

# **Objects and Identity: inspiring cross-disciplinary learning through university teaching collections**

## **Introduction**

This chapter contributes to this book on TEACHING AND LEARNING INNOVATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION by exploring the role of object-based learning in collaborative learning environments in higher education. The chapter draws on the pedagogic disciplines of curriculum development and museological teaching practice and asks ‘how can working with objects in a collaborative cross-disciplinary environment introduce students to new ideas and new ways of working and thinking in an art and design setting?’

The concept of object-based learning in a museum context was first introduced by Scott G. Paris in 2002 and has subsequently become an academic discipline pursued by many university museums in the UK and beyond. In this chapter, we define object-based learning as a pedagogic framework which encourages transactions between objects and students to stimulate curiosity and allow ‘meaning construction’ to take place (Paris, 2002: xvi). We understand collaborative learning environments as discursive spaces that encourage cross-disciplinary exploration and exchange of practices and approaches. Such spaces simulate the multidisciplinary environments students may enter after graduation and foster the learning of how to work as a diverse team, negotiating everyone’s contribution and utilising the skill set available in a multidisciplinary team.

Working across disciplines offers the opportunity for human-centred or social learning (Freire, 1968, Vygotsky, 1978) where students focus on developing skills in areas such as self-direction, confidence, interpersonal relationships, curiosity, and perseverance rather than focussing on the content of a particular discipline. Object-based learning also offers opportunities for human-centred learning, from exploring the collaborative meaning making experience (Hooper-Greenhill, 2002) to developing a greater knowledge of personal learning habits, cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1977) and disciplinary lenses (Willcocks and Barton, 2017). Both practices place the student centre stage and emphasise the value of multiple viewpoints. As such, these practices also have a role to play in contributing to the increasingly important decolonial agenda, combating structural inequalities in higher education and making arts education more inclusive (Hatton, 2015).

This chapter describes a collaboration between curriculum development staff and the Museum & Study Collection at Central Saint Martins (CSM), one of the six colleges that comprise University of the Arts London (UAL). Together we developed a new object-led learning and teaching intervention (described throughout as an ‘event’) to be delivered to students participating in the *Bigger Picture*, a four-week collaborative Unit

for second year BA students that explores the University's values in relation to questions of design theory and practice through cross-disciplinary and intercultural interaction. Our ambition was to introduce a new methodology to be used with and by students in mixed disciplinary groupings with a view to teaching them the value of engaging with a wide variety of disciplines, knowledge bases and cultures.

Iterations of the object-based teaching and learning 'event' have been run over two successive years, for between 270 and 350 students. Data on how the students and their facilitators responded to the 'event' has been gathered through evaluations, reflective essays, teaching observations and facilitator feedback, enabling us to analyse the impact of the workshops on students' knowledge, understanding and practice. This chapter will focus on the most recent 'event', which benefited from many small improvements made in response to student feedback, and which we called *Objects and Identity*.

Reading this chapter, you will gain the following three insights:

1. The potential for object-based collaborative practice to establish empathetic engagement and respect for a range of cultures, identities and disciplines.
2. The power of objects as mediators for students working across disciplines and on collaborative projects.
3. The potential for mobilising object-based learning on a large scale.

### *Overview of main sections (subsection)*

This chapter is divided into three sections. In the first section, we describe the genesis of the collaboration and how it resulted in the development of the *Objects and Identity* teaching intervention. In the second section, we explain the intervention in more detail, and offer up suggestions for how it might be emulated or replicated in other educational settings. We also acknowledge some of the challenges inherent with working with large groups of students in this context. In the third section, we describe the impact of the intervention, through our reflections as educational practitioners and as evidenced through feedback from student and teaching staff involved in the intervention. Here we explore the range of skills and competencies that can be gained from working with objects in cross-disciplinary settings and share insights from the student experience.

## **1. The background**

The collaboration arose from a combination of motivations. In 2015 a new Associate Dean of Learning, Teaching and Enhancement (AD:LTE) was appointed at CSM. Their portfolio included developing more participatory, collaborative and interdisciplinary practices across the College. At the same time, the College's Museum & Study Collection was thinking strategically about how to use its collections to better support learning and teaching across the university and working to develop its understanding and

practice around the discipline of object-based learning. Both, cross-disciplinary collaboration and object-based learning are described as areas for development in the UAL Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Strategy 2015 – 2022. In 2016 the Museum & Study Collection was brought under the management of the AD:LTE, creating new opportunities for developing innovative learning and teaching activities.

The key focus for the development of collaborative practice at Central Saint Martins is a cross-disciplinary Unit, currently known as the *Bigger Picture*, which brings together undergraduate students from BA Architecture, Ceramic Design, Graphic Communication and Product Design to work together for one month in their second year. When the activity described in this chapter was initiated, the Unit was undergoing substantial revision in response to student feedback.

At the same time, the Museum had been building a reputation for action-based research into the role of objects in supporting teaching and learning in higher education (Chatterjee and Hannah, 2015), building a solid evidence base for the potential of object-based learning to help students address troublesome knowledge and develop a wide range of transferrable skills including research, analysis, communication and team-building (Willcocks, 2015). Later research would explore the role of the object as mediator (Engeström, 1999) and as a means of encouraging self-reflection and self-knowledge in students (Willcocks and Barton, 2017).

The Museum & Study Collection worked with curriculum development staff to create an object-based learning and teaching ‘event’ that would contribute to the *Bigger Picture* by promoting respect for a range of cultures, identities and disciplines and acting as a catalyst for positive intercultural transformation. The ‘event’ was informed by recent efforts by the Museum to address the colonial through material culture, co-curated exhibitions and research initiatives and began with self-led museum visits, culminating in a half-day workshop that included talks and an object analysis session. In addition, associated teaching activities would variously explore representation, meaning making, identity and the power of objects to inspire intercultural conversations, leading to the acquisition of new skills and ways of seeing and understanding.

## **2. The practice**

### *2a: An introduction to the innovative practice*

The *Bigger Picture* learning experience breaks from subject specific teaching traditions, providing space for second year art and design students to work across disciplines, making new connections and exploring new ways of being and thinking. Cross-disciplinarity has had a long history at Central Saint Martins, reaching back to the 1950s and William Johnston’s introduction of Basic Design principals (such as colour theory,

form, line and geometry) which underpinned all subjects taught in the college (Westley and Williamson, 2015). The College's move to a new building in 2011, with huge communal spaces and shared studios, built on this legacy, facilitating the erosion of boundaries between different courses and encouraging collaborative practice.

The *Bigger Picture* goes a step further in that it requires students to work in multi-disciplinary teams to engage with a range of evolving themes, topics and ideas. Instead of knowledge transmission via lectures, large-scale 'events' that promote social learning are designed and facilitated. Teaching is thematic and based around a framework informed by the University's values and behaviours. These include social justice and sustainability, respect and diversity and creativity for positive social change. The 'events' are designed to encourage students to interact and ask questions. Students are split into groups of around thirty (working closely with one facilitator), and further broken down into teams of five or six, with a range of students deliberately drawn from across the cohort of courses. Each small team develops a project which is presented to the larger group at the end of the Unit. As part of the assessment, each student produces a reflective essay, addressing the Unit's themes and the process of working collaboratively based on their own experience.

The Unit is based on three of these 'events', all of which involve talks by practitioners followed by interactive workshops. The *Objects and Identity* 'event' keeps to the same pattern with talks by three curators or makers with links to museum practice preceding a mass object-handling session focusing on individual and collaborative meaning-making, identity, representation and respect for difference. The inclusion of the *Objects and Identity* 'event' is testament to UAL's position as an innovator in the field of object-based learning within the wider context of object-based learning in UK universities. Object-based learning as an academic discipline has been gaining traction in the UK in the last decade, driven by academic staff at University College London (Duhs, 2010; Chatterjee and Hannan, 2015) and later embraced by other higher education institutions, such as Bournemouth University (Hardie, 2015) and the University of Brighton.

Willcocks (2015) has suggested the unique ability of art and design pedagogy to contribute to debates around object-based learning, because many related teaching practices are shaped by embodied experiences or analysis of existing objects and artworks. Hence, object-based practices are well embedded in art schools, and teaching staff have often developed complex ways of conceptualising the use of objects in the curriculum design. The inclusion of object-based learning in UAL's Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Strategy 2015 – 2022 and several university-wide initiatives (including conferences and events and the instigation of an object-based learning Community of Practice) have resulted in a number of object-based teaching innovations. These include object-led self-reflection (Barton and Willcocks, 2017) where objects are used as a basis for exploring student's emotional and extra-rational responses, and ludic practice (Campbell, 2019) where structured game playing with objects generates new

ideas and new ways of seeing. A special *Libraries, Archives and Special Collections* edition of *Spark*, the UAL's online journal, details the wider UAL landscape (2019).

One of the things that distinguishes object-based learning in the art school is that it has evolved to support the development of skills and competencies specific to art and design pedagogies, including emotional intelligence, adaptability and resourcefulness (Shreeve et al., 2009). The ability to negotiate ambiguity (Shreeve et al., 2010) and the importance of the emotions (Spendlove, 2007) have also been noted as key components of art and design education. It was this focus on emotional or extra-rational responses to objects that formed the basis of the *Objects and Identity* intervention, which sought to challenge student's assumed positions and unconscious biases.

The CSM Museum & Study Collection usually runs object handling workshops for small numbers of students (between 15 to 20). Offering a handling session as part of the *Bigger Picture* required significant scaling up, as the workshops involved up to 350 students. In order to achieve this safely a great deal of forward planning was required to ensure the selection of robust but meaningful objects (between 55 – 70) and handling instructions for each piece. In spite of recruiting volunteers from other university collections there were not enough professional curatorial staff to monitor each of the tutor groups. Therefore, a training workshop was offered to all of the facilitators on the *Bigger Picture* to ensure that they were able look after the objects and lead discussions around them. Alongside the introductory course in curatorial practice and object-based learning facilitators were invited to attend a workshop on facilitating students' learning. The purpose of the workshop was to collectively develop approaches to setting up spaces for students to collaborate, connect and relate to each other throughout the unit. Furthermore, with a common approach it was hoped to achieve some form of parity in the student experience across the tutorial groups.

Learning and teaching at CSM is underpinned by a concern with social justice, diversity and the expansion of the curriculum to reflect our diverse student body (Jabbar and Mirza, 2019). It was, therefore, important to ensure that the team of facilitators was drawn from diverse backgrounds in terms of ethnicity and disciplines, and that they received appropriate training to help them understand their position, not just as teaching staff, but as agents for supporting positive intercultural and interdisciplinary exchange (Brockbank and McGill, 2007).

## *2b: A brief overview of the curriculum*

The *Bigger Picture* 'events' are not intended to be subject-specific, traditional lectures for the transmission of knowledge; instead they invite students to interact, ask questions and engage with a range of ideas. The 'events' offer a variety of perspectives and present various ways for students to develop a set of approaches to collaboration - something they can draw from not only during the Unit, but long after it has finished. In the face of

rapid change, successful learning depends on agility in responding to uncertain contexts. Therefore, the content for *Bigger Picture* is not fixed but open to change and evolves each year, depending on the speakers and facilitators who are invited to contribute as well as students' responses and interpretations of the material included.

In order to complete the *Bigger Picture* successfully, students are required to evidence their achievement of the Unit's learning outcomes in two pieces of work. The first is a collaboratively produced group project communicated in the form of an eight-minute presentation. The second is an individually produced reflective essay of c2,000 words that considers the *Bigger Picture*'s themes, topics and the process of working collaboratively. The group project and reflective essay are assessed using holistic assessment (Sadler, 2009), which requires teaching staff to respond to the student's work as a whole before mapping the quality of the work onto a notional grade scale. This allows for the recognition of personal challenges and growth and an array of skills from the integration of complex knowledge, through problem solving to innovation and creative thinking. Holistic assessment also helps to address what Gourlay (2015) describes as the tyranny of participation, where Western education systems tend to privilege a particular model of student engagement, typified by active and observable participation. Holistic assessment offers opportunities to reward less public forms of engagement, and because of the uncertainty of working across disciplines on an open-ended and collaborative project, assessors pay close attention to the depth and quality of the collaborative process, as much as the end result.

### *2c: Organisation of the innovation*

The *Objects and Identity* 'event' began with self-led visits to museums and galleries across London. All of the suggested locations were selected because of their engagement with issues of identity and all were free to enter. Examples include the *Slavery* gallery at the Museum of London: Docklands, the *Being Human* exhibition at the Wellcome collection, *A Queer Walk through British Art* at Tate Britain and *Fons Americus*, Kara Walker's Hyundai Commission at Tate Modern. Students were asked to critique the way the institutions facilitated public engagement with objects. Areas for discussion included how objects were displayed, and whether curatorial narratives embraced other cultures or allowed space for individual meaning making.

Following the self-led museum and gallery visits, the students attended a half-day workshop, which began with three short presentations from creative or curatorial practitioners who addressed race, cultural, sexual or gender identity in their work. Students then split into small, cross-disciplinary groups to carry out an exercise in object analysis, led by their group facilitators (Figure 1.). The object analysis required the students to engage with both individual meaning-making (achieved through a silent, contemplative, structured response to an object) and collaborative meaning-making

(achieved through a group ‘reading’ of the same object.) Worksheets (appendix x) were provided to help structure the object handling sessions.



*Figure 1: Students conducting an object analysis led by their group facilitator. © Silke Lange 2019.*

During the individual ‘reading’ of the object students were encouraged to explore their unique viewpoint, and how their past experiences influenced their emotional or extra-rational responses to the object. During the collaborative ‘reading’ (Figure 2) students were asked to share what the object meant to them personally, before stitching together new narratives about the object from multiple viewpoints. Time was provided at the end of the session for facilitators to discuss with their groups how much of themselves they put into their work, whether they consider how other people will encounter what they make and how issues of identity link to their practice or their *Bigger Picture* project.



Figure 2: CSM Museum & Study Collection object handling session. © Judy Willcocks 2016.

## *2d: Preparation of the innovation*

The object handling element of this teaching and learning activity was delivered using materials from an on-site teaching collection. The presence of this collection, and of the expert curatorial staff who look after it, allows for the curation of a thematic workshop, with the capacity to change year on year. Students were allocated one object per group of five students, which necessitated the selection and preparation of up to 70 Museum objects for the workshops. In keeping with the *Objects and Identity* theme, all of the objects chosen for the activity had the capacity to promote discussion around race, gender, sexuality or cultural difference. Examples include prints by the feminist printmaker Barbara Hanrahan, textiles celebrating gay culture by the textile designer John Drummond, woodcuts produced by school children in Cyrene in north Africa in the 1950s and garments made by the Thai-born designer Teerabul Songvich. It was important to balance the requirements of the workshop against the need to ensure the



safety of the Museum objects which did limit the kind of objects that could be selected and therefore the depth of discussions that ensued.

The question has been asked whether this kind of workshop could be delivered using ‘any old objects’ – not just the kind of objects that are found in a museum. The answer is that it would be possible, but that the impact of the activity would be different. There is an assumed preciousness around museum objects – what Walter Benjamin (1935/1999) describes as their ‘aura’ - that generates a greater level of reverence, engagement and interest. The presence of a relatively large collections also allows for subtler curatorial choices (such as the selection of a large number of artefacts that specifically address issues of identity). However, it is not necessary to have a special collection to deliver this kind of activity.

### **3. The outcome**

#### *3a: Student perspective*

Data on how students responded to the *Objects and Identity* ‘event’ were gathered via student evaluations (179 surveys were completed) and reflective essays submitted on completion of the group project (a sample tutorial group of 50 students was analysed). Group facilitators were asked to provide feedback of their experience of supporting the *Objects and Identity* ‘event’ and identify potential areas of impact for their students. Observational drawings, photographs and notes were also made during the object handling workshop. Appropriate permissions were sought from all parties for the use of the data in research.

Student feedback on the *Bigger Picture* in general (as evidenced in the end of unit evaluation and student reports) focussed on the benefits of working in a multi-disciplinary team and learning how other disciplines approach a question or problem. As one student explained: the *Bigger Picture* ‘enabled me to gain a fresh perspective on elements of my day-to-day practice; from questioning my core values and interest as a designer, to considering how “socially engaged” I feel my work should be.’ A number of students noted the benefits of being able to work and socialise with those from other design disciplines, as there were surprisingly few platforms to support this outside the *Bigger Picture*. Many of the student reports reflected on the experience of groupwork, from challenging their own reluctance to speak up to negotiating the complexities of group dynamics. There was a general acknowledgement that this way of collaborative working more closely reflects the realities of the professional design process than working alone or within a single discipline. This chimes with the suggestion that group work offers opportunities for learning experiences that feel authentic and relevant to the world beyond the learning institution. (Stein et al., 2004).

The student perception of the object-led ‘event’ was highly positive, with 75% of responses to the survey noting that the ‘event’ had led them to new understandings and insights. The responses were grouped thematically, with by far the largest group (25%) saying that the ‘event’ helped them to understand the importance of multiple perspectives. 10% of respondents said they had an increased understanding of the relationship between objects, individuals and society, while 10% expressed an increased understanding of the importance of keeping an open mind and engaging in analysis and critical thinking. 8% noted the power of objects to generate ideas and conversations while a final group described objects as a focal point for reflection, listening and collaboration.

The end of unit evaluations proved highly useful in providing a broad evidence base for the efficacy of the *Objects and Identity* ‘event’. It proved that the intervention did have an impact and that many of the students benefited from taking part. The negative responses (for example, a number of students noted how noisy and chaotic the object handling session felt) will also help us to modify and improve the ‘event’ for future iterations. However, it was through a close analysis of a sample of 50 student reports that the real richness of the learning experience became apparent.

Students talked about the impact of the *Objects and Identity* ‘event’ on their thinking, their approach to group working and their understanding of their discipline. A key theme was the capacity of shared experiences around objects to invigorate and change group dynamics. It was through the object analysis that many students came to have an increased respect for other group members as their cultural, geographic, disciplinary or ethnic backgrounds brought fresh insights and revealed difference in perspectives and skills. Some had continued to use the methodological frameworks shared during the *Objects and Identity* event, both to understand the work of other designers and to better understand the multiple contexts of their own work. A number of students also cited the impact the experience had had on their work as designers:

*‘At a base level I think this activity emphasises a necessity within my own practice as an Architect to interpret and critically analyse my work from the perspective of the other parties involved – particularly those who will use the space or have an existing relationship with the site.’*

*The event ‘made me think about myself as a designer and how meaningless looking objects actually are significant and have a lot of meaning behind them. I was taught to think more than just the surface of design’.*

*‘Analysing the object has influenced how I thought throughout the design process. I realised that any decision we make as a group, either if that’s adding a button in our app, or adjusting pixilation levels of the faces, has some level of influence in society, and that I am accountable and responsible for it’.*

A number of students identified the *Objects and Identity* 'event' as a transformational experience in terms of their thinking or the shaping of their group project. One student recounted: *'...the thematic and contextual links that we began to construct as a group during this time directly formed the basis of our design approach and as such had very strong links to our final outcome'*.

Feedback from the facilitators leading the object analysis element of the workshop was that it enabled students from varying disciplines and cultural backgrounds to verbalise their experiences of engaging with objects and find common (as well as different) perspectives to objects and their relationships with them. The potential for object analysis to bridge the gap between disciplines and generate intercultural conversations was also noted. As one facilitator put it: *'Some groups ran really well with their object and used it as a catalyst to generate multidisciplinary or cross-disciplinary insights.'*

There was also an emphasis on how the 'event' led to the enhancement of observational and imaginative skills, and the development of new skills, such as being open-minded in response to an object, which were, according to another facilitator: *'evidenced in most of their final proposals'*. Finally, it was felt that the skills and competencies gained through the *Objects and Identity* workshop would help prepare the students to design for uncertain futures, where designers would increasingly need to be, in the words of a facilitator: *'empathetic practitioners who can actively listen, anticipate and cater for diverse needs of diverse groups and communities'*.

### *3b: Teacher perspective*

The *Bigger Picture* Unit is an educational and social idea that encourages students and staff from different parts of the College to interact and collaborate, thereby enriching theory and practice by sharing and negotiating a range of cultural and disciplinary viewpoints. Meeting and working with new colleagues and ideas requires developing qualities of openness, empathy and teamwork, all of which are vital for graduate designers working in the world today. Throughout the Unit, we explore different methods and techniques for learning from and with each other, creating an environment of discovery. The object-based learning activity is one example of creating discursive spaces, inviting students to view objects, material and ideas from different disciplinary perspectives.

When observing the object-based learning activity, we witnessed a fuelled sense of curiosity and motivation, referred to by Norman J. Jackson and Malcolm Shaw (2006) as: *'the great engine of academic creativity is intellectual curiosity... the desire to find out, understand, explain, prove or disprove something or simply to imagine something different.'* The role of the facilitator is crucial in creating and nurturing such learning environments, requiring them to listen, engage and support the student learning, so that

learning becomes a collaborative process where knowledge is generated in an interconnected way rather than being isolated to a top down process.

This approach to teaching, which begins with the student's experience, tallies with Lev Vygotsky's suggestion that the teacher ought to construct the learning environment so that the students teach themselves: 'Education should be structured so that it is not the student that is educated, but that the student educates himself... The real secret of education lies in not teaching.' (Vygotsky cited in Neary 2010)

Working on the *Bigger Picture* gave the Museum an opportunity to be involved in a large-scale learning and teaching activity that purposefully challenged disciplinary boundaries and required students to realise a project in a cross-disciplinary group. This was the largest managed handling session ever delivered by the Museum & Study Collection and naturally prompted fears, not just for the safety of the objects, but for how the object analysis workshop would play out when led by teaching staff with limited experience of working with Museum collections. However, this experiment has proven that it is possible to replicate the kind of experiences students report in smaller, more closely managed object handling workshops for vastly bigger class sizes.

That said, there were some issues arising from the sheer size of the activity. Negative responses from the student evaluations were largely centred on the difficulty of managing an object handling session for such a large group of students, from the acoustics of the space to the limited choice of objects. Facilitators also expressed frustration that they were not better prepared in terms of knowing which objects they would be working with before the workshop took place. These are ongoing challenges for consideration, particularly as the *Bigger Picture* Unit will be expanding to more than 500 students in subsequent years. It is hoped that further forward planning, a different venue, hybrid delivery and improved training for facilitators will go some way to ironing out these issues.

## **4. Moving Forward**

There is an increasing move among Higher Education Institutions to acknowledge their position as one of privilege and power. Universities are spaces of agency which seek to have an impact on the way people think and behave and they expect their students to shape the world when they graduate.

The development of this object-based exploration of identity, meaning making and collaborative practice was rooted in notions of ethics, social justice and representation, with the emphasis placed on the student voice and the student experience. The project has proven the potential for objects and object analysis to contribute to the curriculum

developments that seek to liberate or decolonise the curriculum, enabling conversations around self-knowledge, cultural capital and identity (Hatton, 2015).

Moving forward, we will seek to further develop object-led practices to support institutional efforts to enhance cross-disciplinary practice and become more student-centred. In the light of the positive feedback for the *Objects and Identity* ‘event’ we plan to develop and enhance the object-based ‘event’ at the *Bigger Picture*, which in coming years will expand to encompass the Fine Art programme as well as additional design based subjects.

However, we acknowledge that not all feedback received from staff and students participating in the *Objects and Identity* ‘event’ was positive, and in the light of more challenging comments we have planned a number of changes to the way the ‘event’ is introduced and managed. A key development for the next iteration of the ‘event’ will be financial provision for additional curatorial support to select and prepare objects to be used in the physical handling session, and to provide enhanced information about them, which can be shared with *Bigger Picture* facilitators before the ‘event’ takes place. It is anticipated that this will further cultivate their ability to lead rich discussions around the objects.

A second development (resulting from lessons learned during the Covid-19 pandemic) will be the mobilisation of virtual learning environments in support of the physical elements of the ‘event’. Building on our experience of delivering what might be considered ‘haptic’ content online during the period of enforced physical distancing, students will be required to engage with a range of simple object-based activities, introduced via the virtual learning environment prior to the ‘event’ taking place. Thus, we anticipate that both academic staff and students will enter the object handling session with an improved understanding of what to expect and experience richer learning outcomes.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter has explored how object-based learning can be mobilised in cross-disciplinary and collaborative settings and asked whether, in that context, working with objects could introduce students to new ideas and new ways of working and thinking in an art and design environment. Feedback from students and those facilitating the object-led activity discussed in this chapter suggests that working with objects does provide new perspectives, encourages respect for others, acts as a focal point for listening and collaborating and helps unify cross-disciplinary groups as they develop their collaborative practice. On the basis of these findings we will continue to develop object-based learning and teaching activities for the *Bigger Picture* Unit and other initiatives that seek to diversify the curriculum and support student-centred learning. It is hoped

that the evidence cited in this chapter will also encourage other higher education institutions to mobilise their special collections to facilitate cross-disciplinary and intercultural learning.

## References

Barton, G. and Willcocks, J. (2017) Object-based self-enquiry: A multi- and trans-disciplinary pedagogy for transformational learning', *Spark: UAL Creative Teaching and Learning Journal*, vol. 2, no. 17, pp. 229 – 245.

Benjamin, W. (1999) *Illuminations*. London, Pimlico.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J-C. (1977) 'Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction', In J. Karabel and A. Halsey (eds) *Power and Ideology in Education*, Oxford University Press, New York. Pp 487 – 511.

Brockbank, A. and McGill, I. (2007) 'Becoming a Facilitator: Enabling Reflective Learning' in *Facilitating Reflective Learning in Higher Education*. Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press. pp 206-226.

Campbell, S. (2019) Ludic practice: the case for play in university museums in *Spark: UAL Creative Teaching and Learning Journal*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 59 – 70.

Chatterjee, H. and Hannan, L. (eds). (2015) *Engaging the Senses: Object-Based Learning in Higher Education*. Farnham, Ashgate.

Duhs, R. (2010) Learning from university museums and collections in Higher Education: University College London (UMAC Journal 3 2010, Putting University Collections to Work in Teaching and Research: Proceedings of the 9<sup>th</sup> Conference of the ICOM for University Museums and Collections)

Dzierson, I. (2010) Book review of Interkultur by Mark Terkessidis in *Transit, A Journal of Travel, Migration, and Multiculturalism in the German-speaking World*, Volume 8.1, University of California Berkeley, <http://transit.berkeley.edu/2012/dzierson/>. Accessed 29 March 2019.

Engeström, Y. (1999) 'Activity theory and individual and social transformation'. In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen, & R.-L. Punamäki (Eds.), *Perspectives on Activity Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 19-38.

Freire, P. (1968) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, Seabury Press.

- Gourley, L. (2015) 'Student engagement' and the tyranny of participation', *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 402 – 411.
- Hardie, K. (2015) *Wow: the power of objects in object-based learning and teaching*. York, Higher Education Academy, Innovation Pedagogies Series.
- Hatton, K. (2015) *Towards an Inclusive Arts Education*. Trentham Books.
- Hooper Greenhill, E. (2002) *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. New York, Routledge.
- Jabbar, A. and Mirza, M. (2019) Managing diversity: academic's perspective on culture and teaching in *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 22:5, 569-588.  
DOI:10.1080/13613324.2017.1395325
- Jackson, N. J. and Shaw, M. (2006) 'Developing Subject Perspectives on Creativity in Higher Education' in *Developing Creativity in Higher Education: An Imaginative Curriculum*. Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 89--108.
- Paris, S. G. (2002) *Perspectives on Object-Centred Learning in Museums*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.
- Sadler, D. R. (2009) 'Transforming Holistic Assessment and Grading into a Vehicle for Complex Learning' in G. Joughin (ed), *Assessment, Learning and Judgement in Higher Education*. Netherlands, Springer, pp.45 – 63.
- Shreeve, A., Sims, E. and Trowler, P. (2010) "A kind of exchange": learning from art and design teaching. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 29 (2), pp. 125-138.
- Shreeve, A., Waring, S. and Drew, L. (2009) 'Key aspects of teaching and learning in the visual arts'. In: H. Fry, S. Ketteridge and S. A. Marshall (eds), 2009. *A Handbook for teaching and learning in higher education: enhancing academic practice*. 3rd edn. Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 345-362.
- Spendlove, D. (2007) A Conceptualisation of Emotion within Art and Design Education: A Creative, Learning and Product-Orientated Triadic Schema. *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 26 (2), pp. 155 – 156.
- Stein, S., J., Isaacs, G and Andrews, T. (2004) 'Incorporating authentic learning experiences within a university course', *Higher Education*, vol. 29, no. 2, p. 240.
- Terkessidis, M. (2010) *Interkultur*. Berlin: Edition Suhrkamp.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in Society*, Harvard University Press.

Lev Vygotsky as cited in Mike Neary, “Student as Producer: A Pedagogy for the Avant-Garde?” *Learning Exchange* 1, No. 1, 6 (2010). Neary’s citation: Vygotsky, L. (1986) *Thought and Language*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, MIT Press, Cambridge.

Westley, H. and Williamson, B. (2015) ‘William Johnstone: International and Interdisciplinary Art Education’. In N. Llewellyn and B. Williamson (eds) *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World, 1960 to Now*. London, Tate Enterprises, pp. 26.??

Willcocks, J. (2015) ‘The Power of Concrete Experience: museum collections, touch and meaning-making in art and design pedagogy’ in H. Chatterjee and L. Hannan, (eds) *Engaging the Senses: Object-Based Learning in Higher Education*. Farnham, Ashgate.