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Abstract

Museum exhibits and programs are the most common ways by which individuals learn about archaeology. Nevertheless, it is uncertain just how museums represent the science of archaeology and the degree to which they represent archaeology as practiced in the 21st century. This thesis examines how archaeological theory and methods are represented in three different kinds of museums using a combination of archival, observational, and interview methods. Interviews and observations were conducted at the Field Museum in Chicago, Illinois, the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, New York, and the Fort St. Joseph Museum in Niles, Michigan. An analysis was conducted as to how modern archaeology is represented in the three museums through their static exhibits, and through both in-house and out-of-house programming. Interviews with informants illuminate how information is conveyed to the public within the museums through their exhibits and programs. It has become clear through this study that museums only slightly represent contemporary archaeology and that their training programs need to be expanded with education in contemporary archaeology. This research found that the museums studied had limited or missing information on archaeological practices such as bioarchaeology, paleoethnobotony, K/Ar Dating, and lithic analysis. If more archaeological practices are included in education programs and exhibits in museums, then the teaching of archaeology would be more comprehensive.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

A recent survey by the Society of American Archaeology showed that of 1,060 adults sampled from the general population, 88% have seen archaeological material in a museum exhibit (Merriman 2004:85). Museum archaeology is distinct from academic archaeology in many aims and activities, but there are commonalities: museum curators and academic archaeologist conduct field research, publish in scholarly journals, and attend conferences. In smaller museums, the curator is expected to be familiar with a wide range of artifact types and culture areas, and perform a great variety of duties. In larger museums, curators work with other museum professionals, such as designers, writers, and educators (Jones 1993:202).

As noted by Merriman (2004: 85) “Museums are a significant and powerful vehicle for the public construction of the past and for public involvement in archaeology”. Museums are first and foremost an institution for learning. The focus of a museum may be history, science, nature, the arts, or any combination of these fields. They may be government or business sponsored and may have many paid employees or be completely volunteer operated. They can be used for tourism, "edutainment," or as repositories of documents and objects (Lea 2000:316). Lea (2000: 316) uses the acronym “ACRE” to summarize common functions of museums: Acquisitions, relates to the policies and processes for obtaining collections; Conservation reflects policies and processes for keeping collections stable, resorted, and protected; Research focuses on understanding and interpreting collections; and Education is concerned with the policies and processes for sharing the museum's collections, expertise, and research.

Each of these functions affects how archaeology is represented in a given museum, and in combination they produce the image of archaeology that people generally understand (Lea 2000:316). Without the development of museums, large amounts of history, including prehistory,
would not be easily accessible for study. As a consequence, the public would lack an understanding of the past. Museums are important to archaeology because they are the main, if not the only, place where the public comes into contact with artifacts that have been gathered during archaeological research (Lea 2000:315). They are a key venue for educating the public about the significance of archaeology. According to the International Council of Museums, museums are “non-profit making, permanent institution in the service of society and of its development, and open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits, for the purposes of study, education, and enjoyment, material evidence of people and their environment” (Hein 2006:342). Clearly, education is important in museum programs and museums are integral to the education of the general public. If anthropology and archaeology have influenced the development of the museum system, how do museums, small and large, public and private, incorporate archaeology into their teaching? It is important to understand how museums incorporate archaeology to determine if the information being used adequately portrays contemporary archaeological research.

But, some may ask, why is it important for museums to incorporate contemporary archaeological technologies? When new technologies are integrated into a field of study human curiosity comes to light. People want to know about the new science, how it works, and its importance to the field of study. In addition, with this better awareness of the past, society is able to learn about catastrophic events that destroyed past environments. George Santayana said it best, “Those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it.” When the peoples of the world ignore the mistakes of their ancestors, they are more likely to make the same mistakes, dooming their existence. Also, it is important to understand how the general public interprets archaeology to battle the stereotypes of what people think archaeology is. In my course of
studying archaeology, countless times have I been asked about ‘digging up dinosaurs’ or whether I ‘do what Indiana Jones does.’ These stereotypes lead the public to incorrect ideas of what archaeology is and what archaeologists do.

To explore the integration of contemporary archaeological methods and techniques in museums, this thesis examines how modern archaeology is represented in three museums through their static exhibits, in-house programing, and their out-of-house programing. Static exhibits are those exhibits that do not change over time and are considered permanent exhibits. In-house programming typically employs more hands-on interactive learning experiences, such as making a craft, completing a scavenger hunt, or learning a game. Out-of-house programs take place outside the museum walls and can include site visits, lectures at libraries or other public areas, and camps or open houses.

The primary focus of my research is to better understand how museums in the United States represent the practices of contemporary archaeology. I conducted research at three museums of different size and location, which involved observation, interviews, and archival work. Secondary questions address the degree to which contemporary archaeological theories and related methods are accurately represented in museum settings. I will apply criteria that I determined based on the literature review, to decide how well a museum depicts contemporary practices.

Chapter 2 includes a literature review focusing on two topics. The first covers the history of museum education programs. The second considers the way the public interprets archaeology through contemporary museum education programs. Focusing on these two topics aids in the understanding of how museums have changed through history and how museum programming shapes the public’s understanding of contemporary archaeology.
Chapter 3 examines the importance of research in archaeology museums and how it can allow us to better understand how archaeological research is used in education programs. This understanding can create a more accurate and more compelling perception of archaeology for the public.

In Chapter 4, I detail the methods used in this study including literature and archival reviews of archaeological museum pedagogy, observation and documentation of archaeological museum exhibits, and interviews with key informants working in museum education or anthropology departments at the Field Museum in Chicago, Illinois, the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, and the Fort St. Joseph Museum in Niles, Michigan. These interviews are detailed in Chapter 5. I present my conclusions and recommendation for future research in Chapter 6.
Chapter 2: History of Archaeological Education in Museums

Museums were once the primary venue for archaeological research and they are still the main institutional connection between professional archaeology and the public (Barker 2010:294). They hold archaeological collections and interpret them for use in exhibits. Many early museums were homes for antiquarian research or areas used to promote social betterment through art and science access (Barker 2010:294).

In the early Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas said that human cognition is stronger in regard to the sensibilia and that it is natural for people to reach the intelligibilia through sensibilia because knowledge has its beginning in the senses. Sensibilia refers to the sense impressions or data collected through the use of the senses, or the relationship between humans and objects. During the Renaissance, knowledge was considered the endless and circular referencing of all that had been written about a particular phenomenon. There was no distinction between what was observed from the real object, what was written about it, or the myths and fables that surrounded it. Collections were compiled to represent the entire structure of knowledge (Hooper-Greenhill 1992:671).

The new teaching philosophy of the seventeenth century states that learning should be conducted through a direct study of nature and the rejection of all knowledge that could not be demonstrated through such study. The Repository of the Royal Society museum was established during the late seventeenth century to enable a new way of learning at a scholarly level (Hooper-Greenhill 1992:671). In 1753, a mandate by the British Museum stated that the museum was "not only for the inspection and Entertainment of the learned and the curious, but for the general
Use and Benefit of the Public,” thus broadening the mission of the museum to include all users (Lea 2000:317).

At the end of the eighteenth century, the Louvre in Paris was the first free public museum that was established as part of a state education system. Pamphlets were created for use in the museum and acted as a way to turn the feudal peasant into a citizen of the Republic. The museum became an instrument of public education, having a large influence in Europe with new major institutions being established in Germany (Hooper-Greenhill 1992:671). During the nineteenth century, collections, cabinets, and small museums were established in schools to aid in the education of children, with many more museums developed explicitly with educational purposes to the general public (Hooper-Greenhill 1992:672).

Anthropology emerged as a distinctive academic discipline in the late nineteenth century, resulting in the development of anthropological museums (Ames 1992:51). The primary purpose of these museums was to present artifacts from societies deemed uncivilized and primitive by the Western world, as if they were specimens of natural history (Ames 1992:51). Native American artifacts were displayed at the International Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1876, which drew tens of millions of visitors (Jameson 2010:23). As these museums evolved from private entities into public entities, many of them began to narrow their focus. They advanced into programs containing a definition of purpose that emphasized the betterment of the public and the needs of specific audiences (Barker 2010:294).

Growing public interest in Native American cultures encouraged the Smithsonian Institution to record the customs, material culture, and language of native groups. Beginning in 1881, Congress appropriated funds for the Smithsonian’s Bureau of American Ethnology to investigate prehistoric Indian mounds, becoming the first publicly supported archaeology in the
United States. As American Archaeology became more popular, so did the demand for authentic prehistoric antiquities. Looting of artifacts from archaeological sites became increasingly prevalent (Jameson 2010:23-24). In the 1880s and 1890s, scientific investigators visited and reported on the destruction and looting of prominent prehistoric sites, such as the Lower Pecos Canyonlands in Texas and the Casa Grande site in Arizona. Public and scientific outcry resulted in the government creating a preserve at Casa Grande in 1892 (Jameson 2010:23-24). Spurred by the growing public interest in historic conservation, federal action was taken for protecting and preserving historical and archaeological sites, such as American Civil War battlefields (Jameson 2010:23-24). The World’s Columbian Exposition in 1893 led to the founding of the Field Columbian Museum in Chicago (now known as the Field Museum). The museum took over most of the anthropological and natural history collections assembled for the World’s Fair. By 1900, anthropological research dictated a basic pattern of programming for use in exhibits, research, and publications, both scientific and popular. It also contributed to education and popular lectures (Collier and Tschopik 1954:770).

Throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, natural history museums increased in number, size, and complexity. By the turn of the century, there were approximately 250 natural history museums in the United States alone (Jenkins 1994: 244). These museums moved from a misdirected accumulation of artifacts to a more formal organization system. This move changed museums from places for collecting and displaying disparate objects from all around the world to institutions whose purpose included research and education. The public and scholars alike found the new museums useful and enlightening. The exhibits were not only a recent outgrowth of contemporary tendencies of thought, but were more accessible and understandable than a university education (Jenkins 1994:244-246).
During the twentieth century, the development of educational services in museums was sporadic and haphazard. There was not a national plan to follow and specific programs emerged in response to local need. Despite the fact that many practitioners did outstanding work, much of the work went unrecorded and unremarked. Museum education research and publications discussed the structure and general requirements of programs. This research also influenced museum administrators in the production of policy statements that designated the production of materials for teachers, teaching of particular groups, and other policies related to the qualitative experience of the visitors (Hooper-Greenhill 1992:672-673).

In the 1960s, archaeological museums began to take advantage of advancements in technology through the use of new forms of representation such as models, dioramas, ‘reconstructions,’ and audio-visuals. These interactive displays made museums more entertaining and attractive to visitors who could now combine leisure time activities with the desire to hold on to the past in a changing society (Merriman 2004:88). Classical archaeology received support from the wealthy of the 1960s, offering archaeologists funding for major excavations and expensive museum acquisitions (Dyson 1993:196). Certain new museums and sites, such as the Jorvik Viking Center in the United Kingdom, seemed to open archaeology up to popular acclaim. Re-enactments became a huge success in the United States and led to the adoption of open-air sites and museums, such as fort museums (Merriman 2004:88). The American Association of Museums created a standing professional committee on education in 1973 to address public education in archaeological research (Lea 2000:317).
Public Interpretation of Archaeology

In 2000, Harris Interactive, with support from the Archaeological Conservancy, Archaeological Institute of America, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, National Park Service, the Society for American Archaeology, and the Society for Historical Archaeology, conducted a one-time survey with the main objective of learning how Americans understand archaeology. These questions included what Americans think archaeology is, what they think archaeologists do, how they learn about archaeology, and how they think archaeological resources should be treated. It recorded their opinions on the importance and value of archaeology both in society and their own personal lives. It further measured the public's interest and participation in archaeology and archaeological activities, as well as understanding public attitudes towards heritage laws, and conservation issues. The study involved 1,016 adults, ages 18 or older across the 48 continental United States, each being interviewed over the phone (Ramos and Duganne 2000:3-6).

This survey asked individuals about their general knowledge of archaeology, what they thought was done with the items dug up, and where they obtained their information about archaeology. “Digging” was the idea most associated with archaeology (22%), then history, heritage, and antiquities (12%), digging artifacts/things or objects from the past (11%), dinosaur bone excavation (10%), digging up bones in general (9%), and the role of ancient cultures and civilizations (8%) were the most popular field of responses. Seventy-seven percent of people mentioned that items are donated/sold to museums and museum researchers after excavation (Ramos and Duganne 2000:11-13). The study asked individuals where they learned about archaeology. Popular media such as television, magazines, and newspapers were considered the major source of information. Both National Geographic and the Discovery Channel were
mentioned specifically. Traditional learning methods such as books and encyclopedias as well as secondary schools and colleges were also important ways individuals learned about archaeology (Ramos and Duganne 2000:16).

When individuals were asked if they believe that students should learn about archaeology as part of school curricula, a majority (90%) responded that they should. Forty-three percent said students should start learning in Grades K through 4. Thirty-three percent said it should start in Grades 5 through 8 (Ramos 2000:18). This finding shows the importance of utilizing archaeology in museums. Many times school-age children learn about archaeology from attending field trips to museums. Most of the time, these field trips use programs set up by museum education departments; and by incorporating archaeological research into these programs, children are able to learn about archaeology.

The study concludes that people view artifacts in museums more often than at archaeological sites. A large majority of individuals (88%) said they have visited an exhibit at a museum that presented archeological materials. Thirty-seven percent of people said they visited an archaeological site and eleven percent said they participated in an archaeology event sponsored by a state or local society or government (Ramos and Duganne 2000:21). These results show that individuals are exposed to archaeology mainly by visiting museums. Therefore, museums have a responsibility to properly educate individuals about archaeology.

Importance of Public Education in Archaeology

“History matters to all people and it has always mattered” wrote M. Elaine Davis (2005). She also quotes a study conducted by Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen (1998) of 1,500
American adults that indicates that the archaeological past is a very real part of most people’s lives and provides a foundation for understanding the present and for anticipating the future.

Being both attractive and compelling, archaeology does not have a problem with drawing enthusiasm from the public. Public events attract a significant number of people, from interested local citizens to curious tourists (McManamon 1994:63). For example, Fort St. Joseph Archaeological Project and Western Michigan University hold an annual open house every year that brings hundreds from around the city of Niles, MI and tourists from all walks of life. Since the start of the open house in 2006, nearly 10,000 people have attended it, increasing the interest in the Fort project as well as the educational programs and summer camps offered by the Fort St. Joseph Museum. The open house assists the project in defining the needs and desires of the local community as well as illuminating the life and times at Fort St. Joseph.

Contemporary Museum Education

Education is one function of a museum, and one of the primary reasons for its existence. The existence of collections has promoted and enabled the production of knowledge. Learning and teaching with objects generally entails collections of related objects (Hooper-Greenhill 1992:670).

Education is the process of transmitting knowledge and skills through the medium of schools and auxiliary programs, such as in museums (Hoebel 1955:391). As A. S. Wittlin (1949) said:

The creation of the Public Museum was an expression of the eighteenth-century spirit of enlightenment, which generated enthusiasm for equality of opportunity in learning… In practice, the traditions of the former private collections were carried
on in the public museums, notwithstanding the contrariety of purpose and of circumstances (quoted in Hein 2006:341).

The role of museums as educational providers is continually affirmed by major professional organizations, such as the American Association of Museums (AAM). The AAM states that museums must place education at the center of their public services and activities. This qualification and endorsement requires museums to move from a passive repository of artifacts to an active authority on the past, and create educational opportunities for the public (Barker 2010:295). Before the 1940s, there were many negative connotations for museum educators (Hein 2006:340). After World War II, museum education became an acknowledged profession even though education had long been included in museum mission statements (Hein 2006:340). Today, not only is there literature in the field of museum education, but also graduate degree programs in museum education, professional positions for museum educators, standing committees for educators within major professional museum organizations, and journals dedicated to museum education (Hein 2006:340).

*Bringing Education into Museums*

The United States has long been recognized as a leader in developing the educational role of museums. Orosz (1990) argued that museums in the United States were firmly educational from their onset. The Brooklyn Children’s museum (originally known as the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences) opened in 1899 as the first children’s museum 1899. Many U.S. museums developed strong education departments in the early years of the twentieth century, generally in collaboration with their local school district (Hein 2006:341).
While nineteenth-century museums were generally known as educational institutions, the actual teaching was haphazard and often carried out unsatisfactorily when viewed from the perspective of subsequent educational theory. A large concern was the dearth of historical background and theory to guide institutions when they attempted to educate large segments of the population. Critics described museums as restrictive in admissions and lacking orderly arrangements of objects. As with formal education, access to museums was limited for the majority of people because most lived on farms or worked long hours in factories (Hein 2006:341-342).

Miriam Kahn (2000: 92) wrote that “One of the greatest measures of success of any educational enterprise is the way in which deeper, more accurate understandings are reached by a constant working back and forth between purely intellectual theories and the testing of these in the ‘real world.’”. This quote illustrates the relationship between the museum anthropologist’s/archaeologist’s academic studies and what museum visitors see, do, think, and feel as they move through an exhibit. Educators involvement in the exhibit design process is needed in order to make the instructive settings of the exhibit more enlightening (Kahn 2000:92-93).

Museum professionals find it obvious that people wish to play an active role in interpreting the past. Three overlapping learning contexts contribute to the way children interact with and acknowledge objects. First is the personal context, which includes motivation and expectation, interest, prior knowledge and experience, and the dimensions of choice and control. Second is the cultural context, which includes within-group cultural mediation, specifically social aspects of learning within the immediate group, and reconciliation facilitated by others including parents, teachers, docents and other educators. Third, there is a physical context, which
influences learning, including advance preparation, setting and immediate environment, design elements of experience, and subsequent reinforcing of events and experience (Barker 2010:296).

A visitor is empowered through understanding information presented in exhibits, their experiences become part of an overall comprehension of the collection. An educator must balance the needs of both the visitor and the museum when selecting and interpreting artifacts. This process takes into account why individuals come to a museum and what they expect from the exhibits. Market research and visitor tracking through the space are important considerations in creating more engaging traffic flow patterns, light levels, labels, color and topic selection, graphics, and the use of varied and interactive technologies. Exhibits and programs that are seen as communication systems are based on communication theory studies of which the visitor is an integral part. Entertainment is employed, even to the degree of a call to apply some of the same techniques used by Disney. A cooperative approach is employed that utilizes museum staff, such as curators, educators, and designers, as a team that seeks to coordinate with community groups, such as school boards, amateur and avocational societies, and different cultural groups. Lastly, an understanding of education as a formal field of study, in particular as it relates to the developmental stages of learners and the learning processes, is needed to fully develop an exhibit layout (Lea 2000:317).

Archaeologists and museum education staff have helped to develop teaching programs that extend the database that individuals can use to study the past, allowing museum programs an active role in teaching children about the past. The use of authentic historic artifacts as stimuli for creative work encourages persons to begin to understand the reasons why archaeologists value the past instead of solely learning facts and dates and seeing “treasures” behind glass (Stone 1994:24).
With the high cost of field trips, most teachers are not able to obtain permission to leave the classroom unless the experience provided to the students is unavailable in the classroom. Typically, this experience is looking at or touching "real" artifacts, something that can only be done at the museum. There are two ways that programs are developed: Collection-Based Programming and Object-Based Programming (Lea 2000:318). Collection-Based programs include outside collections to meet curriculum needs of the local community. These collections are not ones housed at the museum, but come from an outside source such as another museum, a private collection, or a collection housed at a university. An example of collection-based programming is a museum presenting an Inuit program because Inuit Life is taught in Grade 4, whether or not its collection includes Inuit artifacts (Lea 2000:318).

Object-Based learning focuses on using the museum's collection for educational purposes. Education staff examine the collection to determine areas of strength and need. They then meet with community representatives to assess the needs of the community, especially those of the students they serve. Museum educators and staff then collaborate in acquisition, conservation, and research functions of the institution to develop appropriate programs. This process results in a number of outcomes. First is the modification of acquisition policies in order to develop collections, which reflect the needs and the cultural diversity of the community. De-accession of duplicate artifacts creates reproductions of artifacts for public use, research and design of exhibitions specifically addressing curricula (Lea 2000:319).

Connecting Archaeology to Museum Education Programs

“The goal of public education is to teach young people to be good American citizens,” (Moe 2002:176) leading to an understanding of traditional subjects such as math, language arts,
social studies, art, and science as well as social issues such as drug abuse and teen sexuality. Archaeological education is generally driven by preservation and the desire for the public to protect their cultural legacy. There are federal laws that mandate land-managing agencies to develop programs to increase the public's awareness of the significance of archaeological resources and the need to protect these resources (Moe 2002:176). Concurrently, there have been many educational programs designed by archaeologists from the United States and over the world in response to the overwhelming amount of destruction of archaeological sites and theft of artifacts (Moe 2002:176).

Archaeology is a science that typically destroys what it studies and the quality of later research and interpretation is directly affected by the quality of the notes and materials employed in the original discovery. Since archaeology is not usually part of the conventional course of study in American schools, with the research findings generally being the only things used, such as life in ancient Egypt, but not the process archaeologists use for understanding the past. In recent years, there has been a movement to teach both archaeological process and content to the general public in both museums and public schools. This progress comes from professional archaeologists who have recognized a need to relate their work to the larger public. Recognition has grown as well from the realization that cultural resources are being destroyed at an alarming rate and only an educated public will be able to save the past (Davis 2005:16).

The relationship of anthropology/archaeology to education has four levels. These levels are the anthropological content of subject matter taught in elementary and secondary schools; the effect of anthropological theory, methods, and techniques on educational theory and practice; the role and place of anthropology in higher education; and the utilization of anthropological knowledge and methods in organized programs of education and the initiation of social and
technical change (Hoebel 1955:391). The importance of anthropology and archaeology in understanding the dynamics of human relations makes it critical that they be included in a well-rounded education (Hoebel 1955:391-392).

Inquiry-based science is an important part of the museum education system. Using this methodology, students describe objects and events, ask questions, construct hypotheses, test those hypotheses against scientific theory, and share their ideas with others. Archaeological excavation adheres to the scientific method by examining human-environmental relationships over time and applying the information to current and future dilemmas. Students have the ability to relate archaeological knowledge and use problem-solving skills to propose solutions to current conservation issues. Archaeology also connects children to people who lived in the past through the study of everyday objects (Moe 2002:177).

Oral history and archaeology have been increasingly included in museum education programs, but have yet proven to make a significant impact. Many programs have been initiated by groups outside mainstream education, including advocation archaeologists, historians, or professional community organizations (Davis 2005:15).

There are four approaches to the interpretation and presentation of the past. First is academic or theoretical archaeology; second is indigenous views of the past; third is the way history is taught in schools; and last, the past as it is presented to the general public in museums and historical sites (Stone 1994:15). Each approach focuses on different sets of data, however they are all attempting to understand past human activity (Stone 1994:15-16).

Public education has always been included in the mission statements of modern museums (Smardz Frost 2004:60). Margaret Mead believed museums were an important part of the American culture. During her fifty-year curatorship at the American Museum of Natural History,
Mead ensured public exposure to research and discovery. According to Mead, the public should be able to trust their eyes and explore objects not meant to impress or convert them, but to tell them as much of the truth as is known (Thomas 2002:131-132).

Archaeology allows the public to examine the evidence of the past including structures, artifacts, and other remains. Archaeology can supplement oral histories and historical writings (Lipe 2002:20-21). Archaeological sites are associated with past people, events, and historical events. Understanding what happened there provides an important temporal context for modern life, sustaining American heritage and history (McManamon 2002:31-32). Overall, the principal benefit of archaeology is providing information about the past.

Many educational opportunities available through museums, including site tours, lectures, and active involvement of the public in archaeological research (Davis 2005:16). A prime example involving the public in hands-on archaeological research can be found at the Fort St. Joseph museum. People with a desire to learn archaeology are invited to spend a week with the Western Michigan University field school and learn the basics of archaeological excavation.

There is no one single message that archaeologists should attempt to teach to the public, as the most significant and meaningful accounts are not a one size fits all, but locally tailored. There are different pasts for different communities. It is important for people to know specific things about their pasts. Some versions must be of local interest and specifically attract individuals with no special archaeological training, for example showing how people lived in the area in the past by an unexpected event or an unusual kind of feature or artifact found locally. Museums can help do this by incorporating archaeological research and methods into their programming and exhibits.
Chapter 3: Research Methods

To determine how museums represent archaeology, I visited and interviewed museum education employees at the Fort St. Joseph Museum in Niles, Michigan, the Field Museum in Chicago, Illinois, and the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, New York. I selected museums that represented local, state, and national levels and maximally vary sampling for a qualitative case study (Table 3.1). Local museums are privately owned, sustained by local tax money, or are supported by the local area historical society. Examples of local museums include the Fort St. Joseph Museum in Niles, Michigan and the Sloan Museum in Flint, Michigan. State museums are public institutions that are chartered by the state to preserve the state history and are run by the government. An example is the Fort Michilimackinac State Park in Mackinaw City, Michigan. National museums receive some sort of federal funding. Examples of these museums are the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, New York, and the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. Lastly, there are private museums that preserve personal collections or began as private collections but do not receive funding from the local, state, or national government. Instead, they rely on funding from fees (such as admission and special exhibit tickets), proceeds from gift shop sales, and public donations. An example of a private museum is the Field Museum in Chicago, Illinois.
Table 3.1. Level of Museums Considered for Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. Joseph Museum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Museum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Museum Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Michilimackinac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Museum of Natural History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was also important for this research to include museums that have an archaeological aspect to their programming and exhibits. Typically, state and federally funded museums include an anthropology/archaeology department. However on rare occasions, smaller museums may showcase local archaeological excavations that produced a large number of artifacts and useful information (Table 3.2).
Table 3.2. How Archaeology is Represented within Each Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Archaeology/Anthropology Department</th>
<th>Use of Archaeological Information</th>
<th>Associated with Archaeological Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. Joseph Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Museum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Museum Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Michilimackinac</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Museum of Natural History</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last criterion is that the museum has an education department (Table 3.3).

Table 3.3. Museums with an Education Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Education Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. Joseph Museum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Museum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Museum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Museum Center</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Michilimackinac</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Institution</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three museums met the requirements of my research because each one represented a different level of museum, represented archaeology, and contained an education department: Field Museum in Chicago, Illinois, the American Museums of Natural History in New York, and the Fort St. Joseph Museum in Niles, Michigan (Table 3.4).
Table 3.4. Museums Selected for This Study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Museum Visited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. Joseph Museum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Museum</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Museum Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Michilimackinac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithsonian Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was primarily interested in how particular archaeological techniques were represented. These include Geographic Information Systems (GIS), stratigraphy (Sharer and Ashmore 2003), geophysical survey (Greene and Moore 2010), dating techniques [fluorine dating, C14 dating, potassium-argon dating, seriation, archaeomagnetism (Sharer and Ashmore 2003)]; artifact analyses [ceramic analysis, lithic analysis, DNA analysis (Sharer and Ashmore 2003)], paleoethnobotany, bioarchaeology, light stable isotope analysis, x-ray fluorescence (Greene and Moore 2010), zooarchaeology (Reitz and Wing 2003:1), and thermal ionization mass spectrometry (Potts 1992: 523).

I used three methods in my analysis: observation, archival research, and interviewing. The observational analysis was conducted by visiting museums, surveying sample exhibits, and recording the content in terms of archaeological techniques and methods with hand-written
notes, and if permitted photographs. For my archival research, I visited a number of online resources as well as the museum websites. Interviews were conducted with the use of an interview guide I prepared and with a sample group of individuals that I chose from each museum.

At these museums, I looked for the use of modern archaeological methods within the exhibits. I also interviewed members of the museum community who work or have worked in either the museum’s anthropology or education department. The exception is the interview I had with Museum Director Carol Bambridge at the Fort St. Joseph Museum. Each interview was conducted either at the museum or over the phone and recorded with permission of the interviewee. Each person was asked a series of questions related to the development of the education program. Generally, each interview started off with one predetermined question and then additional questions were adapted based on responses. At the conclusion of the interview, I reviewed the answers and determined similarities between each interview.
Chapter 4: Museum Background

The Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago

In 1891, the director of the United States National Museum, Dr. G. Drown Goode, conferred with J.W. Ellsworth, a member of the foreign affairs committee, that the World’s Columbian Exposition, which was to take place in 1893 in Chicago, was a perfect opportunity to establish a museum. Ellsworth became an enthusiastic advocate and was able to interest other committee members, resulting in some of the purchases made for the Exposition being viewed partly in relationship to their usefulness in a future museum. In July 1893, a letter by S.C. Eastman that was published in the Chicago Tribune called attention to the appeal of a museum and stimulated public interest. A committee of three of the directors of the Exposition called for a public meeting “to adopt measures to establish in Chicago a great museum that shall be a permanent advantage and honor to the city” (Field Museum 2010). The meeting was held on August 7th, 1893 and was attended by about 100 citizens, resulting in a committee being formed to help develop the museum. The Columbian Museum of Chicago was incorporated into the city and on September 16th, 1893, a charter from the State of Illinois was granted to the museum. The objective of the museum was “accumulation and dissemination of knowledge and the preservation and exhibition of objects illustrating art, archaeology, science, and history” (Field Museum 2010). On May 21st, 1894, the Trustees of the museum voted to change the name of the museum to Field Columbian Museum. On November 10th, 1905 the trustees voted again to change the name of the museum to Field Museum of Natural History in honor of Marshall Field, the Museum’s first major benefactor. They chose to emphasize the natural sciences collection of anthropology, botany, geology, and zoology. In March 1920, collections were moved from the
original building in Jackson Park to the current location of the museum at Grant Park (Field Museum 2010).

The Field Museum has a number of mission statements. Each statement outlines different areas of the museum’s mission in educating the public. The preamble of the mission statement states:

Serving The Public As Educator: The Field Museum is an educational institution concerned with the diversity and relationships in nature and among cultures. It provides collection-based research and learning for greater public understanding and appreciation of the world in which we live. Its collections, public learning programs, and research are inseparably linked to serve a diverse public of varied ages, backgrounds and knowledge (Field Museum 2013).

The public learning clause pronounces the museum as a self-motivated, self-directed, and lifelong learning tool, with the exhibits being the principal avenue of learning. The museum also services schools and communities by extending museum experience beyond the museum. The research section states the museum maintain a program of basic research, seeking new knowledge about the physical, biological, and cultural patterns and processes of the earth. Research centers in anthropology, evolutionary and environmental biology, and geology focus on interrelationships of the earth, the environments, and life and culture over time. The public statement professes that the museum serves a diverse range of publics including children, adults, families, and the national and international research communities. All of these mission statements were located on the Field Museum website under the mission statement tab (Field Museum 2013).

According to the 2011 Annual Report for the Field Museum, the Operating Budget Revenue and Other Support totaled $68.2 million. The Operating Budget Expenditures totaled $63.0 million (Field Museum Annual Report 2011: 8). The Field
Museum employs 140 scientists that research the information that is used by the museum (Field Museum Annual Report 2011:4).

I had the pleasure of talking with Jessica Hankey, the School Partnerships Manager in July 2012 at the Field Museum. She holds a Bachelor's of Science in Education with a focus in general science and a Master's Degree of Science in Curriculum and Construction in Science Education. Ms. Hankey coordinates with the museum staff to develop programs that include archaeology. The development of school age programs is based on staff expertise and current local school curriculum. Sometimes the museum conducts surveys with school staff to determine their needs regarding to certain topics, concepts, and subjects that are required by Illinois State Funding Standards. These standards require periodic assessment of the museum collections and how they fulfill goals for learning specific grade standards. A team including education staff, anthropologists, and others creates programs based on those learning standards by examining existing exhibits and hands-on activities. The education department collaborates with teachers to build and structure programs in various subject areas, including archaeology and anthropology. Teachers can then link museum programs to current classroom instruction. Ms. Hankey believes that it would be highly beneficial for archaeology to be used within the all the programs being taught. Included in the Field Museum mission statement is a directive to engage teachers and students in understanding both field and museum activities and the process used to interpret past peoples and events.

Jessica Hankey then referred me to a former employee of the Field Museum by the name of Dr. Sarah Wille. Dr. Wille was specifically hired to help develop educational materials and was employed by the museum from Fall of 2005 through November 2009. She organized teacher professional development programs and student classes related to the Ancient Americas exhibit
that opened in March 2007. Much of the information used in the programs can be found in an Educator's Guide specifically generated to lead groups through the larger exhibits and coincides with labeled content in the displays. Dr. Wille’s primary goal was to create content based on the Illinois State Standards with regards to the current museum exhibits. She then created a guide that teachers can use to introduce their students to the main concepts of the exhibit. Dr. Wille worked with an advisory council consisting of teachers and Native American community members in the Chicago area to determine how the information would be represented in the educator's guide. She also met with other scientists within the Field Museum to incorporate the information they believe should be included.

The Field Museum also offered a classroom-type program where school classes pre-register for a program and receive both time in the exhibit as well as some type of hands-on activity. These programs were less standardized and another member of the education department with a background in archaeology led these groups. According to Dr. Wille, the members of the education department needed to have a background in "everything" and the knowledge of who to consult to ensure the accuracy of the information. All courses were reviewed and approved by a curator as well. The exhibits that have been there for a while, such as the Egypt exhibit, did not necessarily come with an education guide, and the amount of concrete educational materials varied, depending on the budget that was available to the education department at the time. Student classes were developed so that teachers were able to register for a class located within a certain permanent exhibit that focused more on a certain subject. Dr. Wille believes that it is important to speak with the curators to make sure that the educational material being presented is accurate and not misleading.
As Dr. Wille does not have a background in education, it was important for her to understand state and national requirements in social science to create teacher programs that include archaeological information. The museum educator’s main goal is to support teachers and supplement the information presented in the classroom.

*The American Museum of Natural History*

In 1869, Albert Smith Bickmore proposed the idea of creating a natural history museum in New York City. His endeavor was supported by a number of influential men including Theodore Roosevelt, Sr., Joseph Choate, William E. Dodge, Jr., and J. Pierpont Morgan. John (Thompson) Hoffman signed an Act of Incorporation on April 6th, 1869, officially creating the American Museum of Natural History. The museum was moved to an area across from Central Park, between West 77th street and 81st street in 1872, where it still stands today. Starting in 1880, the museum became a forerunner in the world of exploration, including expeditions to the North Pole, unmapped areas of Siberia, the Congo jungles, and Mongolia (AMNH N.d. 1).

The mission statement for the AMNH is “To discover, interpret, and disseminate-through scientific research and education- knowledge about human cultures, the natural world, and the universe” (AMNH N.d. 2). The total amount of assets as determined in the 2011 Annual Report amounted to $1,156,457,013. The sum operating revenue and support of $166,183,596 and full operating expenses grossed to $151,111,642. Of this total, the operating revenue and support in excess of operating expenses, designated contributions, and transfers resulted in $88,649 (2011 Annual Report: 56). The museum employs over 200 scientists who specialize in
one of the following fields: anthropology, astrophysics, biology, earth and planetary sciences, paleontology, invertebrate zoology, physical sciences, and vertebrate zoology (AMNH N.d. 3).

In July of 2011, I met with Dr. David Hurst Thomas, Curator of the Department of Anthropology at the museum. He identifies specifically as an archaeologist, focusing on the relationship between Native American and anthropological communities. He has worked at the Spanish Mission Site on St. Catherine's Island and at the ruins of a Spanish Mission site located south of Santa Fe, New Mexico.

The American Museum of Natural History sponsors a graduate program with a focus on archaeology that connects with NYC universities and colleges. Students are able to work as interns in the anthropology department. Many of them go into the field with the museum’s anthropology department faculty every summer. High school seniors and college undergrads may also volunteer at the museum to gain archaeological lab experience.

The educational department does not employ an archaeologist on staff. They do not require an archaeologist because the majority of their exhibits, while anthropological in nature, are not related to archaeological material. After a perusal of the museum, I found only one exhibit that incorporated archaeology in a small portion of its layout and another that included some aspects of bioarchaeology in the display. The only exhibit that actively used archaeological research was one that identified extinct Native American tribes. In the Human Origins exhibit, bioarchaeological research and techniques were used when exhibiting the remains of past human ancestors (Figure 4.1).
Dr. Thomas felt that if the exhibits incorporated more archaeology, or if there was a specific archaeological exhibit, the education department would use more archaeological research in their programs. There is a lot of expansion available within the museum to increase its use of archaeology in exhibits, and lack of items is not the reasoning for it. As I was being escorted to Dr. Thomas’ office, I viewed the massive artifact collection housed at the museum.
There are many objects stored in rows and rows of cabinets. Information is identifiable on most, if not all, of the objects in storage, and there is ample information for the creation of an archaeological exhibit.

Their education program serves hundreds of students every year. These large groups learn about a number of subjects in the museum, ranging from dinosaurs to sea life to space exploration. The use of archaeological research inside the AMNH is mostly geared towards older/university level students. This practice is a disservice to a large population of youngsters who may otherwise be interested in archaeology. The programs produced by the education department are driven-by state education requirements, but there are opportunities for them to include archaeological research in these school programs.

*Fort St. Joseph Museum of Niles, MI*

In August 2012, I traveled to the small town of Niles, Michigan, located on the state-line between Michigan and Indiana. In 2002, the Fort St. Joseph archaeological site was discovered by Dr. Michael Nassaney and afterwards artifacts recovered through excavation are stored at both Western Michigan University and the Fort St. Joseph Museum located in downtown Niles. During my visit, I spoke with Carol Bainbridge, the Museum Director. It is a small museum with only a few full-time employees. Student interns volunteer at the site as well as at the museum.

A series of activity booklets is the primary method of educating patrons, particularly children. The booklets contain a number of different sections centered around a common theme that changes over time. The August 2012 booklet focused on the fur trade. The first section in the booklet was called “Explore the First and Second Floor.” To complete this section, children needed to find, determine the use of, or answer questions about objects. This method required
children to read the captions and descriptions. The second section in the booklet was titled “Early Days of the Fur Trade.” This section centered on Father Allouez, the priest in charge of the mission at Fort St. Joseph during the 1680s, and explained why the Fur Trade was so important in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. The next section was titled “Fur Trade Community” and examined the lives of the people involved in the fur trade and how they co-existed around the fort. The fourth section was titled “Native Americans and the Fur Trade,” and detailed the importance of Native Americans in the fur trade. The fifth section, titled “Voyageurs and the Fur Trade,” outlined the lives of the Frenchmen who worked in the fur trade. The final section of the booklet was titled “Other People of the Fur Trade,” and introduced other important people in the fur trade business who lived at the Fort. All the sections were written so that children would be able to understand the information, and there were a number of side activities for them to complete, such as a coloring page and a word decoder.

The museum staff also developed a fur trade program that meets a number of the Michigan State requirements in history for third graders. These programs are very popular with the schools and utilized information different from the booklets available to the public. They also included crafts and a PowerPoint presentation on the history of the fur trade generally and the Fort specifically. Inquiry-based activities included a scavenger hunt that takes the students through the museum.

School groups are given the option to either travel to the museum or have the exhibit come to them. A lack of funding at the school district made it difficult to sponsor field trips to the museum, so Bainbridge re-worked the fur trade program and presented it at local schools, such as the Ballard School. Over the course of three days, Bainbridge, along with Renee Hurstwell, a former site supervisor at the Fort St. Joseph site, covered all six classes with the
same museum program that included a PowerPoint presentation and artifact boxes. Between Bainbridge and Hurstwell, both the history of the fur trade and the archaeology of the site were covered in approximately one hour. It is important for the programs at this museum to address state history requirements and the fur-trading program provided a detailed element of local history. This program is an excellent example of meeting state history standards while teaching archaeology through a culture’s past.

The museum has also developed public learning camps that started in 2004. The public is able to attend and work on the site, going in-depth in the use of archaeology to further understand the history of the Fort. There are three programs offered; a junior high group (6th-9th graders), an “adult” group (10th-11th grade, non-professional adults), and a continuing education group (teachers and other professionals who need continuing education credits for Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois). The participants are taught general archaeological methods and the history of the site in a classroom-like setting in the morning. After lunch, they participate in the field school excavations. One afternoon during the week, they clean and categorize artifacts. Camp attendance is made on a first-come first-serve basis. However, many individuals who attended wished to return to the program.

There are plans to take school groups to the Fort site. It is unsure how this trip will be accomplished, since most of the digging is done during the summer when school is not in session. In the next couple of years, when an interpretation center is built at the Fort site, it will make this endeavor easier. The idea is to take the kids down to the Fort site and allow them to use their imaginations to create the way the Fort looked during occupation as a way to introduce them to the site.
Chapter 5: Analysis

The responsibility of museum educators is to empower and ensure that all visitors feel inspired through their experiences at the museum. This endeavor can range from providing wheelchair access to exhibits to acknowledging a constructivist perspective, which allows the visitor to give meaning to an object from their own experience (Lea 2000: 232). In conjunction with the need to invest in the visitors, it is also important to address the preconceived notions visitors have about history. These prejudices regarding the past are almost always in place before any instruction begins, and may or may not align with scholarly versions of ancient times or be infused with a stereotypical image (Davis 2005:21). It is the job of the educator and especially the museum to correct these preconceptions and educate individuals through archaeological evidence.

By means of a literature review, interviews, and participant observation, I determined the presence and absence of archaeological methods in the three museums studied (Table 5.1).
Table 5.1. Methods Described in Museum Exhibits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Field Museum</th>
<th>American Museum of Natural History</th>
<th>Fort St. Joseph Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zooarchaeology</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleoethnobotany</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geophysical Survey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioarchaeology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-ray fluorescence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light stable isotope analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermal ionization mass spectrometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorine Dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C14 Dating</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K/Ar Dating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratigraphy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeomagnetism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithic Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If museums include archaeological research in their education programs, it is mainly limited to the use of the artifacts archaeologists find and the information these artifacts imply about the past. In my discussion with the interviewees, each one expressed that state education
requirements drove the development of programs for school groups. A large emphasis in the information being taught at the Field Museum is to make children think about what these objects tell us about the people of the past.

Five archaeological methods were present in two museums: zooarchaeology, seriation, ceramic analysis, lithic analysis, and DNA analysis. Zooarchaeology and seriation, were present at the Field Museum and the Fort St. Joseph Museum. Ceramic analysis, lithic analysis, and DNA analysis were used at both the Field Museum (Figure 5.1) and American Museum of Natural History. The questions addressed with zooarchaeology, ceramic analysis, and lithic analysis allowed participants to dig a little deeper into what the information being provided might mean. Each of these analyses addresses the concept of mobility of people and trading. Seriation was used to show participants how artifacts relate to one another and allowed for relative dating. DNA analysis showcased genetic traits and the change and movement of humans over time. The DNA programs seemed to be the most advanced, teaching participants the process of DNA extraction and how it is interpreted by scientists to determine genetic traits and characteristics.
Figure 5.1. A display of different stone tools at the Field Museum.

Paleoethnobotany was featured at the Field Museum, mainly in the discussion of the domestication of plants, primarily maize in the New World (Figure 5.2). Bioarchaeology was showcased at the American Museum of Natural History, teaching participants about human origins, evolution of the human brain, and the evolutionary changes in human ancestors.
Light stable isotope analysis, thermal ionization mass spectrometry, fluorine dating, and archaeomagnetism were not utilized in any of the education programs or exhibits. It is possible that one of the reasons for this absence is that the educators believe the knowledge to understand the method is above the knowledge level of those for whom the programs are geared.

My experiences revealed that there is an unfortunate lack of explanation to the general public and school children as to what archaeologists do and what archaeological research involves. In the development of programs, there is mostly the use of items that were found at archaeological excavations and limited information about these items. This is not to say that these items cannot teach individuals about the past, just that the information is limited. There is no discussion of provenience or how the archaeological excavation was conducted. There is no discussion of why items might have been found together, no questioning of the uses of the artifacts, and no reasoning for the item to have been where it was found. Unfortunately, the Field Museum develops programs based around the requirements of the state school system, and there seems to be no deviation from this programming. At the Fort St. Joseph museum there is also a set of state-requirement-based programs, but additional programs were developed. Individuals
who are interested in archaeology can attend the summer camps. The camps offer a way for individuals to interact with professional archaeologists, allowing for a better understanding as to what the science is. It seems as though programs of this type can be offered at more museums. When museums fail to teach individuals about what the discipline truly is, they are reinforcing stereotypes that are seen in mass media. Mass media is enforcing the idea that all archaeologists are whip-carrying Indiana Jones types or individuals who are destroying sites for personal gain, like the individuals on American Diggers. Programs that allow people to participate in the process better educate the public. It seems as though larger museums that have more access to funds, like the Field Museum, should be the leaders in this area, unlike the smaller local museums, such as Fort St. Joseph, that do not have the same access to funds. It is unclear to me as to why only one museum set up additional programs to showcase archaeology when both museums are driven by state standards.

All archaeological methods do not need to be present in all museum educational programs in order for them to be effective. Incorporating just a few of the procedures with a thorough explanation of the information they can supply would aid greatly in providing a better understanding of archaeology. Techniques that allow an archaeologist to determine the greatest amount of information about a site in an economically feasible fashion are the most important. These methods include a full analysis of lithics, ceramics, and flora and fauna remains. These items tell us what they ate, and the tools they used. It is also important for archaeologists to include relative dating techniques (stratigraphy) in case absolute dating techniques (C14 dating) are not available. The more scientific information provided to the public, the better they will understand the archaeological process.
Chapter 6: Conclusions and Future Research

I undertook this study to discover how museums use contemporary archaeology in their education programs. As I stated in the first chapter, there are many reasons this research is important. First, we must realize museums and their programs are a boundless source of information. It is imperative to understand how they use archaeological theory and methods within their programs because it impacts a museum guest’s perspective of archaeology. Second, individuals working in both the museum and archaeological community can benefit from the wealth of information on this thesis topic. Creating a database of the information that is being portrayed in museum education programs, would enable museums to decide which methods work best for teaching the public about archaeology and how to incorporate said techniques into their own programming. It is my hope that when individuals are given a realistic understanding of archaeology as a science, they will be able to appreciate its importance at a more sophisticated level. As interest in the subject increases more people will voluntarily help protect archaeological sites that are important landmarks in United States history.

Future research could focus on the benefit of using more contemporary archaeological methods. If the use of contemporary archaeological techniques is found to be beneficial to both museums and the general public, those advanced tools can be incorporated into “best practices” methods for their education programs. These new “best practice” methods will expand the types of information museums include in their educational programs.

Also, it would be important to look at the scale of operation. Does the size or location of the museum constrict the funding or the ability to create such a program? I have concluded that the small museum I studied, Fort St. Joseph Museum, had the best representation and use of
programs of contemporary archaeology. Yet, the American Museum of Natural History, the largest museum studied, does not have any such programs. This seems to be an interesting point of study. Why would a small museum with few human resources or little money be the one that most accurately portrays contemporary archaeology?

Another interesting study point would be analyzing those museums that offer field school programs to the general public. This research would include studying the age range of participants as well as what methods are used in the school and how the skills relate to what is being taught in the museum. By doing this analysis, it would give a better understanding of how archaeology is being taught.

I believe that museums need to incorporate more fundamentals of archaeology, such as those related above, into their programs and exhibits. Once these methods are incorporated, people will become more interested in the process of archaeology, not just the “cool things” they find. There is a wealth of information that can be provided by these methods and the general public needs to know more about the work executed by archaeologists. Such an increase in knowledge about archaeology will ultimately help protect historic and prehistoric sites in the United States.
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