

Open Museums

Audience Development in the Museums of Finnish Lapland Strategies, Methods and Steps Towards Future

Heidi Hämäläinen

0148072

Advanced studies in Art history

UYLE0325 Research 20 cr.

Tuija Hautala-Hirvioja

2018

Content

Introduction

1	Introduction and Backgrounds of the Study	7
1.1	The Short History of Finnish Museum	8
1.2	Moving Forward – Considering the Audience	13
1.3	Museum in Change	18
1.4	Museums in Lapland	19
2	Museum pedagogy in Museums of Lapland – Corner Stone of Audience Development	23
2.1	Understanding Museum Pedagogy in Lapland	26
2.2	Museum Education in Literature	30
3	Audience Projects in Lapland – Methods and Participation	34
3.1	Visitor’s aid	36
3.2	Drama-tours	40
3.3	Facilitated Wellbeing	42
3.4	Outreach	44
3.5	Collaboration	50
4	Finnish Audience – Research and Speculation	52
4.1	Special Target Groups	54
4.2	Audience Research in Old Market Square Carnival of Rovaniemi	56
5	Supporting the Themes of Learning in Museum, Inclusion and the Future of the Museum	59
5.1	Post-museum	60

5.2	Elitism	61
5.3	Social Inclusion	62
6	Conclusions – The Problematic Public Space	66

Literature

Other printed data

Collected data

Non-printed or published data

Web-data

Introduction

This Laudatur-study presents the first steps towards wider monograph about museum's audience development and social inclusion as a strategy for future museum on the field of Finnish and German museum with a current title: *Finnish and German Audience Development – The New Definition of Social Inclusion for the Future Museum*. In this study I have used the data collected from Finland, to be more accurate, from Lappish museums: Rovaniemi Art Museum, Lapland Regional Museum, Tornionlaakso Regional Museum, Aine Art Museum, Kemi Art Museum and Kemi Historical Museum. The data collected from these museums consists majorly from documents chosen by the staff that is linked on their work with the audience and museum educational activities and projects. This type of data is for example formal and informal project plans, unprinted data used inside the staff, project reports, leaflets and so on. I also sat down with a few of the staff members and the notes about the conversations are included in this data as well. The data collected for my pilot-non-visitor-research in Old Market Square Carnival of Rovaniemi on August 2016 developed into an informal report that is used in this study shortly. The purpose to present this data in this study is to emphasize how complicated reaching actual non-visitors or non-users might be, as almost all of the repliers could be considered as visitors. Literature plays a significant role by setting the example and views towards future as a comparable theory. This study is also strongly influenced by the conversations and discussions from Finnish-German Museum Forum held in Berlin on October 2017.

The aim of this study is to ground the idea of stronger inclusive thinking for future strategy, point out the theoretical and practical obstacles of this development and encourage the professionals of the field to take objective viewpoints on the practices that are still remaining on the level of modernist museum while the literature is so clearly guiding us to take the steps towards post-museum – the ideal democratic museum.

Through this study I am focusing on Finnish museum field. The first chapter *Introduction and Backgrounds of the Study* is representing the starting point for what is Finnish museum, where does it come from, what is audience work on Finnish museum field and how significant role museum education plays on it. Susanna Pettersson (2009/2010) and Marjatta Levanto (1996/2004/2010) both unfolds the history of Finnish museum in length and casts thoughts about the possible future of it. I approach the development of Finnish museum considering the movement towards the audience and more open museum as significant mile stones on this journey. At the end of the chapter I am presenting the museums that took part of this study.

In the second chapter *Museum pedagogy in Museums of Lapland – Corner Stone of Audience Development* I am discussing how museum education is understood in these museums and in what kind of role it is represented. I am aiming to bring up the strength and motivation in outreach work of small museums that are under-represented in museum field on national and international level. Theoretical background for the topic is given mainly by international authors, such as Eilean Hooper-Greenhill (2000/2007) who typically discusses the post-museum and museum learning, Maria Xanthoudaki (2015) who paints the future scenarios for 20th century people and museums, John Falk and Lynn Dierking (2013) who discuss the museum visiting motives and learning linked to the visits. Additionally collected strategies and thoughts from the museums participating this research are bringing their own side to this study.

The third chapter *Audience Projects in Lapland – Methods and Participation* unfolds the strategies, participation projects and methods used in these museums, the aims and the target groups. I have categorized the outreach methods from these museum into: Visitor's aid, Drama-tours, Facilitated Wellbeing, Outreach and Collaboration. I will look in the strategies and evaluate few of the methods with Nina Simon's five levels of the evolution of visitor experience to understand better the difference between participation and real participation or engagement and to create critical approach on the written strategies.

The chapter four, *Finnish Audience – Research and Speculation* I discuss the audience research, the known and unknown audiences and speculate the possible miscommunication or unfamiliarity between the audiences and the museum. The

original source of inspiration to begin with this research are the unknown non-visitors and potential visitors, how to know them better and build a new museum image. To highlight the complexity to actually find out who is a non-visitor and what they think about museum, I am presenting a pilot-non-visitor inquiry conducted in Rovaniemi on summer 2016.

Chapter five, *Supporting the Themes of Learning in Museum, Inclusion and the Future of the Museum*, is a theory-based overlook on the concepts of post-museum, elitism and social inclusion to justify the on-going discussion on the field my research is aiming to be part of. The authors followed here are i.e. Graham Black (2005), Janet Marstine (2006), Robert Janes (2007) and Yuha Jung (2010). The chapter reveals the varying views and the ways how the future work is understood within the field and how it may seem complex. Also it is highlighting the significant role museum education and museum learning – or the understanding of them – can play in the development of outreach, inclusion and audience development in general.

The last, chapter six *Conclusions – The Problematic Public Space* provides an overview and motive of this study and points out the importance to re-evaluate and research the current practices, traditional values and narrow resources in the development of audience work. It also lays further questions about the meaningfulness or even the realism of this development with the overview of theoretical literature on public space and the complexities open spaces “free for exploration” may and will bring along with the help of i.e. Michel Foucault (1986) and Sabine Nielsen (2013). Is “open for all” even possible in the way we may like to think it is?

1 Introduction and Backgrounds of the Study

The reason for the research about museum audience work is the aspect of the current and developing concept of inclusion work in museums. We can reflect inclusion within the discussion of audience work, which can be called – considering the amount of interest and continuous writing about it for over ten years – the hot topic in museum field, yet it remains ill-defined. Here I am reviewing the audience work of museum in Finnish Lapland and reflecting their contents on the topics discussed in Finnish-German museum forum: *Social Inclusion as a Strategy for the Future Museum*, held in Berlin on October 2017. Through the themes I will shortly raise for the reader to think about the museum learning and the possibilities created for this as significant content and offering from the museum side, the remaining elitism or certain sort of museum image that can be discussed as elitist, the heritage from the modern museum or traditional museum and what does inclusion mean in this context.

Finnish museum is young, therefore it cannot be fully reflected with the European museum's colonialist history. It can, however, be viewed inherited from the European museums, which in a way is also causing the most traditional assumptions in museum field what comes to its most basic tasks: collecting, preserving and displaying and finally, to audience work. Typically the discussion about the history of Finnish museum begins with the collections of University of Turku and the Ateneum art museum, opened in 1888. As the museum from Northern Finland are much younger ones – except the Tornionlaakso Regional Museum, originally established in 1914 – they are absent from the researches and publications published nationwide in Finland. (Levanto 2004: 23; Heinonen & Lahti 1988: 61–62; Tornio City web-page.)

The research concerning Finnish museum work is much based on memory-based knowledge (Pettersson 2010). Pettersson states that by viewing the archives there is not much to be found about the history of museum profession. Majority of the documents discuss about application and nomination processes which are limited when there has not been drama involved and wider if there has been discussion. (Pettersson 2010).

Neither has the practices of guiding been systematically documented. The *Finnish Museum Education Association* (Pedaali ry) has brought up the history of Finnish guiding and audience practices in 2010 to inspire museums to search and collect data linked to museum pedagogy. They see it is important since the pedagogical work has a significant role when defining museum's role in society. (Pedafooni 2B 2010: 3–4.) The latter notion enhances the idea of museum pedagogy as the corner stone of the whole audience development work. As the profession of museum educators is significantly new from about 1970s, we are still able to document the information provided by the original professionals themselves who were there to develop it from the beginning.

Some of those professionals, like Marjatta Levanto (2010), has researched their own profession. Levanto has written about the early years of Ateneum in which we can also date the early times of audience development work of Finnish museums. Certainly audience orientation happened also in other museums as soon as they were opened, but as stated above, the documentation of it has been quite limited.

1.1 The Short History of Finnish Museum

The beginning of 1600's was significant time for the development of Finnish museum institution, because then was established the artifact legislation, which applied until 1883, and is still effecting on the background of current legislations. On 1640 The Academy of Turku, from which realm many ideas about the museum development are, was established. It is clear that the significance to preserve cultural heritage was considered important, even when Finland was not an independent country. (Heinonen & Lahti 1988: 53; Rönkkö 1999: 62–63; Turpeinen 2005: 65.) During 1600–1700's the collections emerging on the context of the universities consisted from art, such as portraits of royalty, bishops, chancellors and professors and copper drawings but mainly coins and medals (Rönkkö 1999: 62).

The Enlightenment and Romance established the idea of a national museum. The Academy of Turku wanted to combine the ethnographic and archaeological collections

with coin and medal cabinets as one, university museum. Soon at 1810's the Council of the Academy of Turku planned to combine the collections into Finnish National Museum, but the idea was yet to be executed after the burning of Turku (1827), when the architect C.L. Engel (1778–1840) planned the main building for the Academy which had moved to Helsinki. (Heinonen & Lahti 1988: 21.)

The collections of the National Gallery started to gather in 1849 and they have been open for public since 1863. By the end of the century twelve other cities had gotten their own historical museums: Turku 1881, Kuopio and Sortavala (now Russia) 1883, Pori and Käkisalmi (now Russia) 1888, Rauma 1891, Viipuri (now Russia) 1892, Vaasa and Uusikaupunki 1895, Oulu 1869 and Porvoo 1897. (Rönkkö 1999: 63; Lamminen & Tornberg 2010: 13.) The opening of Ateneum in 1888 brought together art education and art appreciation into one building as the Finnish Arts Society and the Finnish Society of Crafts and Design moved there with their art schools and collections. The idea of civilizing the society rooted on the philosophy of Enlightenment was also happening in Finland (Pettersson 2009: 23, 28.)

Before Ateneum, while the exhibitions of Arts Society – established in 1846 – were very popular, the visitors remained clueless with the lack of additional information. The art provoked questions, but without guidance these questions remained unanswered. The professor of art history, J.J. Tikkanen suggested that he would educate the members of the Arts Society to guide the audience by organizing Sunday morning lectures for all the members. It is unknown if the lectures succeeded, but his demonstrations were popular in the Turku art museum at the beginning of 1900s. (Levanto 2010: 7; Levanto 2004a: 20.)

Suominen (1999) discusses in his licentiate work *Alfred Lichtwark taidekasvattajana, Saksalaisen taidekasvatusliikkeen jäljillä* (Alfred Lichtwark as an Art Educator, Mapping the German Art Education Movement), Alfred Lichtwark as the father of Finnish museum education. The German *Kunsterziehungsbewegung* was established at the late 1800s, during the same era Finnish intellectuals felt the need to establish the museum. The art educational idea had already museum political connections. (Suominen 1999: 6, 9, 11, 15–17.)

The German bourgeoisie was lacking of the artistic tradition of the aristocrats; the basis of their culture was work, not art. Strong, but one-sided and limited sense was the content of the new upper class, which Lichtwark saw as a wrong kind of content. The civilization was based on science and knowledge, which had become almost synonyms. The art education should be directed towards wealthy audience, which would mold the ground suitable for flourishing art. (Suominen 1999: 14, 18–19.) The ideology had characteristics typical for Enlightenment in the form of developing people to be more fitting to the picture of art lovers. Also the notion of wealthy art audience is concerning in the sense of today's inclusive aims and goals of museum pedagogy and audience development work.

The ground of the teaching was the child's own nature and learning happened best in meaningful surroundings. By enriching the used methodologies with art, he saw the direction from knowledge towards skills and how-to, understanding and the ability to research by oneself. The memorized knowledge would be replaced with experience-based matter, which is gained similarly like art through observation and emotions. (Suominen 1999: 28, 30–31.)

On 1886 Lichtwark received an occupation from the Hamburg Art Hall. The museum began with the artistic education of the citizens. Lichtwark established collaborations with schools and supported artistic hobby possibilities. The museum provided versatile exhibitions and the educational ideology affected even the collection work. Museums were thought as the real educators of the free nation. The audience work focused on the locals; Lichtwark established regional gallery at the beginning of 1900s and started to favor the collections of local artists. Contemporary art was however too new, and the people started to call the gallery as the gallery of horrors. (Suominen 1999: 10, 34–35.) Lichtwark understood the whole concept: collecting, exhibition design, display and side practices being part of the educational mission. He thought that the art collections are used the most meaningful ways if they are part of the active presence of the audiences. Without the audience one could freely question the existence of the collections. (Suominen 1999: 34, 36–37, 42, 49.)

In Finland, the vacation course notes by Fredric J. Lindström (1873–1924) in Ateneum 1904 are an early document about guiding practices, visions and ideals that were spread

around Arts Society. He believed the power of art to enhance human soul and moral quite similarly to Lichtwark. Soon at the beginning of 1900s the *Finnish Pedagogical Association* expressed their concern about the development of the artistic sense of school children. Regular museum visits were seen necessary, because only 12–13 year old child could be able to enjoy art. People were supposed to learn how to see additionally to the skills of reading and writing, and museums could be as an assistance with this. Thus the attention in Finland was directed towards Alfred Lichtwark. (Levanto 2004a: 20–22; Levanto 1996: 88.)

The Finnish idea of art education was developed partly through the effect of Ruskin and Morris and partly German influences. The Finns focused on similar sort of aspects than Lichtwark, such as criticizing the intellectual education and the aim to integrate art into general education. For example the reform of the teaching of drawing was similar to Germans. Another focus was on the museum practices, which at the time meant to utilize the collection of Finnish Art Society. (Suominen 1999: 63–64.)

Even though one can consider the ideas of Lindström and Lichtwark very similar, should be mentioned that the basis of Lindström's vision was to serve the people and their rights while Lichtwark might have aimed to civilize the nation with somewhat elitist manner and to produce consumers who understand aesthetics. However, the connection between Finland and Germany on this area may not be very far from each other. Regardless the museum culture in Germany could already been considered as old, the emerging museum professionals of Finland reached up with the concept of audience development quite fast and partly examples were taken from Germany.

Since 1902 there has been organized public lectures in Ateneum and since 1906 Sunday guided tours. (Heinonen & Lahti 1988: 61–62; Rönkkö 1999: 73). The Finnish Museum Association was established in 1923. Its first chairman Julius Ailio stressed from the very beginning the importance of guiding, he was concerned about the strength of the museum's social task. Only when the museum can achieve with the task, it will become the civilizing institution in which everyone can receive the idea of the cultural development. He thought that museums should be open when the people are free from their daily jobs and that the staff should be professionally educated for the task. (Levanto 2010: 5.)

However, during the establishment of museums all around Finland at the beginning of 1900s, the tasks of the museums were concentrated to traditional museum work, although movement towards the audience could be noticed. Heinonen and Lahti (1988: 171) are claiming that at the beginning of the museum institution the audience was not much paid attention to. At the most basic version of audience work was functioning in the form of convenient opening hours and guiding opportunities even when it was mere additional task to the main job. (see Kauppinen 2010).

Levanto (2010) is explaining that to organize guiding practices was not very simple for the museums. There was a little amount of staff which limited the possibilities and it wasn't always considered very important either. The countryside travelers might have heard that the staff is focused to more important tasks than guiding such as research and systematizing the objects. There was also an optimist attitude: since the museum is there now, it is just natural that people will come to see it. There were visitors, but mostly the same people such as researchers and students. Large national level museums have always had the audience and people have travelled from far to visit them. In natural history museums the people studied the objects independently, but there was also labels, long articles and some catalogues and guide books. (Levanto 2010: 7; Kauppinen 2010: 20.)

Also the resources of culture historical museum were quite limited for a long time, so there was not a lot of staff. Guiding was organized more according to the possibilities, and in many museums the guards were proceeding with this task. The castle of Turku was open during the 1890s every Sunday between 12 am and 3 pm, but the visitors could also organize another time with the usher living in the castle. In some culture historical museums the ushers were working as guides long in 1900s and in some smaller museums even all the way to 1980s. (Lamminen & Tornberg 2010: 13–14.)

The yearly reports of Satakunta Museum in Pori, established in 1888, reveals that there is not much told about guiding and guides. Since 1903 guiding was a task of the usher. In 1930s the task was inherited to his successor, who along the way studied and became a conservator. When the conservator retired in 1967 the task of guiding did not inherit to the curator who was just recently hired, but to the janitor whose task was to clean and heat up the exhibition rooms, and who then along with their regular job, guided and

supervised the exhibition area. During the 1960s for the summer guiding there was a summer worker and the guards hired in 1970s apparently guided additionally to the janitor. In 1973 the janitor hired to the new museum building was transformed into guard-cleaner. The guards were not allowed to guide in the new building. The oral history tells that during the 1970s the new researchers; two curators and a regional researcher took care of the guiding. (Lamminen & Tornberg 2010: 13–14.)

According to these evidence, we can discuss about the value seen in guiding and audience work in general inside the museum field and profession. Instead of proud professionals wanting to spread their knowledge, the janitors and ushers – with most likely the passion and knowledge to do so – guiding the audience into the collections.

1.2 Moving forward – Considering the Audience

Today it is stated, that museum pedagogy is generally considered as child-focused, leaving the adults outside as stated in *Open museum for adults* (Fin: *Avara museo aikuisille* 2010: 6). It seems though that the earliest pedagogical attempts were not for children but for the adults. However, we can argue whether or not the earliest audience centered provisions were pedagogical at all, because we can also discuss the actual museum pedagogy being established in the 1960s and 1970s with the positions of museum educators and pedagogical movements of that time, and the earliest attempts before this time being general Enlightenment-based civilizing information provisions.

Either way, during the early years the discussion about art and the topic about if children were able to understand art or not, was busy in media. The focus was especially on the lack of information provided by the Arts Society. The press addressed the fact that Finnish audience, adults or children, were not used to seek for information from brochures, even when they were available. During the 1910s, the articles were discussing also about the untidiness of the museum, bad and misleading display, lack of information and opening hours and the poor condition of the art work. This discussion revealed not only the wishes of the audience but also the museum's reaction to it. On

the museum's side there was not seen any reasons for complaints. Regardless of the idea of educating the society, art seemed to remain only as a hobby for the few. (Levanto 1996: 88–90.)

Gustaf Strengell was chosen for the intendant at the beginning of 1910s, which meant new museum pedagogical era for the museum. During the four years of his occupation Ateneum's collections gained new conditions and a new functional, audience targeted museum pedagogical program was established. He also sparked the idea to start a travelling exhibition in order to decrease regional inequality. His time in Ateneum was however short. Along with the following intendant, Torsten Stjernschantz (1882–1953) the display was returned as it was before Strengell, historical order. But Strengell's spirit remained. He travelled to America, after which he wrote about the idea of a quality museum instead of quantity museum. Information was not anymore the most important thing, now experiences got involved. (Levanto 1996: 90–91; Levanto 2004a: 25–27; Levanto 2010: 5–7.)

Generally Strengell was calling for audience centered approaches, but Finnish museum institution was not fully interested about these radical ideas. The most significant achievement was the publishing of layman's great audience targeted guide book to the collections in 1951. It was applauded and a helpful, since Lindström was struggling to find somebody to continue his guiding practices. There were also other concessions such as longer opening hours, understandable lectures, shifting guiding practices, little publications about certain topics, seasonal publications and child-targeted functions – basically supplies which didn't require the "higher" staff to encounter with the visitors. Finally there was Lindström's daughter, Aune Lindström who started many popularization programs, such as open lectures and a radio show about art. Art historian Sakari Saarikivi visited America in 1950s as well. He was strongly focused towards the audience, which was later shown in his occupation as the intendant of Ateneum. (Levanto 1996: 91; Levanto 2004a: 25–26; Levanto 2010: 5–7.)

The science museums had their own interested visitors already in the early beginning. Kuopio Natural History Museum and Turku Biological Museum were directing towards the audience from the beginning of 1900s. It was shown with display work, in which the objects were easy to look at and additionally the museums provided guiding texts next

to the objects. The first thorough plan was represented in a booklet called *Suunnitelma Kuopion museolle* (The plan for the Kuopio museum, Ståhlberg 1901). Benjamin Ståhlberg had visited i.e. Nordic and German museums, aquariums and zoos which developed his pedagogical aims for the museums of Savo and Karelia. He thought that museum's task was not only to teach, but also to educate. He highlighted the importance of one own observations, reflecting of phenomena and their connection to embracing the nature. (Kauppinen 2010: 20–23.) Basically Ståhlberg was discussing experiential and observational learning, quite similarly to Lichtwark. Only he was applying the idea for natural history museums, but today we can discuss these theories in any museums.

The official starting point – which eventually took another ten years to properly emerge – for guided tours can be placed in the year 1934, because then the archaeological committee gave the Ministry of Education a statement for the proposal by Retkeilylautakunta (Board of touring) that requested the museums that they should organize guided tours. The National Museum was discussing the possibilities and considered recruiting extra staff for the task, if the visiting groups would have been ready to pay for the guiding or if the expenses could have been covered from other funds. They could have also hired a guard who also guides. Lamminen and Tornberg are concluding that the case did not proceed since there are no mentions about it in the yearly reports. (Lamminen & Tornberg 2010: 14.)

Meanwhile museums begun to establish also in smaller towns of Finland, was also spreading the democratic idealism of “the right to know” -movement. Museum practices begun to diversify and the museums started to pay closer attention to their audiences. It was noted that as much as half of the visitors of other museums than “national museums” were local, one quarter from the same region and the other quarter from other parts of the country or from another country. They started to discuss the reasons people visit museums. Part of the professional considered their duty to guide, encourage or entertain their visitors. Meanwhile in America guiding practices were already significant part of the museum's content and Finland took influences from other Nordic countries and America. (Heinonen & Lahti 1988: 171.)

The Finnish Art Academy – the successor of the Arts Society – gave a clear statement in 1940s about the guiding programs in museums. The Academy highlighted the

significance to bring the collections and the audience closer to each other. The museum should begin with regular and free lectures. (Levanto 2004a: 27; Levanto 2010: 7.) Since 1940s different forms of guiding began in The National Museum. The school group -guiding started in 1950s. In 1960s The Castle of Turku hired trained tour guides for travelling groups. The regular staff took care of the tours for school groups and students. (Lamminen & Tornberg 2010: 15–17.)

It appears that the task of guiding had been considered as something done on the side of the usual museum work. Kauppinen (2010) enhances this notion by stating that actual guiding staff has been rare even until recently. The Museum of Kuopio hired fulltime guide in 1974. Additionally the tasks included all forms of audience work, planning and coordinating the museum education between 1982–1997, until the museum organization was changed. Turku Biological Museum has directed nature education especially for children since the beginning of 1900s. The guiding was a side job for the local teachers and they also produced learning material. Since then the job has become a part of the tasks of the museum intendant. (Kauppinen 2010: 24.)

During the 1960s, the discussion about museum education was accelerating. The 1960's was a significant art educational period all around, also in Finland. The motto was: “art belongs to everyone.” Hundred-year-old idea of art belonging to everybody got new meanings. Previously the museum was a space to come in and look, but now museum became active with craft-tables, reading corners, events and so on. (Levanto 1996: 92; Levanto 2004a: 29.)

On the field of museum education, we can view the 1970s as the turning point of its development. The intendant of the Ateneum, Aune Lindström, was known as the spokes person for audience development ideas. Rönkkö (1999: 80) cites Lindström from the year 1953:

The display and making them living for the audience in the contemporary art museum is so important and vital, that the previous development, when the art museums were merely the storages for the art work, dusty and dead, seems unnatural. Certainly it is the museum's task today to keep and perceive them, but the most visible and vital factor in the aims of a modern

art museum is the display for making them seen and transmitting the aesthetic values as efficiently as possible for the wide groups of viewers.

The actual act to vitalize the museums did not however start sooner than at the end of 1960s, Sweden showing the way, and it began particularly from the art museums, from which it spread to the whole museum field (Rönkkö 1999: 97).

The children have been the topic for museums throughout the whole history of the Finnish museum, but not sooner than 1960s the children became sovereign customers. This is the time when the concept “living museum” was developed. (Levanto 2010: 9.) The establishing of the first posts for museum educators began in the National Museum on Summer 1972, and in Ateneum on January 1973. This meant longer term relationship with the visitors. It gave the possibility to concentrate to establish new collaboration and find future visitors who had previously been lacking the attention. In the other art museums the guiding tradition can be dated at the beginning of 1970s and -80s. In Jyväskylä Alvar Aalto Museum in 1980s the director Markku Lahtinen added museum pedagogy as a significant part of the museum practices. The first museum educator was hired in 1984. In Tornio Aine art museum so called “grease-travelers” were able to enjoy auditorium-guiding, after which the visitors could browse the exhibition independently. (Levanto 2010: 9, 11; Levanto 2004: 31.)

Since 1980s the movement towards the audience could be seen among natural history museums as well. (Heinonen & Lahti 1988: 84). Finally, the emergence of the museum educators among other museum professionals motivated the guides to orientate themselves deeper to the audience groups, their complexity and the needs of different groups. This led to the discussion about how different groups should be approached and how different people learn. Rather than merely explaining the content of the exhibitions, there was more notion for all the senses. Also different groups of disabled and multicultural field began to emerge among museum visitors. (Levanto 2010: 11.)

According to Rönkkö (1999) the shifting museum field of the 1970s was still current at the end of 1990s, that the pattern of this discussion has not yet fully outdated. Not all the aims were achieved and the museums had not really changed. The literature frames the picture of ever shifting museum, but Rönkkö already stated that the publications of

the field are not able to reach wider audience than the museum field. (Rönkkö 1999: 28, 36–37.)

In Finland there is more dense museum amount compared to the citizens than in the Europe with its old royalties, but in Finland the museums are established by the people. The art museums tend to consider their culture universal, because it has spread around the world homogenized. However, the case is narrow and hermetic microculture, which only the one's devoted to the field can fully understand. (Rönkkö 1999: 44, 55.)

1.3 Museum in change

In 2004 Levanto and Pettersson described the change in museum field by explaining that museum cannot longer justify their existence with collecting, preserving, researching and displaying tangible proof of human and his surroundings. The focus is now on the visitor, whose needs and wishes and the center of all the practices. The museum work is now about a process between an individual and society in which the audience and museum with its staff are parallel subjects. (Levanto & Pettersson 2004: 7.)

Museums have been shifting towards conversation about learning surroundings during the whole existence of museums, but in 2010s and now along with new school curriculum the discussion is more current than ever before. According to the texts museum are experiencing even pressure to achieve their educational tasks, but the field is remaining somewhat unstructured, as we can conclude from Kumpulainen et al. (2012): *"Museums as learning surroundings are expected to have all the time more expanding and multiple interaction with their visitors and users."* They are asking interesting questions such as: Are museums genuinely supporting lifelong learning within different individuals and cultural groups? How to develop forms of museum pedagogy that are promoting practices for groups such as elderly, long-term unemployed, migrants, people on rehab and other at risk of exclusion? The expanded and multiplied tasks of museums are requiring professional and well-connected staff which have the ability to update and develop their skills. In order museums to function

as open learning surroundings, it is expecting multi-professional collaboration within the museum professionals and relationships with different cultural institutions, educators, work life and health care and consults of different age and culture groups. Central focus is on paying attention to the voices and needs of the ones using museums. (Kumpulainen et al. 2012: 13.)

The unstructured nature of the field is showing through the amount and quality of research and writing about what museums are expected to be able to do and calling for the change. There are several actives on the field promoting the future museum, yet it seems that the lack of funding and staff are slowing the speed. It appears, too, that the non-visitors and potential visitors are still remaining somewhat unfamiliar masses who are not demanding certain kinds of services from the museums, which is also effecting to the quality and speed of change. Especially the increasing conversation about the future of the museum laying on the acceptance of social inclusion as a strategy was shown in the Finnish-German Museum Forum on October 2017 in Berlin, which is partly guiding the aim of this study.

1.4 Museums in Lapland

The data for this thesis and partly for the future monograph is collected from the museums in Lapland, Finland. More precisely I am collaborating with the museums on the area of Sea-Lapland, close the Finnish west coast. The museums are Rovaniemi Art Museum (Korundi), Lapland Regional Museum (Arktikum, Rovaniemi), Aine Art Museum (Tornio), Tornionlaakso Regional Museum (Tornio), Kemi Art Museum and Kemi Historical Museum. The Finnish museum literature I have gotten hold to, discusses closer about the Southern Finnish museum work, some of them also the Middle Finnish and West Finnish museum projects. That is why I wish here to present the northern museum work and highlight the provisions they have to offer for their communities as I see them under-represented in the national museum literature and research.

At this stage, to make more clear clarification about the differences and specifics of each museum, I have categorized them in following way: Aine Art Museum is ranking high on event provision, Tornionlaakso Regional Museum has specialized on drama-tours, in Kemi the art museum and historical museum are working together in the same building and therefore often providing mutual projects that have in the past years focused on wellbeing and health care in the area, as facilitators. Rovaniemi Art Museum has a long relationship as a collaborator with University of Lapland, as the students of art education program are every year conducting one of their major courses in museum surroundings. In this way the art museum is able to provide multiple workshops for participants of all ages as well. Lapland Regional Museum has developed “learning paths” that are focusing on the museum learning integrated in the school work. Readymade learning paths are enabling teachers to take their groups into museum were the material is already provided.

The data provided by these museums consists from yearly reports, plans, project reports, conversations, reports and interviews. It is differing in quality and content, but is building the frame for Northern Finnish museum audience development work. I have received material that have been written for the museums integral use, as a memo for all the staff members, which implies practical thoughts in the planning phase. Different museums have also handed over data focused on different areas on the field and there is differences in systematical updating and archiving of pedagogical plans and projects.

These museums would deserve even higher attention because the work done among the audience is passionate and enterprising. There is pursuit for inclusion, wellbeing, collaboration and outside the museum.

Rovaniemi Art Museum was opened in October 1986 in the previous post car garage, redeveloped by architect Juhani Pallasmaa. The museum is based on the art collection of Jenny and Antti Wihuri Fund, that was donated to Rovaniemi. It is a contemporary art collection that includes pieces from the 1940s until today and it is growing every year. As a Culture House Korundi, the museum opened in 2011, which established collaboration with Lapland’s Chamber Orchestra who also now works in the house. Sales and marketing services are bought from Arktikum Palvelu Oy (Arktikum Services), which is responsible of the museum shop and restaurant. In 2016 the museum

turned 30 years old. It has established collaboration with University of Lapland and schools and kindergartens of the area. (Toimintakertomus 2014: 4; Happonen & Kähkönen 2006: 31; Toimintakertomus 2011: 4.)

Lapland Regional Museum and Arctic Center of University of Lapland are situated in Arktikum, which was opened for public in 6.12.1992, when Finland's 75th independence day was celebrated. The Arktikum building was designed by a Danish architect group Birch-Bonderup & Thorup-Waade. The additional semi-arc-shaped part was designed by architects Bonderup and Lehtipalo and it was completed in Autumn 1997. In the building are working side by side Lapland Regional Museum and the Arctic Center of University of Lapland which central task is research and transmission of data. Lapland Regional Museum and Rovaniemi Art Museum are together forming the museum institution of city of Rovaniemi. The museum collects tangible and intangible heritage of the area and is working with several nature, surroundings, artifact and building related issues as a role of an advisor, an expert and an officer. (Toimintakertomus 2013: 3; Arktikum Web-page)

The museums in Kemi consists from Kemi Art Museum and Kemi Historical museum. Both of them are working in the same building and the audience development is often conducted as collaborative manner. Their mutual strategy is to promote the access on the information about cultural heritage and to organize exhibitions. Their target groups are the local people, learning institutions, travelers, art institutions and the artists and hobbyists. There is established collaboration with other museums, Children culture center, library and Kivalo-college. The museums are also participating in the events concerning the whole town. These complex and established collaboration relationships are fulfilling the audience work as there is not an actual museum educator in the house.

Kemi Historical Museum is 70 years old and its permanent exhibition was renewed and reopened in 2015. Kemi Art Museum is the oldest art museum in Northern Finland. It was established in 1947 on the collection of 136 pieces of lecturer Ape Rantanen. Today the collection consists from 2500 pieces from the 1800s until today. The main focus is on Lappish contemporary art. (City of Kemi Web-page)

Tornionlaakso Regional Museum is the oldest museum in Lapland region. It was established already in 1914 and was municipalized in 1975. As the museum turned 100 years old, it was renewed and reopened in 2014. Then also Haaparanta, the city across the border on Sweden side was also attached to the museum's functioning area. Thus it is the only border-crossing, two countries' mutual museum. The items of the museum consists from objects, photographs, audio tapes and archives in total 103 000 pieces. (Keskustelumuistiinpano 2016; Lantto 2008; Tornio City Web-page.)

Aine Art Museum was opened for public in 1986. It is based on the art collection of Eila and Veli Aine. The museum is owned by the city of Tornio where are preserved the collections of Aine Art Foundation, Aine Art Museum and the collections of Tornio city. The building is designed by a local architect Matti Porkka. The collections are focused on Finnish art with special emphasis of Northern art. Additionally to the exhibitions the museum is focusing on audience development and art education. (Aineen taidemuseon Muistipolku 2011: 4; Kanniainen 2016: personal note.)

2 Museum Pedagogy in Museums of Lapland – Corner Stone of Audience Development

Audience development in these museums is taken as an important aspect of the everyday museum work. During the conversations I had with the museum staff members about my research topic of audience development, it always led towards the concept of museum pedagogy or museum education. Museum pedagogy is understood as the corner stone of the whole audience development. With this chapter I wish to bring up the possibility, that learning in museums and museum education is also a larger concept and something else than merely learning about the collections and the themes of each museum. Museum learning gives the museum its content and meaning. We must not confuse learning in school and learning in museum (Hooper-Greenhill 2007: 4); the learning that appears – or rather is possible and potential – in museum surroundings differs significantly of the one in school, yet it is not less significant. Also the words ‘learning’ and ‘education’ are understood different ways, depending on educational systems and learning and teaching styles (Hooper-Greenhill 2007: 3.)

In the collaborating Lappish museums specifically established visitors are the school groups, which may confuse us to think museums as school-like learning surroundings. Other type of approaches are often depending on resources of time, staff and funding and project type of working is essential for outreach work for special groups.

Museums have always been educational institutions, at least from 1800s when public museums were established all around Europe and North America. Their purpose was to guide their visitors towards proper values and habits. “Civilizing” and “refining” of the society were significant. Museums aimed to shape the people to develop a pleasing nation. The attempt to shape identities has been separating itself from the museums only remotely by today, but it has changed since the 1800s. The concept of nation is not as clear as it used to be and so has shifted the relationship between the teacher and a learner. Museum still remains as “material memory” and it is that in the most clearest

way on state-level, political ethnic -level, because it is expensive and requires mass support. (Aurasmaa 2004: 40, 45.)

In literature it appears, that museum education is no longer explained in strategies as a one-way and simple and therefore multiple ways to encounter the audience is needed. Hooper-Greenhill (2007) explains, “[t]he increasing awareness of the power of culture has opened up questions of consumption, subjectivity, meaning and identity, and all of these are central to learning.” Museums have reshaped themselves for contemporary times, their educational purposes have become prioritized and their educational provision has increased (Hooper-Greenhill 2007: 2). However, I struggle to prove this with my data, that consists mostly from strategies and plans about what a museum can offer towards the audience.

The sizes of the staff in these museums are small in European scale, which can be fragile but also beneficial. Fragility can be seen as the amount of work that could be done for the audience but the basic tasks taking over the focus. We can view as well the need to apply for additional funding for a short term extra project and hiring a project worker for this time is an evidence of this: outreach and participation are seen and worked for as something additional rather than integrated and common part of museum work. However, the projects tend to be efficient and they bring visibility for the museum. Beneficial in smaller staff groups is the chance of efficient communication. As everybody are working closely together, they are also reachable for one another which can be seen shortening the replying times, decision making and flatten the hierarchy.

Heinonen and Lahti (1988: 200) stated that there will always be a gap between museum and its audience, because even when the viewer would be convinced by the value of the museum objects, his or her experience will always remain as personal. This experience will be there regardless of the message the exhibition designer intended. Nevertheless, teaching and education are linked to the relationship between museum and its audience, which also shifts and lives along the time. Museum pedagogy is not a separate point of view of an action accompanying the exhibitions and other events afterwards, but the core of the whole audience oriented work. (Heinonen & Lahti 1988: 227, 237).

Museum education can be viewed in multiple perspectives and the use and definition of it can vary and still remain correct. In Rovaniemi Art Museum, museum education is considered as a method to bring up the audiences view points and taking into account the needs of different visitors. The practice is considered two-way in the sense that it is functioning as a transmitter between the museum and audience. However the museum seems to remain somewhat as a provider rather than collaborating member in audience-museum-relationship. Nevertheless, museum educational methods can for example be applied and adjusted for the needs of different aged and background visitors. The long-term aim is to educate the locals as experienced friends of art from the very young age. (Strategy, Rovaniemi Art Museum.)

In a way museum education as a communicative method is used to build a relationship, or museum image or just approach the audience in different ways. I find it a good approach, because for some it may reveal new perspectives to the world of museums. The literature of the field is however setting a notch harder demands on the educational responsibilities of museums. Xanthoudaki (2015) is unfolding the world of lifelong learning in which museum can have a significant part. She discusses the need for lifelong learning being based on a world in which everything shifts even too rapidly for museums to react on time. The reflection of identities, tasks and influences have always been a concern of institutions, interwoven in history, culture, society and people but in these days of change the need is getting stronger as museums are aiming to enhance their role. The means of communication have transformed in a short time and technology has enabled limitless information and communication. The living habits and shifted relationship with the planet and between people are effecting the change as well. On the other hand the economic conflict and growing gap between the rich and the poor, increasing population and rapid change in it as well as in the needs such as living, working, studying and travelling. It means a transformation from material goods towards activities and services. The skills people have today are demanding new approaches in schools and lifelong education, which will support skills such as 'critical and organized thinking, global acknowledgement, self-regulation, social capital' and so on. This requires individualism, self-directed approaches with which learners are in a collaborative relationship with educators and experts in their communities and around

the world creating specific learning experiences, which are rather based on qualifications than on age. (Xanthoudaki 2015: 247–249.)

She describes the rapidly shifting world and the challenges it brings along and to which the slowly transforming museums are aiming to grab on. The nation they are aiming to “civilize” is not the same it was just twenty years ago. That is why words like learning and learning surroundings have a different meaning today. And that is why audience work and the role of museums are something else as well. Individual need for education is larger than ever before. Xanthoudaki stresses that the individual on 2000s needs to be flexible, inventive, self-managing, highly motivated, willing to take risks and to renew, because they need to create their own challenges. Education itself is not fully serving the needs and there is no jobs. Museums can change things, because they are able to anchor methodology and integrate it in practices they are successful at. They can have a key role in building the skills for 2000s. Xanthoudaki sees the use of technology as a solution in museums. By creating opportunities for experiences, museums are taking part in new approach in life: that kind that is not depending on what and how much you know but on the ability to create innovative solutions. For museums it means that they can create opportunities for conversation towards which the technological evolution is now taking us. (Xanthoudaki 2015: 249, 253–254.)

I am not – and presumably neither is Xanthoudaki – claiming that the museum alone can be there creating these technologically oriented new generation individuals. Rather, museums can with proper amount of effort and resources be there doing their part in the society that can think themselves, invent and create new skills. It seems that the current status of the development of museum education is somewhat further from these ambitions, even though we can interpret them to the background of the idea.

2.1 Understanding Museum Pedagogy in Lapland

In Lapland, the basics for the museum pedagogy is for example to ease, encourage and support visitor’s personal experience and activate own interpretation and creativity

(Rovaniemi Art Museum). It can also be based on human rights, equality, democracy, nature's diversity and sustainable surroundings and the acceptance multiculturalism. (Arktikum 2010). The museum pedagogical program is the basic method, which defines the museum's aims and practices in art educational and audience work. It is based on collaboration, professional staff and new, creative methods, which are focused on the audience service. (Aine Art Museum, Museum pedagogical program 2014: 2–3.) Museum pedagogy is a practice that can emphasize the work among school children and takes into account the school curriculums (Strategy 2016 Tornionlaakso Regional Museum).

In Tornionlaakso Regional Museum, like in the other museums in this research, the museum pedagogical approaches are different kinds of guided tours for adults and children, events, the pedagogical additions for exhibitions, workshops and suitcase exhibitions. (Strategy, Tornionlaakso Regional Museum 2016). The method is to provide services as several ways as possible to get the people closer and familiar with the museum. In these museums it is possible to get guiding at least in two languages, the labels are made clear and easy to reach, you can get everywhere with a wheelchair. The museums in Tornio have technology in their galleries and auditoriums for better hearing for the hearing impaired. Kemi Historical Museum has different kinds of technology in the permanent exhibition. The staff is friendly and in small neighborhood museums like these it is completely possible to have specially organized program by asking and making wishes. However, the more complex outreach, participatory, however you wish to call it, is living during the projects that are slow to establish, hardly funded and rapidly over, with few exceptions.

Considering the concept of lifelong learning, the museum is aiming to be a part of open learning surroundings and providing meaningful aspects and functioning as a field of conversation in which there is space for multiple backgrounds and in which one can develop their skills in interaction with others. This is not happening simply through display and open doors, but there is a requirement for different methods. Learning in groups and combining methods such as guiding and workshops can provide information and learning opportunities in meaningful ways and most of the museums are able to provide these. The data collected for this research also presents that rather than

developing themselves as complex and open learning surroundings – in other ways than opening the doors and promoting access – museums offer more simple products and in a way, collect pieces of participation.

The teaching practices in Lapland Regional Museum is mentioned to promote communality, responsibility and individual rights and respecting other's freedom. The school groups visiting the museum are receiving either acknowledged or unacknowledged education about the right and wrong and their own possibilities to make a difference in their community. The topics in the museum are discussing Finnish culture in a relation of European and Northern culture. Also Sami-culture and migration are essential parts of it. The cultural education is aiming to promote tolerance and understanding between cultures. (Arktikum 2010: unprinted.) The essential task is then to be able to consider all kinds of audiences and to provide equally accessible information. (Aine Art Museum: Museum pedagogical program 2014: 4).

The ideals about what is museum pedagogy in each museum and what its aim and purpose is generally mixed with the ideals of what museum is and what it should be or aim to be. It proves the foundational role of museum pedagogy in audience development, or outreach or participation work in museums. For example in Lapland Regional Museum it is stated that museums are in their nature places where everyone are welcome and where discriminating views are not deliberately taken in exhibition planning. (Arktikum: Museum teaching 2010, unprinted.) In Aine art Museum it is understood that museum is not only transmitting information but is taking its part to effect in attitudes and values. The meaning and effectivity of an art museum is not measured through the growth of visitor quantities, but it lies also in the understanding of why there is art museums and why art is perceived for future generations. (Aine Art Museum: Museum pedagogical program 2014: 4.)

The aim of museum pedagogy can be transmitting information, deepen understanding and increasing knowledge. With this method museum is aiming for openness, clarity and access in all levels. (Strategy Rovaniemi Art Museum.) In Arktikum there is an effort to make the visitors to understand that the world is large and consists from many different cultures and ways of life. The museum education is also politically unbound and religiously unmarked. (Arktikum 2010.) A project *Art Educational Outreach*

(Taidekasvatuksellinen saavutettavuus) in 2001 was the starting point for the museum pedagogical program for Aine Art Museum. The point of the project was that question of outreach is large; if museum wants to be a significant cultural institution, museum should spread on larger area and it should have a vivid connection with the surroundings it lives in. (Pietilä-Juntura 2015.)

As a summary, we can view museum pedagogy under the same headline than audience development, outreach and inclusion. The strategies viewed in this chapter differ from each other with their content, depth and length, yet I can understand how the same ideas are at the background in all of them – finding the paths towards different audiences.

The strategies of museum pedagogy in the museums of Lapland:

Museum pedagogy is based on:

- Easing, encouraging and supporting visitor experience, activating interpretation and creativity.
- Human rights, equality, democracy, sustainable surroundings and tolerance
- Method of practices in art education and audience work
- Collaboration, professional staff and new methods in audience service
- School's curriculums

Museum pedagogy in methods:

- Guided tours for adults and children (different languages)
- Events, pedagogical additions for exhibitions
- Workshops
- Providing services in several ways, clear labels
- Physical access, technology for accessibility (hearing aid), technology (screens)
- Projects

The aims of museum pedagogy:

- Promoting communality, responsibility and individual rights
- Cultural knowledge, tolerance and understanding

- Equality
- Transmitting information, deepen understanding and increasing knowledge
-> openness, clarity and access

Museum pedagogy or audience development means:

- Museum is open for everyone without discrimination
- Museum takes part to effect attitudes and values
- Unfolding the purpose of museums

2.2 Museum Education in Literature

Like Falk and Dierking (2013) state, museums as educational institutions in society are connected to other educational institutions including schools and universities. But museums are also connected to other kinds of institutions with similar content. For example, history museums are connected to archives, libraries, historic sites and art museums are connected to art galleries, dance studios and even gift shops selling arts and crafts. (Falk & Dierking 2013: 73.) Therefore museum as a notion is remarkably complex pattern that cannot be explained in a simple way. It seems to be connected to everything, yet it fails to connect significant amount of potential users.

It is also important to talk about learning rather than museum education, because “[t]he use of the word ‘learning’ indicates an increased focus on the learning process and outcomes of users, and a shift away from thinking about the museum and its educational delivery.” There is much attention paid in how learning can be facilitated as a pleasant and useful experience, and thinking from the visitor’s perspective. (Hooper-Greenhill 2007: 4.)

Not only is it proven, as museum learning has been measured – as it is expected today (Hooper-Greenhill 2007: 3) – that museums have significant educational impact on visitors, museums have also increasingly attempted to define themselves as educational institutions, which reveals in the form of exhibitions, activities and programs being

driven by these educational goals. According to Falk and Dierking, this is often interpreted to mean museum as a support to school-based educational goals, which troubles exhibitions designers to develop “teaching” displays and leads towards didactic thinking. (Falk & Dierking 2013: 107.)

Learning in museums is potentially more open-ended, more individually directed, more unpredictable and more susceptible to multiple diverse responses than in sites of formal education, where what is taught is directed by established standards. (Hooper-Greenhill 2007: 4–5.) Social learning theory suggests that even though exhibition visitors may not wish to learn the facts the exhibitions may wish to communicate, other forms of learning will be taking place. It is not appropriate for organizations to be prescriptive or judgemental about levels of learning achievement, as users have their own criteria for what counts as successful. (Hooper-Greenhill 2007: 27–28) Which is, museum is not the director of individual learning, but still responsible to enable it.

For some, the terms learning and education may seem dry and complicated, but rarely independent learning situations and the chances to make the learning choices oneself are disappointing. Museums are great surroundings for these sort of learning opportunities. According to Kelly (2007) – who is more open to the term ‘edutainment’ than Hooper-Greenhill (2007: 33) – museum experience correlates with the concept of edutainment. It is linking three concepts: education, entertainment and learning. As museums are strongly focusing on learning – at least on paper – the educational role is one way to deliver museum learning and entertainment represents the enjoyment and emotional aspects of the visit. (Kelly 2007: 283.) However, edutainment can be understood negatively not only because of its clumsiness as Hooper-Greenhill is concerned, but because it becomes problematic with the belief that if museums were entertaining they are somehow ‘dumbing down’ to the audience and not being as educational as they are expected to be (Kimmelman 2001 referred by Kelly 2003).

On Kelly’s study, people had generally negative views of education as a passive process over which they had no control and were not offered choices. Yet there was appreciation towards education of providing information and delivering learning. Entertainment was considered as fleeting and short term, good time. The people felt that

learning makes one use their brain, build on previous knowledge, is long term and could be entertaining as well. (Kelly 2007: 383.)

The term edutainment is legitimate but perhaps unnecessary, since learning is in its strongest while enjoyment anyhow. Museums should not be categorized as entertainment learning spaces, but rather as usual learning places, in which there is great frameworks and requirements for multidimensional learning. I am going to leave the term open, since I see it fits for some occasions of explaining learning or museum experiences more simple ways. All in all, the discussion about museum education grounds the topic, social inclusion, as it turns out here that the learning opportunities in museums are wider and more complex than the provisions of workshops, guided tours and clear language labels. I would prefer to discuss about communication, relationships and institution's learning. Data provided by the Finnish-German Museum Forum in Berlin suggests that as we like to think museum-audience relationship as a two-way-relationship, it does not only apply to the exhibition or project design phase to build something for the audience to learn in a best possible and convenient way, but also to the outcome phase, in which the institution should also learn and in a way, change.

There are a few notions that would use as a prove that we are not quite in the world of open learning surroundings or community-based approaches, even though they are clearly stated in the strategies. I feel we need to view the area critically. One of the themes in Finnish-German Museum forum in Berlin, was strategy-critical point of view. It was stated that strategies are easily written, acknowledging the needs and approved aims, while the actual realization is another story. The project work is often lacking continuity and sustainability and therefore failing with their aims of strong audience relationships. The problem also lies in the power relationships between the audience and the museum: museum tends to prefer providing ready-made content rather than actually working side-by-side with the community members. In this way museum is strengthening the image of museum's higher intelligence and expertise and not giving away any real power to the audience.

For example, in Aine Art Museum it is stated that "Museum visit is carefully planned and led by museum professional." This is to emphasize the quality of services offered by the museum as they go on explaining the quality be seen in customer service, easy

access information and developing new services. (Aine Art Museum: Museum pedagogical program 2014: 3–4.) According to the evidence, the museum has the hold on to what happens, when and in which terms. It is not simple to create open learning surroundings in an art museum, because more often there is help needed in the interpretation process and understanding what the exhibition is about, if you are not an experienced friend of art.

3 Audience Projects in Lapland – Methods and Participation

This research is interested on audience development in the means of outreach and the concept of “true” participation. During the Finnish German Museum Forum (2017), it was repeatedly brought up the miss-match of the written strategies and reality. A museum can define itself as participatory and community-led, but the realization of the strategies on a practical level was thought skeptically. All the museums work with participatory techniques, but the question still remains if it is enough. Is the museum fulfilling its aims through the approaches used. How to evaluate then, if the participation is real or not? Every situation should be researched individually, which is somewhat impossible. Also I as an outsider researcher am unable to do these sort of final evaluation for the museums. However, I am able to see the planning phases, written aims and the process of projects from my data. What I cannot find is participatory feedback, some sort of debrief or visitor researches. The literature offers guidelines and demands of what is real participation and encourages the museums to view their work objectively. One way to evaluate the levels of participation is offered by Nina Simon (2010: 26) through her five stages of the evolution of visitor experience.

This experience is viewed through the interaction of the institution and the visitor. The stages develop from personal towards community interaction and they are based on content:

Stage 5: Individuals Engage with Each Other Socially

Stage 4: Individual Interactions are Networked for Social Use

Stage 3: Individual Interactions are Networked in Aggregate

Stage 2: Individual Interacts with Content

Stage 1: Individual Consumes Content

Through the stages we are moving from *Me* towards *We*. Simon suggests that most of the institutionally designed experiences are on stages one and two. Probably the most traditional museum visitors are happy with the two lowest level experiences, ready-planned and offered products, but there are presumably many other potential visitors who would find the provisions on levels three, four and five attractive and meaningful. Many cultural institutions provide led and facilitated experiences in all five stages, such as with the help of guides and educators who encourage with the social participation. The problem emerges when the facilitator is not available or event is not currently happening, so that participation could emerge. (Simon 2010: 27.)

Graham Black (2005: 27) has noted that unlike the regular museum or heritage site visitors, the available evidence suggests that infrequent users value most highly the opportunities for social interaction, active participation and entertainment. Also, the essential difference for younger audiences is likely to be that their demand for participation may well go beyond engagement with collections to having a direct say in programming and content (Black 2005: 39).

The demand for participation will be about opportunities to engage with collections and with each other. A detailed knowledge of target audiences is crucial to their future survival. Audience development work generally implies the policy of reaching new, previously under-represented audiences. This can be risky, because too strong focus on those who are not yet using museums may cause the loss of the traditional ones. (Black 2005: 41, 47.)

We can keep Simon's stages in mind, while talking about outreach or inclusion projects in most museums, as it appears as additional alongside with the regular museum work with its workshops, projects, guided tours, events and lectures, all of which are led and facilitated experiences, provided from museum, towards the audience. However, the pursue for projects is continuous; it has come clear that the staff members of the museums plan on a constant level the future projects, apply the grants and find the right people to work with. Sometimes projects after another are linked together, which makes them part of a larger aim. The projects tend to employ professionals from different fields and give the chances to learn from each other. These projects are revealing the museums tendency to make a difference in their communities, bring the museum closer

to the chosen groups, produce wellbeing and make it even fun. In order to keep the text shorter, I have excluded general audience work – guided tours, everyday workshops and events. However, all the museums are highly oriented to vary even these generally assumed actions but here I focus more on those with extra effort, collaboration and a wider aims.

The data provided includes reports from several projects, longer and shorter ones, which are so many it is impossible to mention every single one of them. I have categorized a few chosen projects here to reveal the variety of participatory methods in the field of these particular museums to promote participation. The categories are: Visitor's aid, Drama-tours, Facilitated Wellbeing, Outreach and Collaboration. Certainly all of the categories intersects each other and in some sense in all of them the question is about outreach and lowering the threshold.

3. 1 Visitor's aid

Visitor's aids like presented here I would view on the stages of 1 and 2 but in some occasions interaction can jump on the stage 5; Individual Consumes Content; Individual Interacts with Content; Individuals Engage with Each Other Socially.

Visitor's aid is a provided tangible or intangible "product" or service for information, education or common benefit. Especially here the project's life circle is very clear, as once the aid is complete, the project is over. Although there is a chance for continuum as the aid-product can be used for another project and so on. Aids are for example the books produced by Rovaniemi Art Museum. *Punainen lanka – Teemapolkuja taiteeseen* (The Red Yarn – Themed Art Paths, 2013) is leading the reader to an art exhibition through four different themed paths. The themes are Elements, Nature, Human and The Circle of Life. Each of the paths has 4–5 different viewpoints, through which the reader can interact with the art works. The guide book is designed to be used as it is in exhibitions, but one can also fulfill it with materials that will activate different senses, such as old photographs, art pictures, poems, scents, sounds, music, objects and

materials to feel in your hands. With the assistance of texts and questions the visitors can discuss about memories they provoke and the thoughts the art works will bring up. The aim is a multisensory, refreshing and thoughts and memories provoking art experience. The guide book is part of *Taide muistaa* (Art Remembers) -project by the National Board of Antiquities in Finland and it was conducted in Rovaniemi Art Museum in 2012. (Leskelä 2013: 4–5.)

With the help of a publication, the visitors are able to interact with the contents of museums without the help of an actual guide person. It may lead, like described above, to interaction with other people as this book was designed to be used together with elderly. However, the proper use of a guide like this is time consuming, which means that the persons using this product would have to really want to do it and prepare the visit in advance. In this sense the publication is not really lowering the threshold, but would serve positively the needs of elderly and their close ones.

Miksi aurinko on vihreä? (Why the Sun is Green? 2006) -publication was aiming to promote the access on contemporary art and develop the collaboration between the museum and local schools. The editors Kaija Kähkönen and Eveliina Happonen were hoping that the book would inspire teachers to use contemporary art as part of their teaching. (Happonen & Kähkönen 2006: 5.) The book includes guidelines how to view the art works and how to discuss about them. Additionally one can find several articles that discuss different viewpoints and successful experiences among art and art teaching.

In a way it is complicated to evaluate this type of aid with the Simon's five stages, because here the responsibility is given to the teachers and the role of the museum is erased from the relationship between museum and audience. However, it may help to bring art closer to the people if it is used in early and compulsory art education and in this way raise people who are familiar with viewing art.

A visitor's aid can also be immaterial. *Creative Stage for Children* (Luova lava lapsille) is a concept which organizes creative summer camps for children and produces an ending show for an audience. On summer 2015 the concept was conducted in Rovaniemi art museum as a part of Jutajaiset – Folk Music Festival. During the festival week the children worked the days in workshops of their choice: Theater, Circus and

Art. The groups worked together and apart and produced a performance that combined theater, circus and art on a stage in Korundi hall. In this project it was an effort of the art museum educational department, an performative art expert, a circus artist and the consult who worked as an event developer and organized the practical and the marketing side of this short project. The product here was the ending performance of the children and the experienced collaboration between the different experts. During the day camp art museum was a space of action, where the children developed their self expression and learned new methods in the techniques of their choice.

Here we can discuss participation on the side of those children participating the day-camp. As there is not a written report of deep analysis of how the surrounding art was used in these different workshops, it is impossible to conclude that art was significant in all of them. The art workshop, however, used the exhibitions in all of the artistic activities as inspiration and idealizing. The final product – performance – was viewed majorly by the families of these children as an entertaining piece and the chance to show them, what was completed during those days. The viewers here are reaching again the levels one and two, but the children can be seen reaching even the level five, although this may happen without them acknowledging it and the interaction is guided by a professional adult.

Aine Art Museum has produced a Memory Path (*Muistipolku*) -service in 2011 to reach those with dementia or other memory related illness. The service is aiming to activate the memory with art and provoke conversation. The booklet funded by the National Board of Antiquities consist from chosen art works and information that have been combined to support the museum visits of the visitors with memory illnesses, their close relatives and the ones working with them. Memory Path includes guided tours that can be booked separately from the museum. (Aine Art Museum: Museum pedagogical program 2014: 7; Aine Art Museum Memory Path 2011: 3.) Likewise the booklet produced by Rovaniemi art museum, this requires effort from the audience to get full benefit from it. It is how ever an optional way to consume the museum contents and a wish to get the visitors to actually benefit from the exhibitions. In this sense, it may reach the levels one and two and skip on stage five.

Memory Path -tours have also been conducted in Rovaniemi Art Museum for total 40 participants. In 18.9.2012 *Taide muistaa* (Art Remembers) -seminar was directed for the professionals in the fields of culture, social and health care or the students, the caregivers, volunteers and other interested individuals. The seminar reflected the illnesses of memory and the meaning of art in memory and wellbeing. In 27.9.2012 was organized *Muistoista voimaa* (Strength from Memories) -seminar which addressed with the basics and techniques of creative memorizing. The project produced a travelling exhibition that consisted from 12 art works with a guidebook about the pieces and artists to use as the inspiration for conversation. Sense Case (Aistisalkku) included sense provoking materials related to the themes of the pieces. The aim was a multisensory, refreshing and memory provoking art experience also for those who are not able to come to the museum by themselves. The exhibition toured during 2013 in Lapin Muistiyhdistys ry, Department of Culture in Posio, Day Center Onnela and Tapionkoti in Rovaniemi, units of Näsmänkieppi and Kolari library. (Annual report 2012: 29; 2013: 29.)

This visitor's aid is created to benefit from the museum collections outside the museum. The target group here is not expected to visit the museum but spreading conversation and wellbeing outside its walls. The topic of this project is not lightly taken and all the museums participating with the nationally funded project are in a sense brave to do so. It is unknown if there has been research conducted about the results, interviews or statistic information about those using the memory products, but in the best case scenario we can view the interaction touching slightly all the five stages.

Painu patsaille (Shoo to the Statues) -statue path in the center of Tornio is designed to support the visits on the public art of the city. The booklet includes 19 sculptures, their pictures, information and meanings. The locations can be found through the coordinates and a small map. The languages are Finnish and Swedish. (Pietilä-Juntura 2015: 2.)

This aid is offering guidance outside the museum walls too and it is not exactly inviting to conversation about museum contents. It offers information about the surrounding art, which is equally valuable as it is part of the cultural heritage work; the citizens knowing and acknowledging the heritage surrounding them and spreading information.

3. 2 Drama-tours

Falk & Dierking (2013) are asking the try to understand museum program participation, including adult, family, and youth programs, within the frame of identity-related needs and expectations. They are noticing the museum staff members being clearly drawn by the world outside the museum's walls toward participation in dramatic change. (Falk & Dierking 2013: 304, 309.) Finnish scholars such as Anni Venäläinen and Mirja Ramstedt-Salonen (2012) are reflecting the context of openness when reflecting participation. They are defining art as a field of human practices and therefore highlighting the learning surroundings. There is space in art museum for different interactions. The aims of audience development ought to be clearly defined and applicable in practical level. The aims must also be based on the good knowledge of audiences and their needs. (Venäläinen & Ramstedt-Salonen 2012: 65.)

The following approaches are discussing about learning activities organized outside museum walls in Tornionlaakso Regional Museum. The topics of learning are important locally, as the children are told about the historical sites of their own living surroundings. The drama-tours have been developed over years in through project after another, and during the time, statistic information about the participants have been collected. However, there is no data about identity-related needs of the participants. It can be suspected though that the school-group visitors, the teachers and museum staff have a communicative connection about issues regarding each group.

The first innovative project was conducted in 1993 when the drama already appeared as a part of a product. The museum has hired an actor for these tours since 2003. The tours have been thematic, providing useful information about i.e. upthrust, seafaring, shoe making and so on. The target groups have been usually small children and 5th.-6th graders. Many of the tours have been conducted outdoors, which has made the implementation heavy. Outdoor experiences are however justified because in Tornio there are preserved a significant amount of old wooden buildings which have been made part of the tours. (Conversation note 6.4.2016.)

During the years 2003 and 2004 were executed two projects: *Tarinamatka* (Story journey), which was dramatized historical tour for 1st and 2nd graders and *Tuhat tavaraa – Tuhat tarinaa* (Thousand Objects – Thousand Stories) for 5th graders. The projects were part of a larger project to regenerate the old museum. Back then it was not yet concrete that the museum would be renovated, but the motivation for development was strong and it was decided to implement due the innovative guiding techniques. The tours were conducted again during the Autumns of 2006, 2007 and 2009. (Tarinamuori taipaleella project plan 2007; Thousand Objects – Thousand Stories –script 2008–09.)

In 2008 drama-tours were expanded to the smaller regional museums in Kolari, Tervola, Simo, Muonio and Keminmaa. In 2011 the museum was closed due the construction work and the drama tours got to develop further with *Kainon kanssa kaupungilla* (Downtown with Kaino) -project. (Conversation note 6.4.2016.) The tours have been usually conducted during two weeks after planning, to have enough visitors for them. For example in 2003 the tours were visited by 550 children and 100 adults. (Tarinamatka Keskikadulla -project report 1.4.2004.) Over the years these smaller projects have developed a living character from the old story woman into Kaino, an enthusiastic museum trainee played by a local theater professional Katariina Salo. The character plays the role in shifting manner as a guide, story teller, conversationalist, questioner, object handler and a presenter. In Thousand Objects – Thousand Stories -tour the guiding was genuine but additionally it included scripted and played parts. (Lantto 2008: TOTS- script 2008–09.)

According to the museum the tours have received positive feedback and appliance of funds is continuous. I assume that the long term collaboration between the museum and the actress has developed certainty and skills and the encouragement to develop them further. They are carefully planned, costumed and scripted and require the work of multiple people simultaneously.

We can well understand the complexity of this museum activity. Not only it require multiple people working it simultaneously, like in theater settings, but also preparations beforehand, applying for funding and so on, require time and effort. I cannot tell how the concept should be developed further into continuous and more integrated part of museum work without hiring full-time team for this purpose. Also, it is complicated to

think about, how to use drama without the need of strongly guiding staff. I assume we can think the future still having the staff we like and are used to, even though we also aim to find solutions to find those open learning surroundings where visitors discover and guide themselves through different sense-stimulating experiences.

3.3 Facilitated Wellbeing

Active participation does not necessarily mean pulling levers or pressing buttons. The real ambition is to engage the visitor's mind, to generate a sense of discovery, mind-on, rather than just hands-on. Visitors learn by a mixture of: doing, thinking, watching, reading, listening, imagining, interacting, discussing and assimilating, which is; using senses and stimulation of emotions. (Black 2005: 198, 203–204.) Although Black is probably referring to participation situations within museums, museums can also be there as a part to make participation possible. This is what I call facilitated wellbeing, wellbeing indicating the content or the topic of these projects that has taken place for example in Kemi Art Museum and History Museum. From Black's mixture of learning, using stimulation of emotions plays a significant role. Also doing and thinking are there to lead the participants to discover their own resources, such as skills and memories.

According to Black, participation also means enabling and encouraging visitors to comment on exhibitions. Incorporating opportunities for visitor feedback is an important element in recognizing exhibitions as a two-way conversation, and becomes more meaningful still if visitor comments are then displayed for all to view and discuss in turn. Black states that interpreters believe learning occurring as a result of visitor participation. (Black 2005: 199.) That is, actual participation is making a real difference, being taken seriously, an equal partner in discussion and getting answers. Learning can be seen as a side product of a successful participatory action. Is this possible in museum surroundings? And should museum education and audience development move their focus from "learning" towards discussion, doing and making? Museums can also facilitate projects that are aiming towards general wellbeing of the target groups without claiming larger visitor numbers.

Kemi's museum institution has distinguished themselves with the outreach projects for healthcare unit. The project *Taiteesta ja kulttuurista hyvinvointia* (Wellbeing from Culture and Art) funded by Ministry of Education and Culture was conducted in 10.10.2011–31.12.2011. This short term project aimed to develop the access to the museum services for the special target groups. As special groups the project team identified people who are not usually able to take part in the exhibitions and activities provided by the museum. This way the chosen target groups were the units of senior and disable care and special youth center Takitsu. On the side of Career Guiding Foundation (*Työhönvalmennus-säätiö*) the focus was on the young and rehabilitants of mental illnesses. (Alm 2011.)

An earlier project had shown that the stimulus activities for the elderly were much depending on the motivation of students and that there is no special stimulus or handicraft guides in the senior homes, therefore the project was very welcomed. The report states that during the work done among the elderly there is the need to pay attention to the different conditions and abilities of the participants and to plan the activities according to this: there cannot be only one type of senior work. The Kemi art museum wished to deepen the relationship with the senior homes and produce activities to the habitants everyday life.

The units working for the youth and mental rehabilitants are aiming to enhance their own ability for life control, managing schedules and finding their career paths. The collaboration took place in these different units and the art museum was functioning as a facilitator by finding the groups, the conductors such as students, artists and project workers and also providing the materials.

Taidemuseosta voimaa (Strength from the Art Museum) -project was conducted directly after the wellbeing-project in 1.1.–30.06.2012, which utilized the experience and knowledge of previous project. The aim was to bring art and culture activities to the elderly i.e. in the form of workshops in senior homes with the help of collaboration. The aim was also to develop the services of art museum so that they pay attention to the needs of special groups and in this way improve the wellbeing in these groups. (Alm 2012: 1.) The previous project had launched the collaboration and was now ready to be enlarged.

“Additionally to the different disabled persons the project also reached staff, students of the field and the relatives. The heard voice of the disabled and visibility in the community as an active subject and not just as a person needing help is increasing the diversity and tolerance. Making art by oneself can at its best enhance one’s self esteem and feelings of success.” (Alm 2012: 13.)

Significant here is that the art museum has used their funding to create collaboration and enabled several peoples employment for a short period of time. The target groups did not concretely visit the museum much and mainly all the activities took place in the groups own units. Instead the museum would have lured the people inside the museum, it established collaboration between different units for general wellbeing.

3.4 Outreach

As museum pedagogical plans and programs, there does not seem to be one right manner to write down the principles of outreach. Not all of the museums have a specific audience development or educational staff to keep the information updated and do research in this area. General museum educator’s work just may contain planning and executing workshops, guiding and applying funding. Usually the principles in each museum are written down as information for the other staff members and to give vague guidelines for the audience work. The general guidelines are listed through the museum law.

Traditionally outreach is understood as physical access which indicates the fluent access in and inside the building for those with moving limitations. Today outreach has expanded to indicate intellectual and prejudiced outreach. The way these concepts are understood in a practical level differ some in each museum.

For example in Rovaniemi Art Museum the concepts of outreach are not specifically unfolded, rather they are listed: access, intellectual outreach and access to information,

cultural, economical access and access in decision making. The concepts of multisensory and attitude towards differences are mentioned in the plan as well. Multisensory is explained as the possibility to experience the exhibitions and gain information through different senses. Additionally to the ability to see, information should be provided by hearing, smelling and touching, even tasting, which can be problematic as the exhibitions especially in art museums tend to change several times a year and not always the art itself allows experimenting with different senses. The multisensory aspect can be enhanced through several added methods such as workshops, guided tours and so on, but they are also requiring additional organizing, staff, time and effort also on the behalf of the visitor, which is not promoting the sustainable and fluent ways for multisensory museum visits.

Attitude towards differences can be understood as prejudiced access. The formation “attitude towards differences” is indicating also to the open minded welcoming of different visitors. It is common in Rovaniemi Art Museum and also in the other museums in this part of research that the aim is to find a solution for the experience of different visiting groups who contact and request or ask about them from the museum. There is the aim to find a solution that satisfies all the parties within the accessible resources.

In Lapland Regional Museum the concepts of outreach are not separately listed, but the practices are based on the principles of outreach. The pedagogical practices are aiming to provide services with which the museum visit is an educational experience. With this notion I assume that museum visits are tailored to different groups in a way that they are able to understand the content of the exhibitions.

In Kemi the economical access is especially promoted as the entrance fees are highly affordable and there is free entrance days on regular bases. Easier access in other levels is regularly promoted as we can see from the larger projects and collaboration in the museum building. Cultural access is emerging for example by focusing on migrants and intellectual access with understandable labels and in the Historical Museum with recorded tapes, videos and touch screens.

In Tornionlaakso Regional Museum along with the physical access, there is an induction loop in the exhibition area to improve hearing. The threshold is lowered multiple times a year with different events together with Aine Art Museum and the library. I see the museum reaching also towards prejudiced access and the access to information by trying different ways to invite the people in the museum. The access to information is emerging in the way how the museum has adopted its educational role and the fact that preserved cultural heritage belongs to everyone. The decisions made about future are aimed towards potential visitors.

In Aine Art Museum outreach is stated to mean physical, multisensory, intellectual, economical, prejudices, decision making, marketing and cultural access. Concrete outreach and access means physical access in the museum. Conceptual access is aiming towards museum, which is available for all. It is stated, that as a museum preserving mutual cultural heritage, Aine Art Museum is responsible, that all the visitors are able to participate and can participate the provisions offered by the museum. The access to decision making means active collaboration between different units of the Tornio city and visitor groups. Prejudiced access depends on attitudes and mindsets. It means that the staff has the attitude and desire to find the ways to serve all kinds of visitors from varied backgrounds and motivations and it is thought to be sufficient starting point for the art education for special groups. (Aine Art Museum: Museum Pedagogical Program 2014: 5–6.)

More than actual outreach, this data discusses the idea of outreach, written strategies. We can think that they are the ancestor of participation, which can be understood, according to Taket et al. (2014: 5) the ancestor of social inclusion. From the idea of outreach museums can move on towards participation as a strategy that addresses specific problems, like all **design techniques** (Simon 2010). As noted several times, the idea of outreach seems still something strange for the most traditional museum professionals, something so daring that the traditional museum is at risk to extinct. Additionally to limited resources this can also be one of the reasons for slow development. Simon sees participatory strategies as practical ways to enhance, not replace, traditional cultural institutions. There will be always them who are not going to share their story, talk with a stranger or consume visitor-generated content, but

increasingly also those who enjoy the opportunity to add their own voices to ongoing discussions about the knowledge presented. Participatory techniques can be seen entirely off-putting but also the converse is true. Successful interactive exhibits promote learning experiences that are unique and two-way on their nature. (Simon 2010: iii, 4–5.)

From the idea and the strategies of outreach, through participation strategies and actual participation, there is a great chance that a museum can reach social inclusion. As Taket et al. (2014: 5) are explaining, social inclusion is emerging in any event when the participation can be proved real instead of tokenism or manipulative. Participatory development has often been criticized for being tokenistic through the stages of reality. (Taket et al. 2014: 28.) Tokenism can be explained as “check-the-box” -practice which is not intended to be sustainable for the relationship between the museum and the audience, but through which the museum can claim itself as participatory by producing one-time participatory projects. The topic is also discussed by Nora Sternfeld (2012) who states this sort of practice as participating in a game invented by some others. Like also Falk and Dierking (2013: 31) are writing, it is common for institutions to claim being participatory, closer look on them usually reveals the reality to be something else.

For this reason, museums ought to be careful when claiming themselves “outreaching”, “participative” or “socially inclusive.” Here I am using all these terms, since I see the meanings of them and the ways they are understood and used varying on the field, limiting within the museum educational unit of the museum or within one museum at a time. Therefore, when audience development work is reflected as a practice that is passing through the whole museum institution, it brings us closer to the questions about museums societal tasks. In participation the audience is there to produce the learning surroundings and is more integrated in the contents of the exhibition than in open learning surroundings. (Venäläinen & Ramstedt-Salonen 2012: 68.)

The word of outreach is used in the data especially when the projects are targeted to certain, under-presented groups. A few examples are provided from the Aine Art Museum. In 2002 as a part of a larger outreach project was conducted *Pilvenpiirtäjät* (Skyscrapers, directly translated as the cloud drawers) for the special schools of the Tornio region. The project discussed a museum as a learning surrounding. It was

proceeded in a two-way learning and encouraging: the staff learnt how to interact with people who do not move, sense or understand things in the same way than the staff. Also the teachers were encouraged to work in art museum and use art in their teaching. (Pietilä-Juntura 2015.) Here we can think of the interaction on Simon's stages moving above the stages one and two, as well as on the next example which also includes collaboration; more interactive participants to have discussions.

In 2007 *Taideavain* (Art Key) -project was again about access and outreach. Aine Art Museum implemented a small non-user-mapping to find out about the people at the risk of exclusion of the area and people, who feel art as something strange for them. Museum organized lectures held by artists and professionals of the field and workshops which included "sadutus" – story telling method by the participants taking part in the same story by adding their own sentence in and the staff writing it down exactly as it is told – for adults, picture interpretation and art. The participating groups were formed as a result of the mapping. The groups got acquainted with the exhibition *Mielen huoneet* (The Rooms of Mind) with a peer conversationalist guide, the key holder of the art museum Hilja Kaukonäköinen Halme, played by an actress Katariina Salo who has also played the drama roles for Tornionlaakso Regional Museum. (Pietilä-Juntura 2015.)

In 2016 Aine Art Museum started a Museum as an Asylum -project with the locals and asylum seekers. The art workshops include practicing Finnish language and cultural interaction. This project has established in a short notice by contacting directly the Ministry of Education in Finland. (Aula 31.3.2016.) In this and the following asylum seeker -project I would evaluate the interaction happening in all five stages on Simon's scale, as the major aim is the usage of the language. The collections are the starting point of any project and here also two-way communication and learning is encouraged. The objects are not just for show, but also the resource of interaction.

In 2016 Kemi Historical Museum received a grant from National Board of Antiquities for the project *Entten Tentten* (Eeny Meeny) in which the migrant children – or as the museum states, new Finns – are helped to become home in Finland with the help of play, short rhymes and toys. The theme of the project is Finland 100-years. Significant for the project is reciprocity in a way that the groups consist also from native Finnish children and the play is learned in two-way, multi culturally. The project is conducted

together with the Children Culture Center. It is acknowledged in the project that there was significant amount of immigrants in 1920s. They were from the East Carelia who integrated well in Kemi when they learned the local habits and maintained their own cultural traditions and religion. (Entten tentten – Kotoutumista vastavuoroisesti 01.09.2016.) The project is a two-year-long and its aim is to establish sustainable action by developing innovative basis which includes the whole life circle of learning process, from idea to testing and into product and event. The meaning is also to combine local units, also other than the cultural ones, to produce learning material of cultural heritage.

Taidetta taskussa (Art in the Pocket) in 2009 was a project of small exhibitions visiting the small village schools in Rovaniemi area. The geographic size of Rovaniemi area is large and it contains many smaller centers with a great distance to the main city center where the museums and other services are. Not many schools have the resources to visit the art museum. In 2009 it was thought in Rovaniemi Art Museum that the schools furthest away were in unequal position compared to the ones closer to the center, few of them are even 50 kilometers away. Granted by the *Lapin lastenkulttuuriverkosto* (Lapland's children culture services) it developed as a part of the studies of art education students, which enabled organizing the workshops in many different locations. The art works were placed in the schools for 3–4 weeks, during which the students designed and conducted workshops linked to the exhibitions. (Annual report 2009: 38.)

Outreach and questions about access are clearly one of the major tasks of every museum. The means and methods differ a little depending on a museum, alongside with the staff members skills, connections and the needs of their communities. However, as we can see, special outreach is a practice that occurs when extra funding or staff – resources – are available. There are projects that have a beginning and ending, and the evidence I have access to, is not showing if these projects have developed further changes in audience development work, work structure in museums or tasks of each staff member. Although an outreach project in Aine Art Museum gave the beginning for the museum pedagogical program that is still regularly maintained today. Since my visit in the museum, one of the staff members is now officially named as the museum educator. In Lapland Regional Museum, there was two museum educators for a short

period of time during which they created the learning paths of the museum and developed further the pedagogical program. Projects have also the tendency to get repeated in a more improved form later on, so in this way we can talk about certain type of sustainability. They help to introduce certain working methods and audiences to the museum as well. The museums are “out there” increasingly all the time, as we speak, the change is slow and is depending on many moving parts.

3.5 Collaboration

As viewed in the projects, no project particularly comes into reality without collaboration and the parties outside the museum project is conducted. We could then safely discuss that collaboration is characteristic for audience outreach work. It is greatly useful and justified: sharing the common cultural heritage would be much more complicated if it would be done merely by those working inside the museum. Bringing together professionals from different fields such as health care, allows all the parties learn from each other. Museum educator is not an expert in every field or of every target group and they would not have to be. Collaboration is based on consulting by for example care takers or teachers who are the closest expert of their group. These people are able to guide what are the needs and wishes for their group and the museum staff are able to offer, plan and guide the groups on different methods that can be beneficial for them. Collaboration can also emerge in other forms such as exhibition collaboration for example in Rovaniemi Art Museum.

Museum education in Lapland Regional Museum is planned and conducted together with the Arctic Center and the museum educator of Rovaniemi Art Museum. In Arktikum, there is collaboration with the students of education in University of Lapland, Faculty of Art and Design, Lapland’s Art Board, Lapland’s Art and Handicrafts Board, schools and other smaller parties. During the year 2010 collaboration was enhanced with the Forest Ministry as it build a new location, Pilke, next to Arktikum.

In Kemi Art Museum and Kemi Historical Museum the collaboration is well established with other parties such as Children Culture Center, the library and Kivalo-college. Through the Children Culture Center artists have arrived to hold workshops. Because of these multiple and common collaboration relationships audience work is vivid despite the fact that the museums do not have an actual named museum educator.

The projects Wellbeing form Culture and Art and Strength for Art Museum collaboration was established again with several other participants.

“Collaboration with culture units can at its best bring about new forms of practices in social and healthcare field and within the collaboration in culture section. The meaning of culture as a promoter of wellbeing and health has stated as significant in several researches.”

- The report of Wellbeing form Art and Culture -project 2011

Linked to the group of seniors and other health care units, collaboration with students is considered especially meaningful. Working with students is grounding the hope for the future, because the students can be there to renew the work culture in their field, creating a common language between these units and opening the doors for collaboration. In Tornio, Aine Art Museum and Tornionlaakso Regional Museum are working side-by-side not only physically but also through long-term collaboration with annual events. (Conversation note 6.4.2016; Strategy 2016.)

Collaboration has therefore enabled wider and more complex products. It is used to produce projects and events and the participants can be individual experts or whole organizations. Collaboration is based on mutual benefit, where the learning is at its best two-way process. There is a third beneficial party as well, the one for whom the collaboration is established. Seeking for collaboration is active and its value is acknowledged. Museum can be there promoting wellbeing, comfort, communication or information, but rarely alone. Museum is the subject and a base for multiple action and aims, in which by inviting and receiving collaborating parties can establish something great.

4 Finnish Audience – Research and Speculation

Audience is the reason museums are changing themselves. Museum is for everyone and all of us have the right for museum experience. Lately it is discussed in Finnish museum field that museums are having more visitors now than ever before. These are quantity observations and part of the reason for increased visitor quantities is suspected to be due the launch of Museokortti (Museum card) in 2015, which is a yearly purchase and allows the card holder to visit over 200 museums in Finland admission free. The amount of Finnish museum visitors increased by one fifth in 2016, which is about one million visitors more than earlier years. (Honkanen, 19.06.2017: Finnish Museums Association, P.S.-blog.)

The latest national audience research in Finland is from the year 2012 (Museokävijä 2011: 2012). Most of the references used here are somewhat outdated. This does not necessarily mean that audience is not interesting for museums, as smaller local audience researches are probably conducted every now and then. The field only seems to be lacking common, general research for the use of whole field. In Museokävijä 2011, the theoretical framework for reasons to visit museum are from John Falk's study in 2009. The profile of non-visitor is framed by a Dutch study The Economic of Museums form 2008 and partly through internet-inquiry together with Fountain Park Oy with 629 participants. The aim was to find out how museums are experienced and what is expected from them. (Museokävijä 2011: 8).

It is not closely researched if there are actually more users or do the same visitors visit more often. Levanto writes about targeting focus on multiple small audiences with their needs and wishes. Multi-vocal museum is a fine thought but practically hard to conduct. Within tightening economic surroundings museums have ended up solutions, which can be defined as commercial and populist proposing the audience. (Levanto 2004: 551–52.) Populism can be lead to the thoughts about service design thinking on museum field that can be viewed as threatening to the traditional museum work. We are then facing a contradiction within the museum field.

The great audience is a concept that was still discussed about in Finnish art museum world in 2004. For this audience there is mega-exhibitions, which are saving the museum economics. The great audience is a term that is used in strategies and visions, although there has never been one. Museum visitors have always been separated depending on their knowledge, education or social position, cultural background, gender or age. This diversity is in contradiction with the fiction that looks good in the annual reports and plans. (Levanto 2004: 53.)

Levanto also suspects that a great reason for why museums can be considered difficult is the lack of mutual language between the staff and the visitor. The academic language used in museum are not balancing with the knowledge of a visitor. (Levanto 2004: 54–55.) Kaitavuori (2004) reinforces by explaining that museum is close to the academic world but its purpose is also to talk to the non-academic audience. Therefore its communication lies in the cross-pressure of academic language and common language. The situation requires self-reflection of the whole museum philosophy and practices and museum pedagogy can be a great method for this, if there is willingness to use it. (Kaitavuori 2004: 137, 139.)

I am suspecting Levanto referring to the need to open up the conversation between different sectors and audience research, which would map the structure of the users and non-users of each museums. Research findings are considered to be useful when developing audience work and display strategies. (see. Museokävijä 2011) Kaitavuori sees the future method of museum pedagogy unfolding the contents on plain language, bring it closer to the audience and help to reflect it with the society and one's own life.

Majority of displays and exhibitions are building on behaviorist knowledge transmitting ideals. Listening to the audience, interviews, visitor research and evaluation are not necessarily part of the basic tasks. Focus is somehow also on the high professional expertise. The exhibitions are most commonly visually pleasing and high quality and therefore also popular. Meanwhile it is also possible that the audience attracted to it are the usual visitors who have always been interested about the museum. Levanto is suspecting that if an active visitor realizes unable to use their skills and knowledge in museum and ended up in a passive role it concludes their feeling of exclusion. Museum

transforms into a place that is not necessarily wanted. It is not encountering the meanings of one's personal life. (Levanto 2004: 55–56.)

However, museums are paying a lot of attention to those with special needs, additionally to school groups. Yet there are significant amount of those who are not easily defined to any of the target groups. There is lots of happening for “everyone” and at the same time to no one. According to Othman (2004) more should be paid attention to those who are easily excluded from museum program. She is referring to a regular adult, who is potential museum visitor but who is not visiting for one reason or another. Therefore cultural outreach work should be viewed more from the social and societal aspects. (Othman 2004: 80.) Defining a service or a product as available, is not yet meaning that it is accessible (Salovaara 2004: 68).

Kaitavuori (2004) emphasizes that individuals are not supposed to get marked through group identity or labels. Belonging into some group is not telling about individuals behavior or world view. She also sees that the special practices in museums to reach new audiences are targeted on groups who are in a weak position in society. The reasons for disadvantage can be socio-economical and are usually linked with educational background. Through the time museums have been promoting the spirit that has made other people feel that they belong to the museum and the rest excluded. Museum is presenting only a part of their communities and a great deal of the people experience that they do not have a say or influence to the world museum is presenting. (Kaitavuori 2004: 132–134.)

4. 1 Special Target Groups

There is straight forward outreach towards certain types of target groups in the museums part of this research. The most reached groups might be – additionally to the traditional museum visitors – school groups, kindergarten groups and travelers, who are one acknowledged group especially in Rovaniemi. Rovaniemi Art Museum has also the group of art students from the University of Lapland. There are more groups as well, if we like to think every outreach project has really reached the group targeted during one

of the projects. Therefore these groups are those who has not particularly visited the museum because of a project but who has benefited from the project someplace else as well. As discussed earlier, the museums participating this research has outreached for the schools, the seniors, those in risk of exclusion, health care units and their customers and asylum seekers.

For those visiting the museum there are occasional and more sustained offerings of how to make better sense and how to get closer to the topics of represented. For example Tornionlaakso Regional Museum offers a guide booklet for families with children. (Conversation note 6.4.2016.) The aim of the “Children’s tour” is to make the museum visit easier to the parents or grandparents and more interesting for the children. The booklet has 19 points and it offers material for conversation, listening and questioning. It is written in a common language and provides easily adoptable information. (Lastenkierros Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseossa 2016.)

Aine Art Museum defines special groups as people with disabilities or learning disabilities but also as people of minority groups and different backgrounds. There is readymade programs for them with the notion on easy access and outreach. (Aine Art Museum Museumpedagogical Program 2014: 10.) The evidence is very clear with the existence of outreach work in museums. Museums are ready to try new things and train their staff and learn new methods. There is space in museums for all sorts of activities and to get people there is only a matter of organizing and resources. The concept of outreach here can be questioned too, if we like to imagine the reached groups being those who come to the museum due to their own interest. We cannot either think the visitors mere groups, because they are all individuals. If we want to be critical here, we cannot think school groups being reached, because the teacher has decided that visiting the museum is a good idea. Then we have reached some culture positive atmosphere of the school, the principal or a specific teacher. We can however reach individuals from the group due these group visits, which is shown in their own decision to visit the museum.

4.2 Audience Research in Old Market Square Carnival of Rovaniemi

In my research I am curious about those who consider museums as places they are not interested about or welcome to visit. Here we are discussing about a topic called museum image. I aimed to map the museum images in the area of Rovaniemi. As it is clear one cannot reach participants from non-visitors inside a museum, I decided to conduct an inquiry outside a museum, in market surroundings with the great help of participant museums in the city, Rovaniemi Art Museum and Lapland Regional Museum during a research grant period provided by Lapland Regional Fund in 2016. Old Market Square Carnival of Rovaniemi is an annual event, conducted fully with the help of volunteers. It is visited by up to 35 000 visitors during one weekend and the profit of its is donated for good cause and it is attracting different people. The museums mentioned here have annually their own booths in the event which allowed them to hand over my inquiry.

The inquiry gathered total 77 responses and it turned out that it did not reach the non-visitors in the sense I understood it. Thus the inquiry did not succeed in reaching non-visitors in these surroundings. However, as the responders were allowed to define themselves as a visitor or a non-visitor, nine responders checked as non-visitors, whose answers did not differ significantly from those who defined themselves as visitors. Most of the responders were female but there was no significant difference between the answers of men and women. Men simply mentioned the interest towards history more precisely. The sample is relatively small, but it gives a hint about the local's motives to visit the museums and the hopes they wish museums would provide. As stated in other inquiries, much of the people hope for is something museums already provide. Perhaps the problem lies then on marketing or low amount of provisions, or maybe there is lacking a common language and one thing means a second thing to the other. The museum visitors turned out to be social and especially they are interested in events.

The museum image is interesting and comments about it were positive. In the area visitors enjoy high quality changing exhibitions, especially about those of historical topics – more precisely – local history, which would make these visitors *Affinity Seekers* as defined by Falk And Dierking (2013: 49). The calmness of museums is highly

valued. Even though there is claims for action and provision, it remains peaceful place and provides interesting information. Rovaniemian museum visitor has also acknowledged the pedagogical side of museums.

In the report of the inquiry that I provided for the Rovaniemi Art Museum and Lapland Regional Museum, I categorized the answers first by the responders own definition of visitor or non-visitor. According to the answers I aimed to find out the reasons to visit museums, museum images and hopes for museum provision. As the visitor-group (64) was the largest one, I also compared these responders purposes to visit to the hopes for museums per responder.

Museum visitor in Rovaniemi is an interested person who goes to the museum to calm down, to enjoy and to learn. They bring other people to visit museums as well. However, I could interpret that even an active museum visitor would wish for personal touch points. People need reception, guiding, activities, touching, and almost anything that differs from the quiet galleries, walking and looking, even though the silence is highly appreciated and there will always be space for that. For many active visitors museums are already good as they are. The local exhibitions are good and interesting. Those who actively follow the event calendars know what happens and when, but some of them also acknowledge gaps in the marketing.

Often the reasons to visit are corresponding the hopes of museum provisions. Museums are wished to provide services they already do. The active visitors have ideas of their own about themed museum days, participation and workshops, which are much provided, which makes me wonder if something could be done otherwise. One significant point occurred as well: museum is needed as a present partner for conversation who could participate the members of their communities.

Even though museum is considered positively by those who are there to response when the questions are asked, the word museum is said to be used constantly used negatively, as stated in Museo-magazine 1/15 commenting on the editorial of the issue 2/1985: *“It is not easy to be a museum. The images about museum are mainly positive and museums are an active part of society. However the word museum is constantly used in*

negative sense. It is yet to be seen if the dusty images of the word can be overcome in the next thirty years, by 2045.” (Museo 1/15: 5.)

5 Supporting the Themes of Learning in Museum, Inclusion and the Future of the Museum

The aim of this chapter is to support the following themes of museum learning, social inclusion and real participation by reflecting the concepts of post-museum, elitism and modernist museum. The reflection to these themes rise from the notion of the wide group of non-visitors. We discuss with joy about successful projects, reached target groups, solid funding and staff resources. We know who is the typical visitor and we know who we invite to the museum, but rarely we do not know exactly who is not drawn to museum and how museum seems to them, while claiming “openness for all.” I am calling for critical self-observation and acknowledging the not so distant history of museum still effecting not only to the attitudes of those traditional museum professionals, but to the attitudes and museum images of the people. In a way, I see the questions about non-visitor and potential visitor correlating with these themes, as an opposite of those discussed earlier in this study, unfolding the other side of the museum “for all.”

We can view the reality of the themes created by museum scholars on the museum field and they also justify the need to have the conversation and speculation about inclusion in museums. For example scholars like Eilean Hooper-Greenhill (2000) and Janet Marstine (2006) have defined and described the tasks of a post-museum and its difference from more traditional museum. Lindauer (2007) writes that the qualities of the traditional – or modernist – museum and the post-museum can be seen simultaneously in many museums. The combination is useful, because it makes the museum professionals to reflect the political aspects of their practices. (Lindauer 2007: 305–306.) For some, the idea of post-museum represents a movement towards carnival spirited events in which the core idea of the museum is forgotten (McClellan 2007: 267).

5. 1 Post-museum

The altar museum discussed by Marstine (2006) is the most traditional form of the museum. The paradigm is supported by directors and curators who are opposing the change by claiming the option to lead towards commercialism and “giving in.” (Marstine 2006: 8–10.) The most traditional way to function can then be seen as the core idea of the museum practices and changing that would make the museum as a popularized space in which the meaning and the basic tasks are forgotten. Janes (2007: 134) concludes the museum today being in a cross-pressure where it is simultaneously a non-profit organization aiming for stability and building new relationships with its communities and simultaneously discussing the meaning of responsibility as a social institution in the world of money and efficiency.

The emerging of the post-museum or post-museum-like structure can be viewed grounding on the acknowledgement of inequality – usually of race and gender – and the discussion about that. Post-museum is the dream and reality of a democratic museum in which the museum is a significant part of their communities, open space for all. Hooper-Greenhill (2000: 153) describes post-museum as a responsive conversationalist who encourages two-way nurturing relationships and promotes diversity. She sees it possible that a significant part of the development of the post-museum is emerging outside of the European centers that saw the birth of the modernist museum.

It is acknowledged that a single museum visit will not spark a change and that equality is not just one mean to claim social control. (Marstine 2006: 19.) Instead of post-museum, Janes discusses socially responsible work, which is unprecedented opportunity for museums to renew themselves and define more sustainable role in their communities. This role goes beyond education work and entertainment and currently many museums are making this decision. (Janes 2007: 135, 143.)

Post-museum is more democratic than modernist museum by encouraging the community members to decide which story the museum is presenting and how the art works and objects should be interpreted. In this way museums would become inclusive, because the people would participate with their multiple back grounds into museum

practices. (Lindauer 2007: 305.) Post-museum offers visitor-friendly space and encourages conversation with the staff. This requires understanding about museum's community-based role. The tasks of museum educators have been developed to concern even more adult visitors and the needs of different groups. This brings along challenges as art is still carrying somewhat elitist image as a hobby of intellectuals and experts. (Dewdney et al. 2013: 25–26.)

5.2 Elitism

We can understand the need for the discussion about the definition and aim of social inclusion in museum field through reflecting the elitist nature of the museum. For example Fleming (2002) claims that museum have systematically excluded socio-economically weaker groups. As a motive he offers the economical survival of museums; the needs of educated, middle-class and economically stronger groups are more significant. The elitist minority has affected on the practices of collecting, directing and program planning. Fleming criticizes especially the role of director-curators because he sees them not placing the participating first and benefiting from their social status and power in a hierarchical organization. Fleming claims this traditional practice being visible in many museums today. (Fleming 2002: 213–219.)

According to Jung (2010) institutionalized museums have been criticized of ambivalent and secluding themselves into higher and lower intelligence through an explaining manner of display. For example in many museums the labels are based on historical knowledge and consist from complex terminology which is not unfolding for non-experts. In this way museums are limiting their potential audience by aiming to teach them specific information, which expands the intelligence hierarchy between the museum and the audience. (Jung 2010: 282.)

Jacques Rancière (1991), brought up by Jung, explains the intelligence hierarchy as a relationship between the “masters” and the students. Masters are not understanding that the students would learn best through experiences, opportunities, failing and self-

correcting. Rancière is referring to traditional sharing of information, in which the experts decide what is good and valuable and share the knowledge from above without considering how the audience could adopt the information in a best possible way. (Rancière 1991: 5–7.) In this way museums can enhance the feelings of inclusion and exclusion (Fyfe 2011: 38). The interest in past is not however belonging only to the elitists. Every time choices are made there is the choice to exclude something. (Hoelscher 2011: 210, 215.)

Some scholars believe that museums can create new spaces, exhibitions, educational plans and consumer opportunities, but in their heart they will remain as elitist institutions. The strategies reveal museums aiming to simplify their “audience” instead of acknowledging their complex identities. In museum hierarchy the curators are still making major decisions paying only little attention and power on museum educators and attention to audience. They who are seeing the post-museum emerging, have more positive idea about the future. (Marstine 2006: 28.)

The authoritative nature of the museum can be utilized in a positive manner. Museum is a respected institution which can be trusted to represent factual, well-documented and shared knowledge. However, this role can be patronizing if the shared information is offered one-sided by thinking that the “great audience” is in the need of this information. Meanwhile museum is open for all in theory, only few of the histories and cultures are acknowledged. (Lindauer 2007: 305.)

5.3 Social inclusion

Social inclusion has emerged on the museum field as a hot topic a good while ago. Hooper-Greenhill (2007) brings up the museum education movement in Britain in 1990s when the British government was calling for museums to prove their claimed educational aspects. This was driven by the ideology of culture having to be socially inclusive, accountable and used by schools. That is when General Learning Outcomes (GLO) were developed through a research by Research Centre for Museums and Galleries (RCMG) in the department of Museum Studies at the University of Leicester

in the early 2000s to address recognizable and accountable learning outcomes and to build a theory about in museum learning. The evidence of the research shows that museum plays a powerful role in working towards an inclusive society by working with special schools and by working with children at risk. (Hooper-Greenhill 2007: 7–11, 17, 20.)

Now the topic seems more current than ever before. A group of audience oriented professionals are defining it as a part of functional future of the museum. Sari Salovaara (2004) describes accessibility (*esteettömyys*) and outreach (*saavutettavuus*) in a following way; access provides possibility to enter the spaces even in a wheelchair and usage of the services through different senses. It also makes sure that the material provided is equally useful for everyone. Prejudiced outreach creates the chance to overcome other boundaries. The acknowledgement and attitude of designers, stakeholders and builders to pay attention to possible target groups will lead towards better access and outreach. Design for all -concept will erase the need to plan separately for each group and meanwhile mark them as “special” and aims to find a suitable method for all instead. (Salovaara 2004: 67. 69–71.)

Graham Black (2005: 4) states that the museum of 2000s is the promoter of social inclusion. According to him, the aim of audience development is not to increase the amount of one-time visitors but to develop and maintain participation in long-term. It requires equal devotement to participate directly with the communities, because the museum must present itself as an active member in the community. It is not functioning one-way but the communities need to receive information about the aims of the museum as well as what it can and cannot do. In this way audience development is financially expensive, like was clearly stated during the Museum Forum, because it requires devotement time. Black states that without devotement and required resources beginning with the process is in vain. (Black 2005: 47.)

Cultural institutions have the social responsibility, due their collections, display and practices and the potential to promote inclusive societies. (Dodd & Sandell 2001: 33). Regardless part of the literature used here are somewhat outdated, they are still expressing the same concerns and ideas that were present in Museum Forum on October 2017. On its part it is revealing how slow the change is and rooting the ideas in large

institutions, which also museums are. To promote the change we should be able to reflect our own institutions critically and acknowledging the characteristics of the modernist museum.

All in all the Museum Forum in Berlin left me with the strong idea that work with inclusion themes is not a fast solution that can be realized in a short time. It requires long-term devotement, re-evaluation and objective view on one's own work. Especially significant is the openness and support from directors. It is not a one-person-job but shared experience within the whole staff. Important is the institution to learn in an abstractive and practical level through courses and workshops. We must not forget that individual inclusion project is not one-off cross-the-box-method but created audience relationships and individuals should be valued and maintained. Often the target groups of inclusion and the topics meaningful for them are sensitive and personal, and that is why abandoning them after the project is morally wrong. Participating in the project is significant from the very first moments. It is not enough to offer something designed within the museum staff but let the community to participate in a transparent and communicative manner. The audience participating in a project should have the chance to comment, get answers and see the changes happening due to what they have made themselves. It requires the staff giving up their power to the audience and leaving space for ideas and unpredicted outcomes. (Presentations and panel discussions in Finnish-German Museum Forum in Berlin 10/2017.)

When working with social inclusion there is always the risk to fail, do wrong, hurt or exclude someone. There is also the lacking of common guidelines and documenting the outcomes of a project for future usage. It is also significant to remember that each project includes several shifting factors and then the chance for failures and mistakes increases. Sometimes it also turns out, that the whole staff or especially the directory is not actually supporting the project which makes the success even more difficult. Sari Salovaara reminds that failures are also needed and we need to accept them because through them we gain energy to make things differently in the future. (First panel discussion in Finnish-German Museum Forum in Berlin 10/2017.)

The inclusion process is in the very beginning in the sense that the inclusion issues are acknowledged and written down to strategies and plans but the actual realization of

them or visibility in actual museum work is another story. As a mistake we can count also the tendency to have one inclusion project here and another one there, which is unsustainable way to work. (First panel discussion in Finnish-German Museum Forum in Berlin 10/2017.)

It is crucial to take a look and realize where are we now. The Future Lab -table conversations in Jewish Museum in Berlin combined the themes of the Museum Forum and provided advice and suggestions for future development. In some cases we are still working on the basic, physical access. But there are also many used methods that vary on the field, such as clear language, integration, projects and shared information. In this conversation it remained unclear, what is the destiny of the people who are not fitting in any specific target groups who the museums tend to work towards. The problem unfolded that the conversation about inclusion is still happening more inside the field or between individual units. It is often something additional, extra or nonintegrated action on the museum's basic offerings. Also, the attitude towards inclusion within the staff varies, which makes it ill-defined and remains as something the museum educators work on, even though it is good enough to be written down in the strategies. It is shown i.e. through the economical support, since the projects are happening with additional funding, it is minimal and often unsure.

The conversationalists have clear visions of what changes should be made for the future; perspective shift from the museum to the audience, sharing the power, making with rather than making for, positive attitude from the whole staff and understanding real participation. It is hard to define where we are now, because on some level we are still finding out what inclusion work can mean at its best and on the other hand some individual museums are very much involved in the lives of their communities. We could say, perhaps, that we are finding out the common guidelines and updating the concepts and spreading the information within the institution.

6 Conclusions – The Problematic Public Space

Throughout this study I have aimed to describe the idea of emerging post-museum through literature and reflect it on actual outreach and participatory thinking on museum field by using examples collected from the museums of Western Lapland, Finland. It may be possible to conclude, that the examples reveal the ideal of more inclusive museum work influencing on background on every aspect of audience development. Quite some of the literature references discussing post-museum, participation, open learning surroundings and social inclusion are already aged, yet they still represent ambitious plans and demands for museums what comes to i.e. participating communities, two-way conversation, democracy and even lower threshold. These museums have created together with their partners many great projects to reach especially underrepresented groups as well as to keep up the interest of those already visiting museums.

On the field general, quite vague guidelines to help museums can be found from the museum law, but it seems there is lacking more practical guidelines on how to understand outreach and true participation, regular audience research to define more specifically the needs of different groups, how to collaborate with communities and to sustain inclusion. Museums work partly as individual executioners of the museum plan and the strategies they have written themselves. The law is interpreted and understood in varied ways as well as the content of the terms of outreach, participation and inclusion.

As long as museum is not exactly familiar with the types their possible audiences, I see highly likely that these possible and also impossible audiences are not quite seeing what museums can do and what they could be for them. Therefore it is justified to call for objective look on each museum's practices and to find out which parts of it are still repeating the concept of modernist museum and supporting the possible elitist image of it that estranges the museums "for all" from the people.

It is also discussed that museum represents chosen narratives by the museum staff. Janes (2007: 136) points out that the access to the “wisdom” is embedded, but too often concealed, in all museums. He has the belief for museums potential to create accesses to the information “that is free of any particular agenda.” In this way it appears homogenous, representing the museum side of the story. Museum as a whole is not an open and public space, since the public do not have the access or influence to the opaque decision making. However, the speculation of the post-museum could maybe place the museum into a position of a public space as it would discuss and encourage multiple simultaneous narratives. In the sense of modernist museum, it would be much more private and closed, like visiting somebody’s home.

However, as last thoughts, we should consider if this free museum for all, free public space for discovering is even possible. The idealized notion of access for all is linked to concepts of the museum as apolitical and as a space where all values are equal. *Apoliticality* refers to museums as safe, physically protected, calm and civil spaces for people to interact. Museums are identified as places that present trusted and reliable information. The museum’s voice is believed to be impartial and value neutral. Cameron has discovered that many audiences have a utopian view of museums as *democratic spaces*. (Cameron 2007: 331–332.) Theoretically there is no space like that.

First of all, the concept of “public space” is complicated and not as open in practice as we might like to imagine. Public space is hard to define: we have to choose certain spaces as “public.” Traditionally the public space as an opposite for private space is defined on who has the right to decide: individual or the community. Public space is also a field of power struggles, debates and negotiations. The conflicts are not coming from the outside of the space and public space is not profoundly free and harmonious. Or as Nielsen refers to Jean-Luc Nancy (*Being Singular Plural*, 2000) public space can be pluralistic stage of separate, intertwined and simultaneously coexisting subject positions. (Nielsen 2013: 228, 234, 236.)

Nielsen discusses Mouffe’s reflections of a radical and pluralistic democracy. Democratic space can only happen when the actors of the space are aware that the basis of any community consist from incidental limitations and power-related exclusions. It is a field of negotiation where different hegemonic projects wrestle without the possibility

of reaching a definitive, rational and fully inclusive consensus. (Nielsen 2013: 238, 241.) According to this, as long as any museum is seen as objective and neutral inside the museum, the democracy has no chances to realize. Thus, if the structure is acknowledged and re-examined, learned over and over again, on a continuous basis, there is a chance. This means, that museums cannot “finish” the work of becoming democratic, that is not how the museum works. The structure is remaining, it only needs to be recognized and worked on, even when it is unbeatable.

There is however a reverse side. As Nielsen describes, a culture of agreement can be seen to endanger democracy, since the effort to equalize different viewpoints can potentially contribute to reinforcement of fundamentalist tendencies and increase the growth of populist and extremist movements. (Nielsen 2013: 238.) Agonistic thinking proposes the participants to bare the differences and multiple subjectivities. As long as there is direct authority, choosing, limiting attitudes and such, we cannot consider the museum democratic or open in the sense we would like.

Foucault was interested about spaces in relation to other places. These places that are connected to all the other places but which are anyhow in contradiction with all the others are two kinds. Utopias are places without a real place. They are representing the society in its perfect form or society in a reverse way, but they are unreal places. Every culture has real places that work as a effectively produced utopia in which real places that can be found inside the culture simultaneously represented contested and reverse. These places are outside of all the places even though it is possible to locate them in reality. Because these places are completely different from all the places they are reflecting and discussing about, Foucault calls them as a contrast to utopia: heterotopias. (Foucault 1986: 24.)

The society can make existing heterotopias to function in different ways: each heterotopia has specific and defined function inside the society. There are heterotopias which gather time in a never-ending manner, such as museums and libraries. Museums and libraries have become heterotopias in which the time will not stop gathering and layering and yet remaining outside of the time and unreachable for destruction. The museum and the library are suitable heterotopias for 1800s Western society. (Foucault 1986: 26.)

Heterotopias are *not free to access*: they always require the system of opening and closing, which also isolates them and makes them penetrable. Generally heterotopias are not free to access like public space in theory. Either the access is compulsory like a prison or individual needs to perform some rites and gestures to get inside. In a way everyone can arrive to these heterotopias, but in reality it is mere illusion: we think we have arrived there where we are, but in reality we have arrived as *outsiders*. (Foucault 1986: 16.) Public spaces also require certain type of behavior to get in or get along at, and not everyone everywhere are completely familiar with them. Therefore, simply opening doors for free entrance may not be the solution.

Duncan discusses museum rituals. Rituals are religious, performative actions which happen in a place constructed for some kind of performance. Anthropologists claim that our anti-ritual culture is full of ritual moments and events, from which only few occur in a religious context. Places such as museums or churches publicly present beliefs about the world order, its past and present and the position of an individual. Museum is constructed like a ritual space, provoking special kind of attention, such as interpretation and learning. People should also behave in the museum along with certain etiquette. Some individuals can use the place more aware than the others – they can be educationally prepared to answer the symbolic signs. Museums provide similarly well developed ritual scenarios, usually in the form of art historical narratives which folds out in the order of the spaces. (Duncan 1995: 8, 10, 12.)

To conclude with the theory of public space it leaves questions about if post-museum is possible on practical level, can museums ever be spaces for all to wander in, discover, fulfill themselves with individually chosen bits of narratives build together with the community? Will the citizens acknowledge their museums as responsive, important and close spaces in their communities? We can approach these questions not only recognizing and fixing our modernist roots and re-evaluating the working practices but also acknowledging the limitations and challenges that comes with the terms of “open” or “public” space.

As Duncan mentions, some of the members – regular visitors – know the rituals more than the others. It does not mean we cannot learn two-ways, which means that also museum can learn from their audiences. Also, it is possible to recognize the

complexities mentioned by Nielsen in a space meant to be open to use for the audience. Thus, as a step towards inclusion, I suggest we can learn on the behalf of the audience, what it means and what it really requires from them to enter a museum, making it through there and acknowledging the different rituals we are claiming from them.

Through the findings of this study I suggest that audience development and outreach is still much expert-led, additional provision that is conducted often with different partners during limited projects. It is much depending on those persons working in each museums, the collections and surroundings what these provisions are and how far they go, which is shown through the variety and differing of programs, aims and outcomes in them. There is no one right way to do the work. A single project's life span is short, often too short to develop a tight relationship with a target group. The non-visitors or visitors not falling into any particular group are unfamiliar to the museums, mainly because of lack of research. At least there is not concrete data about this. I am also calling for more thorough after-project-work to find out about the long-term impacts of each project.

My further research will include similar data collected from museums in Germany and the aim is to develop further discussion between the two countries and critique about the realization of inclusion in the museum field. As I have been aware about the resources of staff and funding directed towards this type of work and development in museum field, the findings of this study did not leave me surprised. Moreover, it makes me certain that the discussion about the topic is not in vain; as mentioned earlier, the discussion about inclusion and the future of it in museums is still happening in more limited circles and between professionals inside of the field, and that is enhancing the idea that the topic needs more voice, more discussion and more people from different areas. The potential can already be found in every museum. Although I ended this study with the complicated theory of public space, I have faith that there will be more chances to find the way around it, or at least to ease the boundaries. The most important starting point is dedication and the ability for objective looks.

As the movement towards more post-museum-type of structure is going forward, it is clear that it cannot happen merely inside the museum but between different professions. Not only should inclusion be interwoven way of thinking and working in museum

surroundings, it should also be sustainable instead of an add-on. It is highly likely that museums could have use for example for service designers, local people willing to share their expertise, social workers, researchers and so on. I see the need for regular research in museums and as well as further education of museum staff through research. As my data collected from Germany includes more interviews and observational data, I am hoping to find out more practical level proof of the condition and thinking of inclusion and audience development work in general and through this overview unfold further the chances for inclusion in museums.

Literature:

Aurasmaa, Anne. 2002. Salomonin talo. Museon idea renessanssiajattelun valossa. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.

Avarampi museo aikuisille. 2012. Edit: Pauliina Kinanen, Hector Nystedt & Leena Tornberg. Suomen Museoliiton julkaisuja 61.

Black, Graham. 2005. *The Engaging Museum. Developing Museums for Visitor Involvement*. The Heritage: Care-preservation-management. Routledge: London and New York.

Dewdney, Andrew; Dibosa, David & Walsh, Victoria. 2013. Post-Critical Museology: theory and practice in art museum. London and New York: Routledge.

Dodd, Jocelyn & Sandell, Richard. 2001. *Social roles and responsibilities*. Perspectives on museums, galleries and social inclusion. Jocelyn Dodd and Richard Sandell (edit.) University of Leicester. Iso Britannia. 23–35.

Duncan, Carol. 1995. *The Art Museum as Ritual*. Civilizing Rituals. Inside Public Art Museums. The Art Museum as Ritual. London and New York: Routledge. pp: 7–20.

Falk, John F. & Dierking, Lynn D. 2013. *The Museum Experience Revisited*. Left Coast Press Inc. Walnut Creek. California.

Fleming, David. 2002. *Positioning the Museum for Social Inclusion*. Museum, Society, Inequality. Edit: Richard Sandell. London and New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 1986. *Of other spaces*. Diacritics, Spring 1986. Originally: “Des Espaces Auters” in Architecture-Mouvement-Continuité, October 1984. Based on a lecture given by Michel Foucault in March 1967. Trans: Jay Miskowiec. pp.22–27.

Heinonen, Jouko & Lahti, Markku. 1988. Museologian perusteet. Suomen museoliiton julkaisuja 34. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

Hoelscher, Steven. 2011. *Heritage. A Companion to Museum Studies*. Edit: Sharon MacDonald. Great Britain: Wiley-Blackwell. pp. 198–218.

Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. 2007. *Museums and Education: Purpose, pedagogy, performance*. Routledge: USA and Canada.

Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. 2000. *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. Routledge: USA and Canada.

Janes, Robert R. 2007. *Museums, Social Responsibility and the Future we Desire*. Museum Revolutions. How museums change and are changed. Edit: Simon J. Knell, Suzanne MacLeod and Sheila Watson. Routledge: London and New York. pp. 132–146.

Jung, Yuha. 2010. *The Ignorant Museum: Transforming the Elitist Museum Into an Inclusive Learning Place*. The New Museum Community. Audiences, Challenges, Benefits. A Collection of Essays. Edinburgh: MuseumsEtc.

Kaitavuori, Kaija. 2004. *Museo ja muu maailma. Yhteisöllisyys museon toimintatapana*. Valistus/museopedagogiikka/oppiminen. Taidemuseo kohtaa yleisönsä. Edit: Marjatta Levanto and Susanna Pettersson. Taidemusealan kehittämissyyskikkö Kehys/Valtion taidemuseo. Hämeenlinna: Karisto. pp. 130–143.

Kauppinen, Jukka. 2010. *Elämää, elämiskeskuksia*. Pedafooni 2b. Opastamisen historiaa. Museopedagoginen yhdistys Pedaali ry. pp. 20–25.

Kelly, Lynda. 2003. *Museums, "Dumbing Down" and Entertainment: A Visitor Perspective*. Paper presented at UNCOVER – graduate research in the museum sector Conference, Sydney.

Kelly, Lynda. 2007. *Visitors and Learning. Adult museum visitors' learning identities*. Museum Revolutions. How museums change and are changed. Edit: Simon J. Knell, Suzanne MacLeod and Sheila Watson. Routledge: London and New York. pp. 276–290.

Kimmelman, M. 2001. *Museums in a Quandary: Where Are the Ideals?* New York: New York Times.

Kumpulainen, Kristiina, Lipponen, Lasse & Krokfors, Leena. 2012. *Museo oppimisen ympäristönä aikuisille*. Avarampi museo aikuisille. Edit: Pauliina Kinanen, Hector Nystedt ja Leena Tornberg. Suomen museoliiton julkaisuja. Vammala. 12–15.

Lamminen, Marjut & Tornberg, Leena. 2010. *Tieteellisistä esityksistä opastuksiin. Opastustoiminnan historiaa kulttuurihistoriallisissa museoissa*. Pedafooni 2b. Opastamisen historiaa. Museopedagoginen yhdistys Pedaaali ry. pp. 13–19.

Levanto, Marjatta. 1996. *Kansanvalituksesta, taidekasvatuksesta ja museopedagogiikasta. Suomalainen yleisö ja Ateneumin sataviisikymmentä vuotta*. Kuvitella vuosisata. Taidekasvatuksen juhlakirja. Edit: Liisa Piironen and Antero Salminen. Taideteollinen korkeakoulu. Taidekasvatuksen osasto. pp. 86–95.

Levanto, Marjatta & Pettersson, Susanna. 2004. *Toimittajien esipuhe*. Valistus/museopedagogiikka/oppiminen. Taidemuseo kohtaa yleisönsä. Marjatta Levanto ja Susanna Pettersson (toim.) Valtion taidemuseo. 7.

Levanto, Marjatta. 2004. *Temppeleissä ja toreilla. Oppimisesta taidemuseossa*. Valistus/museopedagogiikka/oppiminen. Taidemuseo kohtaa yleisönsä. Edit: Marjatta Levanto and Susanna Pettersson. Taidemuseoalan kehittämissyksikkö Kehys/Valtion taidemuseo. Hämeenlinna: Karisto. pp. 48–63.

Levanto, Marjatta. 2004a. *Taide kohtaa yleisönsä*. Valistus/museopedagogiikka/oppiminen. Taidemuseokohtaa yleisönsä. Edit: Marjatta Levanto ja Susanna Pettersson. Taidemuseoalan kehittämissyksikkö Kehys/Valtion taidemuseo. Hämeenlinna: Karisto. pp. 20–38.

Levanto, Marjatta. 2010. *Taidemuseot ja varhainen opastustoiminta*. Pedafooni 2b. Opastamisen historiaa. Museopedagoginen yhdistys Pedaaali ry. pp. 5–12.

Levanto, Marjatta. 2010a. *Taidemuseo kohtaa yleisönsä. Marjatta Levannon opaskokemuksia*. Pedafooni 2b. Opastamisen historiaa. Museopedagoginen yhdistys Pedaaali ry. pp. 26–30.

Lindauer, Margaret. 2006. *The Critical Museum Visitor*. New Museum Theory and Practice. An Introduction. Janet Marstine (toim.). USA: Blackwell Publishing. 203–225.

Marstine, Janet. 2006. *Introduction*. *New Museum Theory and Practice*. An Introduction. Janet Marstine (toim.). USA: Blackwell Publishing. 1–36.

McClellan, Andrew. 2007. *Museum Studies Now*. *Art History*, vol 30, No: 4. Association of Art Historians. Blackwell. pp. 566–570.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2009. *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso. pp. 12, 96, 102–103, 129, 139.

Museokävijä 2011. 2012. Edit: Eeva-Liisa Taivassalo & Kimmo Levä. Suomen museoliiton julkaisuja 62.

Museolehtorina Suomen kansallismuseossa. 2010. Based on the interviews made by the researcher of Finnish National Museum, Marjut Lamminen: Interview of Pekka Sarvas 12.10.2009, interview of Raija Järvelä-Hynynen 13.10.2009. *Pedafooni* 2b. *Opastamisen historiaa*. Museopedagoginen yhdistys Pedaali ry. pp. 31–34.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. 2000. *Being Singular Plural*. California: Stanford University Press. pp:65.

Nielsen, Sabine. 2013. *Public Space: A Concept under Negotiation*. *A Space Called Public*. Köln: Walter König Verlag. pp. 228–246.

Othman, Erica. 2004. *Ajatuksia työpajatyöskentelystä taidemuseossa*. Valistus/museopedagogiikka/oppiminen. Taidemuseo kohtaa yleisönsä. Marjatta Levanto ja Susanna Pettersson (toim.) *Valtion taidemuseo*. Suom. Marjatta Levanto. 76–87.

Pedafooni 2B. 2010. Johdanto. *Opastamisen historiaa*. Edit: Marjut Lamminen, Marjatta Levanto, Nana Salin, Erja Salo, Leena Tornberg, Päivi Venäläinen. Museopedagoginen yhdistys Pedaali ry. pp. 3–4.
(pedaali.fi/sites/default/files/julkaisut/pedafooni2B.pdf)

Pettersson, Susanna. 2009. *Johan Jakob Tikkanen and the Finnish Art Society: Tracing the Roots of Museum Professionalism in the Finland of the 1890s*. *Towards a Science of Art History*. J.J. Tikkanen and Art Historical Scholarship in Europe. Edit: Johanna

Vakkari. Taidehistoriallisia tutkimuksia *Konsthistoriska studier* 38. Society of Art History. Helsinki: Vammalan kirjapaino. pp. 22–33.

Pettersson, Susanna. 2010. *Museotyön historia on musitiitiedon varassa*. Lasuuri: taidemuseoalan ammattilaisten verkkolehti. Valtion taidemuseo. Printed: 19.10.2015. <http://lasuuri.valtiontaidemuseo.info/2010/05/museotyön-historia-o...>

Rönkkö, Marja-Liisa. 1999. *Louvren ja Louisianan perilliset. Suomalainen taidemuseo*. Dimensio 2. Valtion taidemuseon tieteellinen sarja.

Salovaara, Sari. 2004. *Hyvä museo on saavutettava museo*.

Valistus/museopedagogiikka/oppiminen. Taidemuseo kohtaa yleisönsä. Marjatta Levanto ja Susanna Pettersson (toim.) Valtion taidemuseo. 64–75.

Simon, Nina. 2010: *The Participatory Museum*. Museum 2.0. Santa Cruz, California.

Suominen, Tapio. 1999. *Alfred Lichtwark taidekasvattajana. Saksalaisen taidekasvatusliikkeen jäljillä*. Tampereen taidemuseon julkaisuja 83.

Sternfeld, Nora. 2012. *Playing for the Rules of the Game! Participation in the Post-representative Museum!* Saksasta englanniksi: Erika Doucette ja Sam Osborn. *Das partizipative Museum. Zwischen Teilhabe und User Generated Content. Neue Anforderungen an kultushistorische Ausstellungen*. Transcript: Bielefeld.

Taket, Ann; Crisp, Beth R; Graham, Melissa; Hanna, Lisa and Goldingay, Sophie. 2014. *Scoping social inclusion practice*. *Practicing Social Inclusion*. Edit: Ann Taket, Beth R. Crisp, Melissa Graham, Lisa Hanna, Sophie Goldingay and Linda Wilson. Routledge: London and New York.

Turpeinen, Outi. 2005. Merkityksellinen museoesine. Kriittinen visuaalisuus kulttuurihistoriallisen museon näyttelysuunnittelussa. Taideteollisen korkeakoulun julkaisu A 63. Tampere: Tammer-Paino Oy.

Venäläinen, Päivi. 2010. *Puhe, tekstit ja tehtävät oppaana luonnontieteellisessä museossa. Jukka Kauppinen – Luonnontieteellisen museopedagogiikan uranuurtaja*. Pedafooni 2b. Opastamisen historiaa. Museopedagoginen yhdistys Pedaali ry. pp. 35–38.

Venäläinen, Anni ja Ramstedt-Salonen, Mirja. 2012. *Taidemuseo osallistavana oppimisympäristönä*. Avarampi museo aikuisille. Edit: Pauliina Kinanen, Hector Nystedt & Leena Tornberg. Suomen museoliiton julkaisuja 61. Vammala. pp. 64–75.

Xanthoudaki, Maria. 2015. *Museums, innovative pedagogies and the twenty-first century learner: a question of methodology*. *Museum & Society*. March 2015. 13. 247–265.

Other printed data:

Museo 1/15. Museokuviaita. *Kommentti Pääkirjoitukseen 2/1985*. 53. vuosikerta 5.

Collected data:

Annual reports of the museum institution of City of Rovaniemi 2009–2013.

(Rovaniemen kaupungin museotoimen toimintakertomukset 2009–2013)

Alariesto, Tuija & Kähkönen, Kaija. 2009. *Aikamatka markkinoille* (Time travel to the Market Square). *Raito*. Maakunnallinen museolehti. 27. vuosikerta. 33–36.

Alm, Anna. 2011. Kulttuurista ja taiteesta hyvinvointia –hanke. Loppuraportti. 31.12.2011. Kemin taidemuseo. (*Wellbeing from culture and art, final report.*)

Alm, Anna. 2012. Taidemuseosta voimaa –hanke. Loppuraportti. 1.1.–30.6.2012. Kemin taidemuseo. (*Strenght from art museum, final report.*)

Aula, Minna. 2016. Ei haittaa vaikka marmorilattiaan tulee kurajälkiä – ”Museot eivät ole vain keski-ikäisille, koulutetuille naisille”. 31.3.2016. Yle. Kemi. (*The mud stains on marble floor does not matter – ”Museums are not only for middle aged, educated women”*)

Happonen, Eveliina & Kähkönen, Kaija. 2006. *Lukijalle*. Miksi aurinko on vihreä? Toim. Eveliina Happonen ja Kaija Kähkönen. Rovaniemen taidemuseo. 5–6. (For the Reader. Why the Sun is Green? Rovaniemi Art Museum.)

Heljala, Minna. 2009. Tarinamuori taipaleella 2008. Maakuntamuseon innovatiivinen elävöittämisshanke -raportti. 31.3.2009. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo.

(Story Woman on the Way 2008. Innovative revitalizing project of Tornionlaakso Regional Museum, report.)

Lantto, Raisa. 2008. Esitys Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseon innovatiiviseksi hankkeeksi. Eloa vanhaan museoon. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseon opastustoiminnan kehittäminen.

Lastenkierros Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseossa. 2016. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo. (Children's tour in Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.)

Leskelä, Lotta. 2013. Punainen lanka – Teemapolkuja taiteeseen. Toim. Lotta Leskelä ja Kaija Kähkönen. Rovaniemen taidemuseo. (The Red Yarn – Themed Paths to Art. Rovaniemi Art Museum.)

Memory Path of Aine Art Museum. 2011. Edit: Katriina Pietilä-Juntura. Aine Art Museum. Kalevaprint.

(Aineen taidemuseon Muistipolku. 2011. Katriina Pietilä-Juntura (toim.) Aineen taidemuseo. Kalevaprint.)

Museum pedagogical program of Aine Art Museum. 14.2.2014. Aine Art Museum. (Aineen taidemuseon museopedagoginen ohjelma. 14.2.2014. Aineen taidemuseo.)

Poster of *Down Town with Kaino*. 2012. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.

Pietilä-Juntura, Katriina. 2015. Patsastellaan ja pällistellään!. Painu patsaille. Veistosreitti Tornion keskustassa. Aineen taidemuseo. (Shoo to the Statues. Sculpture path in Tornio center. Aine Art Museum.)

Pietilä-Juntura, Katriina. 2015. Aineen taidemuseon taidekasvatusprojektit. Päivitetty 15.10.2015. Aineen taidemuseo. (Art education projects in Aine Art Museum. Updated in 15.10.2015.)

Poster of Thousand objects – Thousand stories. 2009. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.

Rovaniemen taidemuseo museokasvatuksen toimintapoliittinen ohjelma. Sähköinen tiedosto. Rovaniemen taidemuseo. (The policy program of museum education in Rovaniemi Art Museum. Electric file, no date, unprinted.)

Tarinamatka Keskikadulla -projektin tiliselvitys. 1.4.2004. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo. (Story tour in Keskikatu –project. Account statement. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.)

Tarinamatkan käsikirjoitus. 2003. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo. (The script of Story tour. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.)

Tarinamuori taipaleella. 2007. Hanketta koskeva suunnitelma. Museoiden innovatiiviset hankkeet. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo. (Story woman on the Way, the plan. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.)

Toimintasuunnitelma. 2016. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo. (Action plan. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.)

Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo. (Proposal for Tornionlaakso Regional Museum innovative project. Life in old museum. Developing the guiding practices of the regional museum. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.)

Tuhat tavaraa – Tuhat tarinaa -käsikirjoitus. 2009. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo. (Thousand objects – Thousand stories, script. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.)

Visitor quantities of Thousand objects – Thousand stories. 2006. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.

(Kävijämäärät Tuhat tavaraa – Tuhat tarinaa 2006. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo.)

Non-printed or published data:

Alariesto, Tuija. 2010. *Lapin maakuntamuseon museo-opetuksesta. Lapsi- ja nuorisopoliittiseen ohjelmaan 2010.* Sähköinen muistio. Arktikum. (Electric file: About museum education in Lapland Regional Museum)

Alariesto, Tuija. 2010. *Sananen Lapin maakuntamuseon (LMM) koululaistoiminnasta. Pilkkeen, AK:n tiedeviestinnän ja LMM:n koululaisyhteistyötoiminnan kehittämisen pohjalle*. Sähköinen muistio. Arktikum. (Electric file: About the school work in Lapland Regional Museum as a basis for collaboration with Pilke, Arctic center and Lapland Regional Museum.)

Arktisen keskuksen ja Lapin maakuntamuseo pedagogisen toiminnan arviointia, päivitystä ja uusia tulevaisuuden näkymiä. Tuija Alariesto, Heikki Hepoaho, Hanna Kyläniemi, Leena Tornberg (kirj.) Kommentoijat: Nicolas Gunsley, Hannu Kotivuori, Hilikka Liikkanen. Päivi Heikkala AP. 2006. Sähköinen muistio. (*Electric file: Evaluating, updating and future views of the pedagogical practices of Arctic Center and Lapland Regional Museum.*)

Conversation notes. In Tornionlaakso Regional Museum with Minna Heljala 6.4.2016. In the author's possession.

Conversation notes. In Kemi museums with Venla Kakko and Helka Savikuja. In the author's possession.

Conversation notes. In Lapland Regional Museum with Tuija Alariesto 5.2.2016. In author's possession.

Finnish-German Museum Forum in Berlin 10/2017: Presentations and panel discussions.

Guided workshops for elementary schools in Autumn 2015. Newsletter for schools 9.9.2015. Lapland Regional Museum. Electric newsletter.

(Lapin maakuntamuseon ohjatut työpajat alakouluille syksyllä 2015. Tiedote alakouluille 9.9.2015. Lapin maakuntamuseo. Sähköinen tiedote.)

Grant application. Development project for 2003–2005. Action plan. Tornionlaakso Regional Museum.

(Avustushakemus. Kehittämishanke vuodelle 2003–2005. LAKU - Tornion lastenkulttuurikeskus. Toimintasuunnitelma. Tornionlaakson maakuntamuseo.)

Hämäläinen, Heidi. 2017. Yleisökysely Rovaniemen Wanhoilla Markkinoilla 19.–21.8.2016. Raportti. University of Lapland. Rovaniemi Art Museum. Lapland Regional Museum.

Kulttuuriopetussuunnitelma. Opetussuunnitelma. Sähköinen muistio. Arktikum. (Electric file: Culture curriculum. Lapland Regional Museum.)

Museo-opetuksen strategia keväälle 2010. Sähköinen muistio. Arktikum. (Electric file: Strategy for museum education on Spring 2010. Lapland Regional Museum.)

Learning concept. Electric file. Lapland Regional Museum. No dates. (Oppimiskäsitys. Sähköinen muistio. Arktikum.)

Web-data:

Aine Art Museum: <http://merilapinmuseot.fi/museot/aineen-taidemuseo>
<https://www.tornio.fi/kulttuuri-ja-vapaa-aika/aineen-taidemuseo/> (Read: 26.03.2018)

Arktikum (Lapland Regional Museum) www-sivut: <http://www.arktikum.fi/> (Read: 2017, the information has changed.)

Entten tentten – uusi yhteinen perintö. Kotoutumista vastavuoroisesti. 2016. Meri-Lapin museot. Kemin historiallinen museo. 1.9.2016.
merilapinmuseot.fi/nayttelyt/etten-tentten-uusi-yhteinen-perinto-kotoutumista-vastavuoroisesti. (Article: Eeny Meeny – new common cultural heritage). (Read: 07.09.2016)

Honkanen, Seppo. 19.06.2017. Miltä Museokortin tilastovaikutukset näyttävät?:
<http://museoliitto.blogspot.de/search?updated-max=2017-08-31T16:49:00%2B03:00&max-results=5>

Kanniainen, Virpi. 2016. Aineen taidemuseo vetovoimainen vierailukohde (Aine Art Museum is attractive place to visit). [http://merilapinmuseot.fi/museot/aineen-
taidemuseo/aineen-taidemuseo-vetovoimainen-vierailukohde](http://merilapinmuseot.fi/museot/aineen-taidemuseo/aineen-taidemuseo-vetovoimainen-vierailukohde)

Kemi Historical Museum: <http://www.kemi.fi/palvelut/kulttuuripalvelut/museot/> (Read: 26.03.2018)

<http://merilapinmuseot.fi/museot/kemin-historiallinen-museo> (Read: 26.03.2018)

Kemi Art Museum: <http://www.kemi.fi/palvelut/kulttuuripalvelut/museot/> (Read: 26.03.2018)

<http://merilapinmuseot.fi/museot/kemin-taidemuseo-alueaidemuseo> ja

<http://www.kemi.fi/palvelut/kulttuuripalvelut/museot/>

Rovaniemi Art Museum: <http://www.korundi.fi>

Toimintaohjelma: Taide ja kulttuuri lisäämään hyvinvointia 28.01.2010 (Program: Art and culture to increase wellbeing):

http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Tiedotteet/2010/01/kulttuuri_hyvinvointi.html?lang=fi

Tornionlaakso Regional Museum : <https://www.tornio.fi/kulttuuri-ja-vapaa-aika/tornionlaakson-maakuntamuseo/lisatietoa-tornionlaaksosta/tornionlaakson-maakuntamuseon-historia/> (Read: 26.03.2018)