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ABSTRACT

This qualitative study defined the hermeneutic approach as a strategy for developing museum education programs, and examined its implementation in two museum settings. A hermeneutic research methodology was used to design, interpret, and explain the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development and its implementation by two museum educator research participants, a co-developer and an implemener. Four sequential stages comprised the study that addressed the following questions: What is the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development? How does the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development work? What does the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development offer to museum educators?

In Stage One, elements of hermeneutics, curriculum theory, pedagogy, and museology were drawn from a review of the literature to define the hermeneutic approach. The hermeneutic approach was aligned to an interpretive curriculum theory paradigm. After establishing its theoretical foundation, the hermeneutic approach was diagrammed as a template for guiding the development of museum education programs that included the following components: curriculum topic, museum's mandate, storyline, themes, artifacts, and program: pre-understanding, meaning-in-context, connectedness, process, experience, and communication.

Stage Two continued with the introduction of the co-developer, a seasoned museum educator who assisted in refining the hermeneutic approach template by piloting its implementation in the development of a museum education program. Insights gained
from this stage were used to modify the hermeneutic approach for Stages Three and Four of the study.

The hermeneutic principles of pre-understanding, meaning-in-context, connectedness, process, experience, and communication were used as a format for conducting a workshop to teach the hermeneutic approach to seasoned and novice museum educators in Stage Three.

According to the study's design, the Stage Four museum educator implementer autonomously developed a museum education program using the hermeneutic approach. A back and forth interplay between the experiences of the co-developer in Stage One and the implementer in Stage Four was mediated by the research to examine the template and its components. Results of the study indicate that the hermeneutic approach forces museum educators to move away from an objectives-based program planning strategy, thus redefining the role of artifact interpretation.
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CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

It's typical. It's the only way I know. It's the way I've been taught.

- Sandy, museum educator and research participant

Prologue

The idea for this research, to examine the hermeneutic approach as a strategy for developing museum education programs, germinated in 1994 when I began to question how I defined museum education, interpretation, and program development. By then I had been a museum educator for five years. Having entered the field as a trained teacher, I transferred or adapted most of what I had learned about pedagogy to my new role of museum educator to perform the program development duties. I used the objectives-based format for lesson planning that I had learned as a teacher to develop museum education programs. After several years of planning programs following the same pattern, I became curious about the existence of alternative strategies, so I enrolled in a museum education workshop to learn different program development techniques. Unsatisfied with the strategies suggested by other museum professionals, and speculating that current perspectives of curriculum theory exist to inform my program development practice, I entered a doctoral program in curriculum studies.
Early in my studies I happened upon the term "hermeneutics" as a theory of text interpretation and was immediately intrigued by its potential as a strategy for artifact interpretation. Hermeneutic principles had implications not only for the way artifacts are interpreted but also for the roles of visitors and tour guides during the interpretive event. Since the program planning strategies used by other museum educators did not meet my needs, I decided to create my own by modifying the hermeneutic principles. What evolved was a conceptual framework for museum education program development that incorporated pedagogy, museology, hermeneutics, and curriculum theory. It became an alternative planning strategy to my typical objectives-based pattern; I have called it the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. This study illuminates the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development by examining its conceptual and theoretical development, its potential as a program planning strategy, and its application by a co-developer and an implemeneter.

**Background to the Study**

As a novice museum educator newly employed in the museum field, my duties included evaluating the effectiveness of programs in meeting teachers' curricular needs, revising existing programs to maintain curricular ties, and developing new programs for various grades that incorporated curriculum topics and artifacts from the museum. My teacher training and employment provided me with knowledge and experience in creating objectives-based lesson plans, and I simply transferred this approach to the development of museum education programs. Each program was like a social studies lesson for classroom use, except that it was held in the museum. I imagined that the museum lesson fit within a unit of study on a particular topic. For example, in 1994 I developed a grade
four/five program for the Diefenbaker Canada Centre called *Vote For Me!* I envisioned the program as a culminating activity in a civics unit about the election process. Pre- and post-visit materials accompanied the program to help teachers prepare their classes to visit the museum late in the unit. The process of creating the program began with a search of the grade four and five social studies curricula to find a suitable topic (i.e. government) to act as a foundation. Next, I developed a key learning objective to give focus to the program (e.g., the students will learn about the election process through the example of former Prime Minister Diefenbaker). I conducted a pre-assessment to determine what students should already know when they come to participate in the program. For example, in class they should have learned about political parties and how candidates are selected so that the activities at the museum are a natural extension of their classroom learning. Then, I wrote three behavioural objectives: knowledge (e.g., the students will know that the election process involves campaigning by candidates and voting by constituents); skills (e.g., the students will learn to vote by participating in a mock election day); and values (e.g., the students will appreciate their right to vote). In the next step, I concentrated on developing learning experiences at the museum that realize the objectives. The ten minute introduction, or motivational set, begins with a welcoming of the students to the Centre. It also includes a check via questioning to determine what had been completed in class prior to the visit, to review what students have learned in class that will be needed for the museum learning experience, and to focus students' attention on the topic at hand. It is expected that at least two brave students from the class will have agreed to let their names stand as candidates for election. The next twenty minutes is spent in the permanent Diefenbaker gallery learning about the art and science of
campaigning. To realize the skills and values objectives, the students move to a different area of the museum that has been set up to resemble a polling station where they vote in a mock election. If the teacher has completed the pre-visit materials and has properly prepared the class, then the two student candidates may give their final speeches convincing voters that theirs is the best platform. At this point, the students learn polling station etiquette and the proper way to mark a ballot. During the election, the tour guide conducting the program, whose name is also on the ballot as a potential candidate, does as many illegal things as possible. These include trying to buy votes with candy, going behind the screen to see how constituents are voting, distributing campaign materials in the polling station, trying to register his or her pet to vote, and trying to vote more than once. A vote count is conducted after everyone has voted, and the winner is declared. The teaching strategy employed for the two twenty minutes segments that constitute the body of the lesson is primarily a lecture format, with students working independently. A ten minute activity in the replica rooms of the gallery concludes the program. At this time, the two student candidates are allowed to sit at the desk in the Prime Minister's office and the Privy Council Chamber in order to introduce the post-election events of selecting a cabinet by the Prime Minister and the role of the opposition party. We ask the teacher to complete an evaluation at the end of the program to determine if their expectations have been met. The tour guide can also write comments about the program on the back of the evaluation form.

The development and implementation of *Vote For Me!* was a linear process, with the tour guide directing the flow of the program. For five years, this had been my typical pattern of program development. I had always done it this way because it was an
adaptation of the way I had been taught to develop lesson plans as a teacher. The theory supporting this approach to lesson, and, by extension, to program development, derived from a traditional or empirical analytic orientation of curriculum theory influenced largely by Tyler (1949) and Taba (1962). A more thorough examination of this paradigm is presented in Chapter Three. However, after five years of planning programs from a traditional perspective, I began to question if this was the best or only way of interpreting and applying curriculum within a museum setting. Questions surfaced that needed answers: What is museum education? What are the current trends of curriculum development and implementation? What else is there besides the traditional or empirical analytic perspective? Would another approach be as effective, or perhaps more effective?

My search for new program planning methods led me to a one-day Museums and Education workshop conducted by the Museums Association of Saskatchewan (MAS) in 1995. The approach suggested by the Museums Association is offered in the form of a "checklist for a complete education program" (Museums Association of Saskatchewan, 1995, HO.6). It recommends that the following sequence be followed in the development of a program: content (the subject or display to be interpreted), audience (the characteristics of the visitors for whom the program is designed), research (of the subject, audience, artifacts), learning objective (program goals), method (activity that will meet the objectives), resources (artifacts, equipment), administration (budget, advertising, training of docents), and evaluation.

The checklist has similar structure and content characteristics to the lesson plan format that I adapted for use in program development. Both are structured in a linear-sequential manner. Both contain the writing of objectives, although mine are more clearly
defined and comprehensive in their distinction of knowledge, skills, and values. The pre-
assessment of my strategy loosely matches the checklist's audience step. Although both
the pre-assessment and audience steps address students' characteristics, they do so only in
a general way. In the Vote For Me! program, for example, pre-assessment assumes that
students bring to the museum visit a common knowledge base about the political process;
any personal knowledge or individual experience is ignored. The information that all
students have learned in class that they bring to the visit is used as a foundation on which
to build the new learning at the museum. Similarly, the audience step in the checklist
examines common attributes shared by visitors of the age group for which the program is
targeted. Neither the pre-assessment nor the audience steps address cultural differences,
multiple intelligences within the class, or personal experiences.

The method and resources steps of the checklist are similar to the main body of
the visit in my plan that incorporates activities in the galleries as learning experiences.
Artifacts are selected in the methods and resources steps. Evaluation is a key element of
both plans.

The workshop did not provide me with the theoretical foundation of the checklist,
and I wondered: Who developed the checklist? and, Where did they get the ideas for the
eight steps? With the elements of objectives, methods, resources and evaluation, it might
be assumed that the checklist is a product of the empirical analytic orientation of
curriculum development. One positive characteristic of the checklist was that it seemed to
address issues of budgeting, artifact selection, and advertising that are important
considerations in museum education program development. However, the checklist did
not prove to be a suitable alternative program development strategy because it held the
same view of the roles of the tour guide and students as my typical program planning strategy. In both the checklist and my typical strategies, artifacts were used as aids to achieve the objective, yet I desired a strategy that would accentuate the role of artifacts. I also wanted a program development model that would actively involve students in constructing knowledge that incorporated their own life experiences. Finally, I wanted a strategy that was different from my typical program planning method to improve the quality of my programs. The checklist was too similar to my typical method of program development in its view of tour guides, students, and structuring and presenting the learning experience to capture my interest. My search for other strategies resumed.

Another strategy for interpreting with artifacts for use in a museum education program is the object-based lesson (English & Lipton-Doidge, 1997; Hooper-Greenhill, 1994). In this approach, an artifact is "read" to glean factual information about its function and composition; a more detailed examination of object-based learning is provided in Chapter Three. My understanding of this approach is that the focus of the lesson is reading one object extensively, and this is the point with which I take issue. In some instances, the object is unfamiliar, like an unfamiliar word in a sentence. One way to identify, or develop an understanding of, an unfamiliar word is by analyzing the context in which the word is situated (Thorn & Braun, 1974). Clues found in the sentence or paragraph and in illustrations surrounding the word assist the reader in deciphering the meaning of the word. Similarly, the surrounding objects in a display often contribute to a contextual analysis of the unfamiliar object. In an object-based lesson the context is not typically presented, which I believe changes the nature of the interpretation. If contexts
help students analyze words, then a display, like a sentence or paragraph, acts as a context to help students analyze an object.

The object-based lesson as a museum education program also did not appeal to me as a program development strategy for reasons similar to the checklist and my typical method. I did not believe that students were as engaged in the learning process as they could be if they were encouraged to connect new learnings to prior experiences and knowledge. I also view the object-based lesson as an independent learning activity where students interact with the object but not necessarily with each other; my preference is to provide opportunities for communication between students that promotes a sharing and clarification of ideas.

In 1996 I began my doctoral studies at the College of Education in the Department of Curriculum Studies. Through my course work, I began to receive answers to my questions. In addition to the empirical analytic orientation of curriculum, I learned that critical theory and interpretive orientations existed that proved to be transferable to museum education programs. Each orientation has a different view of pedagogy that influences the development of learning experiences for students. The role of the teacher and the student varies with each paradigm, as does the view of how knowledge is acquired. When adapted for use in the museum, each orientation provides a different perspective from which to develop a program that in turn influences how artifacts are used and how children are engaged in the learning process. Chapter Three outlines the various orientations and their implications for museum education program development, and my reasons for choosing a particular paradigm in which to situate the hermeneutic
approach to museum education program development. An overview of museum education is also provided in Chapter Three.

In 1997, I attended a three-day workshop sponsored by the American Association for State and Local History in New Orleans called Interpretation and Community History. The approach to museum program development suggested at this workshop was slightly different than the Museums and Education checklist, although it was not targeted at program development specifically for school groups. The most notable difference in this approach is the lack of objectives. Instead of writing objectives, a storyline provides direction for the program. Flowing from the storyline is the selection of three to five themes to be fleshed out in the program. Evidence, such as artifacts, is then selected to demonstrate aspects of the themes. Using themes to organize the information that will be addressed during a tour presented the possibility of introducing more artifacts to the visitor. However, missing from the New Orleans workshop was any mention of how a curriculum topic would fit into the program. It also appeared to me that there was less structure for docents (museum volunteers that act as teachers) or tour guides for starting and concluding the program. Similar to my typical strategy, the tour guide was the expert delivering the program via lecture to the visitors. Although the storyline-theme approach was an alternative, it did not meet my needs as a thorough program development strategy that incorporates curriculum and students' prior knowledge. A question remained in my mind about this approach's theoretical foundation; I could not attach the approach to a curriculum orientation.

Early in my doctoral studies, I encountered the term, "hermeneutics" (Aoki, 1980). Further investigation (Palmer, 1969) revealed that hermeneutics, meaning
interpretation, has traditionally been applied to the interpretation of biblical and classical texts. It seemed to me that the philosophy of hermeneutics could be transferred to artifact interpretation and adapted to fit an approach for museum education program development. If so, the approach would need to be linked to a curriculum orientation to provide the theoretical foundation that was lacking in the other strategies I had seen. My task was to define a hermeneutic approach to museum education program development by establishing its philosophical and theoretical foundations, and to uncover how it might work when applied by other museum educators. In contrast to the other approaches I had seen, I thought that using hermeneutics would allow the message of the artifact to be communicated to the visitor. I also saw the possibility of making an encounter with artifacts more meaningful to visitors because they were encouraged to relate it to their prior knowledge and experiences. As a researcher, my task was to design a study that would define the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development and examine its interpretation by museum educators.

Purpose and Design of the Research

The purpose of this research was to examine the conceptual underpinnings of a practical approach for developing museum education programs using hermeneutic principles and to investigate its potential in a museum education setting. To accomplish this, the research was separated into four stages. As a result of the staged sequential nature of the research, I was able to collect and analyze data about the hermeneutic approach template from its theoretical beginnings in Stage One, to its practical interpretation by an implementer in Stage Four.
Briefly, the hermeneutic approach is a strategy for developing museum education programs that is both theoretical and practical. It is diagrammed as a template with steps to follow for planning programs. Incorporated into the steps or components are elements significant to museum education programs: curriculum, the museum's mandate, artifacts, and hands-on experiences for visitors. A diagram of the prototype hermeneutic approach template follows in Figure 1 (page 12).

**The Hermeneutic Circle**

Due to the complexity of this study, I needed a way of visualizing and organizing its progression from start to finish. After reading Palmer's (1969) description of a hermeneutic circle, I realized that two circles were occurring simultaneously, one with the study and the other with the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. He describes the hermeneutic circle as: "The whole receives its definition from the parts, and, reciprocally, the parts can only be understood in reference to a whole" (Palmer, 1969, p. 118). The study is seen as a whole, receiving its definition from the four parts or stages. Reciprocally, the four stages are understood in reference to the research as a whole. Each stage sheds new light on the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. At the end of each stage of the research, the hermeneutic approach template was revisited in light of new understandings. In the section that follows, I briefly discuss each stage of the research. Chapter Two presents the stages in greater detail.

The hermeneutic approach template is a whole that receives its definition from its parts or components. Each component is essential to the whole. With the implementation of each component by the museum educator, there was a back-and-forth interplay
Figure 1. Template for the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development
between theory and practice. Chapter Three provides a definition of the template's components.

**Stage One**

In Stage One, I first examined various interpretations of "museum education" and investigated the epistemological foundations for several strategies of museum education program development. Next, I explored and revised the philosophical roots of a hermeneutic view of interpretation and combined it with a curricular paradigm to form a theoretical framework for an approach to museum education program development that blended important elements of pedagogy and museology. I developed a literature review that led to the synthesis of curricular and philosophical epistemologies into a conceptual framework for developing museum education programs. I have called the conceptual framework "a hermeneutic approach to museum education program development" based on its roots in hermeneutic philosophy. The hermeneutic approach comprises components incorporating pedagogy, curriculum theory, hermeneutic philosophy, and museology. It was further synthesized into a model or template that was used as a guide in the development of museum education programs.

**Stage Two**

The research continued in Stage Two with a sequential analysis of the hermeneutic approach template interpreted by a co-developer. Lenna, a seasoned museum educator with a background in archaeology and well-known within the Saskatchewan museum community, agreed to be my first research participant. Together, Lenna and I applied the theoretical concepts that I had developed in Stage One for each of the template's components in the creation of a program for her museum. The hermeneutic
approach template was refined as a result of Lenna's implementation of it. Once the hermeneutic approach template had been refined, and the practicality of the components had been checked against their theoretical intentions, I moved to the next stage of the research.

**Stage Three**

Stage Three was a bridge linking Stages Two and Four with an examination of the potential for teaching the theoretical and practical application of the hermeneutic approach template to museum educators. Materials were developed incorporating theoretical and practical elements of the hermeneutic approach to be shared with other museum educators in a day-long workshop. I had hoped that one workshop participant committed to trying the template would consent to become the implementer in Stage Four.

**Stage Four**

Stage Four of the research was an investigation of the revised hermeneutic approach template that was implemented by another museum educator. Sandy, an art educator with five years experience as a part-time educator in a small urban art gallery and museum, focused on the template's practical application.

**Research Questions**

The following questions guided the research and focused the sequential analysis of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development:

*What is the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development?*

*How does the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development work?*
What does the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development offer as a program planning strategy to museum educators?

Additionally, I sought to uncover the ways that the co-developer in Stage Two and the implementer in Stage Four of the research interpreted the hermeneutic approach template to meet their instructional needs. Pseudonyms were assigned to both research participants.

Structure of the Dissertation

This study used a qualitative methodology to address the research questions.

Uncharacteristically, this dissertation changes the traditional order of chapters for the purpose of maintaining continuity from the development of the hermeneutic approach to its implementation. Chapter Two has become the Methodology chapter. Chapter Three is the development of Stage One, the philosophical and theoretical model of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development that emerges from an examination of the literature. Chapter Three answers the research question: *What is the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development?* Chapter Four addresses the second question: *How does the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development work?* by reporting on the experience of one museum educator who tried the approach under my guidance in the development of a program for her museum. Chapter Five addresses the question: *What does the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development offer as a program planning strategy to museum educators?* by outlining a workshop conducted to teach the approach to other museum educators. It also revisits the question *How does the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development work?* in the experience of a second museum
educator who tried the approach, this time without any assistance from me. Chapter Six outlines my reflections on the study and what I have learned, as well as offering suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER TWO: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The intent of this study was to develop, examine, and refine the hermeneutic approach template as a strategy for developing museum education programs. To accomplish this, the study was separated into four consecutive stages. Hermeneutics was employed as a qualitative research methodology to guide the study because it emphasizes explanation, understanding, and illumination (Palmer, 1969; Van Hesteren, 1986). In each stage of the research, I sought to understand, illuminate, and describe the hermeneutic approach from my perspectives as a researcher and a museum educator and through the experiences of a co-developer in Stage Two and implementer in Stage Four. I adapted the hermeneutic understanding of text interpretation outlined by Palmer (1969) to meet my needs as a researcher in understanding the hermeneutic approach and its interpretation by the co-developer and implementer. He states:

Hermeneutics is the study of understanding, especially the task of understanding texts. Natural science has methods of understanding natural objects; "works" require a hermeneutic, a "science" of understanding appropriate to works as works. Certainly the methods of "scientific analysis" can and should be applied to works, but in doing so the works are treated as silent, natural objects. Insofar as they are objects, they are amenable to scientific methods of interpretation; as works, they call for more subtle and comprehensive modes of understanding. The field of hermeneutics grew up as an effort to describe these latter, more specifically "historical" and "humanistic" modes of understanding. (Palmer, 1969, p. 8)

In this study, I looked beyond a scientific analysis of the hermeneutic approach as an "object" to a humanistic understanding of the hermeneutic approach as a "work" (Palmer, 1969). In other words, I sought discover how the co-developer and implementer
made meaning of the hermeneutic approach by adapting it to meet their needs, rather than gathering statistical data about it. I wanted to uncover how each of us interpreted and understood the hermeneutic approach. My role as researcher was "to mediate between the familiar and strange in order to achieve meaning" (Rothe, 1993, p. 16). I mediated between the worlds of the researcher and the researched, between the theoretical design and the practical implementation of the hermeneutic approach, between the worlds of research and museum education, and between the lived experiences of the participants and the interpretations of those experiences. As a museum educator, I brought to the study my experiences in program development, assumptions about the implementation and potential of the hermeneutic approach template, and views about the educational role of museums. My reflections as a researcher and a museum educator are woven into the fabric of the study; in Chapter Six I reflect a final time on my roles as researcher and museum educator.

Once the conceptual framework for the hermeneutic approach had been developed in Stage One, and after permission had been obtained from the University Advisory Committee on Ethics in Behavioural Science Research (Appendix A), I continued with Stage Two of the study.

Stage One:

The Hermeneutic Approach to Museum Education Program Development

In the first stage of the research (Chapter Three), I developed the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of the hermeneutic approach as a program development template. My role was that of complete participant in the research as I developed the template for use by a co-developer in Stage Two and an implementer in Stage Four
(Spradley, 1980). Having been a museum educator for ten years, I drew on my experience and training to create a strategy that would be practical, easy to implement, and that would include all of the essential ingredients for developing exceptional museum education programs. As a researcher I drew on hermeneutic, curriculum theory and museology literature as I constructed the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of the hermeneutic approach template.

As the hermeneutic approach began to take shape, I started to consider the next stage of the research which involved the participation of a museum educator as a co-developer. My attention turned to how she might record her actions and reflections as she interpreted and applied the hermeneutic approach in the development of a museum education program. The hermeneutic approach consisted of several components to be completed sequentially by the museum educator who was developing the program, and I was concerned with how the museum educator research participant would interpret each component. For example, I had several concerns about the interpretation of the storyline component, as I noted in a journal entry:

An anticipatory concern is choosing an "angle" and sticking to it, taking enough time to get it right, [that the museum educator will be able to write] a clearly written storyline that will work .... Not get too broad. (Sept.2, 1998)

In an effort to ensure that the components be given careful consideration by the co-developer in Stage Two and the implementer in Stage Four, I developed a journal entry form (Appendix B) for each component that included topics for reflection. My impetus for selecting the topics was the claims, concerns, and issues suggested in fourth generation evaluation procedures (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).
According to Guba and Lincoln (1989), a claim is an assertion that is favourable to the component; a concern is an assertion that is unfavourable to the component; and an issue is something about which anyone might disagree. I also added an anticipatory concern step to precede the claims, concerns, and issues.

Once I had developed a conceptual framework for the hermeneutic approach, I, too, wrote journal entries comprising claims, concerns, and issues that might be used to initiate dialogue with the first research participant or co-developer. Both of our claims, concerns, and issues journal entries were used to make decisions about refining the approach for Stage Three of the research, the workshop to teach the hermeneutic approach to others. Additionally, the themes emerging from Stages One and Two of the research were used to initiate a conversation with the Stage Four participant. Essentially, I mediated between the two participants to create a "dialogue" about aspects of the template in a modified hermeneutic-dialectic process (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper & Allen, 1993; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). An example of this process is the discussions I had with Lenna of Stage Two of the research and Sandy of Stage Four that bring together our thoughts on the meaning of artifacts. Segments extracted from our journal entries and conversations form a dialogue about the topic of artifacts, as demonstrated in the following:

Lenna: In the museum world, we believe that artifacts can 'speak,' that they have a message to deliver. (undated, artifact component journal entry)

Lee: I can connect with Lenna's feelings towards artifacts -- they are similar to mine. Old artifacts in particular speak powerfully to me. (Feb. 4, 1999, fieldnotes)

In Stage Four, Sandy contributed to the dialogue as she spoke about the role of artifacts:

Sandy: I think artifacts speak particularly to different types of children, maybe ones that aren't so academically inclined or ones that are having perhaps learning
disabilities. I think this is a good way for them to learn, an alternate way for them to learn instead of always reading and writing. (Apr. 4, 2000, interview)

Journal entries and interview transcriptions from Lenna and Sandy were used to compare and contrast their two interpretations of the hermeneutic approach. As in the sample dialogue noted above, I was able to use Lenna's reflections on concepts, such as the meaning of artifacts, to initiate dialogue with Sandy. Other concepts extracted from Lenna's journal entries and interview transcriptions used for discussion with Sandy included connections between components, the ordering of components, and the manner in which the components flowed from one to the other.

Stage Two:

How Does the Hermeneutic Approach to Museum Education Program Development Work?

Through the assistance of the Museums Association of Saskatchewan, I obtained the cooperation of and permission to participate from one museum educator (Appendix C) from Saskatoon in trying the hermeneutic approach as an education program development strategy. Over a ten month period, Lenna and I worked together to develop and implement a program for a local school group using the hermeneutic approach template (p. 12).

My intention was to uncover the ways in which Lenna interpreted, defined, and made meaning of the hermeneutic approach template in developing a museum education program for her museum, and I viewed our roles as being co-developers of the template. Since I had intimate knowledge of the hermeneutic approach template, I assisted Lenna in interpreting the template by defining the components as I understood them; she assisted me in understanding her interpretation of the template. We met after each component was
completed to discuss Lenna's progress through that component of the hermeneutic approach. During our meeting, I received her journal entry for that particular component. As Lenna worked on the next component, I read the previous week's journal entry to gain insights into her interpretation of the component. She used her journal entries not only to record her actions implementing the component, but also as a reflective journal. The following extract from the experience component journal entry exemplifies Lenna's reflection on, and decision about, implementing the component:

What hands-on activity will pass the 'cool' test, so that 13-14 year olds will participate actively? I think after a guided tour of the exhibit, I would like to introduce some sort of game format to reinforce concepts. I think the game idea would 'sell.' (Feb. 2, 1999, journal entry)

Lenna's journal entries were checked against the journal entries that I had written when I developed the hermeneutic approach template. I also maintained fieldnotes during this stage of the research. Bogdan and Biklen (1992) suggest that, in addition to writing thoughts and feelings, the researcher should record "important insights that come to you during data collection" (p. 157). During Stages Two and Four of the study, I recorded in a fieldnotes log my insights, reflections, thoughts and feelings about the implementation of the hermeneutic approach template. The fieldnotes expanded my understanding of the template because they contained my reflections on the practical implementation and revision of a theoretical model. The fieldnotes differed from the journal entries because the latter dealt with the practical matters of implementing the template, whereas the reflections recorded in my fieldnotes log often included my emotional responses to Lenna's interpretation of the hermeneutic approach template. Fieldnote entries are sprinkled throughout Chapter Four.
In order to gain a thorough understanding of Lenna's reflections recorded in her journal entries about the hermeneutic approach's components, and after she signed a release for her journal entries (Appendix D), I applied aspects of the voice-centred relational method (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998) designed for the analysis of interview transcriptions. The method is relational/ontological in nature, recognizing self in relation to others. Mauthner and Doucet (1998) adapted the voice-centred relational method to meet their needs as researchers by establishing two sets of readings. The first set included four readings of the transcripts; the second involved a breaking down of the data into summaries and themes. In reading Lenna's journal entries, I used the idea of sets as suggested by Mauthner and Doucet (1998). In the first analysis, I completed multiple readings of the journal entry. The second included a search for emerging themes, connections between components, and illumination of the template.

In the first analysis, each of Lenna's journal entries was read a minimum of four times. The purpose of the first reading was to become familiar with the text and what she had written about the component. The second time through, I looked for "myself" in the words, for anything that I could relate to as a museum educator rather than as a researcher. For example, I noted the following journal excerpt as one in which I saw myself: "In the museum world, we believe that artifacts can 'speak,' that they have a message to deliver". In the third reading I noted any "I" messages that Lenna wrote, as in this example: "I was not certain if I should account for all artifacts, listing them appropriately under the four themes, or content myself with a smaller selection". The final time I looked specifically for evocative responses, such as frustration or satisfaction with the component; the previous example demonstrates Lenna's uncertainty in
interpreting the component. Evocative responses provided insights into the power and limitations of the hermeneutic approach and its components. If, for example, a component was difficult to interpret or implement, Lenna would respond by indicating frustration, a signal that indicated a need to modify the component. The evocative responses, "I" and "self" texts, were used to initiate audio-taped interviews at our next meeting that would further clarify Lenna's interpretation of the hermeneutic approach. For example, Lenna noted that artifacts can speak, and, during our next meeting on November 24, 1998, I asked her to elaborate on that comment.

As Lenna completed the program using the hermeneutic approach, her journal entries were read again for pervading themes and relationships. For example, Lenna's concern about the age group's willingness to actively participate in the program was a theme that surfaced several times during the development of the program. I also discovered that a relationship existed between the artifact component and the meaning-in-context component.

After each of our audio-taped interviews was transcribed by me, the transcriptions were approved and released by Lenna (Appendix E). They were read in two phases. During the first phase, I drew on Kvale's (1996) application of hermeneutics to guide my interpretation of each interview transcription. In the second phase, the transcriptions were reread to search for themes and expressions that described the hermeneutic approach's components.

Kvale (1996) states that "hermeneutics is the study of the interpretation of texts. The purpose of hermeneutical interpretation is to obtain a valid and common understanding of the meaning of a text" (p. 46). While hermeneutics has been used
traditionally for the interpretation of biblical and classical texts, Kvale (1996) extends the
definition of text to include transcribed interviews. Kvale (1996) applies the principle of a
hermeneutic circle to the interpretation of interview transcripts to obtain an understanding
of the text's meaning. He defines the process in the following way:

The understanding of a text takes place through a process in which the meaning of
the separate parts is determined by the global meaning of the text, as it is
anticipated. The closer determination of the meaning of the separate parts may
eventually change the originally anticipated meaning of the totality, which again
influences the meaning of the separate parts, and so on. In principle, such a
hermeneutical explication of the text is an infinite process, while it ends in
practice when one has reached a sensible meaning, a valid unitary meaning, free
of inner contradictions. (Kvale, 1996, p. 47)

I used Kvale's (1996) seven hermeneutical canons of interview text interpretation
to interpret Lenna's interview texts during the first reading phase. The seven canons, and
their application in my study, are listed below.

Kvale (1996) describes the first canon as a "back and forth process between the
parts and the whole" that follows from the hermeneutical circle" (p. 48). The circularity is
in the shape of a spiral "which implies the possibility of a continuously deepened
understanding of meaning" (Kvale, 1996, p. 48) rather than a circle. In my application of
the first canon, I began with an initial reading of each transcription to obtain a general
meaning, followed by further readings to acquire deeper understanding. The
transcriptions were read several more times to pick out themes and expressions, then read
again for the "more global meaning of the interview in light of the deepened meaning of
the parts" (Kvale, 1996, p. 48).

The second canon states "that an interpretation of meaning ends when one has
reached a 'good Gestalt,' an inner unity of the text free of logical contradictions" (Kvale,
1996, p. 48). Each of Lenna's interview transcriptions was read multiple times until I felt
that I had an understanding of how she interpreted and applied the components of the h**ermeneutic approach template.**

**Kvale (1996)** suggests in the third hermeneutical canon of interpretation that single statements be tested against both the global meaning of the text and other texts by the same participant (p. 48). As the study progressed, I was able to test single statements in earlier transcripts with those in later ones. Additionally, some transcription statements were cross-checked against journal entries. **An example of testing and cross-checking is outlined below:**

Lenna: In the museum world, we believe that artifacts can 'speak,' that they have a message to deliver. (undated, journal entry)
I think artifacts do speak some of the time to some of the people. (Nov. 24, 1998, interview)
Artifacts have an unspoken power.... One artifact can represent many stories....
I'm convinced of the power of artifacts. (Dec. 7, 1998, journal entry)
Will grade 8 students allow the 'magic' of the artifacts to overcome their natural resistance to participate?.... This step in the hermeneutic approach template provides an important opportunity to think again about the message to convey, and the artifacts representing that message, in light of the students' own knowledge. (Dec. 22, 1998, journal entry)
For me artifacts always are a springboard, a starting place for thinking about other things and for thinking about the artifacts themselves....How can the pleasure, the beauty of this artifact, or the intensity that the story gives me, how can I share that with others? (Dec. 22, 1998, interview)

In the above example, multiple journal entries and interviews contain statements that support Lenna's view of the significance of artifacts. Multiple statements reflecting the same view of artifacts can also be found within the journal entries dated December 7, 1998 and December 22, 1998.

Kvale's (1996) fourth canon is "the autonomy of the text, that the text should be understood on the basis of its own frame of reference" (p.49). I found this canon easier to apply during the initial reading of the transcript to become familiar with its story.
Analyzing the autonomous meaning of interview statements was difficult because interviews were most often structured as a link to the journal entries. For example, in an interview held on February 18, 1999, I asked Lenna to elaborate on a statement she had written in a journal entry about artifacts, which she did at length. While the interview transcription can be read as an autonomous entity, it was difficult for me to divorce Lenna's response from her journal entry, and to statements in later interviews that reflect the same sentiments.

In the fifth canon of text interpretation, Kvale (1996) states that:

Conducting a qualitative research interview requires an extensive knowledge of the theme so that the interviewer may be sensitive to the nuances of meanings expressed and the different contexts into which the meanings may enter. (p. 49)

My experience as a museum educator developing education programs and thorough knowledge of the hermeneutic approach template provided me with a comprehensive understanding of the theme and a sensitivity to the nuances of meanings. For example, I had extensive knowledge of the role of artifacts in a museum education program and sensitivity to the significance that Lenna attributes to artifacts, as reflected in my fieldnotes entry: "I can connect with Lenna's feelings towards artifacts -- they are similar to mine. Old artifacts in particular speak powerfully to me" (Feb. 4, 1999).

The sixth canon states that "an interpretation of a text is not presuppositionless. The interpreter cannot 'jump outside' the tradition of understanding he or she lives in." (Kvale, 1996, p. 49). In light of my experiences and knowledge, it was impossible to escape from the presuppositions that I brought to the text interpretation. However, Kvale (1996) suggests that these presuppositions should be acknowledged in the interpretation.
To address my presuppositions, I applied Van Hesteren's (1986) concept of bracketing my worldviews as a museum educator, researcher, and author of the hermeneutic approach during the interpretation of texts. In my fieldnotes log I was able to acknowledge and bracket any presuppositions I had about the implementation of the hermeneutic approach by the co-developer in Stage Two and the implementer in Stage Four that might affect my interpretation of the texts. In the example that follows, I used my fieldnotes log to record my thoughts about the implementation of the template to acknowledge and bracket my views for interpreting the co-developer's texts:

I have a concern that the essence of the components, their original intent, is maintained, exploited to their fullest.... Every museum educator is going to interpret the [hermeneutic] approach differently, personally; it will be a different interpretation, not necessarily better or worse. (Jan. 11, 1999, fieldnotes)

In Chapter Six, I reflect on bracketing my training and experiences as I developed the template in Stage One.

Finally, the seventh hermeneutical canon declares that through innovation and creativity employed in each interpretation of a text, greater understanding is achieved (Kvale, 1996). An example of the seventh canon was my discovery of the use of metaphor by Lenna in making meaning of the hermeneutic approach template (see Chapter Four).

My role in Stage Two of the research was that of a participant-as-observer; data collection was secondary to the role of participant (Rothe, 1993). Rather than standing back observing and collecting data, I was involved in teaching the hermeneutic approach to Lenna, making suggestions as to how she might implement a component of the program, and acting as a sounding board for her ideas. If she needed clarification of a
component, I was ready to offer it. Together, Lenna and I modified, refined and improved the hermeneutic approach for future use by other museum educators.

Once Lenna had completed a program using the hermeneutic approach template, I contacted the superintendent of schools to obtain permission to conduct a research project within the school system (Appendix F). Permission was granted, and I approached a teacher who was willing to participate in Lenna's program to gain his permission to be interviewed about the class' visit to the museum (Appendix G). Since this was a pilot of the program, and I was interested only in his perceptions of the program, I did not seek parental permissions as I did not interview students. The teacher, Martin, approved my request to follow the class as they participated in the program, and to return to the school later in the day to interview him. Once he had approved the transcriptions of the audio-taped interviews (Appendix H), I requested and obtained permission to share some of his insights with Lenna (Appendix I).

Stage Three:

What Does the Hermeneutic Approach to Museum Education Program Development Offer to Museum Educators?

Typically in a qualitative research study, data analysis begins during data collection (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). I conducted a cursory analysis of the data gathered during Stage Two of the study to determine the power and possible limitations of the hermeneutic approach as a program development strategy. These insights were to be used in the development of workshop materials that were to be shared with other educators recruited through the Museums Association of Saskatchewan. Lenna and I chose to offer the workshop in April 1999, but the workshop
was postponed to the fall of 1999 because museum educators were too busy completing grant applications to meet spring deadlines, and training staff for summer peak visitations to attend.

As an introduction to the rescheduled workshop, I published an article in the Bulletin, a newsletter produced by the Association, to inform educators of the basic concepts of the hermeneutic approach (Brodie, 1999). The Museums Association promoted the workshop as an advanced course supplementing the Museum and Education course of the Museum Studies Certificate. Lenna introduced some of the concepts of the hermeneutic approach during a Museum Education workshop in September 1999, and promoted the Stage Three workshop to be held the following month.

My role in Stage Three of the research was to be a moderate participant, balancing participation with observation (Spradley, 1980). Lenna and I worked together developing workshop materials, and it was my intention that she would conduct the workshop while I observed how it was received and perceived by those attending. However, Lenna's primary involvement in the rescheduled workshop was not possible, and I conducted the workshop. Consent forms were signed by both workshop participants (Appendix J). A detailed account of Stage Three is provided in Chapter Five of the study.
Stage Four:


It was intended from the Stage Three workshop that one educator who committed to trying the hermeneutic approach template in the development of a museum program would be asked to participate in a study of his or her experience. Of the two people who attended the workshop, neither was interested in participating in Stage Four of the research. Sandy, a museum educator from a small museum in the eastern part of the province, was interested in learning about the hermeneutic approach template but was unable to attend the workshop. As an alternative, I met with Sandy in October of 1999 at the museum where she is employed to discuss the hermeneutic approach and her potential involvement in the final stage of the research. She seemed interested in learning the hermeneutic approach and trying it to develop a program, and consented to becoming a research participant (Appendix K). On January 18, 2000, we met again and I presented a condensed workshop to teach the hermeneutic approach to Sandy, and to outline in greater detail her responsibilities as a research participant. To assist my understanding of how Sandy made meaning of the approach, she was asked to maintain a journal throughout the process of interpreting and applying the approach. She was also asked to sign a release for my use of the journal entries (Appendix L). The same claims and concerns statements used in Stages One and Two of the study provided starting points in interpreting the implementation of each component of the hermeneutic approach. Sandy was given the template that Lenna and I had refined in Stage Two, as well as the
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definitions of the components that were used by Lenna. After describing in a mini-
workshop the hermeneutic approach template and its components, and the process of
journal writing, Sandy was left on her own to complete a program using the hermeneutic
approach template. In contrast to my role as complete participant in the first stage of the
research, my role in Stage Four was that of an observer-as-participant, with data
collection taking priority (Spradley, 1980). Sandy's experiences in the last stage of the re-
search are detailed in Chapter Five.

The voice-centred relational method (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998) was also used to
interpret Sandy's journal entries, although they were less reflective in nature than Lenna's.
Since I did not have contact with Sandy until the hermeneutic approach template had
been implemented, I received all of the journal entries after the program had been
conducted. Therefore, all of the journal entries were read at one time, prior to our last
meeting. The journal entries were read in two stages identical in purpose to the
interpretation of Lenna's entries. In the first set of readings, each entry was read a
minimum of four times to get a general idea of what was written, to search for "I"
statements, to search for myself in what was written, and to search for evocative
statements. The second set of readings was to search for themes and relationships, and for
points of comparison and contrasting to Lenna's experience implementing the
hermeneutic approach.

Three audio-taped interviews were held with Sandy. The first provided an
account of her program development practices prior to learning the hermeneutic approach
to museum education program development, the second was to describe the hermeneutic
approach template in detail, and the third was held after the template had been
implemented. After transcribing the audio-taped interviews and obtaining signed releases (Appendix M), I again employed the same hermeneutical canons suggested by Kvale (1996) in the interpretation of Sandy's interview transcriptions. However, new understandings of the hermeneutic approach gained from Stage Two of the study coloured my interpretation of the transcriptions. For example, I now brought specific presuppositions to the text interpretation (Kvale, 1996, sixth hermeneutical canon of interpretation, p. 49). These included the presupposition that the hermeneutic approach template could be successfully interpreted and implemented by museum educators in the development of museum education programs, that museum educators are tuned to the power of artifacts, and that complementary couplings exist between certain components of the template.

While my role in this stage of the study was that of observer-as-participant (Spradley, 1980), I also acted as a mediator between the data collected from the research participants in Stages Two and Four of the study. For example, Lenna and I discovered that relationships existed between the artifact and meaning-in-context components as well as the pre-understanding and connectedness components. Sandy also recognized those pairings.

After Sandy had developed a program using the hermeneutic approach template, she made the program available to school groups in the area. I contacted a superintendent of one of the local school districts to obtain permission to observe a class that had booked a visit to the museum (Appendix F). Permission was granted, and I contacted the teacher to gain her permission to shadow the class (Appendix N); parental permissions were unnecessary since I was not interviewing the children. I met the group at the museum just
prior to their visit, then followed them as they participated in the program that Sandy had
developed using the hermeneutic approach template. After the class had returned to
school and been dismissed for the day, I interviewed the teacher about her impressions of
the program. Once her interview was transcribed, the teacher approved and released the
transcriptions (Appendix H). I interviewed Sandy for a third and last time after the school
group had participated in the education program at the museum to obtain her impressions
of the program and the implementation of the hermeneutic approach template.

Conclusion

To summarize, the study comprised four stages, each providing new knowledge
and understandings about the hermeneutic approach to museum education program
development. In the first stage that emerges in Chapter Three, I synthesized principles of
hermeneutics, curriculum theory, pedagogy, and museology into a conceptual framework
for the development of museum education programs. In Stage Two, I worked with a co-
developer to implement and refine the theoretical and practical applications of the
hermeneutic approach template. Our experiences are detailed in Chapter Four.

In Stage Three of the study, I prepared materials for a workshop to teach the
refined hermeneutic approach template to other museum educators. The materials
included the theoretical underpinnings of the template's components and examples from
Lenna's experience implementing the template. Chapter Five provides details about the
workshop.

Stage Four of the study is the implementation of the hermeneutic approach
template by a museum educator research participant, or implemter. Chapter Five
chronicles her experiences interpreting the hermeneutic approach template.
CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW AND STAGE ONE

The Literature Review chapter is an integral part of this study for two reasons. First, it serves to establish a context for the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development in pedagogy, curriculum theory, and museology. Second, the literature reviewed in this chapter is used in the theoretical design of the hermeneutic approach. Elements of curriculum theory, museology, pedagogy, and hermeneutics are extracted from the literature and formed into a conceptual framework that I have called Stage One, the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development.

The intent of this study was to develop, examine, and refine the conceptual underpinnings of a practical approach for developing museum education programs and to investigate its potential in a museum education setting. This practical approach, which I have titled the hermeneutic approach, incorporates principles from the fields of education and museology that I felt were fundamental to the development of an effective museum education program based on my years of experience as a museum educator. In my opinion, the key elements in a museum education program include pedagogy and curriculum from the education field, and artifacts and the museum's mandate; the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development that I created incorporates these elements. I have also integrated hermeneutic principles into the development of the template's theoretical foundation.
Prior to introducing it, I provide a context for the hermeneutic approach template by describing the role of education in museums. School groups constitute one audience that visits museums, and in this chapter I present an overview of their reasons for participating in out-of-classroom excursions (resource-based learning and recreational, educational, entertainment, and reverential uses of the museum). While at the museum the students view artifacts and exhibits not available in the classroom, and there is a variety of ways that students can interact with the displays. In this chapter, I relate two common methods for guiding students' experiences with artifacts -- the artifact-as-text and object-based learning. Next, I describe curriculum theory and how it informs museum education program development, specifically the hermeneutic approach template. Finally, I examine hermeneutics as a philosophy that contributes to the development of the hermeneutic approach template.

Essentially, this Chapter Three is a review of the literature pertinent to the study, but it also contributes significantly to the development of a conceptual framework for a program planning strategy to be explored in the next stage of the research. Traditionally, the Literature Review is written as the second chapter of a dissertation, followed by the methodology chapter. I have chosen to rearrange the two chapters in order to maintain continuity from the development of the hermeneutic approach template at the end of Chapter Three into its application by the first research participant in Chapter Four.

The Role of Education in Museums

Through displays and programming, museums educate local, national and international visitors. "Museum education" is an ambiguous term that applies to one function of a museum. It is ambiguous because museums serve diverse audiences with an
assortment of formal educational programs, such as structured programs for school
groups, gallery talks for seniors, craft-based activities for families, wine and cheese
lectures for singles, and informal educational programs such as exhibits with descriptive
labels. As Hooper-Greenhill (1999) suggests, the educational role of the museum
includes "exhibitions, displays, events and workshops" which broadly encompasses
"education, interpretation and communication" (p. 3).

Education for the masses has long been a role of the museum, and in the early
nineteenth century Britain museums displayed natural, historical, and cultural objects so
that the public, regardless of class, could educate themselves (Hooper-Greenhill, 1991).
Harrison (1960) identifies the educational goal of the museum as:

The fullest development of the whole human being and among its many means it
must neglect neither the factual evidence of real, tangible objects nor the
evocative, imaginative impact of things of beauty and worth. (p. 81)

To paraphrase, the museum serves two purposes: to appeal to the visitor's intellect, and
to fulfil a recreational role. The former is intended for "the broader education of the user
so that he or she may lead a fuller life and be a better member of the community" (Allan,
1960, p. 24). The latter is intended as an escape, thereby:

Enlarging the emotional response of the individual to his environment, and easing
him of some of the worries and restraints of such environmental handicaps as the
harsh struggle of earning a living or the grim surrounding of a factory community.
(Allan, 1960, p. 24)

As an activity for families to pursue on a Sunday afternoon, the museum visit of the past
was also intended to promote positive family values rather than the alternative outing to
public houses (Bennett, 1995).
Allan's (1960) comment, that museums educate the visitor so that he or she will become "a better member of the community" (p. 24), calls into question the purpose of museum education. As Molyneaux (1994) states:

The past that is presented may be that of a single, dominant group in a society or, as is so common in countries now independent but with a colonial past, one that still reflects the colonialist view. (p. 3)

This view is supported by Hall (1991), who cites the example of museums in South Africa that traditionally have served the dominant white culture to the exclusion of "the historic, political, social and economic experiences of all South Africans" (p. 10). The majority of the population, Blacks, have not had their culture adequately or properly displayed and interpreted, and the museum has not met their educational needs (Hall, 1991).

By his comment that the past of the dominant culture may be the only one presented, Molyneaux (1994) challenges me as a museum educator to look critically at the message being conveyed and at the education that the visitor is receiving in an exhibit or program that I develop. His comments prompt me to check that my programs do not marginalize groups by presenting only the viewpoint of the dominant culture.

Ceron and Mz-Recaman (1994) suggest that the museum's educational role be proactive. Their experiences in Colombia, which led them to acknowledge the potential of museums to significantly influence school children, provide insights for the role of museum education in Saskatchewan:

Education therefore must no longer be seen simply as a means of transferring culture, but as an integral part of a process of social emancipation. Museums must try to become places of freedom and democracy, in which children and adults can recover lost or forgotten cultural values and traditions, and, through this process of discovery, learn to develop their capacity for independent decision-making in society. The principal task of a museum, therefore, is to preserve objects from the
past for the purposes of education and communication for the future. (Ceron & Mz-Recaman, 1994, p. 148)

Ceron and Mz-Recaman (1994) provide another way of interpreting Allan's comment. Being a better member of the community (Allan, 1960) suggests an informed citizenry capable of making independent decisions. One way to guard against presenting the past of the dominant group is by offering more than one viewpoint in an exhibit or program. As Molyneaux (1994) suggests, "This enlightened approach can only begin to develop, however, if those who hold responsibility for mass education accept the importance of alternative histories within their midst" (p. 10). Incorporating alternative histories, or diverse viewpoints, into a display or program provides a larger context for the visitor to make meaning.

One thread running through the discourses of Molyneaux (1994), Allan (1960) and Ceron and Mz-Recaman (1994) is interpretation. The onus of interpreting an exhibit or program is both on the museum educator and the visitor. The educator creating a program for the display chooses to include or ignore information. A display or program can be skewed towards the view of the dominant culture, which might be the group providing funding for the exhibit, or an interest group promising a large visitor attendance. As Hooper-Greenhill (1999) notes:

Interpretation is a very loosely defined word in the museum context, but it usually means 'doing interpretation' for others. 'Exhibition interpretation' is the way the exhibition is designed to allow people to understand the ideas it wants to put across. 'Object interpretation' is the attempt to interpret objects for others, by making links between the object and the viewer that they might be expected to recognize. (p. 12)

Interpretation can also be controlled during an exhibit tour. For example, while on a tour of a cultural history interpretive centre, I was informed by the tour guide that the
ancient people of the area were very clever because of the many ways they used their surroundings to meet their needs. Essentially, the tour guide interpreted the exhibit for me. As a museum educator I have the responsibility of deciding how an exhibit will be interpreted in a program, and whether I will provide the interpretation or present enough information for the visitor to make his or her own interpretation. My options are to transmit facts objectively, to steer the visitor towards invoking social change, or to provide a climate of personal interpretation by connecting the exhibit to his or her own experiences. These three orientations will be discussed later in the empirical analytic, critical theory, and interpretive orientations of curriculum; the interpretation of objects and material culture will also be discussed later in the chapter.

One of the challenges that I face as a museum educator is developing programs for diverse audiences. Successfully meeting that challenge depends largely on my adeptness at matching the exhibit with the needs, interests, experiences, desires, knowledge and ability levels of the target audience. The objective of teaching in the museum is to create a relationship between the collections and "the needs and interests of the particular museum visitor" (Hooper-Greenhill, 1991, p. 3). One audience with a long history of visiting museums is the school group. Special skill is required in matching the museum visit to students' particular needs, since most school groups use the museum as a resource to supplement their classroom work.

**Resource-Based Learning**

With their vast collection of artifacts and paintings, museums store a wealth of resources that supplement curricula. The bridge between the museum and the classroom is resource-based learning, which is defined as "planned educational programs that
actively involve students in the meaningful use of a wide range of appropriate print, non-print and human resources" (Saskatchewan Education, 1991a, p.1). The goal of resource-based learning programs is to provide a variety of sources to students for obtaining and processing information. The school library or resource centre is seen as one of the most important sources of materials in resource-based learning; it is outside of the classroom yet inside the school. Saskatchewan Education (1991a) acknowledges that:

Resource-based learning can take place in the community as well as in the classroom. Students can learn a great deal by visiting museums, historical sites and local businesses, and by experiencing the natural environment. (p. 9)

"Outdoor education" is a term that is also associated with resource-based learning because it includes learning beyond the confines of the classroom by using an experiential learning method of teaching (Knapp, 1996). The goal of experiential learning is to "link students with the curriculum through structuring and guiding meaningful outdoor adventures" (Knapp, 1996, p. 20). Taking students out of the classroom into museums, businesses, and natural sites is seen by some teachers as opportunities for students to actively participate in "real-world settings" (Willis, 1997, p. 2).

"Authentic learning" is another way that students learn in "real-world settings" outside of the classroom. It is also identified as "learning by doing," and is supported by research demonstrating that "most students learn better by solving real-life problems, compared with completing drills on decontextualized bits of information" (Knapp, 1996, p. 10). Tasks typical of authentic learning include gathering and analyzing raw data on a problem of personal interest, and reporting the results so that they will have an impact in the real world (Schack, 1993).
Benefits of field excursions, or outdoor adventures, are that they appeal to varied learning styles and intelligences and provide a change from typical pencil-and-paper methods (Willis, 1997). They also offer a variety of teaching situations that increase educational potential (Ceron & Mz-Recaman, 1994).

Museums in particular are excellent venues for resource-based learning, but some classes visit museums as a day off, not connecting the experience to their learning in school. Mann (1997) comments that:

Unless students have a purpose or context for museum visits, much of the learning potential is squandered. Museum experiences should be part of the curriculum for all students, not a reward for good behaviour. (p. 4)

Francis (1997) recommends that field trips occur early in the school term to "provide a common set of experiences from which students can approach problems and situations throughout the year" (p. 44). Connecting the field trip to more than one content area also makes the learning experience more meaningful (Francis, 1997). Through follow up activities in the classroom, the students can use the knowledge gained at the site. Willis (1997) suggests that a field trip is successful if it meets curriculum objectives, and that both pre- and post-visit activities be integrated into the curriculum. In this way, the visit is one piece of a larger learning picture. Used in this manner, the museum visit is a bridge that connects one curriculum topic or lesson to another. However, Mikolajczyk (1994) sees the museum's role as filling in the gaps in the curriculum's coverage of the past by creating exhibits that help teachers explain history to specific age groups.

A successful field trip should stimulate discussion, reflection, and interest while generating as many questions as it answers (Willis, 1997). Ceron and Mz-Recaman
(1994) state that the following specific objectives should be included in the development of museum exhibits and programs:

To create enthusiasm, to excite curiosity, to teach basic techniques or skills, to promote active learning, to clarify methods and processes, and to provide information and stimulate awareness. (p. 149)

To me, these are broad objectives that do not relate closely enough to the museum's mandate. Museum educators hope that their programs will create excitement and enthusiasm so that children will return later with their families, but these are by-products rather than the main focus of the program. One focus is resources, such as paintings, artifacts, or natural habitats and the message we are communicating about them to the visitor. Another is the role of the museum education program in enhancing curricula and providing teachers with resources that are not otherwise available. Many museum programs for school groups, such as those offered at the Diefenbaker Canada Centre, have the enrichment of a curriculum topic as their objective, rather than creating enthusiasm.

**Recreational, Educational, Entertainment,**

**Convenience, and Reverential Uses of the Museum**

Falk and Dierking (1992) have identified three broad categories for classifying visits to museums that, although initially applied to the general public, have implications for school groups. Their three reasons for visiting include social-recreational, educational, and reverential. I would suggest that a fourth category be added, that of convenience. At the Diefenbaker Canada Centre, for example, surveys indicate that classes have visited for the following reasons: to participate in a program that complemented the curriculum (education); the Centre was a free educational place to visit
between other venues (convenience and recreation); the visit was cost effective because the group was able to participate in more than one program per visit (education and convenience); the Centre was an interesting and fun place to visit (recreation); and the Centre was a conveniently located place to stop for a washroom break (convenience) (Brodie, 2000). A reverential visit to a unique exhibit or museum is a personal, almost spiritual encounter that is neither purely educational nor entertaining. One way of regarding visits by school groups is a continuum with entertainment on one end and education on the other. On the entertainment end of the continuum, the goal of the visit is not to link the experience to curriculum but to have an enjoyable time. For example, one teacher desiring a purely entertaining visit criticized a program at the Diefenbaker Canada Centre for being too much like a lesson at school (Brodie & Wiebe, 1999). On the other end of the continuum is the program that enriches learning because curricular topics are exemplified through museum exhibits. The outcomes of the two visits are different, as Ansbacher (1998) notes:

If one's goal is entertainment, then only the agreeableness of the experience needs to be considered. If, on the other hand, education is the goal, then success lies in having positive future effects. (p. 43)

Entertainment and education are not mutually exclusive; it is possible to have an enjoyable learning experience. The key to any museum visit is the experience itself. As a museum educator developing programs for school aged children, my focus is the educational aspect of the experience and my teaching background influences the decisions that I make when developing a program. Like a classroom teacher, I want to provide students with a positive learning experience that is enjoyable, educational, and experiential.
Museum Education as Experience

Earlier, I noted various strategies of "learning-by-doing" that exemplify experiential learning. Defined as "inductive, learner centred, and activity oriented," experiential learning "makes use of a variety of resources," such as museums (Saskatchewan Education, 1991b, p. 18). Due to the "hands-on" nature of experiential learning, it is recommended for use as a teaching method prior to pictorial and the more abstract symbolic methods. A five-phased cycle exists that demonstrates the emphasis on the process of learning rather than the product:

- Experiencing (an activity occurs);
- Sharing or publishing (reactions and observations are shared);
- Analyzing or processing (patterns and dynamics are determined);
- Inferring or generalizing (principles are derived); and
- Applying (plans are made to use learnings in new situations).
(Saskatchewan Education, 1991b, p. 18)

In this study, experiential learning is a modification of the above definition. The two museums that will be highlighted in Chapters Four and Five of the study focus on the first phase of the cycle, experiencing, and the activity or program at the site. Experiencing refers to a hands-on component, such as passing around artifacts and creating a craft, or viewing an artwork. The second phase, sharing, might be categorized as communication, while analyzing or processing might be couched in the pre-understanding or connectedness segments. This will be addressed in greater detail later in this chapter in the explanation of the hermeneutic approach template.

Artifact as Text

One attraction that brings school groups to the museum is the opportunity to view and perhaps hold artifacts that are not otherwise available. Students can learn about the past by studying or "reading" artifacts. There are strategies for reading artifacts to gain
information and I will explore some of them (reading material culture, object-based learning) as well as related topics.

In order to clarify how the strategies might work in artifact interpretation, I provide examples using a top hat as an artifact. The top hat is black, soft and shiny, and made of beaver pelts. It was manufactured in England and was purchased by former Prime Minister John Diefenbaker. If the top hat is considered as text, then it can be read for the story it has to tell. Rosenblatt (1980) has identified two possible ways that a text can be read. The first is to read the text (the top hat) efferently, the second is aesthetically. During an efferent reading of a text, "the reader's attention is focused primarily on what is to be carried away, retained after the reading event" (Rosenblatt, 1980, p. 387). Emotional reactions to the text are suppressed and it is only the ideas that have future use that are carried away. An efferent reading of the top hat would be for the purpose of discovering facts, such as the manufacturer's insignia or the marks that identify the top hat as belonging to a famous person. Probst (1992) suggests that efferent reading of texts is objective, and although it is appropriate for instructional texts, it is not adequate for literary works. The text is something apart from the student that is worked on, where the reader "comes to it, takes something from it, and departs virtually unchanged" (Probst, 1992, p. 60). An artifact can be seen in the same way, as an object to be worked on that is apart from the viewer.

An aesthetic reading, on the other hand, attends to:

The sensations and feelings and associations triggered by the ideas, images, people, and places that we conjure up under the guidance of the text .... We are absorbed in what we are thinking and feeling and seeing, what we are living through, during the reading event. (Rosenblatt, 1980, p. 387)
Reading aesthetically means attending to emotional responses and imagination during the encounter with the top hat. For example, while holding and looking at the top hat, I can imagine what it was like to wear it to an important state dinner. No two aesthetic readings are the same, since every reader brings something different to the event. Unique to each reader is personal experience and personality that influence the interpretation.

Reading aesthetically is also an opportunity to personally reflect on the message of the text to gain a deeper self-understanding (Probst, 1992). The text, or artifact, evokes memories and experiences that, upon further reflection, cause us to clarify ideas and articulate interpretations of past events. An aesthetic reading can also teach us about others. For example, the top hat gives us insights into its owner, and Canadian society in the mid-twentieth century.

Artifact Analysis

Reading an artifact as material culture allows a different perspective of interpretation. The artifact is read as a symbol to deconstruct a cultural message, or to determine its meaning within the culture (Sayre, 1993). The top hat is read for the message it tells about its owner and the time period within which it was used. An historic reading of the top hat helps solidify "the idea that our things reflect our characters, and that possessions can serve as symbols of who we are" (Sayre, 1993, p. 15).

Pershey (1998) suggests that material culture, or artifacts, be examined in a process called artifact analysis, which he defines as "the professional term for digging the history out of a thing" (p. 18). He sets out four basic principles of artifact analysis that will "extract the historical information from them" and enable students to get at "the
stories of the people who built or used them" (Pershey, 1998, p. 19). Using his four basic principles, students are to define: what an artifact is; the four roles of artifacts; the five basic properties (history, material, construction, design, functions); and the four operations of artifact study (identification, evaluation, cultural analysis, and interpretation). This format provides a very thorough efferent reading of the artifact that is recommended for use in classrooms (Pershey, 1998). However, an artifact analysis using this method ignores features that I believe are important. Students' prior knowledge and experiences are not incorporated into the artifact analysis, which I believe is a significant consideration in making the event meaningful to them. Also, the analysis appears to be an isolated activity, not connected to what students are learning in the curriculum. Further, this method of artifact analysis does not specifically address the communication of ideas and concepts between or among students that I believe is an important part of the social construction of knowledge. The items that I have identified that are not included in the artifact analysis method are included in the hermeneutic approach.

**Object-based Learning**

A variation of artifact analysis is the object-based lesson, which will be explored in more detail because it has been suggested for use in museums (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994). Object-based learning as a teaching method came to North America from England as early as the eighteenth century, reaching its zenith after 1850 (Tanner & Tanner, 1980). It was Pestalozzi [1746-1827] who has largely been credited with using objects in teaching, as Dewey (1915) states:

In this phase of his activity as teacher, Pestalozzi was particularly zealous in building up schemes of object-lesson teaching in which children should learn the
spatial and numerical relations of things and acquire a vocabulary for expressing all their qualities. (pp. 65-66)

Pestalozzi, inspired by Rousseau's writings, believed that education provided a means of freedom from the rottenness of society and that "Nature is the best teacher" (Green, 1912, p. 5). Pestalozzi also held the belief that children should begin their education with things before words, moving from concrete to abstract (Green, 1912). Objects found in the child's environment, or in "real life", were preferred. Pestalozzi summarizes his philosophy of teaching with objects by stating:

I concluded, therefore, that number, form, and language, constitute the elementary means of instruction, inasmuch as form and number comprise all the *external* qualities of an object, and language gives it a specific place in my mind. (Pestalozzi in Green, 1912, p. 110)

It was the teacher's duty, through questioning, to establish firmly "the foundations of counting, measuring, and speaking; for the correct knowledge of all the objects that touch our senses is dependent upon them" (Pestalozzi in Green, 1912, p. 110).

Using objects for lessons soon developed into a method of pedagogy. The objectives of object-based learning "were to develop alertness, accuracy of perception, concepts and generalizations, and vocabulary" (Tanner & Tanner, 1990, p. 51). However, object-based learning as a teaching method came under scrutiny as it became more formalized. Lessons built around objects "were unrelated because there was no overall plan" (Tanner & Tanner, 1990, p. 51). Some lessons went off track, leading to discussions of one topic rather than the one set for that class, and others were merely vocabulary lessons.

The strength of object-based lessons is that direct experience with an object is a substitution for teacher verbalization about an object (Tanner & Tanner, 1990). The
legacy of object-based learning is learning by experience, learning by doing, learning as inquiry, visual aids, and field trips.

By emphasizing the importance of learning with objects, Pestalozzi created a niche for museums in the education field. His format for teaching with objects is easily transferred to teaching with artifacts in museums. Hooper-Greenhill (1991) upholds the object-based lesson and its long educational tradition by stating:

Object-teaching was common in schools in the second half of the nineteenth century and many of the methods of teaching from objects that were recommended at that time are recognizable as similar to those methods in use today. The recommendations concerning the presentation of objects to be apprehended, first through the senses, second in relation to things already known, third to be grasped and understood, and lastly to be critically considered, have stood the test of time. (p. 27)

The object-based lesson in the museum is grounded in the principles outlined by Pestalozzi. Hooper-Greenhill (1994) suggests the following methodology for developing an object-based museum lesson: 1) sensory exploration of the object; 2) discussion and analysis of the meaning, use, design, production and materials of the object; 3) associating the object with things already known about it, comparing it to other objects, and synthesizing information learned about the object; 4) placing the object in other contexts, and 5) linking the object to all subject areas. The purpose of the object-based lesson is skill development, particularly sensory perception, thinking, and language (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994).

English and Lipton-Doidge (1997) also promote museums as a place where students can learn from objects. Students must be taught how to read objects by developing two sets of skills for looking at and learning from them. First, students use observation skills (senses) to learn about an object. Next, students think about the object
using the higher order thinking skills of forming generalizations, making comparisons, interpreting evidence, and forming hypotheses. English and Lipton-Doidge (1997) suggest that in order for students to learn more from a site visit, they should develop their observation and analyzing skills in the classroom first.

Many of the concerns that I addressed about the artifact analysis method arise with object-based learning. Students' prior knowledge is not used as a base on which to build new learning, and the new learning is not connected to students' daily life in order to give it more meaning. Additionally, these methods of interpretation do not emphasize a context for the artifact because attention is focused on examining one object in isolation. There is little, if any, hands-on experience in an object-based lesson, and few opportunities for communication between students to share their new learnings. I believe that these are important considerations in the learning process.

**Curriculum Theory**

The focus of this study is the hermeneutic approach template as it is interpreted by museum educators in the development of programs for school children. Curriculum, the bridge that links the museum and school communities, is a vital element of the hermeneutic approach template. Curriculum, in the eyes of most educators, has become a text, or document, that is implemented by teachers in the classroom and, as such, is scrutinized by museum educators for a topic that can be incorporated into a museum education program. However, curriculum-as-document is informed by various orientations that also influence its interpretation by museum educators. In this section of the literature review, I examine three orientations of curriculum theory (empirical analytic, critical theoretic, and interpretive) and their relationship to museum education.
program development. The three paradigms were first identified by Habermas (1971) as the empirical-analytic, historical-hermeneutical, and critically oriented or emancipatory; these were later adapted as the transmission, transaction, and transformation positions (Miller & Seller, 1990) in the education field. Although originally conceived for use by teachers, curriculum specialists, and curriculum theorists, I contend that the three orientations of curriculum theory are transferable to the museum field. The top hat that was used previously to demonstrate the artifact as text is used below to clarify the practical applications of the three orientations.

Aoki (1980) establishes a man/world relationship framework that provides guidance in examining the three curriculum orientations because "it permits probing of the deeper meaning of what it is for persons (teachers and students) to be human, to become more human, and to act humanly in educational situations" (p. 6). This framework, which I suggest be redefined in current terminology as a person/world relationship, provides a mechanism for investigating what it means to be a museum educator or tour guide, artifact, and student within the three orientations. Aoki (1980) names the three orientations of curriculum inquiry as empirical analytic, situational interpretive, and critically reflective; I use empirical analytic, interpretive, and critical theory terms.

**Empirical Analytic Orientation of Curriculum**

Positivist, traditional, technical-scientific, technical-rational, and transmissiveal are synonyms for empirical analytic. They describe an orientation to curriculum planning that is designed to "optimize students' learning" and increase students' output (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1998, p. 196). Taba (1962) claims that curriculum is a plan for learning, and "a
way of preparing young people to participate as productive members of our culture" (p. 10). The central activity of this orientation is technical and intellectual work, with an empirical knowing and an understanding that comes from learning facts, cause and effect laws, theories, and generalizations (Aoki, 1980).

Within the empirical analytic orientation, curriculum is developed as a road map or blueprint for organizing human and material resources to create efficient learning environments. It is seen as a course of study, as exemplified by the documents produced by the Saskatchewan Department of Education, and as planning, teaching, and learning in educational environments (Tyler, 1988). Tyler (1988) states that curriculum development refers to planning an educational program that includes identifying and selecting objectives, selecting learning experiences, and program evaluation. Rather than being a theoretical activity, curriculum development is practical and oriented to the achievement of an educational end. Teachers can adapt the curriculum to meet their needs and personal teaching styles (Tyler, 1988).

Curriculum developed from the empirical analytic paradigm is linear and hierarchical, as noted by Blenkin and Kelly (1981):

[Curriculum planning] takes us from specifying objectives to selecting the content or the educational experiences most likely to help us to attain those objectives to planning the methods best suited to the effective organization of those experiences and finally to an evaluation of whether our purposes have been achieved. (p. 67)

Curriculum serves technical interests within the social organization of work (Schubert, 1986), and it provides a means to an end that can be rationally implemented and evaluated (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1998). Since knowledge is objectified, subject areas such science and mathematics that require quantitative inquiry are valued.
In the relationship between teacher and students, the teacher is viewed as the expert that passes knowledge on to the pupils. The lecture format is a common teaching strategy for communicating information to pupils. Textbooks and individual seatwork are also typical of an empirical analytic classroom.

The empirical analytic orientation is transferable to the museum field, as demonstrated briefly in Chapter One. A museum program developed from this perspective includes the identification and selection of objectives, the selection of learning experiences and materials, and program evaluation. The museum educator or tour guide who conducts the program is the expert that transmits knowledge of the artifacts or exhibits to the students, usually in a lecture format called a tour. Artifacts replace textbooks as a resource. However, worksheets written in the form of scavenger hunts are common.

To demonstrate the application of the empirical analytic orientation within a museum setting, I return to the example of the top hat in a program incorporating the grade four social studies topic of Saskatchewan heroes of the past and present. After selecting the topic, in this instance a Prime Minister from Saskatchewan, the next task is to state a learning objective. Tyler (1988) suggests that objectives be stated clearly and generally rather than specifically, and in terms of behaviour. Therefore, the objective for the museum program is that the students will learn about the political life of John Diefenbaker, Canada's eighteenth Prime Minister.

The next step is to select and create learning experiences that enable students to perform the learning objective, or the desired behaviour. Creative and exciting experiences that capture students' interests and provide opportunities to practice the
desired behaviour are necessary, as is "feedback to inform the learner when his performance is not satisfactory so that he can try again" (Tyler, 1988, p. 229). At the museum, a program incorporating the top hat and other artifacts provides an opportunity for students to learn facts about Prime Minister Diefenbaker to fulfil the objective. During the visit students sit passively, like they do in their classroom, to hear the tour guide explain that the top hat was made in London in 1920, purchased by Mr. Diefenbaker, and worn at formal functions such as state dinners hosted for world leaders. Tyler (1988) recommends that the learning experience be transferable to the student's life outside of school; knowledge gained at the museum about the political system and the duties of Prime Minister Diefenbaker are transferable to current political practices. Finally, students' learning is evaluated at the conclusion of the program via questioning; students might be asked to identify former Prime Minister Diefenbaker's use of the top hat, or where it was purchased.

An objectives-based program incorporating the top hat is generic, meaning that all visitors are given the same information despite their various backgrounds and learning styles. The program does not accommodate cultural differences. For example, new Canadians may not be familiar with the top hat and its significance as a fashion statement. There is no attempt to facilitate understanding by connecting the top hat with headgear in their culture that plays a similar role.

**The Use of Objectives in Curriculum and Museum Education Program Planning**

As noted above, the use of objectives in the planning of curriculum and classroom lessons is fundamental to the empirical analytical orientation. The same reasons given by planners for using objectives in curriculum development are adaptable by museum
educators in the planning of programs. Blenkin and Kelly (1981) identify logical, scientific, politico-economic, and educational arguments for the use of objectives, and I would add prescriptive as a fifth for museum educators. After briefly describing the reasons for using objectives, I suggest reasons for not developing objectives-based museum education programs in order to lay the foundation for introducing a program planning strategy that does not employ objectives.

A logical reason for using objectives is that it provides a way of stating our teaching intentions. Education, as a rational activity, must be aimed at achieving a purpose or goal, otherwise it risks becoming aimless. Therefore, objectives are used in stating the purpose or goal of the curriculum (Blenkin & Kelly, 1981). Museum educators also adopt logical reasoning as an argument for using objectives, as I discovered in a conversation with a peer when I introduced the concept of the hermeneutic approach at a Museums Association of Saskatchewan meeting held on November 28, 1998. When it was discovered that the hermeneutic approach did not employ objectives, one museum educator stated that a museum education program without objectives would lack direction and be unacceptable to teachers. The experiences of the co-developer in Stage Two (Chapter Four) and the implementer in Stage Four (Chapter Five) demonstrate that objectives-free programs can be successfully developed and implemented.

The scientific reason holds that many of the principles used in the sciences can be applied to curriculum planning, such as measuring and analyzing. The means-end notion that is prevalent in the sciences is evident in curriculum planning. Museum education programs exemplify scientific characteristics in program objectives that outline the end to be achieved (learning facts about the collections) and the means to do it (gallery talks or
tours). Student behaviour is determined by objectives that can be tested and measured at the end of the program.

Blenkin and Kelly (1981) define the politico-economic reason as being tied to accountability of public funds. When the purpose of teaching is clearly defined in curriculum objectives, it can be evaluated to determine whether tax dollars have been well spent. If an evaluation determines that objectives have not been met, then changes in financial support are possible. In museums, the evaluation of objectives to determine program effectiveness is often a requirement of corporate sponsorship and government grants.

The educational reason for using objectives is tied to evaluation (Blenkin & Kelly, 1981). Once objectives have been stated and the curriculum or program is evaluated, the effectiveness of teaching can be determined. The curriculum, or the museum education program, can be changed effectively if data about its effects are gathered and analyzed.

Finally, the use of objectives is prescriptive in its methodology for developing museum education programs. Its linear format is easy to follow, as noted in Chapter One and my example of the Vote For Me! program.

Arguments against the use of objectives in curriculum planning noted by some authors (Blenkin & Kelly, 1981; Ornstein & Hunkins, 1998) provide the rationale for considering an alternative museum education program development strategy. One argument suggests that the scientific approach to curriculum planning reduces education to an industrial model, and assumes that:
It is legitimate to mould human beings, to modify their behaviour, according to certain clear-cut intentions without making any allowance for their own individual wishes, desires or interests. (Blenkin & Kelly, 1981)

As a museum educator, the emphasis of my programs is to provide opportunities for students to have an interactive experience with artifacts, rather than to affect or change their behaviour. Therefore, objectives-based program development is not the optimum program development strategy for meeting my needs.

At the Museums Association of Saskatchewan meeting of November 28, 1998, one museum educator expressed an interest in learning about the hermeneutic approach as an alternative program development strategy because she found it difficult to write objectives. Not having been trained as a teacher, the technique of crafting well-written statements of expectations for students' behaviour was a process that did not come easily to her, and she welcomed a different approach for planning programs. The hermeneutic approach to museum education program development is an alternative to the objectives-based format for educators such as the one previously mentioned, and for others who simply want to have a variety of planning strategies at their disposal. An alternative strategy need not be less effective at producing a successful program as an objectives-based model. As Oliva (1997) states:

I would be hard-pressed to come up with solid experimental data to show that students exposed to a behavioral-objectives approach consistently show higher achievement than students whose instruction has been guided by other approaches. (p. 343)

Finally, Ornstein and Hunkins (1998) note that the empirical analytical orientation presents a rational, objective, and logical view of education that is output-oriented. However, a non-technical, non-scientific approach emphasizes "the subjective, personal, aesthetic, heuristic, and transactional" (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1998, p. 203). Rather than
viewing curriculum as something that can be planned with precision, it is something that evolves, and is activity-oriented. It is the non-technical, non-scientific view of curriculum planning that I think has been overlooked in favour of an empirical analytical approach; I believe it should be explored and developed more fully in museum education program planning. The hermeneutic approach, grounded in the non-technical (interpretive) approach, is discussed a little later in this chapter.

**Critical Theoretic Orientation of Curriculum**

Criticisms of the empirical analytic orientation by critical theorists sheds light on the critical theoretic perspective of curriculum. In the next few pages I examine ideas raised by selected critical theorists (Anyon, 1981; Apple, 1993; Freire, 1970; Gaskell, 1993; Giroux, 1985) to set the stage for introducing an interpretation of the top hat from a critical theoretic orientation.

Drawing from Marxist philosophy, the critical theoretic orientation views schooling as part of a larger, oppressive, social order (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1998). The purpose of critical theory is "to enable people to reflect and critique the dominant socioeconomic class structure and the ways in which the curriculum serves to perpetuate such structure" (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1998, p. 186). Critical theorists question class, race, gender, and economic issues related to curriculum and pedagogy by reflecting on questions such as "Whose interests are being served by curricula?" and "What knowledge is of most worth?" The central activity of the critical theoretic orientation is reflection with an intention to take action to liberate people and improve the human condition (Aoki, 1980). Understanding is a result of reflection, and knowing is in terms of a critical knowing combining reflection and action (Aoki, 1980).
Freire (1970) metaphorically describes the empirical analytic orientation as a banking concept of education in which "knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing" (p. 58). The teacher deposits knowledge into students, the depositories, who are viewed as containers or passive receptacles (Freire, 1970). Knowledge is not a process of inquiry.

Anyon (1981) suggests that a "hidden curriculum" exists to educate students for future careers according to their perceived social class. In an analysis of her study conducted in working-class, middle-class, affluent professional, and executive elite schools, she concludes that "the 'hidden curriculum' of schoolwork is tacit preparation for relating to the process of production in a particular way" (Anyon, 1981, p. 339). For example, students in the executive elite classroom were expected to "reason through a problem, to produce intellectual products that are both logically sound and of top academic quality" (Anyon, 1981, p. 333), whereas students in the working-class school performed mechanical, rote work. Students in the elite classroom were being prepared for white collar careers "that demand the creativity and the skills necessary for a self-managed existence," whereas working class students were being prepared for blue collar jobs "that are routine and mechanical in nature" (Anyon, 1981, p. 317).

Gaskell (1993) examines three dominant discourses in education pertaining to gender issues in curriculum. The first discourse is the attempt to eliminate gender differences so that males and females are more alike, and thereby able to compete equally for rewards or jobs. From this perspective, women can do what men do, and research serves the purpose of critiquing "the different and unequal treatment that girls and women get in school and in society" (Gaskell, 1993, p. 146). The second discourse addresses how
women are valued, and that what women do is seen as less important than what men do, particularly in research and scholarship. Therefore, this view is concerned "less with individual mobility than with redressing the power balance between men and women, reason and emotion, reproductive and productive spheres" (Gaskell, 1993, p. 147). Finally, the third discourse recognizes "that differences exist not just between men and women, but among and within groups of women and men" (Gaskell, 1993, p. 147) and is concerned with gender categories.

Apple (1993) challenges educators to examine social and personal power relations within the classroom, curriculum, and resource materials such as textbooks, by asking whose knowledge it is that is being taught. Power can be social or personal, and is used by a group or individual to dominate another. Evidence of power relationships can be found in textbooks that superficially mention issues significant to the less powerful (Apple, 1993). This "mentioning" of selected issues gives the appearance of acceptance by the dominant group, as he suggests:

A small and often separate section is included on the "contributions of women" and "minority groups," but without any substantive elaboration of the view of the world as seen from their perspectives. (Apple, 1993, p. 56)

In his critique of the empirical analytic orientation, Giroux (1985) notes the hierarchical nature of curriculum development and implementation that results in a deskilling of teachers. Experts design the curricula and teachers simply implement it without having an opportunity to deliberate and reflect on it (Giroux, 1985). He also notes the effect of empirical analytic curriculum development on students:

More specifically, the narrowing of curricula choices to a back-to-basics format, and the introduction of lock-stop, time-on-task pedagogies operate from the theoretically erroneous assumption that all students can learn from the same materials, classroom instructional techniques and modes of evaluation. The notion
that students come from different histories and embody different experiences, linguistic practices, cultures and talents is strategically ignored within the logic and accountability of management pedagogy theory. (Giroux, 1985, p. 378)

The role of the critical theoretic teacher is to be a "transformative intellectual" (Giroux, 1985) or change agent within the classroom who empowers and enables students to actively seek social change. Teaching requires reflection about what is taught, to whom, how, and why. Students become participants in education, as co-discoverers with teachers. Rote learning is replaced by problem-posing education (Freire, 1970).

As a critical theoretic teacher and co-discoverer of knowledge, I would use the top hat to generate questions of race, class, gender, and economic status. For example, the use of the top hat by a white male Prime Minister could be used to raise questions of the marginalization of women and the economically disadvantaged from positions of political power. As co-discoverers, the students and I could research whose interests were served by the fur trade industry, and by the social events attended by the Prime Minister wearing his top hat. Our investigations would lead to social action, for example writing letters to Members of Parliament lobbying for gender equity in the public service.

While critical theoretic is one perspective from which to develop museum education programs, in this study I chose not to align myself to it for the following four reasons. First, it requires preparation by the teacher prior to their museum visit that some are not willing to complete, particularly for end-of-the-year recreational field trips. Second, there is an expectation that students will return to class and follow up as agents of social change; this may not happen. As a result the museum visit becomes an isolated event, unconnected to pre- and post-visit classroom learning, and is less meaningful to students. Third, not all teachers are familiar or comfortable with a role of transformative
intellectual (Giroux, 1985) and they do not view their students as oppressed, making the museum visit incompatible with their teaching style. Fourth, some of the issues raised, such as the marginalization of women and minority groups, are political in nature and may require teacher intervention. Perhaps there are issues that teachers, parents or school board members do not want discussed but that may be raised in the museum program. It is against my nature to turn students into active agents of social change about contentious issues raised at the museum and then send them back into the classroom for the teacher to manage, unless this type of visit has been pre-arranged or pre-approved by the teacher. Given these factors, the museum visit could leave the teacher unsatisfied. He or she might not return for another program and might spread negative comments to other teachers about the visit.

**Interpretive Orientation of Curriculum**

I believe that the interpretive orientation best reflects the essence of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. In the next few pages I provide a description of the interpretive orientation prior to demonstrating an activity with the top hat. In the interpretive orientation to curriculum, understanding is in terms of the meanings people, including students, give to situations (Aoki, 1980). The central activity is communication between people and their social world (Aoki, 1980). There are two ways in which this is significant to museum education program development. First, the central activity of communication is addressed in experiences students have sharing their new learning with each other. Second, students visit museums to view and possibly handle artifacts. Each artifact communicates a message to students about the context in which it was created and used, including a social context. Understanding, context, and
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meaning are considered in greater detail in a description of the hermeneutic approach template later in the chapter.

The interpretive orientation is child-centred and subjective. It acknowledges that people give their own meanings to situations. As Ornstein and Hunkins (1998) state:

The key focus of curriculum activity is not the content, the subject matter per se, but rather the individual. Subject matter tentatively selected in the development process has importance only to the degree that a student can find meaning in it for himself or herself. Subject matter should provide opportunities for a reflection on and the grist for a critique of knowledge, for engaging the student dynamically in the creation of meaning. (p. 203)

This orientation recognizes that "each individual gives meaning to his or her particular situation, and these meanings vary from one individual to another according to their interpretations" (Jacknicke & Rowell, 1987, p. 65). Therefore, there are multiple ways of knowing.

The interpretive orientation has roots in the child-centred progressive movement of the early 1900's. Rather than the rote transmission of facts by an expert teacher as exemplified (in the extreme) by the empirical analytic orientation, students learned from a variety of activities that are still practiced today. As noted by Ornstein and Hunkins (1998):

From this approach, numerous curriculum activities have emerged, mainly at the elementary school level, including lessons based on life experiences, group games, group projects, artistic endeavors, dramatizations, field trips, social enterprises, learning and interest centers, and homework and tutoring stations (or corners). These activities include creative problem solving and active student participation; they emphasize socialization and life adjustment for students, as well as stronger family and school-community ties. (p. 8)

The interpretive orientation considers the development of the whole child, including the cognitive and affective dimensions, meaning that music, art, and literature are as important as mathematics and science. Cooperative, independent, and small group
learning are favoured over teacher-directed, competitive, large group instruction. The teacher is a connoisseur while the student is a participant in education. Curriculum includes life experiences.

As an exemplar of the interpretive orientation, Dewey (1915) advocated the use of experiences in the implementation of curriculum in two ways. First, students' own life experiences are used as a foundation for building new experiences. Dewey (1915) recognized the significance of a child's daily experiences when he stated:

The task of the school is to take these crude experiences and organize them into science, geography, arithmetic, or whatever the lesson of the hour is. Since what the child already knows is part of some one subject that the teacher is trying to teach him, the method that will take advantage of this experience as a foundation stone on which to build the child's conscious knowledge of the subject appears as the normal and progressive way of teaching. And if we can enlarge the child's experience by methods which resemble as nearly as possible the ways that the child has acquired his beginning experiences, it is obvious that we have made a great gain in the effectiveness of our teaching. (p. 72)

Dewey's (1915) second reference to experience reflected a process of experiencing, which he called "learning by doing". Schoolwork included more than textbook learning; subject content was applied in practical situations, such as the building of houses, the planting of gardens, or the lobbying of politicians. Dewey (1915) held the belief that:

No book or map is a substitute for personal experience; they cannot take the place of the actual journey. The mathematical formula for a falling body does not take the place of throwing stones or shaking apples from a tree. (p. 74)

More than merely providing isolated experiences for students, Dewey believed that experiences should be cumulative, with continuity over time. He expressed this in the term "experiential continuum," meaning "every experience lives on in further experiences" (Dewey, 1938, p. 28). Therefore, the quality of the experience is important,
as is the effect of the experience. Both of these factors will have a bearing on desirable future experiences (Dewey, 1938).

According to Dewey (1916) the curriculum must be developed with the needs of the community first, "with the intention of improving the life we live in common so that the future shall be better than the past" (p. 191). The teacher's role is that of facilitator in a reciprocal learning relationship with the student. The goal is to stimulate thinking and to instigate learning by sharing an experience with the student. Problem-solving is the preferred method of education, as it promotes reflective thinking which will result in social progress.

Another of Dewey's contributions to curriculum theory is the notion of whole-to-part teaching. In response to the object-teaching pedagogy advanced by Pestalozzi, Dewey (1916) notes the fallacy of Pestalozzi's part-to-whole approach when he states "it is assumed that before objects can be intelligently used, their properties must be known" (p. 199). While Pestalozzi advocated learning from the simple to the complex (Green, 1912), Dewey (1915) believed teaching the elements of an object prior to viewing the object as a whole was a misrepresentation to Pestalozzi's simple to complex suggestion that resulted in the part-to-whole methodology. Dewey (1915), who believed that learning should be reasonable, saw the part-to-whole process as unreasonable.

Learning by experience, the use of field trips, children as active participants in learning, meaning-making, and whole-to-part learning are characteristics of the interpretive orientation that fit well with the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development, as will be demonstrated later in the chapter.
As an artifact in an interpretive orientation, the top hat would not be displayed in isolation. Rather, it would be placed within a context, perhaps perched atop a mannequin dressed in formal attire symbolizing Prime Minister Diefenbaker attending a state function. Students would be encouraged to reflect on their own prior experiences of formal occasions, or times when they have been required to wear headgear. A new experience might include trying the top hat on to see how it feels to wear it, and what it looks like. Then, students would be encouraged to gain a deeper understanding of their experiences by sharing it with others, and to find commonalities among experiences. Emphasis is not placed on learning facts about the top hat (as in the empirical analytic orientation) or reflecting about the top hat as a symbol of an oppressive male dominated western culture (as in the critical theoretic orientation). Instead, the emphasis is placed on assisting each student make meaning of their experience with top hat and the message it is communicating. Unlike the empirical analytic orientation with its generic view, the interpretive is more accommodating to cultural differences by encouraging students to bring their prior understandings to the learning event.

The hermeneutic approach to museum education program development is strongly connected to the interpretive orientation and its view of students, teachers, and the roles of experience and communication. Hermeneutics also contributes to the approach, and will now be discussed in greater detail.

Hermeneutics

Hermeneutics provides the philosophical base for the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. The word hermeneutics originates from the Greek verb "hermeneuein," meaning "to interpret," and the noun "hermeneia," meaning
"interpretation" (Palmer, 1969). It is linked to Greek mythology through Hermes, the messenger god, who "is associated with the function of transmuting what is beyond human understanding into a form that human intelligence can grasp" (Palmer, 1969, p. 13). Language and writing are tools discovered by Hermes to help bring to human understanding the message of the gods.

The verb "to interpret" has three different meanings -- to say, to explain, and to translate (Palmer, 1969). Therefore, interpretation:

Can refer to three rather different matters: an oral recitation, a reasonable explanation, and a translation from another language -- both in Greek and English usage. Yet one may note that the foundational "Hermes process" is at work: in all three cases, something foreign, strange, separated in time, space, or experience is made familiar, present, comprehensible; something requiring representation, explanation, or translation is somehow "brought to understanding" -- is "interpreted." (Palmer, 1969, p. 14)

The discipline of hermeneutics has essentially been concerned with the translation of text from something foreign or separated in time into a familiar idiom, and two approaches having significance for museum education program development -- the philological and the theological -- have evolved which realize the "Hermes process."

**Philologicaal Hermeneutics**

Philological hermeneutics, used in the interpretation of classical texts, focuses on the form of the text, particularly its aesthetic and grammatical features. Ast [1778 -1841], for example, clarified the basic task of hermeneutics as "grasping the 'spirit' of antiquity, which is most clearly revealed in the literary heritage" (Palmer, 1969, p. 76). Grasping the spirit of antiquity is accomplished by attending to grammar and the changes of language over time. Additionally, philological hermeneutics attempts to understand the literal meaning conveyed in the text, and the historical context within which it was
written. Other works by the author might be explored to know the exact sense or meaning of the words. Hermeneutics is used to clarify the work "through the development of its meaning internally and the relationship of its inner parts to each other and to the larger spirit of the age" (Palmer, 1969, p. 77).

Adapting the philological approach for the interpretation of artifacts in a museum education program implies a focus on the form of the artifact, specifically its literal meaning. A philological approach to interpreting the top hat, for example, would emphasize its literal or exact meaning as formal headgear, followed by a study of the time period in which it was manufactured. Attention is paid to factual information, such as the age, function and attributes of the top hat, as well as its historical significance. This approach matches the previously mentioned object-based learning.

One of Ast's most significant contributions to hermeneutics is the idea that reproduction, or the repetition of the creative process, is instrumental in the course of understanding (Palmer, 1969). To understand the top hat in an Astian sense, visitors would need to reproduce one of their own, and try wearing it to replicate the exact use, or literal meaning, of the object. Thus, the philological approach to interpretation, with its emphasis on form, includes the sensory exploration of an artifact in the development of museum education programs.

Theological Hermeneutics

The theological approach to hermeneutics, used in the interpretation of biblical texts, focuses on content rather than form. The text, which is a voice speaking from another world, communicates a message to be translated into a familiar form for "appropriation" by humans (Bulhof, 1980). The insights contained in the text are intended
to personally affect the reader. Museum education programs developed using this approach focus on the message conveyed in the artifact or exhibit. The message of the top hat to be rendered intelligible might be the relationship between attire and social functions within a political administration and its influence on the general populace.

Dilthey's Hermeneutics

The German philosopher Dilthey (1833-1911) extended theological hermeneutics beyond biblical interpretation to the study of history through historical evidence (Bulhof, 1980). More than text interpretation, hermeneutics is a theory of "how life discloses and expresses itself in works" (Palmer, 1969, p. 114). For museums, artifacts and paintings are works that disclose something to the visitor about the life of the work's user or creator. Dilthey's discourses on hermeneutics provide insights into the study of history, and his hermeneutic formula of expression, experience, and understanding also contains philosophical ideas pertinent to museum educators.

Experience. Dilthey recognized that life, or human experience, is expressed in history. The importance of studying history is not just to learn factual information about people and events of the past, but to learn about ourselves (Palmer, 1969). This implies that museum education programs need to do more than disseminate facts to visitors; they need to present an opportunity for visitors to discover something about their own human nature through people and events of the past.

Dilthey also recognized the value of history "as the training ground of judgment" (Rickman, 1988, p. 41). A temporal relationship exists among the past, present, and future, as we can use the past to explain the present and anticipate the future. Dilthey identified the historicity of humans, "the fact that man is, essentially, a historical being
whose thinking is rooted in the cumulative experience of temporal existence and who has to be understood in these terms" (Rickman, 1988, p. 41). A parallel view of historicity is evident in Dewey's (1938) experiential continuum, or cumulation of experiences, which he describes:

Just as no man lives or dies to himself, so no experience lives and dies to itself. Wholly independent of desire or intent, every experience lives on in further experiences. Hence the central problem of an education based upon experience is to select the kind of present experiences that live fruitfully and creatively in subsequent experiences. (pp. 27-28)

In the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development, experience is accommodated through temporal and physical experiences. The temporal nature of experience is acknowledged in the pre-understanding phase, at which time the students reflect on previous experiences about a theme or artifact prior to engaging in a new experience in the education program that may lead to future experiences of visits to the museum. The students have an opportunity to gain new experiences by physically handling and perhaps replicating artifacts.

Expression. Dilthey used the word "expression" to refer to expressions of life or lived experience, such as laws, texts, gestures, ideas, musical compositions, and works of art, rather than an embodiment of one's feelings (Palmer, 1969). He extended theological hermeneutics with the view that cultural products also communicate a message to be "appropriated" by the interpreter. Each artifact, document, or work of art "talks" to us about reality or human nature. Therefore, an artifact chosen for a museum education program expresses life, lived experience, or human nature, which differs from its role in an object-based lesson for "the training of the senses, the development of thinking, and the development of language" (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994, p. 232).
Understanding. Dilthey used the term "understanding" to mean "that special moment when life understands life" (Palmer, 1969, p. 115). Understanding is accomplished through the appropriation of another's experience, "a transposition and reexperiencing of the world as another person meets it in lived experience" (Palmer, 1969, p. 115). In the brief time that students participate in a museum education program, understanding can be facilitated through the provision of activities which reproduce a moment in the life of another, and by connecting a new experience or understanding to ones already held by the student. If, for example, the students are to understand the lived experience of a Canadian Prime Minister wearing a top hat to a state function, then the program's activities should facilitate the appropriation of that lived experience. The process of making and wearing a top hat becomes as important as placing the artifact in the meaningful context of a mannequin wearing formal evening attire.

Dilthey's hermeneutic formula of experience, expression, and understanding can be elaborated into a strategy for developing museum education programs. Experience, for example, includes those experiences or pre-understandings that students bring to the program, and the new experience gained in the visit. Artifacts from the museum's collections represent expressions of lived experiences that the students will see during the visit. Placing the artifacts within a context, connecting them to students' pre-understandings, providing experiences for students to recreate a process of the lived experience of another, and giving opportunities for communicating their experiences to others are ways in which the museum program facilitates students' understanding. These components, and their place within the program development strategy, are discussed in more detail in the next section.
Stage One:

The Hermeneutic Approach to Museum Education Program Development

Conceptually, the hermeneutic approach comprises elements of museology (artifacts, museum mandate, educational programming for visitors), pedagogy (structure and presentation of educational activities), hermeneutics (principles of pre-understanding, communication, context, experience), and curriculum theory (curriculum orientation, topic of study) that form a strategy for developing museum education programs. My intention was to develop the theoretical foundation for a practical program development strategy as an alternative to the objectives-based model. I wanted an approach that blended important characteristics from the education and museum fields, such as curriculum and artifacts, and was easily implemented by museum educators. Rather than learning facts about artifacts, I wanted a strategy for creating an experiential program in the Dewey tradition of learning by doing that incorporated Dilthey's hermeneutic philosophy of understanding (Palmer, 1969). What evolved was the theoretical framework of a template blending curriculum, hermeneutics, pedagogy, and museology that had the potential to be a valuable practical tool.

The hermeneutic approach template comprised the components of curriculum topic, museum mandate, storyline, themes, artifacts, program: pre-understanding, process, meaning-in-context, connectedness, experience and communication. My interpretation of storyline and themes is rooted in a method of interpretation advanced by Levy (1996). I have used artifacts as a title rather than evidence (Levy, 1996). Figure 1 (p. 12) represents a prototype of the template in diagram form. I felt that a linear, step-by-step format would be easy for the co-developer in Stage Two, the workshop participants
in Stage Three, and the implementer in Stage Four to interpret in the development of a museum education program. Each component of the hermeneutic approach template is examined below.

**Curriculum Topic**

One of the first tasks in developing a museum education program using the hermeneutic approach is to find an appropriate curriculum topic, usually a few words, that will be enhanced in the program. A grade-specific topic provides guidance to the museum educator in developing a program with activities that are suited to the abilities of the students and fits with their course of study in the classroom. The curriculum topic is the connection to the teacher that fixes the museum as an out-of-classroom resource. Some museum programs are not curriculum-specific, and risk being so general in nature that they do not meet the particular curriculum needs of any teacher. My preference is to make a strong curriculum link between the classroom and the museum so that the museum program fits naturally within a unit of study.

Since the curriculum in Saskatchewan has been determined by the Department of Education, subject-specific documents for each grade level exist that outline what is to be taught. These are available to museum educators in hard copy or on the Internet. As an educator in a museum focusing on a certain period in history, I would likely look to the social studies curriculum first for curriculum topics. This was the case with the co-developer in Stage Two. It was even the case in Stage Four, where the implementer who worked in an art gallery and was developing a program for a predominantly art-oriented exhibit looked to the social studies curriculum rather than the art curriculum for a topic; this was atypical for her.
The definition for the hermeneutic approach template's curriculum topic component reads as follows: *The specific point or topic to be addressed in the museum program*. This definition was given to the Stage Two co-developer, Stage Three workshop participants, and the Stage Four implementer.

**Museum Mandate**

The next component to consider in the implementation of the hermeneutic approach template is the museum's mission statement or mandate. Many museums have a policy that states their focus and determines the scope of their collections and exhibits. Some temporary exhibits for which a program is developed also have a mission statement in the form of a paragraph that describes its main characteristics. Either the museum mandate or the temporary exhibit's statement is considered in the museum mandate component.

The museum's mission statement is an integral component of the hermeneutic approach template because it keeps the focus of the program's development on the museum's resources. Since our responsibility as educators is to educate the public about our museum's collections, the mandate component ensures that this vital duty is not overlooked. When accountability is an issue, incorporating the mandate into a program demonstrates to governing boards that the educational role of the museum is being fulfilled.

The definition for the museum mandate component of the hermeneutic approach template reads: *The parameters within which the museum defines its collections and exhibitions.*
**Storyline**

The storyline combines both the curriculum topic and museum mandate into one or two sentences that provide direction for the development of the program. Crafting a well-written, succinct storyline is neither easy nor quick, as Lenna found in Stage Two of the research. She found that writing the storyline required reflection and editing over several days.

In a Museums Association of Saskatchewan meeting of November 28, 1998 when I introduced the hermeneutic approach as a strategy for developing education programs, one museum educator in attendance stated that the storyline was an objective, but with a different name. To me, the storyline is not an objective, as I recorded in my fieldnotes log: "Indeed it [the storyline] isn't [an objective]. Objectives are measurable, often designed to change behaviours, but a storyline isn't an objective" (Nov. 28, 1998).

The storyline captures the essence of the program and gives it focus. The definition that was developed and presented to the museum educators in Stages Two, Three and Four states: *A single sentence or two which communicates the basic story weaving together the curriculum topic and the museum’s mandate. Ideally, the curriculum topic and museum mandate will fit like a hand to a glove.*

**Themes**

From the storyline, three to five themes emerge to be developed in greater detail in the program. The themes, written in one or two sentences, are key ideas that enhance the storyline. Levy (1997, workshop materials) suggests that the theme be written in an objective format "Visitors will understand that ...." While this may be a helpful way for some museum educators to begin framing the wording of the theme, I think it narrows the
focus of the theme. It risks reducing the theme to a measurable objective and turning the
program into a transmissional mode of explaining. My concern in creating an objective-
based statement such as "Visitors, or students, will understand" is that explaining
supplants understanding. As Palmer (1969) notes:

Explaning is for the sciences, but the approach to phenomena which unites the
inner and outer is understanding. The sciences explain nature, the human studies
understand expressions of life. Understanding can grasp the individual entity, but
science must always see the individual as a means of arriving at the general, the
type. (p. 105)

Rather than generalizing so that all students are given the same information and
are expected to understand in the same way, I prefer each student to have an individual
experience of understanding. In my opinion, the theme statement that does not begin
"The visitor, or student, will understand that" provides more potential for creating a
program directed at individual understanding and meaning-making.

Another concern I have with stating "The visitors will understand" is that the
emphasis will be on understanding to the exclusion of experiencing and communicating.
For example, consider the theme "The visitors will understand that Prime Minister
Diefenbaker hosted state occasions requiring formal attire." My focus is ensuring that
visitors understand the fact noted in the latter part of the statement. I might show the top
hat as an example of the formal attire worn by the Prime Minister at state occasions.
However, if the theme states "Prime Minister Diefenbaker hosted state occasions
requiring formal attire," then my scope is broader. I might provide opportunities to
experience what it is like to wear a top hat and host a state occasion, or I might encourage
visitors to communicate their recollections of formal occasions. Visitors arrive at an
understanding of the theme, but in a different way than if it is stated simply as an
objective oriented to understanding. My desire is that they will appropriate the lived experience of the Prime Minister, to capture "that special moment when life understands life" (Palmer, 1969, p. 115).

I provided a definition of themes to Lenna, the workshop participants and Sandy that reads: 3 to 5 themes emerge from the storyline. These are written in one or more sentences. They are the important points that you want visitors to understand by the time they leave. Studies show that visitors remember between 3 and 5 themes (Levy, 1997, workshop materials).

Artifacts

Once the themes have been identified, then artifacts are selected to explain and enhance them. Placing the selection of artifacts later rather than earlier in the development of the program is a contentious issue among museum educators. For example, at the November 28, 1998 meeting of the Museums Association of Saskatchewan when I introduced the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development, a discussion ensued about the topic of artifact selection. Some educators hold the view that artifacts should be chosen first, then the program is built around them. They argued that before a program can be created, the museum educator has to know what is available in the collection to work with. My counter-argument is that artifact selection is appropriate later in the development of the program because specific artifacts are chosen as the best examples to enhance the theme. Additionally, if the museum's mandate is incorporated into the storyline, then it is likely that the artifacts chosen for the themes will be appropriate to the storyline and will be available in the
collections. In Stage Two, Lenna demonstrates that placing the artifact selection later in the development of the program is successful.

Artifacts are expressions of lived experience, whether they are texts, works of art, or objects. When treated as text, the role of the artifact changes from an object providing sensory data to something that communicates a message and invites interpretation. As Bulhof (1980) explains:

As entities having a "voice" of their own, and wanting to be understood, works of art figure like subjects instead of like objects: as autonomous sources of meaning, in their own way addressing man. (p. 74)

Like biblical texts that convey messages to be appropriated by humans (Palmer, 1969), artifacts also have messages to communicate. In Stage Two of the study (Chapter Four), the co-developer discusses the notion that artifacts can speak and have messages to deliver to visitors.

There are several ways that artifacts can be chosen for use in a program. In some cases, as was Sandy's experience in Stage Four, artifacts are pre-selected and the museum educator has to use what is exhibited. A temporary travelling exhibit is an example of pre-selected artifacts. However, not all artifacts might be used in a program. As in Sandy's example, she chose several artworks that were on display to enhance the themes. In other cases, the museum educator can select artifacts from the collection for use in hands-on parts of the program. These artifacts might be extras that will not be displayed because of their condition or their quantity, but are made available for educational purposes; Lenna in Stage Two had this experience. Sometimes artifacts, or replicas of artifacts called props, are purchased specifically for the museum education program. Some artifacts are used for hands-on purposes, others are for looking but not touching.
Some are grouped in a display while others are used on their own. Each situation will be different, and the museum educator has to choose the most appropriate use of artifacts for the program.

I had defined the artifact component as follows: *Evidence which enhances, enlightens, or describes the theme.*

**Program**

The first five components of the hermeneutic approach template (curriculum topic, museum mandate, storyline, themes, and artifacts) tend to be of a planning nature, but the next six program components (pre-understanding, connectedness, process, experience, meaning-in-context, and communication) focus more on the activities that will engage students during their visit. The latter six are the practical and pedagogical implementation of the former six museological and curricular elements.

In Figure 1 (p. 12), I had clustered the six latter components in a circle around the title "program". Conceptually, I envisioned "program" as being the visit itself. The program part of the template was to include the development of activities for welcoming students, engaging them in learning, and concluding the visit. I was unsure how another museum educator would interpret the program section, and what order the components would take. I saw pre-understanding as being first and communication last, but was unsure of the order of everything else in between. Rather than seeing the hermeneutic approach template as being completely linear, I positioned the six components in a circle as a rejection of my typical program planning method, not realizing that it might be confusing for Lenna. Quite accidentally the components were placed in a particular order when I typed a set of definitions to give Lenna. I inadvertently chose an order that she
followed. My definition for "program" reads: *Putting the themes into action. What the students will learn on their visit and how they will learn it.*

**Pre-understanding.** The pre-understanding component is derived from hermeneutics. Palmer (1969) states:

> Since we understand always from within our own horizon, which is part of the hermeneutic circle, there can be no nonpositional understanding of anything. We understand by constant reference to our experience. (p. 121)

At the beginning of the program, students are challenged through questioning or some other means (Lenna used a birth order questionnaire in her program) to recall their previous experiences and prior knowledge about the artifacts or theme. Students' prior knowledge, or pre-understanding, is their horizon. Therefore, their horizon of understanding is the starting point for introducing a new horizon of information in the remainder of the museum program.

Dilthey believed that "concrete, historical, lived experience must be the starting and ending point" for disciplines such as humanities and the social sciences that interpret expressions of the inner life of humans (Palmer, 1969, p. 99). I have applied this philosophy to the pre-understanding component of the hermeneutic approach template. The students' lived experiences are the starting points for entering into an interpretation of the themes and artifacts presented in the museum education program. The definition for pre-understanding was: *What do students already know about the themes? This step establishes a foundation on which to build new knowledge about the theme.*

**Connectedness.** Connecting the theme and artifacts to students' lives is another component of the hermeneutic approach template that is rooted in hermeneutic philosophy. Its purpose is to make the new learning relevant and meaningful to students.
Dewey (1915) recognizes the importance of providing relevant experiences for children when he states:

It is possible for a child to learn the various properties of squares, rectangles, etc., and to acquire their names. But unless the squares and rectangles enter into his purposeful activities he is merely accumulating scholastic information. (p. 68)

In other words, making an artifact such as the top hat relevant to students' lives is preferred to accumulating scholastic information about it. Rather than learning the properties of the top hat, the students should have a purposeful activity with it.

To explore the issue of relevancy further, and to consider making an interaction with artifacts more meaningful to students, I have applied Dilthey's philosophy of the human sciences to a museum visit. He believed that:

The object of the human sciences should not be to understand life in terms of categories extrinsic to it but from intrinsic categories, ones derived from life. Life must be understood from the experience of life itself. (Palmer, 1969, p. 102)

I interpreted this statement specifically for use in the development of a museum education program by replacing the word "life" with the name of an artifact, or with an experience of an artifact, thus connecting what students already know with something new. For example, the word "life" can be replaced by "top hat". The "top hat" must be understood from the experience of the "top hat" itself. Further, students gain an understanding of a snippet of Prime Minister Diefenbaker's life as a statesperson from their experience with the top hat.

The connectedness component connects students' experiences over time, as in Dewey's (1938) experiential continuum and in Dilthey's view of the temporality of experiences (Rickman, 1988). An experience with the top hat, for example, is one of many experiences with hats that students have in their lifetimes. Our role in the museum
is to connect students' current experiences with past experiences as they interact with artifacts in the program.

The definition for connectedness that was used in Stages Two, Three and Four of the research is: *How the theme and artifacts are connected to students' lives today, making the learning relevant to today.*

**Meaning-in-context.** The meaning-in-context component of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development revisits the use of artifacts by addressing the context in which they are placed. In the object-based lesson, an artifact is usually observed and analyzed by itself, but in the hermeneutic interpretation an artifact is studied within a context. According to Dilthey (Bulhof, 1980), it is not possible to study an individual and his or her expressions of lived experience without also studying the social and cultural structures to which he or she belongs. Therefore, an artifact as an expression of lived experience must be placed within its social or cultural setting to be studied. The hermeneutic approach to museum education program development attempts to address this philosophy through the meaning-in-context component. For example, in Stage Four of the study the artifacts selected for use in the program were part of an exhibit about agriculture. The model of the grain elevator was surrounded by paintings of farms and elevators. The context also included language; the discourse between the students and museum educator focused on agriculture.

In Stage One, the meaning-in-context component definition read: *Establishes where the artifact fits into an exhibit.* Upon reflection, I realized the whole-part nature of this component. An exhibit is a whole with an artifact being one part. By extending this idea to students, I conceptualized their learning about the subject matter as a whole, with
the museum learning being one part. Therefore, I added the following line to the meaning-in-context definition: *Where new information fits into a larger picture.*

**Process.** The process component further develops the meaning-in-context and artifact components by examining an artifact's creation and use. The process component refers to recreating or reliving the experience of another in order to better understand or appropriate the other’s experience. In summarizing Dilthey's approach to history, Bulhof (1980) captures the essence of the process component:

Thus, in understanding of the past, the understanding of others reinforces the understanding of self. The knowledge gained by re-experiencing is not simply an external, mechanical repetition of other persons' experiences that can afterwards be forgotten -- nor is it a total submersion, in which the person of the knower effaces himself. It is an active recreation of other persons' experiences -- a process which leaves a profound impression on the mind of the knower. True historical understanding is a process of communication between two autonomous subjects who come to understand each other, be they living persons or their testimonies in symbols. (p. 62)

While re-creating the experience of another is one interpretation of the process component, it was impossible to achieve in Stage Two because most of the artifacts were mass-produced. Therefore, the definition was broadened to include the process of using the artifact. I believe this fits within the original intent of the hermeneutic principle, as Palmer (1969) writes in summarizing Dilthey:

First, experience is not construed as the "content" of a reflexive act of consciousness, for then it would be something of which we are conscious; rather, it is the act itself. It is something we live in and through. (p. 108)

In other words, we live in and through the act of using artifacts. Two different experiences are available for exploration -- creation and use of an artifact. The process component becomes a preparation phase for the next component, experience.
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To recapitulate, the definition for the process component reads: What the artifact's creator experienced at the time; the process of creating; the process of using the artifact; setting the stage for students to have their own experience.

Experience. At this place in the hermeneutic approach template, consideration is given to the experiences students will have at the museum. Handling, using, and recreating artifacts, or reliving an event through role play, are experiential activities that get students actively involved in learning. The experience component is the practical side of the process component. The pre-understanding component has laid the foundation for students to have an experience with the artifacts. The definition for the experience component is: Hands-on activity; building students' own experiences.

Communication. Although communication is listed as the last component, it occurs throughout the museum education program in dialogues between the tour guide and the students, and among students. While many guided tours have a predominantly one-way communication of tour guide to visitor, the hermeneutic approach encourages two- and three-way communication that includes questioning, comparing, contrasting, clarifying, sharing, and explaining. It is my belief that verbalizing their experiences helps students understand and make meaning of them. The communication definition reads: Dialogue, discussing the experience with others; sharing insights and experiences to find comparisons and contrasts.

Summary

The preceding pages have outlined the theoretical framework of a strategy for developing museum education programs. Once a museum education program has been developed, the next steps are to market and deliver the program. Since the hermeneutic
approach is contextualized in the interpretive paradigm, there are implications for the role
of the tour guide who delivers the program to a school group. Unlike the transmissional
role of the tour guide in a traditional or empirical analytical program, the tour guide
conducting a hermeneutic program assumes a different role.

The Role of the Tour Guide Conducting a Hermeneutic Program

The person conducting the program for the school group might be a volunteer,
paid tour guide, or the museum educator who developed it. I use the term tour guide for
the person who conducts the program to distinguish between development and the
delivery of the program. Unlike the expert transmissive role of the tour guide in the
empirical analytic orientation, the role of the tour guide in the interpretive perspective
models Hermes, the messenger god. Hermes mediated between the worlds of the gods
as:

Something foreign, strange, separated in time, space, or experience is made
familiar, present, comprehensible; something requiring representation,
explanation, or translation is somehow "brought to understanding" -- is
"interpreted". (p. 14)

The role of the tour guide is to mediate between the worlds of the museum and the
classroom, between the artifacts and the students. This is accomplished by assisting
students to make the connection between their prior knowledge and new learnings, and
between objects that are familiar and those that are unfamiliar.

One of my concerns about the program delivery is that the tour guide might lapse
into a lecture style when mediating between the unfamiliar artifact and the students. It is
likely that some lecturing will be necessary, particularly in response to students' questions
about an artifact they are unable to identify. However, lecturing is less likely when the communication component is addressed in the program.

Another concern I had was whether anyone other than the museum educator would be able to conduct a program developed using the hermeneutic approach template, as I noted in my fieldnotes log:

Can someone other than myself or Lenna who is committed to delivering a program from a hermeneutic perspective be trained to, or expected to conduct the program in the intent it was created? (May 4, 1999)

In a conversation we had on May 6, 1999 Lenna expressed some concerns about having volunteers conduct the program that she created following the hermeneutic template, and that it might best be delivered in a teacher-directed program. I believe that the deliverer of the program, whether paid staff or volunteer, can conduct the program as it was designed. My reflections were noted in my fieldnotes log:

These are the museum's programs, not the volunteers' programs. The training is key in demonstrating (by modeling how) the program is conducted and conveying your expectations that this is the way it will be done (in a nice way). Any volunteer not prepared to conduct the program in the manner demonstrated will not be assigned to deliver it. However to support the volunteers, the script provides (or should provide) clear guidelines, even wording, for conducting the program. In this way, volunteers don't have to "make it up as they go along". (May 6, 1999)

Conclusion

A theoretical framework for the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development that incorporated principles from hermeneutics, museology, curriculum, and pedagogy, had been developed and synthesized into a conceptual model or template. Hypothetically, it could work. My role in Stage One had been that of a complete participant in defining and developing the conceptual underpinnings of the
hermeneutic approach template. The template was ready for trial with a co-developer in Stage Two of the study.
CHAPTER FOUR: STAGE TWO

The purpose of this research was to examine the conceptual underpinnings of a practical approach for developing museum education programs and to investigate its potential in a museum education setting. In the first stage of the research, the theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of the approach were established to address the question *What is the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development?* A conceptual model or template based on hermeneutic principles was created to guide the development of museum education programs.

The next stage of the research continued with the introduction of the first research participant, a museum educator who co-developed the template or conceptual model by implementing it to develop a museum education program. As a participant-as-observer, my role was to assist the museum educator in interpreting each component or step of the template, and to uncover how she made meaning of it. Observations, interviews and written journal entries provided insights into the potential of the template as a program development strategy, and answered the question *What does the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development offer to museum educators?*

Lenna, a museum educator for about fifteen years, agreed to become the first research participant or co-developer. She is very experienced in developing education programs for school groups that incorporate artifacts, and has participated in and conducted workshops and seminars about museum education.
This chapter presents Lenna's thoughts, concerns about and reactions to the hermeneutic approach template as she worked through its components to develop a program, as well as my thoughts, observations, concerns and reflections as a participant-as-observer researcher. The chapter is not written as a chronology of events; it is a grouping of pertinent data about each of the components collected from our journals and interviews.

Also included in this chapter are the reactions to the program by Martin, a teacher who brought his grade eight class to pilot the program on June 1, 1999. Martin was not teaching the particular curriculum topic (roles) selected for use in the program, so the class' visit was something of a misfit. However, in consenting to participate in the program, Martin did prepare the group by completing a pre-visit discussion about roles. I interviewed Martin on June 7, 1999, one week after the class visited the museum. His reflections are sprinkled throughout the chapter.

Stage Two

Lenna's name was suggested to me by a staff member of the Museums Association of Saskatchewan as someone who might be interested in trying a new approach to museum education program development. I contacted Lenna by telephone to briefly outline my study and to schedule an appointment to meet and discuss the study in further detail to determine her interest in becoming a research participant. At our first meeting in May of 1998, I described the hermeneutic approach as a program development strategy and outlined Lenna's obligations should she agree to participate in the study. The following September we met again to build rapport and to discuss her interest in proceeding as a research participant.
At our next scheduled meeting in October, we planned to look at the hermeneutic approach template in greater detail for the purpose of implementing it in the development of a program. I provided Lenna with a copy of the template or conceptual model and definitions for each of the components (curriculum topic, museum mandate, storyline, themes, artifacts, program: pre-understanding, meaning-in-context, connectedness, process, experience, and communication). There was so much information to address that it was almost overwhelming, as my fieldnotes reflect:

It is difficult to know where to begin when teaching the approach. Harking back to Palmer (1969) -- "the whole receives its definition from the parts..." Do you start with the sentence or the words? Do I start with the template or its parts? The template or the context in which it is situated? How much information does Lenna need? What about teaching this to others - will it be too complicated if I get into paradigms? How typical is Lenna as a museum educator? She may catch on easily, but what about others? (Oct. 13, 1998, fieldnotes)

Deciding to stay true to the hermeneutic way of doing things, I presented the information about the hermeneutic approach in sentence form first (the big picture), rather than words (the template components). We talked about the interpretive paradigm as a context within which the hermeneutic approach is situated, as compared to the empirical analytic paradigm that I felt would be most familiar to Lenna. By drawing on her pre-understanding of the traditional paradigm with its objectives-based orientation, I was able to compare and contrast the interpretive paradigm and the hermeneutic approach template.

Next, I described the hermeneutic approach template in greater detail, addressing each component and providing definitions for future reference. Although my original conception of the template had the six latter components (pre-understanding, process, experience, meaning-in-context, connectedness, and communication) in a circular pattern
identified as "program," I rearranged them into a linear progression of activities for Lenna to follow. I felt that the circular representation might not have given enough guidance as to where to begin, resulting in confusion for Lenna. Figure 2 (p. 93) represents the prototype circular pattern and Figure 3 (p. 94) is its modification into a linear progression. My impression is that she was very comfortable with a step-by-step format. To me, it seemed logical to start with pre-understanding as a foundation on which students can build new knowledge, then move on to end with communicating their experiences with others as a way of making meaning of the museum visit. In retrospect, another order might have proven as rewarding, but by dictating the order of elements, I never gave Lenna the opportunity to explore that possibility.

As we began to work together implementing the template, I was acutely aware of my participant-as-observer role. At times it was a challenge to restrain myself from delving into and taking over the development of the program as a museum educator instead of maintaining my researcher role as Hermes, translating the hermeneutic approach template rather than interpreting it. Having seen some of the artifacts and the proposed exhibit, it was impossible not to be excited by their programming potential. However, I ultimately wanted to see how Lenna would interpret the template, and my role became one of encouragement and offering suggestions for possible activities. At one point, for example, Lenna was pondering how to apply the pre-understanding element so that the students would start thinking about the roles they assume. She had considered developing a role-playing activity, as she replied in an interview to my question about how she was planning to bring out the students' pre-understandings of their roles:
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Figure 2. Original conception of the program section of the template for the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development
Program:
- Pre-understanding
- Meaning-in-context
- Connectedness
- Process
- Experience
- Communication

Figure 3. Revised program section of the template for the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development
I was really paying attention to that with one half of my brain as I was writing what I thought thirteen year olds knew about themselves and their roles. And I thought role-playing is an obvious, but they're such a bad age for role-playing. They really have a hard time shedding their uncomfortable feeling, opening up in front of their peers, or whatever. So I honestly don't know what I'm going to do yet. (Nov. 24, 1998, interview)

Lenna seemed to be stalled at this point, unsure of an activity that might resolve her concerns about drawing this age group into the program, so I suggested the possibility of a readers' theatre presentation in which students would participate by reading a pre-written script. Readers' theatre is an activity that I have used successfully in programming at other museums, and I used this opportunity as a participant-as-observer to share my experience with my colleague. In the end, Lenna decided to use a non-scientific questionnaire about birth order descriptors as a way of teasing out students' pre-understandings of roles.

After meeting with me a few times in the fall of 1998, Lenna was eager to begin implementing the template to develop a program for one of the museum's future displays. She initiated work on the program by searching through Saskatchewan curricula for a suitable topic and grade level.

**Storyline**

The storyline, a two to four sentence paragraph combining a curriculum topic with the museum's mandate, provides direction for the development of the program. Lenna's task was to search for a grade level and curriculum topic that would fit with the mission statement of the museum incorporating general ideas to be addressed during the students' visit.
The museum was in the process of constructing a display of newly acquired artifacts consisting mostly of toys from a homestead in Saskatchewan, and Lenna's job was to create an educational curriculum-based school program to accompany the exhibit when it travels to other museums in the future. She decided to use the hermeneutic approach template in the development of the program for the *In a Prairie Attic: Family Toys* exhibit. As our meeting in early October concluded, Lenna agreed develop a storyline combining the museum and by extension exhibit mandate, and a curriculum topic.

The storyline took several revisions before it met with Lenna's satisfaction, a process that took longer than I had anticipated. Lenna found the storyline development difficult; it took much work and refining. Meanwhile, I waited patiently until Lenna had completed the storyline to her satisfaction. Since a storyline provides direction for the remainder of the program, and is useful in promoting the program to teachers, I wanted to ensure that Lenna had full ownership of it without any influence from me. But I wondered at the time whether or not she would modify the storyline after the program had been developed and/or piloted. As it turned out, she was comfortable with what she had originally written, and no changes were made after the program was scripted and piloted.

Lenna's journal entry about her experience implementing the storyline element pleasantly surprised me, as I had not expected this result. She wrote:

Prompting some 'soul-searching' regarding the exhibit goals and content, and a review of potential curricula, forces a slower-paced storyline identification and development. This allows for a more thorough and methodical assessment of program potentials. (undated, journal entry)
I interpreted her comments to mean that she had not anticipated spending time soul-searching or pondering the exhibit and the curriculum to find suitable matches. The connection between the museum or exhibit and the curriculum will be stronger as a result of the research undertaken to create the storyline, or as Lenna stated, "a more thorough and methodical assessment of program potentials". By thoroughly researching curriculum areas, Lenna eliminated topics until she located the most suitable match to the exhibit. Her decision to linger at the storyline element and do some "soul-searching" was not a result of any prodding from me, although it may have been a result of her dedication to completing her task as a research participant to the best of her ability.

Another observation Lenna made had implications for the next stage of the study where the hermeneutic approach template is taught to other museum educators. Lenna stated we should emphasize that the wording of the storyline should echo the curriculum. Although I thought I had made that point in the definition of the storyline, I will possibly need to revise the definition, which currently reads:

> a single sentence or two which communicates the basic story weaving together the curriculum topic and the museum's mandate. Ideally, the curriculum topic and museum mandate will fit like a hand to a glove.

The storyline that Lenna finally adopted reads:

> Like people today, people who came to Saskatchewan a century ago filled many roles in their families and in their communities. The Blain family, who immigrated to Saskatchewan from Illinois in 1910, faced new roles and changing roles as they built their home in a new country, and as they grew and matured. (Nov. 6, 1998, journal entry)

This final, revised storyline included the grade eight curriculum topic of roles, and the significant exhibit features of the immigration to Canada of the Blain family.
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Specifically, the curriculum match was recorded by Lenna in the training manual that accompanies the exhibit as follows:

Grade 8 Social Studies curriculum 'The Individual in Society' Unit 3, 'Roles':
- Roles are patterns of behaviours associated with a particular position or status.
- Each person assumes a variety of roles each of which has expectations and appropriate behaviours.
- Roles and expectations may conflict.
- Roles fulfil a necessary function within groups and communities and may undergo change to meet new expectations.
- Roles may influence an individual's perception of self.
- There are personal roles like family, school and peer roles and there are community roles determined by memberships in formal and informal groups in local, regional, national and global memberships.
- Roles change.

Included implicitly in the storyline was the museum's mandate, which is "To preserve and promote an understanding of the economic and cultural development of Saskatchewan." The Blain family exemplified the cultural development of Saskatchewan.

I had been curious about how obvious the curriculum topic might be to a teacher, and in an interview with Martin one week after his grade eight class piloted the program in June, 1999, I checked his recognition of the curriculum connection. He addressed my curiosity by stating:

As to my expectations, I think that the program exceeded what I thought it was going to be like. It fit really nicely into the curriculum. I think it would be very easy for me to connect the curriculum requirements to the program itself. It'd be almost like a case study. You could do the whole unit on a case study of that family, actually, in terms of connecting between the student and their roles, and the roles of the children of the Blain family. So you could do a comparison. I just think it's an excellent fit to the curriculum. And I believe that students would benefit from this program. (June 7, 1999, interview)

Themes

Once Lenna was comfortable with the storyline, she was ready to move to the next component of the template, the identification of themes. In the storyline, Lenna
linked the curriculum topic of roles to the new and changing roles experienced by the Blain family. She then developed the theme of roles further to include personal, informal community, formal community, and changing roles.

I was very excited about Lenna's choice of roles as the curriculum topic. Using the different roles, she would be able to draw out information about the Blain children which would give students a perspective for viewing the exhibit, rather than merely looking at the artifacts for their own sake. The various roles provided a framework for charting or categorizing students' learning about the Blains, as well as points of reference on which to compare and contrast their own lives with the Blain children.

Lenna followed my definitions of the components and developed a brief description for each theme. These points enhanced the storyline and were the concepts we wanted the students to understand by the end of their visit. For example, Lenna described the theme of changing roles as follows: "The roles of Blain family members grew and changed, as they grew and changed, and as times changed" (Nov. 9, 1998, journal entry). By expanding on the themes, Lenna explained in greater detail the connection between the exhibit and the curriculum topic. Although my attention had been focused almost exclusively on Lenna's implementation of the hermeneutic approach template, seeing the expanded descriptions of the themes alerted me to their potential as topics for further development as pre- and post-visit classroom activities. Each of the themes had potential of being expanded into one or two social studies or language arts lessons by the teacher.

Lenna was committed to the themes of personal, informal community, formal community, and changing roles that she had developed from the storyline. Since the themes were significant ideas being addressed in the program, I asked Martin, the grade
eight teacher, to identify the concepts he thought the students grasped during their visit.

He answered:

Definitely the role of people, individuals and families I think is the main one that the students sort of bought there. I was talking about the older sister and her role, she became the mother of the family. It was interesting that only two children married I think and the rest of them stayed on the farm. And how each person while they're in a family they each develop very different personalities, so I think those are some major things that they caught on to. (June 7, 1999, interview)

Based on Martin's comments, I am satisfied that the themes component worked well in the template. For Lenna, her next task after developing the themes was to consider selecting artifacts to support them.

Artifacts

Having decided on the themes to be addressed in the program, Lenna moved to the artifact component of the template. As a museum educator, this area caused me some concern. By placing the selection of the artifacts after the storyline development, I was refuting the argument by some museum educators that one cannot create a program without knowing what artifacts there are to support it. Lenna's familiarity with the artifacts in the Blain collection prior to the development of the program may have had some influence on her choices, but I believe that she still had to select specific artifacts that would demonstrate the themes she had identified. Since Lenna's program was being designed to accompany an exhibit with the artifacts already chosen and displayed by the curator, her artifact selection would be somewhat restricted. This was a concern of mine, as indicated in my fieldnotes:

Artifacts were already selected somewhat for her because of the nature of the display. What is the difference between this and the 'shopping cart' style of artifact selection? (Nov. 10, 1998, fieldnotes)
In retrospect, Lenna still used a "shopping cart" method in her selection of hands-on artifacts for demonstrating roles of the Blain children. The shopping cart method is my term for the manner in which artifacts are sometimes chosen for use in a program -- the museum educator goes through the museum's collections and picks artifacts off the shelves to be used as visual aids. Lenna selected tonsil snippers, for example, from the museum's larger collection to be used for comparing and contrasting tonsillectomies in the early 1900's as experienced by the Blains and today's surgical procedures. The tonsil snippers were not from the Blain collection, but were chosen as a representation of the Blain children's experiences.

The selection of artifacts for both the hands-on portion of the program and the self-guided tour resulted in a philosophical reflection on the significance of artifacts by Lenna. Her thoughts about artifacts, similar to my own, affirmed to me the potential for hermeneutics as a method of artifact interpretation. For example, Lenna states in her journal: "In the museum world, we believe that artifacts can 'speak', that they have a message to deliver" (undated). In an effort to explore this idea further, I asked her at our next meeting where she got the notion that artifacts speak. Her response was:

Oh, now there's a good question. I presume it's been a long time sort of forming within. Certainly through reading, interacting with other educators, conferences, and that kind of thing. I think when I came here fresh out of university I wouldn't have said that. And in a way I think sometimes they only speak to some people, like a steam traction engine says different things to different people, and says nothing to some others.... I think though I'm the kind of person who personally sees stories and messages in things. And maybe everybody isn't like that but I know that some other people are. (Nov. 24, 1998, interview)

As Lenna worked through the template, her philosophy of artifacts surfaced again, when she wrote in her journal: "Artifacts have an unspoken power," "One artifact can
represent many stories," and "I'm convinced of the power of artifacts." I asked her to explain what artifacts meant to her, and she responded:

What artifacts mean. The way I am, the person I am, I can't look at things without wanting to know more or speculating, sometimes daydreaming, you know, fantasizing in a way, about where these artifacts have been. I'm the kind of person -- I get my glasses back and for awhile I couldn't get the lenses ground anywhere but Japan. So I would look at these and think, oh, these glasses have been where I haven't. So artifacts sort of do that same thing to me. They tweak me into thinking about things beyond what I see exactly there and then in that artifact. It's the same as when I walk in that Blain exhibit In a Prairie Attic. I can't help but begin to daydream about that big three story house and those toys in the attic and the family who lived there, the chores in the barn. It gets my imagination going. And some of that's based on history and reading, so it's not all imagination, it's some speculation and some theoretical pulling together of things. But artifacts do that for me. And because they do, I think that they do that for others.... But I think for me artifacts always are a springboard, a starting place for thinking about other things and for thinking about the artifacts themselves. (Dec. 22, 1998, interview)

As our discussion continued, I asked Lenna, "Do you consciously think about, when you create a program, how am I going to make that artifact speak to somebody else?" She responded:

Yep, I do. As I say, this isn't the kind of conversation you have with everybody, so you really don't know if other people are as moved or as touched by artifacts as you are. But it's the kind of feeling that I have -- this inner drive to share. So, yeah, that's a thought that I often have. How can the pleasure, the beauty of this artifact, or the intensity that the story gives me, how can I share that with others? (Dec. 22, 1998, interview)

The artifacts in the In a Prairie Attic: Family Toys exhibit had a special magnetism for Lenna, as she stated "the artifacts in this exhibit are powerful particularly in their number and condition" (Jan. 10, 1999, journal entry). She described the exhibit as being "spellbinding" with "something in there that is tweaking people" (Feb. 18, 1999, interview). The In a Prairie Attic: Family Toys exhibit is all about toys. Artifacts have been grouped and displayed according to gender or type, so the context has already been established. During the self-guided segment of Lenna's program, students enter the
exhibit and proceed to each display area that Lenna has specified to answer questions about the artifacts. Following the introduction and while the class is still together as a large group, they can see and touch those artifacts selected from the museum's collection that represent the Blain family and the roles of each member. Since the use of artifacts was a significant element in the hermeneutic approach template and the program, I was interested in Martin's impression of how they supported the themes and enhanced the curriculum topic. He stated:

They [the Museum] did a really good job of using the artifacts to talk about the roles and the identity of the kids in the family, what their interests were at the time. There was some hands-on work with the puzzle [in the exhibit] that the kids were able to play -- they really enjoyed that. (June 7, 1999, interview)

In retrospect, I believe that Lenna successfully incorporated into the grade eight program artifacts from the exhibit and artifacts that she picked from the museum's collections representing roles of the Blain children. Two types of artifact selection, the shopping cart style and the pre-selected artifacts in an exhibit, influence the implementation of the artifact component of the template; Lenna used both types as she interpreted the hermeneutic approach template to develop the museum education program.

Program: Pre-understanding

After the selection of artifacts, the next step in the hermeneutic approach template was the program segment, comprising six elements (Fig. 1, p. 12). In the development of the conceptual model of the approach, I envisioned this segment as the practical application of the storyline, bringing together the students, museum educator (tour guide, docent), artifacts, curriculum, and museum mandate. With the linear progression of
elements I had established for Lenna, pre-understanding was the next step after the selection of artifacts.

I was interested to see how Lenna would interpret this component. Would she interpret it to mean, as I had hoped, that this was the time to consider what students already know, to tease out their prior knowledge for comparing and contrasting with new information they would be learning during the visit? Indeed, this is how Lenna interpreted pre-understanding. I had assumed that she might use questioning as a technique for focusing students' thoughts on their roles within a family or community. However, Lenna pondered the more exciting activities of role-playing and readers' theatre before settling on the birth order questionnaire.

Three issues emerged from Lenna's implementation of the pre-understanding component which I had not anticipated, but which merit further contemplation. They are: museum educators must have a general understanding of the characteristics of the group for whom their program is developed; museum educators must assume that visitors have a certain amount of prior knowledge and experience related to the concepts being addressed in the program; and, barriers to participation may exist during the implementation of a program.

The first issue was raised briefly by Lenna in her journal entry on pre-understanding, when she wrote "Can I reasonably and accurately predict what 13 year olds know about themselves and their roles?" (Nov. 23, 1998, journal entry). Her awareness of the characteristics of this age group was later expressed in one of our conversations, when she stated:

I was really paying attention to that [bringing out students' understandings of their personal family roles] with one half of my brain as I was writing what I thought
thirteen year olds knew about themselves and their roles. And I thought role-playing is an obvious, but they're such a bad age for role-playing. They really have a hard time shedding their uncomfortable feeling, opening up in front of their peers, or whatever. (Nov. 24, 1998, interview)

Having had four children who were close in age to the target group, Lenna was in a good position to be aware of how thirteen year olds think. However, not all museum educators will have the advantage of being closely involved with the target age group, and this can be an obstacle to program development.

The second emerging issue referred to the prior knowledge and experiences that we assume visitors bring to their museum visit. Their pre-understandings are the foundations for building new knowledge and experiences during the program, so it is important that visitors recall prior experiences. Lenna assumed that the students have an awareness of their roles, as she related:

The pre-understanding, what the kids already know about their roles, that's what I hope -- that discussion I hope to establish and reinforce and reaffirm after they've played their little questionnaire of if you're a first child, middle child. I hope that that breaks the ice and opens up discussion and I think it will. Then I think if they get a really good sense of what I mean by roles and what expectations are given them if they're the star on the basketball team or they're the towel boy, expectations differ with your role. (March 16, 1999, interview)

Lenna also assumed that students have an awareness of childhood illnesses and surgeries, which she used for comparing and contrasting the lives of the Blain children at the turn of the century to their own lives today. In describing the selection of artifacts, she stated:

I had come across in one of Maggie's [the youngest of the Blain children] taped interviews that the three youngest ones, Vern, well Bob, Tony and Maggie all had their tonsils out at the same time on the dining room table. Bob was fourteen, so then Tony would have been three years younger, he would have been eleven, and Maggie another few years younger than that. So I thought Bob got his tonsils out on the dining room table under ether at the very same age these kids are at. So I thought that's really a good one to get them, you know, have you had your tonsils
out, have you thought about your role as a patient, your outdoor activity curtailed for a few days, so I thought that had some potential to capture their interest and collections can get me some sort of medical snipper or something. (Dec. 8, 1998, interview)

In both of these examples, Lenna assumed students' prior knowledge of roles. The pre-understandings she expected students to bring to the program were mostly common human experiences such as illness, emotions, and families that were solid foundations on which to build new concepts.

The third issue was barriers to participation. The notion of barriers in hermeneutics is not new; Palmer (1969) identified barriers to understanding a text by the reader as being "time, space, language". Lenna identified peer pressure and teenage angst as two potential barriers to students' participation in the museum program. They were recurring concerns, both in her journals and in our conversations. In her journal, she wrote:

Will the teenage bravado, the 'I'm not interested in what adults think' attitude undermine the program? How can I immediately engage modern students, get them to 'buy in'? (Nov. 23, 1998, journal entry) My concern at this stage was not so much with the program development, as with the students. Grade 8 can be a year of angst for many 13-14 year olds today. Will they 'allow' connections [between themselves and the Blain children]? .... Will the Grade 8 students allow the 'magic' of the artifacts to overcome their natural resistance to participate? .... Can Grade 8 students allow themselves to participate, give their peers permission to show their interest? They can make connections, but will they? (Dec. 22, 1998, journal entry)

Six weeks later, Lenna revisited this concern when she wrote: "What hands-on activity will pass the 'cool' test so that 13-14 year olds will participate actively?" (Feb. 2, 1999, journal entry).

Due to the recurrence of the perceived barriers to participation, I felt my participant-as-observer role required me to draw from my experiences as a teacher and a
museum educator in reassuring Lenna. I suggested that one person might think the program is 'cool', then the others would follow, or that preparation by the teacher might prevent barriers. A third possibility in overcoming barriers mentioned to Lenna was the connections students would make between their roles and those of the Blain children. These were addressed in the following excerpt of a conversation between Lenna and myself:

Lenna: Yes that's true. I think maybe my receptors are more, raised higher on this one just because I've known so many of those kids in that age group who have really not bought into much and I'm really hoping that they can let their hair down and buy into this.

Lee: Well maybe it was the way it was presented before.

Lenna: Yes. I mean it could be things going on within the kids themselves.

Lee: And maybe connecting will help them to buy into it. I'm hoping, anyway.

Lenna: Me too. I know that many of them think it's not cool to show enthusiasm or participate. But I really think that this exhibit is so strong -- the opportunities will be so strong that I think that we can overcome it.

Lee: Oh I think so too.

Lenna: And you're right. There are in other age groups people who just are too apathetic to participate, or too shy, or whatever reason. I think I may be a little bit more sensitive just having a houseful of kids, you know how bad they can be at that age. Bad as in not buying in.

Lee: Well I guess that's maybe one thing we can watch for when we come to do the program.

Lenna: Yeah, I will be curious to see their behaviour. Because they'll be choosing some roles to play, actually. And if there's a noticeable class leader, and if that leader exercises her or his role to participate then that could sway too.

Lee: Yes. And maybe a little farther along we'll need to think about the pre-visit material and preparing them for what they're going to see so that they won't be shocked.
Lenna: That's right. It won't be totally unfamiliar. There'll be at least some very good directions.

Lee: Maybe the teacher will prime them a bit to participate.

Lenna: Yeah, the more the teacher knows what to expect, the better the kids will be prepared. (Jan. 11, 1999, interview)

Lenna's interpretation of the pre-understanding component became an introduction for students that included an overview of the Blain children and their roles, a discussion of students' roles compared with the Blains, and a prediction quiz or birth order questionnaire. This activity was designed to get students actively engaged in the early stages of the program, and would be more effective than the simple questioning that I had in mind. The success of the questionnaire was evident with the class that piloted the program in June, 1999. Although I felt the introductory lecture was a little too long, my observations of the questionnaire were recorded in the following fieldnotes entry:

The questionnaire was a hit. At first they [students] seemed a little apprehensive, but once they got going it went well. It got them participating, involved. I didn't notice any evidence of peer pressure or not being involved because it was 'not cool'. Possible barriers to participation we had identified were peer pressure and that the program would engage this age group, which I think it did. (June 1, 1999, fieldnotes)

The grade eight teacher's assessment of the questionnaire activity was that it was successful in heightening students' awareness of their roles. In a post-visit interview, Martin stated "The icebreaker activity was good, it got the kids thinking about their roles in their own families" (June 7, 1999, interview). The pre-understanding was for the class an important foundation for building new information about the roles played by the Blain children.
Program: Meaning-in-context

To me, connectedness seemed the next logical component after pre-understanding as it involves connecting students' prior knowledge to new learnings, but after a discussion about options Lenna decided that meaning-in-context was the next logical step for her in developing the program. Lenna had considered experience as a possible next stop, but I felt that the experience component belonged later in the order. By moving to meaning-in-context instead of connectedness (my preference) I was challenged as a researcher to surrender control of the template's interpretation to my research participant. Doing this allowed Lenna to freely interpret and make her own meaning of the hermeneutic approach template by modifying it to meet her needs. By adapting the hermeneutic approach to fit her own program development style Lenna caused me to reflect on these questions: am I so possessive of my conception of the hermeneutic approach that I will not entertain the possibility of modifications (improvements) or varied interpretations? and, what order will I present the program elements to the museum educators in the Stage Three workshop -- Lenna's or mine?

In answer to the first question, I must admit to being a little usurped by someone changing what I considered to be a nearly perfect work of art -- my template. I was surprised and a little embarrassed at my feelings of ownership over my conception of the hermeneutic approach template. I had laboured over the creation of the template for many months, and now it was moving from its infancy into adolescence. It was changing, evolving, as a result of Lenna's interpretation. I was too embarrassed to record my feelings in my fieldnotes log, and decided that I needed some distance from the study in order to regain a more mature outlook, so I busied myself with household duties while I
tried to sort out the reasons for my feelings of ownership. After thinking through the situation, I realized that my hope was that Lenna would make the hermeneutic approach template work for her and that it would be an aid when she develops museum education programs. Lenna was indeed using the template to her benefit.

In Stage Three of the research, I decided to teach Lenna's order of components to the workshop participants. Since it had appeared to work successfully for her, I thought it might work well for others.

Moving on to meaning-in-context seemed the right move at the right time for Lenna, and she commented more than once that it "flowed naturally" for her from pre-understanding. The definition provided to Lenna for this element stated that meaning-in-context "establishes where the artifact fits into an exhibit, or where new information fits into a larger picture." In retrospect, the definition could be interpreted at least two ways -- one for artifacts and one for the message being conveyed to students. Lenna chose to revisit the role of artifacts in the program, which resulted in deeper understanding of their significance. The relationship between the artifacts and the themes of roles was more clearly identified, as Lenna commented:

This did flow naturally for me. I was ready to look again at the artifacts that would substantiate the exploration I want the students to do about themes and labels, the roles and the labels those roles give them. So I looked again at the artifacts that are already there and that are hands-off be virtue of being behind plexi[glass], and thought it's a good opportunity to get the extras from the collection out in a way that they can be used to symbolize certain roles .... make connections to these kids [Blain children], were kids just like them. But then to make that other connection that the world they grew up in was different. So the artifacts I think will show the differences. And the roles, I think, will show the similarities. (Dec. 8, 1998, interview)

It was during the preparation of the meaning-in-context component that Lenna began to finalize her selection of artifacts from the museum's collection that
demonstrated the roles of the Blain children. The transition from general to specific can be seen in Lenna's journal entries. In the entry for the artifact component (Nov. 10, 1998, journal entry), she has identified general artifact categories, as exemplified in the personal, family roles theme:

- variety of 'girls' toys' - growing up 1910-1925
- variety of 'boys' toys' - growing up a boy in this period
- wedding photo, wedding certificate
- American souvenirs
- Canadian souvenir items
- clothing: overalls, apron, cap
- license to operate radio receiving equipment
- 1927-1928 hockey schedule
- Grade 8 diploma
- Victory Loan

Revisiting the role of artifacts in the program was a beneficial step for Lenna, and in her meaning-in-context journal entry of December 7, 1998, she had refined the list to include the following specific items:

- overalls, farm journal, books, bit -- horse connection, marking gauge, potato masher, medical something, telephone company artifact, baseball artifact, music, other sporting artifacts.

This list more closely resembled Lenna's final choices for the program, which included a farm journal, the bit of a bridle, potato masher, tonsil snipper ("medical something"), baseball glove, curling rock ("other sporting artifact"), and Tinker Toys.

As Lenna was implementing the meaning-in-context component, and as I was reflecting on its definition, I began to have concerns that the message of the artifact is communicated to visitors in a program developed using the hermeneutic approach. It began as the following entry in my fieldnotes log:

We had a very good discussion about artifacts and their meaning. Lenna's views are much like mine -- the artifact has a message, a story to tell. One of my
concerns about the template is whether or not the message of the artifact will be
told effectively or sufficiently. (Dec. 22, 1998, fieldnotes)

Further reflection on the role of the artifacts in the program led to the
identification of two separate but related issues. The first was whether a museum
educator using the template would clearly identify and communicate the artifact's
message; the second was the use of the artifact in the program. Both of these issues can
be demonstrated in the following two examples.

Lenna chose a curling rock as an artifact to support the theme of informal
community roles. The curling rock was not the smooth, squat, round, dark rock used in
the Brier or Tournament of Hearts bonspiels we see on television during the winter
months. The rock Lenna used was rough, light in colour, made of wood, and at least four
times larger than the ones commonly used today. The curling rock had a message to tell,
and I was concerned that students would be able to spend enough time with the curling
rock to "hear" its message. This concern made me focus again on the artifact element of
the template, and whether I had adequately emphasized the importance of the
hermeneutic approach in drawing out the story of the artifacts. It had also occurred to me
that the message of the artifact might be obscured by the other elements; perhaps I was
overemphasizing the importance of the artifact element to the detriment of other
elements.

This led to my second concern of how the artifact would be used in the program.
Often in museum programs, artifacts are used as props or visual aids to focus visitors'
attention, and as a way of explaining a concept. The curling rock, for example, might be
used to demonstrate a throwing technique, but might not be investigated for other
significant messages. These could include the life and times of curling's inventor, how a
A game using a modern curling rock compares and contrasts to a game using a wooden curling rock, or the importance of winter leisure activities in early Saskatchewan and to children today.

However, I began to realize that it was not my interpretation of the curling rock's message that was important to the program. Lenna had read the message of the artifact as having something to tell us about roles, and it was within the context of informal community roles that the curling rock was placed. There is more than one message conveyed by an artifact, and my interpretation is not the only one. As Lenna stated in her journal:

One artifact can represent many stories. Discussion around the artifacts should be careful to reinforce the role each artifact is intended to represent. (Dec. 7, 1998, journal entry)

Rather than focusing attention on the message of an individual artifact, Lenna used each artifact to support one of the roles identified as themes. The artifacts were like words in a sentence that became the message Lenna wanted to portray. In my mind, I saw the artifact as being the sentence, not a word in the sentence. This caused an adjustment in my thinking. For Lenna, the message was not about the artifact, but related more to the students. She stated:

We have a really powerful message that's being transmitted in different ways and in different forms, but the message is the same. To get them to think about themselves and then to take that experience and apply it to others. You know, that's a giant leap forward for thirteen year olds. (April 5, 1999, interview)

To me, the significance Lenna placed on artifacts and her desire that the message be accepted and adopted by students reflected a theological interpretation of the template. In my opinion, the program, or the finished product of the hermeneutic approach template's application, was like a text with insights intended to personally affect the
visitor. Similar to a biblical text, the program communicated a message (as stated above, April 5, 1999) to be translated by the museum educator for appropriation by the students.

**Program: Connectedness**

Lenna had spent considerable time both articulating her philosophy of artifacts and selecting the artifacts for use in the program by working through the artifact and meaning-in-context components of the template. Her inclination was to then move on to the connectedness component. Connectedness was defined as connecting the themes and artifacts to student's lives so that the learning becomes relevant, and it seemed for Lenna the next logical element to work on. She stated in her journal:

> This step in the hermeneutic approach template provides an important opportunity to think again about the message to convey, and the artifacts representing that message, in light of the students' own knowledge. It flows naturally from meaning-in-context contemplation and defining. (Dec. 22, 1998, journal entry)

Encouraging students to compare and contrast their roles in their families, sports organizations, and school community with the roles of the Blain children was one way to facilitate connectedness. Students were challenged several times in the program through the questionnaire, the artifacts, and the self-guided tour, to make connections to the themes of roles.

After she had implemented connectedness, I asked Lenna how it worked for her. She replied:

> I liked the flow of it. It was a good timing for me to stop and think and sort of review in my mind -- okay, the artifacts are here, this is the message I want to deliver, the themes, and things I want to explore with the kids, and then to stop and think, okay, let's connect, reconnect that with what they already know. It was good timing I think. As I said, what I found myself thinking about was their receptive powers: letting themselves accept the information with interest, and their whole peer pressure thing, letting the group of them participate without any, some of that grade eight stuff. I think they have to allow themselves in, and I'm really hoping they will. I hope this is the exhibit that will do it. It's got the power
of the artifacts and it's got I think a pretty good connection to them. We're talking about these kids when they were thirteen and fourteen. I think I mentioned last time that one story. One of the kids at fourteen had his tonsil removed. Placed on the dining room table, put under ether and tonsils snipped. Now I know that the sort of the value, the shock value of that will I think, will grab them. This kid was their age. Can they imagine laying on their kitchen table? So I hope that it'll work. It was a good time to make, to sort of pause and think about what grade eights know and what they're going to be willing to do. (Dec. 22, 1998, interview)

In choosing the tonsil snippers as an artifact for use in the program, Lenna used a visual aid along with a personal story to prompt students to make connections between the Blain children and themselves. This built on the earlier questionnaire activity of examining their roles as family members in making connections between themselves and the Blains.

After the program had been piloted, I asked Lenna what she thought were the strongest connections between the Blain children and the students. Her response was:

I think that the connections the students made to other humans was really important. I wasn't saying "Look at these artifacts, they're a good collection. Look at these artifacts, aren't they pretty?" I was saying "Look at these artifacts, they used to belong to someone just like you." And I think they made that connection, I really do. (June 16, 1999, interview)

What emerged for me after Lenna had completed the connectedness step was the hermeneutic nature of the program components. For example, meaning-in-context caused Lenna to revisit the artifact element and to view the artifacts in light of new understandings about their power and their representation of roles. Connectedness caused her to reflect on students' pre-understandings, therefore seeing in a new way the themes and storyline which connected the lives of the Blain children to the grade eight visitors.

Program: Process

My original conception of the program's process element was to expand on Dilthey's interpretation of understanding, which he saw as "that special moment when life
understands life" (Palmer, 1969, p. 115), and is accomplished through the appropriation of another's experience. I had envisioned process as a recreating or reliving the experience of another through re-experiencing, or "an active recreation of other persons' experiences" (Bulhof, 1980, p. 62). Therefore, I developed the following definition for process: What the artifact's creator experienced at the time; the process of creating; setting the stage for students to have their own experience.

My expectation was that students would have an experience recreating an artifact. Perhaps the experience of recreating could happen in some programs, but it was not practical in Lenna's. Many, if not all, of the artifacts were mass produced or manufactured. They were purchased by the Blain parents through the catalogue or in stores. Recreating a model steel train was not possible. In attempting to remain true to my definition, Lenna struggled to reconcile the process element. Unable to offer a reasonable solution to recreating an artifact, I suggested the following modification to the process definition:

Maybe rather than creating the artifact, it's using it, which I think probably we are doing in the rest of the program. Maybe instead of looking at that part as being the creation of it, it's getting more at how these were used in different ways by the children to fulfil those themes. (Dec. 22, 1998, interview)

Changing the definition of process to include an artifact's use when recreation is not viable was the first major modification to a component of the template. My 'ownership' of the template caused me to be concerned about the possible erosion of the process element's philosophical foundation. I had envisioned recreating an artifact. After pondering this dilemma for some time, I began to realize that my original idea for the process element need not be abandoned. There will be programs where recreating a handmade tool will be appropriate. In Lenna's program, it was not the experience of the
artifacts' manufacturers that she wanted to capture; it was using the artifacts for reliving the Blain children's experiences in order to understand their various roles.

Although the direction of the process component had changed slightly, Lenna was still upholding one of the principles of its philosophical foundation by appropriating the experiences of the user of the artifact. The students would gain an understanding of the lives of the Blain children, while at the same time learning about their own roles.

Lenna had been working through the template's components as they seemed naturally to progress for her. I asked her how it had worked for her to proceed to process after connectedness, and she replied:

I think because we were already talking about the artifacts, it flowed quite nicely, because I hadn't really left connections behind in my thoughts as I was working on process. (Jan. 11, 1999, interview)

In reading her journal entry, I got the feeling that Lenna was struggling to reconcile the role of manufactured artifacts in the program with the intent of the process element. She wrote:

The artifacts in this exhibit, and those selected for hands-on use, are generic in the sense they were purchased from local merchants and the Eaton's catalogue. They are not hand-made. Do they still have a story to tell?.... Will the artifacts generate interest and provide a springboard for far-ranging discussion? Will the students get a sense of this 'brush with the past' represented by artifacts? (Jan. 10, 1999, journal entry)

Lenna's comments seemed to reflect the same concerns about the philosophical underpinnings of the process template that I had been wrestling with. She began to reconcile them a short time later by recognizing that the artifacts do have a story to tell. In the same journal entry she commented:

The artifacts in this exhibit are powerful, particularly in their numbers and condition. This, I think, gives an advantage to this element of the hermeneutic approach template in this case. Even if they are not handmade, they do represent,
typically, a life and time in early Saskatchewan history. (Jan. 10, 1999, journal entry)

This reconciliation was reiterated in our conversation the next day:

So you'll remember we talked more that it would not be the maker of the artifact, it would be more the use. And I think that even thought these weren't hand made I think they're really typical of the times and can act as springboards for discussion, so I think that they'll be fine. (Jan. 11, 1999, interview)

The artifacts' use by the owners became the focus of the process component, and I believe that as a result, they more effectively supported the themes and storyline of the program than if the focus had been examining their creation.

Program: Experience

The time to plan hands-on activities for building new experiences is during the experience component of the template. Originally I had intended that students recreate an artifact, or reenact an historical event. In retrospect, my focus was too narrow and I had not investigated other possibilities. Lenna interpreted the experience component to mean an experience with the artifacts, such as a tour of the exhibit. Since the artifacts were manufactured, and could not be handled by the students, she devised a self-guided tour to get the students as close to the artifacts as possible. The tour required students to move through the exhibit answering mostly higher order, evaluative questions about specific artifacts or displays. At the display of dolls, for example, students were asked: What do you think the popularity of 'Barbie' dolls today says about our society?

At the display about the Blain parents, students were asked: Name two responsibilities you think Dan Blain would have felt in his role as head of the Blain household. Do you think fathers today feel that they have these same responsibilities? Why or why not?
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Other experiences included the questionnaire during the introduction of the program to determine students' pre-understandings of family roles, the slide show about the Blain children and their various roles, handling artifacts demonstrating roles of the Blain children, and a game to conclude the program. Despite these many and varied activities, I was concerned that the original intent of the experience component had been compromised. To obtain a deeper understanding of the roles played by the Blain children informally or formally in the community, or as members of a large family (there were nine members) compared to today's standards, I envisioned reliving or reenacting one of the roles.

Each of the seven Blain children developed specific roles. Matt, for example, kept a farm journal most of his life; Ethel was a helpful, hospitable person who assumed the role of hostess at the death of her mother. My question was whether the students would experience those roles fully within the program, as I had intended in this element. If not, then I did not adequately communicate my expectations of the experience element to Lenna.

We had modified the process component to include the artifact's use, which may have impacted the next element, experience. If we had followed through on the original definition for process by incorporating the artifact's creation, then the next logical step might have been experiencing through recreation. Rather than focusing on the artifacts and reliving their creators' experiences, we were now focused on the experiences of the Blain children who used the artifacts. Our attention was shifting from experiencing the artifacts to experiencing the themes.
Since the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development had been a concept until its interpretation and implementation by Lenna, the slight change in focus from artifact to theme experience might have signaled the template's evolution. As Lenna worked through the components, I had become concerned as a researcher about a possible deviation from the direction the hermeneutic approach was to play in "magnifying" artifacts. In conceptualizing the hermeneutic approach, I saw the program resulting from the template's implementation as exposing the many facets of an artifact. My focus had been on the artifact's message, the creator's experience in making and using the artifact, and providing students with experiences to uncover the message by reliving its creation. The practical application of the template seemed to be taking the spotlight away from the artifacts and placing it on the themes or storyline. Looking back through my fieldnote entries, I was able to glimpse traces of concern about this shift:

One of my concerns about the template is whether or not the message of the artifact will be told effectively or sufficiently. Would an object-based lesson be more effective in passing on the artifact's message? What about emphasizing a theological hermeneutics in an object-based lesson? Too confusing! (Dec. 22, 1998, fieldnotes)
What is it we really want students to experience? How is this different for mass-produced items as opposed to hand-crafted ones? Or is it the message we want them to experience? Or both? (Jan. 25, 1999, fieldnotes)
My concern as a museum educator is facilitating between the artifact and the visitor so that the visitor gets a sense of that power. One of my concerns is that the essence of this (power of the artifact, role of the facilitator) is lost within the remainder of the template. Perhaps this is a caution -- that the 6 elements [pre-understanding, connectedness, process, experience, meaning-in-context, communication] draw out the story of the artifact, and not become a distraction. It may be due to my focus on the power of the artifact that I'm shying away from objectives-based programs. These tend to put student behaviour changes before the artifact, i.e. "The student will be able to ...." instead of "The artifact will ...." The template, particularly in the artifact element, might need to be revised to place more emphasis on message -- what message do you want students to gain from the artifact through the program? (Feb. 4, 1999, fieldnotes)
Again I have to wonder -- would it have been better just to develop an improved version of an object lesson? Maybe not -- would it have a context? Would it incorporate children's pre-understandings? (Feb. 23, 1999, fieldnotes)

I was beginning to see that a "message dichotomy" existed within the conceptual framework of the hermeneutic approach template. The storyline, incorporating the curriculum topic and the museum's mandate, held the main message of the program. The artifacts contained their own messages that could be read under the right conditions without the aid of a program. In retrospect, Lenna was mediating the two messages as she implemented the template. She was identifying a message for the artifact and deciding which message would be presented to students. In this program, the message was roles, and students were being asked to read the artifacts for the role message.

Lenna had chosen to use the artifacts to support the message of the program, rather than having students search for new messages in the artifacts as I had envisioned. What I came to realize was that Lenna made a more accurate interpretation of the way the hermeneutic approach template fit together than I had. If the template was like a sentence, with all the elements being the words forming the sentence, then Lenna had read the sentence while I fixated on a word (artifacts). As she worked through the experience element, Lenna was developing ways that students could experience the hands-on and hands-off artifacts to gain a deeper understanding of roles.

After the program had been piloted, I asked Lenna what new experiences she thought the students gained, and she replied:

For many of them I suspect the museum visit itself was a new experience. We don't usually see them much past grade five .... and any program they would have gotten in those early years at the Museum would be not as deep a look at life in 1910 as we were able to do at this age and with this exhibit. So new experiences in that way, also sort of a new awareness, a new thinking about hey, maybe things are different but we're not. So, I mean I can only speculate on that, but there were
perhaps some who went away thinking new thoughts because of it. (June 16, 1999, interview)

The final experience in the program was a game that pulled together everything that the students had learned in the visit. Modeled roughly after the game show Jeopardy! the categories of questions were the themes -- personal, informal community, formal community, and changing roles. On the day that the program was piloted, the students arrived late, so the game show was omitted from the visit because the group had to rush back to school.

Program: Communication

Communication, the last of the template's program components, was defined as dialogue; discussing the experience with others; sharing insights and experiences to find comparisons and contrasts. The program's concluding Jeopardy! style game was chosen to fulfill the requirements of the communication component. Lenna expected that the game would cast students in a new role while prompting dialogue, as she noted:

A game, played as a team, encourages discussion, debate and collaboration. Students assume new roles as 'players', another reinforcement of the many roles we assume throughout life. (Feb. 17, 1999, journal entry)

Since the game was never tested, we can only speculate about its success in accomplishing the tasks of debate and discussion. However, communication was not limited to the concluding game. When the students were participating in the program during the pilot, I followed one group into the exhibit while Lenna presented the slide show to the other group. I observed students chatting about the toys in the exhibit, and discussing answers to the questions in the self-guided tour. After the students had gone, I asked Lenna how they had communicated their experiences and new learnings with others. She replied:
Now that of course would be difficult for me to answer. They certainly spoke freely and openly with me, as though they had enjoyed the interaction. That's probably as far as I can comment. I don't know what went on in the bus or in the classroom, or even on the way out of the museum. (June 16, 1999, interview)

Later I asked if she had noticed any dialogue among the students, and she answered:

To be honest I didn't. As I said, I was busier presenting than I was observing, so they engaged directly with me, yes, and they did. They all, you know, they seemed anxious to speak at certain points, particularly in that slide show, they seemed to really want to participate. So, but among themselves, I don't have any examples of that. (June 16, 1999, interview)

While the communication component was the last to be addressed, it was evident throughout Lenna's program. The opening questionnaire prompted discussion about family roles and birth order, and the self-guided tour enabled further discussion about roles and artifacts. Communication existed throughout the program between the museum educator and the students, between and among students, and between visitors and artifacts. Lenna's task after finishing the communication element was the scripting or writing of the program for tour guides to follow when delivering the program to a school group.

**The Template Revisited**

After Lenna had worked through the template and was preparing the program for delivery to Martin's grade eight class, I asked her to look back over the process of interpreting the template and tell me what she identified as the strengths of the hermeneutic approach. Her response was:

Definitely a strength was sort of a step by step leading through and unfolding as each step went along. I think that gives you time to think and reflect and not leap. It's really a deliberate stop and we do a lot of leaping. I think particularly looking at what the students already know and building on that is something maybe we don't often do, or do enough. So that was a good exercise. It seemed to me to be instrumental in keeping me focused and that's another danger in museum programming .... I didn't digress as easily because it was keeping me on track.
And again it was a process so it was sort of like having a map that would tell you you're coming to a left turn and soon there'll be a right turn. So you knew to be planning ahead. So I liked it for that reason. And then again because of giving information and not testing on retention. That gives a lot of freedom of presentation and yet I'm convinced that kids are going to learn a lot .... I liked the freedom on one hand and the structure on the other. (March 16, 1999, interview)

While Lenna was forthcoming with the strengths of the template, she was less so when asked about weaknesses:

I guess when I started out trying to get it into a form like this I thought "I wonder if all of these things have to appear in the program?" and as I decided in the end they don't have to appear with a label, they'll all be there but they may not be flagged as hermeneutic step number 3. (March 16, 1999, interview)

As Lenna and I worked through the template's components, we both began to wonder at what point the program should have been formalized, or scripted. This was the process of writing up the notes for tour guides, including what activities would be offered and when, what information would be presented, where and how it would be presented, when the artifacts would be introduced, and what questions would be asked of the students. I had not identified during the template's creation where the scripting should occur, as I was not sure myself whether the program should be written during or after the hermeneutic approach template's implementation.

The issue of writing up the program into a formal document arose in one of my fieldnotes entries:

As we work through the template, a concern I have: where does one begin writing up the script for the program? We already have the storyline and artifacts, but what about the activities that students will do when they visit the museum? Will this decision be an individual one? Will it be dictated by the template? I think if I were doing it, I might develop a draft of the script as I move through each element. (Feb. 4, 1999, fieldnotes)

When asked about pulling the information together into a script or tour, Lenna identified her process in the following way:
So far mine has been a mental image as I've been journalling, and now I just thought I can't go any farther here, I've got to get these kids into the exhibit, which I hadn't done in my mind until that point. (Feb. 18, 1999, interview)

Lenna had coupled the scripting of the program with touring the exhibit, which was a bigger concern for her. Programs that do not incorporate exhibits like this one does will not have a gallery tour to consider. Some programs for school groups do not include activities such as tours of an exhibit, although they do include hands-on experiences with artifacts. Her concern of including an exhibit tour had been identified also in her journal entry:

Am I correct in thinking that the time to tour the exhibit is now? Or is the actual tour not built into the program template because it is such an obvious part of any museum program? (Feb. 2, 1999, journal entry)

Perhaps the timing of an exhibit tour would be more obvious if the script had been drafted along the way, or considered during the artifact element. Not all programs will have a pre-determined exhibit to incorporate, but it must be included as a consideration in the template's implementation. Drafting a script while working through the elements is a suggestion also for the workshop in Stage Three of the study, as museum educators will not be journalling like Lenna. In a sense, her journalling acted as a draft of the program script because she made decisions along the way about the artifacts and activities to be incorporated into the final product.

Once scripted, the program had to be piloted to determine whether revisions would be necessary and to gauge its educational potential. I interviewed the teacher of the pilot class to check his reaction. Martin's overall impression of the program was positive, as he stated:

I thought it was a fantastic display. The attic part was great. The icebreaker activity was good, it got the kids thinking about their roles in their own families.
And the self-guided tour I thought was really good too. The kids seemed to enjoy that. (June 7, 1999, interview)

I asked Martin to assess the program in order to illuminate the strengths and weaknesses of the template. As noted previously in the storyline section, the curriculum connection was certainly a strength. I attribute this to the curriculum and storyline steps of the hermeneutic approach template which force the museum educator to seek a specific curriculum topic to incorporate into the program. Martin also recognized the novelty of the program, as he stated:

I think it was a new and different way of introducing some concepts to them. I would talk about it [to other social studies teachers] in terms of being an excellent motivator or concluding project for the kids, depending on how you wanted to use it. But definitely if you're doing that unit it'd be one that you should take in, I would say. Just because of all its attributes. (June 7, 1999, interview)

In the short conversation presented below, I revisited the issue of scripting the program into a written document to check whether Lenna had any new insights to share:

Lee: And the other thing that actually has come up a couple of times I think is when do you actually start writing the program? So now when you look back at it, should you have been writing the program from the beginning, or doing what you did, which was looking at and gathering data at all of the steps and doing the research and then doing the program at the end?

Lenna: My inclination would be to do it as we did it. To gather along the way and then to bring it all together in the end. It made the bringing together quite an easy process because you had those chunks already and it was just a matter of slipping them in. And sort of giving them voice, whether that's through the Jeopardy! or through the tour, or through a self-guided tour or the slide show or the game, that little quiz. I think I would probably do it again the same way. I think to begin to write before you've sifted through this is to jump the gun and then you make some ... you either go off in a direction that you decide doesn't uphold what you're trying to do and then you've wasted that amount of time or that energy. So I would likely do it again the very same way.

Lee: Actually now when I look back on it that being done this way, I think this is the right way to do it, too. Although, you know, once you get it done you might decide, well, next time you do it, it might not work that way.
Lenna: Right. And everybody has different styles, too. But for me, I'm sort of a methodical plodder. Step by step worked. (March 16, 1999, interview)

As we discussed the writing up of the program, it became evident to me that modifications to the original conceptual framework were necessary. I had viewed the program as including the six final program elements (pre-understanding to communication), but Lenna had seen program and the six components as two different things. Our discussion that followed clarified that miscommunication, and caused us to reflect on a modification of the template:

Lee: So we might want to look at is there another way that we can configure this [template] in order to give it to other museum educators. Is there a better way of presenting this?

Lenna: Where does program figure on yours? These things are elements of the program but I did them before the program, essentially. If you know what I mean, so I guess program development, and these things and then program confirmation ....

Lee: My feeling is we would see that if we put these elements -- pre-understanding, communication -- in as program development or even program research, then maybe we need to add that other step there of research synthesis, or something .... So the synthesis would be more of a script writing. Deciding on activities and their placement in the programming. (March 16, 1999, interview)

The resulting change in the template clarified aspects of the template that were vague to me in its conceptual development. The adolescent template was maturing into adulthood, and I was very excited by the turn of events, as I recorded later in my fieldnotes:

Undoubtedly one of the most productive meetings we've ever had .... Hermeneutically, we've come full circle to the template and based on new understandings have revised it. Where previously I have the six principles in the program section, we've changed that to a section called program research. What follows is the addition of a new section called program synthesis which takes everything learned from the research section and boils it down into the script for delivery .... In all, this is quite exciting. I think the template is evolving in a positive way. And, I see my role as researcher to be that of a participant-as-
observer. Lenna and I have co-interpreted, or perhaps more accurately co-discovered the template revisions. (March 16, 1999, fieldnotes)

The template changed slightly from its original conception, with the six program principles in a circular pattern (Figure 1), to the format given to Lenna. I had thought that the first pattern might be too difficult for her to comprehend, so the circle gave way to a linear progression beginning with pre-understanding and ending with communication. The next evolution of the template was the modification of the program section into program research, and the addition of a program synthesis section. The version of the hermeneutic approach template refined by Lenna and I in Stage Two is presented as Figure 4 (p. 129).

The Use of Metaphor for Meaning-making

As I reflected on ten months of data, one unexpected observation was Lenna's use of metaphor in describing the template. Metaphor is an important literary device "for the communication of cognitive content" (Van Maanen, 1995, p. 204). Lenna used metaphor not just to communicate the cognitive content of the template, but to make meaning of the program planning template for herself and me. "There is a fairly wide agreement that metaphor involves, or is, the transfer of meaning" (Ortony, 1975, p. 45), and in several instances Lenna used metaphor to transfer her meaning-making of the template to me. Her metaphors helped me understand how she was interpreting the hermeneutic approach template. Ortony (1975) identifies the communicative purpose of metaphor in language in a way that relates to Lenna's use of metaphor to enlighten me:

Metaphors are necessary as a communicative device because they allow the transfer of coherent chunks of characteristics -- perceptual, cognitive, emotional and experiential -- from a vehicle which is known to a topic which is less so. In so doing they circumvent the problem of specifying one by one each of the often unnameable and innumerable characteristics; they avoid discretizing the perceived
Figure 4. Template for the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development, after implementation by the Stage Two research participant.
continuity of experience and are thus closer to experience and consequently more vivid and memorable. (p. 53)

"The essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 5), and Lenna understood and experienced the template as Food, as Journey, and as Building. This was exciting for me because I had only seen the template as a step-by-step process, much like a lesson plan, for developing programs. Seeing it in other terms -- as Food or Journey, broadened my perspective and provided me with a way of communicating the concept of the program planning template to others. This is what Lenna had to say about the template as Food:

I guess as I was going through [the template] I wasn't sure if, as I put the ingredients together I would make a cake that mixed ingredients and you wouldn't know them one by one.... Once they're mixed in, they're sort of invisible ingredients. (March 16, 1999, interview)

I responded in my fieldnotes to Lenna's cake metaphor by stating:

She's come up with a great metaphor for the template that I think will be a wonderful way of introducing it to.... museum educators. The template is like a cake- each of the elements is an ingredient. When you eat the cake, you don't necessarily separate the ingredients, for example now I'm eating flour, now sugar, so is it necessary to separate the elements when writing up the script [or tour guide notes]? Probably not, just as long as they end up in the mix. The template is the recipe for a cake. The cake is the program. (March 25, 1999, fieldnotes)

As I journaled my thoughts about the cake metaphor, I began to realize that there were two metaphors at play -- the obvious cake, and a less obvious recipe. Goatly (1997) states that "metaphors suppress some features and highlight others" (p. 2). Sometimes two metaphors are needed in order to address a subject or topic more fully. What one metaphor misses, a second will catch.

The [hermeneutic approach] template can be seen as both process and product -- the process being the act of creating the product, or program. Lenna uses metaphors to address both the process (the recipe) and the product (the cake). (Dec. 4, 1998, fieldnotes)
Underpinning metaphor is the concept of similarity or analogy (Goatly, 1997). The critical features of a recipe, such as its methodical introduction of ingredients, were similar to the methodical application of the hermeneutic approach template's elements. Non-critical features, such as the baking of the product in an oven, were hidden or forgotten.

In order to better understand and explain metaphor use, Way (1991) summarizes the more common theories and views of metaphor. One, the Interaction View, originated by Max Black (Way, 1991), is helpful in understanding Lenna's use of the Food metaphor. According to the Interaction View, a metaphor is divided into two parts, the literal primary and the metaphoric secondary (Way, 1991). If the cake was used as the metaphoric secondary vehicle for the literal primary subject, the program, then the metaphor involved the interaction of these two parts. Both the primary and the secondary subjects have associated ideas and implications common to each, therefore the associated ideas and implications of the secondary part, the cake, were transferred to the primary system, or program. More than just the words are considered in the two parts; there is a shared body of knowledge associated with the cake and the program (Way, 1991). The program is seen through the "filter" of the cake's properties, which influences how the program's properties are viewed (Way, 1991).

Metaphors are not necessarily used to transfer only one characteristic (Ortony, 1975), so my challenge was to create a similarity between the previously dissimilar ideas of the cake and the template by teasing out the common elements. A cake is the product of many complementary ingredients such as flour and sugar that blend when mixed into a form with texture, colour, taste, and smell. A program is also the product of many
complementary ingredients, such as artifacts and curriculum, but doesn't have texture, colour, taste, and smell in the same sense as a cake. In order for a cake to be finished, it must be baked, which is a process different than mixing the ingredients. A museum education program is "baked" when it is scripted into notes for tour guides, although the process is not the same for the program as for the cake. To truly appreciate the cake, it must be viewed and tasted. A program is viewed also, and visitors taste it through their active participation handling artifacts, and learning new information.

Lenna had other food metaphors to describe attributes of the program she developed:

That birth order little quiz.... before we had a tour. That was my buttering up, my softening process [to prepare the students for the remaining activities in the program]. (Feb. 18, 1999, interview)
I thought one of the strengths [of the template] was that it allowed for a variety of learning styles, for the pupils to have those learning styles and still all learn from the smorgasbord that was presented to them. (June 16, 1999, interview)
As a presenter [the program] was most enjoyable. I'm sorry it was rushed because I really think that we left the icing off the cake by not doing the concluding activity. (June 16, 1999, interview)

In these selections, Lenna used Food to describe specific attributes of the program. The quiz used to introduce the program prepared students for the remainder of the tour by buttering them up. To me, this is a weak use of metaphor, as "buttering somebody up" works better as an expression. The smorgasbord reference was a stronger use of metaphor than the buttering up example. Viewing the program through the filter of the smorgasbord implied that there were a variety of wonderful experiences waiting to be discovered by students. Also implied by this metaphor was the belief that there were enough activities offered in the program to satisfy all students. The choice of words in the final metaphor, the "icing", suggested that the concluding activity was the sweetest part
of the program. While the previous cake metaphor viewed the introductory activity, tour of the exhibit, and experience with artifacts as ingredients that mixed together to make the program, the concluding activity was not an ingredient. Rather, the concluding game activity came after the program had been 'baked' to establish its importance as one of the best parts of the cake.

Lenna also structured the concept of the template-as-process in terms of a road map. Interestingly, both a road map and a recipe imply directionality, with beginnings and destinations. She has identified herself as a 'methodical plodder' who prefers a step-by-step style of program development, therefore a road map and a recipe fit her personality (March 16, 1999, interview). She made these comments about the template as Journey:

It was... like having a map that would tell you you're coming up to a left turn and soon there'll be a right turn. So you knew to be planning ahead. (March 16, 1999, interview)
The template gave me a road map. A road map with pitstops to stop and assess and evaluate and plot my route more strategically. I very much appreciated that. (June 16, 1999, interview)
[Moving from one element to the next] it flowed naturally... I was ready to look again at the artifacts that would substantiate the exploration I want the students to do about themes and labels. (Dec. 8, 1998, interview)
At this stage I think the process is actually flowing quite well. (Dec. 22, 1998, interview)

The common comparison theory provided a framework for examining Lenna's use of the road map metaphor. The comparison theory states that:

The meaning of any metaphoric expression can still be completely captured by a literal equivalent, as long as the literal expression is one of explicit comparison. (Way, 1991, p. 34)

The example used to demonstrate the comparison theory is that men are wolves, not men are like wolves. All the characteristics of men and all of the characteristics of
wolves are compared for similarities. The similarities found between the tenor, in this case "men", and the vehicle, "wolves", become the ground of the metaphor. In the "template is road map" metaphor, the template and road map can be compared for similarities. Like the road map, the template was a guide for getting from one place to another. Both had a starting and ending point. A fluid, forward movement, as opposed to a static position was implied. Each leg of the journey was a component. Both allowed for flexibility and creativity in choosing how long to spend at each stopover or component. One of the features suppressed in the metaphor was Lenna's flexibility with the order in which some stages were completed, an impossibility with a road map journey. Neither the road map nor the template provided details of unexpected adventures or potholes that were inevitable along the way, and neither told how long the trip from beginning to end would take. Using a road map metaphor to understand the functioning of the template helped me to recognize its potential strengths and weaknesses.

"A metaphor works when it satisfies a purpose, namely, understanding an aspect of the concept" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 97). The template as Food, and the template as Journey, successfully assisted my understanding of Lenna's interpretation of the template. She used the metaphors unconventionally, because her unit of discourse- the cake and the road map- do not conventionally refer to the template, yet I understood the metaphors because of our shared understandings of both the metaphors and the template, and the similarities or analogies between the two (Goatly, 1997). I surmised that the metaphorical-literal distinction was approximative, as the distance between the thought, in this case the template, and the proposition or cake metaphor, was small (Goatly, 1997).
Both the cake and the road map metaphors have worked successfully in representing the concept of the template. What I found intriguing as well was how she has used experiences common to her, such as making a cake or planning a journey, to reconstruct the experience of developing a program using the template. However, she has also used a building metaphor to structure the template:

So those things are all built into the tour. (Feb. 18, 1999, interview)
I think particularly looking at what the students already know and building on that. (Mar. 16, 1999, interview)
I had to re-itemize the 'building blocks' or elements. (Mar. 16, 1999, interview)

The use of the template as Building was a weaker metaphor than road map or cake. To me it was significant because Lenna chose these words specifically to describe actions. The used part of the metaphor indicated a foundation onto which something else was added. However, I was curious about how few of the references were to the template as Building, as compared to the template as Food. I will stick my toe into gendered waters and speculate that the reason for this could be that Food and food preparation are more representative of female choices of metaphor than are Building and construction. If gender was an issue, then the likelihood that both of us, being female, would make meaning of food metaphor is greater than both of us making meaning from a typically male building metaphor.

One more metaphor emerged from the data that had less to do with the template than a particular component within it. Unlike the structural metaphors noted previously, the final metaphor was ontological in nature, pertaining to the personification of a physical object. As I read and re-read Lenna's journal notes, and later the transcripts of our conversations, the personification of artifacts surfaced several times, as noted in her
comment "In the museum world, we believe that artifacts can 'speak', that they have a message to deliver" (undated, journal entry).

Not only do artifacts speak, they are intelligent. They have messages and stories to tell, and they are selective about to whom they tell their stories. As Lenna states: "Artifacts have an unspoken power to hint at, or to direct students to think about unfamiliar roles of the past, leading them to compare to familiar roles of today" (Dec. 7, 1998, journal entry).

By personifying artifacts, Lenna invited us as museum educators "to make sense of phenomena in the world in human terms- terms that we can understand on the basis of our own motivations, goals, actions, and characteristics" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 34). Basically, artifacts were understood in the human terms of communicating by speaking, tweaking, touching, and sharing their stories.

In two of the examples noted above, overlapping metaphors were used:

Artifacts may speak, a message may be delivered, but the circuit isn't complete until the visitor 'hears'. (undated, journal entry)
Will the artifacts and the program snare the interest of 13 to 14 year olds who are at pains to appear disinterested? (undated, journal entry)

In the first example, the personification of artifacts was overlapped by a construction metaphor; the communication between the artifact and the visitor was a circuit. In the second example, the artifacts were personified as hunters to catch students in a snare.

I'd like also to briefly acknowledge that three metaphors were used but didn't seem to get off the ground:

I would have to tailor-make the program to fit the other branches of the museum. (June 16, 1999, interview)
So these [themes] are sort of second skin to me. (June 16, 1999, interview)
[The artifacts] allowed me to talk about [the people] and hang some flesh on their bones to give them some personality. (June 16, 1999, interview)

While it is difficult to categorize these metaphors, I think they acted as structural metaphors. The concept of the program, the themes, and the artifacts, were metaphorically structured in terms of other concepts- sewing, skin, and hanging flesh.

This brings me to the question of good and bad metaphors. A metaphor is deemed good:

When the new substance we recognize provides us with an illuminating way of looking at the objects identified as its instances. A good metaphor introduces a conceptually innovative substance that we are not [yet?] ready to usher into our canonical ontology. It unites the items denoted by the terms of the metaphor by suggesting a new, hitherto unthought of, essence. A metaphor is good if taking the objects denoted by its terms as instances of one substance modifies our understanding of them in a fruitful way. (Zemack, 1994, p. 252)

Through her use of the metaphors "the template as Food, the template as Journey, and the template as Building", the answer to my question: What message does the template communicate through Lenna's metaphors? was that the template provided a linear progression of components to follow when developing a museum education program. Without the help of the cake and the building block metaphors, I would not have fully understood the inter-relatedness and compatibility between the elements of the template. But while Lenna's metaphors acted as spotlights to highlight critical features of the template, they also cast shadows. What the metaphors did not illuminate are her concerns about offering an exciting program that would capture the interests of young teenagers, and her struggle to make sense out of some of the elements.

By scrutinizing Lenna's metaphors, I was able to uncover how she made meaning of the template for herself, and how she employed metaphors as a communication vehicle to help me understand what the template meant to her. While metaphors illuminated the template, shadows were cast that suppressed or ignored certain features. As a researcher,
I recognize the transformative power of metaphors and their limitations as devices for analyzing qualitative research data.
CHAPTER FIVE: STAGE THREE AND STAGE FOUR

Stage Three

The purpose of Stage Three of the research was to share with other museum educators the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development as it had been refined in Stage Two, and to recruit a participant for the next stage of the research. It was intended that this stage would address the question: *What does the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development offer to museum educators seeking to plan effective programs for school groups?* This chapter begins by summarizing my efforts in offering a workshop to share the hermeneutic approach template with other museum educators. Also included in the chapter is Stage Four of the research, the interpretation and implementation of the hermeneutic approach template by a museum educator research participant identified as an implementer.

Initially I had intended to offer a workshop for museum educators in Saskatchewan to teach the hermeneutic approach as a program development strategy. I envisioned the workshop as being a one-day session in which the participants would work through the components of the hermeneutic approach template to create at least a rough draft of a program for their museum. I thought that Lenna might be the best person to lead the workshop, since she had recently used the approach to create a program for her museum. My role would be that of a moderate participant (Spradley, 1980) in which I would observe how the workshop is received and perceived by those attending, and to
provide support to Lenna as required. As a researcher, I wanted to uncover any additional
ways that Lenna made meaning of the hermeneutic approach that she might divulge while
communicating her experiences of it with others. I also wanted to observe the viability of
the hermeneutic approach as it was explained by someone other than me, and as it was
interpreted by novice and seasoned museum educators. Finally, I wanted to examine the
strengths and limitations of the workshop format that had been structured according to
the six hermeneutic principles incorporated into the template (pre-understanding,
connectedness, meaning-in-context, process, experience, and communication).

In March, 1999 I contacted a staff person at the Museums Association of
Saskatchewan to update her about our progress co-developing the hermeneutic approach
template and to enlist her support in organizing a workshop. We decided to hold the
workshop on April 16, 1999 in Saskatoon, and the Museums Association mailed out
flyers advertising the workshop to museum educators. Four people registered for the
workshop. Several museum educators responded that although they were interested, the
timing was not good. Grant applications for federal funding were coming due, and the
busiest season for many was approaching; some who wanted to attend could not take time
away from work. By April 15, two of the four workshop registrants had withdrawn, and a
third had called to say he could only attend for a half day. Since the fourth person would
have to drive a long distance, the staff person at the Museums Association and I decided
not to proceed with the workshop.

Cancelling the workshop caused a change in the research design because I had
perceived it as a necessary precursor to Stage Four. The workshop was also an
opportunity to officially launch the hermeneutic approach as a program planning strategy,
and I had eagerly anticipated the reactions of my colleagues. As I stated in my fieldnotes log:

I was looking forward to getting the reaction of museum educators to the approach -- their projections about whether or not it might work for them. (April 15, 1999, fieldnotes)

Since the workshop materials were prepared and could be used another time, I opted to offer the workshop in the Fall of 1999 in the hope that it would be a better time of the year for museum educators.

One of the positive outcomes of canceling the workshop was that it gave Lenna time to pilot her program with a school group prior to sharing her experiences with others. In this way, we would be able to relate the reactions of the teacher and students to the program, the strengths and weaknesses of the program that might be attributable to the hermeneutic approach, and any anecdotal information that might prove useful. Subsequently, we were able to convey that one of the strengths noted by the teacher was the match between the curriculum and the program.

In early October, 1999 I published a small article called "The hermeneutic approach to museum education program development" in the Bulletin, a newsletter produced by the Museums Association of Saskatchewan (Brodie, 1999). The article described the approach and was intended to spark interest among museum educators in the hermeneutic approach as a program development strategy. About the same time, I faxed invitations to museum educators to attend a half-day workshop about the approach on October 12, 1999. Several museum educators expressed an interest but were unable to attend because of prior commitments and busy schedules. One person registered but
withdrew later. The workshop began in the morning of October 12 with Lenna, myself, and two participants.

My role as researcher changed from my initial expectation of moderate participant to that of participant as observer (Spradley, 1980), because Lenna preferred to take a secondary role. I led the workshop by teaching the components of the hermeneutic approach to the participants, with Lenna providing support by relating her experiences interpreting and implementing the hermeneutic approach template.

Both workshop participants were trained teachers; one was a seasoned museum educator and the other newly hired to the position. With their prior training and experience working with curricula and children, I was able to build new information about the hermeneutic approach onto an existing pedagogical foundation. Both seemed quite positive about the hermeneutic approach and saw its potential as a program development strategy. In a post-workshop evaluation Pat, the new museum educator, stated that the hermeneutic approach "seems very natural" (October 12, 1999) and felt that it was similar to the way he typically developed programs.

While the initial response to the hermeneutic approach seemed positive, I felt that the workshop had been too rushed, and there was not enough time to fully explore the components. Definitely a day-long workshop would have been preferable. Also, more participants would have provided a greater opportunity to exchange ideas about the components. Pat had begun to make connections between the components and to identify how the components related to each other, such as the way pre-understanding and connectedness build on each other. There could have been a very interesting session had there been more time and more people to discuss Pat's insight.
Since timing was a major consideration implementing the workshop and there was a large amount of information to process in a short amount of time, I seemed to fall into a "transmissional" mode of communicating the components. This was frustrating for me because it was not what I had envisioned. I wanted more dialogue, with more sharing of how the participants currently create programs as compared and contrasted to the hermeneutic approach to program development. And I wanted more time to observe how the participants were making meaning of the components as we worked through them, as in the example of Pat's experience connecting the components.

The workshop was structured using the six program principles (pre-understanding, meaning-in-context, connectedness, process, experience, and communication) as guidelines for teaching the hermeneutic approach template. I began by establishing what the two participants already knew about program development as a pre-understanding on which to build the new information of the hermeneutic approach template. Although it started slowly, this was a good beginning, but because it took longer than anticipated, it caused the remainder of the workshop to be rushed. The meaning-in-context component of the workshop, which was to place the hermeneutic approach into an interpretive paradigm context, was deleted due to time constraints. When each of the template's elements was introduced, I gave its definition, Lenna provided the example from the In a Prairie Attic: Family Toys program, then the participants were given a short amount of time to create their own piece. The final four components of the program research section were addressed together by giving the definition and an example of each, with the participants given time at the end to work
through each element separately. The research synthesis section was skimmed. To me, this was a less than ideal training situation.

It was also frustrating for me that neither of the two workshop participants agreed to be involved in the next stage of the research. Pat appeared interested and wanted to consider the offer to participate, but in a follow-up telephone call he did not commit to assisting with Stage Four.

One of the options I had considered in April after the cancellation of the first workshop was to teach the hermeneutic approach template to one or two interested museum educators in a non-workshop, outreach setting in the hope that someone would agree to participating in Stage Four. As neither of the workshop participants committed to being involved in the next stage, I pursued the option of soliciting a research participant by contacting a museum educator who had expressed an interest to Lenna in learning the hermeneutic approach template during the September Museums Association of Saskatchewan workshop. The museum educator had been unable to attend my Stage Three October workshop. However, she agreed to learning about the template on a one-to-one basis.

**Conclusion**

Stage Three proved to be frustrating because neither workshop participant committed to trying the hermeneutic approach in the development of a museum education program, and neither agreed to become the implementer in Stage Four. However, developing the workshop materials forced me to consider the steps in delivering a workshop. I applied the same hermeneutic principles used in the hermeneutic approach as steps in the delivery of a workshop. I also came away from the workshop feeling that I
needed to reflect further on the efficacy of a workshop in teaching the hermeneutic
approach.

**Stage Four**

In September 1999, Lenna taught a Museums and Education workshop through
the Museums Association of Saskatchewan. Throughout the day-long session, she
mentioned the work she had done developing a program using the hermeneutic approach
template. One of the participants, Sandy, expressed an interest in learning more about the
approach. Lenna passed this information on to me, and I invited Sandy to attend the Stage
Three workshop on October 12, 1999. As mentioned above, only two people attended the
workshop; Sandy was not one of them.

After neither workshop attendee consented to participate in Stage Four of the
research, I contacted Sandy via email to inquire if she was still interested in learning
about the hermeneutic approach. She agreed to become the research participant in Stage
Four, and we met for the first time on October 28, 1999 to discuss her involvement in the
study.

Sandy has worked part time as a museum educator at the Pairieview Art Gallery
and Museum for the past five years. Two of the gallery spaces frequently exhibit works
of art, so Sandy's degree in fine arts provides her with a solid training for developing art-
based programs to accompany the displays. During our second meeting on January 18,
2000 I described in detail the components of the hermeneutic approach template using the
materials I had prepared for the Stage Three workshop. In essence, I delivered an
abbreviated version of the Stage Three workshop to a single participant. This abridged
workshop omitted the practical aspect of developing a rough draft of a program as we
worked through each component. Sandy did not have the opportunity to apply each component while I was in attendance so that I could address any questions or concerns she might have about the template or affirm her interpretation of the template. Sandy had seen the template already, in the Museum and Education workshop conducted by Lenna in September 1998, and she was somewhat familiar with the hermeneutic approach template's components, yet I was uncertain as to her level of understanding since I was unable to check for comprehension in a rough draft. However, I felt that this would be a good opportunity to see how well the hermeneutic approach template could stand on its own with minimal support from me. Additional reflections on this can be found in Chapter Six.

At the January 18, 2000 meeting, I also explained to Sandy about recording in a journal her experiences implementing the hermeneutic approach template. After this meeting and according to the study's design, Sandy and I had no contact during her implementation of the template in the development of a program for her museum. During the first three months of 2000, Sandy developed and implemented a program using the hermeneutic approach. On March 31, 2000 I shadowed a school group as they participated in the program Sandy had created using the hermeneutic approach template. Sandy and I met for the last time on April 4, 2000 to discuss her reactions to the hermeneutic approach as a program development strategy and to address the themes that had emerged in Stage Two of the study. We also revisited the concerns Sandy had expressed in our first two meetings. Some of these concerns included the placement of artifact selection in the program development process, and Sandy's perception of the role of curriculum in the template.
In Stage Four of the research, I was most interested in uncovering through Sandy's autonomous experience what the hermeneutic approach has to offer museum educators as a program development strategy. The following headings provide a structure for examining the template's potential: traditional vs. new program development practices; the template's strengths and weaknesses; the template as adolescent; and the template revisited. A short description of the program Sandy developed using the hermeneutic approach template precedes the illumination of the template's potential.

The Program

The program was called *Prairie Elevators*. It was designed to complement the grade three and four social studies curriculum topic of interdependence and how a community meets its needs through agriculture. The curriculum topic was a good match with the museum's mandate to collect, preserve, and exhibit artifacts related to the City of Prairievlew and surrounding district. The storyline Sandy wrote incorporated both the curriculum and museum mandate:

One of Saskatchewan's most important industries is agriculture which meets the basic human need for food. Our province has been called "the breadbasket of the world" because our climate is ideally suited to the growing of cereal grains. The grain elevator has come to symbolize our agricultural history. However, science and technology are continually changing the face of agriculture. Urbanization has become a sign of the times as have the gigantic grain terminals which are replacing grain elevators. As our 'sentinels of the prairies' vanish so does a way of life. (undated)

The themes that emerged from the storyline included the importance of agriculture on the settlement of Saskatchewan and the effect of climate on agriculture, the influence of mechanization in agriculture, the identification of crops exported from Saskatchewan, and the consequences of mechanization. Since paintings were the primary materials of the exhibit, Sandy chose about six to enhance the themes. All of the...
paintings seemed to incorporate aspects of themes; I could not assign one painting per theme.

On March 31, 2000 I tagged along behind a school group that was participating in the program. We assembled in the foyer and, after a five minute introduction, the students were escorted into the first gallery where they spent the next twenty-five minutes participating in four activities. One activity included using the paintings chosen by Sandy to compare and contrast rural farming scenes spanning the last fifty years. A brief activity required students to describe the construction of two sculpted model grain elevators. A slightly longer compare-and-contrast activity included the use of a poster showing a cut-away of a wooden grain elevator and a concrete terminal. Another activity included passing around seed samples. The students seemed to enjoy making the connections between the seeds and their uses. For example, Sandy pointed out that the durum wheat seeds are grown and eventually made into pasta, canola seeds are grown for cooking oil, mustard for hot dogs, barley for beer, and lentils for soup.

Next, the students were taken into a second gallery for ten minutes to view a large display demonstrating urbanization and the death of many rural towns in the province. For the remainder of the time, about one hour, the students completed a craft and played in the discovery room. Teachers booking the Prairie Elevators program could choose from three craft activities that accompanied the program. On the day that I observed the grade three-four class at the museum, the teacher had chosen a lantern-making activity. In this activity students drew a symbol that reminded them of rural Saskatchewan on a piece of paper cut to the same size as a piece of tin. Next, they used a hammer and a nail to punch holes along the lines of the picture, and through the tin. The tin was then stapled
onto a circular wooden base and riveted along the seam to hold it in place. A wire handle was attached to the top, and a candle placed inside. Light from the candle illuminated the picture punched in the tin.

**Traditional vs. New Program Development Practices**

In our initial meeting of October 28, 1999 I asked Sandy how she typically develops museum education programs, and she responded:

The first thing I do when we get an exhibit is I talk to Pat about it, the curator, and she gives me an idea of what she thinks is important about this particular artist's work. Then I come back into my room and I look at Arthur Efland's approaches to studying art and look at the chart that he has. There's personal development, artistic heritage, and art in society. This is what curriculum was developed from -- Arthur Efland's work. But I like to go back to it instead of going to the curriculum because it's a little more detailed. Then I look at that and it helps me focus on what my main objective is going to be. And then when I've decided on the main objective, between talking to Pat and looking at how it fits in this Arthur Efland thing, then I go into the curriculum guide and look at foundational objectives and put together the program that way. And then I go into the viewing artworks and the different steps in viewing artworks.... The seven steps. (Oct. 28, 1999)

The seven steps that Sandy incorporates into her program are integral elements of the art curriculum developed by the Saskatchewan Department of Education (1991c). In order to make the viewing experience meaningful, teachers guide the students through the following process of viewing an artwork: preparation, impressions, description, analysis, interpretation, background information, and informed judgement (Saskatchewan Education, Arts Education Curriculum, 1991c). Each step requires specific tasks to be completed by the student, from recording their first impressions about the work (step two: impressions) to listing everything students see in the work (step three: description) and learning more about the artist and the work (step six: background information).
Sandy also mentioned that her typical way of developing a program includes the use of objectives, so I explored her approach:

Lee: You have an objective and that's what you teach to?

Sandy: I'll decide: what's the most important thing that's happening here, and how can I use that, how can I get that across to the children when they come in. The last one [art exhibit] we had, he [the artist] used a lot of symbolism and it was quite simple symbolism. I could see that it was going to be easy for me to teach and easy for the children to catch on, so I'm thinking symbolism is the main part of his work and how we use symbols to express who we are in life. Okay, that's my theme -- it's going to be symbolism. And then I came back and I looked at the Efland approach and I thought, okay that fits in the cultural historical part where how artists discover ideas from personal experiences and transform those ideas into the symbol and create works of art. Then I would go into the curriculum guide and see where it fits in on the foundational objectives, and there's one part where it says becoming aware of where artists get their ideas and transform those ideas. Then I go into the viewing of the artworks themselves [the seven steps].

(October 28, 1999)

The seven step approach is similar to the object-based lesson approach mentioned in Chapter Three. Like an object, the painting is the focus of the lesson. Students train their sense of sight by gathering data from the painting. As much information as possible is gleaned from the object or painting; its function is not to enhance a theme or topic but to train the senses and to sharpen observation skills.

During a program, students usually spend about twenty minutes in the gallery viewing the artworks, then spend about an hour in the hands-on classroom completing an art activity. In the program mentioned above, students would complete an artwork incorporating their own personal symbols. Sandy also used the seven step style of program development with artifact-based exhibits.

Sandy's practice of developing programs included the selection of the artifacts, or artworks, prior to establishing objectives and incorporating the seven steps for viewing. I was uncertain how she would react to placing the selection of artifacts later in the
program development process as the template requires. When I described the steps or components of the template to Sandy, which included the selection of artifacts after the development of the storyline and themes, she questioned the notion of having the themes rather than the piece of art drive the direction of the program. Our conversation captured our differing sentiments:

Lee: I find the easiest thing to do is when you're satisfied with your storyline, go through it and with a highlighter pick out the themes, three to five themes from the storyline.

Sandy: And then look for them in the art? You don't work the other way around?

Lee: No, you don't do it the other way around.

Sandy: You don't think so?

Lee: No.

Sandy: I don't know. To me that mixes me up. If the artists are talking about these prairie icons, and that's the story that the artist is telling and there's five of them telling that story, shouldn't I follow that?

Lee: Not necessarily.

Sandy: Not necessarily?

Lee: The storyline is going to drive your program, so if you're looking at, just say for example a history of elevators, and you're looking at the evolution of elevators from wooden to concrete, then that's one of your themes. It's going to be in your storyline and it's going to come out as one of your major themes that you're going to accentuate or enhance so that students will learn that theme which is really actualizing your storyline.

Sandy: This is completely different from the way I've worked in the past, because in the past whatever the artist has been trying to tell, the story that the artist is trying to tell, is the story that I try to adapt to fit. It's backwards. It's completely backwards from this way. So this way, you're making your own storyline and getting the work to adapt to your storyline and not the other way around.

(January 18, 2000)
Once she had worked through the template, I asked Sandy if she had trouble with selecting the artifacts after creating the storyline. She responded:

Boy I sure did. I fought the whole first day. I kept trying to do it the old way. So I said, no, I'm trying Lee's program here, I've got to do it the other way. And I finally think I got it. But it was hard…. Now I can see it. I can say, this is the story I want to tell, what artifacts do we have? I never would have thought of that before. (April 4, 2000)

During our last visit, I wanted to get Sandy's impression of how the hermeneutic approach compared to her traditional practice of program development. She had the following reflections about this new way of doing things:

Lee: What did you think was different about the way you did this program than how you normally would have done it?

Sandy: A lot more concentration on the curriculum. I usually look at the curriculum but I don't spend a lot of time trying to make sure it fits in. I spent more time trying to make sure it fitted in. I spent more time thinking about what the kids already knew and what they were bringing so I could ask questions that I thought that they could answer, because I thought they would already know something about some of the answers. So I spent more time thinking about that than I normally do.

Lee: The other person that I worked with [Lenna] when we first tried this out, she said she thought this approach, or this template, was like a recipe and you followed it and what you made at the end was a program. Would you say that, or can you think of a different analogy that you would use?

Sandy: No that's exactly how it worked for me, because I started off as I do usually with no idea at all what the end result's going to be. So instead of being very scattered which I normally am, drawing ideas from all over and writing them all down, it gave me a structured way to do it. And I think it speeds things up. Instead of randomly trying to get things put together which I have piles of paper all over the place, it gave me a pattern to follow through, so that I ended up with a program faster than normal. (April 4, 2000)

Like Lenna, Sandy found that the hermeneutic approach provided a step-by-step process for creating a program. Later, she stated that the format worked for her, that it
was laid out very well, and that "I didn't have to jump around. I started at the beginning and worked through" (April 4, 2000).

**Strengths and Weaknesses of the Hermeneutic Approach**

In our conversation of April 4, 2000 Sandy mentioned several observations about the hermeneutic approach that I interpret as strengths. As previously noted, Sandy mentioned that she concentrated more on the curriculum and spent more time thinking about what the students already knew (pre-understanding), as she states in her journal:

Particularly pleased with the way it made me stick closer to curriculum and meaning-in-context and pre-understanding. Issues I am aware of but don't take the time to really make sure I incorporate. (undated)

The template provided a structure or pattern to follow, and it sped up the program development process. She further stated that both the connectedness and meaning-in-context components helped her to focus, and the template "made things simpler" for her (April 4, 2000). Sandy went on to say:

I don't want to stand and lecture about the artifacts. I want them [students] to discover on their own, and this let me do that. This program let me do that.

Thinking that the strengths of the hermeneutic approach template might shine through the program, I questioned Marion, a grade three/four teacher, after she brought her class to the museum to participate in Sandy's program. Since curriculum had been identified as a strength of the hermeneutic approach template by Lenna and Sandy, I asked Marion for her impression of how the program fit into the curriculum. She responded that "it fit in just perfect" (March 31, 2000), particularly with the grade four class because they were studying Saskatchewan. Other comments included an appreciation of the hands-on and craft segments of the program. Marion also stated that the program was enjoyable, helped students make connections between farming and their
lives, offered variety, and "there was something that would interest all the kids and it was all tied together" (March 31, 2000). During the tour, students were heard to comment that it was "neat," and "cool", and it was the hands-on experiences that seemed to appeal to them. One student, for example, was overheard commenting that he liked the second gallery the best with the model demonstrating the death of rural Saskatchewan, while another liked feeling the different grain samples. A third student's favourite part was making the lamp (March 31, 2000).

When asked if she would use the hermeneutic approach template again, Sandy replied that she would. However, I also wanted to know what weaknesses Sandy found in the hermeneutic approach template, and she responded:

I think the only problem is there's a very specific way of looking at art, because we're in the art museum context here, so in the curriculum there's a specific way of looking at art. You do a description, analysis, and so my conflict was trying to amalgamate the two. I was trying to amalgamate that which was curriculum based and I need to follow with this particular one which is also important. So sometimes I found a conflict. (April 4, 2000)

In retrospect, I think that Sandy was trying to superimpose the art curriculum on the social studies curriculum. Since her typical experience is to enhance the art curriculum using exhibits at the Prairiewood Art Gallery and Museum, it would be difficult to break from the comfortable and familiar (the seven steps of viewing artworks and the art education curriculum) to venture into the new and different (the hermeneutic approach template and the social studies curriculum). Sandy identified that she "had a hard time breaking away from old habits" (undated journal entry). Essentially I was asking Sandy to replace her customary view of paintings as a program's focus with a new view of paintings as artifacts in a supporting role.
The Template as Adolescent

In Stage Two of the study, my role was that of participant-as-observer. Lenna and I met after the completion of each component, and I felt connected to the development of the program and the interpretation of the template. However in Stage Four, my role flipped to observer-as-participant. After explaining how the hermeneutic approach template worked, I left it in Sandy's hands to interpret, and I returned only after the program had been delivered several times. My different roles as researcher became clearly evident to me after relinquishing the template's interpretation to Sandy, as I recorded in my fieldnotes log:

I am beginning to sense distinct differences in my role as researcher. As a complete researcher (stage one) I was in total control of the template's development and evolution. There was no doubt in my mind about the template's potential as a helpful program development strategy. In my role as participant-as-observer (stage two) my control over the development of the template loosened. I felt that I still had some authority over it, and was able to influence its potential as a helpful strategy. As an observer-as-participant (stage four), doubts are beginning to surface about the template's potential as a helpful program planning strategy. I have little, if any control over the interpretation and use of the template. And I have little opportunity to influence the research participant's impression of the template (i.e. to see it in a positive light, to see its potential). The template is very much like a child moving through stages of infancy (stage one), adolescence (stage two), young adulthood (stage four). (March 4, 2000, fieldnotes)

My fear was that the hermeneutic approach template would not be able to stand on its own without my support of, or more accurately my influence on, the museum educator. At our last meeting, Sandy put my fear to rest by stating:

But I still think that if I had somebody come in and was going to be my assistant I would use this template. I'd say, "Okay this is how we can develop a program" so that they would have an understanding and a way to go. (April 4, 2000)

However, this signals to me a caution about the use of the hermeneutic approach. Perhaps I am overprotective, but I have concerns about maintaining the integrity of the
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theoretical and philosophical underpinnings of the hermeneutic approach template. In my opinion, formal training is needed for an educator to fully understand and interpret the components. It was not my intention that the template in its diagrammatic form be used to plug in activities to the appropriate component without the benefit of coaching (or at least a comprehensive instruction manual).

Sandy's typical program development experience was different from Lenna's and mine in that she works mostly with paintings, whereas we work mostly with artifacts. I had not considered paintings as artifacts when I developed the hermeneutic approach, and I was unsure as to its success in this circumstance. My concern about the impact this would have on the artifact component of the template was noted in my fieldnotes log shortly after I had seen the exhibit for the first time, and just prior to viewing a school group participate in the program:

The exhibit on which the program was built is largely comprised of paintings. The paintings have become the artifacts in the program, which challenges my thinking about the scope of the artifact component of the template. Is the component broad enough to include paintings? Is a painting different from an artifact such as a curling rock? Will the template work for art and/or paintings? (March 31, 2000)

In answer to my second question, a painting is both different from and the same as an artifact. In the difference category, the message of a painting is overt whereas the message of an artifact is covert. For example, the 1940's painting of the grain field with the horse drawn wagon and the wooden elevator in the background is meant to communicate a message capturing a moment in time. It is symbolic of rural prairie life during the Second World War. The painting captured that moment in time. Our concern is with the action in the painting rather than the painter or the painting's owner. The curling rock used by Lenna in Stage Two, on the other hand, functions differently. It
doesn't particularly tell us about one moment in time, and we may be more interested in
the owner than the rock itself. Another difference is that a painting appeals mostly to the
sense of sight, and generally is not meant to be touched; an artifact can be handled and
investigated by several senses.

A painting and an artifact are similar in that they both have a message to tell. The
message can be more meaningful to the viewer or reader who brings personal experience
to the interpretation. For example, a viewer raised on a farm in Saskatchewan during the
1940's brings a pre-understanding to viewing the painting. A curler who has used that
type of curling rock to win several bonspiels also brings a pre-understanding to viewing
the artifact.

In Stage Two of the study, Lenna mentioned that "One artifact can represent
many stories" (Dec. 7, 1998). A painting can also represent many stories. The 1940's
painting tells stories of harvest time, rural life, the past, and early technology on the farm.
In both situations, the artifact and the painting were selected as evidence to enhance,
enlighten, or describe a theme. Therefore, in answer to my first question, I believe that
the artifact component of the hermeneutic approach can include a painting.

After the program had been completed and delivered to school groups, I asked
Sandy to reflect on the idea of paintings as artifacts by asking if the program allowed the
artifacts to speak. She responded:

I think it's more difficult with paintings. It's not as nice because you can't touch
them. It's really nice if you can touch things.... Paintings tell stories just like
every picture tells a story. You know, that old saying. They do tell stories and
they do speak. They speak quite literally.... I try to get them [students] to think
about the symbolism, the underlying meaning. (April 4, 2000)
Using a painting as an artifact provided Sandy with an opportunity to move away from the arts education curriculum and into the social studies curriculum. The painting was not the focus of the program, as in an object-based or visual arts lesson, but instead enhanced or demonstrated a social studies theme. This implies that paintings need not only be used for arts-based curricular activities. Viewed as an artifact, the painting's usefulness extends to other curricula. The painting of the lonely, dilapidated grain elevator, used in a social studies context, enhances our learning about agriculture, Saskatchewan, and life on the prairies at the close of the twentieth century and enables students to connect with their own experiences.

The Template Revisited

Unlike my involvement with each step of the hermeneutic approach template's interpretation in Stage Two of the study, my role in Stage Four was limited to before and after the template was applied in the development of a program. When I returned to the museum to view the program, I had no idea what to expect. I did not know how Sandy had fared on her own or if she had modified the hermeneutic approach template. During our last conversation on April 4, 2000, it appeared that she had not significantly changed the template. However she made some observations indicating that the hermeneutic approach might need to be revised.

In Stage Two of the study, Lenna noted that meaning-in-context caused her to revisit the artifact component, and that connectedness caused her to reflect on students' pre-understandings. A deeper appreciation for artifacts and students' prior knowledge were the product of additional reflection time. Sandy felt that some of the components caused her to be "heading in the same direction so that when I turned the page to do the
next part, I'd already done it" (April 4, 2000). She suggested that the similar components be joined together, perhaps under a new heading, which would simplify the hermeneutic approach template.

As this was a suggestion borne out of Sandy's recent experience implementing the hermeneutic approach independently, I decided to investigate the blending of four components into two, and the implications that this might have for the template. The first coupling includes the pre-understanding and connectedness components. The definition of the two components provided to Sandy as a guide for interpreting the hermeneutic approach states:

Pre-understanding: what do visitors already know about the themes? This step establishes a foundation of what is already known on which to build new knowledge about the theme.
Connectedness: how the theme and artifacts are connected to visitors' lives today. The new learning is connected to what is already known, making the learning relevant to today.

The intent of the pre-understanding component is to help students recall some knowledge and prior experiences at the beginning of the program so that they have a base or foundation on which to attach new ideas and concepts. For the museum educator, pondering this component heightens awareness of what students already know, so that the activities offered in the program will be at their level but will not be redundant. My hope in incorporating the pre-understanding component into the hermeneutic approach was to ensure a child-centred focus in the program's development, rather than a museum-as-expert transmissive style.

Pre-understanding is not limited to the beginning of the program. It is cyclical, returning whenever connections are made between what students are learning for the first time at the museum and what they already know. Connectedness helps the museum
educator become cognizant of assisting students in making connections, and provides a "conversation starter" about an artifact or theme. For example, Sandy used the samples of seeds to initiate dialogue connecting what students already knew about soup and bread with what they were now learning about lentils and wheat seeds.

Coupling the two components opens the door to possibly skimming over or omitting the pre-understanding element. I believe that pre-understanding is an important first step in focusing students' attention on the task of learning. It is an opportunity for review, particularly if the teacher has completed some pre-visit preparatory work in the classroom. In both stages of the study, neither Lenna nor Sandy had developed pre- and post-visit classroom materials to accompany their programs. Perhaps the pre-understanding component will assume a greater importance in a program that includes pre-visit classroom materials. Based on these reflections, I am reluctant at this time to combine the pre-understanding and connectedness components. To me, pre-understanding lays the foundation at the beginning of the program to bring to their consciousness the knowledge students have about concepts that will be addressed in the program. Connectedness takes that prior knowledge and connects it to new concepts students are exposed to throughout the program.

The second potential component coupling is artifact and meaning-in-context. A definition of the two components follows:

Artifacts: evidence which enhances, enlightens, or describes the theme. 
Meaning-in-context: establishes where the artifact fits into an exhibit, or where new information fits into a larger picture.

Sandy suggested (April 4, 2000) that these two components be merged under the heading "meaning." This would result in either simplifying the hermeneutic approach or
rewording the definition, I believe the two components should remain distinct. One advantage to keeping the two components separate, as exemplified by Lenna's experience, is that it allows time for refining the choice of artifacts.

There is a cyclical essence also to the meaning-in-context element. Reviewing artifacts during the meaning-in-context stage in light of the new understanding that is obtained after completing the pre-understanding element gives a hermeneutic quality to the component. A similar cyclical, hermeneutic action takes place with the pre-understanding-connectedness coupling. In both couplings, the components are separated only by one other element. Pre-understanding separates artifacts and meaning-in-context while meaning-in-context separates pre-understanding and connectedness. My original design of the hermeneutic approach had connectedness following pre-understanding, but the format was changed during Lenna's interpretation. Returning the position of the two components to the original might result in their amalgamation over time. When the hermeneutic approach template was presented to Sandy, the three theme and artifact headings were replaced by one heading for each. I think that the themes heading should be separated into three headings to provide a better visual representation of the hermeneutic approach.

Conclusion
Two of the questions I sought to answer in this study were: how do museum educators interpret the hermeneutic approach template? and, how do they adapt it to fit their personal style? In Stage Four of the study, Sandy used the hermeneutic approach template as a pattern (April 4, 2000), similar to Lenna's road map or recipe, that provided a structured program planning process. The hermeneutic approach template simplified
and hastened the program development process, and caused Sandy to focus more closely on curriculum and the meaning of artifacts (April 4, 2000).

Sandy's adaptation of the template to suit her needs and seasoned program development practices was for me an interesting twist. At times she incorporated the seven steps of viewing artwork into the program, for example by asking students to identify the materials of the sculpted elevators in gallery one. She identified a concern about adhering to the format for viewing art outlined in the art curriculum (the seven steps) yet trying to honour the spirit of the hermeneutic approach template. Our conversation details Sandy's adaptation of the template to the art curriculum:

Sandy: I think the only problem is there's a very specific way of looking at art, because we're in the art museum context here, so in the curriculum there's a specific way of looking at art. You do a description, analysis, and so my conflict was trying to amalgamate the two. I was trying to amalgamate that which was curriculum based and I need to follow with this particular one [template] which is also important. So sometimes I found a conflict.

Lee: How did you resolve that conflict?

Sandy: I leaned more towards your template because I knew we were testing your template and left out some of the parts, a lot of the parts, of the other one. For example, in the curriculum- way of looking at art, you're supposed to have the children sit down and describe all the things that they see in a painting, and then analyze it. Decide what the materials the artist has used and that sort of thing. So I did it, what I ended up deciding to do was just put a spattering of that throughout. There's the clay green elevator, I asked what materials is this made out of, or the collage made out of fabric -- the elevator scene -- I said what's this made out of. I just pulled out a spattering of those kinds of things so that it was still there but not in everything we looked at. (April 4, 2000)

In Sandy's case, the template provided flexibility to accommodate tenets from a different strategy (seven steps) that produced a hybrid of artifact and painting interpretation. She noted that in the future she would use the template again in an adapted
version that combined some of the components, and she would also incorporate elements from the art curriculum (April 4, 2000).
CHAPTER SIX: FINAL REFLECTIONS

In this chapter I provide a summary of my reflections on the study and what I have learned, as well as suggestions for further research. The impetus for this study dates back almost seven years when I became curious about the existence of alternative program development strategies to supplement my typical empirical analytic model. As I began to search for alternatives, I expected to find an effective program planning strategy used by other museum educators that I could adopt. Failing that, I anticipated finding a lesson plan format used by teachers that would be adaptable for museum education programs. I was surprised that I was unable to locate a thorough planning strategy for museum education programs. At the beginning of the study, I could not have imagined creating and testing my own strategy; developing a personalized program planning model seemed the only way to incorporate all of the elements I deemed important. Now that the study has concluded, I will reflect on what I have learned as a museum educator and as a researcher.

Reflections of a Museum Educator

Prior to the study, I operated within an empirical analytic worldview that guided my museum education program development practices. My program planning methods were linear, and always included the writing of objectives. In my initial foray into the museum education field, I discovered that other museum educators were influenced by the same worldview (e.g., the MAS checklist). After enrolling in the doctoral program, I
learned that two more curriculum theory paradigms existed with the potential to influence museum education program development in the same way they influence lesson plan development. Until initiating this study, I was oblivious to curriculum theory paradigms; I suspect that other museum educators are similarly unaware. This study has clarified the way that three significant worldviews (empirical analytic, interpretive, and critical theory) inform museum education program development. This information is vital for museum educators and their program planning practices. Although originally applied to pedagogy (Miller & Seller, 1990), the three curriculum theory paradigms are transferable to museum education for the development and implementation of museum education programs. I contend that most museum educators are not cognizant of the roles that educators and visitors play within each paradigm. To fully appreciate the potential of the paradigms in program development, museum educators need to be educated about applying the essential elements of each in the development of programs. Therefore, I intend to share my knowledge of the three paradigms and their influence on education program development with my colleagues in future museum education coursework and seminars.

As the study progressed, I discovered that the dominant paradigm influencing program development was the empirical analytic. However, the overlooked interpretive paradigm is an alternative to the transmissional orientation of the empirical analytic paradigm because it emphasizes meaning-making rather than fact-gathering. Museum educators who strive to actively engage visitors in an interpretive event are naturally aligned to the interpretive worldview, although they often struggle to fit into an empirical
analytic framework. Sandy exemplified this in our Stage Four conversation when she commented:

    I don't want to lecture. I don't want to stand and lecture about the artifacts. I want them [students] to discover on their own, and this [hermeneutic approach] let me do that. This program let me do that. (April 4, 2000)

This study has clearly demonstrated that the interpretive orientation is an appropriate worldview for museum education, and that Dilthey's hermeneutic formula of expression, experience, and understanding (see Chapter Three) is particularly adaptable to the interpretive museum education paradigm. It has shown that the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development has resulted in a method of planning activities that facilitates student visitors' connections between "the known and the new" (Hein, 1998, p. 157). I believe that the hermeneutic approach can be used in any museum, with artifacts or artworks. Since the hermeneutic approach is a new strategy for program planning, further research needs to be conducted into the nature of the knowledge that visitors construct while participating in hermeneutically-developed programs. Additional research is needed on the application of the hermeneutic approach as a program planning strategy in cross-cultural settings where visitors bring a non-western way of knowing to the interpretive event.

Prior to the study, I held the view that a school group's visit to the museum is an integral part of their learning. Every museum program I created was intended to be one lesson among several in a unit of study that supplemented classroom work with concrete materials such as artifacts. My viewpoint has not changed as a result of this study. I believe even more strongly that the museum visit must continue to be an integral lesson in a unit of study. Based on my experience as a museum educator and a researcher, I
believe that the museum visit belongs in the middle or end of the unit rather than as an introduction. Students need to be prepared in the classroom for what they might be expected to see and learn during their museum visit. General concepts need to be introduced prior to the visit for the purpose of directing or scaffolding students' learning. Further studies need to examine the effect of hermeneutically-developed programs on students’ learning that occur during the middle and end of units of study.

The hermeneutic approach to museum education program development that I developed in this study is intended to be a strategy for planning one lesson on a curriculum topic that is taught in the museum rather than in the school. As a lesson, the museum education program cements the museum-school educational partnership. The hermeneutic approach is an effective lesson planing strategy because it blends pedagogy and museology within a curriculum theory paradigm that is common to both the museum field and the educational community. One of the strengths of the hermeneutic approach is that museum educators can use it to create one lesson targeted at specific subject matter in one grade level. This is less overwhelming and more manageable than trying to create a general program for several grade levels, although the latter would not be impossible to carry out. I recommend a study be conducted to compare teachers' satisfaction between a general program and a grade-specific program.

As a result of the Stage Three workshop, I learned that teaching the hermeneutic approach as a lesson plan strategy for museum education programs requires more than a half-day workshop. Since most museum educators are unfamiliar with the interpretive paradigm, time needs to be spent providing this curricular context for the hermeneutic approach. The hermeneutic approach needs to be taught in a course rather than a
workshop to avoid rushing through the implementation of the components, and to establish it within the context of an interpretive worldview. I intend to expand the workshop materials into a museum education course that contrasts the strategy with others and provides a context for its interpretation. Recently, I had the opportunity to work with two university students who are enrolled in a Master of Arts program and who are employed temporarily as museum educators in a small museum. I demonstrated both my traditional or typical empirical analytic program planning strategy and the hermeneutic approach as two effective strategies that they could apply in the development of their programs. Both museum educators chose the latter as their preferred strategy because it was the one that they believed would meet their needs for developing creative and interesting learning opportunities for students. I have come to the conclusion that novice museum educators need to have a selection of program planning strategies made available to them, and I suspect that the hermeneutic approach will appeal to many because of its strong philosophical and theoretical foundations.

Since the hermeneutic approach for museum education program development is at least a lesson planning model, I believe that it can be adapted for use by teachers in classrooms as an alternative to the prevailing objectives-based format. At the same time that I was conducting this study, I was teaching curriculum and instruction methods courses to pre-service teachers. I had an opportunity to share an adapted version of the hermeneutic approach as a lesson planning strategy. The hermeneutic approach appealed to some of the pre-service teachers because it allowed them to design more creative and interesting lessons for children, particularly in art and drama. Two of the pre-service teachers commented that the objectives-based lesson plan formats were too constraining
and seemed to stifle their creativity. This experience reminded me that pre-service teachers, like the students they teach, have multiple ways of learning, and as teachers we have varied teaching styles. Therefore, the hermeneutic approach needs to be taught to pre-service teachers in curriculum methods courses as another lesson planning strategy. Subsequent research needs to be conducted in classrooms where the hermeneutic approach is used by teachers as a lesson planning strategy to examine its effectiveness.

As I began the study and promoted the hermeneutic approach as a program development strategy to museum educators, several of my colleagues appeared skeptical that it would work. First, it lacked the inclusion of objectives that were deemed necessary by many museum educators for a program's success. Second, artifacts were chosen later rather than at the beginning of the program's development. This study has proven that the hermeneutic approach is a viable program development strategy. Upon reflection, I believe that adjustments in the attitudes of some seasoned museum educators are needed prior to their acceptance and use of the hermeneutic approach as a program planning strategy. Essentially, I am recommending that museum educators shift from an empirical analytic to an interpretive worldview. Since this change in paradigms is voluntary, I suggest that a normative-reeducative (Chin, 1967) program be used to effect attitude changes in museum educators.

In his classic work, Hencley (1967) describes one method of facilitating change by "employing the group as a target of change" (p. 63) that has the potential for success in changing the attitudes of seasoned museum educators. In applying this method, I would become the change agent that:
Places primary emphasis upon building channels of communication within the group, upon the creation of shared perspectives and perceptions, and upon creating desires for change within the group itself. (Hencley, 1967, p. 63)

Characteristics of the normative-reeducative method resemble hermeneutic principles. For example, both emphasize communication. By communicating the experiences of Lenna and Sandy in developing successful programs using the hermeneutic approach, and by addressing the artifact and objectives concerns with examples from this study, museum educators will realize the potential of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. Creating shared perspectives can be achieved by first building on museum educators' pre-understandings of program development as a foundation on which to build new information about program planning using the hermeneutic approach. Seasoned museum educators will adopt an accepting attitude towards the hermeneutic approach at the conclusion of a course in which they have implemented the hermeneutic approach to create an exciting and creative museum education program.

In summary, the hermeneutic approach is a viable program development strategy that fits within the context of the interpretive paradigm. It contrasts with, and is an alternative to, the empirical analytic and critical theory orientations that influence lesson planning and by extension museum education program planning. Excluded from this study was an examination museum education programs developed from a critical theory orientation; research is needed in program development within a critical theory worldview. Museum educators need to be informed of the three orientations and their influence on program development in order to apply the paradigms effectively. In an effort to shift the attitudes of seasoned museum educators to accept programs without
objectives with a change in the order of artifact selection, a normative-reeducative strategy of change theory can be applied in a museum setting.

**Reflections of a Researcher**

During this study, I had the rare experience of moving along a researcher continuum from complete and sole participant in Stage One to an observer-as-participant in Stage Four. At each stage of the research, I stepped away from my participant role to observe the implementation of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. My involvement as a complete participant in Stage One led me to feel an ownership of the hermeneutic approach that I identified in Stage Two. The data collected in Stage Two and reported in Chapter Four contain many of my emotional responses to the template's interpretation by the co-developer research participant, as opposed to a more detached reporting of my observer-as-participant data in Stage Four.

In Stage Two, Lenna and I worked closely together over a long period of time while she interpreted and implemented the hermeneutic approach. As participant-as-observer, I was an active and involved researcher. Lenna and I were a team that brought complementary skills and knowledge to the development of a program using the hermeneutic approach. In retrospect, I think it was difficult to be both a participant and an observer because I had to force myself as a researcher to reflect on meetings with the research participant in which I had been consumed as a participant. Since I have been a museum educator for a long time, and due to my attachment to the hermeneutic approach, I found it difficult to be a researcher rather than a colleague trying a new program development strategy. At times I felt awkward as a researcher interviewing Lenna; it was easier to converse as a colleague. Our interviews might have been less strained had we
not been researching a strategy that I had created and was totally committed to successfully implementing. It was difficult to be open to the possibility that the hermeneutic approach might fail as a program development strategy.

I was able to reconcile being an observer and an emotionally attached participant by acknowledging both facets and defining for myself the characteristics of each. For example, my role as an observer was to record Lenna's interpretation and implementation of the hermeneutic approach template, keeping in mind the typical researcher duties of obtaining release forms and transcribing interviews. My role as a participant included paying attention to my feelings about Lenna's interpretation of the hermeneutic approach. It also involved being as committed to the success of the program we were creating as I would any other museum education program. Since both my roles of observer and participant comprise my role as researcher, I was able to enter research notes in my fieldnotes log that represented both areas. The voice-centred relational method (Mauthner & Doucet, 1998) assisted me in categorizing my observations as either an observer or a participant. For example, when reading Lenna's journal entries, I searched for myself as a museum educator in her words. My responses to her words were as a participant.

In Stage Four, I felt more relaxed as an observer-as-participant researcher because I was less intimately involved in the implementation of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. It seemed easier to observe and participate in Stage Four than to participate and observe as I had in Stage Two. In Stage Two, the study seemed to unfold on its own because the hermeneutic approach had not been previously implemented by a museum educator, and I did not know how exactly it would work. By Stage Four, I knew that the hermeneutic approach was viable, but my role was to be
present in the beginning of its implementation and after its trial by a school group. As an observer-as-participant researcher I had more distance from, and less influence over, the successful implementation of the hermeneutic approach. I felt more detached as an observer-as-participant in Stage Four than I had as a participant-as-observer in Stage Two.

Since I was involved only in the introduction of the template and the observation of the program in progress, the process of Stage Four seemed at times to be disjointed. I had not followed the interpretation of the template's components because that was Sandy's responsibility; as a result I felt a sense of discontinuity. Unlike my experience with Lenna, if Sandy had difficulty implementing the hermeneutic approach, I would not have been immediately available to assist her in solving interpretation problems. The study seemed to go on without me.

As a participant-as-observer in Stage Two, I was able to complete some data analysis continuously as the study was progressing and as Lenna was working to interpret and implement the hermeneutic approach. In Stage Four, the data analysis seemed bunched in the beginning and at the end.

By conducting my research as a complete participant, participant-as-observer, and observer-as-participant I have had a unique experience of glimpsing different observation perspectives. In retrospect, these three observation points share an issue of researcher control. As a complete participant, I held the control over the time I spent developing the hermeneutic approach, how quickly or slowly I completed Stage One, and the version of the template that was presented to the research participant in Stage Two. In Stage Two, my control as a participant-as-observer weakened. I relied on the time schedule of the
research participant, although I had some influence over it during our meetings. My control over the template's interpretation weakened, as did my control over the progress of Stage Two's completion. By the end of the study, I had no control over the template's interpretation and no control over the completion of the fourth Stage.

During Stages Two, Three, and Four of the study, I used my fieldnotes log as one way of bracketing my presuppositions about the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development as a museum educator researcher (Kvale, 1996; Van Hesteren, 1986). For me, this was a vital and useful exercise in identifying my understandings that might influence analysis of journal entries and interview transcripts. In reflecting on Stage One of the study, I found it more difficult to bracket for the purpose of setting aside my presuppositions as a trained and experienced empirical analytic pedagogue in developing a purely hermeneutic program planning strategy.

As I developed the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development in Stage One of the study, I unintentionally employed a hermeneutic process of a back and forth interplay between the literature and my experiences as an educator. The development of the prototype hermeneutic approach template (p. 12) was a process that spanned about sixteen months and included reading and reflecting, so that the template as a whole received its definition from the component's parts (Palmer, 1969). As I read hermeneutic literature, I reflected as a museum educator, researcher, and pedagogue on how a concept might work in the practical development of a program. I also reflected on fitting the concepts together into a workable template, much like putting pieces of a puzzle together to form a picture. There was a constant interplay between my experiences as an educator and new learnings gained from reading the literature as I
refined the template into its prototype. This challenged me to speculate and evaluate the potential effectiveness of the hermeneutic approach as a museum program planning strategy. For example, connectedness was one of the first hermeneutic concepts that I discovered in the literature on hermeneutics. After reflecting on its meaning as a hermeneutic, interpretive principle, I had to negotiate its relevance to museum education program development, pedagogy, and curriculum theory prior to assigning it a position in the template. Further reading about connectedness clarified my understanding of its significance as a hermeneutic principle. This was followed by more reflection, firstly as an educator about contextualizing connectedness within an interpretive orientation of curriculum, and, secondly, as a researcher establishing its role as a component within the hermeneutic approach template. After the hermeneutic approach was implemented in Stage Two and Stage Four, the interplay between the literature and my new learnings about connectedness continued. This hermeneutic process of interplay between the literature and my experiences as a museum educator was repeated for each component until I felt a "good gestalt" (Kvale, 1996, p. 48) about the hermeneutic approach template.

Epilogue

In retrospect, I have taken a great risk as a museum educator to conduct research on my own creation (the hermeneutic approach) within my field. If the research had demonstrated that the hermeneutic approach was not a viable program development strategy, my credibility within the field would have been compromised. Several of my peers remain skeptical about the potential of the hermeneutic approach based on its lack of objectives and placement of the artifact selection, but I believe that their attitudes can be changed based partly on the results of this study. Perhaps it was a fear of "I told you
so" that strengthened my resolve to develop a viable program planning strategy, and to demonstrate my confidence in the hermeneutic approach by observing other museum educators interpret and implement the strategy in their museums.

When this study began, I was a museum educator assuming an additional role of researcher. During the study, I made a conscious effort to monitor the contributions of each role to my interpretations of the data that I was collecting. Now at the conclusion of the study, I am aware that a new role of museum educator researcher has emerged combining the two previous roles. As a result of the study, it is impossible for me to completely shed the researcher role and return to my role as museum educator.

As a museum educator researcher, I have discovered that not many of us exist in Saskatchewan, which leaves the burden of research to a few. There is a need for research to be conducted by museum educators on topics such as the application of pedagogy in museum settings, the prevalence and implications of adopting curriculum theory worldviews as museum education paradigms, and ethnographies of museum educators. In particular, there is a need for qualitative studies to be completed by and for museum educators.

My qualitative study was intended to illuminate the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development, and I have concluded that it is a viable strategy based on the experiences of a co-developer and an implementer. Museum educators need to know that the hermeneutic approach is one of several strategies available to them for developing museum education programs, and they need to know how to implement it effectively as a program planning strategy.
References


APPENDICES
Appendix A

UNIVERSITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON ETHICS IN BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

NAME: A. Ryan (L. Brodie)  
Department of Curriculum Studies

DATE: March 1, 1999

The University Advisory Committee on Ethics in Behavioural Science Research has reviewed the Application for Ethics Approval for your study "Hermeneutic Approach to museum education program development" (98-154).

1. Your study has been APPROVED.

2. Any significant changes to your proposed study should be reported to the Chair for Committee consideration in advance of its implementation.

3. The term of this approval is for 3 years.

4. I wish you a successful and informative study.

Daryl Lindsay, Chair  
University Advisory Committee  
on Ethics in Behavioural Science Research  
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Journal Entry

Component:

Anticipatory concerns:

Claim:

Concern:

Issue:

Comments:
Appendix C

Museum Educator Consent Form

Please read this Consent Form. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 966-8384, or Dr. Alan Ryan at 966-7659. Once you have read and fully understand the Form, and if you are in agreement with the contents, please sign and date both copies of the Form and return one to me. The other is for your records.

1) Commitment that is required
   a) You will be expected to meet with me at least once per week for approximately three months while you develop a museum education program using the approach. We will discuss your reactions to and concerns with the implementation of the approach. These meetings may be audio-taped; you will have an opportunity to proofread the transcripts of the meetings, at which time you will be asked to clarify statements and/or give more detailed explanations of your comments to ensure that I have correctly and adequately interpreted you intended meanings. A release form for audio-tape transcriptions is attached.

   b) A journal will be supplied to you for recording your concerns and reflections during the program development phase. It will be an important instrument of communication between us, as it will help me understand your thoughts and feelings as you work through the program. The journal is a source of data for the study. A separate release form for the journal is attached.

2) Benefits to participants
   The hermeneutic approach is an alternative museum education strategy to supplement those offered currently by the Museums Association of Saskatchewan.

3) Possible inconveniences
   a) The time commitment in journalling, interviewing, and responding to audio-tape transcriptions.
   b) Scheduling meetings in addition to your other responsibilities, particularly at peak visitation or booking times, or during docent training.

4) Rights of the participant
   a) Participation is voluntary; you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, and all data collected to date will be destroyed.
   b) Pseudonyms will be assigned in the final documentation of the study.
   c) Any information which you share will be treated with all possible confidentiality.
d) All data, including journals and interview transcripts, will be kept secure with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for five years after the conclusion of the study, and then destroyed.

5) Feedback process
   a) Transcripts: after transcribing the audio-tapes, you will be given a copy to proof-read, at which time you can make changes in the wording so that it is clear to the researcher what you meant by your statements. The transcriptions will be changed accordingly, and you will be given another opportunity to read and approve them.
   b) Throughout the study, we will meet to discuss the components of the hermeneutic approach. At the conclusion of the study, we will meet privately to review all of the findings of the study.

6) Conference presentations and journal articles
   Some of the data collected, such as your words in describing your reaction to a component, may be included in conference presentations and/or journal articles. You and your museum will be assigned a pseudonym to preserve your anonymity.

I have read the information outlining Lee Brodie’s proposed research, and I am volunteering to be a participant in the study.
Please sign both copies of this consent form; keep one for your own records and return one to me.

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Lee Brodie ___________________________ Date ___________________________
Appendix D

Journal Release Form

A hermeneutic approach to museum education program development

Throughout the course of the study, you will be asked to record your impressions in a "journal" as you work through each component of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. I will take a copy of each entry to develop questions for discussion and for the purpose of clarifying your impressions of the approach at our next meeting. You will have an opportunity to review and revise the journal entries to your satisfaction prior to releasing their use to the researcher. Once you have had the opportunity to read and revise your journal entries to your satisfaction, and acknowledge their accurate portrayal of what has been said, please sign the appropriate places at the bottom of this form.

Some of your words may be quoted in my final report, journal articles, and/or conference presentations. A pseudonym will be assigned to you and your museum to protect confidentiality. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 966-8384, or my supervisor Dr. Alan Ryan at 966-7659.

Upon completion of the final report, my copies of your journal entries will be secured with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for five years, and then destroyed.

I, __________________ , have reviewed my journal entries of the components of the hermeneutic approach, and acknowledge that the entries accurately reflect my impressions, thoughts, concerns, and/or experiences using the approach. I hereby authorize the release of my journal entries to Lee Brodie to be used in the manner described in the consent form. I have received a copy of this Journal release Form for my own records.

Participant _______________________________ Date _____________

Lee Brodie _______________________________ Date _____________
Appendix E

Transcript Release Form

Throughout the course of this study, I will be conducting interviews which will be audio-taped in order to record your exact words as you describe your impressions of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. Audio-taped interviews will then be transcribed, after which you will be given an opportunity to read and approve the transcriptions. You may review and revise the transcripts to your satisfaction. After you have read and revised the transcripts and acknowledge their accurate portrayal of what has been said, please sign the form in the appropriate place at the bottom of this form.

Some of your words may be used in the final report, conference presentations, and/or journal articles, however pseudonyms will be assigned to you and your museum.

Audio-tapes and transcriptions will be secured with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for five years, and then destroyed.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact myself at 966-8384 or my supervisor, Dr. Alan Ryan at 966-7659.

I, __________________, have reviewed the complete transcript of my personal interview in this study, and acknowledge that the transcript accurately reflects what I said in my personal interview with Lee Brodie. I hereby authorize the release of this transcript to Lee Brodie to be used in the manner described in the consent form. I have received a copy of this Transcript Release Form for my own records.

________________________  ______________________
Participant                          Date

________________________  ______________________
Lee Brodie                          Date
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Appendix F

[University of Saskatchewan letterhead]

[Date]

[Director of Education
School Board
Address]

Dear [Director]

I am a University of Saskatchewan graduate student in the College of Graduate Studies and Research. Through the Department of Curriculum Studies, and under the supervision of Dr. Alan Ryan, I am researching a new hermeneutic approach as an alternative museum education program development strategy. The museum educator at the [Name of Museum] has created an education program using the new approach, which blends a curriculum topic with artifacts from the museum's collections, and one of the classes from your school district has booked a visit to participate in that program.

I am writing to request your permission to observe an elementary teacher and students as they participate in the program created at the [Name of the Museum]. I would like to interview the teacher about his reactions to the program. My interest is in the effect of the hermeneutic approach on the development of a museum education program. While I will be observing students as they participate in the program, I will not be interviewing them.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate in contacting me at 966-8384, or my supervisor, Dr. Alan Ryan, at 966-7659.

Sincerely,

Lee Brodie
Ph.D. candidate
Appendix G

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

A hermeneutic approach to museum education program development

Permission has been obtained by the researcher from [Director of Education] of the [Name] School Board to request your participation in this study. You may withdraw from the study at any time, at which time your data will be deleted from the study and destroyed. This consent form is designed to ensure the rights of all participants involved in the study of the *In A Prairie Attic: Family Toys* program. The following safeguards are in place:

1. Participants will not be mentioned by name in the final report. The researcher intends to maintain the confidentiality of the participants.
2. The study is an examination of the anticipated and unanticipated outcomes of the implementation of the program, and are not a study of the participants.
3. Interviews with the teacher will be audio-taped for the purpose of maintaining the accuracy of comments.
4. Transcripts of interviews used will be submitted to the participant to review for accuracy or for possible lapses in confidentiality.
5. All transcripts of interviews, notes, and tape recorded interviews will be secured with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for five years, and then destroyed.
6. Some of the data, such as your words to describe the program, may be used in future conference presentations and/or journal articles, however a pseudonym will be assigned to you, the school, and students to preserve your anonymity.
7. Once the study is complete, the researcher will be available to meet with the teacher and students to discuss the findings.

I __________________ agree to participate in the study of the *In A Prairie Attic: Family Toys* program subject to the conditions outlined above.

Two copies of this consent form are being provided to you. Please sign both copies; keep one for your own records and return one to me.

__________________________   __________________________
(name)                        (signature)

I, Lee Brodie, agree to conduct the study of the *In A Prairie Attic: Family Toys* program according to the conditions outlined above.

__________________________   __________________________
(signature)                    (date)
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Appendix H

Transcript Release Form

As you are aware, you and your class will be participating in a newly developed program that I am currently researching. I would like to conduct audio-taped interviews in order to record your exact words as you describe your impressions of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. Audio-taped interviews will then be transcribed, after which you will be given an opportunity to read and approve the transcriptions. You may review and revise the transcripts to your satisfaction. After you have read and revised the transcripts and acknowledge their accurate portrayal of what has been said, please sign the form in the appropriate place at the bottom of this form.

Some of your words may be used in the final report, conference presentations, and/or journal articles, however pseudonyms will be assigned to you and your school.

Audio-tapes and transcriptions will be secured with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for five years, and then destroyed.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact myself at 966-8384 or my supervisor, Dr. Alan Ryan at 966-7659.

I, __________________, have reviewed the complete transcript of my personal interview in this study, and acknowledge that the transcript accurately reflects what I said in my personal interview with Lee Brodie. I hereby authorize the release of this transcript to Lee Brodie to be used in the manner described in the consent form. I have received a copy of this Transcript Release Form for my own records.

__________________________________________
Date [Participant] Lee Brodie
Appendix I

TEACHER CONSENT FORM
PROGRAM POST-PILOT INTERVIEW

From our interview, six issues arose which, with your permission, I would like to raise with the developer of the program. These are:

☐ The role of curriculum in museum field trips
☐ The significance of curriculum in this program
☐ Ideas for improving the program
☐ Strengths of the program
☐ Weaknesses of the program
☐ The program as related to the transformational paradigm

Please check off the issue you permit me to raise with the developer and sign below. Two copies of this consent form have been provided; please sign both copies, keeping one for your records and returning the other to me.

I give Lee Brodie permission to raise the items checked above with the developer.

__________________________  ______________________
(signature)                (date)
Appendix J

[University of Saskatchewan Letterhead]

MEMORANDUM

TO: Workshop participants
FROM: Lee Brodie
DATE: October 12, 1999

This workshop is a component of my doctoral research on the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. The research is under the supervision of Dr. Alan Ryan in the Department of Curriculum Studies at the College of Education. The hermeneutic approach is an alternative strategy for developing education programs that you might find useful. It is one more strategy to add to your repertoire.

During the course of the workshop (i.e. coffee breaks) I would like to ask, and keep a written record of, your opinions about the hermeneutic approach. Your ideas will help me to understand how different museum educators interpret the approach.

You may withdraw from the study at any time, yet remain in the workshop to learn about the hermeneutic approach. If you decide to withdraw from the study, all information that you have shared will be deleted from the study and destroyed.

Some of your comments may be included in the final report, subsequent journal articles, and/or conference presentations, in which case a pseudonym will be used. If you wish to attend the workshop, but choose not to be interviewed, you may of course do so. I would also like to use the results of your completed anonymous post-workshop evaluation. If you do not wish your exit evaluation to be included in my research study, write on it: "Do not include in research."

After the completion of my dissertation, I will be offering to meet with all workshop participants to discuss the findings of my research.

All data (including recorded comments and exit evaluations) will be secured with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for five years and then destroyed. Should you require further information, please do not hesitate in contacting me at (306) 966-8384 or Dr. Alan Ryan at (306) 966-7659.

I, agree to be interviewed about the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development, and to have those comments as well as those on the workshop evaluation included in the final report, journal articles, and conference presentations.

Two copies of this consent form are being provided to you. Please sign both copies; keep one for your own records and return one to me.

(name) (date) 

Lee Brodie
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Appendix K
Museum Educator Consent Form

Please read this Consent Form. Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 966-8384, or Dr. Alan Ryan at 966-7659. Once you have read and fully understand the Form, and if you are in agreement with the contents, please sign and date both copies of the Form and return one to me. The other is for your records.

1) Commitment that is required
a) Developing a program using the hermeneutic approach will take approximately three months. Once you have finished developing the program, we will need to meet to discuss your reactions to and concerns with the implementation of the approach. I would like to audio-tape these meetings; you will have an opportunity to proofread the transcripts of the meetings, at which time you will be asked to clarify statements and/or give more detailed explanations of your comments to ensure that I have correctly and adequately interpreted you intended meanings. A release form for audio-tape transcriptions is attached.

b) A journal will be supplied to you for recording your concerns and reflections during the program development phase. It will be an important instrument of communication between us, as it will help me understand your thoughts and feelings as you work through the program. The journal is a source of data for the study. A separate release form for the journal is attached.

2) Benefits to participants
The hermeneutic approach is an alternative museum education strategy to supplement those offered currently by the Museums Association of Saskatchewan. It might be useful to you in the future as you develop educational programs for your museum.

3) Possible inconveniences
a) The time commitment in journalling, interviewing, and responding to audio-tape transcriptions.
b) Scheduling meetings in addition to your other responsibilities, particularly at peak visitation or booking times, or during docent training.

4) Rights of the participant
a) Participation is voluntary; you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, and all data collected to date will be destroyed.
b) Pseudonyms will be assigned in the final documentation of the study.
c) Any information which you share will be treated with all possible confidentiality.
d) All data, including journals and interview transcripts, will be kept secure with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for five years after the conclusion of the study, and then destroyed.
5) Feedback process
a) Transcripts: after transcribing the audio-tapes, you will be given a copy to proof-read, at which time you can make changes in the wording so that it is clear to the researcher what you meant by your statements. The transcriptions will be changed accordingly, and you will be given another opportunity to read and approve them.
b) Throughout the study, we will meet to discuss the components of the hermeneutic approach. At the conclusion of the study, we will meet privately to review all of the findings of the study.

6) Conference presentations and journal articles
Some of the data collected, such as your words in describing your reaction to a component, may be included in conference presentations and/or journal articles. You and your museum will be assigned a pseudonym to preserve your anonymity.

I have read the information outlining Lee Brodie's proposed research, and I am volunteering to be a participant in the study. Please sign both copies of this consent form; keep one for your own records and return one to me.

______________________________  _________________________
Signature                            Date

______________________________  _________________________
Lee Brodie                             Date
Appendix L

Journal Release Form

A hermeneutic approach to museum education program development

Throughout the course of the study, you will be asked to record your impressions in a "journal" as you work through each component of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. I use each entry to develop questions for discussion and for the purpose of clarifying your impressions of the approach at our meeting. You will have an opportunity to review and revise the journal entries to your satisfaction prior to releasing their use to the researcher. The research may use the revised journal entries in the final report, articles, and/or conference presentations.

Some of your words may be quoted in my final report, journal articles, and/or conference presentations. A pseudonym will be assigned to you and your museum to protect confidentiality. Should you have any questions or concerns. Please contact me at 966-8384 or my supervisor, Dr. Alan Ryan, at 966-7659.

Upon completion of the final report, my copies of your journal entries will be secured with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for 5 years, and then destroyed.

I consent to having my journal entries, once I have reviewed and approved them, used in the manner mentioned above.

Two copies of this consent form are being provided to you. Please sign both copies; keep one for you own records and return one to me.

Date ___________________________ Signature ___________________________ Lee Brodie
Appendix M

Transcript Release Form

A hermeneutic approach to museum education program development

Throughout the course of this study, I will be conducting interviews which will be audio-taped in order to record your exact words as you describe your impressions of the hermeneutic approach to museum education program development. Audio-taped interviews will then be transcribed, after which you will be given an opportunity to read and approve the transcriptions. You may review and revise the transcripts to your satisfaction.

Some of your words may be used in the final report, conference presentations, and/or journal articles, however pseudonyms will be assigned to you and your museum.

Audio-tapes and transcriptions will be secured with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for five years, and then destroyed.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please contact myself at 966-8384 or my supervisor, Dr. Alan Ryan at 966-7659.

I consent to having my interviews audio-taped and transcribed, and to have the approved revised transcript used by the researcher. I also consent to having the reviewed/revised transcripts quoted in the final report, conference presentation, and/or journal articles. Two copies of this consent form are being provided to you. Please sign both copies; keep one for your own records and return one to me.

Date Signature Lee Brodie
Appendix N

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

Permission has been obtained by the researcher from [Director of Education] of the [Name] School Board to request your participation in this study. You may withdraw from the study at any time, at which time your data will be deleted from the study and destroyed.

This consent form is designed to ensure the rights of all participants involved in the study of the [Name] Museum's education program. The following safeguards are in place:

1. Participants will not be mentioned by name in the final report. The researcher intends to maintain the confidentiality of the participants.
2. The study is an examination of the anticipated an unanticipated outcomes of the implementation of the program, and are not a study of the participants.
3. Interviews with the teacher will be audio-taped for the purpose of maintaining the accuracy of comments.
4. Transcripts of interviews used will be submitted to the participant to review for accuracy or for possible lapses in confidentiality.
5. All transcripts of interviews, notes, and tape recorded interviews will be secured with Dr. Alan Ryan at the University of Saskatchewan for five years, and then destroyed.
6. Some of the data, such as your words to describe the program, may be used in future conference presentations and/or journal articles, however a pseudonym will be assigned to you, the school, and students to preserve your anonymity.
7. Once the study is complete, the researcher will be available to meet with the teacher and students to discuss the findings.

I __________________ agree to participate in the study of the [Name] Museum program subject to the conditions outlined above.

Two copies of this consent form are being provided to you. Please sign both copies; keep one for your own records and return one to me.

______________________________
(signature)

I, Lee Brodie, agree to conduct the study of the [Name] Museum program according to the conditions outlined above.

______________________________
(signature)