the change it may promote, that perpetuates a feeling of the possibility of such change. Participants, through learning the language of the arts (DCMS 2007b) gained a sense of

empowerment to point out these nuanced forms of exclusion. In creating a cohesive group that can further market the Tate to excluded audiences by means of networks (Hayes and Slater 2002), the course has the potential to present challenges to the structures of both the field of the arts and the specific organisation of Tate Liverpool, which may thereby actually achieve its aim of inclusivity (Fleming 2002). In addition, the course presented an opportunity for participants to feel empowered to address similar change in their own social care organisations. As a result of, and despite, these tensions, the Opening Doors course is evidenced as one that simultaneously justifies and challenges the government's attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy. It appears that individuals involved in the course have been able to develop alliances based on their shared impressions and experiences of the arts and gallery visits (Diani and Bison 2004). By means of these alliances, participants and practitioners appear to have overcome some of the barriers within their individual professional practices for promoting social inclusion (Powell and Gilbert 2007).

Chapter 8

CONCLUSIONS: DESIGN FOR LEARNING

> *"I think when you start to see...this one little boy really sticks in my*
> *memory...he was clearly like the naughtiest child in the class and,*
> *you know, he was always the one who was causing trouble. And he*
> *came to visit us with his dad and there was clearly like quite a lot of*
> *issues there and ... reading between the lines there was a lot of social*
> *problems in that family and it just all seemed very fraught but he just*
> *seemed to enjoy so much the fact that his dad came with him to do*
> *this project that we were doing...*
>
> *...But I just remember this little boy, that he...ended up helping the*
> *other children how to do their activity...I just remember hearing him*
> *saying something like, 'Oh, I can't believe I'm helping you with this,'*
> *'cos it was clearly the really good child in the classroom...the real*
> *academic achiever [who he was helping]. And I just thought that*
> *there was something really worthwhile in that, in that kind of*
> *experience that is out of his everyday, everyday life."*

This statement above from an arts administrator who works in Education and
Outreach highlights how culture may illustrate yet potentially question the
power structures in which we work as a society (Williams 1958; Arnold
1993 [1867-69]). The ways in which such structures are played out,
mediated, and negotiated in art galleries has been the focus of this thesis. The
thesis began by explaining the conflicts that are inherent in gallery and
artistic practice since the nineteenth century when public art galleries grew in

prevalence and thus British cultural policy began to emerge (Appleton 2004). The study has shown that since that time politicians, theorists, academics, arts professionals, and audiences alike have spoken to the ability of art to encapsulate and address the toils of our everyday lives (Williams 1958). The perception of art's ability to do so has elevated its status in society in both material and instrumental ways (Arnold 1993 [1867-69]; Eckersley 2008). Individuals who participated in this research project have explained that creating work or even looking at and discussing artwork in a gallery setting has led people to introspect and reflect, express and share. These acts are believed to be manifest in the ways in which art, as objects representative of time, place, societies and cultures, may provoke people to understand as well as construct meanings about one another, society and ourselves (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b; DCMS 2005a).

The problems with the role of the arts in combating exclusion are evidenced in the quotation above. From a wider social perspective, the boy described is given a glimpse of his own potential. However, it is implied that the boy's potential is only made evident within the setting of the art gallery project. This implication is marked by the fact that upon the project's completion, the boy must return to the reality of his family life and "social problems", his "everyday life." The arts become illustrative of the kinds of boundaries of exclusion and inclusion that exist within society at large (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991). As a result, this statement exemplifies some of the ways in which the thesis has attempted to reveal the difficulties existing for art galleries in addressing aspects of social inclusion, such as confidence building and increasing individuals' self-esteem (DCMS 2000). Further complicating these issues, is the involvement of the market and the value often placed on the production of 'art' over its consumption (Harris 2006).

Such values tend to privilege the perceptions of the individuals who make art and manage its spaces as well as those with the appropriate cultural and even economic capital to appreciate them (Bourdieu 2000). Over time, state policies have intervened in ways dependent upon prevalent political, social and economic situations to encourage publically funded arts organisations to prove they are engaging more directly with the needs of the market, or the wider public (Lee 2005). Chapter 2 showed how gallery and artistic practice have been reflective of and responsive to these changes (Gallagher 1992). In light of the social inclusion agenda that privileges notions of 'aspirations of opportunity' and the targeting of 'socially excluded' individuals for receipt of those opportunities (Blair 2006), the arts could be argued again to be responding to political and social matters in a market-driven society (Bauman 2005). This response is couched in language that emphasises 'access', 'audience development', and 'inclusion' (Kawashima 2006).

From the perspective of this gallery administrator described above, justification of the government's social inclusion agenda for cultural policy is made clear. She clarified that witnessing 'change' in this boy helps her to validate her position in the field. She does so, she explained, with the desire to not only help diminish its exclusive nature, but to also use that dissolution to help others see the potential in themselves. This simple and isolated examination of her statement, as in many studies reviewed in Chapter 2 (Sandell 1998; Belfiore 2004; Kawashima 2006; Scott 2006), focuses solely on her impression rather than that of the boy, the participant. This perspective ignores the context of the social interaction that she has described as occurring. Under such conditions, many studies are left to focus on art gallery projects as evidencing prescribed notions of culture's impassable barriers (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991). That focus is felt to hinder

deeper study of the interpretations and social interactions individuals engage in during such projects, ignoring any real consideration of the negotiation and mediation that can be seen to occur across art's exclusive boundaries.

What has been of direct interest to this thesis is how the interpretations of cultural practice in relation to the visual arts may enact such mediation and negotiation under the guise of social inclusion policy. In fact, the attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy is felt to allow for new questions regarding boundaries of exclusion and inclusion in relation to culture and the arts. The varied definitions of the policy itself (Levitas 2005) actually promote a flexibility of interpretation within different fields, which may go some way toward encouraging the elasticity of the predetermined boundaries the policy ironically implies. The individual quoted above indicates that mediation and negotiation of the boundaries of exclusion and inclusion has taken place, but it is not clear how. The thesis argues that this mediation and negotiation demonstrates that the boundaries of exclusion and inclusion may be elastic. Further, this study argues that such elasticity is dependent upon the types of engagement in which individuals existing across those boundaries share. In order to understand the possibilities of such an interpretation, one must examine the processes by which those intersections may be occurring. In pointing out areas in need of further research on arts and social inclusion, Mason (2004: 65) has explained there has been a need to "focus more on the processes of interaction and the range of possible experiences within a [gallery] setting, rather than on specific outcomes" of policy. In other words, we could focus more on what was actually occurring during the project described above, rather than being left to "read between the lines" of what the practitioner *perceives* to be occurring (Francis 2004). Such an investigation allows for new theorisation of the relationship between

galleries, practitioners and visitors more generally, while additionally recognising the specific experiences visitors as well as practitioners derive from those relationships in galleries. This consideration illuminates the specific boundaries that exist, rather than the distant social and political ones on which much academic literature seems to base its analysis of the matter (Belfiore 2004; Kawashima 2006; Belfiore and Bennett 2007).

It has been argued that individuals involved in this research approach an understanding of social inclusion in terms of their understandings of culture. Those individuals targeted in the Opening Doors course and the Parent and Baby sessions are not necessarily categorised in central government policy as 'socially excluded' (Kawashima 2006), but rather in Arts Council and DCMS policy (Bunting *et al.* 2008; DCMS 2007b) as those who are excluded from engagement in cultural offering. While individuals participating in the Blue Room are categorised as 'socially excluded' (SEU 2001; DH 2001), the Blue Room similarly addresses 'cultural exclusion' (Sandell 1998) in the way that it promotes an audience of adults with learning disabilities to access its exhibitions and creative activities. As a result, social inclusion is here seen to be directly affected by how inclusive those individuals may perceive the cultural field and its organisations to be.

The above perceptions are shaped by two frameworks (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). The first framework is related to 'structure'. Structure is defined here as the effects field and organisational structures may have in shaping the viewpoints and subsequent interactions of practitioners and participants involved in social inclusion projects. It is the tools and resources provided by these organisations that contribute to the ways in which arts projects for inclusion may be delivered. By taking into consideration the specific and situational contexts of the Walker Art Gallery, the Bluecoat, and Tate

Liverpool, the ways those structures may allow for yet also restrain inclusion by means of the Parent and Baby sessions, the Blue Room and the Opening Doors course respectively can be clarified (Chapter 4). In addition, with respect to the Blue Room and the Opening Doors course, the field and organisational structures of social care work also come into play. Here, they are seen to influence individuals' interpretation of culture's role in promoting social inclusion more generally as well as within the arts more specifically.

The second framework is related to 'agency'. Agency is defined here as encompassing the roles individual practitioners and participants may have in dissolving yet perpetuating the boundaries of and barriers to inclusion with respect to the arts. These roles are understood as relating directly to the social interactions participants and practitioners have within the space of the specific projects and gallery settings under investigation (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). It is argued that the relationships and interactions that occur between practitioners and participants additionally shape the forms of inclusion occurring via the specific case study projects under investigation. What is revealed is how these individuals, who seem to meet on two opposite sides of art's exclusive boundary, may actually ally themselves for the furthering of what they perceive to be social inclusion (Wenger 1998; Diani and Bison 2004).

Of critical significance in utilising the terms structure and agency is the ways in which the context of the gallery as an organisation within the cultural field and the individuals engaging within them may shape one another's perceived aims and practices for the promotion of inclusion to cultural offering. This chapter's more detailed comparison of the Blue Room, the Parent and Baby sessions and the Opening Doors course, reveals how these two parties of structure and agency relate to one another to potentially further and hinder

both organisational and individual understandings and resulting acts of inclusion. The ways in which these frameworks are seen to interact within the case studies illustrate how our collective and individual understandings of culture continually remake and reinforce the boundaries of inclusion existing within the arts. This interaction is similarly evidenced in the historical account of social inclusion policy development within the arts presented in Chapters 2 and 4. As a result, the case studies presented within this thesis may be understood as types of action research within this wider historical context (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b). This conclusion is reached because the case studies reveal processes of learning in real time about how we can better understand our own roles in both challenging and perpetuating art's exclusivity. In so doing, we may more strongly realise how our individual practices within the field can actually influence change (Powell and Gilbert 2007).

Perspectives on Meaning: Buying into the Belief System of Policy Design for Inclusion

Changes in cultural policy and artistic and gallery practice since the nineteenth century, but particularly the mid to late twentieth, have intermittently and incrementally moved toward addressing issues of inclusion. However, the imposition of the government's social inclusion policy within that of the cultural has now presented the arts with a 'design' for making cultural offering more inclusive. That design presents new ways in which art galleries can (or should) negotiate the meaning of relationships to and with audiences (Wenger 1998). How gallery practitioners identify with the imposed design of social inclusion policy is largely determined by the ways in which they interpret it through meaning and identification

(Wenger 1998; Bevir and Rhodes 2005). Practitioners and even participants directly engaged in each of the case study projects explained they have faced barriers to 'inclusion'.

The barriers to inclusion staff perceived are related to promoting the engagement of new audiences to the arts and their affiliated galleries. They explained that either the organisation in which they work, the field of the arts, or both presented these barriers. In most cases staff, both senior and non-senior, acknowledged the ideological differences inherent in marrying artistic and aesthetic aims with that of social welfare provision. Despite this acknowledgement, there appears to be a general belief in, or identification with, the positive effects of the arts within society that on the one hand perpetuates the idealisation of culture and its institutions, while on the other hand, also attempts to bring that culture more into the everyday lives of people. The first major DCMS (2000: 9) directive for promoting 'social change' via culture emphasised that cultural activity should be and can be enjoyed by *everyone*. The issue is whether not that opportunity exists.

Both project practitioners and participants see this provision of 'opportunity' in ways that directly match the Labour tradition of 'aspiration of opportunity' for individuals that may be labelled socially excluded (Levitas 2005; Blair 2006). In discussing accessing social services more broadly, former Prime Minister Tony Blair (2006) has said that such services are all developed on the assumption that people may want them and/or know how to get them and such an assumption is not always a safe one. There have been similar findings in relation to the promotion of access and audience development to galleries for new audiences (Audit Commission 1991a; 1991b; Cogman 2006; Kawashima 2006). Practitioners across the three case study projects all shared an understanding that the barriers to individuals' inclusion into

cultural offering was related to those individuals' understanding of the relevance of 'high' art to their everyday lives. The DCMS (2000: 9) reiterates these notions in its policy directives. Practitioners' ability to prove that relevance is directly related to the tools available to them for doing so. These tools include the structural practices of their organisations as well as the artwork and creative processes they uphold. As a result, providing access to and promoting the audience development of galleries can be seen to complement the government's ideology of 'aspiration of opportunity' for socially excluded individuals. Such an ideology serves as a means by which standards of cultural offering can be maintained yet simultaneously appear to be opened up to the appreciation of a 'socially excluded' audience.

Statements made by project participants were similarly in line with the notion that inclusion is fundamentally dependent upon understanding that the 'opportunities' of cultural offering are open and relevant to them. Like the ways in which the social inclusion policy places the onus on individuals to 'improve' their situation (Levitas 2005), many of the obstacles to accessing galleries that participants acknowledged have been centred on the ability they perceive themselves to have in doing so. It is not so much a lack of awareness that the opportunities exist, but the relevance they are perceived to have for the individual participants in question. For example, the social care professionals attending the Tate's Opening Doors course felt the project promoted social inclusion. This fact is based on their perception that the module addressed their own personal hesitations in discussing art in the exhibition spaces. Some of the participants had previously been to the Tate, so accessing the space had not been a barrier as such, but it was the use they felt they were able to make of the space via the delivery of the course that was. They felt that the ways in which the course 'included' them in turn

empowered them to bring their service users to the gallery. As a result, the Tate was seen to be relevant to the everyday working lives of those participants as it not only addressed their own personal and professional development but also the access to and inclusion in mainstream leisure activities for their service users (DCMS 2000; DH 2001; DCMS 2007b).

The Effects of Structure: Promoting and Limiting Inclusion

Organisational structures and practices go some way to informing the manners in which exclusion and/or inclusion may be addressed (Bourdieu 2000). As practitioners and participants understand social inclusion within a cultural context to be related to the perceived opportunities to and relevance of cultural offering to the everyday lives of people, it has been necessary to gain a better understanding of the organisational contexts in which specific social inclusion projects take place (O'Reilly 2005). Chapter 4 illustrated the ways in which the Liverpool arts scene has engaged with the public since the founding of the Walker Art Gallery in the nineteenth century. This examination showed how local arts practitioners and organisations have often taken the initiative to promote the arts for addressing social and economic aims despite a lack of interest for doing so in the local political arena. It also demonstrated the ways in which the particular organisations in the case study projects have struggled with that engagement. This struggle has largely been based on the ways in which ideas of culture are disseminated and related to not only the public, but the field of the arts as well (Willett 2007 [1967]; Fleming 2002).

As organisations that must engage audiences with the objects they contain, the Tate, the Walker and the Bluecoat have used certain resources for

promoting the inclusion of new audiences to their spaces. These resources are directly related to both individuals' beliefs in the relevance of art to the everyday lives of people as well as the organisations' need to be accountable to the public via state cultural policy and, not insignificantly, the field of the arts (Belfiore 2004; Scott 2006). We can recall Willett's (2007 [1967]: 86-87) description, originally quoted in Chapter 4, of the difficulties that result from such a marriage:

> "The success of a gallery...is judged increasingly by the impression it makes in the wider field of art scholarship, international exhibitions and so forth—a field to which more and more attention is being paid by government, universities and the Press—rather than by any evidence of the satisfaction which it gives to the citizens."

Willett's statement in the 1960s is still relevant today. Fleming (2002) has made contemporary notice of a similar notion with regards to the structures in which galleries often work. As a result, the government's attention on art galleries as a means to promote social inclusion does not necessarily fit easily with the structures in which galleries work to uphold high cultural ideals (Fleming 2002).

The Bluecoat, the Tate, and the Walker have all taken a marketing approach that appears to privilege the needs of the market, adults with learning disabilities, social care professionals and families with young children under the age of four, over the product on offer (Lee 2005). Such methods adhere to cultural policy, specifically in the emphasis on improving access as a means to encourage audience development, in turn as a foundation for addressing issues of social inclusion (Audit Commission 1991a; 1991b; Sandell 1998; Kawashima 2006). Targeting specific audiences in particular

ways is also seen to maintain a sense of marginalisation for those audiences within specific galleries as well as within the field of the arts, which in turn upholds the standards of excellence to which the field of the arts adheres. At the same time, promoting the access and audience development of new visitors encourages arts practitioners to "stay in the field" and new visitors to continue visiting. The changes targeted marketing to 'excluded' audiences appears to encourage in developing audiences seem to foster new perceptions of inclusion within the respective art galleries for both practitioners and participants. This perception is the level of "citizen satisfaction" to which Willett (2007 [1967]: 86-87) was referring and is argued here to be based on the social interactions that occur as a result of the design social inclusion policy makes for promoting targeted marketing.

In addressing exclusion from cultural offering the Tate, the Bluecoat, and the Walker have attempted to promote cultural inclusion (Sandell 1998). The different ways in which the chosen case study projects engage their target audiences show how project design, as affected by organisational and field structures presents both resources and obstacles for inclusion (Wenger 1998). Comparing the approaches taken within each organisation for developing the specific project that it has for social inclusion, reveals the critical importance that structural context has for developing an understanding of project delivery and outcomes. All of the case studies show that while barriers of access and inclusion to the arts have been lessened for each of the targeted audiences, it has been on the terms and conditions of the organisations that help shape the projects. This idea is illustrated, for instance, in the ways that the Parent and Baby sessions create a designated space for families within the Walker, in some ways marginalising the inclusion that the project attempts to promote. The level of 'opportunity' in the arts provided for all

the groups studied here is decided upon by both the allowances and limitations the structure of the organisation in question will or can permit. The organisations provide a set of methods, tools, strategies and resources that contribute to the processes through which these projects are delivered. Each organisation cannot be expected to deliver the same types of aims for socially inclusive practices because their starting points for embarking on such aims, described in Chapter 4, are not the same. In fact, the historical developments and changing cultures of these organisations in Liverpool have illustrated how a process of learning is undergone through the practice occurring in them, thereby promoting new forms of structural negotiation (Chapter 4). However, while the organisations may provide the dimensions for the practices of social inclusion under investigation here, they are also very much shaped by the engagement occurring between the individuals charged with delivering them and those who take-part (Wenger 1998). It is in the roles and relationships of those individuals where we may better understand the processes of learning and potential change that takes place for inclusive practices.

Agency: The Roles and Interactions of Individuals in Promoting Inclusion

The power struggles and the tensions regarding excellence and inclusion within the arts are further brought to light through the practices of the individuals within the case study projects. Because the processes involved in these projects are in fact everyday occurrences engaged in by different people (arts administrators, artists, social care professionals, parents, and service users) within the structural conditions of the arts organisation where the project is situated, a negotiation of those conflicts and tensions inevitably

ensues (Wenger 1998). Wenger (1998) has explained that it is by means of social participation where learning occurs. Learning is related to our changing abilities to "participate, belong, [and] negotiate meaning" (Wenger 1998: 226). The different forms of participation, belonging, and meaning negotiation that are seen to develop amongst individuals within the case study projects further illustrate the tensions regarding excellence and inclusion apparent in the arts, which individual practitioners and participants are negotiating in order to define their own design of inclusion in practice. The ways in which this negotiation and mediation takes place demonstrates that individuals do help shape the circumstances of inclusion these particular projects in question permit.

Each case study presented in this thesis has demonstrated the ways in which practitioners and in some cases participants themselves have mediated the barriers presented for, and facilitated the engagement of (other) participants, in order that new audiences may access the arts. In each project, this mediation and facilitation can be seen to have initially taken place in the form of targeted marketing (Lee 2005). As one of the tools available within the specific organisational structures, targeted marketing attempts to 'market' the arts as a place where everyone can 'belong'. This boundary of belonging and un-belonging is in part communicated through the forms and structures of arts organisations, such as in the physical structures of gallery buildings and the design of exhibition displays (Hooper-Greenhill 1988). This demarcation is further acknowledged through the necessary ways in which practitioners and even participants must market the specific galleries to 'excluded' individuals by means of the social inclusion projects in question. Through communication and social interaction, practitioners and participants

convey exclusive and inclusive messages about galleries (Hooper-Greenhill 2000b).

In discussing issues of social inclusion with respect to the arts, practitioners expressed empathy for the reasons why individuals may feel excluded. Practitioners' identification with the participants' sense of 'un-belonging' to the arts enhanced their abilities to, and roles in, negotiating participants' possible inclusion by means of the specific case study projects (Wenger 1998). For practitioners engaging in the Parent and Baby Sessions, for example, the ability to understand the needs of the target audience of families with young children was perceived to be vital. The Arts Council's *Evaluation Toolkit* for families (Cogman, 2006) even suggests this notion in the way that it encourages arts professionals to identify with the needs of families. In some cases, this identification promoted a sense of alignment between practitioners and participants in engaging in promoting the inclusion of other audiences outside the immediate circle of the specific groups involved (Diani and Bison 2004). For parents and carers in the Parent and Baby sessions, the fact that the sessions were delivered in a flexible manner led to the impression that arts administrators understood the nature of families with young children. For staff and instructors working within the Opening Doors course, understanding the conditions and approaches taken within social care organisations was vital to developing a course not only tailored to the participants professional development needs, but also to their personal development for accessing modern art. In the specific cases of the Opening Doors course and the Blue Room, these approaches allowed practitioners to serve as facilitators of experiences that enhanced group cohesion, mutual negotiation and alignment of both practitioners and participants in promoting the role of the arts in the social care sector. For

both of these projects, a shared language between practitioners and participants was seen to develop. This shared language promoted some level of joint negotiation of the structural and practical constraints that at times threatened the aims of the Blue Room and the Opening Doors course to promote inclusion.

Shared alignment and identification between practitioners and participants was acknowledged by the participants themselves as being critical to their continued engagement in each project and thus the audience development of the affiliated organisations. The way in which practitioners were perceived to empathise with participants helped develop trust and mutuality, furthering the gap these participants had initially perceived existed between their professions or personal situations and that of the arts. This notion not only relates to addressing the needs of families, but also matters of inclusion with respect to the social care sector. For instance, in the Opening Doors course and in the Blue Room project, being able to coordinate the inclusion aims facing both the arts and the social care sector created bridges between those two fields of practice, making "creative use of [the] respective repertoires" in ways that furthered individuals' engagement and the group cohesion that resulted in the two projects' enterprises to promote inclusion (Wenger 1998: 227). In each case study, the effects of these personalised approaches helped establish networks via which participants themselves began to mediate across the boundary of exclusion they had initially perceived to exist as an obstacle. The evolution of these networks further promotes the Walker, the Tate, and the Bluecoat as inclusive organisations and thus fosters the further development of new audiences.

The ability to "speak the language" of the partners and individual participants involved and the characteristics of flexible project delivery with

and empathy for individual participants matches recent policy and marketing discussions regarding the promotion of access and inclusion to the arts (O'Sullivan 1997; Lee 2005; Hayes and Slater 2006; DCMS 2007b). This link between the personalised approaches with what is discussed in policy and marketing literature (see also Leadbeater 2005) demonstrates a growing significance of the value placed on the role of individuals as intermediaries for participation in cultural offering. Placing greater significance on the role of individuals in perpetuating cultural ideals while breaking down the barriers to them additionally shows that organisations themselves are not solely responsible for the shaping of potentially inclusive practices. The communication of both the organisation, in the form of its buildings and activities, *and* the individuals working within them (participants and professionals) are seen to be critical in developing any practice of exclusion or inclusion within the arts.

Negotiating Structure and Agency: A Process of Learning for Inclusion
The case studies presented in Chapters 5, 6, and 7 demonstrated how different forms of 'interpretive communities' developed amidst the aims of the projects to promote social inclusion (Hooper-Greenhill 2000a). By seeing these projects as forms of 'interpretive communities' in which individual participants and practitioners develop personally and socially based meanings for their practices within galleries, the possibility for manoeuvring boundaries of exclusion and inclusion becomes clear. While these art projects are in some ways limited by the art word and political structures in which they exist (Stallabrass 2004), those structures are mediated via the interpretation and ensuing actions the case study projects evidence (Eagleton 1994; Bevir and Rhodes 2005). The effects of individuals' varied

engagement in these actions demonstrate that practices themselves are not static, but change over time (Wenger 1998). As a result, the case studies make evident that cultural ideologies are also not static, but are informed by the ways in which we negotiate and maintain them.

The thesis has considered context as well as individual interpretations of inclusion and the ways in which practices are conducted for addressing those interpretations via an examination of social interaction. The case studies show that boundaries of exclusion and inclusion are not clear-cut. They vary as the personal impressions and experiences of individuals vary and particularly when those are in relation to the impressions and experiences of others (Wenger 1998). In studying those forms of social interaction, we may see the processes of learning that result. In the Blue Room, we see that projects designed for inclusion may serve as social spaces in which resistance to structural powers can occur (Powell and Gilbert 2007). Forms of exclusion that may remain for groups may still potentially be addressed as long as the individuals involved continue to engage with and reflect on their practice *with one another* (Wenger 1998). The learning gained from the Parent and Baby sessions is based on ascertaining whether or not the value of inclusion should be placed on how the target audience perceives their own needs of inclusion as being met or if the value should be placed on the staff's perceptions of that audience's need for inclusion. While the Opening Doors study evidences that "utopian visions" of inclusion may not be possible in the current structure in which the project is situated (Allan 2005: 31), the course does show that highlighting difference may incite debate about the social boundaries that exist. This debate allows us further room to engage in addressing those boundaries. In summary, by examining context, interpretation and interaction as expressed through project delivery,

practitioners, organisations and participants may be able to better understand that participation can also be seen as a form of learning about how we ourselves influence the domination or dissolution of certain cultural ideologies within our own practices (Wenger 1998).

Reflecting on the Role of Research in Promoting Learning in Practice

The ways in which the methodological approach was carried out during this research process is felt to have fostered the kind of reflection on learning this thesis aims to promote. During this process, each case study organisation asked for an evaluation report of the projects observed. This development in no way implies that the thesis was an evaluation of the case study projects, but that it did offer evaluative value to those projects. The agreement to evaluate the case study projects was reached to acknowledge and show appreciation to practitioners and participants for not only giving their time in the interview process, but in allowing me to join in their activities as well. Evaluation reports were written for the Parent and Baby sessions at the Walker Art Gallery and the Opening Doors course at the Tate at the completion of the participant observation period. As a researcher with experience in developing gallery-based projects, I would have developed informed critical perspectives on these projects' delivery. The evaluation reports provided me an outlet to share these perspectives outside that of the thesis project. As a result, practitioners and participants were given direct access to some of the tentative findings of the research at an earlier stage than the thesis initially allowed. This opportunity also demonstrated the ways in which the involvement of an outside researcher observing sessions and interviewing individuals engaged could contribute to the understanding and learning of those involved in the case studies.

274

In addition, though the Blue Room practitioners and participants requested my involvement in conducting a long-term evaluation of the project at the completion of the thesis, this became impossible due to time constraints. In order to provide an alternative means of assisting the group in evaluating their practice, I approached the situation by assisting the service users to develop a user-led evaluation methodology. By having participants inform and own their own evaluation, the process has allowed practitioners the opportunity to take greater consideration of the input of service users/participants in the delivery of the project as a whole. The approach for evaluation suggested has been accepted and is currently being implemented. This approach was certainly influenced by the findings of that case study presented in Chapter 5, particularly those surrounding the miscommunication between and misunderstandings among the practitioners (artists and staff) and service users. This engagement between researcher and project practitioners and participants demonstrates the ways in which thesis study can serve to promote action research within projects. By service users developing and delivering the evaluation of the project, individuals involved are given a more direct means of addressing any further misunderstanding that may result, thus furthering the potential for that project to promote a more broader sense of inclusion in the arts for those participants.

Areas for Further Research

As with any research project, the findings that are obtained often go beyond the initial scope of its aims and objectives and this project is no different. This section will detail areas that would further augment the research findings presented here as well as provide new ground for understanding the development of a socially inclusive policy within the arts sector as a whole.

<u>Participants' Viewpoints</u>

The research presented here has demonstrated that the specificity of audiences' viewpoints of social inclusion projects is under researched in academia (Prior 2003). This research goes some ways into considering participants' viewpoints of and involvement in the process of project development and delivery. Findings from this research show that individuals who are classed as 'groups' with respect to the arts, such as adults with learning disabilities, cannot be presumed to have a consensual desire to be labelled as such in the form of their categorisation as artists. While literature examining these issues discussed the possible empowerment of disabled adults in their unity as such within the arts (Delin 2002; Allan 2005), research on the Blue Room project demonstrated that this might not consistently be the case. Such issues should be taken under consideration in future research, giving more thought to gathering the viewpoints of participants as individuals, rather than 'types'. Such research would further augment the academic and practical understanding of developing socially inclusive arts projects.

Further, with respect to the participants in the Opening Doors course, in particular the social care workers, background research conducted demonstrated that there is little study conducted on social care professionals' impressions of art-related forms of therapy (Staricoff *et al.* 2003; Starricoff 2004). Most studies focus on the relationship of therapy to the field of the arts and how that field may benefit from that in developing new audiences. In addition, it examines the engagement of service users with art in furthering their therapeutic progress. Research conducted on the Opening Doors course revealed that the care professionals themselves had a number of barriers to overcome in even beginning to address discussing works of art,

even more encouraging their service users to do so. Giving more attention to the relationship or the barriers that care professionals may perceive as existing in the arts might not only improve provision of art therapy in the social care sector, but it might also promote arts organisations to develop projects that are more catered to the needs of that sector, particularly as the care professionals are the gatekeepers to service users.

Finally, in addressing the family audiences of the Parent and Baby sessions, it was discovered that as an audience 'type' in today's society, the family is much more complex than the traditional viewpoints would indicate (Sterry and Beaumont 2006). Depending on the individual situation of a family, one or all individuals may be classed as 'socially excluded', which would in turn be seen to affect that family unit. Further unpicking the nuances of family experiences and needs in accessing gallery activity may be needed. It is felt that the research conducted on the Parent and Baby sessions only touches on the issues involved in an organisation interpreting 'exclusion' in terms of audience viewpoints. The limitations of that study revolve around the fact that the research was focused on the impressions of inclusion and the delivery of the project, rather than the nuanced experiences of the family in its broader context. More research on these issues could lead to better understandings of their needs in accessing the arts as well as augment programming for such audiences.

The Role of Practitioners as 'Cultural Intermediaries'

Interviews conducted beyond the scope of the case study projects revealed that individual art practitioners (artists and administrators), who work directly in Education or with 'socially excluded' groups and/or atypical art audiences, exist in a 'blurred zone' of social categories. This social position

277

shows that they are at once included within the elitist world of the arts via their previous education and/or current employment, yet also in some ways excluded from it. Many of these individuals who shared personal stories with respect to how they came to work in the arts expressed notions that were similar to those conveyed in Chapter 1. In short, these individuals while having the cultural capital to work within the field of the arts may have either struggled to get to that point or feel that they do not necessarily 'fit-in' with others working in the field. At the same time, however, because of these impressions and in some ways despite them, these individuals have a strong personal desire to encourage others who may not overtly appear to 'belong' in the field of the arts, to access cultural offering. The belief is that while they may acknowledge the arts are elitist, because these individuals feel the arts have made a personal difference in their own lives they wish to help others to disregard such a divisive boundary. They seek to foster opportunities for new audiences to access the arts and determine whether or not it is a field in which they are also interested. It is felt that because of these individuals'' personal viewpoints and experiences, they are uniquely suited to "speak the language" of various 'types' of people who perceive barriers to the arts. These impressions were in part responsible for practitioners' ability to identify with participants feelings of exclusion from the arts, which this thesis found to be critical in the forms of social interaction that occurred within the case study projects.

These practitioners' placement in this 'blurred zone' uniquely situates them as key marketers or cultural intermediaries for the arts. Findings from DCMS reports (20007b) as well as the case studies presented in this thesis mentioned the ways in which arts practitioners are often 'facilitating' or 'mediating' the boundaries of the arts for individuals who may initially

perceive they are excluded from the field. An article based on these findings due for publication next year (Durrer and Miles 2009) investigates the role of these practitioners in marketing arts projects for social inclusion alongside the notions of 'cultural intermediaries described by Bourdieu (2000), Featherstone (1991), and Nixon and du Guy (2002). Within the recent context of the government's agenda for social inclusion by way of the arts, little, if not no effort has been made to understand the situated nature of the role of cultural intermediaries.

Structural Constraints as Upheld by Individual Staff 'Types'

The sample of interviewees accessed for this research included different levels of staff from the three organisations involved in the case studies. Directors and Education, Outreach, or Learning staff were all interviewed. The approach was taken in order to gain an understanding of how social inclusion is interpreted across the organisation. More research could be done, however, on comparing the statements on inclusion made by senior level staff with that of non-senior. Such a comparison would detail the forms of alignment shared (or not) by practitioners within given institutions for furthering institutional aims of inclusion. It would further illuminate whether or not organisations themselves were taking cohesive approaches in developing inclusive practices and the ways in which those approaches may be part of organisational strategies. Finally, such investigation would highlight circumstances of buy-in organisations have to cultural policy agendas and whether or not different practices for inclusion within various organisations may serve as examples of best practice. Findings might encourage organisations to look more closely at holistic approaches to the circumstances of inclusion to cultural offering they provide.

Interdisciplinary Research Methods

It is felt that the interdisciplinary research methods undertaken for this study
have added to a better contextualisation of the broader concerns of social
inclusion and the arts with work that is carried out on the ground.
Approaching the topic with not only a historical understanding of artistic and
gallery practice as well as an understanding of that practice on-the-ground
but also with knowledge and experience of social scientific research
techniques has provided a strong means for examining the processes
involved in gallery based and creative arts projects. Bringing these two fields
of art history and sociology together has broadened the scope from which to
understand how individuals and organisations approach policy in practice,
freeing the research from presumptions that policy simply dictates practice
(Appleton 2004).

Further examining the language of art historical discourse and gallery
practice as expressed by individuals working within those structures reveals
that there are incredibly strong links between the language of 'opportunity'
they share with respect to accessing the arts to that of Labour's terminology
of social inclusion as increasing 'aspiration for opportunity' (Blair 2006).
The links between these two discourses could reveal that we are in the midst
of a new or developing amalgamation of traditions of thought as evidenced
in the theoretical framework of culture employed in this thesis (Arnold 1993
[1867-69]; Williams 1958; Bevir and Rhodes 2005). At the same time,
however, rather than examining these considerations from solely a removed
sociological perspective, but augmenting this perspective with considerations
of practice, we may better understand the ways in which policy is
implemented in practice as well as the reasons for the methods taken.
Bringing academics with differing perspectives together to consider these

issues in a more coordinated way may provoke greater debate centred on perceived academic issues of social control versus the agency that individuals may have in manipulating or working around those issues of social control. It is suggested that more links between the academic and practical worlds need to be made, such as via interdisciplinary conferences where practitioners and academics come together to share impressions of policy and practice. Further, it is viewed as the responsibility of academic institutions to make research accessible in language and availability to practitioners. In addition, consulting directly with practitioners on findings reached in research would not only promote its accessibility and visibility, but would also be more informed of practice on the ground.

Design for Learning

The government's attachment of the social inclusion agenda to cultural policy marries both the presentation of standards of excellence to the inclusion of people within those. Arts organisations are similarly struggling with the maintenance of both ideals. This struggle is evidenced in the ways in which the seemingly opposed interpretations of culture described by Arnold (1993 [1867-69]) and Williams (1958) come together in both policy and practice. Cultural policy for social inclusion may express patterns or set procedures for addressing inclusion within the cultural realm, but those patterns and procedures do not "produce the practice as it unfolds" (Wenger 1998: 229). An examination of the terminology of the social inclusion policy within the arts promotes further potential for unpicking the very nature of exclusive practices and what it might mean to dissolve them. The tensions inherent in our collective interpretations of culture that the case study projects make more visible are the conceptual plans that the field of the arts

and cultural policy has developed (Wenger 1998). Yet, it is in the delivery of
the social inclusion projects themselves where the mediation of the tensions
between organisational forms of structure and individual forms of agency
occurs. As a result, tensions of exclusion and inclusion that at first seem so
opposed may actually be seen to complement and inform one another in
practice (Wenger 1998).

The fact remains that inclusion and exclusion as well as culture are
interpreted in varying ways. It is the various interpretations that provides the
freedom in which they may engage with one another as well as the freedom
for which a dialogue of opposites may occur, promoting creative tension
(Miles 2005: 895). In calling for galleries to engage the 'excluded', as
defined by the government's social and cultural policy, the state has only
further encouraged galleries to demarcate the social and cultural boundaries
of belonging they are often argued to illustrate (Bourdieu and Darbel 1991;
Hooper-Greenhill 1988). However, perhaps engagement with the social
inclusion policy may be producing additional alternative practices that create
questions about that policy and simultaneously show how its incoherence
actually produces functionality. The various ways in which the policy may
be defined (Levitas 2005; O'Reilly 2005) allows for practitioners working
within specific arts organisations to respond to that policy with the specific
contexts of their organisations and audiences in mind. While slow in
progress, the subsequent social inclusion projects that are developed create a
focus for identification amongst practitioners and participants as well as
promote new avenues for shared ownership of meaning about the relevance
of culture to one's everyday life (Wenger 1998). The resulting coordinated
efforts are not without their contradictions and difficulties, much needs to be
learned about how practitioners and audiences may both hinder and promote

inclusion within the cultural field. This learning is what will effect change, more than the policy itself (Wenger 1998; Powell and Gilbert 2007). Being able to demonstrate the underlying process of learning is how we can better influence policy to give us the freedom to do so. An in-depth understanding of the learning processes underpinning inclusive policy in the arts may help to influence a situation in which change in practice becomes the primary goal rather than implementation of the policy itself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACE (2002) *Beyond Boundaries: The Arts After the Events of 2001*, London: Arts Council of England.

ACE (2003) *Ambitions for the Arts, 2003-2006*. London: Arts Council of England.

ACE (2006) Arts Council Funding website.
Available at: www.artscouncil.org.uk/funding/gfta2006.php
[Accessed 3 September 2007]

ACE (2007) Arts Debate Online.
Availabe at: www.artsdebate.co.uk
[Accessed 6 September 2007]

ACE (2008) Taking Part in the Arts website.
Available at: www.takingpartinthearts.com
[Accessed 3 March 2008]

ACGB (1977) *Annual Report of 1976/77*, London: Arts Council of Great Britain.

ACGB (1984) *Glory of the Garden*, London: Arts Council of Great Britain.

ACGB (1985) *A Great British Success Story*. London: Arts Council of Great Britain.

ACGB (1989) *An Urban Renaissance: 16 Case Studies Showing the Role of Arts in Regeneration*, London: Arts Council of Great Britain.

Adams, R. (1999) 'Forums, not temples', *American Behavioural Scientist* 42 (6): 968-976.

Adorno, T. and Horkheimer, M. (1944) *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, New York: S. Fischer Verlag.

Allan, J. (2005) 'Encounters with exclusion through disability arts', *Journal of Research in Social Education Needs* 5 (1): 31-36.

Allen, F. (1995) 'Gallery education', in M. Dickson, (ed.) *Art with People*, London: AN Publications, 1995: 42-50.

Ames, V. (1944) 'Art as expression', *Ethics* 54 (4): 283-289.

Anderson, R. (2005) 'To thrive or survive? The state and status of research in museums', *Museum Management and Curatorship* 20: 297-311.

Andrews, G. (1997) 'The inclusive society', *New Times* 21 June: 6-7.

ANONa (1873) *Daily Courier* 6 August.

ANONb (1874) 'Walker Art Gallery', *Liberal Review* 26 September.

ANONc (2003) 'History lessons for future Capital of Culture', *The Guardian* 24 November.

Appleton, J. (2001) 'Museums for 'the people'?', *Conversations in Print*, London: Institute of Ideas.

Appleton, J. (2004) 'Art for inclusion's sake': cultural diversity policy substitutes political goals for artistic standards. *Spiked Essays*, 7 April, no pagination.
Available at: www.spiked-online.com
[Accessed 7 July 2006]

Arnold, M. (1901) *Culture and Anarchy: An Essay in Political and Social Criticism*, London: Smith and Elder.

Arnold, M. (1901) *The Letters of Matthew Arnold 1848-1888* (2nd ed.), Collected and arranged by G. Russell, 2 volumes, London: Macmillan 1901 (1st edn., 1895).

Arnold, M. (1993 [1867-69]) *Culture and Anarchy and Other Writings*, S. Collini (ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arskey, H. and Knight, P. (1999) *Interviewing for Social Scientists: An Introductory Resource with Examples*, London: Sage Publications.

Audit Commission (1991a) *Local Authorities, Entertainment and the Arts*, Local Government Report No. 2, London: HMSO.

Audit Commission (1991b) *The Road to Wigan Pier: Managing Local Authority Museums and Art Galleries*, Local Government Report No. 3, London: HMSO.

Bailey, C. (1996) *A Guide to Field Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Barry, A. (1998) 'On interactivity: consumers, citizens, and culture', S. Macdonald, (ed.) *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture,* London and New York: Routledge, 1998: 98-117.

Barton, D, and Tusting, K. (eds.) (2005) *Beyond Communities of Practice: Lanuage Power and Social Context,* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bates, P. (2002) *Working for Inclusion,* London: Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health.

Bates, P. and Davis, F. (2004) 'Social capital, social inclusion and services for people with learning disabilities', *Disability and Society* 19 (3): 195-207.

Bauman, Z. (2005) *Work, Consumerism and the New Poor,* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

BC (2007) Bluecoat website.
Available at: www.thebluecoat.org.uk
[Accessed 11 November 2007]

BC Archives (1981) *Not Just a Pretty Façade*, Programme Brochure, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (1982) *Short Courses in Contemporary Dance with Spiral Dance Company at the Bluecoat,* Programme Brochure, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (1983) *Bluecoat Events, Summer 1983,* Programme Brochure, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (1999a) *Bluecoat Brochure, January – March 1999,* Programme Brochure, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (1999b) *Bluecoat Brochure, October – December 1999,* Programme Brochure, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (2000) *Bluecoat Brochure, April – June 2000.* Programme Brochure, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (2001) *'Table Talk' File,* Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (2002) *'Wild! Project' File,* Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (2003) *Connect Seminar Report*, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (2005) *Bluecoat Brochure, May – June 2005*, Programme Brochure, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

BC Archives (2006) *'The Blue Room' Files*, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

Beart, S., Hawkins, D., Kroese, B., Smithson, P., and Tolosa, I. (2001) 'Barriers to accessing leisure opportunities for people with learning difficulties', *British Journal of Learning Disabilities* 29: 13-138.

Becker, H. (1982) *Art Worlds*, Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press.

Beckett, A. (1987) 'How the Tate came to Merseyside: the exhibitions planned for the North's new museum of modern art', *The Times* July 19.

Belchem, J. (2007) 'Celebrating Liverpool', in J.Belchem, (ed.) *Liverpool 800*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007: 9 – 58.

Belfiore, E. (2002) 'Art as a means of alleviating social exclusion: does it really work?', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 8 (1): 91-106.

Belfiore, E. (2003) 'Economic impact: Inconclusive evidence', *Arts Professional* 43: 9-10.

Belfiore, E. (2004) 'Auditing culture: the subsidised cultural sector in the new public management', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10 (2): 183-202.

Belfiore, E. and Bennett, O. (2007) 'Rethinking the social impacts of the arts', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13 (2): 135-151.

Bell, B. (2000) 'Beyond the death of the author: Matthew Arnold's two audiences, 1888-1930', *Book History* 3: 155-165.

Belton, R. (2005) *Evaluation of the Wild! Project*. Liverpool: Liverpool Biennial.

Bennett, O. (2005) 'Beyond machinery: the cultural policies of Matthew Arnold', *History of Political Economy* 37 (3): 455-482.

Bennett, T. (1988) 'Museums and 'the people'', in R. Lumley, (ed.) *The Museum Time-Machine: Putting Cultures on Display*, London and New York: Routledge, 1988: 63-85.

Bennett, T. (1998a) 'Speaking to the eyes: museums, legibility and the social order', in S. Macdonald, (ed.) *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998: 25-35.

Bennett, T. (1998b) *Culture: A Reformer's Science*, London: Sage.

Bennett, T. (2000) 'Acting on the social: art, culture, and government', *American Behavioural Scientist* 43 (9): 1412-1428.

Berger J. (1977) *Ways of Seeing*, London: Penguin.

Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. (2003) *Interpreting British Governance*, London: Routledge.

Bevir, M. with Rhodes, R. (2005) 'Interpretation and its others', *Australian Journal of Political Science* 40: 169-187.
Available at: University of California Postprints, pp. 1-42.
http://repositories.cdlib.org/postprints/1109
[Accessed 27 February 2006]

Bierstedt, R. (1938) 'The meanings of culture', *Philosophy of Science* 5 (2): 204-216.

Biggs, B. (2007a) 'Welcome to the pleasure dome: art in Liverpool 1988-1999', in C. Grunenberg and R. Knifton, (eds) *Centre of the Creative Universe: Liverpool and the Avant-Garde*, Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 2007: 184-202.

Biggs, B. (2007b) 'Introduction: "art in a city is not a static affair"', in Willett, J. (Biggs, B. ed.) Art in a City, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007: vii – xiv.

Blair, T. (1998) *The Third Way*, London: Fabian Society.

Blair, T. (2006) *Our Nation's Future—Social Exclusion*, speech, York, 5 September.
Available at: http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/Page10037.asp
[Accessed 1 June 2008]

Blau, P., and Blau, J., Quets, G., and Tada,T. (1986) 'Social inequality and art institutions', *Sociological Forum* 1 (4): 561-585.

Boddy, S. (2003) *Out of Sight, Out of Mind: A Report on the Limited Public Profile of Learning Disability Partnership Boards.* London: MENCAP.

Boorsma, M. (2006) 'A strategic logic for arts marketing', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 12 (1): 73-92.

Boseley, S. and Dunn, A. (1985) 'Tate goes north to draw Mersey tourists/new art gallery for Liverpool', *The Guardian* March 9.

Bourdieu, P. (1980) *The Logic of Practice,* Nice, R. (trans.) Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1987) 'What makes a social class? on the theoretical and practical existence of groups', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 32: 1-18.

Bourdieu, P. (1997) 'Forms of capital', in A. Halsey, H. Lauder, P. Brown and A. Wells (eds) *Education, Culture, Economy, Society,* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1997: 46-58.

Bourdieu, P. (2000) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste,* R. Nice, (trans.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Darbel, A. (1991) *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and their Public.* C. Beattie and N. Merriman, (trans.) Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourriaud, N. (2002a) *Relational Aesthetics.* S. Pleasance and F. Woods, (trans.) Paris: Presses du Reel.

Bourriaud, N. (2002b) *Postproduction, Culture as Screenplay: How Art Reprograms The World,* New York: Lukas & Sternberg.

Bowen, P. (1999) *A Gallery to Play to: The Story of The Mersey Poets,* Devon: Stride Publications.

Braden, S. (1978) *Artists and People,* London: Routledge.

Brown, L. and Gilligan, C. (1992) *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Pyschology and Girls' Development,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bunting, C., Chan, T., Goldthorpe, J., Keaney, E., and Oskala, A. (2008) *From Indifference to Enthusiasm: Patterns of Arts Attendance in England*, London: Arts Council England.

Burchardt, T., Le Grand, J., and Piachaud, D. (1999) 'Social exclusion in Britain 1991–1995', *Social Policy and Administration* 33 (3): 227–244.

Butterfoss, F. (2006) 'Process evaluation for community participation', *Annual Review of Public Health* 27: 323-340

Byrne, D. (1999) *Social Exclusion*, Buckingham and Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Calhoun, C. (1993) 'Habitus, field, and capital: the question of historical specificity', in C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma and M. Postone, (eds) *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993: 61-88.

Cameron, D. (1971) 'Museums, temple or forum', *Curator* 14 (1): 11-24.

Carmichael, S. (1996) 'Making creative connections — our architectural townscape and its re-use potential for museums and the arts', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996: 23-35.

Caust, J. (2003) 'Putting the 'art' back into arts policy making: how arts policy has been captured by the economists and the marketers', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 9 (1): 51 – 63.

CERU and ICPPU (2007) *Evaluation of the Cultural Pathfinder Programme*, London: DCMS.
Available at: www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/71B27A21-4E7A-49F2-A8BC-FC88DA6EBF2D/0/CulturalPathfinder_160707_full.pdf
[Accessed 27 September 2007]

de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*, S. Rendall, (trans.) Berkeley, Ca. and London: University of California Press.

Charnock, V. and D'Silva, S. (2003) *Opening Doors: A New Approach to Person-Centred Working in the Gallery*, Liverpool: Tate Liverpool.

Cogman, L. (2006) *Family Friendly Toolkit*, London: Arts Council England.

Cohen, A. (1989) *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge.

Cole, H. (1884) *Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry Cole, K.C.B., Accounted for in His Deeds, Speeches and Writings*, London: George Bell and Sons.

Collini, S. (1994) *Matthew Arnold: A Critical Portrait*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cork, R. (1979) *The Social Role of Art*, London and Bedford: The Gordon Fraser Gallery, Ltd.

Corrigan, P. (1975) 'Community work and political struggle: what are the possibilities of working on the contradictions?', in P. Leonard, (ed.) *The Sociology of Community Action: Sociological Review Monograph 21*, Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent: J.H. Brookes, Ltd, 1975: 57-73.

Coté, J. (1996) 'Sociological perspectives on identity formation: the culture-identity link and identity capital', *Journal of Adolescence* 19: 417-428.

Couch, C. (2003) *City of Change and Challenge: Urban Planning and Regeneration in Liverpool*, Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Cox, A., Lamb, S., and Orbach, K. (2000) *A Shared Experience. A Qualitative Evaluation of Family Activities at Three Tate Sites*, Tate Internal Report, August.

Crabbe, T. (2007) 'Reaching the 'hard to reach': engagement, relationship building and social control in sport based social inclusion work', *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing* 2 (1/2): 27-40.

Craig, M., Burns, T., Fitzpatrick, R., Pinfold, V., and Priebe, S. (2007) 'Social exclusion and mental health', *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 191: 477-483.

Creigh-Tyte, S., and Stiven, G. (2001) 'Why does the government fund the cultural sector?', in S. Selwood, (ed.) *UK Cultural Sector*, London: PSI, 2001: 173-186.

Davies, K. (19999) *Arts and Creative Industries Strategy 2000 – 20002: Creativity, Culture, and Business A Platform for European Capital of Culture*. Liverpool, not published.

Davison, J. (1988) 'Arts: secret report sparks off urban warfare—why a radical plan to help the inner cities is under attack', *The Times* February 14.

DCMS (1998) *The Departmental Spending Review and Response — A New Cultural Framework*, Consultative Document, 14 December 1998, London: DCMS.

DCMS (1999) *Policy Action Team 10 Report*, London: DCMS.
Available at: http://www.neighbourhood.gov.uk/publications.asp?did=320
[Accessed 10 January 2005].

DCMS. (2000) *Centres for Social Change: Museums, Galleries and Archives for All*, London: DCMS.
Available at: www.culture.gov.uk/pdf/social_change_1-11.pdf
[Accessed 10 January 2005].

DCMS (2001) *Building on PAT 10: Progress Report on Social Inclusion*, London: DCMS.
Available at: www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/E57F69D8-96FB-4C09-B2DF-27D9063A59E4/0/socialinclusion.pdf
[Accessed 21 May 2007]

DCMS (2004) *Culture at the Heart of Regeneration*, London DCMS
Available at: www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/AD9F039E-4C09-42B6-98F2-7F88096A11E2/0/DCMSCulture.pdf
[Accessed 21 May 2007]

DCMS (2005a) *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life: The Value of Museums*, London: DCMS. (January)
Available at: www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/31419198-35C1-4A00-8C12-CB0572EC9B57/0/UnderstandingtheFuture.pdf
[Accessed 24 January 2006]

DCMS (2005b) *Understanding the Future: Museums and 21st Century Life – A Summary of Responses*, London: DCMS. (November)
Available at: www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/03DF53F9-752F-403A-99B2-C5635D052C95/0/understanding_the_future_responses.pdf
[Accessed 7 December 2006]

DCMS (2006) *Understanding the Future: Priorities for England's Museums*, London: DCMS.
Available at:
www.culture.gov.uk/Reference_library/Consultations/2006_closed_consultations/cons_uf_pem.htm
[Accessed 2 July 2007]

DCMS (2007a) *From Ballroom Dancing to Book Clubs - National Study of Voluntary Arts Activity in England* 6 September, London: DCMS.
Available at: www.culture.gov.uk/Reference_library/Press_notices/ archive_2007/national_study_voluntary_arts_dcms102_07.htm
[Accessed 15 September 2007]

DCMS (2007b) *Changing Lives and Places: Lessons from Cultural Pathfinders*, London: DCMS.
Available at: www.culture.gov.uk/Reference_library/Publications
[Accessed 31 October 2007]

DCMS (2007c) *Inspiration, Identity, Learning: The Value of Museums*, London: DCMS.
Available at: www.le.ac.uk/ms/research/Reports
[Accessed 10 November 2007]

Dean, F. (2000) 'Spaces of mediation: excavating art's boundaries', *JADE* 19 (2): 181-188.

Deleuze, G., and Guattari, F. (1988) *A Thousand Plateaus*, London: Athlone Press.

Delin, A. (2002) 'Buried in the footnotes: the absence of disabled people in the collective imagery of our past', in R. Sandell, (ed.) *Museums, Society, Inequality*, London: Routledge, 2002: 84-97.

Demos (2003) *Valuing Culture — Event Speeches*. London: Demos.
Available at: www.demos.co.uk
[Accessed 7 July 2007]

Denzin, N. (1989) *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods* (3rd ed), London: Prentice Hall.

DH (Department of Health) (2001) *Valuing People: A New Strategy for Learning Disability for the 21st Century, A White Paper*, London: Department of Health.
Available at: http://www.archive.official-documents.co.uk/document/cm50/5086/5086.pdf
[Accessed 10 November 2007]

Diani, M. and Bison, I (2004) 'Organisations, coalitions, movement', *Theory and Science*, 33: 281 – 309.

Dibdin, E. (1889) 'The Liverpool Corporation collection', *The Magazine of Art* 12: 50-56.

Dibley, B. (2005) 'The Museum's redemption: contact zones, government and the limits of reform', *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 8 (1): 5-27.

Dickie, G. (1997) 'Art: function or procedure: nature or culture?', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 55 (1): 19-28.

DNH (1996) *People Taking Part*, London: Department of National Heritage.

Dodd, J. (2002) 'Museums and the health of the community', in R. Sandell, (ed.) *Museums, Society, and Inequality*, London and New York: Routledge, 2002: 182-189.

Duffy, T. (1996) 'The leap frog effect', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996: 119-121.

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

Dunn, A. (1985) 'Special role for Tate of North/new Tate Gallery in Liverpool', *The Guardian* April 19.

Dunn, P. (1997) 'The aesthetics of collaboration: aesthetics and the body politic', *Art Journal* Spring: no pagination.
Available at: www.findarticles.com
[Accessed 10 July 2006]

Durrer, V. (2008a) 'Theoretical perspectives in New Labour's cultural policy: art museums as vehicles for social inclusion', *Museological Review* 13: 11 – 28.

Durrer, V. (2008b) 'A case study in policy delivery: examining social inclusion through interpretation and practice' *Cultural Policy, Criticism and Management* eJournal, 3: 1 – 31.

Durrer, V. and Miles, S. (forthcoming 2009) 'New perspectives on the role of cultural intermediaries in social inclusion', *Consumption, Markets, and Culture*, May.

Eagleton, T. (1994) 'Ideology and its vicissitudes in western Marxism', in S. Zizek, (ed.) *Mapping Ideology*, London: Verso, 1994: 170-225.

Eagleton, T. (2000) *The Idea of Culture*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.

Eckersley, S. (2008) *A Cultural Policy Cycle?* Paper presented at Revealing All 2, Department of Cultural Policy and Management, City University, London, February.

Edwards, R., Armstrong, P., and Miller, N. (2001) 'Include me out: critical readings of social exclusion, social inclusion and lifelong learning', *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 20 (5): 417-428.

ESRC (2006) *Research Ethics Framework*, Swindon: ESRC.
Available at: www.esrc.ac.uk
[Accessed 10 March 2006[

Evans, G. (2001) *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?*, London and New York: Routledge.

Evans, M. (2001) 'Economy of imagination', *New Statesman* Lecture
Available at:
http://www.locumconsulting.com/pdf/LDR5EconomyImagine.pdf
[Accessed 12 January 2007]

Evans, R. (1996) 'Liverpool's urban regeneration initiatives and the arts: a review of the policy development and strategic issues', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996: 7-22

Falk, J. and Dierking, L. (2000) *Learning from Museums: Visitor Experiences and the Making of Meaning*, London: AltaMira Press.

Featherstone, M. (1991) *Consumer Culture and Post-Modernism*, London: Sage.

Finn, D. (1985) *How to Visit a Museum*, New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc.

Firstake (2007) website.
Available at: www.first-take.demon.co.uk
[Accessed 7 July 2007]

Fish, S. (1980) *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*, Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press.

Fleming, D. (2002) 'Positioning the Museum for Social Inclusion', in Sandell, R. (ed.) *Museums, Society, Inequality*, New York: Routledge.

Florida, R. (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure Community and Everyday Life*, New York: Basic Books.

Foundation for People with Learning Disabilities (2001) *Learning Disabilities: The Fundamental Facts*, London: Foundation for People with Learning Disabilities.

Francis, R. (2004) 'Managing disappointment: arts policy, funding, and the social inclusion agenda', in J. Harris, (ed.) *Art, Money, Parties: New Institutions in the Political Economy of Contemporary Art*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004: 133-161.

Fyfe, G. and Ross, M. (1996) 'Decoding the visitor's gaze: rethinking museum visiting', in S. Macdonald and G. Fyfe, (eds) *Theorizing Museums*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1996: 127-50.

Gablik, S. (1995) 'Connective aesthetics: art after individualism', in S. Lacy, (ed.) *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*, Seattle, Washington: Bay Press, 1995: 74-87.

Gallagher, C. (1992) 'Raymond Williams and cultural studies', *Social Text* 30: 79-89.

Garcia, B. (2004a) 'Urban regeneration, arts programming and major events', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10 (1): 103 – 118.

Garcia, B. (2004b) 'Cultural policy and urban regeneration in western European cities: lessons from experience, prospects for the future', *Local Economy* 19 (4): 312-326.

Garcia, B. (2005) 'Deconstructing the city of culture: the long-term cultural legacies of Glasgow 1990', *Urban Studies* 42 (5/6): 841-868.

Garnham, N. (2005) 'From cultural to creative industries', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11 (1): 15-29.

Garrick, J. (1999) 'Doubting the philosophical assumptions of interpretive research', *Qualitative Studies in Education* 12(2): 147-156.

296

Gathercole, S. (2007) 'Facts and fictions: Liverpool and the avant-garde in the late-1960s and 70s', in C. Grunenberg and R. Knifton, (eds) *Centre of the Creative Universe: Liverpool and the Avant-Garde*, Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 2007: 136-153.

Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.

Gell, A. (1998) *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*, Oxford: University Press.

Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilmour, P. (1979) 'How can museums be more effective in society?', *Museums Journal* 79 (3): 120-122.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, Chicago: Aldine.

GLLAM (2000) *Museums and Social Inclusion: The GLLAM Report*, Leicester: Research Centre for Museums and Galleries.

Graham, B., Ashworth, G., and Tunbridge, J. (2000) 'The uses and abuses of heritage', in G. Corsane, (ed.) *Heritage Museums, and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, London: Routledge, 2005: 325-332.

Gray, C. (2002) 'Local government and the arts', *Local Government Studies* 28 (1): 77-90.

Graeme E. (2003) 'Hard-branding the cultural city – from Prado to Prada', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 27 (2): 417–440.

Green, A. (1996) 'Liverpool City Council and the evolution of the 'creative quarter", in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996: 112-118.

Grindley, B. (1875) *Exhibitions of Pictures and Municipal Management*, Liverpool.

Hacking, S., Secker, J., Kent, L., Shenton, J., and Spandler, H. (2006) 'Mental health and arts participation: the state of the art in England', *The Journal of the Royal Society for the Promotion of Health* 126 (3): 121-127.

Hall, S. (1990) 'The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis of the humanities', *The Humanities as Social Technology* 53: 11-23.

Hall, E. (2004) 'Social Geographies of Learning Disability: Narratives of Exclusion and Inclusion', *Area* 36 (3): 298-306.

Hannigan, J. (1998) *Fantasy City: Pleasure and Profit in the Postmodern Metropolis*, London: Routledge.

Harding, D. (1995) 'Another history', in M. Dickson, (ed.) *Art with People*, London: AN Publications, 1995: 28-39.

Harland, J., Kinder, K., and Hartley, K. (1995) *Arts in Their View: A Study of Youth Particiaption in the Arts*, Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Harris, J. (ed.) (2004) *Art, Money, Parties: New Institutions in the Political Economy of Contemporary Art*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Harris, J. (2006) *Art History: The Key Concepts*, New York: Routledge.

Harrison, J. (1993) 'Ideas of museums in the 1990s', in G. Corsane, (ed.) *Heritage Museums, and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, London: Routledge, 2005: 38-53.

Haskey, J. (1995). 'Trends in marriage and cohabitation', *Population Trends* vol. 80 London: HMSO.

Hayes, D. and Slater, A. (2002) "Rethinking the missionary position'—the quest for sustainable audience development strategies', *Managing Leisure* 7: 1-17.

Healy, T., Cote, S., Helliwell, J., and Held, S. (2001) *The Well-being of Nations: The Role of Human and Social Capital*, Paris: OECD Publications.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2006) 'Bourdieu, the media and cultural production', *Media, Culture and Society* 28 (2): 211-231.

Hewison, R. (1995) *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics Since 1940*, London: Methuen.

Hewitt-Jones, R. (1984) *A Short History of Bluecoat Chambers*, Liverpool: Bluecoat Arts Centre.

Hill, M. (2006) 'Representin(g): negotiating multiple roles and identities in the field and behind the desk', *Qualitative Inquiry* 12: 926-949.

Hoggart, R. (1958) *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-class Life with Special Reference to Publications and Entertainments*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Holden, J. (2004) *Capturing Cultural Value: How Culture has Become a Tool of Government Policy*, London: Demos

Hood, M. (1983) 'Staying away: why people choose not to visit museums', *Museum News* 61 (4): 50-57.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (1988) 'Counting visitors or visitors who count?', in R. Lumley, (ed.) *The Museum Time-Machine: Putting Cultures on Display*, London: Routledge, 1988: 213-232.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2000a) 'Learning in art museums: strategies of interpretation', in N. Horlock, (ed.) *Testing the Water: Young People and Galleries*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000: 136-145.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2000b) 'Changing values in the art museum: Rethinking Communication and Learning', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 6 (1), 2000: 9-31.

Hope Street Limited (2007) Hope Street Limited website.
Available at: www.hope-street.org
[Accessed 8 August 2007]

Horlock, N. (2000) 'Young people and galleries', in N. Horlock, (ed.) *Testing the Water: Young People and Galleries*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000: 17-19.

Howard, P. (1976) 'Slippery words *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* By Raymond Williams', *The Times* 5 Feb: 11.

Hudson, K. (1977) *Museums for the 1980's: A Survey of World Trends*, Paris: UNESCO; London: Macmillan.

Jackson, T. (2000) 'With visitors in mind: The museum with permeable walls', in N. Horlock, (ed.) *Testing the Water: Young People and Galleries*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000: 22-29.

Jahnukainen, M. and Jarvinen, T. (2005) 'Risk factors and survival routes: social exclusion as a life-historical phenomenon', *Disability and Society* 20 (6): 669-682.

Jahoda, A. and Cattermole, M. (1995) 'Activities of people with moderate to severe learning difficulties, living with purpose or just killing time?', *Disability and Society* 10 (2): 203 – 219.

Jermyn, H. (2001) *The Arts and Social Exclusion: A Review Prepared for the Arts Council of England*, London: Arts Council of England.

Jermyn, H. (2004) *Art of Inclusion*, London: Arts Council England.

Johnson, K. (2007) *Big Art for Little Artists: Review of Year One of Operation*, Liverpool: Walker Art Gallery.

Jones, P. and Wilks-Heeg, S. (2004) 'Capitalizing culture: Liverpool 2008', *Local Economy* 19 (4): 341-360.

Jones, P. and Wilks-Heeg, S. (2007) 'Repackaging culture, regulating culture: the re-branded city', in C. Grunenberg and R. Knifton, (eds) *Centre of the Creative Universe: Liverpool and the Avant-Garde*, Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 2007: 202-215.

Jones, P. and Krzyanowski, M. (2008) 'Identity, belonging and migration: beyond constructing "others"', in G. Delanty, P. Jones and R. Wodak, (eds) *Identity, Belonging and Migration*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008, 28-53.

Josefowitz, P. (1996) 'Personality of the year: Neil MacGregor, Director, the National Gallery', *Apollo* 144 (418): 23-32.

Jowell, T. (2004) *Government and the Value of Culture*, London: DCMS.

Kavanagh, G. (2002) 'Remembering ourselves in the work of museums: trauma and the place of the personal in the public', in R. Sandell, (ed.) *Museums, Society, and Inequality*, London and New York: Routledge, 2002: 110-122.

Kawashima, N. (1997) *Museum Management in a Time of Change: Impacts of Cultural Policy on Museums in Britain 1979-1997*, Coventry: Center for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick.

Kawashima, N. (2000) *Beyond the Division of Attenders vs. Non-attenders: A Study into Audience Development in Policy and Practice*, Coventry: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick.

Kawashima, N. (2006) 'Audience development and social inclusion in Britain', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 12 (1): 55-72.

Kay, A. (2000) 'Art and community development: the role the arts have in regenerating communities', *Community Development Journal* 35 (4): 414-424.

Kenway, P. and Palmer, G. (2006) *Social Exclusion: Some Possible Broader Areas of Concern*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Kester, G. (1995) 'Aesthetic evangelists: conversion and empowerment in contemporary community art', *Afterimage* (January): no pagination.
Available from: www.findarticles.com
[Accessed 10 July 2006]

Kester, G. (2004) *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Kidd, B. (2008) *Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium, Draft Position Statement*, October (not published).

Kirchberg, V. (2007) 'Cultural consumption analysis: beyond structure and agency', *Cultural Sociology* 1: 115-135.

Knight, L. (1988) 'Merseyside's black spot leads the search for a sick city cure; Liverpool', *The Times* October 30.

Kolb, B. (2000) *Marketing Cultural Organisations: New Strategies for Attracting Audiences to Classical Music, Dance, Museums, Theatre and Opera*, Dublin: Oak Three Press.

Labour Party (1997) *Create the Future: A Strategy for Cultural Policy, Arts and the Creative Economy*, London: Labour Party.

Lacy, S. (1995) 'Cultural pilgrimages and metaphoric journeys', in S. Lacy, (ed.) *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*, Seattle, Washington: Bay Press, 1995: 19-47.

Lacy, S. (2001) *The Work of Suzanne Lacy*, paper given at Morris Museum of Art, Augusta Georgia, 2 April.

Lamont, M. (1989) 'Review of *L'Ontologie Politique de Martin Heidegger* by Pierre Bourdieu', *Contemporary Sociology*, 18 (5): 781 – 783.

Landry, C., Green, L., Matarasso, F. and Bianchini, F. (1996) *The Art of Regeneration: Urban renewal through cultural activity*, Stroud: Comedia.

Laurence, A. (1996) *Women in England in 1500 – 1760: A Social History*, London: Phoenix.

Leach, S. and Game, C. (1991) 'English metropolitan government since abolition: an evaluation of the English Metropolitan County Councils', *Public Administration*, 69 (2) 141 – 170.

Leadbeater, C. (2004) *Personalisation through Participation: A New Script for Public Services*, London: Demos.
Available at: www.demos.co.uk
[Accessed 12 January 2008]

Lee, H. (2005) 'When arts met marketing: arts marketing theory embedded in Romanticism', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11 (3): 289-305.

Leichter, H. J., Hensel, K., and Larsen, E. (1989) *Families and Museums: Issues and Perspectives*, New York: Hawarth Press.

Leighton, D. (2002) 'Searching for politics in an uncertain world: interview with Zygmunt Bauman', *Renewal: A Journal of Labour Politics* 10 (1): 1-14.

Leonard, P. (1975) 'Introduction: the Sociology of community action', in P. Leonard, (ed.) *The Sociology of Community Action: Sociological Review Monograph 21*, Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent: J.H. Brookes, Ltd, 1975: 5-20.

Levitas, R. (2004) 'Let's hear it for humpty: social exclusion, the Third Way and cultural capital', *Cultural Trends* 13 (2): 41-56.

Levitas, R. (2005) *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour* (2nd ed), New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E., Gordon, D., Lloyd, E., and Patsios, D. (2007) *The Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Social Exclusion*, Bristol: Department of Sociology and School for Social Policy, Townsend Centre for the International Study of Poverty and Bristol Institute for Public Affairs, University of Bristol.
Available from:
www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/social_exclusion_task_force/publications
[Accessed: 1 May 2007]

Lipman, S. (ed.) (1994) *Culture and Anarchy (Rethinking the Western Tradition) by Matthew Arnold*, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Lippard, L. (1995) 'Looking around: where we are, where we could be', in S. Lacy, (ed.) *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*, Seattle, Washington: Bay Press, 1995: 114-130.

Lister, R. (1998) 'From equality to social inclusion: New Labour and the welfare state', *Critical Social Policy* 18: 215-225.

Liverpool Biennial (2006). Liverpool Biennial website.
Available at: www.biennial.com
[Accessed 10 October 2006]

Liverpool City Council (2002) *Cultural Strategy for Liverpool*, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council.

Lofland, J. and Lofland, L. (1995) *Analyzing Social Settings: A guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis* (3rd ed) Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Long, J., and Bramham, P. (2006) 'Joining up policy discourses and fragmented practices: the precarious contribution of cultural projects to Social Inclusion?', *Policy and Politics* 34 (1): 133-151.

Longmore, J. (2007) 'Civic Liverpool: 1680-1800', in J. Belchem, (ed.) *Liverpool 800*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007: 113-169.

Lorente, P. (1996a) 'Introduction', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996: 1-6.

Lorente, P. (1996b) 'Museums as catalysts for the revitalisation of ports in decline: lessons from Liverpool and Marseilles', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996:36-60.

Lorente, P. (1996c) 'The contribution of the arts scene to the revilitisation of declining inner-city areas in Liverpool and Marseilles', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996: 90-111.

Lumley, R. (2005) 'The debate on heritage reviewed', in G. Corsane, (ed.) *Heritage Museums, and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, London: Routledge, 2005: 15-25.

MacCunn, W. (1956) *Bluecoat Chambers: The Origins and Development of an Art Centre*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

MacDonald, R., Shildrick, T., Webster, C., and Simpson, D. (2005) 'Growing up in poor neighbourhoods: The significance of class and place in the extended transitions of 'socially excluded' young adults', *Sociology* 39 (5): 873-891.

Macdonald, S. (1998) 'Exhibitions of power and powers of exhibition: An Introduction to the Politics of Display', in S. Macdonald, (ed.) *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture*, London: Routledge, 1998: 1-2.

Machann, C. (2004) 'Matthew Arnold', *Victorian Poetry* 42 (3): 324-334.

Mandelson, P. (1997) *Labour's Next Steps: Tackling Social Exclusion*, Fabian Society Summer Lecture, 14 August, now published as Fabian Pamphlet 581.

Mason, R. (2004) 'Conflict and complement: an exploration of the discourses informing the concept of the socially inclusive museum in contemporary Britain', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 10 (1): 49-73.

Mason, R. (2005) 'Museums, galleries, and heritage: sites of meaning and communication', in G. Corsane, (ed.) *Heritage Museums, and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, London: Routledge, 2005: 200-211.

Matarasso, F. (1997) *Use or Ornament: The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts*, Stroud, Glos.: Comedia.

Matarasso, F. (2007) 'Smoke and mirrors: a response to Paola Merli's 'Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities', IJCP, 2002, vol. 8 (1)', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 9 (3): 337-346.

Mauthner, N. and Doucet, A. (2003) 'Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis', *Sociology* 37: 413-431.

McDonald, R., Shildreick, T., Webster, C., and Simpson, D. (2005) 'Growing up in poor neighbourhoods: The significance of class and place in the extended transitions of 'socially excluded' young adults', *Sociology* 39 (5): 873-891.

McCann, R. (1998) 'Finding the future audiences', *Prompt*, 15: 8-9.

McGuigan, J. (1996) *Culture and the Public Sphere*, London: Routledge.

McMaster, B. (2008) *Supporting Excellence in the Arts From Measurement to Judgement*, London: DCMS.

McWeeny, G. (2003) 'Crowd management: Matthew Arnold and the science of society', *Victorian Poetry* 41 (1): 93-11.

Merli, P. (2002) 'Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities: a critical review of François Matarasso's 'Use or Ornament?'', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8 (1): 107-118.

Merry, T. (1997) Counselling and creativity: an interview with Natalie Rogers', *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 25 (2): 2263 – 273.

Message, K. (2007) 'Museums and the *utility of culture:* The politics of liberal democracy and cultural well-being', *Social Identities 13 (2): 235-256.*

Miles, M. (1994) 'Art in hospitals: does it work?', *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 87: 161 – 163.

Miles, M. (1997) *Art, Space, and the City: Public Art and Urban Futures*, London and New York: Routledge.

Miles, M. (2005) 'Interruptions: testing the rhetoric of culturally led urban development', *Urban Studies*, 42 (5/6): 889 – 911.

Miles, S. and Paddison, R. (2005) 'Introduction: the rise and rise of culture-led urban regeneration', *Urban Studies*, 42 (5/6): 833 – 839.

Miles, S. (2007) 'Feeling 10 feet tall: creative inclusion in a community of practice', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28 (4): 505–518.

Milevska, S. (2006) 'Participatory art: a paradigm shift from objects to subjects', *Eurozine* 1-6.

Available from: www.eurozine.com
[Accessed 7 July 2006]

Moreno, M. (2004) 'Art museums and socioeconomic forces: the case of a community museum', *Review of Radical Political Economics* 36 (4): 506-527.

Moore, J. (1998) 'Poverty and access to the arts: inequalities in arts attendance', *Cultural Trends 31*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Moore, J. (2004) 'The Art of Philanthropy and the Formation and Development of the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool', *Museum and Society* 2 (2): 68-83.

Morris, J. (2001) 'Social exclusion and young disabled people with high levels of support needs', *Critical Social Policy* (21) 2: 161-183.

Mulgan, G. and Warpole, K. (1986) *Saturday Night or Sunday Morning? From Arts to Industry—New Forms of Cultural Policy*, London: Comedia.

Murden, J. (2007) "City of change and challenge': Liverpool since 1945', in J. Belchem, (ed.) *Liverpool 800*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007: 393-485.

Myerscough, J. (1988) *The Economic Importance of the Arts on Merseyside*, London: Policy Studies Institute.

Nahm, M. (1947) 'The functions of art and fine art in communication', *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 5 (4): 273-280.

Negus, K. (2002) 'The work of cultural intermediaries and the enduring distance between production and consumption', *Cultural Studies* 16 (4): 501-515.

Newman, A. (2001) "Social exclusion zone' and 'the feel good factor", in G. Corsane, (ed.) *Heritage Museums, and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, London: Routledge, 2005: 325-332.

Newman, A. and McLean, F. (1998) 'Heritage builds communities: the application of heritage resources to the problems of social exclusion', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 4 (3/4): 143-153.

Newman, A. and McLean, F. (2004a) 'Presumption, policy and practice: the use of museums and galleries as agents of social inclusion in Great Britain', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10 (2): 167-181.

Newman, A. and McLean, F. (2004b) 'Capital and the evaluation of the museum experience', *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7 (4): 480-498.

Newman, A. and McLean, F. (2006) 'The impact of museums upon identity', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 12 (1): 49-68.

Newman, A., McLean, F., and Urquhart, G. (2005) 'Museums and the active citizen: tackling the problems of social exclusion', *Citizenship Studies* 9 (1): 41-57.

Newman, T., Curtis, K., and Stephens, J. (2003) 'Do community-based arts projects result in social gains? a review of the literature', *Community Development Journal* 38: 310-322.

NHS (2008). Turning Point Social Inclusion Project website
Available at: http://www.tin.nhs.uk/events
[Accessed 5 May 2008)

Nochlin, L. (1971) 'Why have there been no great women artists?', *Art News* 69 (9): 22-39.

O'Reilly, D. (2005) 'Social inclusion: a philosophical anthropology', *Politics* 25 (2): 80-88.

O'Sullivan, P. (1997) 'Marketing the arts: from paradigm to plan', in Fizgibbon, M and Kelly, A. (eds) *From Maestro to manager: Critical Issues in Arts and Culture Management*, Dublin: Oak Three Press, 1997: 139-181.

Page, A. (200?) *Open Eye: A Case Study*, M.A. Dissertation, John Moores University, Liverpool.

Parkinson, M. (1985) *Liverpool on the Brink*, Hermitage, Berks: Policy Journals.

Parr, H. (2006) 'Mental health, the arts and belongings', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31 (2): 150-166.

Pearson, N. (1982) *The State and Visual Arts: A Discussion of State Intervention in the visual arts in Britain, 1760-1981*, Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.

Petrie, S., Fiorelli, L., and O'Donnell, K. (2006) "If we help you what will change?'—participatory research with young people', *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law* 28 (1): 31-45.

Physick, J. (1982) *The Victoria and Albert Museum: The history of its Building*, London: Victoria and Albert Museum.

Pih, D., and Knifton, R. (2007) 'Timeline', in C. Grunenberg, and R. Knifton, (eds) *Centre of the Creative Universe: Liverpool and the Avant-Garde*, Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 2007: 238-248.

Piper, J. (2003) *Remembering Matthew Arnold and Other Poems*, Huntsville, Texas: Estate of Janet Piper.

Piper, D. (1967) 'Art and its environment', *The Guardian* 26 May.

Plaza, B. (1999) 'The Guggenheim-Bilbao museum effect: a reply to María V. Gomez' 'Reflective images: the case of urban regeneration in Glasgow and Bilbao", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 23 (3): 589–592.

Plaza, B. (2006) 'The return on investment of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30 (2): 452–467.

Pollit, C. (1990) *Managerialism and the Public Services: the Anglo-American Experience*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Powell, M. (2000) 'New Labour and the Third Way in the British welfare State: a new and distinctive approach?', *Critical Social Policy* 20 (1): 39-60.

Powell, J. and Gilbert, T. (2007) 'Performativity and helping professions: social theory, power and practice', *International Journal of Social Welfare* (16): 193-201.

Prior, N. (2003) 'Having one's Tate and eating it: transformations of the museum in a hypermodern era', in A. McClellan, (ed.) *Art and Its Publics*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003: 50-74.

Prior, N. (2005) 'A Question of perception: Bourdieu, art, and the postmodern', *The British Journal of Sociology* 56 (1): 124-139.

Probyn, E. (1996) *Outside Belongings*, New York: Routledge.

Purnell, J. (2007) *World-class from the Grassroots Up: Culture in the Next Ten Years*, speech given at National Portrait Gallery, 6 July. Available at:
www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/Minister_Speeches/James_Purnell/ja
mespurnellsos_speechcultureinthenexttenyears.htm?contextID={127FDDFA
-03AA-457A-9B53-D5E7A506CC71}
[Accessed 14 September 2007]

Putnam, R. (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ranciere, J. (2004) *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*, Rockhill, G. (trans), London: Continuum.

Rathbone, P. (1875) *The Political Value of Art to the Municipal Life of a Nation*, Liverpool.

Reeves, M. (2002) Measuring the Economic and Social Impact of the Arts: a review. London: Arts Council England.

Regional Museums Task Force (RMTF) (2001) *Renaissance in the Regions: A New Vision for England's Museums*, London: Resource.

Resource (2000) *Response to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport Consultation Document Centres of Social Change: Museums, Galleries and Archives for All*, London: Resource.

Reynolds, P. (1979) *Ethical Dilemmas and Social Science Research*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rice, D. (2003) 'Museums: theory, practice, and illusion', in A. McClellan, (ed.) *Art and Its Publics*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003: 76-95.

Richardson, L. and Le Grand J. (2002) *Outsider and Insider Expertise: The Response of Residents of Deprived Neighbourhoods to an Academic*

Definition of Social Exclusion, London: Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE, Paper 57.

Robson, C. (1993) *Real World Research*, London: Routledge

Roche, J. (2006) 'Socially engaged art, critics and discontents: an interview with Claire Bishop', *Community Arts Network Reading Room*. Available at: www.communityarts.net/readingroom
[Accessed 11 June 2007]

Rogers, N. (1993a) *The Creative Connection: Expressive Arts as Healing*, Los Altos, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

Rogers, N. (1993b) 'Person-centred expressive arts therapy', *Creation* March/April: 28 – 30.

Room, G. (1995) 'Poverty and social exclusion: the new European agenda for policy and research', in G. Room, (ed.) *Beyond the Threshold: The Measurement and Analysis of Social Exclusion*, Bristol: Policy Press, 1995: 1 – 9.

Ruane, J. (2005) *Essentials of Research Methods: A Guide to Social Science Research*, London: Blackwell Publishing.

Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (1995) *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*, London: Sage Publications.

Russell, J. (1995) 'Leisure and recreation services', in N. Malin, (ed.) *Services for People with Learning Disabilities*, London: Routledge.

Russell, J. and Gablik, S. (1969) *Pop Art Redefined*, London: Thames and Hudson.

Sandell, R. (1998) 'Museums as agents of social inclusion', *Museum Management and Curatorship* 17 (4): 401-418.

Sandell, R. (2002) 'Museums and the Combating of Social Inequality: Roles, Responsibilities, Resistance', in R. Sandell, (ed.) *Museums, Society, and Inequality*, London and New York: Routledge, 2002: 3-23.

Sandell, R. (ed.) (2002b) *Museums, Society, Inequality* London: Routledge.

Sandell, R. (2003) 'Social inclusion, the museum and the dynamics of sectoral change', *Museum and Society* 1 (1): 45-62.

Saunders, P. (1993) 'Citizenship in a liberal society', in B. Turner, (ed.) *Citizenship and Social Theory*, Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications, 1993: 57-90.

Scherer, L. (2002a) 'Commitment and artistic expression—community connections', *Arts and Activities* June: no pagination.
Available from: www.findarticles.com
[Accessed 10 July 2007]

Scott, C. (2002) 'Measuring social value', in R. Sandell, (ed.) *Museums, Society, and Inequality*, London and New York: Routledge, 2002: 41-55.

Scott, C. (2006) 'Museums: impact and value', *Cultural Trends* 15 (1): 45-75.
Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09548960600615947
[Accessed 2 September 2007]

Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Paris Exhibition (1867) *Report of the Select Parliamentary Committee of the House of Commons on the Paris Exhibition.*

Selwood S. (1998) 'Born again or dumbing down? cultural trends in the 1990s', *International Journal of Art and Design Education* 17 (1): 7-16.

Selwood, S. (2002) 'What difference do museums make?', *Critical Quarterly* 44 (4): 65-81.

Sennett, R. (2000) 'Work and social inclusion', in P. Askonas and A. Steward, (eds) *Social Inclusion: Possibilities and Tensions, Basingstoke*, UK: Macmillan, 2000: 278-290.

SETF (2006) *Reaching Out: An Action Plan on Social Exclusion*, London: SETF.

SETF (2007) Social Exclusion Task Force website.
Available at: http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/social_exclusion_taskforce/
[Accessed 1 December 2007]

SEU (1998) *Bringing Britain Together: A National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal.* London: SEU
Available at: www.sportdevelopment.org.uk/Bringing_Britain_together.PDF
[Accessed 10 May 2007]

SEU (2001) *A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal: National Strategy Action Plan*, London: Cabinet Office.
Available at:
neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/HTMLDocs/downloads/NationalStrategyReport.pdf
[Accessed 10 May 2007]

SEU (2004) *Breaking the Cycle: Taking Stock of Progress and Priorities for the Future, Social Exclusion Unit Report—Summary*, London: SEU.
Available at:
http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/social_exclusion_task_force/publications/index.asp
[Accessed 10 September 2007]

SEU (2005) *Reaching Out: An Action Plan on Social Exclusion*, London: Cabinet Office.
Available at:
www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/social_exclusion_task_force/publications
[Accessed 10 Sept 2007]

Shaw, R. (1987) *The Arts and the People*, London: Jonathan Cape, Ltd.

Sherman, D. and Rogoff, I. (eds) (1994) *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Silver, H. (1994) 'Social exclusion and social solidarity: three paradigms', *International Labour Review* 133: 531-578.

Silver, H. (1995) 'Reconceptualising social disadvantage: three paradigms of social exclusion', G. Rodgers, C. Gore and J. Figueiredo, (eds) *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses*, Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies, 1995: 57-79.

Silver, L. (1986) 'The state of research in northern European art of the Renaissance era', *Art Bulletin*, 68 (4): 518-535.

Silverman, L. (2002) 'The therapeutic potential of museums as pathways to inclusion', in R. Sandell, (ed.) *Museums, Society, and Inequality*, London and New York: Routledge, 2002: 69-83.

Simmons, R. and Birchall, J. (2005) 'A joined up approach to user participation in public services: strengthening the 'participation chain'', *Social Policy and Administration* 39 (3): 260-283.

Stallabrass, J. (2004) *Art Incorporated: The Story of Contemporary Art*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Staricoff, L., Duncan, J., Wright, M., Loppert, S. and Scott, J. (2003) *A Study of the Effects of the Visual and Performing Arts in Healthcare, Chelsea and Westminster Hospital Arts*, London: Chelsea and Westminster Hospital. Available from:
http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/archive/research/documents/ChelseaAnd WestminsterResearchproject.pdf
[Accessed 1 June 2008]

Staricoff, L. (2004) *Arts in Health: A Review of the Medical Literature, Research Report 36*, London: Arts Council England.

Sterry P. and Beaumont, E. (2006) 'Methods for studying family visitors in art museums: a cross-disciplinary review of current research', *Museum Management and Curatorship* 21: 222–239

Stevenson, D. (2004) "Civic gold' rush: cultural planning and the politics of the Third Way', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 10 (1): 119-131.

Stewart, K. (1996) 'Communities of art', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996: 90-111.

Sudbury, P. (1995) 'Background to the evaluation project', in Sudbury, P. and Russell, T. (eds) *Evaluation of Museum and Gallery Displays: The Main Public Venues of the National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside from 1986 to 1991*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995: 1-12.

Sudbury, P. and Forrester, J. (1996) 'Some museum developments in Liverpool, their benefits to the community', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*. Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996: 68-89.

Sudbury, P. and Russell, T. (eds) (1995) *Evaluation of Museum and Gallery Displays: The Main Public Venues of the National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside from 1986 to 1991*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Tate Liverpool (2007) *Opening Doors 2007: Course Induction Pack*, Liverpool: Tate Liverpool.

Tate Liverpool (2008) Tate Gallery Liverpool website.
Available at: www.tate.org.uk
[Accessed 11 November 2007]

Taylor, B. (1999) *Art for the Nation: Exhibitions and the London Public, 1747-2001*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Taylor, C. (1971) 'Interpretation and the sciences of man', *Review of Metaphysics* 25: 3-51.

Thompson, E. (1963) *The Making of the Working Class*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Thompson, I. (1996) 'Arts and community: regeneration or gentrification', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*. Leicester: University of Leicester, 1996, pp.135-165.

Tilman, O. (1999) *Pop Art*, London: Taschen.

Tlili, A., Gewirtz, A. and Cribb, A. (2007) 'New Labour's socially responsible museum: roles, functions and greater expectations', *Policy Studies* 28 (3): 269-289.

Townsend, P. (1979) *Poverty in the United Kingdom*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Tranter, R. and Palin, N. (2004) 'Including the Excluded: An Art in Itself', *Support for Learning* 19 (2): 88-95.

van Aalst, I. and Boogaarts, I. (2002) 'From museum to mass entertainment: the evolution of the role of museums in cties', *European Union and Regional Studies* 9 (3): 195-209.

Vasari, G. (1915) *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* de Vere, G. du C. (trans.), London: Macmillan.

Vasey, S. (1992) 'Disability arts and culture: an introduction to key issues and questions', in S. Lees, (ed.) *Disability Arts and Culture Papers*, London: Shape Publications, 1992: 7-13.

Vergo, P. (1989) *The New Museology*, London: Reaktion Books.

Wagner, A. (2007) 'Debate, citizenship through education: a comment on 'Social exclusion in Europe: some conceptual issues", *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 16: 1-5.

Walker, A. (1997) 'Introduction: the strategy of inequality', in A. Walker, and C. Walker, (eds) *Britain Divided: The Growth of Social Exclusion in the 1980s and 1990s*, London: CPAG, 1997: 1-13.

Walker, A. and Walker, C. (eds) (1997) *Britain Divided: The Growth of Social Exclusion in the 1980s and 1990s*, London: CPAG Ltd.

Walker Art Gallery (2006) *Artbase Information Sheet*. Liverpool: Walker Art Gallery.

Wallinger, M. and Warnock, M. (2000) *Art for All?: Their Policies and Our Culture*, London: PEER.

Waterman, H., Tillen D., Dickson R. and de Koning K. (2001) *Action Research: A Systematic Review and Guidance for Assessment*, Health Technology Assessment 2001.

Weil, S. (1997) 'The museum and the public', in S. Weil, (ed.) *Making Museums Matter*, Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002: 195-213.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E., and McDermott, R. (2002) *Cultivating Communities of Practice*, Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.

West, C. and Smith, C. (2005) "We are not a government poodle': museums and social inclusion under New Labour', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11 (3): 275-288.

Weston, A. (2006) 'City to Host '08 Turner Prize', *Daily Post*, July 11.

Whitehead, C. (2005) 'Visiting with suspicion: recent perspectives on art and art museums', in G. Corsane, (ed.) *Heritage Museums, and Galleries: An Introductory Reader*, London: Routledge, 2005: 89-101.

Williams, D. (1997) *Creating Social Capital*, Adelaide: Community Arts Network of South Australia.

Williams, R. (1958) *Culture and Society, 1780-1950*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Williams, R. (1975) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, London: Fontana.

Williams, R. (1977) *Marxism and Literature*, London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams, R. (1979) *Politics and Letters: Interview with New Left Review*, London and New York: New Left Books.

Williams, R. (1981) *Culture*, London: Fontana.

Williams, R. (1989a) *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism*, London: Verso.

Williams, R. (1989b) *The Politics of Modernism*, London: Verso.

Williams, R. (2004) *The Anxious City*, London: Routledge.

Willett, J. (2007 [1967]) *Art in a City*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Yepez Del Castillo, I. (1994) 'A comparative approach to social exclusion: lessons from France and Belgium', *International Labour Review* 133 (5-6): 613-633.

Yin, R. (2002) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yural-Davis, N. (2006) 'Belonging and the Politics of Belonging', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 40 (3): 197 – 214.