

# **Can private conversation as performance act as critical pedagogy to inform and reframe restrictive and subconscious positions of the individual?**

Damali Ibreck 2020  
MA Art and Learning  
Goldsmiths University 2019 - 2021

You must have learned principles so firmly that when your desires, your appetites or your fears awaken like barking dogs, the logos will speak with the voice of a master who silences the dogs by a single command. (Plutarch from Foucault, 1984)

## **Introduction**

My intention in this essay is to explore the learning activity 'Table for Three' through a theoretical lens, examining the barriers and identifying predetermined failures that prevent the activity from achieving its aims of fostering empowerment and affecting change. I aim to explore the activity in relation to theories of assemblage, critical race and self-care. I will attempt to show the limitations of the activity examining the embedded and complex obstacles that prevent it from achieving its goals. I draw in the work of Frantz Fanon and Foucault on the possibilities of truth and offer alternative models that might still bring valuable information to the fore should participants be open to exposing themselves as they 'become undone'<sup>1</sup>.

Table for Three (TfT) is a learning activity that aimed to 'drive equality and future change in art curation' and is composed of two parts. Part 1 aims to enable learning and connection between the individuals taking part in the activity and Part 2 aims to use a recorded version of the activity (recorded performance) as a learning resource for a wider audience.

Two iterations of TfT have so far taken place, the first in the gallery space at Tate Modern, the second via the Zoom online platform. Part 1 of the activity sees three

---

<sup>1</sup> See Atkinson 2018 p 13, 20 and 42 in reference to Judith Butler's sites of learning.

participants from the arts selected<sup>2</sup> from those fitting generally into the categories of: Patron (art collector, gallerist), Artist (mid-career) and Student (or early career artists). The activity is hosted by facilitators (light touch in the live version, hidden in the online version) who set a series of questions and select an artwork for the group to discuss. The questions such as “How do you choose which artworks you support?”<sup>3</sup> are designed to be both targeted towards individuals but answerable by all participants, allowing space for disagreement and discussion as each participant reveals what they feel about their personal understanding and experience of the question.



Figure 1. Table for Three at Tate Modern



Figure 2. Table for Three held online via Zoom

Originally designed to take place in the gallery setting, each participant is seated around a triangular table. Perched at the end of a point to achieve a lateral and non-hierarchical physical experience, each participant holds equal responsibility to realise the activity. This lateral format was not as successfully achieved in the online version<sup>4</sup>. In the first iteration TtT also included the means for making, with materials placed in the centre of the table, encouraging an additional dimension of both learning within the group and learning through observation for the eventual audience.

---

<sup>2</sup> The participants are curated to enable the most opportunities for learning e.g. placing individuals from differing backgrounds, professional roles and ages who might not normally engage within a such a context (i.e. a place of potential confrontation, personal development and learning)

<sup>3</sup> A full list of questions posed for both parts of the activity is given in Appendix 1.

<sup>4</sup> Due to the formatting of the Zoom platform the equilateral presentation designed in the live version was not maintained as there is always an order of placement on the screen, relating also to when a participant joins the meeting. It was unfortunate that the patron joined first and was therefore placed at the top of any vertical screen layouts, underlining both her own and perceived conscious / subconscious assumption of power. This is an area that needs to be resolved before any subsequent delivery can take place.

The workshop at Tate Modern was held in front of MAAL students and used volunteers from the group (including a self-identified 'patron' who seemingly fit all pre-conceived notions of the stereotype<sup>5</sup>), and two additional students (a practiced and experienced artist, alongside a more unexperienced artist representing the student. All participants in this instance identify as white. The second iteration placed a white patron alongside a Muslim artist and Black, non-binary student. The making activity was withdrawn as it was decided to be too difficult to enact in the virtual space, however, as referenced later in this essay, in removing this element, a further opportunity to disturb hierarchies was lost.

The second part of the activity takes the form of presenting the recorded activity as a learning resource in itself, to a wider audience with a vested interest in the arts. The development of the activity grew first out of a desire to tackle what we perceived to be the main influencing barrier to minoritised<sup>6</sup> groups truly becoming more represented and included within the gallery, collections and Canon i.e. the Patron<sup>7</sup>. We discussed the need to open up learning spaces whereby each individual is learner and teacher in a constant transaction, creating a reciprocal trichotomy of learning sites detailed in the table below.

---

<sup>5</sup> The stereotype is recognised for this essay as a person who is white, wealthy, very assertive and confident yet who reveals through comments and questions, a total lack of understanding of the lived realities of the art that they purport to support and understand e.g. *"I'd never thought about it that way..."*

<sup>6</sup> The term minoritized communities is commonly used within Critical Race Theory in opposition to the more commonplace term 'minority communities'. Minoritised communities recognises, more accurately describes and highlights the imposition of a set of determining codes applied by a dominant majority to distinguish communities as 'other', seeking to contain such communities as unequal to the majority. The term 'minority communities' also fails to place these groups within a wider global context providing an unrealistic view of the global demographics, serving to uphold a dominant white, heteronormative view. (See Gilborn, 2008, Rollock and Gillborn 2011).

<sup>7</sup> Tate receives 40% of its funding from private Patrons.

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Lacking / Seeking</b>	<b>Holding</b>
<b>Student</b>	Experience and knowledge of how to progress within the existing institutions.	Burgeoning ideas, energy for change, fresh perspectives of what the present is and future can be, knowledge of themselves.
<b>Artist</b>	Pathways to transform and surmount perceived barriers to equality and representation within existing institutions.	Knowledge of the institution: inc the experience of compromise, precarity and discomfort of attempting to hold space within the institution. A knowledge of themselves split between the professional and personal.
<b>Patron</b>	Connected empathetic understanding of the experience of minoritised artists experience of, attempts at and actual progression through the institution.	A set of conscious and subconscious rules and codes influenced by and developed through existing systems entrenched in centuries of lopsided development.

TfT aims to use critical pedagogy as a tool to tackle and redress the hierarchical structure omnipresent within the Institution<sup>8</sup>, attempting to remind patrons and those perceived as being gatekeepers within the arts, of the value of continuous learning about the lived experience of the structures they help to uphold and the need to dismantle or at least unsettle these in service of equality. Despite professing to welcome in the 'Other', The Institution is seen by many from currently excluded communities<sup>9</sup> as incapable of truly offering an 'ownership'<sup>10</sup> of their space. My approach is supported by Freire's explanation of the oppressors need to maintain power: *"what is to his (the oppressors) interest is for the people to continue in a state of submersion, impotent in the face of oppressive reality."* (Freire, 2014 p.52) and underlined by Critical Race Theory which asserts the pervasive, embedded nature of racism throughout our continuing everyday structures and systems.

Annette Krauss has described the need for institutions to 'unlearn' i.e. to perform "an active critical investigation of normative structures..." (Krauss and Choi 2017 p.68) and refers to a recent wave of forums that focus on, "a common struggle to

<sup>8</sup> The Institution refers throughout to a grouping of art museums, institutions and galleries in the UK and Europe.

<sup>9</sup> Including all communities who identify with the feeling of exclusion from represented and included in mainstream arts institutions.

<sup>10</sup> In a recent discussion, hosted by Iniva with curators from Manchester Art Gallery and the artist Jade Montserrat the idea of being offered 'ownership' from a gallery was discussed. Views suggested that the idea of offering ownership was misplaced, e.g. "has anyone asked whether I would want to own anything within those spaces?" "Why would I want to own anything in a space that doesn't welcome me or represent me?"

change such institutions from within.”(Ibid), pointing out that following these forums, often ‘no action’ is taken to address the issues identified. Her own project, “Site of Unlearning” based at Casco uses various approaches to try and achieve institutional unlearning (from staff cleaning the office to reconsidering the use of computer technologies) and connects strongly with Spivak’s suggestion to “short circuit” rather than “re-examine (the) argument and its premise.” (Ibid). This is an approach that I agree with as necessary to break existing habits of subconscious privilege which prevent real learning from taking place. Extending the table above, Tft’s learning outcomes could be described thus:

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>
<b>Student</b>	Gained from the artist / patron and themselves in reaction to the group: A greater understanding of the mechanics of institutions and how to navigate within them. A deeper insight to the role and approach of the patron. A deeper understanding of how their current thinking and practice sits in the wider landscape.
<b>Artist</b>	Gained from the student/ patron and themselves in reaction to the group: A greater understanding of the changes in outlook from the younger generations of artist, a confirmed or contrasting understanding of the patron’s approach and considerations.
<b>Patron</b>	Gained from the student/artist and themselves in reaction to the group: An understanding of the lived experience of students and artists from minoritised groups within the arts and society and how the role of the patron continues to uphold a system of inequality and bias.

Tft pertains to create private conversations with the notion that such conversations provide space for vulnerability, truth, honesty and challenge, believing that it is a personal shift in thinking (in unlearning) that will create change. The aim is to then use these relational conversations with their elicited dynamics as a learning tool for others. In the first instance a difficulty arises with the idea of finding truth within ‘private conversation’ as the success of the pedagogies involved in Tft rely in part on participants willingness to recognise and expose their truths. This potential exposure risks an initially private but then public ‘becoming undone’ a site of letting go of deeply held ideas or instincts, in front of people you don’t know, being recorded to be picked apart at a later date. It presents a risk to the Artist and

Student who will perhaps meet with the Patron or her peers at a later date outside of the safety found in the sympathetic framing of the activity, and without the backup of their community peer. Perhaps also, the risk of this is too much for the Patron or those who do not recognise at a personal level the need for any shifts to be made.

Within the Zoom based activity, a prime example of the potential for future embarrassment (and feelings of entrapment which would eradicate any positive learning) can be seen in the following interaction between the Patron and student:

**Patron:** “(When looking at art) I don’t start from a position of wanting to know about colour or gender or faith or anything... I’d rather look at art ‘blind’.”

**Student:** “Do you not worry that if we look at art ‘blind’ we would be looking at it through the lens that we’ve been taught in our education: a very patriarchal, heteronormative, white lens.”

**Patron:** “I’d like to believe I can look beyond that.”

This statement belies a lack of understanding about the lived experience of people of colour and those of minoritised groups, for if you are in a position where you can choose not to look at the complex issues of colour, gender and faith it simply demonstrates the position of privilege that you hold. I want to introduce here Fanon’s writing on “the Negro is comparison” (Fanon 2008 p.163) i.e. the impossibility of forming a true identity within a structure that forms you in comparison<sup>11</sup> and the asymmetrical ontology that is the colonised space (in which Britain is still rooted) to bring in the question of whether it is possible for us to change the system from within at all when the space is ultimately controlled by the coloniser. It feels (particularly in reviewing the responses to the current Black Lives Matter protests from arts institutions) that a more radical approach needs to be taken if we ever hope to create a level playing field.

---

<sup>11</sup> See Lornezini and Tazzioli 2016 and Fanon 2008 p 163.

This is not about solving paradoxes or synthesizing different points of view from the outside, as it were, but rather about the material intra-implication of putting “oneself ” at risk, troubling “oneself,” one’s ideas, one’s dreams, all the different ways of touching and being in touch, and sensing the differences and entanglements from within. (Barad)

For TtT to work for the Patron, I suggest that a ‘becoming undone’ can only happen via a ‘short-circuit’ or through an experience of emotional pain that breaks or creates a shift in his or her thinking, creating the different patterns of re-lationality that Barad describes above. Otherwise the whole that is the current status quo of the Patron will not shift no matter how much of a surface connection he / she seems to make within the other participants. I would go further though that even if there is an unlearning that gives space to new ways of thinking and being, in relation to Fanon’s asymmetrical ontology, we still are unable to shift out of the structure that holds the Patron in place. What is at stake (or rather what both the structure and therefore the patron are afraid of) is the potential loss of face, situation and power that they have established. I’d like to briefly comment on viewing the Patron (holding their bias) as an assemblage (in relation to Delanda’s interpretation of Deleuze and Guattari’s theory). The Patron is then part of a larger assemblage of organisations, which is then part of an even larger political and socio-economic assemblage (and /or narrative). If you think of that Whole in the frame of Critical Race Theory and in terms of the neo-liberalist agenda, one can visualise how entwined and embedded the systems are that uphold the current structure of the Institution. Whilst at one point within this vast assemblage you might find a de-territorialisation<sup>12</sup> of a component that shifts and attempts to move out, the larger assemblage is still strong enough to remain intact. I posit this specifically to also bring in Deleuze’s rhizomatic theory as a possible alternative and suggest that we need to de-territorialise the Whole and start again!

---

<sup>12</sup> DeLanda 2017

The rhizomatic theory relates also to the work of Juha Yung who, using Freire and Ranciere, suggests that to move out of their current oppressor / oppressed dynamic, museums should adopt an ecological mind-set and a complete de-professionalisation of the museum. An example for how an element of this can work might be found within the 'Marc Vaux' programme at Museum of Montparnasse. Mélanie Bouteloupe describes the programme objectives as "to build stories of individuals adrift, exiles and cultural exchange, exploring the social life of artworks". This has the effect of broadening the artwork substantially:

...so we can map who passed through Montparnasse throughout the twentieth century and get a sense of the circumnavigations of ideas and individuals that influenced each other. (Bouteloupe, 2017 P.80)

This creates a rhizomatic artwork that could potentially negate the hierarchy within the work itself which provides the basis for collecting / purchase of works by Patrons. Could the dismantling of the Institution re-assign the Patrons to supporting a broader more egalitarian artistic pursuit?

The idea of abandoning the Institution is certainly one that resounds with colleagues of colour and myself who feel that incremental changes will not be enough to realign an asymmetrical ontology. Jung continues: "As long as museum's function like the oppressed-oppressor relationship, their practices will not be able to change in an inclusive and democratic way." (p.275)

What also skews the balance for any larger shift towards achieving the goal of TfT's part 1, is that for change to occur, the weight of the learning must be on the Patron, ergo the weight of the teaching falls on the minoritised communities. This is a consistent pattern that we see repeated throughout institutions 'tackling racism' or inequality, the onus is placed on the 'other' to help those in the dominant position understand. This fails to recognise the emotional and psychological energy that it



takes to discuss your own (and centuries of your friends and family's) 'Othering', it also further positions the Other as subordinate to the heteronormative subject as there is no equal exchange.<sup>13</sup>

What might carry more impact towards change is the reviewing of the activity as a learning resource within institutional / organisational groups, potentially for staff training. The opportunities arise here to observe and pick apart the interactions and expressions, to pause, rewind and relisten for the unconscious bias for the moments of recognition and resistance. I am thinking here of 1) Justin Infinito's insistence on the importance of group discussion following the inaction of Jane Elliot's "Blue Eyed, Brown Eyed"<sup>14</sup> exercise and 2) studies on the efficacy of peer observation in teacher development.

First, Infinito talks about his students experience of learning from the exercise, not just from the physical and mental impact of the experience, but most fruitfully from the group discussions that follow the experience:

It is not that we are conjoined by having similar reactions, but that we were present at the same event and can construct knowledge of that event together from our diverse perspectives... (Infinito, 2003 p.74)

It is in the voicing of the experience in relation to their other lived experiences of the group that cements their learning through emotion and relational connection.

Peer observation in teaching has long been used to review and grade a teacher's ability, because of this it carries a counterproductive reputation for instilling fear, and expectation of judgement. However, when used for peer to peer learning and by handing over elements of control to those being observed (allowing for trust to be at the forefront, i.e. trust in the observer, trust in the reasons for the

---

<sup>13</sup> See Reni Eddo -Lodge 2017 for further exploration of this recurring problem.

<sup>14</sup> Jane Elliot's exercise is aimed at creating a real sense of the painful injustice of racism and prejudice. involves her splitting a class of pupils into those with brown eyes and those with blue. She thereafter bestow's preferential treatment on the brown eyed pupils supporting their learning and is dismissive, harsh and unsupportive of learning towards the blue eyed pupils. She began this exercise in 1968 after the death of Martin Luther King Jr and continues to deliver it today.

exercise), Thomson, Hendry and Bell found that teachers experienced great benefit and in some cases voluntarily repeated the exercise at regular intervals to support personal and professional development.

The reported usefulness of 'just watching' also led us to wonder what it was about it that enabled academics' learning to remain at the forefront. Could it be that 'just watching' encourages academics to focus on what they perceive to be important for their development? Could it be that 'just watching' allows academics to set the 'teaching problem' for themselves? (p 1061)

In Tft's part 2. reviewing others as they stumble through an activity would automatically provide an element of safety from which to observe and critique. It is a hyper familiar position for us now to 'regard the pain of others' replayed on a screen, and using others perceived failures or successes as a resource, provides a distance which would allow an observing group the space needed to grasp openly at the complex issues Tft attempts to explore. It is interesting to reflect that the work that goes into enacting Tft part 1 could simply be the foundation of a larger and more impactful learning site of part 2 and needs to be tested.

The benefits of demographically selecting groups to review and learn together through Tft part 1 might be further explored when considering David Gillborn's comment that:

Whites should be included in the focus on White privilege in that the responsibility in educating other whites rests heavily with them. Their experiential knowledge of the construct enables them to unpack the intricate and subtle functions of White privilege and its various rationales. (2008)

This also then reduces the expectation of explanation and answers to come only from the minoritised community. It also has the potential to mirror a pattern of support that is currently enacted within these communities whereby there is a call, unspoken rule, ambition for those who attain privilege within and despite the system to pass this on, open doors, bringing others from the community with them.

**Conclusion:**

In this essay I have attempted to explore whether barriers that exist on conscious and subconscious levels within the Patron, (embedded by and within a longstanding structure of pervasive societal racism) are too great for part 1 of TtT's original objectives of 'affecting real change' through shifting the mindset of individual Patrons. Particularly when adhering to a lateral and non-hierarchical approach. The call from the Artist participant Hassan Vawda to receive information on the Patron in advance of the activity, "*so that the Student and I could meet beforehand and discuss how we might approach them (the patron)*" does not support the egalitarian approach of the activity but if the activity is taking place in order to address an asymmetrical ontology then it stands to reason that the activity must be skewed the other way.

Opportunities such as being more careful around the selection of the artwork used in the activity, choosing an artist/ artwork that is not easily linked to the Institution would also remove the immediate hierarchy of the Patron's assumption of greater knowledge or understanding. So too by offering more power to the Artist and Student through the retention of a making activity (which might push the Patron outside of a comfort zone) we might be able to better support an interaction that creates a 'short-circuit' with any hope of a shift in understanding. It is in the wider Institution however that the work needs to be done. There is a quid pro quo at work between the Institution and the Patron that (unconsciously or consciously) maintains the exclusion of minoritised groups and the work carried out by many of the larger organisations under the guise of addressing this, falls incredibly short both in impact and authenticity<sup>15</sup>.

Critical Race Theory acknowledges the importance of the lived experience and the personal narrative in influencing opinion (and law making) and so the theory that the personal connection that might take place between the Artist, Student and Patron to

---

<sup>15</sup> In discussion with black and brown artists and those from the LGBTQ+ community that work or have worked within organisations such as Tate, there is a deep rooted suspicion of opportunities which often come in short bursts, as part of a larger 'trend', are not sustained throughout the organisation and remain at surface level and are wholly expected to come to an abrupt end.

support a de-territorialisation is of value. In their exploration of Foucault, Fernet-Betancourt, Becker, Gomez-Muller describe his analysis of Ancient practices of self-care that inherently link to the formation of as the self as an ethical being. They state, “that there is no one ‘liberation’, more perhaps that one liberation gives way to additional liberatory pursuit.” (1984 p.114) and that,

In order for the self to free itself to become the ethical citizen required to form an ethical society<sup>16</sup> one must exercise ‘technologies of the self’ requiring perpetual meditation, reflection and consideration of vigilance.

How then to support this if the self still has to maintain its position within a much larger whole designed to repress a more ethical self in support of a neo-liberalist understanding of self-care as self-centred?

This is not about solving paradoxes or synthesizing different points of view from the outside, as it were, but rather about the material intra-implication of putting “oneself” at risk, troubling “oneself,” one’s ideas, one’s dreams... (Barad, K 2012, p.77)

The risk that the Patron takes is too great within this activity however in order for the activity to work in both part 1 and part 2 we need the patron to sacrifice themselves either willingly or unwittingly to be able to gain any substantial benefit towards real change.

---

<sup>16</sup> “A city in which everyone would be correctly concerned for self would be a city that would be doing well. And it would find therein the ethical principle of its stability.” Foucault 1984, p 118)

## Reference List:

Atkinson, Dennis. *Art, Disobedience, and Ethics : The Adventure of Pedagogy*. 2018. Print. Psychoanalysis, Education, and Social Transformation.

Barad, K, Kleinmann A, 2012 Title. "Intra-actions" *Mousse*, [online] (34), p.76-81 Available at: <https://www.academia.edu/1857617/ Intra-actions Interview of Karen Barad by Adam Kleinmann>

De Landa, Manuel. *New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. Annotated ed. Bloomsbury UK, 2006. Web.

DeLanda, Manuel. 2017. *A Comparison of Deleuze's Assemblage Theory and the New Materialist Approach*, University of the Aegean, Greece accessed via <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VzJqOX4ASA8>

Eddo-Lodge, Reni. *Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People about Race*. Bloomsbury UK 2018.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Pluto Press London, 2008.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed : 30th Anniversary Edition*. S.I.: Bloomsbury (USA), 2014. Web.

Fornet-betancourt, raúl *et al.* (1987) 'The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom: an interview with Michel Foucault on January 20, 1984', *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 12(2-3), pp. 112-131. doi: [10.1177/019145378701200202](https://doi.org/10.1177/019145378701200202).

Gillborn, David. *Racism and Education Coincidence or Conspiracy?* London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Infito, Justen. Jane Elliot Meets Foucault: The Formation of Ethical Identities in the Classroom. *Journal of Moral Education* 32 .1 (2003): 67-76. Web.

Jung, Yuha. "The Art Museum Ecosystem: A New Alternative Model." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 26.4 (2011): 321-38. Web.

Lorenzini, Daniele, and Martina Tazzioli. "Confessional Subjects and Conducts of Non-Truth: Foucault, Fanon, and the Making of the Subject." *Theory, Culture & Society* 35.1 (2018): 71-90. Web.

Thomson, Kate, Amani Bell, and Graham Hendry. "Peer Observation of Teaching: The Case for Learning Just by Watching." *Higher Education Research & Development* 34.5 (2015): 1060-062. Web.

O'Neill, Paul, Lucy Steeds, Mick Wilson, Fondation LUMA, and Bard College. Center for Curatorial Studies. *How Institutions Think: Between Contemporary Art and Curatorial Discourse*. 2017. Print. Includes:

- Day, Pip When the Colonizer Comes to Stay
- Choi, B and Krauss, A. Unlearning Institution: Do as You Present (or Preach)

## **Appendix 1**

### **Table for Three Questions Asked in Part 1 and 2**

#### **Participant Questions:**

How would you make decisions about the artworks you support?

What reasons might you have for making artworks with a specific outcome in mind?

How do you think your education has influenced your appreciation and understanding of artworks?

#### **Audience Questions and Feedback**

##### **What did you enjoy about watching Table for Three? Why?**

A1: It was particularly interesting hearing how the group collectively un-packed particular terms and assumptions, and the various roles and attitudes they brought to their engagement of art. [...] The resulting infrastructure of support around artists that it revealed was far more complicated, and collective, than the traditional framings you would find in a museum or gallery's workforce. By allowing the individuals to also interpret and unpack the questions, it led to different ways of thinking about art than I would have anticipated.

##### **What did you not enjoy about watching Table for Three? Why?**

A2: Didn't like the continued control from the invisible activity - it made the reaction from the group sometimes seem a little less genuine and felt controlled.

##### **What did you learn from watching the activity?**

A3: it reminded me about how much more work there is to be done to make the art world reflect diverse cultures and artworks but also how much an individual's world view depends on circumstances - and that the more these different worlds can collide (like in this conversation) the better it will might be for learning, but this depends on what happens after the conversation, I think.

##### **Who do you think could gain from watching the activity?**

A1: Directors and Senior Management in museums could gain a lot from the qualitative insight the video puts forward. As a methodology, I think this could be used as a way of creating a more equitable conversation between artists, gallerists, curators and funders.

What can we do to make your experience better / create more impact?

A3: Move the conversation out of the film and into the real world of those taking part in the conversation (or those listening to it) in some way [...] Maybe also make the conversations/films available more widely in the commons.

**Would you take part in the activity yourself? (If yes or no please state why)**

A3: I think these are good opportunities to engage on topics with people who I wouldn't normally have access to in this way.

**Would you watch other Table for Three sessions? Please give a reason.**

A1: The dialogic nature of the conversation complicates a lot of concepts and ways of framing arts and museums practice in a way that could be productive for the sector. The focuses of the discussion also seem to have no final answer, so more perspectives would help with developing my own view.

A3: I enjoy engaging in these kinds of conversations – to have my own views challenged or grown.

**Please add any other comments, suggestions or thoughts you might have.**

A1: This would be a great tool to use as part of a commissioning process in an arts/museums context. If not for any other reason, the conversation made explicit that each individual brings to bear a whole range of different personas, interests, motivations, needs and aspirations to their engagement with art, not simply their professional 'role' or 'function'. This is something we often forget when working within a particular role of function within the arts sector.

A2: Editing speakers would help the audience [...] Questions would need to be introduced more quickly or opened up more to illicit more expansive discussion.