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Abstract

The new museology and need for greater accountability for public funding have prompted debate about the purpose of museums and their contributions to the wellbeing of society. Research has convincingly demonstrated that experiences of art can be positive for people, however visitor studies suggest audiences of public art galleries remain predominantly narrow in range and traditional non-users have not become regular visitors. Internationally, the issue of democratic access in public art galleries has become more important, resulting in a growing interest in greater public participation and a need to show social outcomes. When social inclusion goals were embedded in and mandated through British policy, significant progress was made; but what about the New Zealand situation?

This dissertation investigates how two public art galleries in New Zealand’s capital city advance and evaluate social inclusion. A case study of Wellington City Council and its public art galleries, City Gallery Wellington and Toi Pōneke Gallery, was used to explore the social inclusion policy and practices in relation to international developments. Interviews were conducted with eight staff of these and related institutions and an inductive method was used to analyse the data, framed by a social justice perspective.

This research found that the transformational potential of Wellington City Council’s galleries is limited by unclear policy and professionals’ relatively narrow understandings of social inclusion through museums. Results suggested the galleries rely predominantly on exhibitions about ethnic cultures as a form of audience development and it is likely that museums in other regions of the country would show similar traits. It appears that social inclusion and its measurement is not a priority of New Zealand public art galleries, echoed by the lack of integration across local and central government on this issue. This study argues that evaluation is necessary not only to justify public funds, but also to provide a measurement framework for a greater range of social inclusion practice within our valuable cultural institutions. The research contributes to museum and community studies literature by producing modest, yet original data about museum evaluation and policy, and provides insights for central and local government and the museum sector in terms of measuring the social impact of public art galleries. Overall, this dissertation reiterates the critical view of the disjuncture between museum theory, policy and practice, and ends by discussing some practical steps to bring these into closer alignment.
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Introduction

Social inclusion and public art galleries are not usually seen in the same sentence in New Zealand. Social inclusion is “the combating of social inequality,”¹ often seen as the role of a social worker.² Although gallery professionals are not traditionally viewed as social workers, might they have the potential to be? Many scholars argue that museums and galleries ought to be more socially responsible public institutions which should aim to affect people’s lives positively.³ This dissertation explores this issue in the context of New Zealand’s cultural sector using a Wellington case study. Although the research poses a challenge to aspects of current gallery policy and practice, it acknowledges the responsibility for social inclusion by central and local government. In addressing this topic, this study contributes to the fields of museum and community studies by demonstrating, albeit on a small, localised scale, the impact of policy and evaluation about social inclusion for local public art galleries.

Museum studies is the critical academic analysis of museums within their social context, from large government-funded social history and heritage museums to community managed eco-museums, to public art galleries of all sizes.⁴ In this dissertation when I use the word ‘museums’ I refer to the broad spectrum of museums, including art museums and public art galleries, and when I use ‘art gallery’ or ‘galleries’ I refer to local public art galleries. The field of museum studies examines the broad range of professional practice, from museum

---

management, collecting and curating, to marketing, education and public programmes.\(^5\) Traditionally, internal functions such as museum collections were of paramount importance within museum practice, but more recently, influenced by the ‘new museology’, greater emphasis has been placed on public practices like community engagement, consultation, education, representation and meaning-making.\(^6\) New museology underpins the framework for this research, which explores a relatively new aspect of current professional practice.

Museum studies draws on a range of interdisciplinary theories, including community studies,\(^7\) which forms an important strand of this research. Community studies “considers mainly how understanding the dynamics of community will bring a greater appreciation of the formation of identity, the creation of relationships, and definitions of belonging.”\(^8\) Crooke defines community studies from three angles. The first is the symbolism of community identity (symbolic community), the second is community in local and central government policy (civic community), and the third is community as action towards social democracy (political community).\(^9\) This research fits largely into civic community studies, but also runs into political community, with the aim to “transform the experiences of its community to enable a better future.”\(^10\) This area of community studies aligns with social inclusion.

I have been interested in art since I could hold a paintbrush and my upbringing has shaped my interests in social inclusion. My experiences of inequality, discrimination and poverty on an American Field Service intercultural exchange in Chile led me to social work. Thereafter I gained an interest in local government when working in policy at the Department of Internal Affairs. This work experience and my interest in art have steered me towards researching the place of social inclusion in locally-managed public art galleries. Informed by coursework reading for the Master of Museum and Heritage Studies, I had debates with lecturers and fellow students about the lack of measurement of social inclusion in museums. I also had a

---


\(^7\) Labrum and McCarthy, "Museum studies and museums.”


\(^10\) Crooke, *Museums and community*, 37.
conversation with museum professional Jaqui Knowles, who mentioned what she felt was a need to research how community engagement occurs in local museum practice. My first student placement was for Arts Access Aotearoa, a non-governmental organisation that advocates for the inclusion of disabled people in the arts. Since this placement I have held onto my passion for social inclusion in arts and culture. Public art galleries have been my focus because it seemed to me that they tend to fall behind in this area, and I wanted to find out more about this problem. In this dissertation, while observing the normal objectivity which scholarly research demands, I take an unashamedly political stance on the social role of public art galleries, believing that social inclusion should be a priority because these institutions are publicly funded.

This dissertation explores social inclusion practice in Wellington City Council’s art galleries. The two galleries under the Council are City Gallery Wellington (City Gallery), managed by the Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) Wellington Museums Trust (WMT); and Toi Pōneke Gallery (TPG), managed directly by the Council. My major research question was: How do Wellington’s major and minor local public art galleries work towards and evaluate social inclusion? The results presented in the research suggest that, although social inclusion generally lags behind the overseas experience, there are solutions to the problems outlined above which could help further develop both galleries’ social inclusion practices.

In terms of the disciplinary context for this research, I set out to expand and refine museum studies by analysing current museum practice through the lens of community studies. There are a variety of ways that museum practice can incorporate theory and practice from community studies, with ‘community engagement’ a commonly used term. Community engagement in museum practice might involve the following:

• increasing community participation through collaborative exhibitions,
• involving community members in decisions about collections, and
• diversifying audience through engagement with certain demographic communities of other ethnicities.

However, I need to be clear from the outset about what this research does not do. I do not focus on these modes of community engagement in themselves, although I mention them as a

---

11 The case study is explained in more detail on pages 25–29 in chapter one.
12 Golding and Modest, Museums and communities; Watson, Museums and their communities.
result of the interviews. Nor am I concerned with documenting aspects of museum practice in any depth, such as curatorial practice, public programmes or exhibition development. There have obviously been a number of art gallery exhibitions in New Zealand, focusing on certain demographic groups, for example youth, however this study does not concentrate on any particular visitor demographic or cultural group. Rather, I have looked at the policy influences of social inclusion on galleries, including their missions. Overall this research aims to undertake the first investigation of this topic in New Zealand, which, by situating the local experience in the international context, provides a barometer for further local research and the development of professional practice.

Literature review

There are three main bodies of theory in museum studies and related fields that underpin this research into social inclusion in art galleries. The first is ‘Social inclusion and community engagement’, the second is ‘Art and the public’ and the third is ‘Museums and evaluation’. These are outlined below.

a) Social inclusion and community engagement

The term ‘social inclusion’ emerged in policy development in the United Kingdom in the mid-1990s and is now prevalent in European as well as British policy. British social inclusion policy urged organisations to better represent their communities and enhance public participation and democracy, including in arts and culture. Social inclusion also aims to reduce social exclusion which was defined by the Social Exclusion Unit and extensively used in British policy documents thereafter as: “a shorthand term for what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health, poverty and family

---


15 Selwood and Davies, "Policies, frameworks and legislation."; Crooke, "Museum significance and community."

16 More detail is on page 21 in chapter one.
breakdown.”\(^{17}\) It should be pointed out that ‘social exclusion’ and ‘social inclusion’ have been criticised for generalising and simplifying diverse areas of prejudice,\(^{18}\) and I use these terms broadly and critically.

Research suggests that museums have an impact on visitors’ senses of self (identity, confidence and self-esteem), which likely impact on community identity and social inclusion.\(^{19}\) Given this, there is a large amount of literature about the need for museums to be socially inclusive. It has been argued that for museums to have inclusive practice, they must be relevant to the public,\(^{20}\) and that they need to improve people’s wellbeing and be reflective about their effects on people.\(^{21}\) Without neglecting their committed core audiences, museums also need to acknowledge the importance of meeting the needs of diverse visitors and communities who have traditionally been excluded.\(^{22}\) However, despite all the academic analysis of this topic, there is no agreed definition of social inclusion specifically for museums. I have written one possible definition to clarify what I mean when I refer to ‘social inclusion practice’ and ‘working towards social inclusion’:

Enhancing public participation from all areas of society with the aim of improved wellbeing at individual, community and/or wider social levels.

Below is a diagram by Sandell that illustrates the societal dimensions where museums can combat social inequality.\(^{24}\) It is perhaps rather simplistic in terms of museum practice, however it breaks social inclusion down into individual, community and society and shows

\(^{21}\) Sandell, "Museums as agents of social inclusion."; Sandell, Museums, society, inequality; Sandell, Museums, prejudice and the reframing of difference; Anwar, Gewirtz, and Cribb, "New Labour's socially responsible museum."
\(^{24}\) Sandell, "Museums and the combating of social inequality: roles, responsibilities, resistance," 5.
how these three levels influence each other. The strength of the diagram is its systems theory approach, showing the interrelationships of the micro (individual), meso (community) and macro (society).²⁵

![Diagram of personal interaction, individual, community, and society with impact and process]

Museums and the combating of social inequality: impact and process.

The idea of community in museum studies and practice has been widely and diversely used, largely because communities are fluid, changeable and complex, therefore difficult to define.²⁶ For this dissertation, ‘community’ is defined as something made up of people who share a commonality, self-determined by its members, who are fluid parts of other communities.²⁷ Some scholars have critiqued museums’ loose and generalised use of ‘community’. Crooke argues that in museum practice, much of which is policy-related, the breadth of the term ‘community’ means it is sometimes used to generally encompass ‘other people’ without stipulating how.²⁸ The use of ‘community’ was also criticised by Cochrane in the 1980s for being an add-on to policy, rather than being integrated to improve democracy.²⁹ This still seems to be the case.

²⁸ Crooke, "Museum significance and community."
Scholars have argued that, through interpreting and articulating social ideas, museums define community relationships within civil society. Some suggest the concept of citizenship, although debated widely, can help guide museums’ active work towards improving social inclusion. Influenced by Marshall’s concept of citizenship, Newman and McLean use a diagram to show the connections between social value, identity and citizenship to producing inclusive communities:

![Diagram showing connections between inputs, process, and outputs in museums.](image)

The contribution of museums to inclusive communities.

A common theme in the literature is the difficulty that museums have in involving communities in significant and meaningful ways. “For many museums,” writes Lynch, “the reality of their public engagement work frequently fails to match the rhetoric, even when the work is inspired by a genuinely democratic impulse.” One study found that British museums’ engagement with their community partners was what Cornwall labels “empowerment-lite,” meaning communities were given very little power to engage in dialogue, disagree with or question the museum’s practices. Onciul critically points out that when talking about community engagement, it is only certain community members that are...

---


35 Andrea Cornwall, "Democratising Engagement: What the UK can learn from international experience," (London: Demos, 2008).

36 Lynch, "Custom-made reflective practice."
engaged with. Drawing on Clifford’s contact zone theory, Onciul introduced the concept of ‘engagement zone’, a unique, dynamic and changeable space of power flux, based on all the complexities surrounding the museum-community interaction. The difficulty in community engagement therefore arises from the requirement to share power and resources in order to go beyond networking and buy-in to sustainable collaboration for the development of museums’ civic purposes. Intrinsic reflective practice and critical examination about the involvement of external groups is required for museums to work towards social inclusion.

Due to the longstanding authoritative relationship between museums and communities, in which museums are positioned over and above the people they supposedly serve, it has been argued that museums need to radically transform their whole organisational practice to enable community partners and other publics to actively participate. The museum’s management has a crucial role to ensure relationships with external people and partners are strengthened and sustained. Museums need to have clear missions that all staff, including the Board, are dedicated to, before reaching outwards. However James acknowledges a cohesive mission is a struggle to maintain, and, to assist this, community museums need stronger relationships with their claimed communities. The other argument holds communities responsible for their engagement with museums. Karp asserts that for communities to be actors and have the

38 James Clifford, Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997).
39 Onciul, "Community Engagement, Curatorial Practice, and Museum Ethos in Alberta, Canada."
40 Thelen, "Learning community."
41 Lynch, "Custom-made reflective practice."
43 Nightingale and Mahal, "The heart of the matter."
44 Thelen, "Learning community."
right to speak, they also need a conscious identity and mission. The American Alliance of Museums (formally the American Association of Museums) stresses that the community-museum relationship needs to vary according to the museums’ and communities’ needs but should focus on ‘inreach’ rather than outreach, meaning that communities choose to influence museums’ agendas. The literature explains that effective community engagement by museums requires both the museum and community to take responsibility for their contribution to the relationship.

b) Art and the public

It has been convincingly demonstrated that participation in the arts increases individual wellbeing. This finding corresponds with museum studies literature that claims museums have a positive individual, community and social impact. Nonetheless, art galleries attract an audience that is more socially exclusive than social history museums. Many surveys show that the majority of visitors to art galleries are well-educated (with completed tertiary degrees), white, professional and affluent. However, several scholars argue that not everyone has the resources to fully understand and be positively influenced by art. Bourdieu points out that people who have been acculturated into the codes, values and practices of art (generally by their families and schooling) have gained a certain cultural capital, which enables them to decode art and galleries, and therefore to understand and appreciate art, whereas others are not. Wright suggests that public art galleries should provide more information to visitors about the art and institutional background so they are equipped to get

46 Karp et al., Museums and communities: the politics of public culture.
the most out of their visits,\(^{54}\) meaning that curators and other staff need to share their power with the public. Other studies suggest that curators of contemporary art need to be especially aware of a tendency to be exclusive, which may reinforce the perceived inaccessibility of art with a broader audience that is not familiar with it.\(^{55}\) The literature suggests that museums need to be aware of potential and current audiences’ backgrounds and knowledge, and ensure their curating meets public need.

In this review of the literature I found there are views for and against the focus on public art galleries’ social outcomes. Traditionalists and scholars of the ‘old’ art history argue for ‘art for art’s sake’ and the display of art without social interpretation.\(^{56}\) Cuno claims it is impossible to represent communities equally; therefore the job is too big to undertake.\(^{57}\) But contrarily, it has been pointed out by others that art galleries offer people positive experiences for individual and social development, and that this should be one of their motives.\(^{58}\) However the potential of galleries to be transformational, requiring a connection between art interpretation theory and practice, is limited by many institutional and situational factors, including stakeholders that are not focused on social change, the limited time of gallery professionals and the lack of money and other resources.\(^{59}\) It has also been argued that the belief that high quality art is the most important part of an art gallery experience, and its central mission, actually inhibits social inclusion.\(^{60}\) I would argue that this area needs further investigation, and intend to explore in this research whether the translation of art interpretation theory into gallery practice needs development to enable improved social inclusion practice.


\(^{57}\) Cuno, "Money, Power and the History of Art."


\(^{59}\) Whitehead, *Interpreting art in museums and galleries*.

\(^{60}\) Wright, "The Quality of Visitors' Experiences in Art Museums."
c) Museums and evaluation

In this section I review a wealth of literature on measurement, evaluation and assessment. This scope reflects the widespread trend for Western governments to put increasing pressure on museums to measure and document the impact of their exhibitions, education and public programmes in order to provide proof that they benefit communities. The value of art galleries needs to be well-communicated to show their relevance and positively affect policy and funding decisions. However this proves difficult without a robust measurement framework. Governments in the English speaking world have been criticised for stipulating reporting measures with unachievable goals determined by a lack of robust data on audience. Additionally, the robustness of research that claims to prove that museums and galleries cause personal and social change has been questioned. Frameworks for measuring the social impact of museums are in the very early stages of development, and several international ideas are outlined in the next chapter.

Large scale quantitative research of visitor demographics in arts and culture was carried out in the 1980s and 90s, however qualitative visitor research is lacking. Effective qualitative measurement of social outcomes needs further research, but it has been suggested that public art galleries should start by increasing visitor surveys to align with non-art museums higher survey usage. This would require galleries to recognise and act on the need for qualitative research, which might cost more, but may spur organisational change. Black argues for regular consultation with visitors and evaluation of the results to assist with continual

---


62 Selwood and Davies, "Policies, frameworks and legislation."


66 Hooper-Greenhill, "Studying Visitors."; Wright, "The Quality of Visitors' Experiences in Art Museums."

67 Wright, "The Quality of Visitors' Experiences in Art Museums."

68 Ibid.
improvement of practice.\textsuperscript{69} This is a form of measurement that should ideally be both quantitative and qualitative.

Visitor research has become common in museums due to pressure to attract bigger visitor numbers, and the necessity to prove the museum’s worth to funders in tight economic times, a trend which has become evident in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{70} For example, Davidson and Sibley found that the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa (Te Papa) competes for visitors with other leisure activities and needs to prove to visitors that their time at the museum has been worthwhile.\textsuperscript{71} Around the world, and in New Zealand, short-term Blockbuster exhibitions (particularly international art exhibitions), and free entry, draw in large visitor numbers.\textsuperscript{72} Black believes this is due to a sustained boom in cultural tourism, but argues that large numbers do not equate to diverse and new audiences.\textsuperscript{73} With visitor studies becoming a sophisticated sub-field of museum studies,\textsuperscript{74} if both quantitative and qualitative methods were utilised with an interpretive approach, visitor research could be used as a contributing tool to measure inclusion and demonstrate value.\textsuperscript{75} However this related topic of visitor studies was not explored in depth as it lies outside the parameters of this research.

**Research design**

The survey of the relevant literature above provided several themes and concepts which will be employed in this study, principally Sandell’s work on social inclusion and how it can be incorporated into current museum practice. The review demonstrated that there is a significant amount of literature on social inclusion and community engagement in social history museums, but little about social inclusion in art galleries specifically. There are very few studies about policy that impacts on galleries’ social inclusion practices, and very little

\textsuperscript{69} Black, *The engaging museum.*


\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{72} Andy Martin, "The impact of free entry to museums," *Cultural Trends* 47(2002); Black, "Building a 21st Century Audience."

\textsuperscript{73} Black, "Building a 21st Century Audience."


\textsuperscript{75} Lynda Kelly, "Evaluation, Research and Communities of Practice: Program Evaluation in Museums," *Archival Science* 4, no. 1 (2004); Davidson, "Visitor Studies."
original research on the situation in Aotearoa New Zealand. This dissertation therefore sets out to gather data, using a Wellington case study, to contribute to addressing this gap.

The overall approach to the research is, like much work in the field of museum studies, a style of interdisciplinary analysis using social science research methods and philosophical ideas drawn from the humanities. It leans towards basic, as opposed to applied research, not directly solving a problem, but aiming to give insight on how social inclusion can be improved and measured in public art galleries through policy. I chose a case study from which to conduct my research. Definitions of case studies vary depending on the research purpose and methodology; however the definition by Feagin et al fits best with my methodology. “A case study is here defined as an in-depth, multi-faceted investigation, using qualitative research methods, of a single phenomenon,” they write. “The study is conducted in great detail and often relies on the use of several data sources.”

Developed in the 1930s for American sociological analysis of the interwar period, case studies were useful for providing access to personal meanings within the given context, and were assumed to be generalisable to the field of study. However, because case studies are specific to one locality, there is controversy as to how they contribute to general theories. For this research, generalisations from the small case study to other regions in the country were made, however appropriate theories were applied in order to increase validity. For my analytical framework, I used museum theories on community engagement and social inclusion, which resulted in greater applied knowledge in terms of how the theories relate to museum practice in New Zealand.

I used two research methods to conduct my research: studying relevant local and central government documents, plus gallery documents and website content (see the list of sources in Appendix one); and interviewing professionals involved with the art galleries and overarching local authority. Documentary research sources were selected to represent each of the case study organisations’ strategies and operations, and central and local government policy regarding social inclusion in arts and culture. Documentary research is unobtrusive,
inexpensive and accessible, however an organisation’s recording of data may have been selective or the document may have been edited.\textsuperscript{81} The interviews balanced these concerns by providing richer data about the organisations from the perspectives of the professionals I interviewed. My interview method was a mixture of a standardised open-ended interview and a general interview guide approach. Patton defines these two types of interview approaches:

The standardised open-ended interview consists of a set of questions carefully worded and arranged with the intention of taking each respondent through the same sequence and asking each respondent the same questions with essentially the same words…The interview guide simply serves as a checklist during the interview to make sure that all relevant topics are covered.\textsuperscript{82}

A mixture of the two approaches was appropriate because I could use predetermined questions and also have the flexibility to probe into certain themes or add topics that I had not anticipated.\textsuperscript{83} This was important for my research, as the participants had varying degrees of knowledge about the question topics.

I gained approval from the Human Ethics Committee of Victoria University of Wellington to allow human subjects to participate in my research. I interviewed the following eight people:

Wellington City Councillors:
1. Ray Ahipene-Mercer (Arts Portfolio Leader and Wellington Museums Trust Board member), Māori heritage: descendent of the iwi (tribes) Ngai Tara and Ngati Ira
2. Paul Eagle (leader of Community Engagement portfolio\textsuperscript{84}), Māori heritage: descendent of the Tainui iwi (tribe)

Research, Consultation and Planning, Wellington City Council:
3. Martin Rodgers (Manager Research, Consultation and Planning, and previously Manager City Arts)

City Arts, Wellington City Council:
4. Natasha Petkovic-Jeremic (Manager City Arts)

\textsuperscript{83} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{84} Cr Eagle held this position at the time of the interviews in September/October 2013 during local government elections. Following the elections, Cr Eagle’s leadership position changed to chairperson of the Community, Sport and Recreation Committee. He is also a member of the Economic Growth and Arts Committee.
5. Eve Armstrong (Arts Advisor, and member of the TPG Visual Arts Selection Panel)

Wellington Museums Trust (WMT):
6. Dr Sarah Rusholme (Head of Strategic Development)

City Gallery Wellington:
7. Elizabeth Caldwell (Director)
8. Tracey Monastra (Manager Visitor Learning)

As part of the Master of Museum and Heritage Studies, I undertook placements in the Marketing and Communications team at City Gallery, and in the City Arts team of the Council. The knowledge I gained about the institutional functioning and culture influenced my analysis. During these placements I had access to the documents held by City Arts and City Gallery, which were not available to the public. These documents and placement experiences helped me to understand the processes of the two galleries and the Council in a significantly deeper manner.

I used an inductive approach to analyse the qualitative data, which is common for previously unstudied phenomenon. As Thomas explains, “inductive analysis refers to approaches that primarily use detailed readings of raw data to derive concepts, themes, or a model through interpretations made…by an evaluator or researcher.” My own personal bias, namely the social justice framework (mentioned earlier) undoubtedly influenced the analysis, but I endeavoured to objectively analyse the findings as much as possible. I identified key quotes that aligned with or challenged the themes emerging from the literature, or things that stood out in relation to international and local developments in social inclusion practice. I organised the results into themes based on my questions (see Appendix two). As a “mediator of languages,” I linked the participants’ views through my own interpretation and connected them with my documentary research and the scholarship. The participants were given the

---

85 Because these documents are not publicly available, they are not listed in Appendix one: Sources included in documentary research.
89 Blaikie, "Designing social research."
opportunity to check quotes and paraphrasing, which ensured they were represented sensitively.

The limitations of this research largely stem from the small size of the project and the correspondingly small sample size. The parameters of the dissertation meant I could only research one case study and needed to keep the interviews to a manageable number. I acknowledge my critique is based on a small amount of evidence and the validity of the results for the arts and culture sector in New Zealand is relatively weak. Nevertheless, the results do show useful data for Wellington City Council and its galleries, along with a case study for other local authorities, and their museums and galleries to learn from. If the project had the capacity for more interviews, I would have included City Gallery curators. These arts professionals would have possibly given different perspectives from their experiences working with artists and developing exhibition programmes as a means towards social inclusion. It would have also been helpful to find out what some representatives from the general public thought of social inclusion in City Gallery and TPG, but as already stated, I did not have the capacity to conduct any visitor research.

**Conclusion**

I conclude the introduction by outlining the contents of this dissertation, which is divided into three chapters and a conclusion. Chapter one provides further background to the research topic and case study, describing the major international, national and local contexts of social inclusion policy, practice and evaluation impacting on galleries. Chapter two outlines the results from the interviews with eight local government and art gallery professionals in Wellington. Chapter three analyses and discusses the results of the research, identifying the major themes of the findings with respect to scholarship and current practice (Art exhibitions, Local policy and evaluation, and Towards an evaluation framework). In the conclusion I reiterate the major findings, and discuss the contribution this research has made to museum studies, as well as recommendations for further academic research and the development of gallery practice.
Chapter one:

The policy–practice gap: Background

As pointed out in the introduction, this dissertation explores the current practice of social inclusion in Wellington City Council’s art galleries. This chapter provides the background setting to the topic before I move on to the findings of the research in chapter two. In the first section of this chapter I describe important international developments towards social inclusion in museum practice. The second section outlines the national structures, policy and evaluation frameworks and the third section describes the same themes within the local context and provides background to the case study. Sources largely arose out of the documentary research (see Appendix one).

International policy and practice

Museums have been working on engaging new and previously excluded communities since the early twentieth century. Influenced by the civil rights movement, American museums led the work towards social inclusion with their community and neighbourhood museums. A key example of social inclusion and democracy in museums is the Anacostia Community Museum, set up in an old cinema in a black district of Washington DC in 1967, backed by the Smithsonian Institution, and directed by a young African American youth worker, John Kinard. This was a step from the purely educational model towards community development and interpretation in museums. Nowadays, the United States museum sector still argues for social inclusion by way of democratic museums and exhibitions on social justice themes, such as the Social Studies series at the Arizona State University Art Museum.

Significant social inclusion developments have more recently taken place in museums of other English speaking countries. In the early 1990s, museums in Britain and Australia, among other Western countries, had to expand their social purposes and

2 Black, "Building a 21st Century Audience."
4 Crooke, "Museums and community."
5 Archibald, "Introduction."
widen their audiences, or risk closure. This was due to declining visitor numbers, influenced by competition with other leisure activities, and demands for greater accountability of public funds. The New Labour British government (1997–2010) brought social inclusion and community growth into policy by establishing the Social Exclusion Unit in 1997, and in Australia the Liberal government established a Social Inclusion Unit in the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet in 2002. Australia made no positive causal association between museums and social change, whereas Britain firmly implemented social inclusion strategies into arts and culture. The British government established the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) which, influenced by the Social Exclusion Unit, advocated for social inclusion in museums and encouraged them to include community initiatives in their practice. Practical successes include the four Contemporary arts and human rights exhibitions (2001–2010) at Glasgow’s Gallery of Modern Art. These British policy developments demonstrate the impact that a national mandate can have on museums’ social inclusion practices.

A number of ideas have been put forward by the United Kingdom for measuring museums’ impacts on people. However the challenge is how to define the markers “in a way that ensures that the unique and idiosyncratic effect of museums is credited and then to measure with tools that are sensitive enough to show the heritage sector’s contribution, including

---

8 Black, "Building a 21st Century Audience."
10 Stam, "The informed muse."
11 Selwood and Davies, "Policies, frameworks and legislation."; West and Smith, "We are not a Government poodle."
14 Crooke, "Museum significance and community."
qualitative (patient or people centred) words and meanings.”\textsuperscript{16} Weil proposes that museums be included in not-for-profit organisations’ evaluation frameworks, with an intended bottom line to differentiate between success and failure.\textsuperscript{17} However some scholars argue that locating museums with organisations that have purely social goals would undermine their cultural role.\textsuperscript{18} Kelly argues there is huge potential for collaborative visitor research between academic researchers and museum professionals that would have strategic benefits in terms of overall organisational health and sustainability.\textsuperscript{19} Evaluations of public programmes could be included to increase the understanding of public expectations.\textsuperscript{20} I would argue the objectives of any evaluation should outline how the research will contribute towards advancing social inclusion. This is more obvious in Ander et al’s proposed framework, which aims to measure personal, social, cultural, physical and sensory wellbeing, plus dimensions about recovery from illness.\textsuperscript{21} It has a focus on therapeutic health and is only an initial step towards identifying indicators for measuring social outcomes of museums, thus further research is needed in this area.

**National influencers**

In Aotearoa New Zealand, the Local Government Act 2002, administered by the Department of Internal Affairs (DIA), stipulates how local authorities function, which obviously impacts on their cultural institutions and services. Stated in the Act, the first and major purpose of local government is to “enable democratic local decision-making and action by, and on behalf of, communities.”\textsuperscript{22} A reform of the Local Government Act 2002 ‘Better Local Government’ is currently underway to improve fiscal transparency and efficiency and to clarify the role of local government.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{19} Kelly, "Evaluation, Research and Communities of Practice."
\textsuperscript{20} Weil, "From Being about Something to Being for Somebody."
\textsuperscript{21} Ander et al., "Generic well-being outcomes."
\textsuperscript{22} Local Government Act 2002, s 3.
As part of the local government reform, it was decided that the second purpose of local government, as stated in the Local Government Act 2002, was impractical. This purpose covered social, economic, cultural, and environmental wellbeing. In December 2012, it changed to the provision of “good quality local infrastructure, local public services, and performance of regulatory functions in a way that is most cost-effective for households and businesses.” Although more focus is now given to spending, the core services of local government, stated in the Act, still include “libraries, museums, reserves, and other recreational and community facilities.” The legislative change means that museums are less clearly positioned within local authorities and Councils may have less freedom to spend in the arts and culture sector, although museums are core services.

The Ministry for Culture and Heritage (MCH) and Creative New Zealand (CNZ) are New Zealand’s arts and culture government bodies. MCH oversees the country’s cultural sector, manages cultural provisions, undertakes projects to support the sector and provides advice to the Minister for Culture and Heritage. MCH administers funding to several statutory bodies, including CNZ, which includes two arts Boards, one to cater for Māori and one for the general population. The function of CNZ and the Boards is “to encourage, promote, and support the arts in New Zealand for the benefit of all New Zealanders.” An example of this function is the Arts for All handbook, written by Arts Access Aotearoa and published by CNZ for arts and culture organisations and artists to use in improving the inclusion of disabled people.

The Ministry for Social Development (MSD) is the government department leading New Zealand’s development towards social inclusion. It uses social inclusion and participation together as one term which does not solely focus on combating social exclusion. An MSD document states:
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Social inclusion and participation describe both:

- the results government (on behalf of citizens) wants to achieve through its social policies and programmes
- the means by which these results are to be achieved (ie. working in ways that include rather than exclude, and that promote and enable participation in social, economic, political and cultural life).

Other government departments work on developing social inclusion in their own specialty areas. For example the Ministry of Health produced The New Zealand Disability Strategy, which guides government practice and “presents a long-term plan for changing New Zealand from a disabling to an inclusive society.” One of the strategy’s objectives specifies improving inclusion in culture and recreation. In general, it appears that social inclusion policies include arts and culture and acknowledge that participation in this sector is optimal for individual and social wellbeing.

As demonstrated in legislation, the New Zealand government recognises that to improve performance in any sector, regular evaluation is required. Performance reporting in the public service was introduced in 1989 through the Public Finance Act and Local Government Amendment Act. This was translated into Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), known in other countries as Key Results Areas (KRAs). Following this, a number of public art galleries’ performance measures included visitor numbers and satisfaction but the links between the measures were unclear and poorly justified. MCH’s Cultural Indicators Programme (established in 1993 in partnership with Statistics New Zealand) has been refining the measurement of culture as a contributing factor to New Zealand’s social and economic wellbeing. The Programme produced the Cultural Indicators for New Zealand Tohu Ahurea mō Aotearoa which breaks cultural outcomes down into five themes: ‘engagement’ (including access), ‘cultural identity’, ‘diversity’, ‘social cohesion’, and ‘economic development’. Internationally influential, Australia used the Indicators to help...
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develop “Vital Signs: Cultural Indicators for Australia.” It appears that the measurement of arts and culture by local authorities is conducted poorly compared with the national framework, however more research is needed to justify this conclusion.

In summary of this chapter so far, there appears to be a weak relationship between social inclusion and culture, currently the focus of MSD and MCH respectively. It does not appear that MCH and MSD communicate their potential commonalities in progressing social inclusion. Unlike the United Kingdom, there is no cross-governmental drive for social inclusion; hence it is not embedded in policy. National policy, in terms of aims and evaluation of social inclusion in arts and culture, is currently unclear, and further research is needed to fill this gap. In the next section I describe the context of cultural policy and evaluation in Wellington, the location of the case study.

Wellington: The case study

Wellington is the capital city of New Zealand, located at the bottom of the North Island. Many national and international visitors pass through Wellington, crossing to and from the South Island. Wellington hosts large annual arts and culture events and is home to many national arts and culture bodies, including Te Papa. The population of Wellington City is 210,000 (calculated in 2011). Wellington’s residents are higher educated (holding a tertiary qualification) and have higher income levels than the country’s averages. Seventy per cent of Wellington’s residents identify as Pākehā/New Zealand European, thirteen per cent as Asian, five per cent as Māori, seven per cent as Pacific Island, and one per cent as Middle Eastern, Latin American or African. More Wellington residents were born overseas than the general population.
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Wellington City Council (the Council) has several strategies for the city’s development, which factor in arts and culture. The Arts and Culture Strategy and Economic Development Strategy correspond with the long-term strategy Wellington Towards 2040: Smart Capital, acknowledging that creative cities are attractive cities to live in.\(^44\) The Council’s Economic Development Strategy mentions arts and culture in its aim “to maintain Wellington’s reputation as the arts, culture and events capital.”\(^45\) However the major strategy for arts and culture is obviously the Arts and Culture Strategy, which during its development underwent consultation with local arts communities.\(^46\) It focuses on supporting the local growth of arts and culture, and encourages community-driven projects.\(^47\) The strategy has three priorities, which only superficially align with social inclusion:

1. Enabling the best and boldest of arts and culture
2. Diverse Experiences by Diverse Communities – Wellington as a region of confident identities
3. Thriving Creative Enterprises

The above strategies lack any substantial traction for improving social inclusion in arts and culture in Wellington. To fill this gap, the Council has an Accessibility Action Plan, which includes a section on arts and culture that aims to “remove barriers to access so everyone can participate in the cultural life of the city.”\(^48\)

I have included two Council teams in the case study: City Arts; and Research, Consultation and Planning. These are visually depicted in Figure 1 on the next page. The City Arts team is the smaller of the two, with six full time equivalent staff members. City Arts provides advice and advocacy for the local arts sector, manages the public art fund, the city’s art collection, and the Toi Pōneke Arts Centre (Toi Pōneke).\(^49\) In 2013 the City Arts team was restructured into the Economic Growth unit. This strategic move aligned the Council’s structure with the Wellington Towards 2040 strategy, echoing that Wellington’s arts and culture impacts on its economic growth within a global setting.\(^50\) The Research, Consultation and Planning team

\(^{46}\) Ray Ahipene-Mercer (Councillor, Wellington City Council), interview with the author, 18 September 2013.
\(^{47}\) Martin Rodgers (Manager Research, Consultation and Planning, Wellington City Council), interview with the author, 4 September 2013.
\(^{50}\) Rodgers.
monitors the Council’s progress against its strategic priorities and is in charge of producing documents for public consultation.\textsuperscript{51} The team manages the GetSmart survey, designed for use by all Council units to enable consistent evaluation and correspondence with KPIs.\textsuperscript{52} City Gallery began using the evaluation strategy in late 2013, and it is not used by TPG.\textsuperscript{53} The GetSmart survey for museums, galleries and heritage sites is a comprehensive visitor survey designed to elicit a mix of quantitative and qualitative data.\textsuperscript{54}

Figure 1: Case study

The Wellington Museums Trust (WMT), a Council CCO, manages City Gallery Wellington and five other cultural attractions.\textsuperscript{58} “WMT’s objective is to further the development of
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City Gallery is the only WMT organisation shown in the diagram as it is the only one included in this study.
museum and cultural activities within the city for the benefit of Wellington residents and the wider community.”

City Gallery has its own director and Foundation with a Board of Trustees. According to City Gallery’s website, “Foundation members ensure the City Gallery's continued reputation and success for showing widely-acclaimed exhibitions of international standard.”

In contrast, TPG is managed directly by the Council, overseen by the Manager of Toi Pōneke. There are no staff members singly dedicated to TPG, unlike City Gallery, with fifteen staff members (most of which are full-time) plus the gallery hosts and their supervisors.

Toi Pōneke, including TPG, was established in 2005 as a result of local emerging artists’ needs for affordable studios. The Council website states, “Toi Pōneke Arts Centre and Gallery are a creative space for artists, arts businesses and arts organisations to meet, work, rehearse and exhibit in the heart of the city.”

Being part of Toi Pōneke means a number of exhibition proposals for TPG come from the artists who rent the centre’s studios, and at the end of each year a group exhibition is produced by the artists. TPG does not have a curator, as the curating is part of the artist(s)’ professional experience. A call for exhibition proposals is sent out biannually and exhibitions generally change every four weeks. The Toi Pōneke Visual Arts Selection Panel selects the exhibitions, of which a City Gallery curator is a member. The exhibition proposal guide states:

In considering exhibition proposals, priority is given to:
- Wellington-based artists, curators and groups, particularly those in the early stages of their career
- those who demonstrate a high standard of technical ability and presentation.

TPG collects information about the artists’ exhibiting experiences through post exhibition surveys and conversations with the artists. Despite not being a reporting requirement, a
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gallery visitor survey was developed in May 2013 to contribute information towards the Toi Pōneke review.67

City Gallery, a contemporary art gallery, is the major local public art gallery in Wellington. City Gallery’s website states it is a “non-collecting” gallery with a “reputation for innovation and style, inspiring and challenging its audiences through local, national and international exhibitions as well as international exchanges and joint ventures with other art museums.”68 Although this tells us a little about the gallery, the mission is not clearly stated on its website, nor stated in the City Gallery Foundation Annual Report 2011–12 or the Wellington Museums Trust Annual Report 2013. In contrast with TPG, City Gallery must plan its exhibition programme at least eighteen to twenty-four months in advance, which is decided by the curators (one senior curator and two assistant curators) and the gallery’s management.69 Front-of-house staff members record demographic data about visitors (gender, approximate age, and whether a New Zealand or foreign visitor) and at the end of each exhibition, staff do an informal evaluation by discussing successes and needs for improvement.70

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the professional context for social inclusion in art galleries, internationally, nationally then locally. I have also described the background to the case study. As I demonstrated in this chapter with reference to the international literature, a lot of progress towards social inclusion in museums has been made overseas. In particular, the United Kingdom demonstrated that national social inclusion policy can significantly impact on arts and culture practice. However, it seems that the New Zealand museum sector does not have an overarching social inclusion mandate. Various government departments and local authorities contribute to the purposes and evaluation of arts and culture by producing strategies and guidance, particularly regarding physical accessibility and cultural diversity. However, they do not appear to be integrated, creating a gap between museum policy and practice. In Wellington, City Gallery has more resources than TPG (with no dedicated staff),

67 This project was voluntarily carried out by the author as part of her student placement with City Arts.
68 City Gallery Wellington, “About the gallery,” 2013, http://citygallery.org.nz/about. The italicised phrase has been added by the author to highlight the social inclusion aspect.
69 Tracey Monastra (Manager Visitor Learning, City Gallery Wellington), interview with the author, 7 October 2013.
70 Ibid.
but its mission is perhaps unclear in terms of social inclusion. If institutional policies are vague, and there is no mandate, it is likely that public art galleries only have good intentions to advance social inclusion. Overall, it is unclear how the social inclusion practice of New Zealand’s local public art galleries is influenced by policy and evaluation. The interviews allowed me to begin to explore these issues and the results are described in the following chapter.
Chapter two:  
Social inclusion-lite?: Findings  

Introduction  

In the last chapter I set the scene of Wellington City Council’s locally-managed art galleries. I briefly described the national and local policies for social inclusion in arts and culture, and found a gap between social inclusion policy and museum practice. This chapter summarises the results from my interviews with eight cultural sector professionals from the Council, WMT and City Gallery.¹ The interviews gave participants the opportunity to express their institutional and personal views on social inclusion policy, evaluation and practice in City Gallery and TPG. After the analysis of the interview data, the results were organised into themes. These are social inclusion, policy and evaluation, challenges, successes, and developments, which are each discussed in the corresponding sections below. These themes are central to this research and provide the basis for my analysis and discussion in the following chapter.  

Thoughts: Social inclusion  

All participants had a good understanding of social inclusion, referring to all people having opportunities for participation and access regardless of demographic and social status, and some participants emphasised community engagement. Rodgers unpacked the participation aspect of social inclusion, explaining that “it goes beyond being an attendee to being a participant in the development of projects…where the participant’s response to the project or activity, as it is being developed, is valued and incorporated into the work some way.” The views of Rodgers, Petkovic-Jeremic and Cr Ahipene-Mercer relate to the legal requirement for local government to consult with communities on major activities by way of draft long-term and annual plans.² Petkovic-Jeremic said, “Consultation is a form of inclusion – getting views from the sector and responding to them.” Cr Ahipene-Mercer integrated social  

¹ Specific participant details and the data analysis methodology are located in the Research design section of the Introduction, and the interview questions are in Appendix two.  
inclusion with policy. He said, “It’s about the consideration of inclusiveness in all the policies that we set at the Council, whether its arts or anything else.” Cr Eagle hinted at social inclusion’s connection with social exclusion, stating it is “a concept that applies to people, those who are less fortunate, or a situation where it’s about bringing people together…with different points of view.” Cr Eagle explained that his view of social inclusion is influenced by his Māori heritage and his Christian upbringing as the son of a Methodist Minister. Valued by his church and whānau, Cr Eagle is accustomed to social inclusion as a common theme of conversation and religious action.

Participants’ views on social inclusion within arts and culture were influenced by their workplaces. Justifiably, Rusholme (WMT) and Monastra (City Gallery) only mentioned social inclusion practice within museum institutions, in contrast to the broad views that councillors and Council officials hold. Cr Ahipene-Mercer, Cr Eagle, Rodgers and Petkovic-Jeremic view public places as spaces for real social inclusion and community engagement with art, from murals to sculptures. “The street is a gallery without walls,” Petkovic-Jeremic said. Rodgers commented that the arts community in Wellington has the disposition to counter social exclusion:

Arts practitioners have created groups or opportunities for people that could potentially be marginalised, that provide them with an opportunity to show their creative expression and that support their creative development…So it doesn’t always require government intervention for something to happen.

Comments by Council participants frame Wellington’s galleries within the wider cross-disciplinary arts and culture scene.

The need for the arts and culture sector to be inclusive of ethnic diversity in particular was raised by the majority of participants. Rodgers mentioned Wellington’s aim to be a “welcoming diverse city,” driven originally from a social imperative and recently reinforced economically in the Council’s strategic documents:³

For some time now, Wellington has recognised the importance of being a creative, diverse, inclusive and tolerant city. However, the importance of such qualities has increased significantly as we look to develop and attract smart and creative businesses. We have identified through our strategies that these businesses are key to our future and we know that people working in them are attracted to creative and diverse cities.

³ See page 26 in chapter one for a description of these documents, also listed in Appendix one.
In line with this argument, Caldwell and Cr Ahipene-Mercer mentioned the need for City Gallery to welcome international visitors of diverse cultures to Wellington. However Cr Eagle argued that City Gallery, a service for the community, should focus on its local residents. Irrespective of cultures, Monastra and Rusholme believe social inclusion in the museum sector is about having friendly, welcoming institutions. Rusholme said, “It’s about feeling safe, welcome – ‘this is part of my terrain, my environment. I would go here to shelter from the rain’.”

Caldwell’s views on social inclusion in galleries stood out from the other participants, particularly from Petkovic-Jeremic’s views. Caldwell said City Gallery is “Art and artist led; audience focused,” whereas Petkovic-Jeremic concentrates on social outcomes of the museum sector. Petkovic-Jeremic said, “Social inclusion, in terms of wide cross-engagement with audiences, is what we should be all about.” She added that museums must be relevant to their communities:

To be relevant, museums need to ask questions, and be forums for discussion on the past, present and future. Inclusion means being accepted by the community as a place that people can relate to...For cultural institutions, rather than being internally focused, it’s about engaging with people...In an art gallery, you’re connecting people with art.

Contrasting this statement with more traditional views, Caldwell said, “There are organisations within Council that might be classified more obviously than galleries as having social inclusion as their core purpose. However, while City Gallery’s work includes social inclusion as part of its objectives and goals, its core purpose is focused on artistic outcomes.”

Cr Ahipene-Mercer and Monastra raised audience development as a means to social inclusion in art galleries. Monastra understands audience development as “giving a great experience and opening the door.” She said, “It’s not lost if next month they don’t come; that door has been opened and what you want to do is build on it.” Monastra believes City Gallery can break down people’s fears of the institution by educating children and their families. “If we can hook children in early to the experience and open up what these sorts of spaces are for kids and their families then City Gallery can become part of their lives,” she said. Cr Ahipene-Mercer explained how audience development can be understood and realistically achieved by galleries, likening City Gallery to an ivory tower:
How can we make the base of the ivory tower wider? I’m not saying we make the tower lower. I’m saying we keep that high end dimension of it, but we broaden the base. We can accidentally exclude people without meaning to, without putting in place the programmes, the education, getting families in. That’s not about dumbing down. With art, we are talking about excellence. Of course people have different views on what constitutes excellence. I think we all know, irrespective of preferences (like going to movies), they might be excellent, but not necessarily our preference. We have to make sure we don’t compromise our excellence, but in doing so we give consideration to other factors.

**Strategy: Policy and evaluation**

Participants mentioned the following Council strategies and national policies influence social inclusion practice in City Gallery and TPG:

- Wellington towards 2040: Smart Capital
- Accessible Wellington Action Plan (and the New Zealand Disability Strategy)
- Arts and Culture Strategy
- Local Government Act 2002

According to Rusholme, the Accessible Wellington Action Plan, guided by the New Zealand Disability Strategy, is user-friendly and provides a strong mandate for social inclusion in Wellington. Rodgers and Rusholme argue that national and local policy needs to be practical, rather than aspirational, to enable on the ground projects to occur and succeed. Council and WMT staff mentioned the Arts and Culture Strategy helps to drive social inclusion in City Gallery and TPG, whereas City Gallery staff did not. Armstrong and Cr Ahipene-Mercer noted that the strategy, produced in 2011, needs revising to ensure it is relevant, and Cr Eagle argued its visibility should be elevated.

Cr Eagle, Monastra and Petkovic-Jeremic argue that social inclusion needs to be embedded in policy as a core function, and understood by policy makers, despite changes in priorities. Cr Eagle noted the Council needs a social development strategy to embed civil service and social justice values. Highlighting his understanding of bureaucratic processes, he said, “If you don’t have a framework, in a bureaucracy like Council, then things don’t get their due worth.” Petkovic-Jeremic believes that prioritising social inclusion requires an organisational culture change, which will be slow, but can be achieved. She noted the potential amalgamation of Wellington region’s local authorities as a potential vehicle for this kind of change.
Rodgers and Petkovic-Jeremic believe social inclusion strategies are not implemented because the Council is unclear about how to achieve its diverse aims. Petkovic-Jeremic argues that the Council needs to be specific about what it means to engage with and serve communities, as do galleries. To make priorities clearer, Rodgers said councillors need to be vigilant about their priorities, which are published in the Annual Plan and Annual Report. Armstrong agreed, stating: “If [social inclusion] is identified as a key strategic priority, then you have to deliver on it, for the gallery. At the level of policy, if it’s going to become a priority, then funders or whoever dictates that also needs to support it to make it happen.” Cr Eagle takes issue with CCOs’ focus on finance and thinks they need to consistently be given the message that the Council is primarily about people and the city, perhaps through an emphasis on qualitative measures. Rodgers believes the Council needs to do better at enforcing social inclusion practice in its CCOs, including WMT. He said, “We could do better at working with our CCOs to ensure their work is more closely aligned to our strategies and priorities. We should be able to exert more influence on them than we currently do.”

The measurement of social inclusion was identified as a challenge by participants. Aware of recent studies about evaluating social outcomes, Petkovic-Jeremic explained that the Council is challenged with measuring wellbeing, as it requires more qualitative data gathering and analysis:

> It’s easy to measure the numbers and the dollars but how do you measure wellbeing? There have been quite a few studies about it in last couple of years to find the formula that describes that. It’s a challenge we face here – any funder will face. The economic benefits are relatively easy to quantify – you multiply the number of people by the number of dollars and cents – whether that has the same status as wellbeing…?

Rodgers thinks it is possible to qualitatively assess the immediate impact of art exhibitions on people. He suggests that art exhibitions about communities or community issues would fit this type of measurement because they increase people’s awareness. He said:

> What you could measure quite readily is a change in people’s understanding or awareness of an issue and then that could impact on wellbeing further down the track…There’s the immediate impact in terms of their understanding, which you could assess, and then ask people what they might do as a result… It’s about the people themselves. The individual can anticipate what might change for them.

Caldwell believes that the Council is focused on collecting quantitative data. “Typically, councillors want to know about money – that it is being well managed and they are getting
good value for their spend – and they want to know about visitor numbers. They want to know the organisation is valued, demonstrated by being patronised.” It appears that the Council’s evaluation is perceived as being focused on quantitative measures when in reality it is also interested in qualitative evaluation. This might simply be an internal issue regarding the Council’s lack of clarity on priorities and poor communication with WMT and City Gallery, or it could reflect a wider philosophical problem about the value of culture.

Caldwell believes City Gallery, like most galleries, would benefit from better articulating its value so funders, particularly government, understand why it is worthy of support. She stated:

I would like to see the cultural sector get better at articulating the value, benefit and merit of culture in people’s lives. I would like to see people who occupy roles outside of the cultural sector, but who have an influence on the cultural sector, with greater awareness of the issues affecting it and of its value. These are people making the decisions or influencing those making the decisions about funding and resource allocation, not just to cultural institutions, but areas such as education.

Caldwell proposed a multi-layered approach to communication with the Council, stating, “The lines of communication could be improved enormously. There are too few, and they are not as robust as they could be, and are not necessarily the right kind.” Caldwell emphasised the importance of City Gallery communicating to the Council the information that is needed, such as “what your organisation is doing, why and with what outcomes.” She mentioned that City Gallery’s reporting to the Council could be a subject for review and analysis.

KPIs have an impact on the measurement of social inclusion by the galleries. Visitor inclusion is not part of the KPIs for TPG and this lack of mandate means staff do not prioritise the evaluation of visitor responses, according to Armstrong. She informed me the gallery’s visitor survey is typically only completed if the receptionist requests the visitor to fill it out, which is irregularly done. Rusholme mentioned different KPI reporting systems are in place for each of the WMT organisations. KPIs that City Gallery must report on however are not targeted at social inclusion, although there is a KPI for visitor satisfaction. KPIs are often focused on quantitative measures, and it should be reiterated that these crude measures do not encompass social value or wellbeing.4

4 Lang, Reeve, and Woollard, “The Responsive Museum.”
City Gallery’s measurement of wellbeing outcomes can be improved considerably, Caldwell believes. She said, “City Gallery’s data gathering about its audience would benefit from being more robust and more consistent. The systems are not sufficiently defined and maintained.” Monastra thought conducting evaluations of public programmes was a good idea, but cannot undertake this due to resource constraints. Time constraints also prevent Monastra from conducting more focus groups to learn about their art gallery experiences and using online platforms to receive audience feedback, which is particularly useful for planning relevant public programmes. Caldwell explained that quantitative evaluation is undertaken more commonly than qualitative methods because it is easier to initiate and assess. That said, she added, the sector is much more aware of the value of collecting and mining qualitative information and a number of galleries are now either already starting to collect this data, or like City Gallery, planning to collect it.

City Gallery is implementing GetSmart, however Caldwell is critical of Council resident opinion surveys and visitor satisfaction surveys. She said:

My argument with those sorts of surveys is that they are not sufficiently nuanced – they are blunt instrument-like in their framing of questions. It is all too easy for a person who did not like the particular kind of art they looked at to rate the experience less highly. It crudely translates to “I hate that kind of art, therefore I didn’t have a good experience,” when in fact they may have had a great experience of the organisation. They may have received friendly, helpful guidance from front of house staff, clearly signposted information, a choice of activities in support of the exhibitions (talks, film screenings etc.), plentiful seating for rest breaks, clean toilets and somewhere to have coffee. There could be a lot of positives, but if the questions favour personal taste and they didn’t like the art, the whole experience is downgraded.

Rather than typical local authority surveys, Caldwell and Monastra were enthusiastic about the Morris Hargreaves McIntyre visitor 360° survey because the questions are well-researched, both quantitative and qualitative, and without a focus on demographic categories. CNZ offers seminars on basic audience development to staff of arts organisations using Morris Hargreaves McIntyre material. Given that current evaluation tools by various organisations are competing and inconsistently used, an overarching evaluation framework could integrate the different models to better align with the needs of local authorities and galleries.
Hurdles: Social inclusion challenges

The buildings and lack of resources were identified as major challenges for both galleries. The entrance and signage of TPG is unclear, however as Armstrong explained, the building is not owned by the Council, so cannot be drastically altered. Armstrong found not having a dedicated TPG team is challenging for developing social inclusion and explained that if social inclusion was identified as a priority the gallery would need an experienced staff member to work with the artists to develop public programmes. Caldwell and Monastra explained that City Gallery’s primary challenge was lack of funding, which directly impacts on resources, including staff capacity and building redevelopments. Monastra noted the lack of time means there is less capacity for her to do outreach and build meaningful relationships, which would positively correlate with social inclusion.

Rusholme and Monastra both find the architectural layout, especially the entrance, a significant challenge for City Gallery. Rusholme said, “The building is very imposing. You can’t stick your held round because of the double doors…Once you’re in City Gallery you’re kind of committed.” Rusholme feels that the front-of-house area is imposing because of its immediate location directly facing the entrance. Although a regular visitor to City Gallery, she felt that the entrance could be a little intimidating and wondered how that might affect the experiences of first time visitors. Rusholme suggested an ideal solution, if there were no funding constraints, would be to remodel the whole entrance. She would open up the gallery from both sides – Harris Street to Civic Square – to make the ground floor a thoroughfare and plaza-like space. She and Petkovic-Jeremic talked about the gallery needing to be a ‘hub,’ a dynamic public space with activities and events, whereas Monastra, of City Gallery, thinks it is a hub, and has the ability to be anything, even grassroots. However, sharing Rusholme’s concerns about the gallery entrance, Monastra said, “We all acknowledge that the entrance is not as welcoming as it could be. It’s quite imposing. There is a long term vision to redevelop the entrance to make it more user-friendly.” This solution would help, but it seems bigger changes to social inclusion practice are needed that alter how the gallery functions.

Further challenges for TPG were related to community engagement. Cr Ahipene-Mercer found that engaging communities following exhibitions is a challenge for the gallery, but collaborative, short-term exhibitions work well. However, he points out not every exhibition can be collaborative, as that would not represent the diversity of artists’ projects, and the
gallery does not have the resources to manage this. Petkovic-Jeremic believes the identity of TPG, within what might be called the ‘ecology’ of art galleries in Wellington, is not widely understood or recognised. She said that while staff know its mission and identity, TPG needs to better convey this mission or purpose to the public. Rodgers and Petkovic-Jeremic believe that Council and Toi Pōneke staff generally have a reactive, comfortable attitude to the challenges that TPG faces. Petkovic-Jeremic and Rodgers explained that when people are used to working in public and political entities they tend to become unaware of potential problems until they arise. Lacking time, they tend to be reactive, rather than addressing the bigger issues strategically. Petkovic-Jeremic’s and Rodgers’ explanations echo scholarship that critiques museum professionals’ tendency to react, rather than proactively engage in policy and strategy.5

The typically narrow audience of public art galleries was raised as a challenge for City Gallery. Cr Eagle felt that the gallery needs to think about serving all residents of Wellington. He sees City Gallery as “an historical exhibition space with status and history on its side,” contrasted with TPG’s grass roots nature, managed by a “community arts response team.” Further explaining the differences, Cr Eagle said, “[City Gallery] might be segmenting out our target market because other parts of the arts world [such as TPG] provide for those people. Not everyone wants to go. They see City Gallery as bastions of the elite. They just go to see Colin McCahon and Yayoi Kusama.” Caldwell acknowledges that the majority of visitors to art galleries, including City Gallery, tend to be educated, white and female, despite their many efforts to diversify their audience:

Galleries are very aware that the typical demographic profile of its audience is skewed towards educated, white females. That’s not to say that is the whole audience – just that it tends to be a majority figure when the broad profile is assessed. For some reason, despite considerable effort on the part of galleries over many years, it is a profile that doesn’t seem to change. City Gallery, like other galleries, wants to attract and engage as broad and diverse an audience as possible.

Caldwell’s statement echoes international findings that museum audiences have increased in numbers, but not in diversity of visitors.6

5 Selwood and Davies, "Policies, frameworks and legislation."
6 Black, "Building a 21st Century Audience."
Rusholme mentioned the type of art on display at City Gallery is a huge barrier for many people. “The fact that they’re an art gallery, a contemporary art gallery at that – for lots of people it’s a huge barrier, straight off the bat,” she said. Caldwell’s response to this is to educate people about art. She notices there are visitors that choose not to visit City Gallery, any gallery, because they think, “There’s nothing there for me, I don’t know about art, it is a place for people that know about that sort of thing.” Caldwell believes people can say that about any topic they don’t know about, and used an analogy of watching rugby to explain further.

> If I was to watch a rugby game I’d have no clue what was going on. The fact that I don’t know puts me off going to a game or watching it on TV because I don’t know what I’m looking at, what to look for. But if I was told about the rules, if I was shown how to watch a game of rugby, I might feel differently and I might develop an interest.

Although an interesting comment, there are vast differences between rugby and City Gallery, with the major point being that City Gallery is a civic facility.

**Good intentions: Social inclusion successes**

Participants gave examples of exhibitions that they felt demonstrated successful social inclusion. Below are the exhibitions that were mentioned by at least two of the participants:

**City Gallery Wellington:**

- *Sui faiga ae tumau fa’avae “tatau”* (tattoo) (August – October 2012)
- *Yayoi Kusama: Mirrored Years* (September 2009 – February 2010)

**Toi Pōneke Gallery:**

- *Tīvaevae Taonga: Our Tīvaevae Glory Box* (September – October 2012)
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7 Interviewees were given opportunities to comment on both galleries, however data provided was skewed towards City Gallery.
The “tatau” exhibition (*Sui faiga ae tumau fa’avae*) was mentioned for its inclusion of Samoan and other Pacific cultures, including young people. Rusholme found it a privileged and moving experience: “…in my life, one of the seminal experiences in an art gallery.” Rusholme acknowledged the trusting and rich relationship needed between the gallery and the community to make the exhibition a success, observing that the gallery had a different feeling because of the sense of ownership from the community. As a visitor, it gave Rusholme insight into another culture. Cr Ahipene-Mercer and Rusholme commented that the Yayoi Kusama exhibition was an obvious success for visitor numbers, with queues across civic square.8 “Kusama was astonishing”, Rusholme said. Caldwell and Monastra, both from City Gallery, identified that *Moving on Asia* as a big success because it brought in a lot more visitors of Asian origin. This was due to direct marketing at the Chinese New Year festival. Caldwell and Monastra also gave examples of exhibitions and public programmes that were successful not for reasons of cultural inclusivity or visitor numbers. They mentioned ‘late nights’ were popular with young people, and Monastra gave a specific example of a cellist’s performance during the Kermadec exhibition to which a surprising audience of pre-schoolers and their teachers visited.

Monastra commented that *Parihaka* was a ground breaking show for City Gallery, both in terms of inclusion, and using art in relation to social history. She explained historical and commissioned artworks were used in curating the exhibition. For Rodgers, the *Parihaka* exhibition stood out as inclusive because it allowed different perspectives. He said it was not necessarily comfortable for everyone but was a really enlightening exhibition about social justice, and it would benefit people to see more art exhibitions along a social justice theme. He explained:

It’s really important to me that preconceptions or misinformation are challenged. It was definitely educative, so it added some value to society as a whole, as opposed to something that’s just a personal experience, an aesthetic experience, or a personal response to something. It actually had a collective impact and it was inclusive in terms of participants. That’s the power of art. Art really has that potential to change societal views or influence thinking and I don’t think we do see as much of that as we could…The potential for social justice I don’t think is being exercised.

Rodgers also gave an example of a TPG exhibition that he feels had the potential to change societal views. *Thanks Driver (2007)* was a photographic exhibition about taxi drivers in
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8 *Yayoi Kusama: Mirrored Years*, an international show with admission charges, was the first exhibition in City Gallery’s redeveloped building.
Wellington that helped visitors to see them as people with personal lives as well as taxi drivers.

The identified success at TPG was the Tīvaevae Taonga exhibition, for which Armstrong and Petkovic-Jeremic gave numerous reasons. The gallery space was an informal venue, and flexible to the artists’ needs; the women making tīvaevae could use the kitchen and eat lunch in the hub, whereas most galleries would not have these facilities for artists; the exhibition brought in a different audience who were connected to the women’s communities; and the exhibition had a public programme, consisting of the artists sharing their tīvaevae-making knowledge with visitors. Armstrong reiterated that a team behind the organisation of the exhibition and a public programme were essential. The exhibition had a group of three organisers and funding from Creative NZ, which enabled them to arrange transport for people to get to the gallery. Petkovic-Jeremic pointed out the challenge of retaining this non-traditional art gallery audience, wondering whether they will visit TPG again. Overall, most of the social inclusion successes identified by participants were exhibitions, predominantly about ethic cultures.

**Future: Developments in action**

Data on social inclusion developments for the galleries focus on City Gallery, with WMT working on several initiatives. WMT has two projects underway with aims of improving physical accessibility and educational provisions to children and young people across its institutions, including City Gallery. Rusholme outlined the accessibility project:

The first WMT project is a three-year contract with an organisation based in Auckland, called Be Accessible. Last year WMT started working with Be Accessible to develop a programme of change for their six organisations, including City Gallery. Be Accessible will conduct an accessibility audit for two Trust institutions each year, paying special attention to sensory barriers, and also barriers for families and children. City Gallery will take part in the auditing in 2014. Be Accessible will provide comprehensive feedback and annual staff training to build staff confidence and capability. The project is part of WMT’s continuous social inclusion improvement strategy.
The above project aligns with the goal in the Council’s Accessibility Action Plan to cyclically audit Council venues, facilities and programmes. Auditing enables a ‘critical distance’ to challenge assumptions, the importance of which is emphasised by Lynch. WMT is also working to ensure the education provided by its institutions is meeting children’s and young people’s needs, as Rusholme explained:

The second project is part of WMT’s ongoing work programme which looks at its organisations’ provision for children and young people. The six month project started with an internal data audit of who attends the organisations, breadth and depth of programming, and benchmarking against regional institutions. Greater Wellington Regional Council’s Greater Say Online Citizen Panel was used to seek public views – digging deeper into their perceptions of WMT’s provisions. Wellington City Council provided a research platform for a survey of WMT’s education provision among the region’s teachers. Finally, LITMUS research will take small groups of children and young people to each institution for an accompanied visit and focus group discussion. They will use iPads so they can record images, film or their comments as they are guided around.

The two projects show that physical accessibility and inclusion of young visitors and their families are priority social inclusion areas for WMT. Caldwell mentioned that the organisations under WMT, including City Gallery, have developed an internal Access and Diversity Policy, still to be formally adopted by the WMT Board. The policy covers barriers relating to physical ability and mobility, ethnicity and economics.

City Gallery is working towards long-term goals around visitor participation and accessibility. Despite the free entry, the gallery is considering other costs for visitors, such as bus prices to travel into Wellington from greater Wellington regions. City Gallery is also planning tours for visually impaired people. Monastra explained that City Gallery is working on improving its public programme to include toddlers and pre-schoolers in its life-long learning approach. Current public programmes regularly cater for mothers and babies (Gallery Babes), school students and adults (Artsight after school and weekend art classes) and young people (particularly Open Late events). To compensate for constrained resources, City Gallery often partners with external arts organisations, such as Footnote Dance and local musicians, to produce public programme events. Working part-time at City Gallery, Monastra suggested that to improve social inclusion the gallery needs three of her.
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10 Lynch, "Custom-made reflective practice."
Developments within the Council include the revision of the Arts and Culture Strategy. In order to focus its work programme, the City Arts team is looking at the strengths and weaknesses, and opportunities for partnership. Cr Ahipene-Mercer asked, “How can the Council partner with organisations to produce strategic outcomes and meet the vision of the arts and culture capital of this country?” As part of the strategy revision, City Arts is developing an Implementation Plan to sit alongside the Arts and Culture Strategy. Overall, developments are focused on physical access, children and families, and strategic collaboration. However evaluation of these developments for the greater goal of social inclusion was not mentioned, nor were the implementation methods for the galleries.

**Conclusion**

Although small, the data gathered for this dissertation reveal interesting findings in relation to the research topic. All participants had a good general understanding of social inclusion theory and some participants claimed that the relevance of exhibitions to society correlated with social inclusion. The results suggest that there are two common ways of viewing social inclusion by the Council’s galleries: by ethnic participation in or visitation of ‘cultural exhibitions’, and by visitor numbers. These narrow audience development categories do not represent all non-users or traditionally excluded people, and maintains the perception, exemplified by most of the participants, that ‘cultural’ exhibitions are socially inclusive. These findings demonstrate a limited understanding about the application of social inclusion theory in public art galleries, and point to the gap between museum theory and practice.

Interviewees were given opportunities to comment on both galleries, however more data and critique was provided about City Gallery, especially examples of exhibitions and future developments. This suggests City Gallery is viewed as more important than TPG. Most Council staff felt City Gallery should focus more on social inclusion and social outcomes, whereas this is secondary for City Gallery, with its primary focus on contemporary art and the artists. It seems to me that, underlying this narrow understanding is the traditional culture of public art galleries, which has been argued adopts a powerful position of specialist
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11 ‘Cultural’ exhibitions showcase an aspect of a non-Pākehā/Western ethnicity, which tend to partly attract a non-traditional ethnic audience.
authority, and thus a social distinction which does not effectively speak to non-users.\textsuperscript{12} The ‘new museology’, with its exploration of social inclusion and democratic access,\textsuperscript{13} appears to be in its infancy in our public art galleries. As a solution, social inclusion policy and measurement may be required to influence socially inclusive practice in the galleries. In the next chapter I use theory to analyse and discuss these points and refer to the theory to build an argument for a more effective socially inclusive practice in public art galleries.

\textsuperscript{12} Whitehead, \textit{Interpreting art in museums and galleries}; Duncan, "The art museum as ritual."; Grenfell and Hardy, \textit{Art rules}; Bourdieu, Darbel, and Schnapper, \textit{The love of art: European art museums and their public}; Silva, "Distinction through visual art."; Anson and Garrett, "Encounters with Contemporary Art."; Karp, "Museums and communities."; Wright, "The Quality of Visitors' Experiences in Art Museums."

\textsuperscript{13} Vergo, \textit{The new museology}; Stam, "The informed muse."; Macdonald, "Introduction."
Chapter three

Advancing social inclusion: Analysis

Introduction

In the previous chapter I outlined the major findings from interviews with the eight participants. From the results of the Wellington case study, significant themes emerged concerning the relationship between local government and galleries, and how social inclusion is perceived and worked towards. All of the participants have a good working knowledge of social inclusion in general terms, however their understanding was narrow regarding social inclusion in the museum sector. They mainly identified ‘cultural’ exhibitions related to non-Western ethnic groups as social inclusion successes because they diversified the typical audience. For social inclusion practice to be further developed across a broader range of gallery activity, participants believed that policy leaders needed to prioritise social inclusion in arts and culture.

This chapter discusses these results and the themes coming out of the research, and develops an argument in relation to the research question. To build the key ideas, it links the discussion to the theories drawn from the museum studies literature. To organise the analysis in this chapter, I have segmented the discussion into the following sections:

- Social inclusion: Art exhibitions
- Social inclusion: Local policy and evaluation
- Social inclusion: Towards an evaluation framework

In the first section I analyse current practice and discuss how social inclusion can be worked towards in collaborative exhibitions. In the second section I use the information gathered from the case study to discuss local policy and evaluation for social inclusion. In the third section I discuss how national and local government policy might link with the measurement of galleries’ social inclusion outcomes in a national framework. Finally I end the chapter, synthesising my argument, which is presented in the conclusion that follows.
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14 Data collected was skewed towards City Gallery, despite opportunities given to participants to comment on and give examples from both galleries.
Social inclusion: Art exhibitions

The galleries’ different resource levels and priorities were highlighted by the participants. Despite being given opportunities to comment on both galleries, a range of exhibitions demonstrating social inclusion successes was identified for City Gallery, compared with just one exhibition for TPG. This implies that City Gallery exhibitions were easier to remember, probably due to their larger scale, but also suggests that City Gallery is more important than TPG. Participants failed to mention the 2010 TPG exhibition *Complex Creative* which showcased the art work of Council housing tenants, a good example of a non-ethnic exhibition with social inclusion goals.\(^{15}\) City Gallery has more resources and specialist knowledge to display “widely-acclaimed exhibitions of international standard,”\(^{16}\) whereas TPG, with little resourcing, has a focus on supporting the professional development of local, emerging artists. TPG exhibitions are about the artists “high standards of technical skill and presentation,”\(^{17}\) rather than visitor inclusion, which needs substantial resources to maximise.

According to Lynch, constant long-term funding should enable museums to prioritise big-picture issues such as community engagement.\(^{18}\) Caldwell and Ahipene-Mercer explained that art galleries can accidentally exclude people and need structures in place aimed at involving people, such as public programmes. City Gallery has those structures in place, but its representing participants explained that the gallery lacks the resources to make significant changes to its strategies and practice to advance social inclusion. Given that the results suggest policy is needed, I question whether endless resources would make social inclusion a priority.

Art galleries have made an effort to involve the public, generally through public programmes and free entry, but the diversity of the audience has remained fairly static,\(^{19}\) as Caldwell pointed out. Recognising these efforts, the question is: How much power have they really handed over to the public in order to advance social inclusion? From my position, curators of public art galleries such as City Gallery have retained their power, deciding on the content of exhibitions, and this may contribute to maintaining the traditional audience. Public

\(^{16}\) City Gallery Wellington. “City Gallery Wellington Foundation.”
\(^{18}\) Lynch, “Custom-made reflective practice.”
\(^{19}\) Black, "Building a 21st Century Audience.", Martin, "The impact of free entry to museums."
programmes help to engage visitors, but again, does the gallery hold all of the control over what programmes are produced? Even with community-driven exhibitions, effort needs to be made to continue including the community. From what I understand, since the Tīvaevae Taonga exhibition, there has been no effort made to include that Cook Island community. From the information gathered, Tīvaevae Taonga possibly falls into the “empowerment-lite” method of working with communities, where engagement is short-term and the majority of power remains with the gallery.

City Gallery curators have in-depth knowledge of visual arts and art history, which is not commonly held by the public. A small minority who have formally or informally studied these fields have the education to analytically critique the galleries’ practices. If the gallery does not have a culture of “critical self-appraisal,” this transfers to an unequal relationship with audiences, a relationship of power over the audience whereby the audience is viewed as lacking knowledge (the deficit model of education). For Caldwell, promoting the creativity of artists is the primary priority and social inclusion is not its core business. This does not sit with much of the contemporary museum studies literature, which mentions the need for museums to be relevant to their communities, requiring regular consultation with visitors and evaluation of the results. City Gallery, like many galleries, requires visitors to learn how to get the most from the institution by learning how it works – filling in their knowledge deficits – rather than adapting its practice towards visitors’ needs using a collaborative, power-sharing approach. People who have been acculturated to art are more comfortable with these codes. To justify the approach, Caldwell used an analogy about similarly needing to learn the rules of rugby to become interested in the game. Not undermining the benefits of sports for wellbeing, unlike rugby games, City Gallery is located in the civic square of the capital city. Caldwell’s views are more in line with the conventional views expressed in the
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20 Crooke, Museums and community; Golding and Modest, Museums and communities.
21 Cornwall, “Democratising Engagement: What the UK can learn from international experience.”
25 Black, The engaging museum.
27 Bourdieu, Darbel, and Schnapper, The love of art: European art museums and their public; Grenfell and Hardy, Art rules.
literature on public art galleries in terms of traditional values and autonomy.\footnote{Maleuvre, "A Plea for Silence."; Cuno, "Money, Power and the History of Art."; Cuno, Museums matter.} I call City Gallery’s deficit-model gallery practice ‘audience-inclusion-lite.’ This is in contrast to social history museums – a broader and more ‘relevant’ field that more people understand\footnote{Anson and Garrett, "Encounters with Contemporary Art."} – and TPG, which is relatively flexible in its practice, therefore it can more easily enable community-driven exhibitions. City Gallery appears to have more work to do than TPG on improving social inclusion.

City Gallery’s curatorial practice could be described as traditional, that is to say, the expert-scholar model rather than producer, entrepreneur, facilitator or social activist. City Gallery’s exhibitions contrast with major social history museums’, which are often collaboratively produced with communities with the aim of enhancing understanding between visitors and the collaborating communities.\footnote{For example, Death and Diversity (2012) at Museum of Wellington City in collaboration with the Office of Ethnic Affairs.} TPG’s Tīvaevae and Complex Creative exhibitions are examples of collaborative curating that aimed to increase understanding between visitors and marginalised artists. In order for major art galleries to produce “widely-acclaimed exhibitions of international standard,”\footnote{City Gallery Wellington. “City Gallery Wellington Foundation.”} collaboration to make exhibition content is not necessarily appropriate. However, there are many good artists that talk about social justice in their work, and City Gallery could choose to showcase this art more often to benefit society. Contemporary art can be difficult for the public to interpret,\footnote{Anson and Garrett, "Encounters with Contemporary Art."} so public programmes can provide education on the topic and forums for discussion and debate. Forms of ‘new curatorship’ such as collaborative curating, present exciting possibilities for public art galleries.\footnote{Ken Arnold, "From Caring to Creating: Curators Change their Spots," in In Museum Practice: Critical Debates in Contemporary Museums, ed. Conal McCarthy (Oxford & Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014).} With the audience-focus of new museology, curators have had to broaden their roles to become political activists, artistic directors and public investigators of visual and material culture,\footnote{Ibid.} and with the rise of collaborative curating, art curators might be known as producers or project managers.\footnote{Beryl Graham and Sarah Cook, Rethinking curating: art after new media (MIT Press, 2010).} However rather than this being the sole role of curators, it would be more effective for the whole museum to take on a creative role as “interpreter,
provocateur, and catalyst” for art and engagement.\(^{36}\) This is a recommendation for City Gallery in particular, a much more highly resourced gallery than TPG.

Despite being more common in social history museums,\(^{37}\) there are examples of co-curation in art galleries in which the curator acts as an artistic director or mediator for the community. A large-scale exhibition for the regional Laing Art Gallery of Newcastle was co-curated with sixty-seven members of the public who worked with a ‘creative facilitator’ to make a digital story, short film, sound piece or photographs about their interpretation of the local region.\(^{38}\) On a smaller scale, *Click!* (2008) was a crowd-curated photography exhibition at the Brooklyn Museum, New York, whereby artists responded to a call for photographs on the theme “Changing faces of Brooklyn” and the public ranked them online.\(^{39}\) More time is needed to successfully undertake collaborative curating, but if galleries think outside the square, similar initiatives could be achieved. The public could suggest content or themes for art exhibitions and ideas for public programmes, or the gallery could even allow the public to make the final decision out of a selection of potential upcoming exhibitions. Given its resources, City Gallery has huge potential to develop its curating practice to more deeply and seriously involve the public. It basically requires openness and motivation to change.\(^{40}\) TPG does not have a curator and having one would minimise the professional development opportunities for the exhibiting artists and curators. However, if there was a staff member dedicated to supporting the artists with their exhibition development, TPG could potentially produce more collaborative exhibitions with the public. Having a project manager meant the *Tīvaevae* exhibition was a success and had an engaging public programme. TPG could apply these lessons to its general exhibition management.

In the United Kingdom and United States, social inclusion and democracy in art galleries appear to be better understood and valued greater than in New Zealand. There, it is viewed in broader terms than the inclusion of new ethnic cultures for a one-off community-focused


\(^{38}\) Ibid.

\(^{39}\) Ibid.

\(^{40}\) Ibid.
Exhibitions about cultures appear to be overused in public art galleries, but it also seems to be a factor of our social history museums. Exhibitions in Te Papa’s community gallery highlight “the contribution made to New Zealand by different ethnic communities,” for example Aainaa: Reflections through Indian Weddings (2002–2004), and The Mixing Room: Stories from Young Refugees in New Zealand (2010–ongoing). There is a large amount of literature from the United Kingdom and United States that discusses diverse practices of social inclusion in public art galleries, whereas New Zealand studies that relate to social inclusion in museums predominantly focus on ethnic cultures. All in all the evidence suggests that the New Zealand museum field – in terms of theory and practice – falls well behind international practice. Currently using exhibitions about ethnic cultures as a ‘panacea’ to social inclusion, New Zealand needs to catch up with other Western countries’ diverse social inclusion solutions. There is an urgent need to look beyond curating exhibitions about cultures to other areas of museum practice that will contribute to social inclusion.

Social inclusion: Local policy and evaluation

Results in the previous chapter highlighted the necessity for national, local and institutional policy to be clear to enable evaluation and action towards social inclusion. The issues with evaluating social inclusion outcomes were also raised. This section analyses the local strategic context for social inclusion in City Gallery and TPG.

Galleries’ mission statements are important for conveying its vision to staff and the public, however City Gallery falls behind in this area with no obvious or clear mission statement. The director’s understanding of City Gallery’s mission, “Art and artist led; audience
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41 Exhibition examples are given on pages 20 and 21 in chapter one.
45 Thelen, “Learning community.”; Hooper-Greenhill, Museums and their visitors; Fleming, "Policies, frameworks and legislation."
46 City Gallery website text is quoted on pages 29 in chapter one.
focused,” reinforces the institution’s role to primarily showcase art and secondarily work towards social inclusion. Fleming argues that mission statements need to clearly state museum’s major purposes and challenge the status quo to motivate stakeholders and internal staff towards social goals, a feature of non-profit organisations, including museums. On the other hand, the looseness of mission statements might allow arts and culture institutions, especially CCOs, to perform the way they see fit, and not be tied down to wider goals, even if part of a local authority. Lynch states that if the mission statement did mention social inclusion, museums would require “critical self-appraisal” to transfer it into practice. City Gallery might realise some positive changes if it implemented Fleming’s and Lynch’s suggestions.

The results suggest the galleries are focused on audience development in terms of increasing visitor numbers and cultural diversification, possibly partly driven by policy and government initiatives. CNZ’s training seminars have a business approach, not a social inclusion methodology, and in my view are rather ‘social inclusion-lite’. This attitude that inclusion is about developing audiences most likely trickles down to the participating staff and their organisations. CNZ’s focus on the economic success of arts organisations is similar to the Council’s drive for economic development, currently the backbone of Wellington’s strategies. Social inclusion is only included in the strategies in narrow cultural inclusion terms. Therefore, on the whole it seems that social inclusion is seen as a means to an end, a requirement for audience development and an (economically) healthy city.

The results suggest it is a challenge as to how to qualitatively measure social inclusion, and requires commitment to do so. Museum scholarship reinforces this impression. Caldwell has the opinion that visitor satisfaction and resident opinion surveys (used by local authorities) are narrowly focused on certain aspects of visitor experiences and are not sensitive to galleries’ evaluation needs. Ander et al. seem to understand this. They explain that the challenge is how to define the evaluation markers “in a way that ensures that the unique and idiosyncratic effect of museums is credited and then to measure with tools that are

47 Fleming, "Policies, frameworks and legislation."
50 Ander et al., "Generic well-being outcomes."; Weil, "Outcome based evaluation."
sensitive enough to show the heritage sector’s contribution, including qualitative…words and meanings.”  

This statement would be useful for MCH to keep in mind when the Cultural Indicators for New Zealand are inevitably revised.

Both the Council and City Gallery want to improve the measurement of social inclusion from their own standpoints, as mentioned by Rodgers and Caldwell. Although implementing the Council’s GetSmart survey, City Gallery participants were critical of surveys like this because they do not take the whole visitor experience into account. In fact, the GetSmart survey does ask about the site’s facilities and staff attitudes and can be adapted to fit with the site, and what it needs to know. There seems to be some resistance from City Gallery to implement Council initiatives that might streamline the gallery into local government systems. To improve audience engagement, Wright proposes art galleries need to increase visitor surveys to align with non-art museums higher survey usage. GetSmart will at least help to achieve this by increasing the frequency of City Gallery’s visitor surveys, so it can better understand its audience. However GetSmart does not include questions that Rodgers suggested about visitors’ responses to the art displayed or their anticipated behaviour change. Understanding these types of responses requires qualitative research, such as focus groups, which Monastra commented she would like to conduct if she had more capacity. If the Council organised and conducted this qualitative research, not only would it fill a big gap in public art gallery research, it would start to change the impression that Council evaluations are crude and less valuable.

Monastra agreed with Weil’s suggestion to conduct evaluations of public programmes, but again explained that resource constraints, particularly time, would prevent this from happening. The results align with Whitehead’s work, who acknowledges lack of time as a major reason for social inclusion being a low priority. However, it seems that lack of time can also be used as an excuse for underachievement. Voluntary work is an option for public art galleries, given there are museum studies students needing practical placements and members of the public that want to gain work experience through volunteering. Helping in a gallery would provide opportunities for suitable members of the public to get involved, and improve social inclusion. If people who are not typical visitors experienced the inner

51 Ander et al., "Generic well-being outcomes," 255.  
52 Wright, "The Quality of Visitors' Experiences in Art Museums."  
53 Weil, "From Being about Something to Being for Somebody."  
54 Whitehead, Interpreting art in museums and galleries.
workings of the gallery, barriers to future participation could potentially break down. This would be a radical shift in social inclusion practice, but to make social inclusion a priority, an attitude or culture change is first required.55

The results suggest the Council and City Gallery are more closely aligned in social inclusion interests than they believe but there seems to be an issue of miscommunication. The reasons can be explained by analysing the scholarship and organisational structures. Scholarship argues that government-stipulated reporting measures can be unclear and poorly justified because of lack of research,56 which keeps museums at the beck and call of funding, limiting their development towards best practice.57 This helps to explain why City Gallery believes the Council is purely interested in quantitative data, as used to be the case.58 Nowadays Council departments aim to include a balance of qualitative and quantitative reporting data.59 Additionally, City Gallery being at arms-length to the Council makes communication more complicated, as it is mostly channelled through WMT. This means the Council cannot drive social inclusion in City Gallery so easily. On top of this, the institutions under WMT have diverse systems for evaluation, which might contribute to the misunderstanding. As Rodgers and Petkovic-Jeremic pointed out, City Gallery may rightly feel disillusioned and confused about the Council’s priorities because it is not clear about them. In its revision of the Arts and Culture Strategy, the Council needs to ensure the goals are clear, justified and achievable.

Social inclusion: Towards an evaluation framework

The results suggest museums need leadership of social inclusion practice and a framework for measuring social inclusion. Caldwell explained that if the value of art galleries is better understood by people in positions of political power, they will be better supported and social inclusion will likely improve. Clear policies and guidelines could improve the perception among policy makers and, in turn, the public, about the value of art. Scholarship reinforces

55 Black, The engaging museum; Davis, "Museums, Identity, Community "; Whitehead, Interpreting art in museums and galleries; Nightingale and Mahal, "The heart of the matter."; Golding and Modest, "Introduction.
56 Lang, Reeve, and Woollard, "The Responsive Museum."; Thompson, "Problems with service performance reporting."
57 Lynch, "Custom-made reflective practice."; Reeve and Woollard, "Influences on Museum Practice."
58 Scott, "Museum measurement."
the need for strong leadership. Cr Ahipene-Mercer is driving the current review of the Arts and Culture Strategy and development of an Implementation Plan to ensure the strategy’s goals can be met. The results suggest that social inclusion will only become a priority if strategic decision-makers, such as councillors and other leaders in local and central government, make it a priority and are vigilant about its progress. “If you don’t have a framework, in a bureaucracy like Council, then things don’t get their due worth,” Cr Eagle said. If a national policy or framework, developed by MCH, made the importance of social inclusion measurement clear, it would trickle down to local government and their arts organisations.

Policy has three tiers; it needs to be broad at a national level to allow local authorities to narrow it further in their strategies, and art galleries to narrow it even further in their implementation plans. Galleries need to include the goals for social inclusion in their business plans to operationalise the higher level policy aims from local government. This framework is illustrated below in Figure 2. The major government departments for arts and culture and their specialty areas are listed under ‘National policy’. MCH is listed first to show its leadership role in arts and culture policy. Other relevant departments/offices might include Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry for Pacific Island Affairs, the Ministry of Education, the Office for Ethnic Affairs, and the Ministry of Health. Policy made by individual local authorities which impacts on public art galleries is listed under ‘Local authorities’. The final box lists policies that public art galleries should produce to develop their social inclusion practice.

Figure 3: Policy flowchart for local public art galleries
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New Zealand can learn from the impact of wide-reaching social inclusion policy in the United Kingdom. Despite funding cuts to the museum sector from the current Coalition Government, the changes that were made in the past appear to have influenced the ethos of the arts and culture sector, and social inclusion continues to be a priority for practice and research. For example, the Happy Museum project was lobbying for public participation in museums to be included as contributing factors to national happiness. New Zealand has not had the same political history as the United Kingdom, and this is reflected in the performance of our arts and culture institutions.

The first step to moving our arts and culture practice forward is to develop research about the standard of social inclusion in organisational practice. With an international reputation, the information produced by MCH’s Cultural Indicators Programme is a starting point. However the programme does not look at social outcomes or differentiate between responses from different types of cultural audiences (for example, ‘working class’ non-users versus typical ‘educated’ audiences) so it is impossible to know if social inclusion is advancing. Currently quantitative, the research would also need to include qualitative methods to gauge social outcomes, such as interviews with the public. MCH would need advice from other government departments as well as non-governmental organisations such as Museums Aotearoa and Arts Access Aotearoa. This research would help to inform future developments in arts and culture policy.

As mentioned, a major issue for social inclusion in New Zealand galleries is that there is no clear mandate or policy for its implementation. A solution might come from the obligatory measurement of their performance; a KPI/ KRA for measuring the factors that City Gallery and TPG contribute to social inclusion. Caldwell emphasised the common perception that quantitative data is best for justifying the expenditure of public funds. However results suggest local authorities are interested in measuring longer-term qualitative social outcomes of art galleries, and galleries need to do better at communicating their worth to local and central government, policy-makers, politicians and funders. I argue it is time to focus on new
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61 This was explained earlier on pages 20-21 in chapter one.
62 A major contributor is the Research Centre for Museums and Galleries within the University of Leicester’s School of Museum Studies.
63 Thompson et al., "The Happy Museum."
64 See bottom of page 35 in chapter two for the quotation.
qualitative ways of measuring to investigate the longer term effects on individuals, communities and society, and this needs further research and development.

As part of this necessary development, Ander et al.’s research into wellbeing outcomes as evaluation measures could be built on by MCH. Ander et al.’s evaluation model consists of indicators that show how museums can contribute to people’s health and wellbeing.65 This model could be adapted into two streams – social history museums, and public art galleries – to account for major differences. The differences in the exhibitions and purposes of City Gallery and TPG suggest the model also needs to capture diversity between large and small institutions. MCH could lead this research as part of its Cultural Indicators Programme. The research would produce indicators that quantitatively and qualitatively measured social inclusion in arts and culture, which the programme currently lacks. An implementation guide would need to be developed which prescribes adaptable methodologies and interview questions.

Much of the literature holds museums and galleries accountable for their downfalls in social inclusion, recommends various solutions such as a professional development and staff culture change,66 and strong priority and vision driven from the director and the Board.67 It has been suggested that governments do not see it as their role nor understand enough about arts and culture to take a leadership role in developing social inclusion in this area,68 and museums have been criticised for being reactive to policy that affects them, rather than taking initiative to influence it.69 Less of the literature promotes a cross-institutional approach to improving social inclusion and the scholarship rarely suggests more responsibility for the performance of local public art galleries could be taken by the local authority. Although national policy could potentially be implemented, I need to reinforce the point that local authorities are ultimately responsible for ensuring local public art galleries are responsive and relevant to communities, and their practice needs to reflect this. Local authorities should know what communities’ pressing needs are, and relay this information to their CCOs, including those who oversee galleries. Furthermore, local authorities have more resources than galleries to develop social inclusion strategies. Rodgers commented that WCC should exercise its
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65 More detail is on page 22 in chapter one.
66 Black, *The engaging museum*; Davis, ”Museums, Identity, Community “; Wright, ”The Quality of Visitors’ Experiences in Art Museums.”
67 Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and their visitors*.
68 Lang, Reeve, and Woollard, ”The Responsive Museum.”
69 Selwood and Davies, ”Policies, frameworks and legislation.”
authority more, particularly because it is City Gallery’s major funder. Therefore, I would argue that local authorities should look at what policies and strategies would help their art galleries to achieve goals for social inclusion, and produce guidelines which provide support for this to happen.

**Conclusion**

Through this research I have discovered that audience development is the major route for Wellington art galleries to engage with more diverse audiences, rather than exhibition collaboration, which is much more common in social history museums. It appears that museums generally use narrow methods to work towards social inclusion, predominantly focusing on including new ethnic/cultural groups. On the basis of the case study and literature, it would appear that Wellington City Council’s galleries tend to use exhibitions about ethnic cultures as a ‘panacea’ for social inclusion, and other New Zealand galleries and museums likely do the same. There are a myriad of other methods and outputs to improve social inclusion, including new forms of collaborative curatorship and other ways of engaging with the public, thereby addressing social exclusion.

Organisational culture change and clear local and central policy are required to make significant improvements to art galleries’ work towards social inclusion. As my diagram on page 55 shows, central government policy trickles down to local government and institutional policy and the links between them need to be more clearly articulated. Local government and galleries need clear strategies for social inclusion. They need to specify how evaluation will be carried out, and include qualitative measurement of social inclusion, such as wellbeing outcomes. Local authorities could establish a KPI/KRA for measuring social inclusion by local public art galleries, which would provide a mandate for social inclusion. As seen in the United Kingdom, government policy needs to drive the development of social inclusion in arts and culture if a nation-wide response is desired. MCH is the most appropriate government body to drive this development in New Zealand, as it is already collecting data, however the information does not demonstrate significant interest in social inclusion. I suggest MCH expand its Cultural Indicators Programme to include research on measuring participation and wellbeing, and in time the indicators could include social inclusion.
measures. With corresponding frameworks, this would also affect local government and gallery practice.

The results of the research have demonstrated that the current system for developing social inclusion in arts and culture is unclear and inconsistent. Many questions remain regarding how social inclusion can be measured and prioritised and more research is required to consider the best way to measure social outcomes from gallery experiences. In the conclusion that follows, I consider the significance of this research, its impact on museum studies and how it can lead to recommendations for future research.
Conclusion

In this dissertation I studied how the locally funded public art galleries in Wellington New Zealand advance social inclusion from the perspectives of policy and practice. My major research question was: How do major and minor local public art galleries work towards and evaluate social inclusion in Wellington? I investigated the practices and evaluation of social inclusion using a case study of Wellington City Council’s galleries, City Gallery and TPG. The dissertation locates City Gallery and TPG in relation to central and local government policy on social inclusion. I interviewed eight Council and art gallery professionals about social inclusion practice in the galleries mentioned above and analysed their responses alongside government, Council and institutional policy. These overall findings were analysed through a framework drawn from a review of the international literature on social inclusion initiatives and evaluation by museums, in order to find out how the New Zealand situation relates to the international context.

Overall findings and contributions

Overall, this research has shown that social inclusion is not an integral or integrated part of museum practice, despite the fact that public art galleries are publicly funded for the benefit of their communities. City Gallery and TPG have good intentions for public participation and social outcomes, but this research seems to suggest that in reality social inclusion is not a high priority. There is no mandate or performance measure for galleries’ social inclusion practice, which in turn suggests it is not a priority of local and central government. The experience of museums in the United Kingdom has demonstrated that when social inclusion is prioritised and embedded in policy, developments occur across sectors, including in arts and culture. In the United Kingdom and United States, art galleries have included the public through various innovative and non-traditional methods such as collaborative curating. But, generalising from the case study, New Zealand appears to be lagging behind in public art gallery practice as far as these issues are concerned. This is not to say City Gallery and TPG do not encourage participation through visitor experiences of exhibitions and public programmes, but this is a relatively marginal concession to community engagement. Wellington’s major public art gallery, City Gallery, continues to hold the power over core activities such as exhibition development and production. There is a perception, reinforced by
this research, that exhibitions about non-Pākehā cultures equate to social inclusion, and thus, exhibitions about other cultures are used as a ‘panacea’ for social inclusion. In the face of this suggested evidence, this dissertation explicitly argues that social inclusion can and should be a key element of public art gallery practice now and into the future. As Weil states, “The most important new skills of all will be the ability to envision how the community’s ongoing and/or emerging needs in all their dimensions – physical, psychological, economic, and social – might potentially be served by the museum’s very particular competencies”.¹

This dissertation provides modest but unique insights into the local government context of public art galleries using social inclusion theory. The research develops the argument for socially responsible museums, but adds a policy frame. A contribution to museum and community studies, this is the first New Zealand study to analyse the policy context for public art galleries through a social justice lens. The findings of this study reinforce the impression that the impact of policy is under-researched in museum studies and insufficiently considered in practice, and although a small, localised study, the data helps to fill the gap in our understanding of the inter-relationship of policy and practice, especially in the New Zealand context. It also contributes, albeit in a modest way, to much needed research measuring the social outcomes of museums. Measurement of the social outcomes of public art galleries’ community interactions will help galleries to demonstrate their value in significant ways and thus aid in funding and support for these important civic institutions.

Recommendations and final comments

I recommend that future studies are significantly deeper and more extensive than this small research project to give more validity and weight to research about social inclusion in New Zealand’s arts and culture sector. To further examine how the public are involved in developing and experiencing exhibitions, future research could involve interviewing gallery professionals, public programme coordinators, educators and curators around the country about collaboration with the public. It is necessary to investigate the relationship between curating and social inclusion practice, as the scope of this research did not allow for an in-depth analysis of this area. Another recommendation for future research is an in-depth analysis of the philosophies, historical practices and perceptions that are likely to underpin

¹ Weil, "From Being about Something to Being for Somebody,” 253.
public art galleries’ shortcomings in developing social inclusion. Qualitative visitor research is also essential. I would like to see public programme evaluation put into practice by way of focus groups with public programme users. There is also potential for public programme participation to become part of the Cultural Indicators for New Zealand.

Models for effective evaluation of social inclusion in public art galleries need further research and development. Ideas have been put forward by various other researchers that could help to inform an evaluation model for social inclusion in galleries, including the notion that “a singular, sustainable methodology for measuring impact needs to be promoted so that museums can put it into practice.” There is a need for more research to enable this to be achieved. I argue that MCH should lead the development of a practical arts and culture evaluation model with a focus on social inclusion that is appropriate to museums. Part of the model needs to include social inclusion indicators for arts and culture that can be added to the Cultural Indicators for New Zealand. It would be helpful for MCH to work on the research in partnership with a university. I suggest an in-depth academic study would be appropriate to analyse models for arts and culture evaluation (which have been put forward in the literature) with respect to current evaluation practice in local government. Concurrently, MCH would need to liaise with other relevant government departments. Two or three major local authorities and their public art galleries and museums would need to champion the project and formulate KPI/KRAs to measure social inclusion in local government arts and culture. A pilot study with a major local authority and its museums should test the model. As local authorities are responsible for civic wellbeing, it is important that local authorities visibly prioritise social inclusion goals and clearly communicate these priorities with all of their CCOs, which should be reflected in KPIs/KRAs. As interview participants pointed out, this requires strong sector leadership as well as clear communication between local authorities and their respective museums.

As not-for-profit institutions, public art galleries will inevitably never have “enough funding” to achieve everything desired. Looking outside the square and critiquing their own practice is necessary to advance social inclusion. City Gallery is starting to do this by partnering with other arts organisations and professionals to produce public programme events, and TPG has co-created a small number of exhibitions with different marginalised community groups. Additionally, a culture change has the potential, with the necessary staff training, to make
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social inclusion a priority of all gallery professionals, thereby sharing the workload and developing public art galleries into ‘arts facilitators’.

To conclude this dissertation, I would like to paint a landscape where public art galleries are valuably positioned now and into the future. Population diversity is rapidly growing. With this diversity come diverse histories, and the potential for misunderstanding and conflict. But there is also the potential for greater social justice and peace, and public art galleries have the exciting opportunity to contribute to this positive change. National, local and institutional policy evidently makes an impact on the practice of social inclusion. Therefore I would be delighted if this definition for social inclusion in museums is used to inspire vision and mission statements:

   Enhancing public participation from all areas of society with the aim of improved wellbeing at individual, community and/or wider social levels.

Art experiences can positively change lives; therefore public art galleries can and should have a part to play in creating a more socially inclusive world.
Appendix one

Sources included in documentary research


GetSmart Ltd, "Museums/Galleries/Heritage Sites Question Set," (GetSmart Ltd).


Appendix two

Interview questions

1. Have you heard about the term ‘social inclusion’? Please tell me how you understand it.

2. What mission and aims does the Council/WMT/City Gallery/TPG have (for arts and culture)?

3. What is your understanding of social inclusion in arts and culture?

4. How effective do you think central and local government, and institutional policy is at driving social inclusion by City Gallery/TPG?

5. How do the social inclusion outcomes of City Gallery/TPG get evaluated and processed?

6. What social inclusion challenges do you think City Gallery/TPG face (in practice/assessment)?

7. What do you think are the biggest social inclusion successes of City Gallery/TPG?

8. Are there plans to develop social inclusion by the galleries and in policy? Please tell me about these.

9. How do you think social inclusion by local art galleries could be further developed?
Glossary

Short-hand terms

CCO = Council Controlled Organisation
(the) Council = Wellington City Council
City Gallery = City Gallery Wellington
Cr = Councillor
KPI = Key Performance Indicator
KRA = Key Result Area
Te Papa = Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa
Toi Pōneke = Toi Pōneke Arts Centre
TPG = Toi Pōneke Gallery
WMT = Wellington Museums Trust

Key definitions

Access(ibility): Physical, intellectual, cultural, attitudinal and financial access,\(^4\) plus access to decision making (involving consultation) and access to information, such as publicity.\(^5\)

(Art) gallery: A locally-managed public art gallery.

Community: Something made up of people who share a commonality, self-determined by its members who are fluid parts of other communities.\(^6\)

‘Cultural’ exhibition: An exhibition that showcases an aspect of a non-Pākehā/Western ethnicity, which tend to partly attract a non-traditional ethnic audience.

Social exclusion: “A shorthand term for what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health, poverty and family breakdown.”\(^7\)

Social inclusion: Enhancing public participation from all areas of society with the aim of improved wellbeing at individual, community and/or wider social levels.

\(^4\) Department of Culture Media and Sport, "Museums for the Many," (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1999).
\(^5\) Dodd, Sandell, and Coles, Building bridges: guidance for museums and galleries on developing new audiences.
\(^6\) Karp, "Museums and communities."
\(^7\) Social Exclusion Unit, "The Social Exclusion Unit," 2.
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