



MUSEUMS AND CHILDHOOD

Negotiating organizational lessons

MELINDA J. MILLIGAN
Sonoma State University
APRIL BRAYFIELD
Tulane University

Key words:
children, culture, museum education,
organization, socialization

Mailing address:
Melinda J. Milligan
Department of Sociology, Sonoma State
University, 1801 E. Cotati Avenue,
Rohnert Park, CA 94928, USA.
[email: melinda.milligan@sonoma.edu;
aprilb@tulane.edu]

Childhood Copyright © 2004
SAGE Publications. London, Thousand Oaks
and New Delhi, Vol 11(3): 275–301.
www.sagepublications.com
10.1177/0907568204040183

Contemporary museums define educational programs for children as a central and straightforward component of their stated missions. We problematize these programs in our critical discussion of the role of the museum as a source of non-classroom education and the centrality of these lessons in the maintenance of the museum as an organization. Our exploratory study investigates educational programs for children within two traditionally adult-centered museum settings in the US: (1) an architectural museum in a mid-sized city and (2) an art gallery on a university campus. We compare the organizational goals of the two museums with respect to their programs for children and the attempts of museum educators to accomplish these goals through specific programs. Based on interviews with museum officials and field observations, we argue that museum programs attempt to promote both cultural and content lessons to children and teachers through school tours within museum spaces and that their success is tied to the training and beliefs of tour guides, the suitability of museum spaces for children as a participatory audience, and the techniques used to control children's social behavior.

Museums are important sites for informal, non-classroom learning about values, norms and technical knowledge (Schauble et al., 1996; Tunnicliffe et al., 1997), and thus they constitute 'institutional arrangements relating to children, their upbringing, and their education' (Frønes, 1994: 148). We argue that museums contribute to the organizational frameworks of childhood in that they deliberately attempt to teach particular 'lessons' to children through planned activities for families and school groups. Museums work to impart both content and cultural lessons to children as an explicit organizational goal, although a specific museum may choose to emphasize one sort of lesson over the other. These lessons are often enacted, albeit with varying

degrees of success, through museum programs for children. We analyze how two museum organizations – an architectural museum and an art gallery – convey both cultural and content lessons and how their success in doing so is tied to the specific details of their programs, including the training and beliefs of tour guides, the suitability of museum spaces for the incorporation of children as a participatory audience, and the techniques used to attempt to control children's social behavior during school tours.

Sociologists have studied childhood socialization in other organizational settings, such as schools (e.g. Thorne, 1993), workplaces (e.g. Solberg, 2001), sports leagues (e.g. Fine, 1987) and zoos (e.g. DeVault, 2000). Like these sociologists, we conceptualize socialization as a multidirectional, multilayered process of becoming and being socially competent. Individuals who possess the interactional skills to participate in a given organization or type of organization (or any other sort of social group) must understand the culture of the organization and the expectations of its members, and they must have the ability to participate appropriately in that organization as a legitimate member. We view socialization processes as collective, complex, varied and ongoing, and we view children as active participants in the production of their own social competence (see Corsaro, 1992), despite our focus on the socialization messages and efforts of museum organizations in this article.

A central purpose of our research, then, is to expand knowledge about the various ways that organizations – as institutional arrangements – contribute to the contours of childhood in late modern society. The two museums in this study are specific organizations, or concrete enactments of larger institutional categories or frameworks (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991; Meyer and Rowan, 1991). They represent the institution of 'the museum' and its role in non-classroom learning. Many studies have shown how classroom learning and the formal educational system deliver cultural lessons, often via a 'hidden curriculum', along with their required subject matter, or content lessons (e.g. Apple, 1990; Gillborn, 1992; Jackson, 1968; Martin, 1998; Willis, 1977).¹ Here, we are interested in how non-school organizations attempt to impart both types of lessons to children. Prior research has demonstrated that organized sports teach lessons of masculinity and sportsmanship (Fine, 1987) as well as networking skills applicable to future corporate employment (Adler and Adler, 1998). Zoos teach children about the subject matter of animal behavior, but they also teach cultural values about conservation (Kidd and Kidd, 1996), respect for animals (Birney, 1995) and awareness of environmental issues (Morgan and Hodgkinson, 1999). In general, organizations charged with 'character-building' are often directly engaged in the moral socialization (a form of cultural lesson) of the children in their programs in addition to teaching them specific skills or information (Fine, 1987). Our study focuses on the lessons of interest to museums. Although our two organizations represent very different types of museums,

they are both interested in persuading children to believe in the cultural lessons they promote through their education programs (see DiMaggio, 1991; Zolberg, 1984, and on the centrality of education within the missions of most US museums).

Childhood socialization (and all socialization, for that matter) is a recruitment process (Cahill, 1986) that involves the acquisition of the knowledge and facts of a group as well as persuasion to practice and believe them. In this study, we focus on how museums attempt to socialize children into acting as able participants within their specific physical spaces, and more generally, how museums attempt to create socially competent children – children who possess both the knowledge of museum culture and the ability and desire to practice that culture (Cahill, 1986; Corsaro, 1992; Fine, 1987). By comparative study of two particular museums, we examine how these organizations view children strategically and how they attempt to use them to promote their ongoing organizational goals in relation to institutional legitimacy and survival.

This research project contributes to several areas of the existing literature on children in museum settings. Specifically, our work has the potential to expand the understanding of the cultural conceptions brought to museums by children (Kindler and Darras, 1997), the role of museum programs in childhood education (Faraday, 1990; McNamee, 1987), the social control of visitor behavior by museums (Jensen, 1994; Trondsen, 1976) and the importance of social interaction in shaping visitors' experience of museum exhibits (Callaghan, 2000; Vom Lehn et al., 2001). Our research also fits into applied studies of the effectiveness of types of museum tours (Stronck, 1983) and the design of child-aware museums (Cohen, 1987; McNamee, 1987).

In modern Europe and the US, museums and art galleries historically have claimed an educative purpose. While the premodern museum ('the princely gallery') was for the pleasure of the gallery's owner and the owner's guests, the visitor to the 19th-century museum was imagined to be the ideal citizen searching for enlightenment through a civilizing experience (Prior, 2002). Such museums intended their 'less civilized' visitors to be educated through viewing the collections, as 'museums were believed to improve the moral health of the subordinate classes by improving their "inner selves", their habits, manners, and beliefs' (Prior, 2002: 50). Although 19th-century museums argued for the importance of their role in 'educating' the masses, they did very little to promote learning for individuals not already familiar with the world of art (Prior, 2002). Early and mid-20th century museums typically continued to claim education as a value, but offered little of a concrete nature toward that goal. Not until the mid- and late 20th century did museums in Europe and the US counter charges of elitism with an explicit programmatic focus on education, for example, by adding educator positions to their staffs and providing educational services to a wider

range of visitors (Alexander, 1996a, 1996b; DiMaggio, 1991; Zolberg, 1984).

Today education remains a central goal of most museums in late modern society, perhaps even more so than in earlier modernity. Museum organizations, however, increasingly err on the side of populism, tailoring the content of their exhibitions and educational programs to the interests of the 'public as consumer' to boost attendance and ensure financial security (Alexander, 1996a, 1996b; Barry, 1998; Macdonald, 2002). Consequently, although museums continue to justify their existence through their ability to educate, conflicts often occur between curators and educators (Macdonald, 2002), due to 'tensions between elite-scholarly concerns and efforts to broaden the museum's public' (Alexander, 1996a: 108). Still, contemporary museums continue to attract visitors with certain ideological proclivities, specifically those with 'a distinctly *modern* disposition, evincing, first, a faith in progress and in scientific (and artistic) authority; and, second, an open, cosmopolitan orientation to both people and cultures' (DiMaggio, 1996: 161; emphasis in original). To expand their pool of potential future visitors beyond those already inclined to attend, museums often turn to educational programs for children, due to the belief that children who attend museums are more likely to return as adults. Although such programs reach children in a range of ways, programs for school groups are perhaps the easiest way for museum educators to attract large groups of children who would not otherwise visit. Indeed, exposure to the arts through school programs has the potential to encourage children's future art patronage, even when family influences do not promote such patronage (Kracman, 1996). We suggest that it is within programs for school groups that the intended lessons of museum organizations are perhaps most evident.

Methods and descriptions of cases

The research we describe here is part of a larger, ongoing study of children's programs in museums that are not designed to be children's museums. We selected two cases for exploratory study: a non-profit architectural museum and a university art gallery. Both organizations offer programs for school groups, typically classes of primary school children brought to the museums by teachers on field trips. Both organizations also offer a range of other sorts of educational 'outreach' programs, although the art gallery has additional programs explicitly for children and the architectural museum does not. Additionally, the differences between the two organizations add usefully to the study since they allow for comparative discussion of two different museum types, the heritage museum and the art museum, each of which tends to attract different sorts of visitors with its messages (Gable, 1998; Kirchberg, 1996). In particular, our analysis of the architectural museum adds a unique empirical case to the museum education literature.

Case 1: Architecture Museum

Architecture Museum² is affiliated with a non-profit organization that promotes ‘the preservation of historic architecture and neighborhoods’ in its mid-sized US city. The organization offers a wide range of educational and advocacy programs to the city’s residents. The museum is housed within a historic building and contains exhibitions on the city’s architecture and urban design. The displays, some of which are permanent and some of which are changed several times a year, are located in four interconnected exhibit areas. Three rooms are bounded by walls on several sides, while the fourth room is bounded by four walls, and which can therefore serve as a lecture hall for slide shows.

The museum’s education programs include regularly scheduled tours and lectures aimed at an adult audience as well as tours for school groups; the children’s programs were added about one year before the study began. The director of marketing oversees all educational programs because they are defined as ‘community outreach’ activities that require publicity. Her main staff support for the school groups comes from college-student interns, typically individuals pursuing degrees in architecture, and volunteer docents. The content of school group tours was designed originally by one of these interns, a graduate student, in consultation with the director of marketing and the organization’s leadership.

Although the format of the school group program varies slightly depending on current exhibitions and available volunteers, it consists of three standard segments: (1) an initial introduction to the museum, including a tour of the museum displays; (2) two brief slide shows, one on the history of the state (and city) and one on the historic houses found in the area; and (3) a field trip to a nearby historic site. The entire program lasts about 2 hours. The tour groups are typically 4th, 5th, or 6th grade classes from private and public schools in the immediate metropolitan area. Sometimes the tour is given to older students in secondary school, but the director of marketing tries to avoid booking these age groups as she feels the program is less successful with them. Each school group consists of 25–55 children and 2–10 adults (teachers and parent chaperones). During the spring months, the busiest time, two to four groups per week are scheduled, while interest in the tours drops off dramatically during the winter months. The director of marketing schedules no more than one tour group per day and no more than four groups per week to allow time for her other organizational activities, including contacting school administrators and teachers to persuade them to attend tours.

Case 2: University Gallery

University Gallery is located on the campus of a small, private university. It has a permanent collection of objects, namely decorative arts, connected with the early history of the university’s art program. These objects are

rotated on display in one of the smaller rooms in the gallery, while exhibitions of traveling shows and other temporary collections are displayed in the other three rooms of the gallery. One of these rooms is quite large, while the other rooms are much smaller and bounded by walls with door-sized openings between the rooms. The gallery typically hosts about three to four temporary exhibitions each academic year, closing for most of the summer.

The museum's Education Department is staffed by one paid, full-time education coordinator, several college-student interns and a small cadre of volunteer docents. It operates two programs aimed at children: Family Days and tours for school groups. The education coordinator initiated the first Family Days program two years before this study, soon after she was hired by the director of University Gallery to fill a newly created position. For each exhibition, University Gallery hosts one Family Day for children aged 6–12 and their adult companions, usually a parent or grandparent. This program combines a hands-on studio activity, a demonstration by an artist and museum exploration activities for the children under the guidance of their adult companion.

During the year of this study, however, the main focus of University Gallery's educational programming was the second program type: interactive docent-guided tours, combined with hands-on art projects, for school groups. The length and content of the school tours varies with the age of the children. For primary school groups of 15–20 children and two to three adults (teachers and parents), the guided tour usually lasts about 30 minutes with another 30 minutes of studio art work in another room down the hall from the gallery. For secondary school groups of 30–35 children and two to three adult chaperones, the guided tour usually lasts about an hour and excludes hands-on art projects. The number of school group tours varies with the exhibition themes. For example, a very popular sculpture exhibition on display during the observation period attracted between one and five school groups per day, while no school group visited the gallery for another exhibition during the observation period. University Gallery also holds training workshops to help local teachers prepare their students for the tours. The education coordinator designed the workshops to provide teachers with practical strategies for incorporating art into their curriculum through the themes of the specific exhibitions.

Data collection

Fieldwork for both museums took place during the 2001–2 academic year and consisted of non-participant observation of children's programs and interviews with individuals involved in creating and overseeing the educational programs. The first author collected data on the first case, Architecture Museum. She observed 14 school groups, who came from public and private schools and ranged from 4th to 8th grade students (a combined total of 594 children and 62 adult chaperones), and interviewed the director of marketing

and the former intern who originally designed the museum's school group tour program. The second author collected data on the second case, University Gallery. She interviewed the education coordinator and observed one Family Day event and five school tours, all in conjunction with one temporary sculpture exhibition. The 2-hour Family Day event attracted about nine family groups (23 children and 13 adults). The observed school tours included one group of 34 8th graders from an elite private school English class, and four groups of 1st graders from a public school with about 20–25 children per group (a combined total of 117 children and 15 adult chaperones).

We conducted formal, semi-structured interviews with the individuals responsible for creating, supervising and guiding the school groups at each site. The content of each interview varied, depending on the exact role of the person in relation to the museum in question, but it generally covered the history of the museum's programs for children, descriptions of these programs, and the goals that the museum hoped to accomplish. We also had many informal conversations with the tour guides and their assistants before and after the school groups arrived. During these conversations, we were able to conduct 'casual interviewing' (Lofland and Lofland, 1995) and to incorporate these responses into our field notes.

Organizational goals

The organizational goals for the children's programs at both museums fit into three broad themes: (1) teaching 'cultural lessons' to children; (2) teaching 'content lessons' to children; and (3) teaching 'lessons' to educators about the value and legitimacy of supplementing school curriculum with the museums' programs.

Cultural lessons

Cultural lessons include the beliefs, values and practices of an organization and its related fields and/or institutions. Cultural lessons are often viewed as 'factual' by members of the organization promoting them and as 'subjective' and value-driven by non-members (as noted by Macdonald, 2002, in her discussion of one museum's intended lesson of 'public understanding of science'). Organizational efforts to teach cultural lessons to children are a form of socialization in that they are an attempt to persuade children to adopt the organization's preferred beliefs, values and practices. Importantly, these include both ideological and behavioral expectations. Both Architecture Museum and University Gallery clearly promote their own belief systems in the material they present to school groups, and both feel that children are an excellent potential audience for 'recruitment'. As with other socialization efforts, the lessons of educators have the potential to be thwarted by the social locational understandings visitors bring with them to the museum (see

Fyfe and Ross, 1996, on class background, and Macdonald, 2002, on political and other backgrounds). Visitor perspectives often illustrate the value-driven nature of the museum's cultural lessons.

Architecture Museum – teach preservationism to children: The overall mission of Architecture Museum is to promote the preservation of historic architecture and neighborhoods. It expects to accomplish that goal by educating the community about the area's architecture and the importance of preserving it. The Museum's programs for school groups are meant to teach the cultural lessons of historic preservation ideology to children. The overall goal of the preservation movement in the US is to 'revalue and re-present the past through saving, maintaining, and/or reconstructing historic structures and artifacts' (Barthel, 1996: 2). Ideologically, it is concerned with valuing authenticity and plurality in preservation (Barthel, 1996). The latter refers to saving physical structures considered 'representative' of a range of cultures and time periods, not only buildings of elite architectural significance. The expectation of Architecture Museum is that the children who participate in its programs will be more likely to hold pro-preservation values as adults, which will be in the long-term interest of the organization, the city and the preservation movement as a whole. As explained by the former intern who designed the school tour program and who is now a preservation professional:

It's crucial that an organization like [Architecture Museum] reach out to school children because I certainly believe, and I am sure that many others agree with me, that if you wish to interest an individual in something or if you wish to make them aware or conscious of the importance of something, probably the best time to do so is when they're children. And once you plant that seed, hopefully it will grow.

The preservationist stance of Architecture Museum is a central aspect of its programs for school groups, and the museum attempts to instill preservation messages in each of the program segments. For example, the museum's location in a renovated historic building is used to promote the idea of 'adaptive reuse', which refers to saving a building by using it for a purpose other than the one for which it was originally intended. As part of the school tour program, the tour guides typically asked the children to define preservation, and they encouraged the children to see it as an important value to have if they truly care about their city. The tour guides explicitly asserted the idea that historic preservation is in the economic interest of the community because it encourages tourism and creates jobs. As is often the case, the organization's leaders did not see these cultural lessons as promoting a political or moral agenda. Instead, they maintained that this perspective is simply 'common sense'. Nevertheless, they believed in the importance of attempting to socialize children into these lessons.

University Gallery – cultivate sophisticated individuals and lifelong museum patronage: University Gallery is ‘dedicated to the enrichment of the cultural and intellectual life’ of the inhabitants of the city and the surrounding region. Its central mission is ‘to preserve and promote the artistic traditions’ of the university, and to present high-quality exhibitions ‘that will stimulate visitors to think and to learn about the art of diverse times, places, and peoples’. University Gallery strategically attempts to recruit children to the museum, not only to increase the number of visitors, but also to promote art appreciation as a cultural resource to new audiences. The museum staff assumes that a well-rounded, sophisticated person is one who has cultivated an appreciation of art and has acquired some familiarity with art history along with the cultural skills related to viewing, thinking and talking about art. In short, the organization subscribes to a taken-for-granted image of an ‘enriched’ individual, one that regularly patronizes art museums and displays class-based tastes and understandings of ‘the arts’ as a form of cultural currency, a view which is consistent with the modern era museum’s emphasis on education of the masses (see DiMaggio, 1982; Prior, 2002). This stance was implicit in the education coordinator’s comments about the importance of getting young children interested in art and the culture of museums. Accordingly, she viewed children’s programs as a vehicle for helping them become comfortable and culturally adept in museum settings:

Hopefully throughout their lives and then, when they become parents, if they do, or when they see young people, that they would bring those people back into the museum. And I think that’s another important goal, is trying to make museums a much more accessible place and by targeting children, you’re really able to hopefully establish a lifelong relationship with the museum, with the arts, and hopefully they’ll keep coming back.

Content lessons

The second organizational goal for the children’s programs at both museums is to accomplish specific content lessons, or the teaching of generally accepted ‘factual’ information related to the subject matter or theme of the tour in question. Content lessons, unlike cultural lessons, are often viewed as ‘objective’ by both members and non-members of an organization. While the facts of a content lesson are not likely to be disputed, the value and meaning of those facts may be. Organizational efforts to teach content lessons to children are also a form of socialization in that they are an attempt to impart factual information, but particular information that supports the organization’s interests and that the organization defines as being of value to know. Although the material in content lessons may be less controversial in nature than that of cultural lessons, it is also material that museums expect children to learn if they are to appreciate and adopt the cultural lessons of the school tours.

Architecture Museum – ‘history’ with focus on test standards: The content lessons of the school tours at Architecture Museum consist of factual information related to history and government (‘civics’), such as dates, names of regions and names of explorers, and to architecture, for example, the architectural terms used to describe the styles of historic houses found in the area and ways to identify these styles by their architectural features. Also, the program attempts to reinforce basic mathematical terms and skills of the sort that the children are expected to know by the end of a grade level (and on which they are tested at the end of each academic year). For example, the children are asked to subtract and add dates of historic events and to learn to define terms such as ‘parallel’ and ‘perpendicular’ by identifying the roof lines of certain house styles as parallel or perpendicular to the street.

Architecture Museum views many of the content lessons in its children’s programs as necessary to convince teachers to bring students to the museum (as we discuss in another section). However, the central purpose of these content lessons from the perspective of the organization is to facilitate teaching cultural lessons, as noted by the intern who created the original program:

[Our goal is] an introduction to the world of historic preservation and to the built environment in [the city]. We ask the children, why do you like [the city]? What makes it special? Certainly one of those things is the built environment. And to articulate those feelings, you have to have some type of basic vocabulary. You have to know a little bit about the house types in the city. And so we developed a slide show that basically introduced several of the common types.

He noted a similar benefit to teaching about the history of the region – it allows the tour guide to emphasize the importance of the preservation of historic buildings. Overall, the content lessons at Architecture Museum do not overlap with the cultural lessons as much as they facilitate the teaching of them.

University Gallery – ‘introduction to the world of art’ with broad applications: University Gallery introduces children to the subject matter and content lessons of art in both the school group tours and the Family Day events by (1) providing opportunities for preschool and primary school children to create art objects in a studio environment down the hall from the gallery and (2) incorporating basic art vocabulary into a variety of ‘looking’ activities in the exhibition space for children of all ages. For the sculpture exhibition on display during the observation period, for example, children carved miniature sculptures out of spongy blocks, and the lesson plan for the tours emphasized the meaning and application of a variety of concepts, such as symbol, symmetry, abstraction, texture, color, shape and pattern. The writing and drawing activities in the Family Day program for the sculpture exhibition clearly reinforced the content lessons related to these art concepts

by asking children to do activities such as draw their own symbols and list the traits that a lion shares with a king (to illustrate why a lion was used as a symbol of power on a king's buckle). Tour guides for the school groups also repeatedly used these art terms in the process of providing the children with clues about how to view, interpret and evaluate sculptures.

Clearly, the tours and the activities for the children's programs emphasize the importance of conventional ways to think and talk about art as part of the children's experience in the museum setting, but often these content lessons overlap with latent cultural lessons, most likely because the subject matter of art theory is based less on 'factual' information and more on subjective interpretation of artistic expression. For example, during an interview, the education coordinator discussed her belief that the artistic themes and concepts in the children's programs are related to other subjects (or, content lessons) that the children are studying in their literature, social studies and geography classes, but she stressed that, ultimately, these themes as well as the cognitive skills associated with art appreciation are related to something larger in a child's cultural frame of reference (or, cultural lessons):

So we try to stress the formal elements of art, [a] work of art, what it looks like, why it looks the way it does, stylistic elements and then the process, how was this created, and then why, what larger purpose did it serve, why an artist would be making this sort of thing and how can this relate to your life and your experiences.

Lessons for educators

The third organizational goal for the children's programs at both museums differs somewhat from the first two goals in that it involves lessons directed at adults, not children. To gain access to children as an audience for their school group programs, museums must persuade educators that participation in the programs will be worthwhile – they must get the children to the museum. To do so, both Architecture Museum and University Gallery attempt to get school administrators and teachers (gatekeepers to the children) to define the museum programs as important supplements to the existing school curriculum. Both organizations need to get the adult gatekeepers to accept the legitimacy of the cultural and content lessons they wish to teach before they will be able to have the opportunity to teach these lessons to the children. Thus, the third goal links the museums' accomplishment of child-specific aims and practices to their abilities to negotiate successfully with teachers, administrators and the institution of education.

Both museums find that recruiting school groups is a complex and delicate undertaking. They need to teach educators that the existing curriculum should be supplemented, if they do not already believe that it does, and that the museums should be allowed to step in to fill the void. First, museum officials run the risk that teachers will disagree with the lessons they wish to teach and, as a consequence, will restrict access to children by refusing to

participate in the programs. Second, the museums need to ensure that the educators do not perceive themselves as being critiqued for failing to hold the same values and/or for not providing these lessons to children in the first place. One technique used by both organizations to avoid the latter situation is to define a given school's lack of the lessons in question in its existing curriculum as due to a lack of 'resources' rather than due to the school's failure to hold the appropriate values about cultural or content lessons. The museum organizations are able to provide a face-saving vocabulary of motive for educators, the view that 'of course' these lessons were valuable and would be taught in their schools, if only the resources existed to do so. The museums work to position themselves as able to fill the gap in the school curriculum, and thus as capable of performing a public service.

Accordingly, both Architecture Museum and University Gallery define their programs for school groups as a form of service to the community. Doing so, however, is a means to accomplish their initial goal of teaching cultural lessons to children. Both organizations attempt to target underprivileged children as tour participants and, to that end, do not charge a fee of any sort to the schools or to the children themselves. University Gallery even pays for buses to transport children to their site as an attempt to increase the number of children to whom they have access, while school groups visiting Architecture Museum are responsible for transporting children to the museum on their own, a cost that at times prevents groups from attending. Interestingly, Architecture Museum was far more successful than University Gallery at convincing educators from resource-poor schools to schedule children for tours, while University Gallery was much better at eliciting attendance from elite private schools than was Architecture Museum. These differences may be related to the appeal of different cultural and content messages promoted by the two organizations.

Architecture Museum – 'get them in the door': Architecture Museum faced difficulty in 'selling' its intended lessons to school gatekeepers when it first began offering tours. Architecture Museum did not initially define or intend its tours for school groups as a supplement to the curriculum available in local schools, but its director of marketing found that teachers were not interested in bringing their students to the museum unless the programs were linked to curricular issues of concern to them. Just as many museums have altered the content of their exhibitions and appearances of their buildings to appeal to visitors as customers and to get them through the door (Barry, 1998; Macdonald, 2002: 45), Architecture Museum found it needed to appeal to teachers as customers. After it became clear to the director of marketing that teachers did not feel strongly about historic preservation and were ambivalent about the importance of architecture, she consulted with several primary school teachers and officials at other museums. After some experimentation, the director learned she could better 'sell' the program to

teachers if she limited the program's emphasis on cultural lessons and altered its content lessons to emphasize history and government, rather than historic preservation and architecture:

We wanted to make [the tour content] congruent with the [organization's] mission, but we also had a really strong voice from the teachers who said, you know, you're not just going to get people in here just to see an architectural history or before-and-after houses. You're not going to get them. So we had to develop something further. The [addition of] history was really because of the teachers and that part really worked out well, you know, because it does sell.

The director of marketing also began to emphasize to teachers that the tour included information on the basic skills on which students were tested at the end of each academic year (math and history, in particular). Consequently, in order to appeal to teachers and convince them that tour lessons were of value, the director of marketing revised the two slide shows, which originally dealt with the urban transportation history of the city and the preservation accomplishments of the organization, to cover state and local history and historic house styles.

After the alterations to the program, the teachers who were contacted about possible museum visits were more likely to see the content lessons as supplementing their school curriculum in a valuable way. The rhetoric used by Architecture Museum in selling the tours supports the content lessons that must be taught by teachers; rather than critiquing the schools for failing to provide specific content lessons, the museum adopted the strategy of presenting the message that they support the lessons that teachers must already teach and will assist them in doing so. Here, the gatekeeping role of educators presents an explicit illustration of the need for organizations to demonstrate their legitimacy and the value of the cultural and content lessons they wish to teach before they will gain access to children.

University Gallery – 'fill the art gap': University Gallery also has to sell its programs to teachers and administrators. Although its lessons are more familiar to many educators than those of Architecture Museum, University Gallery also works to teach these gatekeepers that the lessons are important. The education coordinator does this by spending much of her time contacting administrators and trying to persuade them that her programs will assist them in their educational mission by filling the well known 'art gap' in the curriculum of American schools. A central concern of the education coordinator is the lack of opportunity for young children, especially poor children, to learn about art theory and practice in schools today:

So many children don't even have art classes in their schools anymore, so this is, you know, really a special opportunity for them to see, you know, big machinery or fancy materials that they don't have access to at school or at home.

Thus, one of the education coordinator's main objectives is to educate

teachers about the cultural and the content lessons of the art world so that they will understand these lessons and define them as information children should have. To do so, she offers regularly scheduled interdisciplinary workshops for teachers to introduce them to the exhibition themes, to suggest ways to incorporate art into their curriculum, and to provide them with resource materials and slides for their classrooms.

The education coordinator voiced special concern about ‘reaching out’ to ‘underprivileged’ children, partly because of her personal values about equal opportunity and partly because of the university’s recent involvement in a variety of community enrichment programs, for example, an after-school tutoring program for poor children. The education coordinator targeted four public schools with predominately poor and African American students and with few institutional resources. She found, however, that it was difficult to get the principals and teachers from these schools to accept her invitations for school tours and teacher training, despite the fact that the school tours were free and a generous grant from the Power Company enabled University Gallery to pay for buses to transport the children. Although she expressed disappointment about her lack of success in recruiting the participation of these particular schools, she was very successful in getting other schools, especially a nearby public school and several private schools, into the gallery.

Her challenge, then, is how to persuade teachers at poorer schools to value the opportunities to increase the cultural capital of their students through museum visits. As might be expected, the education coordinator does not have to work as hard to convince teachers at elite schools of the cultural benefits of bringing children to an art museum.

Organizational strategies to enact goals

Next, we examine the ways in which both organizations work to accomplish their goals. The following sections describe the extent to which the success of these programs was influenced by (1) the pedagogical techniques and abilities of tour guides, (2) the appropriateness of the physical spaces of the museums and the abilities of the guides to make use of these spaces, and (3) the attempts of tour guides to control children’s bodies and behavior.

Pedagogical techniques

The individuals who lead the school group tours at both museums have much to do with the enactment of the programs and, thus, the accomplishment of the organizations’ goals in relation to them. This section analyzes the impact of their abilities – abilities related to their education and training as well as their personal beliefs – to impart the cultural and content lessons of the museums.

Architecture Museum – ‘listening is learning’: The school group tours at Architecture Museum are almost always led by the director of marketing with the assistance of an intern or docent. While both the interns and docents have expertise on the subject matter of the museum’s exhibitions, they have not been trained by the museum to work with children. Likewise, the director of marketing has no formal training in educational theory or teaching techniques and has not worked with children in the past. Consequently, she typically only learns of such techniques or the sorts of behavior she might expect from children when she discusses them with teachers who bring their students to the museum or with museum volunteers who have experience as educators. She is open to learning more about strategies for working with children, but has little time to do so. She tends to expect children on school tours to be very ‘well-behaved’ (i.e. silent unless asked a question, responsive when called on, appreciative and interested only in the lessons she is attempting to impart). Observations revealed that her presentation style was often rushed and much of the detailed information appeared not to be understood by the children. She structured the program around children listening to her presentations and viewing illustrations of them (exhibits, slide shows, etc.). The director posed questions to the children and asked them to repeat key terms, but the tours were not organized to encourage interactivity. (Even during the observation period, however, her pedagogical style increasingly included additional questions meant to elicit children’s responses.)

The director of marketing was limited in her ability to present successfully content and cultural lessons due to her lack of formal training in the history and preservation topics covered by the program (she was frank in noting that she is still learning the material) and her own personal ambivalence about preservationist ideology (she stated that she favors a more limited form of preservationism than do many others in the organization). At times during the observation, she was not able to answer specific content-related questions of a technical nature and presented inaccurate information with regard to details of historic events and dates.³ Also, she has chosen to limit the cultural lessons she presents to match the messages she gives to the teachers to sell them on the program. She feels that to focus too much on preservation would be ‘false advertising’ if such a focus is at the expense of the history and other topics she has promised to educators to ‘get them in the door’. Consequently, her pro-preservation lessons tend to be more limited than the organization would prefer. (See Gable, 1998, for discussion of the common practice of guides presenting their own interpretations of museum artifacts and lessons and, thus, undermining the intended lessons of the organization.) In sum, the execution of the planned cultural and content lessons of the tours at Architecture Museum is impeded by the limited nature of the tour leader’s pedagogical and topic-related training.

University Gallery – ‘doing is learning’: The education coordinator leads about half of all the school group tours at University Gallery; the other tours are led by trained volunteer docents. In contrast to the tour leader at Architecture Museum, she has a background in museum education and art history, which means she has experience and training in pedagogic techniques and is trained in presenting the cultural and content lessons of the organization’s art-based focus. She also feels comfortable facilitating the guided tours and personally believes the cultural lessons inherent in the programs she leads.

The education coordinator relies on ‘interactive pedagogy’ to capture children’s attention and make a lasting impression.⁴ For each new exhibition, she deliberately designs inquiry-based, discovery activities for the children. The education coordinator and the docents use the Socratic method of leading the school tours, and the education coordinator creates a Museum Activity Packet (MAP) for each Family Day program. The MAP is a hand-out with questions and spaces for the children’s written answers, with the questions focused on looking and interpretation activities. There are also several drawing activities in each MAP. The education coordinator explicitly stated that one of her goals is to help children develop the ability to connect to the object and assess the work of art through interactive, guided discovery:

We give them kind of clues on how to look at it, how to interpret it, and then figure out for themselves their own answer, and we guide them through very carefully so that they arrive an answer that’s close to the one that we’re trying to get them at and often we’ll give, in smaller print underneath, the answer but we’ve let them come to their own conclusions so hopefully that’ll have a more lasting impact on them.

The field observations confirmed that the education coordinator and the trained docents enthusiastically promoted the notion that learning about art should be fun and that children appeared to participate eagerly in tour activities. The education coordinator stated her belief that children must enjoy the activities and be actively engaged in a process of self-discovery if the activities are to have a lasting impression beyond the exhibition:

So that when it all comes together, they seem to have a great time, and you see the light bulb click in their mind that, oh I get it, and they don’t realize that they’re learning. And I think that’s what makes it so much fun is that they don’t realize they’re learning but these are skills that they can take with them into the world.

In sum, the school group tours given at University Gallery appears to be much more effective than those of Architecture Museum at accomplishing the organization’s cultural and content lessons due to the training, abilities and beliefs of the education coordinator and her assistants.

Museum spaces and exhibits

The second factor of importance with regard to the museums' abilities to enact organizational goals through school group programs is that of the built environment, or the museums' spaces and exhibits. Both museums were intended for adult visitors – visitors who are typically taller and who tend to hold different abilities and interests than child visitors. Museum spaces have the potential to influence programs for school groups directly, through their suitability for children, and indirectly, through the abilities of tour guides to recognize and take these limitations into account in their planned programs.

Architecture Museum – limited suitability for children: The spaces and exhibits at Architecture Museum are not always conducive to children's participation or use. They were not designed with children in mind and are not very suitable for the large groups who often attend the tours (groups may have as many as 55 students, although the usual size is approximately 40). The exhibits tend to be very text-laden and placed too high for easy viewing. One exhibition room is framed by low walls over which most adults may easily see, but which tend to impede the average child's view; the tours are sometimes given with the assumption that these walls do not block patrons' lines of sight, which is not the case for most children. Finally, the exhibits are not designed to allow large groups to gather easily around them. Even the objects placed on pedestals are located too close to walls to allow them to be viewed from all sides at once. Since the tour leader has no training in children's education or learning styles, she is not aware of the need to place an emphasis on overcoming these limits, and, based on observation, children are often unable to see or hear what is being presented. For example, she was often forced to hold up small balsa-wood models of buildings as she discussed them to allow children other than those in the front rows to see the models, but in doing so, she typically held them over the heads of the children closer to her, making it difficult for those children to view the buildings. There are features of the museum's design, however, that work well for children's groups, including a lecture hall with movable chairs, easily accessible restrooms and an outdoor area suitable for crafts. In general, the built environment of Architecture Museum and the way in which it is used hinders the teaching of both cultural and content lessons.

University Gallery – attentiveness to positioning of objects in museum space: University Gallery also was not originally designed for children, but some of its exhibits are installed with children in mind. The education coordinator explicitly acknowledges the challenges of the placement and size of art objects in relation to children in a museum space that historically has served an adult audience. For example, she convinced the curator to lower the hanging level by two inches and to set particular sculptures on lower pedestals and or put them in the middle of the room to give the

children a better vantage point – closer to their eye level and not tucked away in a corner. Additionally, she focuses on using these exhibit spaces in a way that is suitable for children’s viewing, for example by having children move through the museum space in relatively small groups and by gathering them around the exhibits in such a way that all the children are able to have a clear line of sight. The field observations confirmed that the education coordinator, but not every volunteer docent, was very attentive to ensuring that all children were able to see before she began her discussion on a particular topic. Overall, the built environment of University Gallery is organized and used in a way that enhances the teaching of the organization’s content and cultural lessons.

Children’s bodies and social behavior in museum space

The third factor relevant to the accomplishment of organizational goals is the strategies chosen by tour leaders to attempt to control children’s physical movement and social behavior during the school tours. Once museums gain access to children and get them to the site, they then need to be able to get the children to ‘behave’ and to ‘pay attention’ to the lessons the programs are attempting to impart; for cultural and content lessons to be heard, children need to display ‘self-control’.

Classroom education has long been understood as involving the teaching of the value of ‘self-control’ to children as one of its key cultural lessons (Foucault, 1977; Johnson, 1982; Martin, 1998), and the lesson is a key part of informal, non-classroom education, as well. ‘Self-control’ is the ability to know and follow the behavioral expectations viewed as appropriate in the location and situation in question, even when one does not wish to do so (see Fine, 1987, on self-control as control of emotional display). Similarly, early modern museums attempted to control the behavior of their visitors ‘through rules to control the boundaries of the body – touching, eating, defecating, spitting, expelling mucus – and to keep the socially inadmissible in check’ (Prior, 2002: 202) and, frequently, through the exclusion of children from their sites (Prior, 2002). Most contemporary museums continue to place an emphasis on control of visitor behavior (Trondsen, 1976), whether those visitors are adults or children and whether they are on a guided tour or a self-directed visit. To present the school tour programs as intended, museum officials attempt to gain the cooperation of children and the adult chaperones that accompany them.

To teach the intended cultural and content lessons, tour guides feel that they must control the children in an effective manner, including controlling their use of space, their bodies and their social behavior. Ensuring that children understand what behavior is viewed as appropriate for a museum setting involves ‘locational socialization’ (Lofland, 1985), or the teaching of lessons regarding what sorts of locations require what sorts of behavior. Adults, however, are often not skilled at explaining or have trouble

articulating the standards of behavior expected of children in public settings (Cahill, 1987, 1990), which results in misunderstandings and limits the ability of children to understand how to adhere to these standards (a pattern clearly observed at both museums). Much program time at both museums is devoted to managing children's physical movement and behavior. This management involves ensuring that children adhere to unspoken expectations regarding the sorts of behavior deemed appropriate for classroom, museum and public situations, for example by paying silent attention to the tour guide and not touching displays. Additionally, it involves trying to get children to understand and adhere to explicit instructions, for example when to stand, when to move to a new room, when to answer a question.

Museum tour guides typically encounter a series of constraints in ensuring that children display control while participating in school tours: (1) children must be aware (or made aware) of the expectations held of them in terms of movement and behavior; (2) children must feel the need to adhere to these standards, either due to agreeing with them, due to control of adults, or due to sanctions that bring their behavior into line with expectations; and (3) adult chaperones must not undermine the tour guides' attempts to obtain adherence to rules.

Architecture Museum – expectations of deference and 'self-control':

The director of marketing expects children to respect her authority and to display self-control – to know and follow the unstated expectations and to understand and follow the stated expectations. She has learned, however, to lower her standards since starting the tours. When she first began giving the programs, she expected '100 percent attention' from the students. Although she said that teachers advised her that she would be lucky to get '60 percent attention', she still finds it frustrating that students will not 'behave'. Upon children's arrival at the museum for a tour, she asks them to pay attention and to not talk when she is talking, but, ironically, it is often the case that most of the children are talking when she gives these instructions and probably do not hear them. She does not give the children instructions on how to control their bodies (for example, instructions about touching the exhibits or each other) and seems to expect that the children already know these behavioral norms.

If children violate her expectations of full attention and self-control, she stops to correct their behavior. Based on observation, she appears to be more bothered by talking than anything else. She often uses space and explicit physical manipulation of children to attempt to gain adherence to her expectations. For example, she directs her laser pointer at talkative children while telling them to be quiet and often requires misbehaving children to move across the room to sit beside her during slide shows. Additionally, however, the museum staff proactively uses space to help children adhere to what was expected of them, as noted by an intern:

After the very first presentation it was obvious that there was far too much gossiping and horse-play and so from that time forward, for every subsequent presentation, we spaced out the chairs so that the chairs were maybe two feet apart . . . and as soon as we did that, boom, problem solved.

Finally, the field observations showed that the director relies on other adults to assist in controlling the children's physical movement and other sorts of behavior. She expects teachers to have instructed children on how to behave prior to their arrival at the museum, and she expects them to assist in sanctioning the children during the tour, although not in a disruptive way. Teachers and parent chaperones often step in to correct children at Architecture Museum, typically when the tour leader expresses disapproval with behavior or appears to be having difficulty with a specific child.

The director and other adults have widely varying degrees of success in getting children to exhibit 'self-control'. Much of this variation, however, seems to be related to the extent to which certain lessons of locational socialization have been instilled in the children prior to their arrival at Architecture Museum, including the extent of the teachers' abilities to direct the children's behavior. In short, the director is limited in her ability to convey cultural and content lessons by what the children already know with regard to self-control. Her perception of this limit is evident in her presentation style – if she feels a school group is 'bad' or lacking self-control she will not work as hard to persuade them of the value of the lessons she is trying to teach.

University Gallery – expectations of reciprocal respect and 'self-control': The education coordinator at University Gallery makes her expectations for self-control much more explicitly known to children when they arrive for a program than does the tour leader at Architecture Museum. The education coordinator has several special concerns about bringing children into a museum that is not a children's museum and works to ensure that her expectations are known to children. First, upon a school group's arrival, children are told before they enter the gallery to leave backpacks and anything that isn't 'attached to their body [*sic*]' at the entrance near the security guard's desk:

First and foremost, we don't want them playing with anything, we don't want them fidgeting with anything. And then before they ever enter through the doors, they get a little lesson on not touching and not running and not leaning on the walls and that is also done in a questioning mode so that they are answering what they are supposed to do and not supposed to do.

Next, the education coordinator instructs the children about behavioral rules and positions herself as 'teacher' for the tour:

And then also, they're usually with teachers so they're usually in school-frame of mind but I always reinforce that just like when you're in class, when the teacher is talking, and today I'm going to be your teacher, the docent or who-

ever does it, please be, put on your best behavior and listen to what I'm saying and then I promise I'll listen very carefully when you have something to say and then I also say, and respect your classmates when they're speaking. So we give them all of that kind of up front.

Note that she engages in explicit locational socialization of the children by telling them what is expected of them in a museum setting and comparing her role as museum guide to that of a teacher to help them understand how they are expected to behave in relation to the gallery and to her.

The education coordinator also actively uses space to help the children maintain self-control. For example, she attempts to keep the children's attention and control their behavior by getting them to sit on the floor inside the space of the gallery. She explained why:

. . . they might start to wander off and look at something that you're not talking about. And then they're all going to go over there and they just kind of run amuck. You can lose them. And for whatever reason, teachers seem to think that they and their chaperones abandon all responsibility for their students when they walk in the museum. And I usually ask them to help but it somehow doesn't quite translate so smoothly, so it's often just me trying to manage these kids so if they're seated they usually stay, pretty much.

The field observations confirmed that all tour guides, not just the education coordinator, at University Gallery often struggle with how to best orchestrate children's participation to encourage self-control, especially with the younger children. While older children are less fidgety and more attentive to the tour guide, the younger children have difficulty sitting still in one place for more than a few minutes. The younger children appear eager to participate and many hold raised hands in the air, almost constantly, regardless if the tour guide has asked a question or not. Some children put their hands up and down throughout the session, but others keep their hands up in the air all the time, anxiously waiting to insert a comment. Occasionally, some of the children look around as though their attention has wandered from the discussion. It is rare, however, for children to physically wander away, unless the group is standing up rather than sitting down.

As noted earlier, the teachers and other adult chaperones tend not to step in when children violate behavioral expectations. Few of the chaperones sanction any child's fidgety behavior, with the exception of teachers who tend to 'police' the behavioral infractions in whispering gestures. Although the tour guides sometimes repeat instructions about participation etiquette, such as 'not talking all at once', in order to attempt to gain compliance, the tour guides appeared to be very successful in capturing the children's attention and engaging them in a lively interactive learning session. Thus, the guides at University Gallery are much better than the guides at Architecture Museum at eliciting self-control from children and, as a result, more effective at teaching the intended content and cultural lessons.

Discussion and conclusion

This article has analyzed organizational attempts to impart cultural and content lessons to children through museum programs for school groups with the intention of expanding knowledge of the institutional structures of childhood as they exist at the beginning of the 21st century. Here, we offer conclusions related to the museum organizations themselves and their attempts to socialize children. Museum programs for children serve two purposes for the organizations in which they are located. First, they attempt to give legitimacy to the museum simply through their existence. Second, they attempt to create future patrons and supporters through teaching cultural lessons to children. While the second purpose has been the focus of this article, the first purpose is also important to acknowledge. Thus, we discuss both purposes in turn.

First, the primary missions of both museum organizations involve the education of the public, including children. Museums are expected to have educational programs in order to be viewed as legitimate by the public and by the museum community (DiMaggio, 1991; Zolberg, 1984) – by definition, museums educate. Adhering to this expectation is in the interest of a museum in that ‘organizations which incorporate institutionalized myths are more legitimate, successful, and likely to survive’ (Meyer and Rowan, 1991: 61). Historically in the US, museums often claim they value education, although they do not devote the resources to it that would indicate that they really do. Education is a populist goal that museums take on in order to contribute to their long-term survival in late modern society (Zolberg, 1984); it is as important for museums to state that education is a goal to appear legitimate and to be able to cite high attendance figures as it is for their programs to actually ‘educate’. (See DiMaggio and Useem, 1982, on support for the arts as means to legitimacy.) Thus, simply having educational programs is important for museums, whether or not these programs are successful in accomplishing their stated goals.

Second, as this article has demonstrated, educational programs for children provide the opportunity for museums to teach content and cultural lessons to children. While the public is probably more concerned with the content lessons offered by the museums, the museums themselves appear more concerned with the cultural lessons because these are the lessons that have the potential to increase their power and legitimacy over time by ‘recruiting’ sympathetic patrons and supporters within the community. To that end, teaching cultural lessons about the value of museum ideologies creates an audience for both artistic products and the organizations devoted to their promotion and display. Training in the arts creates appreciative audiences out of those who will never be practitioners but who learn to understand artistic conventions (Becker, 1982).

Both Architecture Museum and University Gallery attempt to accom-

plish the teaching of their own content lessons and larger cultural lessons, although with varying degrees of emphasis. The cultural lessons, however, are of greater importance for the organizations themselves. Both museums are organizations in fields with elitist pasts (historic preservation and art); traditionally elitist organizations often work to overcome this past and to appear interested in broadening their appeal to the 'masses' (Zolberg, 1981, 1984). Architecture Museum has more of a need to succeed in teaching its cultural lessons to children, as its ideology is less likely to be learned elsewhere compared to that of University Gallery. University Gallery has less riding on the success of its specific cultural lessons because these lessons are more likely to thrive without active teaching to the community as they are taught by middle- and upper-class parents to their children as a part of the cultural reproduction of social class (DiMaggio and Useem, 1982). Still, the gallery stands to benefit if students, educators and adults view its particular programs as worthwhile and appreciate its lessons – if its general reputation is enhanced, it is likely to receive donations and to be viewed positively by the campus on which it is located and within the community of other art museums and galleries due to professional links between them.

The specific ideology of a museum organization also influences the way it chooses to convey its cultural lessons to children. Architecture Museum emphasizes cultural lessons over formal preservation or architecture vocabulary due to its more explicit political agenda, while University Gallery emphasizes formal art vocabulary, especially with younger children, over cultural lessons. Architecture Museum attempts to expand upon existing history curriculum in an effort to gain access to children to promote its preservationist beliefs, while University Gallery focuses on gaining access by filling a perceived curriculum gap ('the art gap') with its message. Architecture Museum appears to be less concerned with the children's retention of content lessons. Instead it views content lessons as a vehicle through which to teach cultural lessons. It hopes that the material in the content lessons will interest the students enough to engage them and to encourage them to define the organization's cultural messages as legitimate and intriguing. In contrast, University Gallery is much more concerned with teaching content lessons in ways that will be retained and believes that children's appreciation of such lessons will lead naturally to belief in the related cultural ones. Also, since the content and cultural lessons are quite similar for University Gallery, the organization's programs are able to integrate the two in a way that Architecture Museum does not do. Just as sociologists are learning to focus on the different sorts of visitors who attend different types of museums (DiMaggio, 1996; Kirchberg, 1996), we should also note how different types of museums use different strategies to teach their intended lessons to visitors, as well as how the intersection between the teaching of cultural and content lessons differs by museum type.

Our exploratory study suggests many fruitful avenues for future

research. Here, we note three. First, the study of a larger number of museums with a wider range of goals and resources at their disposal would allow for further understanding of the sorts of cultural and content lessons likely to be taught in different circumstances. In particular, much could be learned from comparative study of different types of museum organizations with different intellectual agendas (for example, art museums, science and technology museums, heritage and history museums), spatial formats, national and regional locations, and sources of funding. Second, additional direct study of the responses of children and teachers to museum educational programs is crucial to assessing the reception and interpretation of the lessons intended by museum organizations. What do children learn from (and how do they view) the cultural and content lessons presented? What do teachers learn and how does this influence the lessons in their classrooms? Third, better understanding of the relation between teachers and museum educators is essential to learning how both groups manage the 'gatekeeping' role taken on by teachers. Children, or, rather, children's time, is a valuable and finite resource over which teachers and museum educators must negotiate. How does this struggle influence the sorts of lessons taught in schools and in museum education programs? In sum, the socialization efforts of museums, like other organizations involved in informal non-classroom learning, are an important topic for future study. They will tell us about the intentions of museums as organizations, about potential sources of influence on children and about the negotiation of meanings of children and childhood taking place in these cultural realms.

Notes

An earlier version of this article was presented at the conference on 'Designing Modern Childhoods: Landscapes, Buildings, and Material Culture' at the University of California, Berkeley, 2-3 May 2002.

1. Apple (1990: 84) defines hidden curriculum as 'the norms and values that are implicitly, but effectively, taught in schools and that are not usually talked about in teachers' statements of ends or goals'.
2. We assigned pseudonyms to both museums and modified the job titles associated with each organization to protect the confidentiality of the museums and the informants associated with them.
3. One of the docents often present during observation was a trained and licensed tour guide who frequently pointed out the director's errors to the first author.
4. See Macdonald (2002: 47) on the shift from the traditional museum view that adult visitors are 'children' to be educated in a paternalistic fashion to a more 'child-centered' view in which adult visitors should be allowed to learn through play and interactivity. She argues that part of the motivation for this change is to treat the visitor as a 'customer who is always right' and to encourage visitors to see museums as enjoyable.

References

- Adler, P.A. and P. Adler (1998) *Peer Power: Preadolescent Culture and Identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Alexander, V.D. (1996a) 'From Philanthropy to Funding: The Effects of Corporate and Public Support on American Art Museums', *Poetics* 24(2-4): 87-129.
- Alexander, V.D. (1996b) *Museums and Money: The Impact of Funding on Exhibitions, Scholarship, and Management*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Apple, M.W. (1990) *Ideology and Curriculum*, 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.
- Barry, A. (1998) 'On Interactivity: Consumers, Citizens, and Culture', in S. Macdonald (ed.) *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, and Culture*, pp. 98-117. London and New York: Routledge.
- Barthel, D. (1996) *Historic Preservation: Collective Memory and Historical Identity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Birney, B.A. (1995) 'Children, Animals, and Leisure Settings', *Society and Animals* 3(2): 171-87.
- Becker, H.S. (1982) *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cahill, S.E. (1986) 'Childhood Socialization as a Recruitment Process: Some Lessons from the Study of Gender Development', *Sociological Studies of Child Development* 1: 163-86.
- Cahill, S.E. (1987) 'Children and Civility: Ceremonial Deviance and the Acquisition of Ritual Competence', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50(4): 312-21.
- Cahill, S.E. (1990) 'Childhood and Public Life: Reaffirming Biographical Divisions', *Social Problems* 37(2): 390-402.
- Callaghan, T.C. (2000) 'The Role of Context in Preschoolers' Judgments of Emotion in Art', *British Journal of Developmental Psychology* 18(3): 465-74.
- Cohen, U. (1987) 'Learning from Children's Museums: Implications for Design', *Children's Environments Quarterly* 4(1): 16-23.
- Corsaro, W.A. (1992) 'Interpretive Reproduction in Children's Peer Cultures', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 55(2): 160-77.
- DiMaggio, P.J. (1982) 'Cultural Capital and School Success: The Impact of Status Culture Participation on the Grades of US High School Students', *American Sociological Review* 47(2): 189-201.
- DiMaggio, P.J. (1991) 'Constructing an Organizational Field as Professional Project: US Art Museums, 1920-1940', in W.W. Powell and P.J. DiMaggio (eds) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, pp. 267-92. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P.J. (1996) 'Are Museum Visitors Different from Other People? The Relationship between Attendance and Social and Political Attitudes in the United States', *Poetics* 24(2-4): 161-80.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and W.W. Powell (1991) 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields', in W.W. Powell and P.J. DiMaggio (eds) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, pp. 63-82. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P.J. and M. Useem (1982) 'The Arts in Cultural Reproduction', in M.W. Apple (ed.) *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education*, pp. 181-201. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- DeVault, M.L. (2000) 'Producing Family Time: Practices of Leisure Activity Beyond the Home', *Qualitative Sociology* 23(4): 485-503.
- Faraday, A. (1990) 'Young Children and Art: The Importance of Critical Studies', *Early Childhood Development and Care* 59: 73-86.
- Fine, G.A. (1987) *With the Boys: Little League Baseball and Preadolescent Culture*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage.
- Frønes, I. (1994) 'Dimensions of Childhood', in J. Qvortrup, M. Bardy, G. Sgritta and H. Wintersberger (eds) *Childhood Matters: Social Theory, Practice and Politics*, pp. 145–64. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Fyfe, G. and M. Ross (1996) 'Decoding the Visitor's Gaze: Rethinking Museum Visiting', in S. Macdonald and G. Fyfe (eds) *Theorizing Museums: Representing Identity and Diversity in a Changing World*, pp. 127–50. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Gable, E. (1998) 'Mainstreaming Boundaries, or "Mainstreaming" Black History in a White Museum', in S. Macdonald and G. Fyfe (eds) *Theorizing Museums: Representing Identity and Diversity in a Changing World*, pp. 177–202. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Gillborn, D. (1992) 'Citizenship, "Race" and the Hidden Curriculum', *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 2(1): 57–73.
- Jensen, N. (1994) 'Children's Perceptions of their Museum Experiences: A Contextual Perspective', *Children's Environments* 11(4): 300–24.
- Jackson, P.W. (1968) *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Johnson, N.B. (1982) 'Education as Environmental Socialization: Classroom Spatial Patterns and the Transmission of Sociocultural Norms', *Anthropological Quarterly* 55(1): 31–43.
- Kidd, A.H. and R.M. Kidd (1996) 'Developmental Factors Leading to Positive Attitudes toward Wildlife and Conservation', *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 47(1–2): 119–25.
- Kindler, A.M. and B. Darras (1997) 'Young Children and Museums: The Role of Cultural Context in Early Development of Attitudes, Beliefs, and Behaviors', *Visual Arts Research* 23(1): 125–41.
- Kirchberg, V. (1996) 'Museum Visitors and Non-Visitors in Germany: A Representative Survey', *Poetics* 24(2–4): 239–58.
- Kracman, K. (1996) 'The Effect of School-Based Arts Instruction on Attendance at Museums and the Performing Arts', *Poetics* 24(2–4): 203–18.
- Lofland, L.H. (1985) *A World of Strangers: Order and Action in Urban Public Space*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press. (Orig. pub. 1973.)
- Lofland, J. and L.H. Lofland (1995) *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*, 3rd edn. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Macdonald, S. (2002) *Behind the Scenes at the Science Museum*. Oxford and New York: Berg.
- McNamee, A.S. (1987) 'Museum Readiness: Preparation for the Art Museum (ages 3–8)', *Childhood Education* 63(3): 181–7.
- Martin, K.A. (1998) 'Becoming a Gendered Body: Practices of Preschools', *American Sociological Review* 63(4): 494–511.
- Meyer, J.W. and B. Rowan (1991) 'Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony', in W.W. Powell and P.J. DiMaggio (eds) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, pp. 63–82. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Morgan, J.M. and M. Hodgkinson (1999) 'The Motivation and Social Orientation of Visitors Attending a Contemporary Zoological Park', *Environment and Behavior* 31(2): 227–39.
- Prior, N. (2002) *Museums and Modernity: Art Galleries and the Making of Modern Culture*. Oxford and New York: Berg.
- Schauble, L., D.B. Beane, G.D. Coates, L.M.W. Martin and P.V. Sterling (1996) 'Outside the Classroom Walls: Learning in Informal Environments', in L. Schauble and R. Glaser (eds) *Innovations in Learning: New Environments for Education*, pp. 5–24. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Solberg, A. (2001) 'Hidden Sources of Knowledge of Children's Work in Norway', in P. Mizen, C. Pole and A. Bolton (eds) *Hidden Hands: International Perspectives on Children's Work and Labour*, pp. 108–20. London: Routledge/Falmer.

- Stronck, D.R. (1983) 'The Comparative Effects of Different Museum Tours on Children's Attitudes and Learning', *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 20(4): 283–90.
- Thorne, B. (1993) *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Trondsen, N. (1976) 'Social Control in the Art Museum', *Urban Life* (5)1: 105–19.
- Tunnickliffe, S.D., A.M. Lucas and J. Osborne (1997) 'School Visits to Zoos and Museums: A Missed Educational Opportunity', *International Journal of Science Education* 19(9): 1039–56.
- Vom Lehn, D., C. Heath and J. Hindmarsh (2001) 'Exhibiting Interaction: Conduct and Collaboration in Museums and Galleries', *Symbolic Interaction* 24(2): 189–216.
- Willis, P.E. (1977) *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Zolberg, V.L. (1981) 'Conflicting Visions in American Art Museums', *Theory and Society* 10(1): 103–25.
- Zolberg, V.L. (1984) 'American Art Museums: Sanctuary or Free-For-All?', *Social Forces* 63(2): 377–92.

