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ABSTRACT

This case study explores the link between historical thinking and historical consciousness at middle school level, over a 14-week unit of study. It builds upon an existing body of empirical research within Canada and internationally, including the recently published *Canadians and Their Pasts* national survey, as well as *The Historical Thinking Project*. With regard to historical thinking, this dissertation focuses on historical narratives, evidence, and sources—since these historical thinking concepts are often encountered within informal learning settings such as community history museums. Indirectly, the concept of historical significance is also relevant to this inquiry.

In keeping with instrumental case study design, the findings provide insight into pragmatic applications for historical thinking within a community history museum. Findings also reveal the phenomenological meaning that both middle school students and volunteer heritage community members drew from the experience. The methodology is informed by a sociocultural theoretical perspective. As a result, research procedures were framed around Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) *Contextual Model of Learning*—during the data collection phase; as well as by Rüsen’s (1987; 1993; 2004) typology of historical consciousness—during the data analysis phase. The ultimate intent was to map out any changes that may have occurred over time regarding participants’ relationship with their past, present, and future.

Through the adoption of a series of scaffolding tools designed around a Material History Framework for Historical Thinking, students became actively engaged in: (a) discovering and deconstructing the narratives that they encountered within the museum,
(b) analysing the artifact sources behind such narratives, and (c) reconstructing their own narrative claims. Through this experience, students’ social roles were transformed from passive listeners to active historians. In turn, adult participants became engaged in: (a) responding to students’ questions, and (b) modelling historical thinking. Through this experience, adult social roles were transformed from information-transmitters to collaborative agents, as they developed a sense of empathy for the students as historical researchers. As a result, the authority of the museum was challenged in a constructivist way, and the community of inquiry was opened up to include students as active members of the community.

Over the course of this inquiry, students’ narrative interpretations became explicitly focused upon the artifact, as a source of evidence to support their narrative claims. Students also came to recognise complexity in interpreting the past. With regard to Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness, their narratives for remembering Canada’s past shifted away from traditional—toward exemplary—templates, while their narratives for remembering New Brunswick’s past also shifted away from traditional—toward genetic—templates.

Through the lived experience of historical thinking, history became something that students envisioned doing for themselves. These findings have implications for classroom teachers, museum educators, and history education researchers. They support the assertions of Seixas (2001) that students can be empowered to “read [and re-write] the [informal] texts that structure their lives” (p. 561).
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"It's not just my teacher, it's the truth! It's in my history book!"
(A.J. Soprano, 2002)\(^1\)

1.1 Setting the Stage

In the fourth season of the television series *The Sopranos* (2002), Anthony Soprano Junior ("A.J.") sits at the kitchen counter of the family home, reading aloud to his mother Carmela. The topic is Christopher Columbus, and the reading source is none other than Howard Zinn’s revisionist publication, *A People’s History of the United States: 1492 to Present* (1980).\(^2\) As the family patriarch, Anthony ("Tony") Soprano, enters the scene, we are provided with a brief glimpse into the breakfast conversation:

Carmela Soprano: *That is just one person’s opinion Anthony.*

Tony Soprano (entering the room): *What, football again? He’s not going to get hurt. He’s a tough kid...*

Carmela Soprano: *We’re having a discussion about Christopher Columbus.*

A.J Soprano: *They would make fine servants - with 50 men we could subgate [sic] them—*

Carmela Soprano (correcting A.J.): *Sub-ju-gate.*

---

\(^1\) Chase, 2002.

\(^2\) This particular choice of reading material is poignant, because *A People’s History of the United States: 1492 to Present* (1980) remains a highly controversial publication that has sold more than 3,000,000 copies to date (Booknotes.org, 2012). The text has since been adapted for students as *A Young People’s History of the United States* (2007). Described by some as radical revisionist history (Herbert, 2010), *A People’s History of the United States* was written with the intent of sparking a “quiet revolution” in democratic socialism (Herbert 2010; HowardZinn.org, 2012; Lamb, 2000).
A.J. Soprano: …and make them do whatever we want. That doesn’t sound like a slave trader to you?

Carmela Soprano: George Washington had slaves, the father of our country.

A.J. Soprano: Well, what’s your point?

Carmela Soprano (turning to Tony Soprano): His history teacher, Mr. Cushman, is teaching your son that if Columbus was alive today, he’d go on trial for crimes against humanity like Milosevic in... you know... Europe. (Chase, 2002)

As the discussion proceeds, A.J.’s father becomes increasingly more agitated, as he realizes that his son’s version of history challenges his own well-established beliefs about —the “brave Italian explorer”—Christopher Columbus. “Your teacher said that?” he asks his son, to which A.J. replies: “It’s not just my teacher, it’s the truth! It’s in my history book!”

Such a scenario, although fictional, provides an excellent illustration of the learning dynamics that can exist both inside and outside of a classroom. In this instance, as the student struggles to understand Christopher Columbus, he must juggle conflicting interpretations (both past and present), as well as weigh available evidence, in search of his own perception of truth. Was Columbus a criminal or a hero? Is his father right? Is his teacher right? Is the history book right? Wherein lays the truth?

1.2 Statement of Problem

The problem, as illustrated by this scenario, is that A.J. (the son) most certainly will never find the truth about Christopher Columbus. At best, according to theorist Jörn

---

1 For a discussion on the many documented acts of cruelty committed against Arawaks living in present-day Haiti, see Loewen (1992, 1995). For a discussion on the re-thinking of Christopher Columbus in the classroom, see Bigelow & Peterson (2003), and Wineburg (2007).
Rüsen, he may reach a contextual perception of the life and times of the explorer, recognizing that times have changed, and drawing personal meaning that is relevant to the present as well as the future. At worse, he may simply choose to accept his father’s well-established beliefs about the "brave Italian explorer," or his history teacher’s criminal interpretation, as an unquestionable obligation to perpetuate a particular belief system. Likewise, as A.J.’s father struggles with generational differences between what he was taught in school about Christopher Columbus, and what his son is currently learning in the classroom, we are presented with a metaphorical question as to whether A.J.’s father, in light of his son’s revisionist thinking, might be capable of changing his own well-established beliefs about his “hero.”

Returning to the kitchen of the Soprano family, in this particular scene we are left with little doubt that Tony Soprano (the father) intends to hold firm to his narrative about Christopher Columbus. His immediate visceral response is quite simple: “So, you finally read a book and it’s bullshit” (Chase, 2002). The family patriarch then proceeds to rationalize Columbus’ actions, using presentist terms to equate their family’s recent experiences of vacationing in Florida with Columbus’ experiences of over 500 years ago, while his son proceeds to challenge his father’s rationality by citing history book evidence of gruesome brutality and ruthless colonial exploitation. Inevitably, however, in this household the heavy hand of truth is dealt by Tony Soprano, as the scene concludes with these weighty words: “He discovered America, is what he did. He was a brave Italian explorer. And in this house Christopher Columbus is a hero. End of story” (Chase, 2002).
My point in elaborating upon this particular episode of a fictional television series is to demonstrate the perceived challenges that exist within history education, and the fragile process by which a young person might construct meaning from the past. As this scene illustrates, history education cannot simply be a case of filling a student’s head with facts, and expecting them to *know* history. It is more a case of empowering students with the intellectual ability to carefully examine (and evaluate) the sources behind such historical claims, to re-construct their own understandings about the past, to reflect upon how this relates to the present, and to consider how such understandings are relevant to the future.

1.3 Current Trends in History Education within Canada

Currently within Canada, pedagogical trends in history education can be summarized as representing four distinct paradigms: nation-building, societal transformation, historical mindedness, and historical thinking (Laville, 2004; Osborne, 2012a, 2012b, 2011, 2006). The former two trends have been in common practise for many years, while the latter two (although not new to academic debates) have more recently re-surfaced within the Canadian discourse on how best to teach history.

1.3.1 Nation-building. A *nation-building* paradigm is something to which many of us are accustomed (and, no doubt, would seem very familiar to Tony Soprano). It is history that is patterned upon chronology, often presented in an ideological way, and fosters an appreciation for progress. As Granatstein (1998) suggests, this is the history on which great nations are built:

If Canada is to be worthy of its envied standing in the world, if it is to offer something to its own people and to humanity, it will have to forge a national spirit
that can unite its increasingly diverse peoples. We cannot achieve this unanimity unless we teach our national history, celebrate our founders, renew the old and establish new symbols, and strengthen the terms of our citizenship… We have a nation to save and a future to build. (Granatstein, 1998, p. 185)

Yet, as noble as this rhetoric might sound, such narratives of nation-building are what Anderson (1991) has dismissed as pure fabrication: an \textit{imagined community} where, “in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (p. 6), crafted by the author to serve some higher purpose.

1.3.2 Societal transformation. A second paradigm within history education, as Osborne (2011, 2006) has pointed out, emerged in Canada during the 1970s. This \textit{societal transformation} approach to history teaching places a greater emphasis upon social, cultural, and gender aspects of the past. In this context, history education is regarded as a tool for social change, by which students are taught isolated aspects of the past within a framework of current public issues. As Osborne (2006) recalls, during the 1970s “history became less a chronological survey of the past and more the examination and analysis of problems, themes, and concepts in which chronology was largely ignored” (p. 112).

Considered more of a social studies approach to history education, this teaching paradigm remains very common within Canada, as the events of the past are interpreted in ways that \textit{seem} to make history more relevant to the present. In this context, history is built around such broad themes as family, community, and nation—starting with the most immediate connection of \textit{me}, and extending out into a broader historical perspective—so that the here and now become part of a collective past. The central problem, however, with both of these paradigms (nation-building and societal transformation), are that they
are substantive in nature: meaning the pedagogical focus is placed upon teaching the
*what* of history, rather than the *how*.

1.3.3 **Historical mindedness.** In recent years, Osborne (2012a, 2011, 2006, 2000) has identified a third paradigm for history education in Canada, *historical mindedness* (Osborne, 2006), which actually dates back to 1899.\(^4\) This approach to history education suggests combining the teaching of substantive knowledge about the past along with procedural skills and the habits of mind of historical inquiry (Osborne, 2012a, p. 175), in order to provide students with a “way of viewing the world that the study of history produces” (Osborne, 2006, p. 125). In this sense, Osborne (2006) argues, a broadened approach to history education might deepen a student’s historical consciousness, by strengthening their intellectual ties between past, present, and future:

Historical mindedness, by contrast, describes the way of viewing the world that the study of history produces. It is a compound of knowledge, skills, and habits of mind. It is the result of the enlargement of experience that arises from the study of

\(^4\) As Osborne (2003) has noted: “By the early 1900s it had become conventional wisdom that good history teaching involved some use of primary sources and documents” (para. 13). As Osborne (2000) has also pointed out, “historical mindedness” is not really new to history education in North America, since in 1899 the American Historical Association Report of the Committee of Seven identified “historical mindedness” as the goal of history education. This could be achieved (according to Committee recommendations) by teaching concepts of change over time, origins and development, rise and decline, causes and effects, as well as “the cultivation of detachment and objectivity; the ability to resist the fads and fancies of the moment and to situate the present in the context of both the past and the likely future” (p. 423). This paradigm, however, as Osborne (2003) explains, quickly fell out of fashion in Canada, and was replaced by an emphasis upon the substantive “matter” of history (and a nation-building paradigm). Hence, Osborne (2003) concludes: “[s]hifting attendance, lack of preparation time, minimal training, unsympathetic school boards, language difficulties, lack of resources, crowded curricula, pressure to stick to the textbook and cover the course - these and other problems made any use of sources seem like a Utopian dream” (para. 29).
other times and other places. It is the ability to situate the immediate concerns of the present in some kind of comparative perspective and to see the world as it appears to others. It helps us understand ourselves as the inheritors of the past and the legatees of the future. (Osborne, 2006, p. 125)

1.3.4 Historical thinking. During the 1990s a fourth paradigm, historical thinking, was added to the mix of history education in Canada. This approach to history teaching, however, while closely resembling historical mindedness (Seixas & Morton, 2013, pp. v-vi), is more specific and focussed in its pedagogy. Historical thinking is currently very popular in Canada (Seixas, 2010a & b), and is supported by such national initiatives as The Historical Thinking Project and The History Education Network/Histoire et éducation en réseau (THEN/HiER). Existing as part of a larger international movement, this paradigm is grounded in cognitive research originating from the British Schools Council Project “History 13-16” (Schools History Project, 1976; Shemilt, 1983; Stearns et al., 2000; Wineburg, 1996) and Shemilt (1983). It emphasizes a discipline-based (procedural) approach to history education that focusses upon specific second-order concepts (historical significance, evidence, continuity and change, cause and consequence, historical perspective, and the ethical dimension) as “competencies… to explore the forest of historical data” (Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. vi).

---

5 Early manifestations of inquiry-based learning reflected a “scientification” of history that would experience a “crisis” in historicism from the 1970s onward. As a distinction from early manifestations of historical thinking and/or historical mindedness in history education, I will discuss in chapter two of this dissertation how historical consciousness (a term that did not exist before 1958) echoes a “new historicist” turn away from what Rüsen (1987) has described as the “scientification” (p. 276) of history.
In Canada, historical thinking has been spearheaded by Seixas (1996), Peck (2008), Lévesque (2008), Duquette (2011), and Clark (2011), who (along with many other international scholars) have found that through adherence to formal methods of historical inquiry, students can be enabled to use procedural second-order concepts to arrive at substantive first-order conclusions about the past (Duquette, 2011; Lévesque, 2011, 2008; Peck, 2009). The end result is believed to be a greater understanding of the past: an understanding that is informed by multiple perspectives, historical concepts, primary sources, evidence, and ethics (Lévesque, 2011; Osborne, 2006; Sandwell, 2005; Seixas, 1996; Seixas & Morton, 2013). In this sense, historical thinking represents a perceived advancement over historical mindedness, because it provides specific and tangible “guideposts” for teaching, learning, and assessment in history education (Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. 9; Seixas et al., 2015, p. 103).

Such guideposts, while providing an explicit dimension to history education, also draw attention to a substantial and pressing problem within the discipline: how to identify a connection (if any) between the procedural act of historical thinking, and the phenomenon of historical consciousness (Seixas & Ercikan, 2015; Seixas, 2012). Indeed, while on a theoretical level, much has been written about historical consciousness in Canada (Laville, 2004, 2003; Létourneau, 2004, 2014; Létourneau & Laville, 2006; Seixas, 2006, 2004; Simon, 2005, 2004), only a small number of Canadian scholars have begun to explore—on an empirical level—the specific links between historical consciousness and historical thinking (Duquette, 2011; Gosselin, 2011; Létourneau, 2014; Létourneau & Moison, 2004; Seixas, 2012, 2005). In addition, to date within Canada no empirical research has been undertaken with regard to middle school students
and their experience of making links between historical consciousness and historical thinking (Clark, 2014).

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this case study is to explore the link between historical consciousness and historical thinking at middle school level. In so doing, I have limited my inquiry to learning in a community history museum, and I have worked collaboratively (within a formal classroom setting) to design procedural tools intended to engage students in the act of historical thinking in a museum. The single-case design (Yin, 2009) was bounded by the context of time (one formal study unit), as well as by the formal arrangement of a classroom (one seventh-grade class) and a specific community history museum experience. The case also contained two embedded units of analysis: a sampling of students participating in the experience of community history museum fieldwork, and elder volunteer members participating in the same experience—although my primary research focus was weighted upon the former unit of analysis (a sampling of seventh-grade students). In keeping with instrumental case study research (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2005), this study provides insight into the pragmatic applications of historical thinking within a community history museum setting, as well as the phenomenological meaning both middle school students and volunteer heritage community members drew from the lived experience. The methodology was informed by a sociocultural theoretical perspective. As a result, research procedures were specifically framed around Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning—during the data collection phase (see Appendix A, 1.6.3), as well as by Rüsen’s (1987; 1993; 2004) typology of historical consciousness—during the data analysis phase (see
Appendix A, 1.6.17). The ultimate intent of this case study was to map out any phenomenological changes that may have occurred regarding participants’ relationship with their past, present, and future.

1.5 Research Questions

The central research question guiding this case study was: “How can a heritage community assist middle school students in deepening their historical consciousness?”

Within this overarching question, there were three procedural sub-questions:

1. Can formal classroom instruction, adopting *The Historical Thinking Project* concepts for historical thinking, enable middle school students to think historically about the narratives they encounter within their community history museum?

2. Does participation in history museum fieldwork activities deepen the historical consciousness of these students?

3. Does student collaboration with older members of this volunteer heritage community deepen the historical consciousness of the older members themselves?

1.6 Definition of Terms

In the interest of brevity and ease of reference, a detailed listing of term definitions adopted for this empirical study can be found in Appendix A. As suggested by Glatthorn and Joyner (2005), definitions have been provided when one or more of the following criteria apply: (a) the term is relatively new in the profession so has not gained general currency; (b) the term is often used ambiguously in the profession, and hence requires preciseness; or (c) the term may be a general one, which is being used in a particular way.

---

6 “Deepening” in this sense is described on page 4 of this dissertation, and refers to the intellectual ability of reaching one’s own conclusions about the past, reflecting upon how this conclusion relates to the present, and considering how one’s understandings are relevant to the future.
In addition, it was also my hope that a detailed definition of terms would be expedient during the data analysis phase of my research, since it was important to be precise on exactly what it was I was analyzing.

1.7 Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made in designing this study:

- All participants responded sincerely when asked to provide their opinions, observations, or recollections.

- Through the shared experience of informal learning in a community history museum, middle school students could indeed be empowered to see themselves as historical agents, and thus orientate themselves within a past, present, and future.

- This could be achieved through the adoption of historic space mapping techniques, whereby students could readily visualize the historical thinking of the curators who created the narratives they encountered within a community history museum.

- By re-experiencing the past with elders within their community, these students could become active participants in a shared historical consciousness that was personally meaningful to each individual.

- Empowerment within this learning context, however, required a set of discipline-specific design knowledge⁷ skills—in order to sort, prioritise, examine, question, and analyze evidence, as well as to consider alternative sources. In developing

---

⁷ Design knowledge is defined by Perkins (1986) as “viewing pieces of knowledge as structures adapted to a purpose” (p. 3). By contrast, information knowledge represents passive storage of knowledge as simply information that one must know (i.e., to pass the test), while design knowledge represents practical implementation of knowledge as an “implement of action” (Perkins, 1986, p. 5).
this design knowledge, students could be enabled to deconstruct the many narratives they encountered within a community history museum.

- Ultimately, however, the quality of the learning experience would depend greatly upon what prior knowledge students brought to the learning setting.

1.8 Limitations

This study was:

- Limited to seventh-grade students who were participating in a formal curriculum of social studies designed around the concept of empowerment.

- Limited to learning taking place (equally) between a formal history education classroom and an informal community history museum.

- Limited to the nature of the museum collection where the study took place, as well as the types of historical narratives students there encountered.

1.9 Summary

In this chapter I have outlined the context, problem, and purpose of this study. By presenting a fictional scenario from *The Sopranos* (2002), I have illustrated the central problem that drives my research: the fragile process by which a young person might construct meaning from the past and negotiate conflicting historical narratives. I have also situated my research within current trends in formal history education in Canada, and have established preliminary links to empirical research about historical consciousness and historical thinking.

In chapter 2, I explore the empirical literature surrounding historical consciousness in Canada, and break this field down into three broad categories: (a) historical consciousness as shared narratives, (b) historical consciousness as a way of thinking
about the past, and (c) historical consciousness as an expression of history in everyday life. I then proceed to review the literature within the contexts of informal (2.3.1) and formal (2.3.2) learning settings. This chapter establishes the basis for my choice of instruments outlined in chapter 3.

In chapter 3, I discuss the unique context of my inquiry, which bridges both informal and formal learning settings. In so doing, I describe the research design in detail, and discuss how the unique nature of learning in a community history museum has shaped my choice of procedures. In this chapter, I also address a number of technical issues relating to sampling, trustworthiness of data interpretation, and other ethical considerations.

In chapter 4, I describe participant sample groups in detail, and present multiple sets of data, which include pre- and post-survey results, as well as pre- and post-open-ended essay questions, documentation, interviews, and observational field notes. Rather than following a linear format, however, each data set is deconstructed according to Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) four contexts of learning and (where possible) coded against Rüsen’s (1987, 1993, 2004, 2005) typology of historical consciousness. In so doing, I lay out my findings in preparation for triangulation in the following chapter.

In chapter 5, I revisit my research question by triangulating my findings against each of the three procedural sub-questions. I do this by presenting my findings according to Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) four contexts of learning (personal, sociocultural, physical, and temporal). In responding to the central research question, I provide practical recommendations for community-based learning in history education, and explain how my findings have led me to re-define what is meant by the concept of “deepening
historical consciousness.” I conclude by discussing how my overall results contribute to the existing body of research surrounding history education at middle school level, thus raising points for future empirical research.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

“… teaching students how to read the texts that structure their lives, and write the ones that might restructure the world.”
(Peter Seixas, 2001)\(^8\)

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews literature relating to two specific strands of my research: (a) historical consciousness in Canada, and (b) historical thinking amongst middle school students. I begin with an introduction to the national research project *Canadians and Their Pasts*, because it provides a broad opening benchmark for this particular case study. The review of the literature that follows points to gaps in the research, and lays groundwork for my own research design.

2.2 Canadians and Their Pasts

Research findings from the national survey project *Canadians and Their Pasts* indicate that a large majority of Canadians engage in the past as part of living their daily lives (Conrad et al., 2009, p. 27; Conrad et al., 2013, p. 29).\(^9\) These findings are particularly significant to social research scholars, because they represent the first national study ever undertaken within Canada to probe the historical consciousness of “ordinary” (Conrad et al., 2009, p. 15) Canadians.\(^10\) The data is also significant to

---

\(^8\) Seixas, 2001, p. 561.

\(^9\) Eighty percent of respondents reported that they had engaged in the past in some way over the past 12 months, and 53% said that the past of their family was most important to them. (Conrad et al, 2013, pp. 29, 77-78).

\(^10\) A similar survey study was undertaken on a smaller scale by Jean-Pierre Charland (2003) between 1995 and 1996, which focused specifically upon tenth-grade (equivalent) students living in urban Montreal and Toronto (n=1913). Preliminary findings from the *Canadians and Their Pasts* national sampling of 3,419 Canadians were first released in 2009 (Conrad et al., 2009). This survey was limited to adults 18 years of age and older (Conrad et al., 2013, pp. 161-178). Random samplings of Canadian households were
international scholars, since *Canadians and Their Pasts* was designed to build upon similar research undertaken in Europe (Angvik & von Borries, 1997), Australia (Hamilton & Ashton, 2004), and the United States (Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1998; Conrad et al., 2007, p. 1). As a result, the Canadian study provides scholars with an opportunity to make international comparisons, and to establish parallels that extend beyond political boundaries.

Launched in 2006 (with data collection completed in 2011), *Canadians and Their Pasts* represents an elaborate alliance of seven academic researchers, 19 collaborators, six universities, and 15 community partners assembled for the purpose of “exploring the role that history plays in the lives of Canadian citizens” (Canadians and Their Pasts, 2012). Survey participants were asked questions designed to: (a) measure levels of general interest in the past, (b) identify activities participants engage in that relate to the past, (c) probe how these activities aid in their understanding of the past, (d) measure the perceived trustworthiness of specific sources of information, (e) probe the relative importance of various pasts, and (f) identify participants’ individual sense(s) of the past (Conrad et al., 2007, p. 1; Muise, 2008, pp. 95-96). The resulting data provides a rich profile about what adult Canadians in general think about the past, and the role of specific sources of information in shaping that thinking. Perhaps more importantly, the data also provides a rich insight into the much broader epistemological question of the way

---

stratified equally over five regions: Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairie provinces, and British Columbia. Supplemental interviews were conducted in several cities, including Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, Toronto and Montreal. An additional 100 interviews were also conducted with Aboriginal people in Saskatchewan, as well as with Acadians in New Brunswick (100 interviews), and new immigrants in the Regional Municipality of Peel in Ontario (100 interviews) (Conrad et al., 2009; Institute for Social Research, 2012; Muise, 2008).
Canadians think about the past (i.e., “in what ways do people understand the problem of knowing the past?” [Seixas et al., 2008, p. 2]).

Findings from the national survey project confirm that many Canadians possess a deep connection to the past—provided that it is encountered through the people who mean most to them: the family unit, culture group, or nation to which they closely associate (Conrad et al., 2013). In addition, as with similar findings in the United States and Australia, Canadians engage with the past in a variety of ways, but activities that relate to the collective memory of families are considered most important (Conrad et al., 2009, pp. 22 & 33; Conrad et al., 2013, p. 67).

In terms of the way Canadians think about the past, analysis of interview transcripts suggest a variety of patterns in reasoning, ranging from historical knowledge as simply found—hence, “it is only a question of getting to the right [secondary] source” (Seixas et al., 2008, p. 7; see also Conrad et al., 2013, pp. 61 - 62); to historical knowledge as constructed from limited surviving evidence—hence, “it will often not be found, whole cloth” (Seixas et al., 2008, p. 7; see also Conrad et al., 2013, pp. 61, 63-64).

In terms of what Canadians think about the past, the findings from Canadian and Their Pasts have led scholars to speculate within the field of education that, if students understand the disciplinary qualities of history (specifically, the role of evidence, context, and interpretation in constructing history), then they may “be better equipped to cope with the very real challenges posed by knowing and using the past in the contemporary

11 Sixty-six percent of respondents considered their family’s past as very important, while 42% of Canadian-born respondents rated Canada’s past as very important to them, and 59% of those born outside of Canada rated the past of their country of birth as very important. In addition, nearly as many respondents rated the importance of their ethnic or cultural group (39%) as highly as they rated Canada’s past (42%) (Conrad et al., 2013, p. 36).
world” (Seixas et al., 2008, p. 13). Indeed, as demonstrated by the introductory scenario (see chapter 1 of this dissertation, pp. 1-2) around the breakfast counter of the Soprano family, the pressure to maintain traditional narratives of family and community can become overwhelming for any individual. How, then, might a student such as A.J. Soprano (for example) navigate such conflicts in historical interpretation? Wherein might he place his trust?

Undoubtedly, as Seixas et al. (2008) have pointed out, the Canadians and Their Pasts study has discerned a significant knowledge gap within Canada society—that points to an intersection between historical consciousness and history education:

If people embraced the disciplinary qualities of history more systematically and whole-heartedly—an understanding of evidence, context and interpretation—they might be better equipped to cope with the very real challenges posed by knowing and using the past in the contemporary world. A clearer picture is needed of how people actually do think about history… As we go forward with this research program, there will be significant implications, for schools as well as other institutions of public history (p. 13; see also, Seixas, 2007).

I wish to address this knowledge gap within this case study, by specifically focusing upon middle school students and their experience of making links between historical consciousness and historical thinking in community history museums.

2.3 Mapping the Historical Consciousness of Canadians

Historical consciousness constitutes a relatively recent topic of interest within history education in Canada. As both Charland (2003) and Laville (2003) have noted, the term was first introduced to academia by Hans-Georg Gadamer, with the publication of
his theoretical treatise: *Le problème de la conscience historique* (1963). Later, during the 1970s, the term was adapted by German didacticians, Jeismann (1977) and Rüsen (1987), to epitomize a *new historicist* turn away from the simple transmission of historical narratives in history education (Hasberg, 2010; Körber, 2008). Thus, rather than approaching the teaching of history as instruction in substantive knowledge that was transmitted to students, history education in post-World War II Germany was re-introduced as instruction in the meta-competencies of thinking historically for oneself (Körber, 2008). In this sense, there could be no *right* or *wrong* historical consciousness—only differing types and values in thinking about the past (Körber, 2008, p. 4). Thus, historical consciousness in history education came to denote a renewed interest in “the specific and peculiar nature of historical thinking and explanation” (Rüsen, 1987, p. 281), which the study of history could enable. Paradoxically, however, it also came to embody a scholarly interest in identifying “common” shared narratives across Europe (Charland, 2003, p. 19). All of this interest was initially sparked by war crime trials taking place in Europe after World War II, and was later fuelled by the fall of the Berlin Wall, as well as the subsequent re-unification of East and West Germany (Lutz, 1997).

Within this historical context, Jörn Rüsen (1993) introduced a “typology of historical narration” (p. 6), which was primarily based upon the historiography of Leopold van Ranke, Johann Gustav Droyson, Hayden White, and Frank Ankersmit (Kölbl & Konrad, 2015, p. 19). From these philosophical underpinnings, as well as a 1991 qualitative inquiry involving 249 high school students in the Ruhr District of Germany (Bracke et al., 2014; von Borries, 1997, p. 141; see also Rüsen et al., 1991),

---

12 For a detailed discussion on the context surrounding this crisis in German historicism, as well as the rise of interest in historical consciousness, see Lutz (1997) and Rüsen (1987, 1993).
Rüsen has developed his typology of historical consciousness (1987; 1993; 2004). Since this time, however, while a great deal of scholarly work has been published around Rüsen’s framework (e.g., Lee, 2004; Megill, 1994; Rüsen, 2004, 2005; Seixas, 2005; Straub, 2005; von Borries, 2000; von Borries et al., 1994), Rüsen’s typology still remains highly theoretical, since, as Kölbl and Konrad (2015) have recently noted, “[c]onvincing empirical evidence…is still lacking (p. 19). For this reason, I wish to address this research gap by applying Rüsen’s theoretical framework to this inquiry.

In Canada, the genealogical tree of historical consciousness can be traced back to common roots in German didactics. This is because the theoretical framework attributed to Jörn Rüsen has greatly influenced empirical research on historical consciousness in this country as well. For example, Duquette (2011), Gosselin (2011), Zanazanian (2009), Seixas (2005), Létourneau and Moison (2004a),13 and Charland (2003) have all drawn upon Rüsen’s theoretical perspectives, in one way or another, when studying the historical consciousness of Canadians.

In examining the current field of empirical research on historical consciousness within Canada, scholarly studies can be grouped into three broad categories that represent slightly different research interests: (a) historical consciousness as shared narratives, (b) historical consciousness as a way of thinking about the past, and (c) historical consciousness as an expression of history in everyday life. Historical consciousness—as shared narratives—has been the primary focus of Létourneau (2014), Lévesque (2014), Daignault and Collin (2012), Robichaud (2011), Cormier and Savoie (2011), Zanazanian (2009), Létourneau and Moison (2004a & b), and Clarke (1998). Historical

13 See also: Létourneau (1997), as well as Jewsiewicki and Létourneau (1996).
consciousness—as a way of thinking about the past—has been the primary focus of Gibson (2014), Duquette (2011), Gosselin (2011), Seixas (2005), and Charland (2003). Conversely, the *Canadians and Their Pasts* study has focused upon historical consciousness as an expression of history in everyday life. While all of these studies have made a substantial contribution to understanding the historical consciousness of Canadians, they all point to a significant gap in the research, because they all demonstrate that the empirical research to date within Canada has focused largely upon individuals 15 years and older \(^{14}\) (Clark, 2014). To date, no empirical research has yet been undertaken in Canada with regard to middle school students (grades 6 – 8; aged 11 – 14 years) and their historical consciousness.

In the two sub-sections that follow, I will briefly survey the methodological approaches and findings of these scholarly studies, in order to summarize what the current research indicates about historical consciousness in Canada.

### 2.3.1 Historical consciousness and informal learning

Within the context of informal learning, Daignault and Collin (2012), Gosselin (2011), and Cormier and Savoie (2011), have all focused their research upon historical consciousness in museums. In addition, Seixas (2005) has focused his analysis upon informal learning through film. Daignault and Collin’s (2012) emerging phenomenological case study, involving 39 museum visitors, is bounded by the museum exhibition *People of Quebec: Then and Now*. Their research purpose is to describe and illustrate “how the temporal aspects and the various components of identity are organized and expressed in the visitor experience”\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{14}\) The only exceptions to this are two inquiries involving primary school students: Cormier and Savoie’s (2011) investigation of grade 5 students (aged 9 – 10 years), as well as Weinert’s (2000) investigation involving grade 1-2 students.
(Daignault & Collin, 2012). The findings from their research have not yet been made public.

Gosselin’s (2011) phenomenological case study, involving two embedded units of analysis (six exhibition developers and 36 exhibition visitors), was also bounded by a museum exhibition. In Gosselin’s inquiry, the exhibition was also situated within the province of Quebec, and is entitled Being Irish O’Quebec. In comparison to Daignault and Collin (2012), Gosselin’s (2011) research purpose was somewhat different, because she chose to explore “the complex and dynamic exhibition performance (the production and public reception of exhibitions), as a dialogical process that is both educational and cultural in nature” (p. 2). Thus, by positioning her inquiry to involve two seemingly dichotic units of analysis (the makers of the message, as well as the receivers of the message), Gosselin revealed how visitors “played” (p. 167) with the exhibition in ways that were very unlike historians. She described two seemingly isolated processes of meaning-making. On one side of the dynamic, exhibition developers perceived themselves as “rigorous storytellers” (p. 173) and the resulting exhibition seemed to present a “compelling and seamless historical narrative” (p. 173). As receivers of the message, however, Gosselin (2011) found that visitors drew upon their own identity (ethnicity, biography, interests), as well as “cultural memory, sensitivity, and geographic proximity to the historical narrative” (p. 168), to engage with specific themes within the exhibition in unintended ways. In this sense, visitors did not adopt “formal, systematic and explicit methods, like historians do, to make sense of the past” (p. 167).

Museums, as purveyors of shared narratives, have also been the focus of research undertaken by Cormier and Savoie (2011) at the Musée Acadien de l’Université de
Moncton. Their ethnographic case study involves 230 fifth-grade students, constituting 11 units of analysis (11 Francophone classrooms) within New Brunswick. Their case was bounded by the exhibition *L’aventure acadienne / The Acadian Adventure*, as well as by a museum outreach program designed around this particular exhibition. Their research purpose was to evaluate how the museum experience enriches students’ identity as Acadians, as well as their interest in Acadian history. Adopting pre- and post-museum-visit evaluation methods designed around writing and drawing assignments, Cormier and Savoie (2011) found that the museum experience strengthens students’ symbolic memory and interest in Acadian history. They also concluded that museums have an important role to play in perpetuating shared narratives of cultural communities.

By distinction from these three case studies, all of which are firmly situated within the paradigm of museums as learning settings, Seixas (2005) has positioned his research within the broader context of popular film. His research is also unique from the others, since he approaches historical consciousness as a way of thinking about the past. Seixas’ (2005) multiple-case study, involving 11 tenth-grade students, was bounded by two films: *Dances with Wolves* (1990) and *The Searchers* (1956). In this particular inquiry, student responses to each of the two films were compared against two embedded units of analysis: Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness (Appendix A, 1.6.17), and Seixas’ concepts of historical thinking. Seixas’ (2005) research purpose was to evaluate these units of analysis and examine how the two might operate in tandem to advance students’ thinking about the past (pp. 141, 142, & 150). Ultimately, he concluded that “a synthesis between two schemes of historical consciousness: one that catalogues seven issues

---

15 Specifically: significance, epistemology, and moral judgment.
confronted by all historical thinkers, and another that provides a scheme for development in historical consciousness” (p. 157) is indeed feasible, although the latter requires further refinement. He also speculated that such a synthesis could provide a “starting point for new research on the growth of historical consciousness” (p. 157).

2.3.2 Historical consciousness and formal learning. Within the context of formal learning, Duquette (2011), Robichaud (2011), Zanazanian (2009), Létourneau\(^{16}\) and Moison (2004a & b), Charland (2003), and Clarke (1998), have all focused their research upon historical consciousness in classroom settings. Three of these inquiries are ethnographic studies of historical consciousness as an expression of shared narratives (i.e., Robichaud, 2011; Létourneau & Moison, 2004 a & b; Clarke, 1998), while the other three are phenomenological studies relating to either historical consciousness as shared narratives (Zanazanian, 2009), or as a way of thinking about the past (Duquette, 2011; Charland, 2003).

Within this context of formal learning, Clarke’s (1998) ethnographic study of Gaspésian youth (aged 18 to 25 years)\(^{17}\) explores socio-divergence in historical consciousness within cultural groups. Interestingly, this inquiry was part of a larger international study involving seven different countries containing Francophone populations (Belgium, Burundi, France, Canada, Poland, Russia, and Zaïre), which was directed by Canadian scholars Jewsiewicki and Létourneau (Neatby, 2000). As with all of the case studies that make up this international inquiry, student participants were simply asked to provide a written response to the following question: “De quoi je me souviens à

\(^{16}\) For insights on more recent work in this regard, see Létourneau (2014).

\(^{17}\) N=151 Cégep students (43 in Gaspé, 47 in Carleton, and 51 in Matane).
propos de mon pays, de ma région, de ma ville? De quoi faut-il se souvenir? "


In Clarke’s case study (1998), he adopted a social discourse methodology that analyzed geographical, sociocultural, and socioeconomic factors extending far beyond the classroom (Clarke, 1998, p. 82). He also compared his findings against control group responses collected from Acadians living in northern New Brunswick. As a result, his research revealed a historical consciousness among young Gaspésians that was rooted in a “structural reality” that was alien to the “political, economic and cultural elite” of the region (p. 72). Among the many factors influencing this historical consciousness, Clarke specifically pointed to the role of heritage institutions in bolstering an elitist narrative of “Harmonie dans le même” that was actually counterproductive, because it alienated Gaspésian youth (p. 90). Clarke found that, unlike their Acadian counterparts in New Brunswick (a region that shared a common history and geography), Gaspésian youth actually expressed sentiments of dis-harmony within a Quebec nationalist historical consciousness, which reflected a sense of marginalisation:

En Gaspésie, la jeunesse témoigne du vide et de la confusion des représentations collectives traditionnelles québécoises…Écartée du processus d’élaboration formelle de l’identité régionale et nationale, elle reprend à son compte celle de tous les marginaux et en façonne une culture qui est sienne. Ces jeunes influencent la société par une adhésion à la culture populaire mondialisante, qui leur donne la
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18 For comparative purposes, control group responses were collected from 100 university and community college students in New Brunswick (41 in Shippagan, 36 in Edmundston, and 23 in Campbellton) (Clarke, 1998, p. 110).

19 Clarke (1998) describes this group-identity as: “Une « Gaspésie région distinct » dans un Québec homogène (l’Autre dans le Même)” (p. 90).
parole, un sens de la réalité, une identité, une esthétique, voire des mythes, bref, les moyens de s’exprimer et de contester. La sociabilité de la jeunesse gaspésienne ne peut se nourrir d’autre chose. Ainsi, ces jeunes témoignent de la dissolution des cadres de référence symboliques et du progrès de l’hybridation des systèmes de représentation qui résultent de l’avènement de la modernité au Québec, et qui produisent une profonde crise d’identité que même les velléités nationales ne peuvent masquer (pp. 107-108).

In New Brunswick, however, Clarke (1998) observed a “consistent and coherent” (p. 108) historical consciousness among Acadian youth that was grounded in a deep sense of language, culture, and tradition: "Les réponses des jeunes Acadiens du Nouveau-Brunswick témoignent de la vigueur de l’identité et de l’imaginaire collectives, reliés à des espaces régionaux et locaux et aux populations qui les occupent" (Clarke, 1998, p. 83).

Indeed, Clarke is not alone in making this observation with regard to Acadian New Brunswick. In a somewhat similar vein, Robichaud’s (2011) ethnographical study of twelfth-grade students in Francophone New Brunswick also confirmed a strong sense of group-identity among Acadian youth that was “anchored” (p. 69) by a shared Acadian nationalist narrative. In the context of Robichaud’s (2011) inquiry, his research purpose was to describe twelfth-grade students’ sense of the past, and how this related to their identity as Acadians. To this end, his findings revealed that Francophone-Acadian students within New Brunswick already possessed a historical consciousness before they arrived in twelfth-grade. Hence, Robichaud concluded that through assimilation from informal sources of learning, Acadian students were, like their counterparts in Quebec,
"porteurs d’un ensemble de récits, clichés, stéréotypes et mythistories plus ou moins bien ancrés dans leur imagination" (p. 69; as cited in Létourneau, 2010, p. 50). Perhaps more importantly, however, Robichaud and Clarke both noted that Acadian students were also very unlike their counterparts in Quebec, because the mythistories, stereotypes, clichés, and narratives that Acadian youth shared were not the same as in Quebec. Acadian mythistories were unique to the region of Acadia. In addition, according to the findings of Clarke (1998), these national narratives were consistently and coherently shared (p. 108).

Somewhat similar conclusions have also been reached in Létourneau and Moison’s (2004a & b) ethnographic study of 403 (eleventh-grade to university) students in Quebec. Their research purpose was to explore students’ historical narratives about Quebec’s past, with the intent of identifying shared narratives (p. 331). As a result, in their inquiry students were simply asked to provide a written or oral response to the following question: “Présentez ou racontez comme vous la percevez, la savez ou vous vous en souvenez, l’histoire du Québec depuis le début." They were then asked: "Pourquoi avez-vous présenté ou raconté l’histoire du Québec comme vous l’avez fait et non d’une autre façon?" Like both Robichaud (2011) and Clarke (1998), Létourneau and Moison (2004a) concluded that students’ historical consciousness develops from many sources of information—the fewest of which can be found in a formal learning setting. Indeed, as Létourneau and Moison (2004a) also noted, the students in their study acknowledged “en masse” that their sources for historical information were namely family, museums, field trips, television series, films, and personal readings (p. 339). Because of this, Létourneau and Moison (2004b) have recommended that formal instruction should enable students to deconstruct and evaluate the narratives they carry (and encounter) as part of their
historical consciousness (p. 122). Similar conclusions have been recurring among other empirical studies on historical consciousness and formal learning (e.g., Charland, 2003, p. 276; Duquette, 2011; Létourneau, 2014, pp. 233-234; Seixas, 2005).

While these qualitative ethnographic studies are all firmly situated within the paradigm of historical consciousness as shared narratives, Charland (2003) has explored the concept using a quantitative methodology. Charland’s (2003) comparative survey, involving 1,913 tenth-grade students in urban Montreal (39 classes) and Toronto (32 classes), was designed to mirror the European study *Youth and History* (Angvik & von Borries, 1997; Létourneau & Laville, 2006). As a result, Charland’s (2003) study was particularly insightful because it generated comparative data that enabled scholars to situate Canadian findings within a larger international context. It was also insightful because Charland focused his research purpose upon describing distinctions between Anglophone and Francophone students within Canada. Charland’s elaborate survey was designed to quantify the historical consciousness of students, using a Likert scale response mechanism of “strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, and strongly agree” (Charland, 2003, pp 303 – 312). With regard to sources of information for learning about the past, Charland (2003) found that informal avenues were particularly valued by students:

… les traces palpables du passé suscitent un reel engouement pour eux. Les sources, les artefacts et aussi les témoignages, en particulier ceux qui viennent de la famille … et qui permettent de relier sa lignée aux grands mouvements de

---

20 This conclusion is also supported by Létourneau’s (2014) most recent empirical study involving 3,475 students in Quebec (grades 10 – 12 equivalent).
l’histoire, exercent une fascination chez eux. Ils devraient toujours figurer en bonne place dans l’arsenal pédagogique. (p. 273)

By contrast, Zanazanian (2009) adopted a qualitative phenomenological methodology, involving 19 tenth-grade (equivalent) teachers within Quebec. Like Charland (2003), he focused his inquiry upon distinctions between Anglophones and Francophones; Zanazanian’s (2009) research purpose, however, was very different from that of Charland’s, since he wished to explore the historical consciousness of teachers rather than students. He also limited his field of inquiry to Montreal, breaking his units of analysis down by language of instruction: eight Francophone teachers within eight Francophone schools, eight Anglophone teachers within eight Anglophone schools, and three Francophone teachers within three Anglophone schools. Zanazanian’s (2009) empirical findings confirm a theoretical view that, within the Quebec formal learning setting that he has studied, students bear witness to “essentialised [sic] historical visions” (p. 168) and power structures of “competing group trendsetters” (p. 168). This conclusion is significant, because it suggests that the pervasiveness of mythistories, stereotypes, and clichés’ within students’ historical consciousness (re. Létourneau, 2014; Létourneau & Moison, 2004a & b; Robichaud, 2011) may also be linked to formal instruction.

Thus, given all of these findings to date, the question remains: How might a student negotiate their own historical consciousness within Canada? How might formal and informal learning function in tandem to deepen their historical consciousness? What might a deep historical consciousness look like? These are the questions that currently speak to me. In Quebec, Duquette (2011) has asked similar questions, and has thus focused her research upon how formal instruction in historical thinking might connect
with historical consciousness (p. ii). Her interest is in historical consciousness as a way of thinking about the past.

Duquette’s (2011) mixed methods inquiry, involving a total of 148 eleventh-grade (equivalent) students within eight participating schools, incorporated testing of an emergent design for formal instruction in history education along with a phenomenological analysis of students’ experiences of working with primary and secondary evidence (pp. 280 – 299). Data was collected—via written assignments and posterior interviews—around three (currently) controversial schematic themes: culture, poverty, and military enlistment. Duquette’s (2011) empirical findings confirm the utility of Rüsen’s theoretical framework for assessing historical consciousness (1993, 2004; Appendix A, 1.6.17). In addition, her findings also confirm (like Seixas, 2005) a “strong correlation” between Rüsen’s four types of historical consciousness and the development of second-order concepts of historical thinking (Duquette, 2011, p. ii).

**2.3.3 Identifying the research gaps.** Current history education research around historical consciousness in Canada indicates that there exists a pressing need to address the links between historical consciousness and historical thinking (Duquette, 2011; Seixas et al., 2008; Seixas, 2005). Since current research also clearly reveals that informal learning sources play a dominant role in shaping students’ historical consciousness—both inside and outside of the classroom (Charland, 2003; Clarke, 1998; Conrad et al., 2007; Létourneau, 2014; Létourneau & Moison, 2004 a & b; Lévesque, 2014; Robichaud, 2011) —and since the substantive aspects of what students think about the past may actually be perpetuated by the historical consciousness of teachers
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21 This design was based upon the problem-based instructional methods of Dalongeville (2000), as well as De Vecchi and Carmona-Magnaldi (2002) (Duquette, 2011, p. 59).
themselves (Zanazanian, 2009), it would appear that students in Canada face an enormous challenge in negotiating their own historical consciousness. Like A.J. Soprano, wherein may they place their trust?

Seixas has argued that intellectual empowerment rests with shifting the axis of power away from the makers of the message, into the hands of students themselves (Seixas, 2001, 2005; Seixas et al., 2008). He has also stated that more empirical research is required in this area. My research makes a contribution to addressing this research gap, by focusing upon the paradigm of historical consciousness as a way of thinking about the past. More importantly, it also contributes to a scholarly void, because (to date) no empirical research has been undertaken in Canada with regard to middle school students (grades 6 – 8; aged 11 – 14 years) and their historical consciousness.

2.4 Middle School Students and Historical Thinking

A growing body of evidence suggests that many of today’s students retain pictures of the past as simplified historical narratives (Barton, 2008a, p. 240; Barton, 2008c; Barton & Levstik, 2008b, p. 259; Boix-Mansilla, 2000, p. 412; Cormier & Savoie, 2011; Espin, Cevasco, van den Broek, Baker, & Gerstyn, 2007; Lee, 2004; Létourneau, 2014; Létourneau & Moison, 2004a & b; Levstik, 2000, p. 300; Levstik, 2008a ; Robichaud 2011; VanSledright & Brophy, 1992, p. 841; VanSledright, 2011, p. 64; Wineburg, 2001, p. viii). This is not surprising, since history itself is a constructed narrative, by which the historian re-members and re-presents the past. Indeed, the historical narrative has been described as a “poetical act constituting historical knowledge” (Rüsen, 2005, p. 10; White, 1997). Wertsch (2002a), however, has identified such narratives as schematic cultural tools. In this sense, he argues that the simplified historical narratives (“schematic narrative templates,” p. 176) that students retain, are a product of recurring narrative plot
lines (traditions) of their social communities and formal schooling. Within these recurring plot lines are more specific sub-narratives that are constructed and remembered (p. 62).  

Similarly, within a formal learning setting, Espin et al. (2007) have drawn correlations between the formulation of sub-narratives and remembering. They have found that when middle school students are provided with specific instruction on making causal links between events in the past, they will remember more of the key events (those that bear more links to other events), and from these links construct their own sub-narratives (p. 181). As Wertsch (2002a) and others (Barton, 2008d; Wineburg, Mosberg, Porat & Duncan, 2007) have pointed out, however, “We still know very little about how these [narrative] traditions are to be understood or how they are transmitted from one generation to another” (p. 176). Indeed, we know even less about the dynamics of narrative transmission at middle school level—or more specifically, how the interplay between formal and informal learning may complicate this transmission.

In the two sub-sections that follow I will briefly summarize the findings of cognitive research regarding middle school students (grades 6-8, aged 11 – 14 years) and historical thinking. I frame my review around two specific areas of formal learning: (a) research on students’ thinking about historical narratives, and (b) research on students’ thinking about
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22 As Wertsch (2002a) has elaborated:

...schematic narrative templates are not some sort of universal archetypes. Instead, they reflect particular narrative traditions. We still know very little about how these traditions are to be understood or how they are transmitted from one generation to another. With regard to the issue of transmission, the data I have reported suggest that public socialization efforts found in formal schooling may be successful in promulgating specific narratives built around mid-level events, but other sites of socialization may play a role in the case of schematic narrative templates. (pp. 176-177)
historical sources. I will then extend the discussion to include opportunities for interplay between formal and informal learning.

2.4.1 Research on middle school students’ thinking about historical narratives.

Researchers have identified several factors that influence students’ uncritical acceptance of historical narratives. For the purposes of this inquiry I have grouped these findings around three central themes that reflect the nature of the message (authority), the medium (familiarity), and the learning context (contingency):

**Authority.** As Paxton (1997) and other scholars have argued, the anonymous master-narrative style of writing found in considerate “silent author textbooks,” can actually dull students’ interest in history (Aldrige, 2006; Loewen, 1995; Paxton, 1997, p. 246; Paxton, 1999; VanSledright, 2008). It has also been observed that such narratives leave students with an impression that knowing history means “knowing the facts” (Ashby, 2005, 2004; Carretero & Rodriguez, 2011, p. 290; Crismore, 1984b, pp. 279-296; de La Paz, 2005; Gabella, 1994, 1995; Kohlmeier, 2005; Wineburg, 2001, pp. 47-48). In such a way, as Levstik (2008b) has so succinctly explained, the historical narrative thus serves as “gatekeeper and arbiter, limiting access to information and serving as a final authority” (p. 24). The end result, these researchers have concluded, is that the anonymity of considerate narratives leads students to adopt an uncritical acceptance of claims as “fact.”

In response to these findings, Wineburg (1991, 2001) has presented a paradox, in suggesting that “a more robust approach to improving students’ understanding might teach students to deal with texts that are, by nature, inconsiderate” (Wineburg, 2001, p. 47). Indeed, Wineburg is not alone in making this assertion (Afflerbach & VanSledright,
If this is the case, then perhaps the introduction of non-authoritarian narratives in either formal or informal learning environments (lacking a masterful silent-author voice and demonstrating history as complex and contradictory) might actually stimulate deeper thinking about such historical narratives.

**Familiarity.** As Wineburg (2001) has also pointed out, it is a fragile balance between distance and familiarity that underpins each encounter with the past. This is because the individual cognitive interaction that exists between examining sources from the past, and comparing these sources against organizing concepts and ideas, constitutes a personal interplay between the past as a “foreign country” (Lowenthall, 1985, 2000) and the past as personal experience:

> The pole of familiarity pulls most strongly. The familiar past entices us with the promise that we can locate our own place in the stream of time and solidify our identity in the present. By tying our own stories to those who have come before us, the past becomes a useful resource in our everyday life, an endless storehouse of raw materials to be shaped or bent to meet our present needs. Situating ourselves in time is a basic human need. Indeed, it is impossible to conceptualize life on the planet without doing so. (Lowenthall, 1985, pp. 5-6)

Familiarity, however, can also be intellectually blinding. For example, as both Seixas (1993a & b, 1994) and Boix-Mansilla (2000) have found, student responses to films and videos about the past are most often framed by whether the medium seems contemporary (thus familiar) in its interpretation, rather than whether it is historically accurate. Similarly, Ashby (2005) has reported in her findings from the project CHATA
(Concepts of History and Teaching Approaches) that younger students (fifth-grade) adopt criteria of excitement and adventure to validate stories as credible, using the response of “I like it” to warrant acceptance (pp. 24-25). Similar observations have led many to conclude that students require specific criteria by which to weigh historical narratives against what constitutes accuracy—and this framework must be based upon the discipline of history (Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Barca, 2005; Bryant & Clark, 2006; Davis, 2001; Havekes, Aardema, & de Vries, 2010; Husbands, 1996; Lee, 2005; Seixas, 1993b; VanSledright, 2011; VanSledright & Limón, 2006; Wineburg, 2001 & 2007).

**Contingency.** Appropriation of historical narratives is also contingent upon the learning context itself. As Levstik (1986, 2008b) and others (Booth, 1994; Carretero et al., 1994; Foster & Yeager, 1999; Leinhardt & Crowley, 1998; Riley, 2001; Straub, 2005; van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008; VanSledright, 2011; Wertsch, 1998) have all argued, the nature of a constructed learning environment (e.g., composition of student working groups, selection of reference materials, and journal topic assignments) will directly impact students’ responses to historical narratives (Levstik, 2008b, p. 27); correspondingly, Torney-Purta (1994) has found that in a middle school classroom, “novice” history students will base their criteria as to whether historical information is important or unimportant upon how often their teacher mentions the event or person (pp. 114-115). Fine (1993) too has articulated the important function of classroom dynamics in enabling open discussion of emotionally charged issues and differing value systems.

These findings combined—regarding the appropriation of historical narratives through authority (in the message), familiarity (with the medium), and contingency (of the learning context)—may lead one to hypothesize that students will never be able to
deconstruct the historical narratives they encounter in society unless they are provided with a disciplinary framework for critical analysis. Indeed, many researchers seem to concur with this claim, concluding that without an organizing framework for critical analysis of the historical narratives students encounter in both formal and informal learning settings, students will continue to appropriate pictures of the past as simplified narratives (Barton, 2008a, pp. 241 and 245; Levstik, 2008b, pp. 321-322; Shemilt, 2000, p. 93; VanSledright & Brophy, 1992, p. 855; Wineburg, 2001, pp. 131-132; Yeager, Foster & Greer, 2002, p. 213).

2.4.2 Research on middle school students’ thinking about historical sources.

Both Shemilt (1983) and Wineburg (1996) have described sophistication in historical thinking as a way of thinking about the past that is “context bound and context sensitive” (Wineburg, 1996, p. 428). In this sense, with sophistication in historical thinking, Shemilt has argued, students acknowledge that the past can never be fully re-lived or re-constructed exactly the way it was, that historical narratives can change as the context of evidence and sources are re-examined, and that the past is kaleidoscopic in nature—thus full of complex patterns and alternative interpretations (Shemilt, 2009, 2000).

**Narrative, evidence, and sources.** Too often, however, students seem to experience difficulties in reaching a sophisticated way of thinking about the past, when, as Ashby (2004, 2011) has pointed out, they are unable to distinguish between evidence and sources. Ashby attributes this difficulty to a common error (made by both students and teachers) in using the two terms interchangeably without distinction (Ashby, 2004, p. 10).
Within any historical narrative there exists (or should exist), an assemblage of evidence that is made up of sources (Figure 3). A source (either primary or secondary) represents a singular base of information. When one or more sources are selectively brought together, the conceptual information that is extracted becomes historical evidence (Ashby, 2004, 2011; Jordanova, 2000). In this way, sources and evidence work together in what Ashby (2004) and Rogers (1978) have described as a “symbiotic relationship between ‘know that’ and ‘know how’ ” (Ashby, 2004, p. 2; cf. Rogers, 1978, p. 7). This distinction is of fundamental importance, according to Ashby (2004), because without the ability to validate and contextualize sources containing (or excluded from) historical evidence, students have little grounds on which to critique such evidence or the narrative it supports:

If students are to develop a concept of evidence they will need to understand the evidential relationship between historical sources (understood in the context of the society that produced them) and the claims about the past they are able to support. (Ashby, 2004, p. 3)

Foster and Yeager (1999) have alluded to this problem in their evaluative study of 12-year-olds’ thinking about historical evidence. They have also identified another potentially significant limitation to teaching historical thinking within a formal learning setting. In a formal classroom, as Foster and Yeager (1999) have pointed out, students
really do not have the intellectual freedom to “do history” as historians do (Foster & Yeager, 1999, p. 311). Instead, they are often presented with a pre-selected “set” of sources for analysis (an assemblage of evidence); thus, while they may be actively learning about the past, they are only doing so within the limited purview of the evidence they have been provided (see also Barton, 2005, p. 749 and Husbands, 1996, p. 17). As Foster and Yeager (1999) have found, such limitations can actually be counter-productive to historical inquiry, because as students become very adept at performing the task, they may become inept at critically examining sources. Foster and Yeager attribute this phenomenon to students not being required to look beyond what they have been given as evidence. As such, the teacher (or designer of the evidence-set) has already pre-determined the outcome:

> When teachers select and sort sources for pupils and present them as a kind of “set” of materials on a particular topic, they may give the appearance that the whole truth awaits being pieced together. (Foster & Yeager, 1999, p. 311)

The end result, as Foster and Yeager have found, is that history can become nothing more than a jigsaw puzzle, to be completed upon demand, employing the pieces as provided.

In addition, several other researchers have pointed to the problem of contextualization as the reason for students’ failure to draw meaning from historical sources (Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Ashby, 2005, 2004; Barton, 2001; Colby, 2010; Foster & Yeager, 1999; Foster et al., 1999; VanSledright, 2001; Wineburg, 1991, 2007; Wineburg & Fournier, 1994). To this end, Shemilt (1987, 2000) has made several recommendations as to how teachers might assist students in learning to contextualize historical sources: (a) background information should always be presented as secondary
source material and never as extra-evidential data; (b) exercises using “primary,” “secondary,” and “primary and secondary” sources should feed into discussions of how each might be used; (c) contextual information can be applied to sources as an aid to interpretation or in order to examine the reliability and authenticity of sources—but this should be limited to one source at a time, in order to make the analysis as “visible and unequivocal as possible”; and (d) background information should be limited and highly selective, so that students are not swamped with “background noise” (Shemilt, 1987, p. 60).

**Sociocultural connections.** Of pressing interest to cognitive researchers is the role that personal (sociocultural) connections and prior knowledge (obtained from informal learning sources) might play in formulating middle school students’ thinking about historical sources (Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Fasulo et al., 1998; Foster et al., 1999; Reisman & Wineburg, 2008). Since a growing body of research suggests that students can (and do) develop their own understandings about the past, prior to—and perhaps, independent of—formal classroom instruction (Barton, 2002; Foster et al., 1999; Wineburg, 2001; Wineburg et al., 2007), the convergence of these findings point to the need for more empirical studies into how middle school students’ thinking about sources and evidence might actually deepen their historical consciousness. Moreover, there exists a general consensus among researchers that students require procedural criteria by which to **dig deeper** into the sources that underpin historical evidence (Ashby, 2000; Barton, 2001; Booth, 1980; Colby, 2010; Foster & Yeager, 1999; Lee & Ashby, 2000; Trofanenko, 2006a, 2008)—and, by extension, the historical narrative that such evidence supports. Without such criteria, many argue, students will draw heavily upon personal
(sociocultural) connections and prior knowledge gained from informal learning sources (Afflerbach & VanSledright, 2001; Fasulo et al., 1998; Foster et al., 1999; Reisman & Wineburg, 2008).

Sociocultural connections and (informal) prior knowledge, however, as Barton (2001) has observed in Northern Ireland, can also prove beneficial in providing students with “starting points” (p. 6) for entering into the past. The key, as Barton (2005) has pointed out (p. 750), rests in being able to recognize complexity within such information resources: thus differentiating between the narrative as well as evidence and sources contained within, appreciating that evidence is selective, and understanding that not all sources are equally reliable or valid.

2.4.3 Opportunities for interplay between formal and informal learning.

Although a considerable amount of research has been undertaken with regard to middle school students’ thinking about historical narratives within the formal learning context of classrooms, very little is known—within this specific grade-range—about the way middle school students think about the historical narratives they encounter in informal learning settings. The dearth of cognitive research addressing learning and instruction in this context, suggests not just mere gaps but huge chasms. As van Boxtel (2010) has observed, “there is not much empirical research into students’ learning experiences and outcomes in heritage education” (p. 1).

In this regard, Barton (2008d) has begun to explore the role of museums as sociocultural learning settings. With his comparative study of first- and eighth-grade students in Northern Ireland and the United States, Barton (2008d) analyzed a selection of national museums and history parks, in order to “place students’ learning in its broader
context” (p. 304). He did not, however, collect any data on students’ cognitive interaction within these informal learning settings, and appears to have greatly under-represented the sociocultural diversity that exists within any nation’s museum community. As several museum education scholars have noted, learning within a museum or historic site is very complex (Falk et al., 2007; Falk & Dierking, 2000, 2013; Hein, 1998; Leinhardt & Crowley, 1998; Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004; Snelson, 2011). This is because learning in this context involves all of the senses (sight, sound, smell, touch), as well as internal/external sociocultural interactions with artifacts, texts, images, concepts, environments, and other living beings. Given such complexity, it becomes evident that Barton’s (2008d) exploratory study serves as a call to action for more empirical research that breaches the chasm between formal and informal learning in history education. My research makes a contribution to addressing this gap.

**Deconstructing narratives.** In response to the dearth of empirical research in this area, perhaps a researcher might ask: given the power to choose for themselves “what, how, where, and with whom to learn” (Seixas, 2002, p. 561), what knowledge will middle school students draw from the historical narratives they encounter in informal settings? Is it possible for middle school students to take away from such encounters anything more than a simplified narrative template? If so, what cognitive tools are needed to empower these students to re-write the texts that structure their lives? These are the questions that currently speak to me.

Although the studies I have surveyed focus upon student learning in a formal setting, similar factors of authority, familiarity, and contingency might also play a role in middle school students’ appropriation of historical narratives they encounter within.

---

informal settings. This is because in most of these settings history is presented as a finished product in which producers, directors, historians, curators, and designers (to list only a few of the individuals involved) have carefully selected what parts of the past to leave in, and what to leave out. Through the creation process, these products often evolve into a type of considerate text: written for a specific audience, with the intent of transmitting a specific historical narrative. Thus, just as the empirical research on middle school students’ thinking about historical narratives in formal settings point to the need for providing students with narratives that are, by nature, inconsiderate, so might the historical narratives students encounter in informal settings also be presented as inconsiderate.

In such a way, as Wineburg (2001, 2007) has argued, informal historical narratives might become less easily consumable, and by way of intellectual engagement, much more educational. To achieve intellectual engagement, however, as VanSledright and others (Lee, 1983; Levesque, 2008; Peck & Seixas, 2008; Seixas, 2001; Shemilt, 1983; VanSledright & Limón, 2006; Wineburg, 1996) have emphasized, students require specific procedural and conceptual criteria to weigh such narratives against what constitutes “history”: to thus assess the narrative constructs, ask questions, work through evidence, sources, concepts, and ideas (as illustrated in Appendix A, Figures 1 and 2)—and this framework must be based upon the discipline of history itself.

**Active learning.** The *experience* of learning in an informal learning setting can be very complex as well as very enabling (Falk, 2009; Falk et al., 2007; Falk & Dierking, 2000, 2013; Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004; Wood & Latham, 2014). This is because an informal learning environment carries the potential to provide students with a wide
variety of ways to contextualize sources and evidence. Indeed, nothing can seem more real than witnessing an original piece of evidence for oneself (Barca & Pinto, 2006; Levesque, 2006; Marcus & Levine, 2011; Snelson, 2007; Trskan, 2006; Wunder, 2002). In this sense, the experience of learning draws many parallels to Booth’s (1980) pedagogical ideal of active learning. Here, as Booth (1980) has described the term, students can be empowered to draw upon (and establish) personal experiences, use a variety of primary and secondary sources (particularly visual sources), and combine these sources with factual, analytical, and conceptual knowledge to engage in open-ended discussions (p. 255). In this context, learning can also be truly active, in that students are able to quite literally move about and physically engage with the past. There exists empirical research to support this claim.

As Nakou (2001) has observed from her longitudinal study within an archeological museum, when tasked to do so, the historical thinking of middle school students (aged 12-15 years) can be (comparatively) much more enabled within an informal museum setting than within a classroom setting. Nakou (2001) has also found that students’ ability to examine sources (and draw inferences) closely relates to the objects, because single objects will be more closely examined as sources than collections of objects. In addition, while the wording (and museological nature) of labels specifically associated with museum objects will “greatly effect” (p. 92) students’ thinking about the past, any “dependent historical information” (p. 91) beyond the labels themselves will be

24 Data was collected over three years from four school groups (141 students). Groups 1 and 2 repeated their visits over three years; control groups 3 and 4 visited only the once. Students were requested to focus upon a pre-selected museum artifact/collection, and were tasked with responding to questions designed to probe their ability to examine and interpret their selection. Students’ thinking about history was analyzed against Shemilt’s (1987) four levels of thinking about historical narratives.
largely ignored. These findings are significant, because they suggest that archaeological museums cultivate students’ historical thinking on many levels that extend far beyond substantive texts. Nakou (2001) thus concludes that by nature of the learning setting, students inevitably encounter a multitude of open-ended questions about the past, and decode meaning from museum objects that extend beyond the intended historical narrative: “from the time they enter the museum; children are likely to ‘see’ objects in historical terms even in tasks that are ‘history free,’ that is, not implying a historical answer” (Nakou, 2001, p. 93).

In Canada, Trofanenko (2006b) has found that when given an opportunity to pursue historical inquiry within a museum, fifth-grade students (aged 10-11 years) are very capable of questioning traditional storylines and analyzing historical evidence presented to them (within exhibitions) as historical narratives. In her critical ethnographic case study involving the Open Minds program in Alberta, Trofanenko (2006b) focused upon how public institutions may “re-affirm the political nature of knowledge” (p. 324). To this end, she has clearly demonstrated that students need not blindly accept the narratives they encounter in informal learning settings. Instead, when tasked with the opportunity to enter into a dialogue with museum objects, students are very capable of questioning historical narratives, analyzing evidence, and examining sources (Trofanenko, 2006a).

25 As part of a critical ethnographic case study within a history museum, Trofanenko reports on documentation gathered from four fifth-grade students (observations and interviews conducted over one week). Students were tasked with selecting an artifact of interest on exhibit in the museum (relating to the subject theme), then researching it, writing an exhibit label, and presenting their findings to fellow students. Students demonstrated an ability of knowing that museum objects can become subjects of further investigation, and that the act of writing an exhibit label can enable critical inquiry. Trofanenko concludes that more research is required about how students are currently engaged in learning in museums.
Dialogic learning. The experience of learning in an informal learning setting can also enable open-ended dialogue on many levels: (a) empathetic dialogue with people in the past, (b) external dialogue with others in the present, and (c) internal dialogue with oneself about what is being observed. These forms of open-ended dialogue have been found to result in very profound levels of learning, because they are sensory, emotional, and intrinsic (Falk, 2009; Kydd, 2005; Nakou, 2001; Rosenthal & Blankman-Hetrick, 2002). They are also believed to be most profound when students are introduced to a multiplicity of perspectives—and thus provoked to “cross borders that may make them feel uncomfortable, to challenge familiarity and complacency” (Korza & Bacon, 2005, p. v).

Yet, while the potential for open-ended dialogue in an informal learning setting remains very promising, there are limitations. Most notably, as van Boxtel (2010) has noted, prior knowledge, structures, and cues for learning directly influence the educational level of the dialogue that will take place within an informal setting:

The quality and intensity of heritage learning experiences and the knowledge, undertakings and attitudes that are developed out of these experiences are shaped by students’ prior knowledge and experience and the quality of interactions that take place with others and with artifacts. (p. 14; as cited in Leinhardt & Knutson, 2004; Falk & Dierking, 1992)

Historical thinking in museums. One of the central difficulties associated with adopting a history domain-knowledge framework for historical thinking in an informal learning setting (as illustrated in Appendix A, Figures 1 and 2), rests with a fundamental distinction between archival and artifact sources. Since history museums are primarily
keepers of artifacts (three-dimensional, non-literate objects), this distinction poses a theoretical problem for historical thinking in museums, because the domain-knowledge employed in history museums is unique to the three-dimensional nature of the collection.

Given the dilemma of museum history domain-knowledge, perhaps by extending the historical thinking framework to include three-dimensional objects, students could be empowered to do material history—as museum curators do on a regular basis. Such a scenario, however, would require teaching students how to “read”—and critically analyze—artifacts for the evidence that they contain. Indeed, curators do this type of material history inquiry within history museums (and other history-based informal learning settings) every day.

To this end, there are various procedures for analytical inquiry that museum curators follow. One of these was developed by graduate students at the University of New Brunswick in the early 1980s (Elliot et al., 1994; Smith et al., 1985). Perhaps by adopting a similar grid analysis as a scaffolding tool for middle school students (Appendix E), a procedural set of observational questions could be asked against any three-dimensional object of inquiry. This warrants consideration, because such a tool has the potential to enable students to think historically within any informal learning setting where three-dimensional sources are found.

As Nakou (2001) and Trofanenko (2006a, 2006b) have so clearly demonstrated in their research findings, middle school students are capable of thinking about the past in domain-specific ways within informal learning settings. Given the nature of the discipline specific to these settings, however, what may be required in this learning context is a
slightly different set of organizing procedures for historical thinking: procedures that reflect the domain of material history inquiry.

2.4.4 Identifying the research gaps. As Wertsch (2002a) and others (Barton, 2008d; Wineburg et al., 2007) have pointed out, little is known about how historical narratives are transmitted from one generation to another (p. 176). The dynamics of generation transmission at middle school level is even less known. By focusing my research upon a community history museum, this study sheds light upon differences in understanding the past, and how each generation may actually assist the other in coming to terms with these differences.

Of pressing interest to scholarly researchers is the role that sociocultural connections and prior knowledge may play in deepening middle school students’ historical consciousness. More empirical research is also needed that examines how historical thinking (particularly with regard to sources and evidence) may enable middle school students to be more selective in weighing the merits of the historical narratives they encounter in both formal and informal learning settings. The current hope is that students may be empowered to deconstruct such narratives—and re-construct their own. My study makes a significant contribution to addressing this research gap.

Given the unique nature of museum history domain-knowledge, situating my research within a community history museum requires re-thinking the history domain-knowledge framework upon which the historical thinking paradigm in Canadian history education has been built. This does not suggest in any way a rejection of the six (second-order) concepts of historical thinking as defined by The Historical Thinking Project (see Appendix A, 1.6.16). It does suggest, however, an intention to recognize the unique
nature of material history research in history museums, and to build this into the historical thinking paradigm.

2.5 Summary

In this chapter I have reviewed empirical research relating to two specific strands of my research: (a) historical consciousness in Canada, and (b) historical thinking among middle school students. With regard to historical thinking, I have focused specifically upon students’ thinking about historical narratives, evidence, and sources, since this is often encountered in an informal learning setting such as a community history museum. In reviewing the literature, I have identified the research gaps, and have indicated how my inquiry will contribute to the larger body of knowledge that links historical consciousness to historical thinking. In so doing, I have discussed the potential for interplay between formal and informal learning. This relationship is central to my research design.

In the chapter that follows, I pursue the interplay between formal and informal learning, by first synthesizing the empirical research relating to learning in a museum, and then integrating these factors into my choice of methodology, methods, instruments, and procedures.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

“We don’t see things as they are; we see them as we are.”
(Anaïs Nin, 1903-1977)

3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research design for this case study. I begin by discussing the unique nature of learning in history museums, and then elaborate upon how this relates to my choice of case study method. Within these parameters I define the case, as well as describe the informal research setting, and elaborate upon my own identity as a researcher. I also analyze each research instrument against a sociocultural theoretical lens that is framed by Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning. The resulting procedures are focused upon three distinct aspects of learning within a community history museum: preparation, documentation, and re-interpretation. Overall, my data analysis is guided by Rüsen’s (1987, 1993, 2004, 2005) typology of historical consciousness.

3.2 Research Design

Perhaps one of the greatest challenges associated with developing a research design for informal learning settings rests with identifying learning itself. Too often, as Wertsch (2002b) has observed, researchers adopt “off-the-shelf” methods of data collection and analysis that are better suited for formal learning settings (pp. 113-114). Such choices in research design can lead to data collection instruments that are less than adequate for studying the unique nature of learning within informal settings, resulting in conclusions that suggest weak learning outcomes (Falk & Dierking, 2000, pp. 149-150; Wertsch,

What works well in the controlled environment of a classroom, may not produce equally valid data results in the differently-controlled environment of a museum. Adding to this challenge, even within informal learning settings, not all learning experiences can be considered equal. The “free-choice” experience (Appendix A, 1.6.6) of an independent visit to a museum may be very different from a compulsory school visit. Likewise, within the discipline of history itself, the object-based (material history) epistemology most often employed by museum curators cannot be considered the same as other approaches to historical inquiry. Hence, differences between in-school and out-of-school learning environments, combined with distinctions between free-choice and compulsory learning, as well as particularities within the discipline of historical inquiry itself, require that a researcher clearly identify what is meant by “learning” before embarking upon any research design.

To this end, as Wertsch (2002b) has suggested, a researcher might ask “precisely what is it that we should be evaluating?” (p. 113):

Should [student] visitors be acquiring new information? Should they be developing new areas of curiosity – “opening a new file folder in their brain” (Valenta, personal communication, 1997)? Should [student] visitors be engaging in some sort of identity project? Or is there something else they should take away from a museum visit? (p. 113)

As an extension of this, a researcher might also ask, what does this learning look like in an informal learning setting such as a museum? How can it be explored? Indeed, several scholars have gathered insights that have been helpful for this inquiry. I summarize these findings in the section that follows.
3.2.1 Identifying the nature of learning in museums. Given the complexities of researching history education within an informal learning setting such as a museum, over the past twenty years, Falk and Dierking (2000, 2013) have developed and refined a Contextual Model of Learning which identifies four broad contexts for data analysis: personal, sociocultural, physical, and temporal (Allen et al., 2007, p. 229). This model has been widely used by researchers in science museums, as a way of trying to make sense of how visitors learn in an informal learning setting (Allen et al., 2007; Kydd, 2005; Falk & Dierking, 2000; Anderson et al., 2007). While Falk and Dierking’s model is not specific to middle school students, nor community history museums per se, it can be considered broadly applicable to my research design, because it recognizes (regardless of age or discipline) that “[l]earning begins with the individual. Learning involves others. Learning takes place somewhere” (Falk & Dierking, 2002, p. 36), and learning continues over time (Falk & Dierking, 2000, p. 12).

The Contextual Model of Learning is also particularly relevant to my own research question, because it recognizes the tacit nature of learning in a museum (which in this inquiry manifests itself as historical consciousness). As Duquette (2011) and others have argued (Charland, 2003; Laville, 2003; Rüsen, 2005, 1993; Seixas, 2004), the phenomenon of historical consciousness is not the same as the act of historical thinking—although the two are very closely associated. This is because, while the latter is explicit, the former is tacit. Likewise, while historical thinking can be evaluated and assessed against specific concepts of historical inquiry, historical consciousness cannot. Correspondingly—as Livingstone (2007) has noted—tacit learning within informal settings can be easily underestimated due to the “embedded and taken-for-granted
character” (p. 207) of such learning. If this is the case, then how can one identify (and thus place value upon) learning that is experiential and unbounded? Falk and Dierking have tried to address this challenge through their *Contextual Model of Learning*. Drawing largely upon cognitive research undertaken within a broad variety of museums, educational researchers currently understand the following with regard to the context of learning in a museum setting:

**Personal context.** A correlation has been found to exist between enjoyment and learning (Ash & Wells, 2007, p. 45). Likewise, as Kydd (2005) has noted, tacit learning is emotion-driven and motivated by pleasure. It has also been linked to episodic learning, because the experience is remembered over time (p. 48; Crowley & Jacobs, 2002).

In addition, personal factors such as prior knowledge, interest, motivation, as well as sociocultural beliefs, and prior experiences, all affect how visitors engage with a museum setting (Anderson et al., 2007, p. 200; Fienberg & Leinhardt, 2002; Kelly, 2007; Leinhardt, Tittle & Knutson, 2002; Paris & Mercer, 2002; Stainton, 2002). In turn, these factors are continuously shaped by the cultural institutions with which individuals come into contact, as well as by the day-to-day experiences of living life (Martin, 2007, p. 251).

Thus, the skills and knowledge that students receive through classroom instruction ahead of time (as well as in preparation for their museum visit), contribute to students’ ability to learn when they arrive at a museum setting (Kydd, 2005, pp. 55-56). Ultimately, however, learning will be most memorable when students are given choice over what they wish to learn, and how they wish to control their learning experience (Kydd, 2005, p. 50). Even more importantly, learning will not end with the museum visit.
**Sociocultural context.** While membership in a sociocultural community can be conscious or subconscious (Astor-Jack et al., 2007, p. 219), the sociocultural identity of a visitor seems to shape what they perceive during a museum visit, and what they will remember afterwards (Anderson et al., 2007, p. 202). In addition, “the practice of dialogue improves the possibilities of learning” (Ash & Wells, 2007, p. 3; Borun, 2002; Piscitelli & Weier, 2002)—and such dialogue involves multiple goals as well as multiple voices (Leinhardt & Crowley, 2002). Thus, the sociocultural identity that students bring to a museum setting can change through dialogue, and this dialogue happens on many levels: (a) externally, between students and other visitors/teachers/tour guides; (b) socioculturally, within a student’s identity lens; and (c) internally, between the voices from the past/artifacts/curator (Astor-Jack et al., 2007, p. 223; Feinberg & Leinhardt, 2002; Martin, 2007, p. 254; Morrissey, 2002; Rosenthal & Blankman-Hetrick, 2002; Rowe, 2002). In such a setting, distinguishing “teachers” from “learners” often becomes difficult, since the formal classroom dynamics of teacher-student relationships are often lost (Livingston, 2007, p. 205). Ultimately, then, students gain more learning benefits from dialogue, than from listening to a presentation (Kydd, 2005, pp. 52, 54). In turn, this dialogue can actually change the museum experience in ways that are unintended, and would not occur otherwise (Anderson et al., 2007, p. 206; Astor-Jack et al., 2007, p. 223; Ellenbogen, 2002).

**Physical context.** The kind of thinking students engage in differs from place to place, and from problem to problem (Martin, 2007, p. 249). This is because learning is closely connected to the setting in which the learning takes place (Kydd, 2005, p. 54; Martin, 2007, pp. 249, 254). As a result, students may experience difficulty in extracting
what they have learned from a formal setting, and applying it directly to an informal setting.

Ultimately, however, it is the museum collection itself, and the experience of physical space within a museum, that establishes the focus for learning (Kelly, 2007; Nakou, 2001, pp. 92-93; Rowe, 2002). In addition, what happens after the museum visit will also affect learning elsewhere (Kydd, 2005, p. 56), because the tacit nature of museum learning is often not fully realized until much later, when the experience is combined with that of another setting (Anderson et al., 2007, pp. 200-201; Astor-Jack et al., 2007, p. 223). As a result, revisiting the episodic memory of a museum visit will benefit subsequent learning in a formal setting.

**Temporal context.** Taking time to process information is key to remembering and making meaning within a museum setting (Kydd, 2005, p. 60). As Kydd (2005) has found, a single one-day trip to a museum will seldom result in any in-depth learning, even when the visit is well planned (p. 55). This is because informal learning occurs cumulatively over time, and involves a number of related activities. Thus, learning in a museum setting needs to be planned out as a series of visits and activities, each building upon the other, with ample time for reflection, and each serving as a mediating tool for the next (Ash & Wells, 2007, p. 51).

In addition, over the long-term (one year or more), what will be remembered from a museum visit is mostly contextual information. This type of memory is often referred to as episodic memory (versus semantic memory, which involves facts and concepts). Episodic memories of museum visits are created with ease, and are tied to visitors’ biographies or personal agendas (Anderson et al., 2007, p. 200). Episodic memories are
also vividly shaped and retained over the long-term, through fulfillment of expectations of the museum experience, emotional connection, and memory rehearsal (Anderson et al., 2007, p. 202). Ultimately, then, what is learned from a museum experience will change as a student’s episodic memory changes (or is retained), and new life experiences are added to the mix (Anderson et al., 2007, pp. 200-201).

3.2.2 Factors influencing research designs within informal learning settings. In synthesizing the empirical research about what learning looks like in a museum setting, one can conclude that when developing a research design for an informal setting such as a community history museum, several factors require consideration: (a) the correlation between learning and enjoyment, (b) the role of prior knowledge that students bring to—as well as take away from—a museum experience, (c) the level of choice and control that students are permitted to exercise during a museum experience, (d) students’ own sociocultural identities, (e) the amount of dialogue students are permitted to engage in during a museum experience, (f) the physical space of a museum learning setting, (g) students’ multiple dialogic relationships with the museum collection, (h) the amount of “thinking” time students are permitted to engage in during (and after) a museum experience, (i) the extent to which one museum experience builds upon another, and (j) the sorts of episodic memories that are generated over time as well as how these might relate to semantic memories.

All of these factors point to experience as key to learning in an informal setting. For this reason, it was important to incorporate into my research design, methods for exploring and observing experiential learning. It was also important to address the
complexity of informal learning, as constituting more than just a one-time museum visit—just as Anderson (2007) has pointed out:

… researchers ought to distinguish between three very different effects of museum visits: 1) museum experiences can reinforce prior experiences; 2) they can provide new experiences; and 3) they may spark new experiences. All three aspects are intertwined as individuals meander through their biographies. (p. 211)

3.2.3 Rationale for a phenomenological case study design. Given these multiple factors, I chose a phenomenological case study method for this inquiry, because it would enable in-depth and thick analysis of the lived experience of learning in a community history museum. This method also lent itself well to researching the phenomenon of historical consciousness within two embedded units of analysis: students participating in the lived experience of community history museum fieldwork (n=24), and adult volunteers participating in the same experience (n= five). In keeping with instrumental case study research (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2005), this design choice provided opportunities to explore pragmatic applications for historical thinking within a community history museum setting, as well as the phenomenological meaning both middle school students and volunteers drew from the experience.

My methodological choice was informed by a sociocultural theoretical perspective. As a result, research procedures during the data collection phase were specifically framed around Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning, as well as (during the data analysis phase) Rüsen’s (1987, 1993, 2004, 2005) typology of historical consciousness (Appendix A, 1.6.17). The ultimate intent was to map out any
phenomenological changes that may have occurred regarding participants’ relationship with their past, present, and future.

3.2.4 Defining the case. The single-case design (Figure 4; Yin, 2009, p. 4) was bounded by the context of time (one formal study unit), as well as by the formal arrangement of a classroom (one seventh-grade class), and a specific community history museum fieldwork experience. The case contained two embedded units of analysis: students participating in the experience of community history museum fieldwork as part of their studies (n=24), and adult museum volunteers participating in the same experience as facilitators (n=five).

3.2.5 Describing the informal learning setting. The community history museum where this inquiry took place had been in existence since 1934. Centrally located within a nationally (as well as provincially) designated historic site, the museum had operated in the current location since 1959. The building itself, known locally as The Officers’ Quarters, was built between 1839 and 1853. As a three-story stone structure, reminiscent of many British military barracks built throughout the British Empire during the 19th century, it stood guard in the heart of the city, as a stoic reminder of military colonialism. Up until 1869, British army officers had lived in the barracks, with their families; later, from 1883 until 1914, the same quarters became home for officers of “A” Company.
Infantry School Corps. This regiment was part of Canada's first permanent military force, and was re-named the Royal Canadian Regiment in 1893. Their honours within this timeframe included duty in the North-West Canada Campaign, the South African War, and World War I. Because of these colonial ties, the British flag continued to hang proudly—just outside of the museum entrance.

Boasting a collection of over 30,000 artifacts, displayed in 4,000 square feet of exhibit space, the exhibitions within this museum were not limited to the building’s military ties. The museum collection was considered particularly valuable for its rare and exquisite treasures, ranging from an elaborately hand-carved Wolastoqwey paddle (c. 1878), which was featured in the controversial exhibition *The Spirit Sings: Artistic Traditions of Canada’s First Peoples* at the Glenbow Museum in Calgary, Alberta,\(^{27}\) to fine portraits of the community’s 19\(^{th}\) century Loyalist elite, such as Benjamin Wolhaupter (1800-1857) and Edward Winslow Miller (1773-1847). Also featured in the collection was what is believed to be the original lock and key from the gates of a nearby French fortification (c. 1670-1690), as well as the oldest arrowhead ever found in the province (dating back more than 10,000 years), a fine collection of women’s clothing, and a legendary giant frog (c. 1885). The exhibits, both permanent and temporary, presented a narrative of the community’s history, which reflected the interests and priorities of the museum’s Board of Directors, as well as volunteers, donors, and funding agencies.

The museum was open year-round, although heating during winter months was minimal. Regardless of this limitation, however, the museum offered an education program throughout the school year, which was geared to groups of students. Volunteers

\(^{27}\) For background on this controversy, see Harrison & Trigger (1988).
were always welcome to become involved with these programs, and job descriptions had been posted on-line for those interested. Permanent staff was limited to one executive director, complemented by seasonal staff, ranging in number from two to ten, who were hired upon availability of provincial or federal employment funds.

3.2.6 Recruitment. One seventh-grade classroom was recruited from a middle school located in close proximity to the community history museum where this inquiry took place. Before approaching the potential school, educational authorities were contacted at both provincial and district levels, to ask permission to recruit participants (Appendix B\textsuperscript{28}). Once these permissions were obtained, a letter of request was sent to the principal of the potential school, inviting the participation of one seventh-grade class and their teacher. I also made myself available to explain the inquiry to school authorities, and to respond to any questions or concerns. After a classroom and cooperating teacher were recruited, letters of invitation (including parental consent forms) were sent home with each student. As a result, informed consent was obtained from all but one parent/guardian.

Concurrently, five adult volunteers were recruited from the community history museum. To commence this procedure, an information letter (Appendix B\textsuperscript{29}) was sent to the museum’s Board of Directors, inviting their organisation to participate. I also made myself available to explain the inquiry to board members, as well as staff, and to respond to any questions or concerns. Following this, adult volunteers were recruited in consultation with the museum’s executive director, in order to achieve a sample

\textsuperscript{28} All letters also included a one-page summary.
\textsuperscript{29} Also including a one-page summary
representation. In selecting adult volunteers, a balance of gender, age, and area of interest in history, was all guiding factors.

All volunteers were requested to complete consent forms (Appendix C). They were also required to provide an authorised proof of police clearance for association with the vulnerable sector, as well as validation of having studied and successfully completed New Brunswick’s *Policy 701: Policy for the Protection of Pupils* (http://701.nbed.nb.ca/ and Appendix D).

### 3.3 Researcher Identity

As Merriam (2009) has noted, the position and role of the researcher in any qualitative case study inquiry can greatly influence the outcome of the findings, since the qualitative researcher herself functions as an instrument of research (Creswell, 2009, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2010). Undoubtedly, my own sociocultural identity, as well as life experience, has shaped the lens through which I constructed my research journal observations. Although in terms of sociocultural background, I do not see myself as a member of any specific cultural group, I am a White Anglo-Saxon, middle-class, female, who is well educated. My roots in the community where I live run very deep. My family has lived in New Brunswick for well over 200 years. My husband’s family has lived in various parts of Canada, as well as in Germany for a short while, but their roots are in Nova Scotia, where their ancestors have also resided for over 100 years. My own family tree can be traced back to New York (second generation Scottish immigrant) Loyalists, arriving in present-day New Brunswick in 1783, and Irish immigrants arriving in New Brunswick via West Virginia in 1860. I have
spent many years tracing my family tree (as well as that of my husband’s), so I am well-steeped in my own past.

To place myself within the context of other Canadians (who participated in the *Canadians and Their Pasts* survey), I rank very high in terms of interest in the past. I can be identified among the 61% of New Brunswickers (Conrad et al., 2010) and 66% of Canadians (Dubinsky & Muise, 2008), who place a very high importance upon the history of their family. The past of my religion, ethnic, or cultural group are of minimal importance to me. I identify most with my region—the Maritime Provinces (to which I am very dearly attached)—and this places me within the 27 percentile of New Brunswickers (41% of whom identify with their province instead) (Conrad et al., 2010, p. 18). Like the majority of Canadians (Dubinsky & Muise, 2008), who place their highest level of trust in museums and historic sites, I place my trust in historic sites.

Although I live in a somewhat traditional (middle class) sociocultural setting, I consider myself very open to new ideas and new ways of living. We have travelled extensively, and have purposely sought out culturally exotic adventures: from dining on soul food on styrofoam plates in Harlem, to munching on duck-tongues at Dim Sum in Calgary. So, in terms of Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness (Appendix A, 1.6.17), I would describe myself as open to change, yet deeply devoted to preserving the past. I like to think that I occupy a level four (genetic) relationship with the past, present, and future.

**3.3.1 Researcher as public historian.** I have chosen to live most of my life in New Brunswick, surrounded by history. My warmest recollections are of sitting near the wood stove in my grandparents’ farmhouse kitchen, listening to my grandfather tell stories of
working in the woods as a young boy, of his grandfather’s farm in Zionville, and the lives of all the extended members of his past family. Likewise, my grandmother shared her memories of working as a household labourer in Georgetown, of the night the steeple of Christ Church Cathedral was struck by lightning, and living through the flu epidemic of 1918. As an adolescent, I remember travelling with my parents on Sunday drives to remote areas of New Brunswick to search out burial sites of distant ancestors. By the age of 13, I was actively tracing my family tree, and soon after, became a frequent visitor to the New Brunswick Provincial Archives.

I have never lost this love of the past, and as a result have chosen to work in the field of public history for my entire career. Although I now work largely in the area of administration, I still see myself as a public historian: developing resources and promoting provincial programs, such as Heritage Week and Heritage Fairs, as a way of helping New Brunswickers become more familiar with their pasts. As a public historian, I understand the complexity of history, I appreciate the role of perspective, and I value primary sources. I believe that history is constructed (not found) and that all interpretations of the past are the product of individual (as well as societal) perspectives. Thus, as both producers and consumers of history (in the words of Anaïs Nin), I believe that “[w]e don't see things as they are; we see them as we are” (as cited by Loewen, 1995, p. 252).

3.3.2 Researcher as educator. My experiences as educator have been much more precarious than that of public historian. I began my history education career at the same museum where this inquiry took place, and continued on, to manage a national exhibition

---

30 The actual community name, as well as names of the middle school and community history museum where this inquiry took place, have all been changed to maintain anonymity.
center, as well as to develop education and interpretation programs for a national and provincial historic site. My training in history education has been largely trial and error, combined with reading as much as I could about the practice. More than twenty years of hit or miss experiences in this field has left me frustrated by the gap that seems to exist between classroom instruction in history education and public history practice. As an educator, I see myself as primarily a public historian, working within a broad informal learning setting, to support the social studies curriculum. My vision for public history is that it be accepted as an integral part of the curriculum—not just a filler of class time, or a reward at the end of the school year.

3.3.3 Role of the researcher. As I have outlined in the beginning of this chapter (sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2), the nature of learning in an informal setting is very different from that of a formal setting. Likewise, the nature of instruction is very different as well. Hence, as is typical of a museum educator, my function in this inquiry was to collaborate with the classroom teacher, not become the classroom teacher. My role as researcher was thus collaborator-participant-observer. For this reason, I developed mediational instruments that were intended to complement (rather than replace) regular classroom instruction.

3.4 Instrumentation

In keeping with the sociocultural perspective which informed this inquiry, research instruments were designed around Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning. They were also designed to correlate with three procedural sub-questions outlined in section 1.5. Research instruments included versions of the Canadians and Their Pasts survey, as well as documentation involving open-ended questioning, historic
space mapping, artifact analysis, photovoice, and observation. As with case study method (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Stake 2005, 1995; Yin, 2009), these instruments provided multiple sets of data for triangulation against the central research question.

In the section that follows, I describe each instrument in detail and also explain how each relates to Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) *Contextual Model of Learning* (Table 1). I do this in order to facilitate (as argued in section 3.2) a more complex analysis of “learning” data within an informal learning setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Personal context of learning</th>
<th>Sociocultural context of learning</th>
<th>Physical context of learning</th>
<th>Temporal context of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and post-survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and post-essay questions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic space mapping documentation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material history framework for historical thinking documentation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo voice documentation and interviews</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation field notes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Matrix for examining data collection instruments against Falk and Dierking’s Contextual Model of Learning (Appendix A, 1.6.3)*

3.4.1 **Pre- and post-survey**. In order to situate this case study within a larger national context of research on historical consciousness, I adapted the *Canadians and Their Pasts* survey (Conrad et al, 2013) as both a pre- and post-museum-fieldwork comparison of the role history plays in the life of research participants (students, as well as adults). In order to maintain consistency with the larger national study, I maintained a close allegiance to the original survey, although, since the original was designed to be administered to consenting adults via telephone, some minor revisions were required in
order to enable individual interview responses, and to make certain middle school
students would clearly understand the questions being asked.\(^{31}\) With exception of these
revisions, the same sequence and nature of questioning was preserved from the original
*Canadians and Their Pasts* survey.

**Personal context of learning.** This instrument was intended to establish a context
for the two units of analysis, by identifying the personal interests, activities, and beliefs
that participants held about the past.

**Sociocultural context of learning.** This instrument was also intended to establish a
context for profiling the sociocultural values and identities participants held in relation to
the past.

**Temporal context of learning.** Pre-and post-surveys enabled the data to be
analyzed in terms of change over time.

### 3.4.2 Documentation.

**Essay questions.** Drawing from previous research undertaken by Clarke (1998),
and directed by Jewsiewicki and Létourneau (1998), participants were asked to respond
in writing to the following three open-ended essay questions: What history do I wish to
remember about my country? What history do I wish to remember about New
Brunswick? What history do I wish to remember about Atlantic Canada?

**Personal context.** This thought-provoking instrument was intended to tap into
episodic memory by prompting participants to delve into their personal beliefs and to
formulate a narrative response.

\(^{31}\) Permission to adopt and revise this survey was secured from Margaret Conrad (Conrad, e-mail
correspondence, October 20, 2012).
Sociocultural context. This instrument was also intended to reveal the sociocultural communities with which participants associated—both consciously and subconsciously—by revealing any narrative templates that participants may have shared. Shared narratives have been found to shape what individuals perceive during a museum experience, and what they remember afterwards (Anderson et al., 2007, p. 202).

Temporal context. Participants were asked to respond to these essay questions both before and after their community history museum fieldwork experience. This action enabled an analysis of narrative responses, as change over time.

Historic space mapping. As part of their community history museum fieldwork experience, students were provided with instruction in historic space mapping—as a way of learning how to deconstruct the historical narratives encountered in the museum. Historic space mapping is a curriculum intervention tool that Cutrara (2010) has adopted, as a way of enabling high school students\(^{32}\) to explore relationships with the past. Cutrara (2010) has found that by introducing classroom techniques of mapping the concepts behind historical narratives, students can be empowered to move beyond complacent acceptance of such narratives. Based upon Cutrara’s (2010) findings, the metacognitive benefits of such an intervention tool seemed promising (as a starting point for student self-reflection and critical analysis) because, as Cutrara has suggested, it can enable students to recognize their own pre-existing assumptions about the past, and ultimately allow them to deconstruct underlying relationships of power within the historical narratives they encounter (pp. 4-16). Historic space mapping also seemed very similar to

what Shemilt (2009) has advocated as event-space mapping\textsuperscript{33} (p. 182) —enabling students to link kaleidoscopic “little picture” micro-histories, with broader “big picture” macro-histories—an attribute that Snelson (2011) has also associated with informal learning settings for history education (p. 251).\textsuperscript{34}

Given these reasons, Cutrara’s historic space mapping technique seemed particularly fitting for this inquiry, since in a community history museum students experience narratives in a variety of complex ways (visually, textually, physically, and sensually). Consequently, one could assume that, by adopting historic space mapping for a museum setting, students could be enabled to map out the historical thinking of the curators who created the narratives they encountered.

*Personal context.* This instrument was intended to encourage students to draw upon their own sociocultural beliefs and prior experience, in order to deconstruct the narratives they encountered within the community history museum. In turn, students would be empowered to re-write the community history museum narratives according to their own personal interests, knowledge, historical reasoning processes, and sociocultural motivations.

*Sociocultural context.* This instrument also enabled students to map out the thinking of the curators and historians who created the narratives they encountered in the

\textsuperscript{33} Event-space mapping is defined by Shemilt (2009) as the temporal “geometry” of thinking about the past. It is based upon three assumptions: “… first, the assumption that the contents of the past have locations that can and should be mapped; second, that, like the present, the past contains stories as opposed to things, events and incidents; and thirdly, that, like spinal vertebrae, little stories from the past link up in strange and complex ways to form a big story of the past” (p. 182).

\textsuperscript{34} For other examples of historic space mapping in practice, see Leinhardt & Gregg (2002), as well as van Drie & van Boxtel (2003), and Seixas & Morton (2013).
community history museum, and then make their own thinking visible, by mapping in their own narratives. This would enable learning dialogue on three levels: (a) externally, between students/teacher/researcher/museum volunteers; (b) socioculturally, within the student’s identity lens; and (c) internally, between the voices from the past/artifacts/curator (Astor-Jack et al., 2007, p. 223; Martin, 2007, p. 254).

**Physical context.** This instrument would also empower students to move about the museum and (quite literally) *connect the dots* between exhibits. Hence, the objective was to provide students with the physical experience of actually thinking about history as a constructed narrative that was—as Shemilt (2009) has described—*kaleidoscopic* in nature (p. 182).

**Temporal context.** This instrument was intended to serve as a mediating tool for students as they documented, re-visited, and built upon their analysis during the entire fieldwork experience. It supported the finding that learning occurs cumulatively over time (Ash & Wells, 2007, p. 51).

**Material History Framework for Historical Thinking.** In keeping with the unique nature of museum history domain-knowledge, a material history framework (Appendix E) was adopted and refined (Appendix H, p. 397) as a scaffolding tool for the community history museum fieldwork experience. This instrument required that students first become familiar with the methods of historical inquiry that curators use in museums. As such, this framework also enabled museum volunteers to become actively involved in supporting students’ research—both in the classroom, as well as in the museum. With regard to second order thinking and the six concepts of Historical Thinking, a recently published textbook, *The Big Six Historical Thinking Concepts* (Seixas & Morton, 2013),
was recommended as a classroom instructional guide for the cooperating teacher (although this offer was not taken up). Nevertheless, as part of the inquiry, students were provided with formal classroom instruction in the historical thinking concept of *Evidence and Sources*.

**Personal context.** This instrument was intended to draw upon prior skills and knowledge that students received through formal classroom instruction in the Historical Thinking concept of *Evidence and Sources*. It also empowered students to exercise their own individual choice and control about which museum artifacts they wished to explore, and how they wished to approach their inquiry.

**Sociocultural context.** This instrument was also intended to enable dialogue on three levels: (a) externally, between students/teacher/researcher/museum volunteers; (b) socioculturally, within the student’s identity lens; and (c) internally, between the voices from the past/artifacts/curator (Astor-Jack et al., 2007, p. 223; Martin, 2007, p. 254).

**Physical context.** This instrument challenged students to extract what they had learned from the formal setting of their classroom, and apply their knowledge to the community history museum experience. It also enabled students to move about in the museum space, since they were not required to follow a guided tour nor compulsory plan.

**Temporal context.** This instrument was intended to serve as a mediating tool for students, as they documented, re-visited, and built upon their analysis during the entire fieldwork experience. It supported the finding that learning occurs cumulatively over time (Ash & Wells, 2007, p. 51).

**Photovoice project.** As a key component of the community history museum fieldwork experience, students participated in a photovoice research project designed to
generate dialogue about the museum collection. The project extended over phases two and three of the research design (section 3.5.2, 3.5.3).

Photovoice has been identified by scholars (Strack et al., 2004; Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001; Wilson et al., 2007) as a “powerful” photographic strategy for enabling youth to identify, represent, and bring about change in their communities (Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001, pp. 560-61):

Photovoice is a process by which people can identify, represent, and enhance their community through a specific photographic technique. It entrusts cameras to the hands of people to enable them to act as recorders, and potential catalysts for change, in their own communities. It uses the immediacy of the visual image to furnish evidence and to promote an effective, participatory means for sharing expertise and knowledge (Wang & Burris, 1997, p. 369).

Originally developed by Wang, Burris, and their colleagues, as an educational voice for the disempowered within healthcare (Wang & Burris, 1994, 1997; Wang et al., 1996), photovoice has since been adopted as a participatory research methodology for indigenous peoples (Castleden, Gavin & Huu-ay-aht First Nation, 2008; Poudrier & Mac-Lean, 2009; Wilkin & Liamputong, 2010), homeless people (Killion & Wang, 2000; Wang, Cash & Powers, 2000), elderly people (Novek, Morris-Oswald, & Menec, 2012), women (Killion & Wang, 2000; Poudrier & Mac-Lean, 2009; Schwartz et al., 2007; Wang & Burris, 1994, 1997), and youth (Moss, 1999; Strack et al., 2004; Wilson et al., 2007).

Within the context of youth aged 11 to 19 years, Strack et al. (2004) have found that photovoice can be particularly beneficial for enabling individuals to: (a) use
photographic images to document and reflect on the needs and assets of their community from their own point of view, (b) promote dialogue about salient community issues through group discussion of photographs, and (c) promote social change by communicating issues of both concern and pride to policymakers and society at large (pp. 50; as cited in Wang & Burris, 1994, 1997; Wang et al., 1996).

Within the context this inquiry, photovoice seemed particularly promising, because: (a) it enabled students to document their community history museum experience from their own point of view by focusing upon the artifact collection; (b) it provided a visual point of reference for explicit dialogue relating to The Historical Thinking Project concept of Evidence and Sources, as well as tacit dialogue relating to historical consciousness; and (c) it promoted social change by visually communicating students’ history beliefs to policymakers. In June, 2012, I conducted an informal photovoice pilot activity with a group of seventh-grade students visiting the community history museum where this inquiry took place, and found the instrument to have great potential. Building upon a curriculum design recommended by Strack et al. (2004, p. 55), photovoice was thus integrated into the overall instructional plan (Appendix G), enabling students to document and re-interpret their museum experience in ways that included photography fieldwork (February 1, 15, & 22), photograph-based student group discussions (February 7 & 21), and photograph-based museum project preparation (March 15 – April 27), which culminated in an exhibition opening on April 30.

Personal context. This instrument was intended to empower students to express their own interests regarding the museum’s collection, by turning their attention to where

35 Who in this case study were represented by museum volunteers, and myself as researcher
they wished to focus their historical inquiry. It also provided students with choice and control, on what and how they wish to document their museum fieldwork experience.

*Sociocultural context.* This instrument was particularly beneficial for providing participants with a visual record of student thinking about the past, and thus served as a meditational tool for extended dialogue on three levels: (a) externally, between students/teacher/researcher/museum volunteers; (b) socioculturally, within the student’s identity lens; and (c) internally, between the voices from the past/artifacts/curator (Astor-Jack et al., 2007, p. 223; Martin, 2007, p. 254).

*Physical context.* This instrument also provided participants with a visual record of the artifacts resting within the physical space of the museum, thus maintaining an orientation—and a visual memory of the museum experience—when back in the formal classroom setting.

*Temporal context.* This instrument served as a mediating tool for all participants, enabling them to re-view, re-think, and re-engage in dialogue between (and after) each museum visit. It was designed to support the finding that learning occurs cumulatively over time (Ash & Wells, 2007, p. 51), and that what is learned from a museum experience will change as one’s episodic memory changes (Anderson et al., 2007, pp. 200-201).

*Observation.* Collaborator-participant-observer journal field notes were maintained during all phases of the inquiry, in order to provide support data for triangulation of research evidence (Yin, 2009, p. 117). In addition, video recordings and photography were used (selectively), in order to gather field notes of non-verbal interactions within the community history museum setting (Moyles, 2007, p. 246). In keeping with Falk and

---

36 Media release consent was obtained from all parents/guardians, except for one.
Dierking’s (2000, 2013) *Contextual Model of Learning*, field note data was collected and organized according to four broad categories: personal context, sociocultural context, physical context, and temporal context.

**Interviews.** As a component of the museum fieldwork experience, semi-structured group interviews were conducted with adult participants at specific points in the inquiry. This enabled the researcher to document and record adult impressions of the learning experience. In addition, semi-structured group interviews were conducted near the end of the inquiry with student participants, as part of their photovoice project. In keeping with Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) *Contextual Model of Learning*, this data was also collected and organized according to four broad categories: personal context, sociocultural context, physical context, and temporal context.

**3.4.3 Reliability.** Since the *Canadians and Their Pasts* survey had already been pre-tested and refined for the original inquiry (Canadians and Their Pasts, 2010), the reliability of this instrument was already very high.\(^{37}\) As part of the larger national study, six pre-tests were undertaken (four Anglophone, two Francophone) between September 2006 and March 2007 (Conrad et al., 2013). In addition, four focus group tests were undertaken, in order to verify that participants clearly understood the intent of the questions being asked (Canadians and Their Pasts, 2010). Hence, for adult participants in this inquiry, no further pre-testing was deemed to be required.

---

\(^{37}\) “Six pretests of the questionnaire were competed between September 2006 and March 2007. Two of the pretests were conducted in French, the remaining four were in English. We completed four “think aloud” or cognitive group interviews where respondents were encouraged to explain their understanding of the intent of the questions and how they arrived at their answers. (Two of the cognitive tests were in English and two were in French.) Most of the study investigators were interviewed so they could evaluate the questionnaire from the viewpoint of a survey respondent. Investigators also listened in on pretest interviews and debriefed with the interviewers” (Conrad et al., 2013, p. 177).
Because all of the participants in the national pre-tests were aged 18 years or older, however, it remained questionable as to whether seventh-grade students (aged 12 to 13 years) would clearly understand the questions in the same way as adults. For this reason, the survey used for this inquiry was re-tested with a small focus group of four non-participating seventh-grade students (randomly selected with parental permission), in order to verify that students would clearly understand the intent of the questions being asked.

Reliability in case study research, as Yin (2009) has pointed out, largely depends upon establishing a research protocol that can serve as an audit trail. In short, one must “conduct research as if someone were always looking over your shoulder” (p. 45). To this end, all survey responses and documents were cross-reference coded, so that a documentary trail could be triangulated against each procedural research question.

3.5 Procedures

Given the challenges associated with conducting research within an informal learning setting such as a community history museum (section 3.2.1 and 3.2.2), combined with the precision associated with establishing (and adhering to) a case study research protocol, it was necessary to break the research procedures down into three phases that correlate with Anderson’s (2007) three distinct aspects of the museum experience: (a) “museum experiences can reinforce prior experiences,” (b) “they can provide new experiences,” and (c) “they may spark new experiences” (p. 211). Hence, in terms of research procedures, the community history fieldwork experience was planned out as three distinct phases:
• **Phase one:** Collaborating with the classroom teacher, museum executive director, and museum volunteers, in preparation for the community history museum fieldwork experience, to ensure that participants were prepared to actively engage with the museum exhibits,

• **Phase two:** Documenting participants’ engagement with the community history museum fieldwork experience—as active and independent learners, and

• **Phase three:** Providing time for the learning to be re-interpreted and re-visited as a new experience.

3.5.1 **Phase one: Preparing for the museum experience.** In preparing participants for the community history museum fieldwork experience, the following criteria were adopted for designing the museum activities:

• Does the activity allow for a combination of learning and enjoyment?

• What prior knowledge (in historical inquiry) do students bring to the experience, and are they empowered to make use of this knowledge?

• How much choice and control are students permitted to exercise during the experience?

• Are students permitted to engage in dialogue (both internally and externally) during the experience?

• How will the physical space be utilized?

• Are students permitted to engage with the museum collection directly?

• How much thinking time are students permitted to engage in during (and after) the experience?

---

38 Developed out of the research discussed in section 3.2.
• How does each experience build upon another?

• Are students permitted to re-visit their episodic memories over time (after the experience), and to continue to attach these to semantic memories?

In addition, the following checklist of prior knowledge requirements was followed, in preparation for phase two of the inquiry (as formal classroom instruction):

• Students will require an ability to “read” three-dimensional objects as curators do, and be familiar with using the analytical model of material history inquiry (Appendix H, pp. 394-396).

• Students will require an ability to work in groups, using a digital camera, to document their community history museum fieldwork experience, as part of an extended, project-based learning, classroom unit of instruction.

• Students will require familiarity with basic foreground information (dates, names, and places) associated with the topic of historical inquiry.

• Students will require additional foreground information and procedural domain-knowledge, provided by volunteer museum members in advance (and following) the community history museum fieldwork experience, via classroom visits.

• Students will require an ability to distinguish between evidence and sources (both primary as well as secondary), and also understand how to validate and contextualize sources embedded within a narrative (Appendix H, p. 393).

• Students will have signed up in advance for one of seven working groups, and have formulated their own individual research question.

---

39 Arranged by history themes pre-selected by their teacher (correlating with the seventh-grade social studies curriculum), and based upon the museum collection currently on exhibit. These project groups were: A British soldier’s lifestyle in Georgetown in the 1800’s; Rural life and farming in New Brunswick in
During this phase, all participants (n=29) were asked to complete the *Canadians and Their Pasts* survey. In addition, all participants (n=29) were asked to provide a written response to the open-ended essay questions, outlined in section 3.4.2, in order to establish a benchmark of participants’ existing historical consciousness, and in order to establish a context for analysis. Extensive observational field notes (both written and visual) were also recorded during this phase of the inquiry, in order to provide thick and rich descriptions of the researcher’s experience.

3.5.2 Phase two: Documenting the museum experience. During the community history museum fieldwork experience (which consisted of four museum visits, as well as four classroom visits by museum volunteers), students were invited to document their inquiry through historic space mapping, material history research, and photovoice. These activities unfolded as a sequence of events (designed in collaboration with the cooperating teacher, museum executive director, and museum volunteers) and were framed around two key questions: (a) how do curators do history in a museum? and (b) how can I do history in a museum?

*How do curators do history in a museum?* These activities involved two classroom visits by museum volunteers, and one museum visit by students, in the following order and purpose:

---

*the 1800’s; Lifestyle of Acadians in New Brunswick in the 1800’s; Alexander “Boss” Gibson, commerce, and the lifestyle of workers in Margaretville; First Nation (Wolastokqiyyik, Mi’kmaq, and/or Passamaquoddy) lifestyles in the 1800’s; Lifestyle of the Loyalist elite (“Family Compact”) in Georgetown in the 1800’s; and New Brunswick’s Role in the War of 1812. Students were given the opportunity to choose three options, and were then assigned to a group by the cooperating teacher, based upon individual preference and group compatibility.*
• Classroom visit #1 – January 7, 2013 - Sources and evidence: Museum executive director familiarising students with what she does in the community history museum, how curators look at evidence and sources, and what to expect during the museum visit.

• Museum visit #1 – January 18, 2013 - Narratives - Historic space mapping: Students receiving a standard guided tour of the museum, and familiarising themselves with the narratives they encounter.

• Classroom visit #2 – January 25, 2013 - Tell me about your museum visit: Students engaging in observations and questioning with two of the museum volunteers, about what they found in the museum and the narratives they encountered.

How can I do history in a museum? These activities involved two classroom visits by museum volunteers, and three museum visits by students, in the following order and purpose:

• Museum visit # 2 – February 1, 2013 – Photovoice journaling part I: Students having free rein in the museum to document the collection with cameras, explore the artifact collection, examine their chosen artifact (and exhibits) more carefully, and ask probing questions of the museum volunteers.

• Classroom visit # 3 – February 8, 2013 - What does the museum tell us about the past: Students expanding the discussion with four of the museum volunteers, asking who, what, when, where, and why questions about their chosen artifact source. In response to specific questions posed by the students, adult participants model historical thinking about the artifact source.
• Museum visit # 3 – February 15, 2013 – Material history framework for historical thinking/ Photovoice journaling part II: Students modelling curatorial thinking by examining their chosen artifact source within the context of an exhibit narrative, also gathering observable data about their artifact source using the Material History Framework for Historical Thinking, consulting the artifact accession file, and engaging in dialogue with museum volunteers about their artifact source.

• Museum visit # 4 – February 22, 2013 - Material history framework for historical thinking/ Photovoice journaling part III: Students in full charge of the museum tour, leading the group through the exhibit spaces, and speaking about each of their artifact sources (using evidence gathered via the Material History Framework for Historical Thinking). Adults simply listen.

• Classroom visit # 4 – March 1, 2013 – Historic space mapping: Students expanding upon previous discussions with museum volunteers, by independently mapping (as a research group) the exhibition related to their chosen artifact source—and contextualising each chosen artifact within the larger museum narrative.

3.5.3 Phase three: Re-interpreting the museum experience. The primary objective of this phase of the research was to enable participants to reflect upon their community history museum fieldwork experience, and to re-interpret their understandings in ways that were meaningful to them.

During this phase of the research, students were actively working in groups (during class time), preparing and discussing their museum (photovoice) projects. This entailed:

• Working in thematically-based groups to analyze their artifact photographs (using a Material History Framework for Historical Thinking—Appendix H, p. 397),
organize evidence, establish historical significance, and map out connections (using historic space mapping),

- Preparing storyboards for their museum exhibition (Appendix H, p. 398),
- Writing artifact labels according to museum standards,
- Preparing oral explanations based upon the original research question,
- Preparing for final exhibition day (April 30, 2013).

Near the end of this phase of the inquiry, group interviews were conducted with each of the seven student working-groups (containing random purposeful study-samples), in order to gain insight into their thinking about evidence and sources, as well as their sense of historical significance, and to reflect back upon their experience.

An open-ended interview protocol was adapted from Levstik and Barton (2008) as follows:

1. Why did you choose this artifact for your inquiry?
2. If you could have selected absolutely any artifact in the museum, which one would you have selected? Why?
3. What meaning does the artifact reveal? Do you think it is important? Does it really belong in a museum? Why or why not?
4. If you were doing this project in fifth- or sixth-grade, do you think your choices would have been different? Why or why not?
5. Did you prepare a Heritage Fair project last year?
6. If someone older, like your parents or grandparents, visited the museum what artifact do you think they would choose for their project? Why?
7. Looking back on this entire project, beginning in January, what did you like the most—and what did you like the least? What should we do differently another time?

Upon completion and exhibition of the student projects (to which all museum volunteers, as well as parents/guardians, and the museum board of directors were invited), post-survey and post-open-ended essay questions were conducted with all participants (n=28), in order to establish an overall comparison of change over time, and in order to obtain specific data for triangulation.\(^4\) Immediately after the exhibition event, one open-ended reflection meeting was conducted with the museum volunteers, as a focus group activity (n=4).

3.5.4 Trustworthiness. Creswell (2009) has recommended several strategies for assessing the accuracy of data interpretation: triangulation; member checking; rich, thick descriptions; reflexivity; prolonged time in the field; peer debriefing; and external audits (pp. 190-192).

**Triangulation.** For this study, a data source triangulation strategy was employed. This involved six sources of data, cross-referenced across four specific learning contexts (Table 1, p. 64), and aligned with three specific procedural sub-questions

**Member checking.** Because a great deal of time had passed between when participants engaged in fieldwork activities and when transcription of the interview data was completed, I was not able to undertake full member checks with participants. During focus group interviews with students, however, I offered them the opportunity to verify and expand upon the visual and written documentation that they had created. I also provided adult participants with an opportunity to verify and expand upon specific aspects of their interviews that were actually included in this dissertation.

\(^4\) This was administered approximately one month after the April 30 event.
Rich, thick descriptions. Collaborator-participant-observer journal field notes were maintained during all phases of the inquiry, in order to provide rich and thick descriptions of the phenomenon being experienced by all participants, including myself.

Reflexivity. My own researcher identity has been revealed within this dissertation. In addition, every attempt was made (within collaborator-participant-observer journal field notes) to reflect upon how my personal and sociocultural identity impacted my perspective on the experience.

Prolonged time in the field. Data collection for this inquiry involved more than 12 months of planning and implementation, four months of which involved intensive, immersive, participation in the field.

Peer debriefing. I communicated regularly with my research supervisor, as well as with my supervisory committee, to discuss my data, data analysis procedures, and findings. In addition, I continued to seek peer review of my research, through presentations at scholarly conferences, as well as Works in Progress sessions hosted by the Faculty of Education at the University of New Brunswick.

External audits. By maintaining transparency in data collection procedures, as well as by maintaining a documentary trail for each participant, I strove to do as Yin (2009) has suggested, and “conduct research as if someone were always looking over your shoulder” (p. 45). As a result, I provided my research supervisor, as well as my supervisory committee, with detailed reports on my data findings, in order to facilitate external audits.

3.5.5 Ethical considerations. As Leadbeater and Glass (2006) have noted, community-based research involving vulnerable populations such as youth under the age
of 18, can present many ethical dilemmas regarding “informed consent, reporting requirements, confidentiality, and the dissemination of findings” (p. 252). To this end, all of the research undertaken as part of this inquiry adhered to Canada’s Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (2010). This policy document draws particular attention to three core principles of research ethics: (a) respect for persons, (b) concern for welfare, and (c) justice. (Canadian Institutes of Health Research et al., 2010, p. 8).

With regard to respect for persons, the following mechanisms were adopted to ensure participants’ autonomy:

**Informal consent:** Every opportunity was made to communicate to all participants (including volunteer heritage community members, parents, students, and school officials) the rationale, procedures, time commitments, benefits, and risks of participating in this study. All participants were informed that they were being invited to participate, and were under no obligation to do so; they were also informed that they were free to withdraw at any time without prejudice or loss of marks. Evidence of signed consent is currently safeguarded by the researcher; all data is also being stored in a locked filing cabinet (or on a password protected computer), and will be destroyed five years following the completion of the last publication relating to this research.

**Usage of Images:** Media releases were obtained in order to establish permission for photographing participants during fieldwork, as well as classroom activities. It was also made clear that these images were only for the purpose of documentation, triangulation, and future (non-profit educational) public exhibition. Any identifiable features within the images (i.e., faces, school emblems) would not be made public.
Ongoing consent: Consent was maintained throughout the entire period of the inquiry, and I also continued to make myself available, on a regular weekly basis, to respond to any questions students, parents, teachers, school principals, district administrators, ministerial staff, museum executive director, museum volunteers, my research committee, or my research supervisor may have had. My intent was to “seek feedback from the participants about their understanding of their rights with respect to the inquiry or intervention, and continue to assess their consent throughout the research in order to sustain their protection and freedom of choice” (Leadbeater & Glass, 2006, p. 261).

With regard to concern for welfare, the following mechanisms were adopted to ensure that participants’ quality of life remained unharmed:

Protection of the vulnerable sector: All adult participants who were not part of the school system (i.e., myself, museum executive director, and museum volunteers) were required to provide an authorised proof of police clearance for association with the vulnerable sector, as well as validation of having studied and successfully completed New Brunswick’s Policy 701: Policy for the Protection of Pupils (http://701.nbed.nb.ca/).

Anonymity of research participants: In this dissertation (and all related public presentations) pseudonyms, as well as fictional place names, have been used throughout. Images were only captured of those participants who provided informed consent, and no identifiers (actual or fictional) are associated with these images, so that imagery containing participants remain independent and unlinked to other data. In addition, images containing any identifiable features (i.e., faces, school emblems) have not been
made public. Personal information about all participants, and any additional data that might link pseudonyms with actual names, have been safeguarded by the researcher.

**Minimal risk:** Participation in this inquiry was of minimal risk, because all of the research was undertaken during regular class time, as part of a formal unit of instruction within New Brunswick’s social studies curriculum. As a result, I asked no more of student participants than would be expected from a unit of study. Likewise, I asked no more of museum volunteers than would be expected from a specialised educational outreach program.

With regard to justice, the following mechanisms were adopted to ensure fairness and equity in research participation:

**Partial disclosure or deception:** No partial disclosure or deception was associated with this inquiry. All participants were treated with equal respect and concern. I did also “strive for transparency and openness with participants in the research process” (Leadbeater & Glass, 2006, p. 260).

**Inclusiveness:** All participants wishing to participate in this inquiry were accepted for inclusion, regardless of their cultural background, language, religion, race, ability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, academic standing, gender, or age.

**Distribution of research:** On the consent forms, participants were given the opportunity to request a written summary of the research upon completion. The research design was also shared with parents/guardians and students during the final exposition that took place on April 30, 2013. All participants (including parents and guardians) were invited to this event.
3.6 Summary

This chapter has described the research design and rationale for adopting a phenomenological case study methodology. I have defined the case, as well as the learning setting, I have reflected upon my own identity as a researcher, and I have described the research procedures in detail. Data collected as part of this study included versions of the Canadians and Their Pasts survey, as well as documentation involving open-ended questioning, historic space mapping, artifact analysis, photovoice, and observation.

My methodological choice was informed by a sociocultural theoretical perspective. As a result, research procedures during the data collection phase were specifically framed around Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning. The ultimate intent of this design was to map out the phenomenon of historical consciousness over a bounded period of time, and to document any changes that may have occurred regarding participants’ relationship with their past, present, and future.

In the chapter that follows I lay out my findings according to Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) model, and (where possible) analyze the results against Rüsen’s (1993) typology of historical consciousness. In so doing, I deconstruct each data set in preparation for triangulation in chapter 5.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

“...if I said King Henry had a rolex [sic] watch and a convertible no one’s going to believe me but at museums when they have all this nolege [knowledge] there [sic] pretty trust worthy.”

(Diane D., 2013 – student participant)

4.1 Introduction

In the section that follows, I present data results from each research instrument, organising each within the framework of Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning (Table 2). Where applicable, I then proceed to analyze these findings against the three procedural sub-questions that have guided this inquiry:

1. Can formal classroom instruction, adopting The Historical Thinking Project concepts for historical thinking, enable middle school students to think historically about the narratives they encounter within their community history museum?

2. Does participation in history museum fieldwork activities deepen the historical consciousness of middle school students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal context of learning</th>
<th>Sociocultural context of learning</th>
<th>Physical context of learning</th>
<th>Temporal context of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and post-survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and post-essay questions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic space mapping</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material history framework</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for historical thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photovoice documentation and</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Field notes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Matrix for examining data collection instruments against Falk and Dierking’s Contextual Model of Learning (Appendix A, 1.6.3)
3. Does student collaboration with older members of this volunteer heritage community deepen the historical consciousness of the older members themselves?

4.2 Data Overview

In keeping with the sociocultural perspective that informs this inquiry, the research instruments selected for this study included versions of the *Canadians and Their Pasts* survey, as well as documentation involving open-ended questioning, historic space mapping, artifact analysis, photovoice, and observation. As with case study method (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Stake 2005, 1995; Yin, 2009), these instruments were chosen to obtain multiple sets of data that could be triangulated against the central research question.

**4.2.1 Describing the embedded units of analysis.** In total, 24 students and five adults (not including myself) participated in this inquiry. All of the students were members of a single seventh-grade social studies class, within a publically operated middle school, located in the heart of a downtown community. This middle school provided an ideal setting for the community history museum fieldwork experience, since it was located within 10 minutes walking distance from the museum where the inquiry took place. As a result, students could walk to the museum, participate in a 40-minute activity, and return to school, all within the timeframe of their social studies class.

**Student sampling.** The student sampling constituted an entire seventh-grade social studies class, who had been assigned to the project by their principal and cooperating teacher. The unit contained a composite of 10 female, and 14 male students. All of these students ranged in age between 11 to 14 years, and all but four had been born in Canada.
In addition, all of the students were enrolled in the course because they were required to do so, since social studies is a mandatory subject in seventh grade.

By nature of its heritage setting, the student learning environment seemed particularly conducive to this inquiry. With a total population of 632 students, occupying 28 classrooms, and four specialty rooms, the Classical-revival-style middle school stood (and continues to stand) as a historic landmark in the city. For well over 80 years, it has functioned as a public school building, having first served as a municipal high school.

Outside (and immediately next door) where one might otherwise expect to find student recreational facilities, stands a large (and ornately enclosed) Loyalist burial ground, where many of community’s founding citizens are memorialised. Containing graves dating back to as early as 1787, this burial ground is recognised as a Local Historic Place, and is considered the most historically important cemetery in New Brunswick.

Inside (and immediately upon entering the building) the past remains ever present. Although layered with paint and battered with wear, almost all of the original interior building features remain largely intact. In this school, students are—quite literally—surrounded by a sense of the past.

**Adult sampling.** The adult sampling for this inquiry constituted a group of five volunteers, who had been recruited by the researcher (in consultation with the museum executive director) to participate in the project. All were deeply involved with museum operations, and all were well-versed in the care and handling of artifacts. The group represented a composite of three female and two male adults, two of whom were aged

---

41 Based upon 2012 enrollment figures.
younger than 55 years, and three of whom were older than 55 years. All but one of the volunteers had been born in Canada (the other had been born in England).

Upon commencing this inquiry, each volunteer provided a personal profile, regarding their involvement with the community history museum, and why they had agreed to participate:

Mary R. Executive director of the museum, Mary is the sole permanent full-time paid employee. She is responsible for overall management, and has been actively involved with the museum for five years. Her responsibilities include children’s programming, collections management, exhibit development, as well as installation, and general operations. Mary agreed to participate in this inquiry because she felt that the subject matter was relevant to her work—and was thus important to her. Through participation, she hoped to achieve “a better understanding of education in an informal environment” (Mary R., 2013).

Lucy K. PhD candidate in Canadian history, and a certified public school teacher, Lucy has been volunteering with the museum for 15 years. Initially, she became involved with public programming when her friend was the executive director. Later, as a university student in education, she returned to the museum to develop a series of “History Hunts.” Through the years, Lucy has remained dedicated to the education of children and youth. She enjoys working with children, and developing children’s programming that “engages…and intrigues…about the past” (Lucy K., 2013). In this context, Lucy sees the museum as “an alternative learning environment—a classroom of a different sort and setting” (Lucy K., 2013). Lucy agreed to participate in this inquiry because she felt that it reflected her own interests in “exposing students to the past.”

Pseudonyms have been used throughout this dissertation.
Through participation, she hoped to “inspire even just one participant” (Lucy K., 2013) with an interest in history.

Ellen E. Member of the museum board of directors, as well as exhibits and collections committee, Ellen has been volunteering with the museum for more than 40 years. Over this timespan, she has taken on many volunteer roles on the board of directors, including social convener for society lectures, secretary, programming committee member, editor of the newsletter, chairperson, co-curator of the Georgetown Notables: The 19th Century Gallery exhibition, and (most recently) member of the exhibits and collections committee. Ellen agreed to participate in this inquiry simply because she thought that she “might be of some assistance” (Ellen E., 2013). Through participation, she hoped to achieve the personal satisfaction of “being of help in any way” (Ellen E., 2013).

Charles B. Member of the museum board of directors, as well as exhibits and collections committee member, “Chuck” is a retired public school teacher who has been volunteering with the museum for approximately five years. His primary duties include volunteer tour guide, and (most recently) he has curated the exhibition New England Planters of Shefferville/Maugerfield, 1763-2013. Charles agreed to participate in this inquiry because he “thought it would be interesting to take part in a project involving the museum and students” (Charles B., 2013). Through participation, he hoped to be able to “help students learn more about history through the artifacts of our museum” (Charles B., 2013).

Murray G. Member of the museum board of directors and currently chair of the War of 1812 committee, Murray holds a PhD in Canadian military history, and is a
retired member of the Canadian Armed Forces. He began his volunteer activities with the museum about 14 years ago, as a member of the exhibits and collections committee, and has since served as secretary to the board. Murray agreed to participate in this inquiry because “it seemed interesting” (Murray G., 2013). He stated, however, that he was uncertain as to what he might achieve.

4.3 Pre- and Post-Survey

In order to situate this phenomenological case study within a larger Canadian context of research on historical consciousness, the Canadians and Their Pasts survey was adopted as both a before and after point of comparison for the community history museum fieldwork experience.

During phase one of data collection, all participants (including myself) were asked to complete an abbreviated version of the Canadians and Their Pasts survey (Appendix F), as well as four open-ended essay questions. For the students (n=24), this was undertaken as a class activity that extended over four days; for the museum volunteers (n=five), this was undertaken as a single independent activity in preparation for the volunteer assignment.

At the end of phase three, portions of the same survey, and three of the original open-ended questions, were re-administered to all of the participants. For the students (n=23), this activity took place as a single classroom activity; for the museum volunteers (n=five), this was undertaken as a single independent activity. Both were timed to take place more than one month after participants had completed the community history museum fieldwork experience.
Survey data was subsequently analyzed quantitatively against the larger *Canadians and Their Pasts* (provincial/national) survey, as well as coded qualitatively against the *a priori* theoretical framework of Rüsen’s (1993) typology of historical consciousness (Appendix A, 1.6.17). Findings were then structured for presentation according to Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) *Contextual Model of Learning* (Appendix A, 1.6.3).

4.3.1 Personal context of learning. Pre-survey data was collected for the purpose of identifying the personal interests, activities, and beliefs that participants held about the past.

**Pre-survey findings.** Upon our first meeting on January 9, students were asked to complete section A (*General Interest in History*) and a portion of section B (*Activities Related to the Past*). No introductory discussions were initiated, since it was felt that this might influence students’ responses. The class was simply asked to respond to the questions as candidly as possible, and they were also reassured that there were no *right* or *wrong* answers. Two days later, on January 11 (the next scheduled social studies class), students completed section B, and then participated in an introductory museum activity entitled *Shoe Stories* (see Section 4.6.1). The following week (Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday respectively) students completed sections C (*Understanding the Past*), D (*Trustworthiness of Sources of Information about the Past*), and E (*The Importance of the Past*), as a warm-up activity to their regularly scheduled social studies class. Again, no introductory discussions were initiated, and students were simply asked to respond to the questions as candidly as possible.

Similarly, the five adult participants were asked to complete an on-line version of the same set of survey questions in advance of our first meeting on January 11. As a
result, the entire *Canadians and Their Pasts* survey, as well as four open-ended essay questions, were completed individually before we came together to discuss the project. Hence, participants were not provided with any advance opportunity to discuss their responses amongst themselves. Figures 5 through 12 provide a detailed summary of student and adult pre-survey results.

*General interest in history (section A).* With regard to general interest in history, few in the seventh-grade case study class (17%) reported that they were “very” interested in history, a level that was significantly lower than either of the *Canadians and Their Pasts* (Conrad et al., 2010) provincial (31%) or national (33%) adult samplings (Figure 5, p. 95). In addition, students reported a significantly lower “very” interest in family history (21%), than either provincial (61%) or national (52%) adult samplings; and a comparatively lower “very” interest (21%) in Canadian history than either provincial (40%) or national (32%) adult samplings.

Unlike adult participants in this inquiry—all five of whom reported that they were “very interested” in history—only 17% of the students reported a similar level of enthusiasm for the discipline. Instead, a majority (62%) of the students classified themselves as “somewhat interested” in history in general. This percentage level was significantly larger than for those reporting a similar level of interest in Canadian history (46%) or family history (42%).

*Participation (over last 12 months) in activities related to the past (section B).* In some ways, seventh-grade students reported similar patterns of participation in activities related to the past (Figure 6, p. 95), as adult samplings from *Canadians and Their Pasts* (Conrad et al., 2010). Similar to their provincial and national adult counterparts, many
students had spent time (over the previous 12 months) looking at old photographs (75%), watching history movies (67%), participating in family oriented activities related to

**Figure 5: General interest in history pre-survey**

**Figure 6: Participation in activities related to the past (over last 12 months) pre-survey.**
documenting their family’s history (58%), and visiting historic sites (42%). Unlike their provincial and national adult counterparts, more students had spent time researching history on the Internet (62%), visiting museums (54%), participating in crafts and hobbies (37%), playing computer history games (25%), and visiting archives or archival web sites (25%); while fewer students had spent time passing on family heirlooms (33%), reading history books (33%), visiting a place from the family past (46%), or creating a family tree (8%).

In addition, of the activities that seventh-grade students reported having participated in over the previous 12 months, reading history books had been primarily a classroom activity (54% inside the classroom, versus 33% outside); while researching history on the Internet was evenly distributed (62%) as an activity that students had engaged in both inside and outside of classroom time (Figure 7). Similarly,

![Figure 7: Participation in activities related to the past (over last 12 months) – within classroom versus outside of classroom (NB case study students).](image)

---

43 Survey question B4: Are you (or a family member) preparing a family scrapbook, cookbook, keeping a diary, writing a family history, or making home movies? Student percentages for each: family scrapbook (25%), cookbook (17%), keeping a diary (4%), writing a family history (12%), or making home movies (12%).
less popular activities, such as visiting archives or archival web sites (29% versus 25%), playing computer history games (12% versus 25%), and creating a family tree (12% versus 8%), were also quite evenly distributed as both inside and outside of classroom activities.

Outside of classroom time, students primarily reported looking at old photographs (75%), as well as watching history movies (67%), documenting their family’s history\(^{44}\) (58%), visiting museums (54%), or places from their family’s past (46%), and historic sites (42%), or engaging in other heritage activities (37%) such as drawing and collecting stamps. To a lesser extent, they reported reading history books (33%), visiting archives or archival web sites (25%), playing computer history games (25%), passing on family heirlooms (33%), or creating a family tree (8%).

As might be expected (given their involvement in museum volunteer activities), adult case study participants in this inquiry reported high levels of participation (over the previous 12 months) in activities related to the past. They had all looked at old photographs, watched history movies, read history books, visited museums, archives, and historic sites, as well as participated in other activities that included history research and exhibits preparation. Undoubtedly, with the exception of two specific activities—passing on family heirlooms (one person) and playing history computer games (no one)—these individuals surpassed provincial and national standards in all categories.\(^{45}\) In this context, they could be considered above provincial and national norms.

---

\(^{44}\) Survey question B4. See previous footnote for a breakdown of categories for this question.

\(^{45}\) The only slight exception to this finding was with regard to visiting places from the family past, in which adult responses across all sample groups were very similar.
Drawing comparisons between the two case study units of analysis (five adult participants and 24 seventh-grade students), it is apparent that both were strikingly similar, as well as dissimilar, in two distinct ways. First, within the domain of family oriented activities, both were alike in that equally few of either the seventh-grade students or adult participants reported being engaged in passing on family heirlooms (33%). Second, the two participant units were dissimilar, in that none of the adults had participated in playing computer history games over the previous 12 months, while 25% of the students had engaged in history in this way.

Figure 8: Activities related to the past pre-survey – How each helps in understanding the past (NB case study students and adults)

Understanding the past (section C1). While the largest proportion of seventh-graders reported that museums were helpful a “great deal” (54%) in understanding the past (Figure 8), more reported that watching movies (63%), looking at old photographs (58%), and playing computer history games (58%) were “somewhat” helpful in understanding the past. In addition, while a minority of students (21%) found playing
computer history games to be “very” helpful in understanding the past, an equal percentage (21%) thought they were “not at all” helpful.

By comparison, however, adult case study participants in this inquiry reported almost unanimously (all but one) that museums, historic sites, looking at old photographs, watching movies, reading history books, and creating a family tree were all helpful in understanding the past a “great deal.” In addition, all of the adults felt that visiting places from their family past helped a “great deal,” while three of the adults conversely felt that playing computer games was “not at all” helpful.

Figure 9: Activities related to the past pre-survey – How each helps in connecting with the past (NB case study students and adults).

Connecting with the past (section C3). It is somewhat contradictory that although the largest proportion of these seventh-graders reported that museums were “very” helpful in understanding the past, when considering ways of connecting with the past (Figure 9), few considered museums to be “very” helpful (25%). Instead (although the percentages were not significantly high in any of the categories), slightly more students reported that visiting family places (29%), creating a family tree (29%), or reading
history books (29%) helped them to be “very connected” to the past. Likewise, many (63%) found watching history movies to be “somewhat” helpful in understanding the past; many also found history movies to be “somewhat” helpful (42%) in connecting with the past. A lesser percentage of students also considered history lectures (37%), along with looking at old photographs (33%), visiting museums (33%), and historic sites (33%), to be “somewhat” helpful as well. Furthermore, some students were indifferent towards the usefulness of historic sites (33%), family places (21%), museums (21%), history books (21%), or the Internet (21%) as connecting them with the past—responding that these sources of historical information made no difference to them.

Unlike seventh-graders, however, adult case study participants in this inquiry were in unanimous agreement that creating a family tree helped them in being “very connected” with the past. Most also felt that visiting family places (all but one), as well as looking at old photographs (three out of five), and visiting historic sites (three out of five) were also helpful activities for becoming “very connected”; while reading history books (all but one), watching history movies (three out of five), visiting museums (three out of five), and engaging in crafts or hobbies (three out of five) were proportionately “somewhat” helpful. In addition, unlike their seventh-grade counterparts, there were no “makes no difference” responses amongst adult participants, towards any of the suggested activities—although, with regard to playing history computer games, all but one of the adults responded that they did not know.

4.3.2 Sociocultural context of learning. Pre-survey data was collected for the purpose of identifying the sociocultural values and identities participants held in relation to the past.
**Pre-survey findings.** During the second week of the inquiry, students continued to complete sections of the *Canadians and Their Pasts* survey as a warm-up activity to their regularly scheduled social studies class. On Tuesday (January 15), they completed section C (*Understanding the Past*), as well as a second open-ended essay question. Then, on the following day (January 16), they completed section E (*The Importance of Various Pasts*), as well as a third open-ended essay question. On Thursday (January 17), students finished off the exercise with section F (*A Sense of the Past*) as well as completed the final open-ended essay question. As in previous days, no introductory discussions were initiated, and students were simply asked to respond to the questions as candidly as possible.

![Figure 10: Most important past pre-survey (NB case study students and adults versus New Brunswick and Canada)](image)

1. Statistics for New Brunswick and Canada obtained from Conrad, Dubé, Northrup, & Owens, 2010. Findings from New Brunswick are not included within the Canada figures. Adult respondents in the national survey also ranked their religion (14% New Brunswick, 8% Canada), as well as Other (13% New Brunswick, 25% Canada); the national survey did not include the option of "My country where I was born".

**The importance of various pasts (section E).** When asked to rank the personal importance of their family’s past against that of their ethnic/cultural group, Canada, New Brunswick, or country of birth, the largest proportion of participants in this inquiry
ranked their family’s past as “most important” to them (Figure 10). These findings are significant because they indicate similarities across sample groups, since—like provincial (63%) and national (52%) adult respondents—the largest majority of seventh-grade students (71%), and three out of five adult participants, ascribed their highest level of importance to their family’s past.

Participants’ reasoning for ranking their family’s past as most important ranged from simple emotional connections, to knowing how particular individuals were interconnected, or establishing broader connections to aspects of history. For instance, examples of students’ statements of significance were as follows:

- “Because I love my family” (Owen T., 2013);
- “Because my family does maple syrup and sells it to people, and my grampy was in the war” (Patsy M., 2013);
- “Because, although I don't know much about it now, I really want to know more about my family” (Matt J., 2013);
- “Because it's important to know about the past of everything and it's best to know most about yourself” (Cathy A., 2013);

Likewise, adult participants’ statements of significance were also remarkably similar:

- “Family is all important” (Murray G., 2013);
- “It is the past that is responsible for me being here” (Mary R., 2013);
- “I want to find out where we fit into the scope of regional history” (Charles B., 2013);
“The history of New Brunswick is the cumulation of all our pasts, all different families and communities - our shared history keeps us connected to each other even though we are strangers” (Lucy K., 2013).

While none of the seventh-graders valued New Brunswick’s past as “most important” (Figure 11), more than half of the students (58%) identified New Brunswick’s past as “somewhat important” to them, followed by Canada’s past (42%) and the past of the country where they were born (37%). It is also significant to note that a large proportion of the students (62%) indicated that they did not identify with Atlantic Canada’s past at all.

A sense of the past (section F). With regard to thinking about history and the past, the largest proportion of seventh-grade students (50%) agreed with the statement that they think about the past mostly when in museums, or when watching a history documentary (Figure 12). These findings are somewhat similar to provincial (44%) and national (54%) adult samplings from Canadians and Their Pasts (email correspondence
Thinking about history and the past (NB case study students and adults versus New Brunswick and Canada).

Where case study students differed, however, was that very unlike provincial (51%) and national (42%) samplings, very few students (8%) agreed with the statement that they think about history and the past as part of their everyday life. In addition, a substantial percentage of students (33%) reported that neither statement was close to what they thought.

Conversely, adult participants in this inquiry reported a very different sense of the past (compared to both seventh-grade participants and other adult samplings). This is because, unlike any of the others, all but one of the adult participants in this inquiry agreed with the statement that they think about history and the past as part of their everyday life (Figure 12). Likewise, none of the adults reported that they think about history and the past mostly when in museums, or when watching a history documentary (although one of the adults indicated that they thought both statements were accurate).
4.3.3. Temporal context of learning. Post-survey data was also collected with the goal of identifying longitudinal changes in participants’ interests in history and the past.

Post-survey findings. In the interest of establishing a temporal context for learning, portions of the same Canadians and Their Pasts survey were administered a second time to the same two case study units, more than a month after all of the participants had completed their community history museum fieldwork experience. For the student sampling (n=23) this post-survey was undertaken as a single social studies classroom activity on June 7, 2013, and was limited to sections A (General Interest in History), D (Trustworthiness of Sources of Information About the Past), E (The Importance of Various Pasts), and F (A Sense of the Past). For the adult sampling (n=four), the same post-survey (limited to the same sections) was undertaken as a single activity, which was completed independently over several weeks. As with the pre-survey, all participants were asked to respond to the questions as candidly as possible. Figures 13 through 23 provide a detailed summary of student and adult post-survey results.

General interest in history (section A). With regard to general interest in history, post-survey results indicate that more than a month after their community history museum fieldwork experience, fewer students within the seventh-grade group reported a “very” or “somewhat” interest in history (Figure 13). In addition, more students reported that they were now “little or not at all interested” in history in general. Nevertheless, slightly more students now reported a “very” or “somewhat” interest in family history, and fewer reported that they were now “little or not at all interested” in family history. In addition, while fewer students now reported that they were “very” interested in Canadian

---

46 The last participant completed the activity on August 16. In total, all but one adult participant and one student completed the post-survey.
history, and slightly more indicated that they were now “little or not at all interested,” slightly more also reported that they were now “somewhat” interested in Canadian history. Overall, these figures suggest a rather static level of student interest in history.

![General Interest in History - Pre versus Post Survey Results (NB Case Study - Students and Adults)](image)

**Figure 13:** General interest in history pre- versus post-survey results (NB case study students and adults).

Correspondingly, all of the adult participants continued to report that they were “very interested” in history in general, as well as their family’s history, and Canadian history.

*The importance of various pasts (section E).* When asked (more than one month after the community history museum fieldwork experience) to rank the personal importance of their family’s past against that of their ethnic/cultural group, Canada, New Brunswick, or country of birth, the largest proportion of participants in this inquiry continued to rank their family’s past as “most important” to them (Figure 14).
Participants’ reasoning for this had not changed a great deal. Student responses continued to range from simple emotional connections, to knowing how particular individuals interconnected, or establishing broader connections to larger aspects of history:

- “Well, there [sic] the ones who raised me, and took care of me and love me” (Patsy M., 2013);
- “Because my family is a part of history” (Owen T., 2013);
- “Because it is interesting” (Cathy A., 2013);
- “Teaches me who I am” (Jun D., 2013).

Likewise, adult participants’ statements as to why their family’s past was most important also remained remarkably similar:

- “It is the part that is most relevant” (Mary R., 2013),
- “It is who we are” (Murray G., 2013).

Figure 14: Most important past pre- versus post-survey results (NB case study students and adults).
Nevertheless, while post-survey findings indicated a continuance (Figure 15) across study groups, a slightly larger proportion of students now identified New Brunswick’s past, as well as Canada’s past, as “somewhat important.” Likewise, the proportion of students who identified the past of the country where they were born as “somewhat important” had also slightly increased to 48%. Significantly, an overall pattern of increase was evident in student rankings—across all categories of pasts—within the values of “very” and “somewhat” important, while a slight pattern of decrease was evident, within the values of “not very important” and “not at all important” (with exception to the category of “my ethnic or culture group”). In addition, fewer students now reported that they did not identify with Atlantic Canada as a region.

*Figure 15: Importance of various pasts pre- versus post-survey results (NB case study students)*

With regard to changes in students’ thinking about history and the past, post-survey findings indicate that after participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience, a slightly
Figure 16: A sense of the past pre- versus post-survey results – Thinking about history and the past (NB case study students and adults).

A larger proportion of seventh-grade students agreed with the statement that they think about history and the past mostly when in museums or when watching a history documentary (Figure 16). In addition, slightly more students now agreed with the statement that they think about history and the past as part of their everyday life, while fewer students reported that neither statement was close to what they thought.

Correspondingly, with regard to changes in adult participants’ thinking about history and the past, post-survey results were very clear. Quite simply, none of the adults continued to agree with the statement that they think about history and the past mostly when in museums or when watching a history documentary. Instead, all of the adults (versus all but one previously) now agreed that they think about history and the past as part of their everyday life.

Trustworthiness of sources of information about the past (section D7). Since it has been noted by the authors of the Canadians and Their Pasts survey (Seixas et al., 2008) that section D of the survey relates specifically to uncovering epistemological
beliefs that participants hold about history, I have focused this portion of my analysis upon findings drawn specifically from this particular section of the survey. Participants were presented with two open-ended questions relating to their trust in sources of information about the past:

1. Can you please tell us why you consider your most trustworthy source to be so very trustworthy?

2. When people disagree about something that happened in the past, how do you think they can find out what is most likely to have really happened?

These two questions are particularly revealing, because question (1) provides insight into how individuals justify the authority of one source of information over another, and question (2) reveals epistemological beliefs in what constitutes trustworthy knowledge (i.e., how we know what we think we know to be true).

Pre-and post-survey responses obtained from case study participants were coded against Rüsen’s (1987, 1993, 2004, 2005) typology of historical consciousness, as an a priori framework (Table 3, p. 111) for exploring the link between historical thinking and historical consciousness (Seixas, 2005). These same responses were then compared against Seixas et al. (2008), as well as Shemilt (1987), to gain insight into how—and if—participants’ historical thinking had changed after taking part in the formal learning process of working with museum evidence and sources. The subsequent student and adult (before and after) survey findings are outlined in Figures 17 through 23.

47 A detailed breakdown of this framework is outlined in table 3, p. 111—as presented in Rüsen (2005). In addition, a discussion regarding correlations with historical thinking can be found in Seixas (2005). For a description on the empirical research from which Rüsen’s typology evolved, see Bracke et al., 2014, pp. 26-32.
Table 3: The four types of historical consciousness (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of time:</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Genetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition of an obligatory form of life</td>
<td>Representing general rules of conduct or value systems</td>
<td>Problematizing actual forms of life and value systems</td>
<td>Change of alien forms of life into proper ones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Patterns of historical significance: | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------|---------|
| Permanence of an obligatory life form in temporal change | Timeless rules of social life, timeless validity of values | Break of patterns of historical significance by denying their validity | Development in which forms of life change in order to maintain their permanence |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation of external life:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation of pregiven orders by consent about a valid common life</td>
<td>Relating peculiar situations to regularities of what had happened and should happened</td>
<td>Delimitation of one’s own standpoint against pregiven obligations</td>
<td>Acceptance of different standpoints within a comprising perspective of common development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation of internal life:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internalization of pregiven life forms by limitation—role taking</td>
<td>Relating self-concepts to general rules and principles—role legitimation by generalization</td>
<td>Self-reliance by refutation of obligations from outside—role making</td>
<td>Change and transformation of self-concepts as necessary conditions of permanence and self-reliance—balance of roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation to moral values:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morality is pregivenness of obligatory orders; moral validity as unquestionable stability by tradition</td>
<td>Morality is the generality of obligation in values and value-systems</td>
<td>Breaking the moral power of values by denying their validity</td>
<td>Temporalization of morality—chances of further development become a condition of morality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation to moral reasoning:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The reason of values is their effective pregivenness enabling consent in moral questions</td>
<td>Arguing by generalization, referring to regularities and principles</td>
<td>Establishing value-criticism and ideology—critique as important strategies of moral discourses</td>
<td>Temporal change becomes a decisive argument for the validity of moral values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-survey findings. With regard to beliefs in the trustworthiness of sources of information about the past (Figure 17), the majority of seventh-grade students (54%)
ranked museums as “most trustworthy.” Their primary reasoning for this was that museums present “real things” or “artifacts,” and safeguard “knowledge” or “proof” about the past. Their responses also varied in sophistication, from a just because faith in the institution itself, to recognizing the function of museums as part of a critical community of inquiry:

1. “Because museums are supposed to be trustworthy” (Henry B., 2013);

2. “Something that makes sense like if I said King Henry had a rolex [sic] watch and a convertible no ones [sic] going to believe me but at museums when they have all this nolege [knowledge] there [sic] pretty trust worthy” (Diane D., 2013);

By contrast, only 32% of Canadians (the largest proportion), and 23% of New Brunswickers (2% under the largest proportionate ranking of family stories), reported museums as the most trustworthy source of information about the past (Northrup, July 31, 2013).

---

**Figure 17:** Trustworthiness of sources of information about the past pre-survey results (NB case study students).
3. …“they get a lot of information from actual artifacts, instead of just stories that could be wrong” (Cathy A., 2013);

4. “Because the [stuff] at a museum is stuf[sic] that scientests [sic] have looked at and they no [sic] there [sic] stuf [sic]” (Chuck D., 2013).

These explanations demonstrate a wide range of trust in the authority of museums, ranging from what Seixas et al. (2008) have described as a low level trust in “faith and its friends” (example 1), to beginning to recognise the role of epistemological expertise49 (example 2), and the notion of primary sources as evidence (example 3), or acknowledging the existence of a “critical community” of inquiry50 (example 4). Within these categories of trust, the overall percentages of student responses were somewhat evenly distributed across the first three examples of reasoning, with nearly a third (29%) of students expressing some notion of investigating primary sources as evidence, followed closely by a low level trust in “faith and its friends” (25%), and a somewhat limited belief in the role of epistemological expertise (21%).

Similarly, these explanations also demonstrate a wide range of epistemological beliefs about knowledge, ranging from what Shemilt (1987) has described as a belief that knowledge is given (example 1), knowledge that is found (example 2) or constructed (example 3), or knowledge that is re-constructed (example 4). Within these categories of beliefs, the overall percentages of student responses were somewhat evenly distributed across the first three examples of reasoning, with nearly a third (29%) of students expressing a belief in knowledge as something that is found (through secondary sources),

49 Defined by Seixas et al. (2008) as believing in the authority of experts as “prima facie,” providing “true accounts of the past” (p.8), with no sense of evidence and sources.
50 Defined by Seixas et al. (2008) as believing in “the strength of a community of inquiry,” involving a social process of peer-review (p. 9). For a detailed discussion on the role of a community of inquiry in supporting historical thinking, see Seixas (1993c).
followed closely (25%) by a belief that knowledge is something that is given (from social groups or institutions), or a more sophisticated belief in knowledge as something that is constructed by using primary sources (21%). Within the pre-survey student unit only 12% presented a belief in knowledge as something that is re-constructed—and hence subject to interpretation.

Within the framework of Rüsen’s (2005) four types of historical consciousness (Table 3, p. 111), these explanations also correlate very closely to the element of “orientation of external life” (Rüsen, 2005, pp. 28-29), and as such, demonstrate a range from traditional (example 1; grounded in “pregivenness”), to exemplary (examples 2 and 3; grounded in “regularities”), or genetic (example 4; grounded in “common development) reasoning about the past. 51 Significantly as well, it is evident that half of the students demonstrated an exemplary relationship to reasoning (grounded in “regularities”), while a quarter expressed a traditional relationship (grounded in “pregivenness”), and only 12% illustrated a genetic relationship to reasoning by way of suggesting pluralism or contextualisation (grounded in “common development”).

In addition to these pre-survey findings, in which students ranked museums as “most trustworthy,” the majority of students also believed museums (67%) to be “very trustworthy.” This was followed by school history teachers (42%), and fact-based history books (37%); while half of the students believed historic sites to be “somewhat trustworthy,” followed evenly by family stories (42%), and fact-based history books (42%). In drawing comparison with Canadians and Their Pasts, the majority of provincial (59%) and national (66%) adult samplings also believed museums to be “very

51 Only one student in the pre-survey demonstrated a critical relationship to reasoning, responding with the statement: “I don’t know” (Wanda A., 2013), and two students did not provide a comment at all.
trustworthy.” Overall, these findings are significant, because they illuminate the high level of trust that seventh-grade participants initially placed upon the informal learning setting of their museum. They also help to place this case study within a broader provincial and national context.

Adult responses. By contrast, the largest proportion of adult participants in this inquiry were very unlike their seventh-grade counterparts. This is because, while most seventh-graders (three out of five) ranked museums as “most trustworthy,” three out of five of the adult participants ranked fact-based history books—over museums—as “most trustworthy.” Likewise, three out of five adult participants (proportionately similar to provincial and national sample groups) also believed fact-based history books to be “somewhat trustworthy.” These findings are significant, because adult participants in this inquiry were all museum volunteers; hence, regardless of their museum status, they still believed fact-based history books to be more trustworthy than museums.

Adult participants also adopted very different sets of reasoning for why they considered fact-based history books to be “most trustworthy.” Fact-based history books, they explained, are based upon primary sources from the past. Their responses were also less varied in level of complexity, ranging from a simple trust in the authority of sources, to recognizing a critical process of historical inquiry:

1. “Primary archival sources” (Murray G., 2013);

2. “Fact-based history books which are replete with footnotes represent the most trustworthy resource because they are verifiable. At the very least, a person can consult the original source material to glean where it came from and any potential bias involved in the text” (Lucy K., 2013).
These explanations illustrate a sophistication in historical thinking that varied only slightly between what Seixas et al. (2008) have described as recognising the notion of primary sources as evidence (example 1), and acknowledging a critical community of inquiry (example 2). Furthermore, within these categories of trust, the percentages of responses were somewhat evenly distributed between the two, with two of the adult participants favouring the latter grouping (example 2), while the other three favoured the former (example 1). Within the framework of Rüsen’s (2005) four types of historical consciousness (Table 3, p. 111), the explanations provided by adult case study participants were limited to either exemplary (example 1), or genetic (example 2) reasoning about the past.

*Post-survey findings.* When asked (more than one month after completing the community history museum fieldwork experience) to rank their beliefs in the most trustworthy sources of information about the past, the largest proportion of student participants continued to rank museums as “most trustworthy” (Figure 18). By comparison, adult participants remained relatively evenly distributed between museums and fact-based history books. These findings are significant, because they indicate a continuance of similarities across case study samplings, with a comparatively larger proportion of both seventh-grade and adult participants continuing to ascribe a higher level of trust in museums than either provincial (23%) or national (31%) samplings. The largest majority of students also continued to believe museums to be “very trustworthy,” although longitudinal distinctions did become evident, in that more students in the post-survey now believed fact-based history books (56% versus 37% previously), school
history teachers (52% versus 42%), family stories (35% versus 25%), and historic sites (35% versus 29%) to be “very trustworthy” as well.

Nevertheless, students’ reasoning, for why they continued to rank museums as “most trustworthy,” had changed somewhat significantly. This is because, even though the belief that museums present “real things” or “artifacts,” as well as provide “knowledge” or “proof” about the past, continued to dominate their reasoning, and students’ responses continued to vary in sophistication, from a blind faith in the institution itself, to recognizing the function of museums as part of a critical community of inquiry, their overall reasoning had changed slightly, in that fewer students now carried a blind faith in people or institutions, while more recognized the strength of a critical community of inquiry. Examples of their reasoning, with regard to museums, were as follows:

Figure 18: Trustworthiness of sources of information about the past pre- versus post-survey results (NB case study students).

Nevertheless, students’ reasoning, for why they continued to rank museums as “most trustworthy,” had changed somewhat significantly. This is because, even though the belief that museums present “real things” or “artifacts,” as well as provide “knowledge” or “proof” about the past, continued to dominate their reasoning, and students’ responses continued to vary in sophistication, from a blind faith in the institution itself, to recognizing the function of museums as part of a critical community of inquiry, their overall reasoning had changed slightly, in that fewer students now carried a blind faith in people or institutions, while more recognized the strength of a critical community of inquiry. Examples of their reasoning, with regard to museums, were as follows:
1. “Because they made a gigantic building just to show us facts, not to troll us” (Salome H., 2013);

2. “Museum because they know about the artifact” (Owen T., 2013);

3. “Because museums have hard based facts and evidence to show” (Maggie K., 2013);

4. “I consider it to be trustworthy because in museums, all the evidence is right there for you to see and criticize yourself” (Cathy A., 2013).

Within these four categories of trust, the overall percentages of student responses continued to be somewhat evenly distributed across the latter three examples. What had changed, however, is that the largest (and slightly increased) proportion of students (30% [seven] versus 21% [five] previously) now demonstrated a somewhat limited belief in epistemological expertise (example 2), and slightly more (26% [six] versus 12% [three] previously) acknowledged a critical community of inquiry (example 4); while slightly fewer students (22% [five] versus 29% [seven] previously) expressed some notion of investigating primary sources as evidence (example 3). What is also particularly significant is that slightly fewer students (9% [two] versus 25% [six] previously) now demonstrated a blind faith in people or institutions (example 1).

Similarly, students’ epistemological beliefs about knowledge also changed slightly. This is because, although students continued to demonstrate a range of beliefs, in what Shemilt (1987) has described as knowledge that is given (example 1), knowledge that is found (example 2) or constructed (example 3), or knowledge that is re-constructed (example 4); what had changed was that slightly fewer students (9% [two] versus 25% [seven] previously) now demonstrated a blind faith in people or institutions (example 1).

52 Two students in the pre-survey provided “no comment” and three in the post-survey as well.
[six] previously) now believed knowledge to be given, while **slightly more** (26% [six] versus 12% [three]) believed knowledge to be re-constructed. In addition, the percentages of student responses had shifted somewhat, in that these figures were now more evenly distributed across the latter three examples of reasoning, with the largest proportion of students (30% [seven] versus 29% [seven] previously) **continuing** to express a belief that knowledge is found (through secondary sources), followed closely by a **slight increase** in belief (26% [six] versus 12% [three]) that knowledge is something that is re-constructed (through critical inquiry), and a **continued** belief (22% [five] versus 21% [five]) that knowledge is constructed (using primary sources). It is significant to reiterate that within the post-survey student unit only two students (9%, versus 25% [six] previously) now expressed a belief in knowledge as something that is given.53

Within the framework of Rüsen’s (2005) four types of historical consciousness (Table 3, p. 111), students’ overall post-survey explanations **continued** to correlate very closely to what Rüsen describes as the element of “orientation of external life” (Rüsen, 2005, pp. 28-29). As such, students **continued** to demonstrate a range of reasoning that stretched from traditional (example 1; grounded in “pregivenness”), to exemplary (examples 2 and 3; grounded in “regularities”), or genetic (example 4; grounded in “common development”) in nature.54 What had changed, however, is that **slightly fewer** students now demonstrated a traditional relationship to reasoning about the past (9% [two] versus 25% [six] previously), while the largest proportion (52% [twelve] versus

---

53 In the pre-survey two students provided no comment and one denied history, while in the post-survey three students provided no comment.

54 No responses were provided in the post-survey that demonstrated a critical relationship to reasoning, although it is important to note that “no comment” was observed, with three students giving this response (versus two students previously).
50% [twelve]) continued to express an exemplary relationship, and slightly more students (26% [six] versus 12% [three]) now conveyed a genetic relationship.

Such shifts in student beliefs are significant, because while they indicate that this group of seventh-graders continued to place a high level of trust in the authority of their museum—well after engaging in the community history museum fieldwork experiences—at the same time, such trust became less grounded in the traditional authority of “pregivennness,” and more grounded in the genetic authority of “common development” (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29; Table 3). As a result, there is evidence to suggest that slight changes occurred in students’ overall ability to think historically about the narratives they encountered, since their reasoning in the authority of sources of information about the past shifted towards recognizing a genetic process of historical inquiry in which they too could be a part.

Adult responses. With regard to adult case study participants, post-survey findings indicate very little change, since adults continued to rank both fact-based history books (two out of four adults, versus three out of five previously) and museums (two out of four adults, versus two out of five previously) as “most trustworthy.” In addition, the majority of adults continued to rank all of the sources of information about the past as “somewhat trustworthy.” These findings are significant, because they indicate no major shift in adult participants’ beliefs in authority.

Adult participants’ post-survey reasoning for why they considered fact-based history books, as well as museums, to be “most trustworthy” did not change dramatically either. Fact-based history books, or museums, they continued to explain, are trustworthy because they are based upon primary sources from the past and involve research. Their
responses also remained somewhat the same, ranging from a simple trust in the authority of sources, to recognizing a critical process of historical inquiry:

1. “Most museums are typically seen as an unbiased source of information and the artifacts tell most of the story” (Mary R., 2013);

2. “They have the artifacts, the records and the research to support their exhibit. The locally based museums have the personnel to present the information accurately” (Charles B., 2013);

3. [fact-based history books] “These are evidentiary in nature [sic], using, employing, and footnoting archival sources” (Lucy K., 2013).

These explanations illustrate a sophistication in historical thinking that continued to vary only slightly between what Seixas et al. (2008) have described as recognising the notion of primary sources as evidence (example 1), and acknowledging a critical community of inquiry (examples 2 and 3). Adults’ explanations also continued to demonstrate a less varied range of epistemological beliefs about knowledge, ranging simply from what Shemilt (1987) has described as a belief in knowledge that is constructed (example 1), to knowledge that is re-constructed (examples 2 and 3).

In addition, within the framework of Rüsen’s (2005) four types of historical consciousness (Table 3, p. 111), adult post-survey explanations continued to be limited to either exemplary (example 1), or genetic (examples 2 and 3) reasoning about the past. Likewise, the same one person continued to demonstrate an exemplary relationship to reasoning (grounded in “regularities and principles”). Together, these findings are significant, because they suggest that no change occurred in adults’ high level of trust in the authority of either fact-based history books or museums.
When people disagree about the past (section D8): Pre-survey findings. When asked how one might resolve disagreements about the past, seventh-grade case study participants suggested a variety of different strategies for resolution (Figure 19). These included consulting with museums (33%) and books (33%), doing research with various sources (17%), searching the Internet (17%), or visiting historic sites (12%):

1. “I would ask them to see museums and to read books. Then they can know that it happened” (Mod’d Aamir K., 2013);

2. “They can try and do more research, use different sources and try and come up with logical explanations” (Alick Chisholm, 2013);

3. “They can ask someone you trust or find a reliable web site” (Florence E., 2013);

4. “They can go to the historic sites, do research, visit museums” (Tzhi J., 2013).

Overall, the majority of pre-survey seventh-grade students (62%) demonstrated some basic notion (as in example 1) of consulting with experts or secondary sources to
find resolution (what Seixas et al. [2008, p. 11] describe as a “good start”). Similarly, a few of the students (21%) recognised the notion of investigating primary sources (example 2) to establish knowledge, or acknowledged (example 4) the role of a critical community of inquiry (what Seixas et al. [2008, p. 11] describe as a “strong response”). In addition, equally few students (17%) suggested a strategy (as in example 3) of turning to social groups (what Seixas et al. [2008, p. 11] describe as “weak moves”).

Students’ strategies for seeking resolution also reflected a variety of epistemological beliefs about the nature of knowledge. Undoubtedly, however, most of the seventh-graders (62%) expressed a belief in knowledge as something that is found through experts and secondary sources (example 1). Conversely, within the pre-survey student unit, only 17% recognised knowledge as something that is re-constructed (example 2), while equally few (12%) expressed a belief that knowledge is given (example 3), and very few (4%) suggested that knowledge is something that is constructed (example 4).

Within the framework of Rüsen’s (2005) typology of historical consciousness, a striking majority of pre-survey students (67%) demonstrated an exemplary orientation to knowledge as “regularities” constructed by experts. Conversely, only a few students (12%) expressed a traditional orientation to knowledge, as something that is “pregiven” (example 3) from social groups, and slightly more (17%) demonstrated a genetic orientation to knowledge as something that is drawn out of differing standpoints, perspectives, and a variety of sources of evidence (examples 2 and 4).

\[\text{What Rüsen entitles the element of “Orientation of external life” (Table 3, p. 111).}\]
These pre-survey student findings are significant, because they suggest that within the unit of seventh-grade students who participated in this case study, a large majority entered into the community history museum fieldwork experience with a well-established belief in knowledge that is found. Hence, for many of these students, when people disagree about what happened in the past, it was simply a matter of turning to museums or books (67% combined total)—in order to consult with the experts, or secondary sources (62%)—to find out (62%)—the “regularities” of what actually happened (67%). Such a strategy leaves very little space for coping with conflicting historical narratives. It also suggests that many of the seventh-graders did not see themselves as part of the “expert” community of inquiry. Instead, history was something that someone more knowledgeable did for them.

Adult responses. Adult case study participants, however, adopted very different strategies for resolving disputes about the past. For them, history was something that they did for themselves. Hence, when people disagree about the past, they explained, it was simply a matter of turning to sources, and researching various perspectives:

1. “Go to the primary resources or consult with an expert in the area” (Charles B., 2013);
2. “Research – Archives, books, diaries, art & artifacts” (Ellen E., 2013);
3. “History is multi-faceted and disagreement is natural. What really happened depends on who is telling the story” (Mary R., 2013);
4. “Original documentation should settle disagreements about events in the past. The nature of the original source may cloud the issue further in some cases” (Lucy K., 2013).
These adult explanations illustrate a sophistication in historical thinking that Seixas et al. (2008) have described as a “strong response.” They recognise the role of a critical community of inquiry (examples 1 and 3), or present the notion of investigating primary sources for evidence (examples 2 and 4). All of the adult responses fell within this category for seeking resolution. Also, unlike seventh-grade participants, adults presented strategies for seeking resolution that were evenly divided between two closely related epistemological beliefs. As a result, three out of five of the adults expressed a belief in knowledge as something that is constructed (examples 1 and 2), while the other two recognised knowledge as something that is re-constructed (examples 3 and 4). None of the adults demonstrated a pre-survey belief in knowledge as something that is simply found.

Likewise, within Rüsen’s (2005) typology of historical consciousness (Table 3, p. 111), all of the adult case study participants demonstrated a genetic orientation to knowledge that is drawn out of differing standpoints, perspectives, and a variety of primary sources (examples 1 through 4). By virtue of this, the adults positioned themselves as part of a critical community of inquiry.

Post-survey findings. When asked more than a month later, how an individual might resolve disagreements about the past, seventh-grade participants continued to suggest a variety of strategies for resolution (Figure 20). What had changed, however, is that slightly more now suggested consulting with museums or books, while more students also suggested looking information up on the Internet. In addition, more students now proposed doing research using various sources, and more students also suggested a strategy of comparing and corroborating sources:
1. “Go to museums and look up the topic and ask people at the museums” (Henry B., 2013);

2. “Go on the internet, go to museums [sic], and ask around teachers. And see if they say the same thing” (Sally J., 2013);

3. “Archeology and documents that may have been forgotten” (Diane D., 2013);

4. “They can look at both points and try and figure out the most likely. They would hopefully do some research to find out more about the topic they are disagreeing on” (Cathy A., 2013).

Overall then, while the majority of students (Figure 21) continued to demonstrate some basic notion of consulting with experts, or secondary sources (example 1), to establish resolution (what Seixas et al. [2008, p. 11] describe as a “good start”); slightly fewer students (one less) now suggested a strategy of turning to social groups (what Seixas et al. [2008, p. 11] describe as a “weak moves”). Furthermore, slightly more students (one more) now recognised the notion of investigating primary sources (example
Figure 2: When people disagree about the past: Seixas, Ercikan and Northrup (2008) four levels of sophistication pre- versus post-survey results (NB case study).

3) for evidence, or acknowledged the role of a critical community of inquiry (examples 2 and 4) in resolving disagreements (what Seixas et al. [2008, p. 11] describe as a “strong response”).

Students’ post-survey strategies for seeking resolution also continued to reflect a variety of epistemological beliefs. What had changed, however, is that a smaller proportion of students (five less; see Figure 22) now expressed a belief that knowledge is something that can be found (through experts and secondary sources) (example 1), and no post-survey students demonstrated a belief in knowledge as given. Instead, slightly more (one student more) now recognised knowledge as something that is re-constructed (examples 2 and 4), and four more students suggested that knowledge is something that is constructed (example 3). These changes, although slight, can be considered significant, because they suggest a shift towards a constructivist epistemology.

Within the framework of Rüsen’s (2005) typology of historical consciousness, post-
Figure 2: When people disagree about the past: Shemilt (1987) beliefs about knowledge pre- versus post-survey results (NB case study).

Figure 23: When people disagree about the past: Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness – pre- versus post-survey results (NB case study).

survey findings (Figure 23) suggest that slight changes occurred in a few of the student beliefs, in that one student less now demonstrated an exemplary orientation to
knowledge\(^{56}\) (examples 1 and 3), while none of the students now expressed a traditional orientation to knowledge, and one student more (22% [five] versus 17% [four] previously) now demonstrated a genetic orientation (examples 2 and 4).

In drawing comparisons between pre- and post-survey findings, while it is evident that only a slight shift occurred in seventh-grade participants’ beliefs in what constituted trustworthy knowledge about the past, these shifts indicate a slight movement towards a genetic orientation to knowledge. Hence, the majority of students continued to believe that, when people disagree, it is simply a matter of turning to museums or books/the Internet\(^{57}\) (Figure 20)—in order to consult with the experts, or secondary sources (Figure 21)—to find out (Figure 22)—the regularities of what actually happened (Figure 23). Nevertheless, there was an increased percentage of student participants who proposed doing research, or comparing and corroborating information (52%; Figure 20)—as a way of consulting with primary sources (26%; Figure 21)—to try to re-construct (22%; Figure 22)—a perspective, or standpoint, on what happened (22%; Figure 23). Such a strategy, although not shared by the majority of students, would suggest that an ability to cope with conflicting historical narratives was beginning to become evident within the student case study unit. Such a scenario also suggests that students’ strategies for coping with conflicting historical narratives had shifted towards seeing themselves as agents within a critical community of inquiry, since (in total) half of the student case study group now proposed doing research, or comparing and corroborating information (Figure 20). As a

\(^{56}\) What Rüsen entitles the element of “Orientation of external life” (Table 3, p. 111).

\(^{57}\) Post-survey strategies were equally divided between books and the Internet (35%). This was not the case in pre-survey findings.
result, overall survey evidence suggests that slight changes did occur in some of the students’ ability to think historically about the narratives they encountered.

**Adult responses.** By comparison, when adult participants, were surveyed a second time, on the same question (more than a month after participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience), they continued to adopt comparatively similar strategies for resolution. For them, history continued to be something that they did for themselves (Figure 20). In this sense, all of the adults suggested doing research by returning to the original sources, and all of the adults made reference to knowledge as something that is established through corroboration of multiple sources. What had changed, however, is that none of the adults now suggested consulting with “experts”:

1. “Primary sources… Yes, I looked at primary sources” (Mary R., 2013);
2. “Consult primary sources” (Murray G., 2013);
3. “Go to the primary sources and find out what information was available when the event took place” (Charles B., 2013);
4. “By consulting the documentary evidence” (Lucy K., 2013).

These adult explanations continued to illustrate a sophistication in historical thinking that Seixas et al. (2008) have described as a “strong response.” All of the adult responses continued to fall within this category for seeking resolution (Figure 21).

In addition, the adults continued to present strategies for seeking resolution that were divided between two closely related epistemological beliefs (Figure 22)—although post-survey responses suggest that two of the adults had changed their beliefs. As a result, two of the adults expressed a belief in knowledge as something that is simply constructed from primary sources (examples 1 and 2), while the other two elaborated
upon this belief by recognising knowledge as something that is re-constructed through context (example 3), and re-examination of evidence (example 4). Likewise, within Rüsen’s (2005) typology of historical consciousness, all of the adult case study participants continued to demonstrate a genetic orientation (Figure 23) to knowledge that is drawn out of differing standpoints, perspectives, and a variety of primary sources (examples 1 through 4).

Hence, more than a month after participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience, adult case study participants continued to see themselves as part of a critical community of inquiry. For them, when people disagreed about the past, it was simply a matter of doing research, or comparing and corroborating information—as a way of consulting with primary sources—to try to construct, or re-construct—either the regularities of what actually happened, or a standpoint on what happened. Thus, overall survey evidence would suggest that adults’ ability to think historically about the narratives they encountered remained virtually unchanged.

In the section that follows, I will analyse written documentation that resulted from phases one, two, and three of the inquiry.

4.4 Written Assignments

During phase one of data collection, participants were asked to respond in writing to three open-ended essay questions: (a) What history do I wish to remember about my country? (b) What history do I wish to remember about New Brunswick? And (c) What history do I wish to remember about Atlantic Canada? These questions where administered to students (n=24) as part of the Canadians and Their Pasts classroom survey, over a period of four days (January 9, 15, 16, and 17 respectively).
Correspondingly, the adult sampling (n=five) was asked to complete all three questions in advance of our first meeting in the museum on January 11.

The resulting responses (116 in total) were subsequently analysed qualitatively, according to a two cycle coding technique (Saldaña, 2009). First Cycle analysis involved descriptive and in vivo coding methods. This was followed by a Second Cycle of analysis, using pattern coding methods, with the intent of identifying narrative templates and shared themes across both case study groups.

As an additional (Third Cycle) of analysis, emergent narrative patterns were then refined, and compared against the existing framework of Rüsen’s (1987, 1993, 2004, 2005) typology of historical consciousness (Table 3, p. 111). During this cycle of analysis, Seixas’ (2005) interpretation of the typology was also consulted extensively, resulting in the following criteria for Third Cycle elaborative coding: Traditional responses reflected an obligatory, or commemorative belief about the past; Exemplary responses presented the past as frozen yet valid for all time; Critical responses disrupted or denied the past, by interjecting students’ own path of interest; Genetic responses placed the past within a context that was both distinct yet linked to the present. The findings were then organised for discussion according to Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning.

4.4.1 Personal context of learning. Commencing the community history museum fieldwork experience, it was assumed that both adult and student participants would bring to the setting their own sets of prior knowledge and beliefs. For this reason, responses to open-ended essay questions were analysed with the intent of tapping into these beliefs, and identifying the narrative templates that underpinned such prior knowledge.
**Student responses.** What history do I wish to remember about my country?

Initially, students entered into this inquiry with several well-formulated narrative beliefs about their nation’s history (Table 4). It was also significant to note that for a large

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About my country</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>About New Brunswick</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>About Atlantic Canada</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our privileged nation</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The founding of a province</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wars my country took part in</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>How people lived back then</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>How people lived back then</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was before what we have today</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The founding of a region</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who made sacrifices in war</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I want to learn</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I want to learn</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing/everything</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Those who made sacrifices in war</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>What was before what we have today</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ties</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Everything!</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Our privileged region</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The founding of a nation</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>What was before what we have today</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>What I like about the past</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people who once lived in Canada</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traditions of New Brunswick</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not interested in the region</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I like about the past</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The wars my country took part in</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When life was better than today</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family ties</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How people lived back then</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>What people looked like</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4**: Pre-student narrative templates (prior knowledge and beliefs) about what history they wish to remember, compared against Rüsen’s (1987, 1993, 2004, 2005) typology of historical consciousness (see Table 3).

majority of students, it was evident that “my country” meant “Canada”—but this was not the case for all students. Several in the class had recently immigrated to New Brunswick.
with their families, and one student in particular actually returned to his home country before the inquiry was completed. Nevertheless, students entered into this inquiry with a variety of beliefs about what they wished to remember about their country’s past (Table 4).

Out of a total of 41 coded statements, the largest proportion of student responses (34%) employed traditional narratives to remember their nation’s past. These represented two distinct templates—“Our privileged nation,” and “Those who made sacrifices in war”:

1. “Our privileged nation” - Students wished to remember that Canada is a great nation; it is a “free country,” it is “the safest country in the world,” “we have good money,” and live “not in poverty.” In addition, some students elaborated upon these qualities by reasoning that “we fight for what we think is right,” and are privileged “with all our rights and freedoms.” As Sally (2013) explained:

   I wish to remember that Canada is a great country. They don’t care if your [sic] black. Also that Canada is a free country. That we fight for what we think is right. That people made sacrifices [sic] for our country so that we today can be free.

2. “Those who made sacrifices in war”- Drawing heavily upon the act of remembrance, some students wished to remember the soldiers who sacrificed their lives for freedom. As Salome (2013) so passionately explained:

   The history that I want to wish to remember about my country is the people, the people who stood up in front of the thieves [sic], the people who gaved [sic] our rights, the people who got our freedom. No one cold [sic] never ever forget about the people who fough [sic] for us, gaved [sic] up their life, just to save us. People
who defend us, things they have done to keep Canada the safest country in the world, hopefully no one could forget about these men/women.

As an extension of this last example, some student responses (17%) adopted the exemplary narrative template of “Wars my country took part in.” These responses were different from traditional narratives, because they were focused specifically upon wars as isolated events frozen in time. As Aamir (2013) stated: “I would like to remember all the history of my country and it’s very important, so I would like to search and to remember the wars and the people that lived in my country.” Another student, Gregg (2013), offered a much more specific response, citing a specific event in recent history as an example of “What Canadians can do”:

I wish to remember when Canadian forces stopped Sonnof Binladiin [sic] in 2011. That was good because Sonof Binladin [sic] would not hurt any more people. I want to remember this because it was a good examples [sic] of what Canadians can do!!

By contrast, a substantial number of students chose to employ genetic narratives (24%) to remember their nation’s history. These narratives represented two very closely related (yet slightly different) templates—“What was before what we have today,” and “When life was better than today”:

1. “What was before what we have today”- Students who adopted this narrative template made reference to the national flag, natural resources, or transportation—as elements of change. As such, they wished to remember aspects of the past that predated the present. Their responses also demonstrated a more temporal relationship with the past, as Caleb (2013) explained: “I wish to remember what the flag was before our
current flag because I think it is important for younger generations to know we haven’t [sic] always had the same flag.”

2. “When life was better than today”- Although only two students chose to employ this particular narrative, both clearly adopted a then-versus-now strategy that was somewhat similar to a “What was before what we have today” template. How this narrative differed, however, is that both students made an assumption that life in the past was better than in the present. As David (2013) stated: “I would like to remember when kids were’nt abused or when Donald Marshall Jr.\(^{58}\) got the fishing rights for the Mik’maq people in Nova Scotia.”

As becomes evident from reading these examples, several students did not adopt a single narrative template when formulating their responses to the question. Clearly, for example, David (2013) did not exclusively adopt a “When life was better than today” schema. Instead, he also made reference to a specific historic event, which can be interpreted as a “What was before what we have today” statement. Like David, all but seven of the 24 student participants constructed hybrid responses to the question, drawing upon two (or sometimes three) of the narratives identified in Table 4 (p. 133).

*What history do I wish to remember about New Brunswick?* The narrative templates that students used to remember their province were far less elaborate than that of their country. Several indicated that they did not know what they wished to remember, while

\(^{58}\) Regarding the 1999 Supreme Court of Canada ruling R. v. Marshall, in which Donald Marshall Jr. a member of the Membertou First Nation was found not guilty of fishing without a licence. (See: [https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100028614/1100100028615](https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100028614/1100100028615)). This ruling recognised Treaty Rights of Mi’kmaq and Maliseet First Nations in Canada.
others stated that they wanted to learn more, or that they simply wanted to remember everything (Table 4, p. 133).

The largest proportion of students, however, chose to employ the exemplary narrative template of “Founding of a province.” Their responses reflected a desire to remember the provincial flag, as well as how New Brunswick came to be named, when it was first “discovered,” and the people who “worked hard to create this province.” Alternatively, a substantial number of students adopted the genetic narrative template of “How people lived back then,” wanting to remember what New Brunswick was like, and what people did in the “olden days.” As Cathy (2013) explained: “I don’t know very much history about N. B. in the first place, and wish to remember everything I ever learn about it. I am interested to learn what N.B. was like before the europeans [sic] came over.”

What history do I wish to remember about Atlantic Canada? A significant majority of students responded to this question with statements that they did not know what they wished to remember about Atlantic Canada. As Mike (2013) explained: “I don’t know because I don’t know very much about the history of Atlantic Canada.” Similarly, as Owen (2013) also stated: “I don’t no [sic] because I don’t no [sic] anything about this past.”

Evidently, these students seemed to think that they had not yet studied Atlantic Canada in school, and they indicated such in many of their responses to the question. This is somewhat problematic, however, since the social studies curriculum for Anglophone New Brunswick is described as a “Foundation for Atlantic Canada” (Foundation for the Atlantic Canada Social Studies Curriculum, 1998, p. 1). As Kaitlyn
explained: “I’m not very sure [what I wish to remember]. When we come around to the history I will probably come around to a topic.” In this sense, Kaitlyn was confident that once the history of Atlantic Canada was opened up to her, she would have something to remember. For the time being, however, like many of her student colleagues, she seemed to think that she had no prior knowledge or narrative beliefs to draw upon when responding to this particular question.

**Adult responses.** *What history do I wish to remember about my country?* Like their student counterparts, adult participants entered into this inquiry with several well formulated narrative beliefs about what they wished to remember about their nation’s past. Unlike the students, however, three of the adults were very specific in citing particular genres of history—Children’s History (Lucy K., 2013), Gender History (Mary R., 2013), Labour History (Mary R., 2013), or Military History (Murray G., 2013)—as their individual preferences.

Yet, despite such distinct historiographical preferences, all five of the adults chose to employ exemplary narratives to remember their nation’s past. This is significant, because out of a total of 34 coded statements, 15 were exemplary in nature, representing four distinct templates—“The path to self-governance,” “Westward expansion,” “How people have made a difference,” and “Military history has shaped the nation”:

1. “The path to self-governance”- Two of the adult participants, Mary and Ellen, employed this narrative, presenting Canada’s past as a chronological march towards Confederation that ended with the repatriation of the Constitution in 1981. In this sense, national history was presented as a progression of landmark concepts or events, valid for all time, and triggered by cause and effect. As Ellen so succinctly recounted:
The sixteenth century discovery of the Americas was a side effect to the European search for a shorter route to Asia. A century later, New France under a Royal Charter was colonised for its fur & timber commerce. Britain ousted what became known as Lower Canada from France 1759/1760. It brought together the indigenous peoples & two very culturally different peoples of Europe; philosophically & religious diametrically opposed. The American Loyalists arrived 1760-1780 spread westward, 1812 defeated the U.S. with army of French, indigenous and British troops & colonists, 1815-50 more migrants from Britain spreading ever further westward, the French & indigenous populations into minorities. Caution prevailed, in the 19th c Canada won the right to self government, which put an end to oligarchys.’ Canada’s history cannot be brought to conclusion because of the entry of Newfoundland & Labrador 1949, on the repatriation of the Constitution 1981. It will remain a state of flux, as it continues to accept migrants and their cultures into the Canadian fabric. (Ellen E., 2013)

2. “Westward expansion”- Ellen was the only participant to adopt this particular template. As is evident from her example above, she incorporated this schema into her “path to self-governance,” referring to the westward “European search for a shorter route to Asia,” American Loyalists spreading westward, and “migrants from Britain spreading ever further westward,” resulting in “the French and indigenous populations” becoming minorities, in a progressive movement from east to west.

3. “How people have made a difference”- Conversely, Charles and Lucy shared a very different narrative template, opting instead for a people-oriented approach to the past. As Charles explained: “I want to see the story of our great men and women told in a
human, respectful way so young people will appreciate their legacy. Sometimes we are
dismissive of our heroes in a false sense of humility” (Charles B., 2013).

Similarly, Lucy opened her response with the statement: “The contributions that
children have made to Canadian history should be memorialized in a meaningful way.”
She then proceeded to explain how the “non-violent children’s protest movement” known
as the Chocolate Bar War\textsuperscript{59} should be remembered, “because it united children across the
country” (Lucy K., 2013).

4. “Military history has shaped the nation”- Murray was the only adult participant
to adopt this narrative template. For him it was very clear. Military history was forefront
in “forging” a nation: “Because of my interest in military history, I would have to say the
military history of Canada. Whether one likes it or not, Canada was forged in war…”
(Murray G., 2013).

Clearly, however (like their student counterparts) adults in this inquiry did not
adopt a single schema when formulating their responses to the question. As a result,
similar exemplary narratives soon became dissimilar, as each of the adults incorporated
traditional, critical, or genetic twists into their beliefs about Canada’s past. For example,
within her “path to self-governance” narrative, Ellen also incorporated a “Diverse but
conflicted nation” template that was traditional in nature (example 1 below), while Mary
incorporated a “Family ties” critical schema into her exemplary narrative (example 2
below). Likewise, Lucy included a critical “What has been forgotten” template into her
exemplary narrative (example 3 below), while both Charles and Murray embedded a

\textsuperscript{59} Referring to “The 5 Cent Chocolate War” which reportedly took place across Canada in 1947. See:
http://bobbea.com/treasure/vancouver/chocolatewar/chocolatewar.html#
genetic “What was before what we have today” schema into their exemplary narratives (example 4):

1. “A diverse but conflicted nation”- Weaving together an obligatory (traditional) narrative of conflict and diversity, Ellen wished to remember that “Britain ousted what became known as Lower Canada from France 1759/1760. It brought together the indigenous peoples & two very culturally different peoples of Europe; philosophically & religious diametrically opposed.” Her narrative then proceeded over a detailed “path to self-governance,” involving “westward expansion,” to conclude with the belief that Canada “will remain a state of flux, as it continues to accept migrants and their cultures into the Canadian fabric.” (Ellen E., 2013)

Similarly, Charles also embedded a traditional narrative of conflict and diversity into his response, opening with the statement: “I wish to remember the early history of the Natives, European explorers, French, British and Irish settlers.” His narrative then continued, referencing cultural conflict as a central component within his remembrance of his nation’s past:

I wish to remember the French and British colonizers, who brought their cultures here and helped it to survive in the New World. I do not want a romanticised vision of history, ie, Madame LaTour, Evangeline. Both sides of the story need to be told. (Charles B., 2013)

2. “Family ties”- Mary, on the other hand, adopted a critical narrative, referencing her family ties as her chosen point of entry into the past. In this way, she wished to “rupture the old stories of significance” (Seixas, 2005, p. 149), by remembering “how my countries [sic] history influenced the lives of my ancestors.” (Mary R., 2013)
3. “What has been forgotten”- Likewise, Lucy also embedded a critical narrative into her exemplary template, citing the *Chocolate Bar War* as a “particular episode in Canadian children’s history” that “has been largely forgotten” and “needs to be remembered not only because it was a discrepant event but also because it united children across the country” (Lucy K., 2013). In this way, Lucy critically rendered the seemingly insignificant to significant (Seixas, 2005, p. 148)—as an exemplary event frozen in time.

4. “What was before what we have today”- This genetic template was evident in both of Murray’s responses. For example, Murray was very precise in placing “the nation we are today” within a context of “what was before.” In so doing, he incorporated a genetic narrative into what was otherwise an exemplary schema:

   Because of my interest in military history, I would have to say the military history of Canada. Whether one likes it or not, Canada was forged in war and war continues to be a significant part of our history context. Political correctness dictates that we not remember this part of our past. Yet, it shaped the nation we are today. This is why I like to research and write about Canada’s military history.

   (Murray G., 2013)

Hence, it was not possible to simply categorise adult responses as fitting neatly into either one typology or another. This is important to note, because it suggests complexity within individual responses. Overall, however, there did exist a singular thread of commonality—an exemplary typology, which presented the past as frozen yet valid for all time. This thread of commonality was not apparent within the student case study group.
What history do I wish to remember about New Brunswick? The narrative templates that adults used to remember their province were more critical than those adopted for their country. Indeed, all of the adults chose critical narratives for New Brunswick’s past—and out of a total of 26 coded statements, 14 of these were critical in nature. Such statements represented narrative beliefs that “New Brunswick played an important role in Canadian history,” as well as that “Family ties” were important, or that “What has been forgotten” needs to be remembered:

1. “New Brunswick played an important role in Canadian history”- Three of the adults (Ellen, Lucy, and Murray) chose to employ this critical narrative template. Their responses reflected a desire to disrupt a “centrist (national) history” (Ellen E., 2013), choosing instead to remember that “Confederation would have crumbled without the participation of New Brunswick” (Lucy K., 2013), that New Brunswick “did not join the [Canadian] Union until it received special recognition of its trade ties with Britain [in] 1867” (Ellen E., 2013), and that “New Brunswick left to fight wars in foreign lands” (Murray G., 2013).

2. “Family ties”- Correspondingly, Mary and Charles also adopted a critical narrative, opting instead for this schema in history. As Mary explained: “New Brunswick is where my ancestors settled and I would like to know what their lives were like and what influenced their culture and day to day living.” As Charles also elaborated:

First of all, I wish to remember my place and the place of my ancestors in the story of our province. I feel that students have to know their own personal history before they can begin to look at the bigger picture of where they and their family fit into the scope of the history of our province. (Charles B., 2013)
Thus, for both Mary and Charles, they believed that an individual’s personal history served as the point of entry into the past. In this way, they wished to disrupt the “bigger picture” of history, by beginning with “Family ties,” and extending outward, through local communities, to broader social and cultural histories.

3. “What has been forgotten”- Ellen and Lucy incorporated this critical narrative template into their schema, explaining how the “non-academic arena shone a light on the little known history of New Brunswick” (Ellen E., 2013) and that it is not widely known that “New Brunswickers originally voted against Confederation” (Lucy K., 2013).

What history do I wish to remember about Atlantic Canada? Most of the adult responses to this question were predominantly genetic in nature. In this regard, three of the adults (Ellen, Charles, and Mary) adopted narrative templates of “Similarities/differences between provinces/regions,” or “How people lived back then,” to remember Atlantic Canada, while Lucy continued with the critical narrative of “A richer history than often given credit,” and Murray opted to not differentiate between regional, provincial, or national narratives at all, noting instead: “If I were to write more, I would only be repeating what I have [already] said about Canada and New Brunswick” (Murray G., 2013). For Murray, the variance between the three essay questions seemed to be a moot point; because of this, he struggled to understand the reasoning behind the line of questioning.60

Regardless of these discrepancies however, out of a total of 25 coded statements, 11 of the adult responses were genetic in nature—and these narratives represented two

---

60 As Murray also footnoted within the question of what history he wished to remember about his country: “Cynthia, I am really having difficulty in understanding these questions. They also seem to be repetitive. Or am I missing something?” (Murray G., 2013).
distinct templates:

1. “Similarities/differences between provinces/regions”- Charles and Ellen adopted this narrative template to draw comparisons between the history of other provinces in Canada. For Charles, it was important to “understand our place in the Atlantic Region” (Charles B., 2013). Similarly, Ellen employed this narrative to establish cultural distinctions between Atlantic Canada and “Upper Canada.”

2. “How people lived back then”- This was the predominant narrative template that Mary employed in her preferred social and cultural history approach to Atlantic Canada’s past. For her, remembering was all about knowing the migration patterns of people—and more particularly, her ancestors: “I would like to know what their lives were like and what influenced their culture and day to day living” (Mary R., 2013, 2013).

Hence, unlike their student counterparts, adult participants entered into this inquiry with very well formulated narrative beliefs about the history of Atlantic Canada and what they wished to remember. It was also significant to note that—across all three questions of remembering Canada, New Brunswick, and Atlantic Canada—there emerged a pattern of predominant templates, representing exemplary, critical, and genetic schema respectively.

4.4.2 Sociocultural context of learning. Six weeks after completing phase three of the community history museum fieldwork experience, all of the student and adult participants were asked to respond a second time to two of the original essay questions: What history do I wish to remember about my country? And what history do I wish to remember about New Brunswick? For the students (n=23), this activity took place as a single classroom activity on June 7. For the museum volunteers (n=three), this was
undertaken as a single independent activity. Both were timed to take place more than one month after participants had completed the community history museum fieldwork experience.

These written responses were analysed qualitatively, according to the same three-cycle method, and compared against the same criteria as previously: Traditional responses reflected an obligatory or commemorative belief about the past; Exemplary responses presented the past as frozen yet valid for all time; Critical responses disrupted or denied the past, by interjecting students’ own path of interest; Genetic responses placed the past within a context that was both distinct yet linked to the present. This was undertaken with the intent of identifying any changes in shared narratives that may have come about as a result of participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience.

**Student post-responses.** By June 7, when students were asked to complete the open-ended essay questions for a second time, the class had moved on to another unit of study in the curriculum. Students were now focussing their attention upon environmental empowerment.\(^6^1\) As part of the unit, all of the seventh-grade classes had travelled to the movie theater to see a newly released documentary film, *Revolution* (2013), produced and directed by Canadian oceanographer Rob Stewart. The film-viewing had been followed by a classroom study component\(^6^2\) in which all of the seventh-grade students had participated. Hence, by this time in the students’ course of studies, their museum fieldwork experience was waning in the background—as an activity that had long since been completed.

\(^6^1\) Researcher’s discussion with the students, June 7, 2013.

What history do I wish to remember about my country? Out of a total of 24 coded responses that were obtained, more than half of the students (13 in total; 54%) employed exemplary narratives to remember their nation’s past (Table 5). All but two of these narratives represented a single dominant template: “The wars my country took part in”—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About my country</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>About New Brunswick</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wars my country took part in</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How people lived back then</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>Specific historic places/people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our privileged nation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>How people lived back then</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing/everything</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>The founding of a province</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Nothing/everything</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The founding of a nation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who made sacrifices in war</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>The wars my province took part in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax Explosion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>Comparing NB with other places</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Acadians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The friendly/nice people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 24

Table 5: Post-student-narrative templates (appropriated knowledge and beliefs) about what history they wish to remember, compared against Rüsen’s (1987, 1993, 2004, 2005) typology of historical consciousness (see Table 3).

and within this narrative, the War of 1812\(^{63}\) was clearly a predominant theme, with 10 (out of 11) responses making reference to this war. Only four of the responses were genetic in nature, and of these four, all but one adopted a “How people lived back then” narrative.

Thus, more than a month after participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience, more of the students now presented exemplary narratives (13/24,\(^{63}\)

\(^{63}\) At the time of this inquiry, Canada’s federal government had initiated a national funding program to commemorate the War of 1812. This generated a great deal of publicity and heritage activity around the theme. The Georgetown Regional Museum had received a considerable amount of federal funding to create an exhibition about the War of 1812, which was present in the museum at the time.
or 54%; versus 10/41, or 24% previously) for remembering their country’s past (Table 5 and Table 4). What was also significant, is that while fewer students now presented traditional narratives for remembering their country’s past (3/24 or 12%; versus 14/41 or 34% previously), fewer students (4/24 or 17%; versus 10/41 or 24% previously) were also employing genetic narratives for remembering.64

What history do I wish to remember about New Brunswick? While nearly one-third of the students (7/25, or 28%) simply stated that they did not know what they wished to remember about New Brunswick’s past; more than a third (9/25, or 36%; versus 8/36, or 22% previously) now employed genetic narratives for remembering (see Table 5 and Table 4). This schema represented three distinct templates: “How people lived back then,” “Specific historic places or people,” or “Comparing New Brunswick with other places.” In addition, within the former two narratives, people was clearly a predominant theme, with five (out of nine) responses making reference to this subject. Only five of the student post-responses were exemplary in nature, and of these, three presented “The founding of a province” narrative.

Thus, it is significant to note that more than a month after participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience, more students presented genetic narratives for remembering New Brunswick’s past. In addition, slightly fewer students presented exemplary narratives (5/25, or 20%; versus 10/36, or 28% previously), and none (versus 5/36, or 14% previously) now employed traditional narratives for remembering. Overall then, a slight transformation was evident in students’ historical consciousness: towards an exemplary narrative for remembering Canada’s past, and towards a genetic narrative for remembering New Brunswick’s past.

64 In addition, four out of 24 students responded with a “Don’t know” or a nothing/everything response.
**Adult post-responses.** Unfortunately, adult responses to this series of post-essay questions provided a far less valid data source, since all of the adult participants perceived the activity as repetitive. As a result, in most cases, the adults simply re-submitted what they had prepared in January. In addition, two of the adults chose not to provide post-responses at all.

What history do I wish to remember about my country? With regard to the three adults who provided post-responses, very little had changed within two of the narratives. Mary simply submitted the exact same response, and Murray did not waiver from his firm belief that Canada’s military past “has shaped the nation we are today” (Murray G., 2013). Charles’ narrative, however, did change significantly, transitioning from “A diverse but conflicted nation” template, in which students would learn “what was before what we have today,” and “How people have made a difference,” to narrating “A diverse but harmonious nation,” in which students would learn about their own local history with the intent of sharing their diversity with one another. In this way, Charles reasoned, history could unite our nation (Charles B., 2013). The resulting three coded adult statements were evenly distributed across traditional, exemplary, and critical narrative templates. Within each, however, there also existed a common thread of an exemplary schema:

1. “A diverse but harmonious nation”- Charles presented a traditional narrative of harmony amidst diversity, in which Canada’s past is commemorated through the local memories of people who lived it:

   I wish to remember the local histories of how Canada was formed by the people who lived here. The local histories, genealogies, folktales, narratives, tall tales,
poems, songs, oral histories all make up the parts of our history worth remembering. As each locality collects their story, we will eventually have a diverse, colourful description of our people, which we can share with one another.

History is more meaningful to people when they can relate to it. (Charles B., 2013)

Within this narrative, Charles also embedded an exemplary “History unites our nation” schema—ever hopeful that by sharing our diverse pasts with one another, Canadians could live together in harmony.

2. “Military history has shaped the nation”- In somewhat stark contrast to Charles’ traditional narrative, Murray continued to employ an exemplary schema, in which conflict has shaped Canada’s past. He also continued to question the purpose behind asking such questions about remembering:

As previously discussed, I have great difficulty in understanding the purpose of these questions. Suffice it to say, that I have a great deal of interest in almost all aspects of Canadian history with an emphasis on military history. Much of Canada’s history, at least prior to the Treaty of Washington of 1870, was shaped by military considerations. In fact, mutual defence was one of the reasons for Confederation. (Murray G., 2013)

3. “Family ties”- As in January, Mary continued to present a critical schema, in which the lives of her ancestors provided the starting point for remembering Canada’s past:

I wish to remember how my country’s history influenced the lives of my ancestors. This history would be mostly regional and would include early settlement, exile,
migration, trade, confederation, conflict, rights (i.e., gender and labour),
governmental policy, etc. (Mary R., 2013)

Within this narrative, however, Mary also embedded an exemplary “path to self-
governance” schema—presenting history as a chronological march through time that
began with early settlement, and ended with post-confederation policy development.

*What history do I wish to remember about New Brunswick?* When remembering the
past of their province, adult responses were also evenly distributed across a somewhat
similar set of narrative templates, which were exemplary, critical, and genetic in nature.

Within these templates, however, there existed very few commonalities:

1. “Military history has shaped the province”—Murray presented a narrative that
   was exclusively exemplary, and almost identical to his response regarding Canada’s past:
   
   Again, I have an interest in almost all aspects of New Brunswick history but with
   an emphasis on the military history of the province. I feel that it is important to
   remember that much of New Brunswick’s history, at least prior to Confederation,
   was shaped by military considerations. (Murray G., 2013)

2. “New Brunswick played an important role in Canadian history”: Charles
   commenced his response by presenting a critical narrative that New Brunswick’s history
   is much more rich in length and depth than other parts of Canada. He then entered into an
   exemplary “Founding of a province” narrative that concluded with a “History unites our
   province” schema:

   New Brunswick history is rich in its length compared; with the rest of Canada,
in its depth; as many activities took place here and in its people; as we have several
important people who lived here.
We should remember our founding peoples - the Native tribes, the French, the Planters, the Loyalists, the Irish, the Scottish and all of the smaller ethnic grouped who settled here. It is important not to judge the past by our present day standards so as to blame a particular group for the decisions of the past. We should study the past so we can understand why certain things happened but not to seek redress for the events of the past.

There should not be two interpretations of our past used to reinforce the prejudices of those - either English or French, who wish to use history as a means to justify their political agenda. (Charles B., 2013)

3. “Family ties” - As in January, Mary continued to present a critical schema that was almost identical to her response regarding Canada’s past. Within this critical template, however, she embedded a genetic “How people lived” narrative, suggesting that she could empathise with people in the past by “knowing what their lives were like”:

I wish to remember the social, material and cultural history of the province. New Brunswick is where my ancestors settled and I would like to know what their lives were like and what influenced their culture and day to day living (Mary R., 2013).

Hence, adult post-responses changed very little as a result of their community history museum fieldwork experience. Both Murray and Mary maintained the same schemas as before, although Charles’ narrative did change slightly, transitioning from a critical “Family ties” template, to a “New Brunswick played an important role in Canadian history” hybrid that also incorporated exemplary narrative schemas.

4.4.3. Temporal context of learning. In addition to the open-ended essay questions analysed thus far, students were also asked to complete a series of written and
oral activities over the period of their 14-week community history museum fieldwork experience (Appendix G). These included two formal homework assignments—on which they were marked—that were based upon historical thinking assessment criteria received in advance as part of the assignment.

The first assignment (introduced on January 18 and due early in the case study on January 31) required students to draw evidence from museum sources—observed during their introductory guided tour of the community history museum (using the scaffolding tool “Looking for evidence in the museum,” Appendix H, p. 393). With this evidence, they were asked to write a paragraph in their own words (50-90 words), responding to the research question: What was life like in British North America in the 1800’s? As a result, students were required to:

- Differentiate between historical time periods by identifying museum artifacts that represented the 1800’s,
- Begin their paragraph with a summary statement relating to the research question,
- Build upon this opening statement in their own words, by describing more than one museum artifact source and elaborating upon evidence drawn from these sources,
- Not copy written text unless it was cited as a quotation,

---

65 Adult participants were not asked to complete these assignments.
66 Due January 31 and February 21 respectively. Owing to school cancellations because of snowstorms, however, the due date for the second assignment was extended to March 1, with oral presentations taking place on February 22.
• Incorporate historical concepts previously discussed and reviewed in class (specifically: museum, curator, British North America, and lifestyle), and
• Complete their paragraph with a concluding summary statement relating to the original research question.

The second assignment was due approximately half way through the case study unit (on February 21), and was similar in nature to the previous assignment. What had changed, however, is that the students had visited the museum two more times since their introductory tour, and had been assigned to work in project groups of three-to-four (organised around specific themes relating to the unit of study). During these two museum visits, students had been given full freedom to explore the exhibits with a digital camera (one per group), and to ask their own prepared questions of the adult volunteers (who had helped curate the exhibits). In addition to these museum visits, adult participants had visited the students’ class twice, and had made themselves available to respond to students’ questions about their selected artifacts (Appendix G). What had also changed since the previous assignment, is that (a) students were now using a set of material history scaffolding tools for historical thinking (Appendix H, pp. 394-396), (b) they had received formal classroom instruction in formulating probing questions of the adult volunteers, (c) they had also received formal instruction in drawing evidence from

---

68 These project groups were: A British soldier’s lifestyle in Georgetown in the 1800’s; Rural life and farming in New Brunswick in the 1800’s; Lifestyle of Acadians in New Brunswick in the 1800’s; Alexander “Boss” Gibson, commerce, and the lifestyle of workers in Margaretville; First Nation (Wolastokqiyyik, Mi’kmaq, and/or Passamaquoddy) lifestyles in the 1800’s; Lifestyle of the Loyalist elite (“Family Compact”) in Georgetown in the 1800’s; and New Brunswick’s Role in the War of 1812. Students were given the opportunity to choose three options, and were then assigned to a group by the cooperating teacher, based upon individual preference and group compatibility. As a result, not all of the students were assigned to the group of their first choice.
artifact sources by asking “What,” “Where,” “When,” “Who,” and “Why” questions, and (d) they had worked with the adults to identify the museum’s exhibition narratives using a historic space mapping technique (section 4.5).

For the second assignment, students were asked to draw evidence from their chosen artifact source within the community history museum, using a material history analysis framework. From this evidence, they were asked to write an artifact label paragraph in their own words (50-90 words), responding to the inquiry questions: What, Where, When, Who and Why? They were also asked to present their findings to the class orally, during the next scheduled study-visit to the museum—hence becoming the museum expert on their chosen artifact source. As a result, students were required to adopt museum standards in artifact analysis and label writing by:

- Clearly identifying the name of their artifact in the label title,
- Beginning their label paragraph with a summary statement that establishes the significance of their selected artifact source,
- Building upon this summary statement in their own words, by presenting evidence drawn from their selected artifact source about What, Where, When, Who, and Why,
- Including at least three references to comparative artifact sources,
- Concluding their label paragraph with a summary statement about what the evidence tells them about their group research topic, and
- Completing the label document by including the artifact accession number in the lower right corner of their paragraph.
The resulting essay documentation provided valuable insight into students’ temporal context of learning. These changes also demonstrate significant transitions in students’ shared narrative templates, as well as their ability to think historically about the narratives they encountered within the community history museum. In the section that follows I will compare these two assignments.

*The past really is a foreign country*69 (*Assignment I*). Student responses (n=23) to the first written assignment demonstrated a very similar narrative template. The largest majority of students (15/23, or 65%) organised their paragraph around a then-versus-now argument, citing how lifestyles in British North America were very “different” compared to today (Table 6). Many of these differences related to farming techniques, as well as the nature of work, the lives of children, women and girls, or the use of machinery and handmade products. Shared artifact references were limited to butter churns, furniture, washing machines, and ploughs (Table 6). Only two students adopted a strategy of drawing evidence from the museum artifacts to support their narrative claims:

> Life in British North America was a lot different than it is today. For one thing, there were little to no machines to help people with things like farming and everyday labour…

> There are many different sources, in Georgetown, from which we can collect this information. For instance, we know that people farmed without machines, from artifacts such as plows [sic] and yokes that would be used with oxen. When we visited the Georgetown Regional Museum, the curator showed us many more artifacts such as swords, guns, butter churns, washing machines

---

69 This narrative description is adapted from Lowenthal (1985) and the title of his publication: *The Past is a Foreign Country*. 
Shared themes: | # | Artifact references: | # | Narrative processes | # |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different from today</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Butter churns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Establishing distance with the past</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Empathizing with the user</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Washing machines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inferring what life was like.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/ work/ labour</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ploughs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recounting narratives from elsewhere</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Four finger grain cradle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recounting the museum narrative.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spinning wheel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferring from the artifact</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handmade/ Homemade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Penny-farthing bicycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drawing evidence from the museum artifacts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toys</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boundary marker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establishing similarities with today</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women/ girls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bricks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No reference to artifacts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food ways</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Camera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establishing significance of the artifact</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War of 1812</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Military coat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville Cotton Mill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coleman Frog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Settle bed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No electricity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Portraits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The British</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scientific (medical) tools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silver spoon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spike-tooth harrow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swords</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxen yoke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Student responses to Assignment I: What was life like in British North America in the 1800’s?*

portraits and scientific tools, providing evidence to allow us to say, with some certainty, that although life in British North America in the 1800s was not as advanced as it is today, it was very similar in many different ways. (Cathy A., 2013)

In this well formulated response, Cathy established lines of similarity with the present, citing how children in the past played with toys “closely resembling those used today,” that “science was going through some huge advancements,” and that “if you were very rich, it was even possible to have your photograph taken” (Cathy A., 2013). Only two students adopted this narrative process (Table 6).
Instead, several students (seven in total, or 30%) simply appropriated versions of narratives that they encountered during their museum visit, with limited degrees of historical accuracy:

Based on the exhibit about the Margaretville Cotton Mill that our curator showed us, life in the 1800s [was] much different than life today. For example, all the bricks were made by hand mostly by women and children on site because there weren’t any machines to do the job. There are many more examples but in conclusion life during the 1800s [was] much different than the lifestyle we live today. (Florence E., 2013)

Even more students (nine in total, or 39%) integrated narratives from sources that were obviously not present within the museum (Table 6), as was the case for Sally and her richly imaginative response:

In british [sic] North America in the 1800s life was busy. Girls or wifs [sic] re [sic] always doing stuff for there [sic] family. Kids always playing or helping out when they were asked. There wasn’t a lot of toys but one toy could be used for lots of things. Because the toys were hand made, all toys were different. There is a lot of toys in the museum. A curator is always working hard. In the 1800s the lifestyle is that everyone is always doing stuff. Every on[sic] in British North America had there [sic] on [sic] colonialism. I really like knowing about the history about british [sic] North America. (Sally J., 2013)

In the end, what appears to have been appropriated from their first guided tour of the community history museum are the following narrative claims:

- Life was very different from today,
• Most jobs were in farming, and this was very hard work,

• The basic life of a British North American was somewhat poor,

• Life was very tough, because there were no machines to do the heavy work, no electronics, and everything was done by hand,

• People had to do manual labour, and in Margaretville bricks were made by hand, “mostly by women and children,”

• Everything was made at home by hand, and never bought in a store,

• Toys were “very rough” with “not much colour,”

• People made their own toys,

• Because of this, all of the toys were different and there were not a lot of them,

• The beds were uncomfortable to sleep on, and furniture was covered with horsehair “to give the room more pop,”

• Yet, life was also not that bad, because everyone was “always doing stuff,” and kids were “always playing or helping out when they were asked,”

• Fashion was also much classier in some cases,

• And if you were very rich, it was even possible to have your photograph taken,

• So some people were “lucky,” but the others were “poor people.”

Overall the findings drawn from assignment I suggest that, within the context of the museum, the temporal distinction between then and now appeared to be very clear for all of the students. In addition, the historical knowledge that students drew from the guided tour also lacked a great deal of accuracy and detail. These findings are significant because they demonstrate what narrative claims were actually appropriated by the students as a result of their first single museum visit.
Let me tell you about my artifact (Assignment II). Student responses (n=19) to the second assignment were substantially different from the previous. In assignment II, all of the students focussed their attention upon a specific artifact source, and drew evidence from that source through a combination of description, inference, or comparison (Table 7). In addition, they did not seem to share common narrative schemes when formulating their responses. Instead, each of their claims were unique—although many had obviously incorporated bits and pieces of the museum narratives (10 in total, or 53%), or narratives from elsewhere (one student), into their responses.

What students seem to have thus appropriated was information drawn from observing their artifact, questioning the curators, and sifting through the museum accession records. As a result, the largest majority of students (16 in total, or 84%) organised their paragraph around an evidence-based description of their chosen artifact source (Table 7). This represents a substantial change from assignment I (Table 6, p. 157), in which none of the students described the museum artifact, and only two students adopted a strategy of drawing out evidence. In addition, more than one-third of the students (10/19; versus 4/23, or 17% in assignment I) drew inferences from this evidence; while another near-third (6/19; versus none in assignment I) incorporated artifact comparisons into their analysis. These findings suggest improvement in students’ abilities to think historically about the artifacts sources that they encountered within the community history museum—by closely examining the source and drawing out evidence, to make

---

70 At this point in this research project, students were deliberately not provided with secondary source information. Instead, they were given full freedom to explore their artifact within the context of the assigned material history scaffolding tools for historical thinking (Appendix H).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assigned research themes:</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Chosen artifacts:</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Narrative processes:</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick’s Role in the War of 1812</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Calvary sword</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Drawing evidence from the museum artifacts</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A British soldier’s lifestyle in Georgetown in the 1800’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>War of 1812 arms chest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Describing the artifact</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pianoforte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recounting the museum narrative.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brown Bess musket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establishing significance of the artifact</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural life and farming in New Brunswick in the 1800’s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Washing machine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferring from the artifact</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corn sheller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comparing the artifact with others</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spike-tooth harrow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Explaining use</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cradle butter churn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Empathizing with the user</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle of Acadians in New Brunswick in the 1800’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rosary beads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inferring what life was like.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stoneware jar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establishing similarities with today</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiddle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establishing symbolic meaning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander “Boss” Gibson, commerce, and the lifestyle of workers in Marysville</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coffee pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recounting narratives from elsewhere</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marysville church photograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marysville Cotton Mill building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boss Buck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nation (Wolastokqiyik, Mi’kmaq, and/or Passamaquoddy) lifestyles in the 1800’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wolastoqwey paddle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Crooked knife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish trap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle of the Loyalist elite (“Family Compact”) in Georgetown in the 1800’s</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legislative Council Chamber chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Council Chamber chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Coy portrait</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Peters Wetmore portrait</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Student responses to Assignment II: Artifact label writing what, where, when, who, and why.
inferences and comparisons to other artifact sources within the museum. The responses also suggest that what was appropriated in assignment II was significantly different from assignment I. By assignment II, students’ narrative claims were no longer simple first impressions, but were now focussed upon the artifact source. Within each group theme there appeared to be no shared narrative templates.

In addition, more than one-third of the students (seven out of 19; versus only one student in assignment I) established significance for their artifact, without receiving any formal instruction in establishing historical significance. Within this one-third student grouping, there emerged two distinct patterns of historical consciousness: (a) trust in the authority of the museum institution, and (b) trust in the authority of the artifact source (see Narrative processes, Table 7, p. 161). These two distinctions align very closely with Rüsen’s (2005) patterns of historical significance, with the former representing an exemplary relationship with the past, and the latter aligning with a genetic typology. With regard to the former (those who placed their trust in the authority of the museum), three (out of seven) of the students reflected this exemplary model for reasoning. As such, they drew from the authority of the museum exhibit to establish significance:

The Acadian Fiddle is [sic] an important piece of entertainment for the Acadians in the 1800’s. Made out of wood, metal, ivory, gut, and mother of pearl, this artifact was played and used on the home farm of Richibucto in the 1890’s.

---

71 These inquiry actions correlate to guideposts 1, 2, 3, and 5 of the Historical Thinking concept Evidence (Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. 40).
73 This information is drawn from direct observation.
Owned by Robert B. Bell, he played it in his teens and returned to it when he was a young man. This artifact is like the clay jar, pan, and chair artifacts because they are something you would find in an Acadian home. The fiddle was used to give entertainment to those to hear it. In [sic] I think that the Acadian society would be different without the musical entertainment. (Matt J., 2013)

Hence, because the fiddle was exhibited within the context of a typical Acadian home, and was included in the exhibition space to convey the message that fiddle music had been an important aspect of Acadian society, Matt drew upon this symbolic narrative to establish significance. In so doing, he placed his trust in the authority of the museum exhibit—and what Rüsen has described as the “timeless validity of values” (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29; Table 3, p. 111).

By contrast, however, four (out of seven) of the students reflected a genetic model for reasoning (drawing from the authority of the artifact source itself to establish significance). An example of this was provided by Cathy:

The cradle churn was an object used in the 1800’s for making butter. It is a long pine barrel with iron legs that would have swung the barrel back and forth, agitating the cream to make it form clumps and turn into butter. This artifact

Actually, Robert B. Bell was not Acadian, and this artifact has no known association with Acadian society. The artifact was included in the exhibit to convey a symbolic message that fiddle music was historically important to New Brunswick’s Acadian community (conversation with the curator, June, 2013).

This indeed was the message that Matt appropriated.

This information is drawn directly from the artifact accession file.

This information is drawn from observation, as well as prior knowledge, since Cathy had been a “Visiting Cousin” at Kings Landing Historical Settlement one summer. During her five-day living history experience, she had learned how to make butter, so knew—from experience—about the buttermaking process (Conversation with Cathy, April, 2013).
would have been used mainly in the kitchen by the women and children, mostly in the mid to late 1800’s, but could have been used as late as the mid 1900’s. This model of butter churn was more convenient and required less effort to use than the dash churn, so we can assume that it’s a newer design. Because of this, the cradle churn is a useful, practical, artifact, that would have had quite an impact on life in the 1800’s. (Cathy A., 2013)

In this example, Cathy drew from her own observations—as well as prior knowledge, comparative analysis, and information gained from her own line of questioning—to infer her own vision of significance: that “the cradle churn is a useful, practical, artifact, that would have had quite an impact on life in the 1800’s” (Cathy A., 2013). In so doing, she placed her trust in the changing authority of the artifact source—and what Rüsen has described as “developments in which forms of life change” (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29; Table 3).

These findings are significant, because they demonstrate curatorial sophistication, in which students were becoming actively engaged within the museum’s critical community of inquiry. By assignment II, all of the student were thinking historically about their artifact sources—by drawing evidence, asking questions, corroborating the source (to a lesser extent), and making inferences. Thus, by way of the material history analysis scaffolding tool (Appendix H, pp. 394-396), all of the students were using observation, comparison, and/or inference—by various degrees—to establish narrative claims about the past. It is also significant to note that each of their resulting claims were individual and unique to their chosen path of analysis. They did not share common

---

77 This information was drawn from questioning the museum curator.
narrative templates—although many (53%) recounted bits and pieces of narratives that they had appropriated from their community history museum fieldwork experience.

*How does the artifact help me remember Canada’s past? (Assignment III).* As part of the final student project of creating and presenting a museum exhibit, students were asked to write a short statement of significance about their artifact. This activity took place in the classroom on April 23 (Appendix G). For this assignment, students were simply presented with two guiding questions to assist with formulating their individual statement: *Why is your artifact important? How does it help you to remember Canada’s Past?* In this way, they were expected to:

- Ask themselves whether they really think their artifact is important,
- Explain why or why not,
- And formulate a *big idea* about their research project.

It is important to note that at this point of time in the unit of study, all of the students were very busy trying to finish their projects before opening night. There remained only four social studies classes before the big opening, and many had fallen behind due to absences from school over the past six weeks. Everyone was feeling the pressure of meeting a firm deadline.

Nevertheless, we began the class by taking 15 minutes to think about a *big idea* as to why their artifact was—or was not—significant. For this activity, students were purposely not provided with specific criteria for establishing significance. Instead, they were simply encouraged to express their own opinions (based upon their own research). The resulting statements of significance (n=14) became a key part of their final museum project, and also provided yet another valuable insight into students’ temporal context of
learning. These statements of historical significance demonstrate how students’ epistemological beliefs about the past were changing over time.

**Patterns of significance.** Over the past 14 weeks, students had completed their community history museum fieldwork, and through this fieldwork had been introduced to the status of being part of a critical community of inquiry. As part of their formal classroom instruction, they had also been empowered to question the authority of the museum as well as the adult volunteers. In so doing, they had encountered knowledge as something that was *re-constructed* from incomplete sources, and thus open to re-interpretation. Hence, through their fieldwork experience, students had actually experienced what Rüsen (2005) describes as a genetic historical consciousness (Table 3, p. 111)—as “developments in which forms of life change” (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29).

Given this context, the statements of historical significance that students re-constructed are particularly relevant to this inquiry, because they reveal (in their own words) the reasoning process that was appropriated from their community history museum fieldwork experience. The resulting statements were compared against Rüsen’s (2005) typology of historical consciousness, according to the following criteria:

- Traditional responses reflected a belief that significance is established by those in positions of authority,
- Exemplary responses reflected a belief that significance is established by timeless rules “affecting the most people over the greatest length of time” (Seixas, 2005, p. 147),
- Critical responses challenged the validity of obligatory traditions, or exemplary rules, establishing significance in the seemingly insignificant,
Genetic responses recognised significance as a changing re-construction of the past, thus contextualising “the present into what has gone before” (Seixas, 2005, p. 149).

In making comparisons between students’ initial open-ended essay question (*What history do I wish to remember about my country?*), and assignment III (*How does it [your artifact] help you to remember Canada’s Past?*), the underlying concept of what was worth remembering about Canada’s past remained similar. Despite these similarities, however, in assignment III students did not respond with the same narrative schemes as in the previous open-ended essay question. Instead, they adopted patterns of significance that reflected their own inferences from material history analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns of Significance</th>
<th>Narrative template,</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revealing</td>
<td>Shows their technology (Cathy, Erica, Sally, Kaitlyn, Gregg, Aamir, Mike)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows how people lived (Caleb, Cathy, Mike, Owen)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps us figure out the past (Diane, Jun, Mike, Cathy)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not do anything important (Chris)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>Represents the culture of the people (Cathy, Kaitlyn)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represents Canada (Sally)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represents changing technology (Aamir)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associates with a historic event (Mike, Jun)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honours an important person (Laurie, David, Owen)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Represents (or not) Canadian history (Jun, Chris)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>Not important (David)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not important (Chris)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8: Student responses to Assignment III (statements of historical significance): Why is your artifact important (or not); How does it help you (or not) to remember Canada’s past?*

Ultimately, out of a total of 14 students who actually developed a statement of historical significance, all but two reached a conclusion that their artifact was important. In addition, within this group of 14, there emerged two distinct patterns of significance: (a) the artifact is important (or not) because of what it reveals about the past, and (b) the artifact is important (or not) because of what it represents symbolically (Table 8).
Revealing responses. All but two of the 14 student respondents found their artifact to be revealing about Canada’s past. In addition, within these revealing responses, all but one was genetic in nature, representing three distinct narrative templates: “Shows their technology,” “Shows how people lived,” and “Helps us figure out the past”:

1. “Shows their technology”- Several students recognised how their artifact was revealing about the technology of the 1800’s. In this sense, their artifact helped them to remember “everything from their natural resources, (like wood and iron) to their food and ways of cooking,” or that “house hold items weren’t made in big fancy factories like we have today.” In addition, some of the students reasoned that their artifact represented change over time, because “if we didn’t have the tools then today we might not have the tools we have today.” As Aamir explained regarding his (hand-crank operated) corn sheller: “My artifact is important because it’s interesting, because it shows or it represents the changing of the farm from hand to machines also it’s a time saver” (Mod’d Aamir K., 2013).

2. “Shows how people lived”- Some students also found their artifact to be revealing about the lifestyles of people in the 1800’s. They reasoned that because their artifact demonstrated what life was like, it allowed them to “see how people lived and survived in the 1800’s.” As Cathy explained about her cradle butter churn:

This butter churn reminds us of life in BNA in the 1800’s because it represents the culture of the inhabitants. It helps us remember everything from their natural resources, (like wood and iron) to their food and ways of cooking. This is what makes it important to keep. (Cathy A., 2013)
3. “Helps us figure out the past” - Others found their artifact to be revealing because it helped them to piece together the past, and thus place their artifact within a broader historical context. As Diane so clearly explained with regard to her portrait of Mary Coy:

This panting [sic] helps us figure out what Mary Coy looked like. It changes our history because we can figure out who painted the painting and her history, and who Mary Coy was. (Diane D., 2013)

As such, Diane considered her artifact to be a source of evidence from which she could "figure out" the past. Hence, Diane perceived knowledge as something that is reconstructed from existing evidence—and thus "changes our history."

In contrast to these three examples of genetic narrative schemes, one student adopted an exemplary template, concluding that his artifact (a finely hand-carved Wolastoqwey paddle, c. 1878) was not significant, because it was both non-revealing and non-symbolic: “I don’t think my artifact is important to Canadian history because it doesn’t involve ‘Canadian’ history. It is just a paddle and didn’t do anything important” (Chris J., 2013).

This statement is particularly relevant, because the paddle in question had been recognised by Canada’s museum community as a very meaningful object to both provincial and national history.\(^{78}\) Yet, regardless of the importance that the museum community had placed upon the artifact\(^{79}\) (and even though Chris was provided access to


\(^{79}\) In the opinion of the researcher, however, the context in which the artifact was exhibited did not seem to convey this message of significance. As a result, it could be argued that the physical learning context may (or may not) have contributed to the student’s conclusions of non-significance.
the contextual information supporting this claim), he did not perceive the paddle as representing "Canadian history." For Chris, it was "just a paddle," so it held no historical significance, since it did not fit his concept of Canadian history.  

Symbolic responses. With regard to those who found their artifact to be symbolic (Table 8, p. 167), all but four of the 14 student respondents adopted this pattern of significance—and of the 10 respondents, seven also found their artifact to be revealing. Within the symbolic patterns of significance, student responses were almost evenly divided between genetic (six out of 11), and exemplary (five out of 11) narratives. Genetic narratives represented two distinct templates: “Represents something,” and “Associated with a historic event”:

1. “Represents something”- Four students recognised how their artifact held symbolic significance because of what it represented. For two of these students, their artifact represented the culture of a people. For another it represented changing technology, and for yet another, Canada itself. As Sally explained: “My artifact is important because if we didn’t have the tools then today we might not have the tools we have today. It helps remember Canada’s past because the Spike Tooth Harrow was a part that resembles Canada” (Sally J., 2013). In this sense, Sally re-constructed symbolic significance by loosely associating her artifact with her vision of Canada.

2. “Associated with a historic event”- Two of the students, however, established symbolic significance by associating their artifact with a historic event. As Mike explained about his War of 1812 arms chest:

---

80 This points to a weakness in the inquiry, since students were not provided with formal instruction in the Historical Thinking concept of Historical Significance (Seixas & Morton, 2013, pp. 12 – 39).
This chest was a very important part of the 1800’s, as it helped in the war of 1812. My artifact is important to keep because it shows that there were very large trees, and it shows that people could make things. My artifact is important because without it it would have been harder to transport weapons, therefore, the chest helped in the war of 1812. (Mike S., 2013)

As is evident from this statement, while Mike also considered his artifact to be a revealing source of evidence because of what it "shows" about the past, he also placed his artifact into the context of the War of 1812, establishing a symbolic association with the historic event. In this way, Mike perceived knowledge as something that is re-constructed from existing evidence, and used this knowledge to reach his own concluding statement that "therefore the chest helped in the war of 1812" (Mike S., 2013).

By comparison, however, students’ exemplary narratives also revealed two distinctive templates that were somewhat similar to genetic responses: “Represents Canadian history,” and “Honours an important person”:

1. “Represents (or not) Canadian history”- For two of the students, their artifact was (or was not) symbolically significant because of what it represented (or not) in Canadian history. In this sense, the timeless rules of “Canadian History” set their terms of importance. As Jun explained about his Brown Bess musket: “My artifact is important to preserve because it represents a lot about Canadian history. It teaches us many things on the War for 1812 and the Napoleonic wars” (Jun D., 2013).

2. “Honours an important person”- Three of the students reasoned that their artifact was symbolically significant because it represented an important person. As Laurie explained, with regard to her commemorative bill: “My artifact the ‘Boss Buck’ is
important to remember from Canada’s history because they were made to honor Alexander “Boss” Gibson for founding Margaretville and for his cotton mill” (Laurie A., 2013).

It is important to note that in many instances (seven out of a total of 14 instances), students employed both revealing and symbolic patterns of significance in constructing their statements of historical significance. For example, Owen adopted both patterns of significance with regard to his Legislative Council Chamber chair. In addition, while his symbolic pattern was exemplary in nature, his revealing element was genetic in nature:

My artifact is important because Thomas Nisbet made it he [sic] is a very well-known furniture maker. This artifact will help me remember Canada because it will remind me of what some of the furniture looked like in the 1800s. (Owen T., 2013)

In constructing this statement, Owen first acknowledged that his artifact was important simply because it symbolised a "well-known furniture maker." Thus, his chair exemplified "timeless rules of social life, timeless validity of values" (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29, see Table 3, p. 111). Owen, however, then went on to suggest a revealing aspect of his artifact, explaining that it reminded him of what furniture "looked like" in the past. In this sense, his reasoning became genetic, because he acknowledged that the chair could reveal to him how people lived in the past—thus suggesting a past that was open to re-interpretation.

In yet another example of complexity, David interestingly adopted a very different pattern of significance for a very similar artifact (an Executive Council Chamber chair). Unlike Owen, however, David adopted a singularly symbolic pattern of significance that was both exemplary as well as critical in nature:
I don’t really think that my artifact is really important since it’s just a chair, maybe it’s important if you want to sit down though. Its helps me remember that Thomas Nisbet was practically famous and as one of the best carpenters in New Brunswick during the 1800s. (David B., 2013)

Hence, David’s statement was critical, in that he began by stating his artifact was, after all, "just a chair." He then proceeded to establish symbolic significance, adding that it represented someone who was "practically famous." In this way—like Owen—his chair exemplified "timeless rules of social life, timeless validity of values" (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29; see Table 3, p. 111).

Ultimately, what is significant about all of these student statements of historical significance is that they demonstrate how students’ historical consciousness had changed over time. Commencing in January, with assignment I (What was life like in British North America?), and ending in April with the more focussed question of How does it [your artifact] help you to remember Canada’s Past? students’ narrative templates became different. In January, students employed traditional (34%81), exemplary (24%82), and genetic (24%83) narrative templates about remembering their country’s past—reflecting generalised beliefs. By assignment III (in April), students were employing genetic (72%84), exemplary (24%85), and critical (3%86) narrative templates about how their artifacts helped them to remember (or not) Canada’s past—focussing specifically upon

81 Fourteen out of 41 responses; see Table 4, p. 133.
82 Ten out of 41 responses; see Table 4, p. 133.
83 Ten out of 41 responses; see Table 4, p. 133.
84 Twenty-one out of 29 responses; see Table 8, p. 167.
85 Seven out of 29 responses; see Table 8, p. 167.
86 One out of 29 responses; see Table 8, p. 167.
their chosen artifact source. In the section that follows, I will analyse visual documentation that resulted from phase two and three of the inquiry.

### 4.5 Historic Space Mapping and Photovoice

During phase two of data collection, participants were asked to engage in historic space mapping of the community history museum exhibits. This activity was also undertaken during phase three, when students adopted the same mapping technique to plan their final project exhibits (Appendix G).

#### 4.5.1 Physical context of learning (connecting the dots).

After their first visit to the community history museum, which involved a standard guided tour, as well as a special visit to collections storage in the museum attic, students participated in an introductory historic space mapping activity (Figure 24). This activity took place within their classroom the following week (January 24), and involved organising printed images from the museum exhibits by theme, and re-creating the visual narrative that they had encountered as a large wall mural (Figure 25). The physical learning objectives of this activity were to enable students to re-visit the museum space within their classroom, talk about what they had encountered there with their peers, and then construct a visual timeline based upon the exhibition themes. In this way, students would become

---

87 It is also important to note, however, that only 14 (58%), out of the entire 24 student case study sample, actually completed assignment III, so not everyone reached this particular transition in historical thinking.
physically engaged in connecting the dots between isolated images, exhibition themes, and historical time (Figures 24 and 25).

This activity seemed to serve as a very useful visual tool for enabling students to review aspects of their museum visit. It also enabled them to formulate precise questions for next day’s class, so that their questions were based upon more than just episodic memories. It is important to note that during the classroom activity students picked up on two critical points regarding the museum exhibits: (a) the spelling of the word “Malecite,” and (b) dates “1900 – 1950” posted outside the entrance to the World War I re-creation of a Vimy trench (which seemed to make no sense).

4.5.2 Sociocultural context of learning (engaging in dialogue). On the following day (January 25), two of the museum volunteers (Lucy and Murray) visited the class to respond to students’ questions about their museum tour. The museum volunteers clearly understood that they were not there to present a lecture. Instead, they had come merely to

---

88 These questions were also added to the museum historic space map, as yet another physical learning activity, during class on February 7. For some of the students, being able to leave their seat and move about the classroom at will was an important part of their learning style.

89 This is an archaic version of the name for First Nations people living along the St. John river. It is derived from the French spelling (Malécite) of a Mi’kmaq word, meaning “broken talkers,” “lazy speakers,” or “he speaks badly” (Erickson, 1978, p. 135). Students were more familiar with the term “Maliseet” (an English spelling) found in their textbooks, although “Wolastoqiyik” (“people of the beautiful river” (Perley, Turnbull, & Allen, 2000, p. 44) would have been more appropriate. The choice of spelling, however, was not a mistake. It represents a conscious decision on the part of the curator to adopt this version of the word (Conversation with Mary R., January 25, 2013).
respond to students’ questions. In this way, the students were empowered to direct the topic of discussion.

The visual point of reference for the Question and Answer session was the museum historic space map (Figure 25), which served to provide participants with visual specifics for formulating questions. Each student posed a question of their choice, and either Lucy or Murray responded—depending upon the topic. The students were well prepared, and seemed to ask questions that interested them. Likewise, Murray and Lucy seemed to enjoy the experience of responding. It appeared that the key to the success of this activity rested with the volunteers’ level of knowledge about Georgetown, New Brunswick, and Canadian history. They each seemed to possess a storehouse of interesting facts and tidbits about these areas of history, and seemed able to respond with ease to any question that was posed to them.90 Through historic space mapping, combined with this Question and Answer session, students seemed consciously aware that they were examining someone else’s conceptualisation of the past.

In preparation for their second museum visit, students returned to their historic space map (on January 31), in order to formulate probing questions for the next day’s unguided visit. In advance of this, however, a portion of class time was dedicated to an introductory lesson about recognising different types of questions. To illustrate these differences, students’ questions from the previous Question and Answer session were organised according to three categories for critical thinking. In so doing, I was careful to explain that all of the questions were great questions—it was just that different questions

---

90 Observational notes recorded by the researcher (Cynthia Wallace-Casey, February 3, 2013).
served different purposes: (a) information questions, (b) opinion questions, and (c) probing questions. This concept of critical inquiry seemed to be new to the students.

Working within their research groups, and using the museum historic space map as a point of reference, students were then asked to develop three questions (each) to pose to the curators the next day in the museum. In this way, they were prompted to engage in a learning dialogue on three levels: (a) sociocultural: between the artifacts that attracted their personal attention, (b) internally: between the artifacts exhibit on the museum map and themselves, and (c) externally: between other student researchers within their group. As a result, upon arriving at the museum (the next day, February 1) for a second visit, all of the students appeared to be prepared to engage in dialogue with the exhibits and/or volunteers. It was obvious that they were armed with a mission, and knew where they were going. They seemed to be happy and enjoying the experience. They also seemed to be very focused upon their research theme.

During their third museum visit (February 15), students engaged in more detailed on-site mapping of specific exhibits within the museum. Upon arriving at the museum, we briefly reviewed the tasks for the day’s visit:

---

91 These categories are defined as: (a) Information questions: Used when you are just asking for the facts (these elicit short, one word, or simple responses); (b) Opinion questions: Used to solicit someone’s opinion. You do not necessarily have to agree with them. (c) Probing questions: Used to challenge a person to provide a more detailed explanation, or to elicit an either/or judgement on their part. These three categories align with The Critical Thinking Consortium definition of questioning as: "Where’s Waldo" retrieval of information questions, "All answers are valid" questions, and "Critical challenge" questions requiring a reasoned judgement on the part of the respondent (Case & Wright, 1997).
• Obtain material history evidence from their artifact source by way of direct examination (Figure 26), as well as refer to the artifact accession files (discussed in section 4.6.3). This was in preparation for assignment II92 (due the following week), as well as a related oral presentation (also taking place the following week in the museum);

• Obtain any images that they wished to acquire, for their research group93 (discussed in section 4.7); and

• Map out the exhibit relating to their artifact, as an idea web. This latter task served to focus the students upon the museum exhibit relating to their assigned research theme, and could be developed with the assistance of the museum volunteers.

In explaining the task of mapping out the exhibit, I used the example of the World War II display case (which was in the room where we were initially gathered), to demonstrate how it could be done. To begin, I asked Chris, who was standing beside the case, to give me a rough estimate of how many artifact sources were on display in the unit. Chris responded: “about nine.” I then asked, why do you think the curator choose to place those sources together in that case? What was he or she trying to say to you? What

92 See section 4.4.3 for an analysis of the results of this assignment.
93 One person in each group, who had not yet had the opportunity, was in charge of the camera. See section 4.7 for details regarding the photovoice component of this research project.
is the message they were trying to convey? Everyone seemed to be captivated by this explanation. They understood that we were trying to map out the thinking of the curator—to think like him or her.

Undoubtedly, students were pressed for time (as usual), since everyone had to be ready to leave and return to school in 30 minutes. Within the time that was available, however, all seemed to accomplish a great deal—although, with regard to mapping out the exhibit containing their artifact, not everyone responded to the task (on paper). Out of a total of 21 student participants that day, only nine actually followed through on this activity within the timeframe that was available.94

4.5.3 Temporal context of learning (deconstructing the museum). On the last day of phase two (March 1), all of the museum volunteers returned to the classroom, to assist students in developing a historic space map relating to their assigned research theme. Despite predictions of a major winter snow storm, school was not cancelled that day, and all but one of the volunteers battled difficult driving conditions to be there. This was also the last day of school before March Break.

As a way of revisiting—and building upon—the community history museum fieldwork experience of three weeks previous, students were asked to map out the museum exhibition relating to their research theme. To do this, they would have to rely upon their own memories, as well as the museum historic space map that they had created

94 Those who followed through on this assignment were: Cathy, Sally and Patsy (Rural life and farming in New Brunswick research group); Salem, Gregg, and Chris (First Nation lifestyles research group); Owen (Lifestyle of the Loyalist elite research group); Mike (British soldier’s lifestyle in Georgetown research group); and Sandy (Alexander “Boss” Gibson, commerce, and the lifestyle of workers in Margaretville research group). See sections 4.6.3 and 4.7 for a report on the findings from other tasks undertaken during the same museum visit.
more than a month before (on January 24), and the explanations of the museum volunteers.

Drawing examples from the museum’s Margaretville exhibition ("The Boss’ World"), I explained how the exhibits were organised around three obvious sections: one section relating to the cotton mill and the lifestyle of mill workers, another relating to “Boss” Gibson's railroad, and a third relating to life in the lumber camps. I also pointed out that not all of the exhibits were as clearly defined as this, but that there was a reason for why artifacts were displayed the way they were.

All of the students were very familiar with the technique of building concept maps. Most of the volunteers, however, were not—which made for a great deal of confusion at the beginning. Initially, there were questions as to whether the “exhibition map” was literally a map of the floor space, or whether it was instead, a map of the ideas presented within the exhibition. Charles, a retired school teacher, knew exactly what to do—the others did not. Nevertheless, eventually everyone caught on, and students became engaged in building their historic space maps along with the volunteers.

In Lucy's absence, I worked with the Margaretville group. With a small amount of instruction, Florence and Sandy were quickly on task. Using the museum historic space map as their starting point of reference, they commenced building a concept map, moving

![Figure 27: “The Boss’ World” concept map](image)
out from the central topic (“Boss” Gibson's Margaretville, 1850 - 1900), to exhibit units (cotton mill, community, and lumbering), and then identifying individual artifacts (Figure 27).

In the end, this activity seemed to be very successful. All of the students appeared to be actively engaged with the museum volunteers (for several of the students, remaining engaged in a cognitive activity for 30 minutes represented a major feat in attentiveness). As a result, all seemed actively involved in deconstructing (as well as re-constructing) their community museum fieldwork experience. Students’ post-evaluations indicate that they enjoyed working with the volunteers (see Figure 54, pp. 269). In addition, the one-on-three/four grouping ratio was very productive. Given that the volunteers also wanted to keep coming back, suggests an important community/generational connection had been established.\(^{95}\) The dilemma remained, however: how to enable the students to begin building their own exhibit narratives? This was the primary objective for phase three of the inquiry, which commenced after the March Break.

4.5.4 Personal context of learning (making personal choices). Upon returning from March Break on (March 15), everyone seemed well prepared to begin phase three of the inquiry. Each student group had developed a concept map outlining the museum exhibit relating to their research theme, each had selected an artifact for analysis according to the material history framework, and most had completed assignment II. Since their museum fieldwork experience had come to an end, there would no longer be opportunities to interact with the museum volunteers. The next step was to enable students to start making personal choices about the museum’s artifact collections and create their own exhibit narratives (Figure 28).

\(^{95}\) Conversations with Mary R. as well as Murray G. after class, March 1, 2013.
To begin, working with the images that they had collected during the fieldwork portion of their community history museum experience, students broke down into their research groups. Working together, they sorted through their images, making group choices on which to add to the exhibit concept map, and making personal choices on where their individual (chosen) artifact connected to the “big idea” of the museum exhibit (Figures 28 to 35).

The resulting documentation provided a visual record of students’ personal selections in deconstructing the exhibits (without the assistance of museum volunteers). It also provided each student with a point of reference for self-reflection, on what they understood the museum exhibit to be about, and where they saw their artifact “fitting” into this narrative. On a more practical level, the exhibit concept maps also proved useful for future classwork, because they enabled students to re-visit their original ideas—and pick up where they had left off—from one class to the next (Figures 29 to 35).

As was apparent from these concept maps, however, some of the exhibits seemed more conducive to deciphering a curatorial message than others.\(^{96}\)

\(^{96}\) This is a direct reflection upon the clarity of exhibit design.
Figure 30: Research project theme: Rural life and farming in New Brunswick in the 1800’s

Figure 31: Research project theme: Lifestyle of Acadians in New Brunswick in the 1800’s

Figure 32: Research project theme: Alexander ‘Boss’ Gibson, commerce, and the lifestyle of workers in Margaretville.

Figure 33: Research project theme: First Nation (Wolastokqiyik, Mi’kmaq, and/or Pussamaquoddy) lifestyles in the 1800’s

Figure 34: Research project theme: Lifestyle of the Loyalist elite (“Family Compact”) in Georgetown in the 1800’s

Figure 35: Research theme: New Brunswick’s role in the war of 1812.
As a final step in historic space mapping (on March 27), students were asked to map out their own exhibit plan in detail (Figure 28). This became a starting point for the final assignment of creating and presenting a museum exhibit project about their artifact (culminating in the opening of their classroom Museum of British North America on April 30). In the section that follows, I will analyse the related scaffolding documentation that resulted from phases one, two, and three of this inquiry.

4.6 Material History Framework for Historical Thinking

Over the course of all three phases of data collection, participants were asked to adopt a series of scaffolding tools, intended to engage participants in museum history domain-knowledge. These tools were designed to support a premise that students could be empowered to do material history as museum curators do, but that such a scenario would require teaching students how to read, and critically analyze, museum artifacts for the evidence that they contain. The resulting four mediational instruments (Appendix H) were refined over time, as a result of feedback received from the students, and included a sources and evidence organiser (Appendix H, p. 393), as well as an adapted version of The McCord Museum’s (2013) Interpreting Artifacts worksheet (Appendix H, pp. 394-396), a modified material history analysis grid (Appendix H, p. 397), and a message and means storyboard organiser (Appendix H, p. 398).

4.6.1 Personal context of learning (thinking historically with artifacts).

Students were first introduced to the concept of thinking historically with museum artifacts.

---

97 See also Corbishley (2011, 2015) for a similar approach to object-based learning.
artifacts, through a simple classroom activity developed by The Bata Shoe Museum. While students seemed to enjoy this activity, their responses were nevertheless very simplistic, and did not seem to reflect the level of historical inquiry to which The Historical Thinking Project is dedicated (Seixas & Morton, 2013; see also: Denos & Case, 2006; Gini-Newman & Misfeldt, 2008; Mandell & Malone, 2007). For example, in response to a reproduction of a 17th century French shoe (which would have been worn by inhabitants of St. Croix Island in 1604), students provided these highly imaginative conclusions:

- A woman who made this leathery shoe to be warmer in the cold days of Canada. This woman could be an adventure [sic] who loves to climb up the mountain but she needed the shoes to resist the coldness. Because it looks like a warm & leathery boots were. Because it looks cozy (Salome H., 2013).

- This person was a man that was probably very in style. I say this because women were a bit more classy. Also, it looked like it would belong to someone who was either very poor or very in fashion. The materials just tell me how this person dressed (Maggie K., 2013).

---


99 This activity involved responding to a series of six questions: (a) “What material is used to make and/or decorate these shoes?” (b) “Are they made by hand or machine?” (c) “What shoes have you seen that are similar?” (d) “Are they a man’s or a woman’s shoe?” (e) “Do you think these shoes were made for a special purpose? Why?” (f) “What do these shoes tell us about the wearer?” Students were then asked to write about the person who they thought had owned the shoe. (The Bata Shoe Museum, 2013)
Subsequently, over a series of five brief lesson periods (January 17, 18, February 7, 8, & 13; see Appendix G), organised around a strategy for differentiating between narrative claims and sources (Figure 36; see also Appendix H, p. 393), students became familiar with distinctions within the historical thinking concept of Evidence and Sources. As a result, by the time that assignment II was due on February 21, all of the students possessed a substantial level of skill and knowledge around how historical narratives can/should be based upon evidence that is drawn from primary sources (Figure 36).\(^{100}\)

This concept in historical thinking became fundamentally important to this inquiry, since the material history analysis process that students would engage in became progressively more challenging as they proceeded onward through phases two and three of the inquiry. Ultimately, by phase three, students were making their own evidence choices about how they wished to approach the final assignment of creating and presenting a museum exhibit about their artifact source. These personal choices were documented through a message and means storyboard organiser (Appendix H, p. 398), which will be discussed in greater detail in section 4.7.4.

\(^{100}\) This understanding is supported by results of assignment II, in which all but three of the students (n==24) completed the requirement of drawing at least three pieces of evidence (who, what, when, where or why) from their artifact source, while the other three students drew two pieces of evidence from their artifact source.
4.6.2 Sociocultural context of learning (drawing from a critical community of inquiry). On February 7, students were first introduced to a modified version of The McCord Museum’s (2013) *Interpreting Artifacts* worksheet (“Doing history with objects,” Appendix H, pp. 394-396). Initially, only the “what” section of questions were posted on the classroom whiteboard, so that students were required to copy them into their journals. In addition, students were also first introduced to the photovoice images that they had gathered the week previous, during their museum visit. These images, as well as students’ episodic memories, were their only source of information for responding to the “what” questions.

The following day (February 8), students were provided with a complete set of the 5W’s questions in class (“Doing history with objects,” Appendix H, pp. 394-396). In addition, all of the museum volunteers (except Lucy) were present. I began the class by reviewing what the students were able to accomplish the day before (using their photovoice snapshots as their visual source):

- Only one person (Cathy) was able to decipher the artifact accession number.
- The entire class was quite responsive to being able to identify the construction material for their artifacts (I used the opportunity to discuss how artifacts might be dated by their construction method—i.e., plastic indicates a more modern construction date, machine stitching as well).
- With regard to a maker, Owen responded that he knew that his artifact had been made by Thomas Nesbitt (upon hearing this, the museum volunteers, as well as myself,

---

101 In hindsight, this did not seem to be a very effective strategy for this particular class. More time seems to have been occupied with simply copying the questions over, than in responding to them (observation notes, February 18, 2013).
were very impressed. This information could not have been deciphered from the photovoice images, so Owen had drawn this information from his memory of the museum visit).

Next I explained that there were many more questions to ask about the artifacts, concerning the 5W’s of what, where, when, who, and why; so today, the volunteers were visiting the class in order to be available for their questions about their artifact. Today was their opportunity to obtain as much information as they could from the volunteer curators.102

In preparation for the activity, Mary had brought along copies of the accession sheets for each of the students’ artifacts, but I asked that she not give them to the students directly—rather, make them available to the volunteers for their reference. My point in making this request was that students needed to perceive the artifact as a problem to be solved. If the accession sheets were made immediately available, I reasoned, they would simply be able to copy the information down (Charles, a retired teacher, nodded in agreement with this rationale). The accession sheets proved to be very beneficial for the volunteers, because they were able to be more precise in their response to students’ questions.

Students then broke down (informally) into their research groups, with their research folder (one per group, containing only students’ photovoice images at this point in the inquiry). The remainder of the entire class was devoted to one-on-one discussion (within their groups)

102 I also explained that this information would help them to complete next week’s written assignment (assignment II).
with a museum volunteer (Figure 37). It is significant to note that the subsequent group discussions seemed to unfold very naturally, and students appeared to be very engaged. There were no discipline problems, and everyone seemed productively active the entire time. The one-on-one discussions continued for more than 30 minutes. At this point in time in the inquiry, it appeared that the students perceived themselves as active members of a critical community of inquiry. They were becoming more familiar with the methods of historical inquiry that curators use in museums, and they were also becoming aware of the problematic nature of historical research.

At the end of class, Charles requested an opportunity to talk about the community heritage fair coming up the following day (February 9) in the city. He left copies of the notice on the table in the front of the classroom. Mary also spoke about the War of 1812 commemorative event taking place the following Saturday (February 16). Then the bell rang, and suddenly everyone seemed more interested in lunch break, than in commemorative events taking place within their community.

As students were filing out of the room, the museum volunteers formed a huddle near the door. The cooperating teacher walked over from her desk, thanked the volunteers (she seemed very satisfied with how the class had unfolded), and explained how much she appreciated having them in the class. The volunteers also seemed satisfied with the
experience, and liked the one-on-one questioning format. In hindsight, not providing students with the artifact accession sheets was a good move, because it required the volunteers to actually talk and explain details to the students. The *Interpreting Artifacts* worksheet (Appendix H, pp. 394-396) also served as an effective scaffolding tool for the museum volunteers, because it facilitated their engagement with the students.

One significant problem, however, was that at this point in time in the inquiry, the dynamics of information-flow still rested with the museum volunteers. As a result, students seemed to be simply listening, and making note of the narratives the volunteers provided. Any thought of challenging what the volunteers said seemed totally foreign to all involved (plus, when students had been initially encouraged to challenge the museum “experts” on January 25, their challenges had been rationalised away by the “experts”). Hence, any possible inaccuracies in the museum’s narratives were being left totally unquestioned.

The following week (on February 13), students returned to their notes, as well as their *Interpreting Artifacts* worksheet, museum historic space map, and images, to prepare for the next museum fieldwork experience (see Appendix G). Their “mission” this time, would be to fill in gaps in the information they had gathered to date, examine the artifacts more carefully, gather more photovoice images, and ask more questions of the museum volunteers. In this way (like the week previous, on February 7 and 8), students were entering into three levels of dialogue: (a) externally— with the volunteer curators, (b) socioculturally— through the lens of interpretation of the museum itself, and (c) internally— with the artifact and the information that it concealed. At the same time, they were beginning to realise that curatorial research is challenging, since researchers
often do not possess a great deal of information with which to construct knowledge about
the past. For this reason, February 13 represented a significant turning point in the
inquiry.

4.6.3 Physical context of learning (returning to the original source). The next
museum fieldwork experience took place two days later, on February 15. This was the
students’ third visit to the museum. When we arrived, all of the adult participants were
there to greet us (Mary, Charles, Lucy, Murray, and Ellen). Mary had pulled the artifact
accession files, and was armed with a large supply of purple plastic gloves (worn to
handle the artifacts).

Upon entering the building, we first gathered in the warmly heated reception room
(with exception to this space and the executive director’s office, the museum was
unheated during the winter, so temperatures inside were very frigid). The excitement
level was very high—and I had to clap my hands to gain the students’ attention. Even at
that, however, some were still talking... so I waited until there was silence (which took
about five minutes), then explained the day’s tasks:

- First, the museum volunteers would go to their exhibit rooms (the students got a
laugh out of this, repeating: "Go to your room!"—as no doubt their parents/guardians had
often said to them). Mary had provided the volunteers with keys to the exhibit cases, as
well as the artifact accession files for each of the students’ chosen artifacts. As a result,
students were free to gather as much information as possible about their artifact. This
marked a very unique occasion, since visitors rarely have an opportunity to actually
handle the artifacts first-hand and examine them so closely.
Students were then asked to refer back to their *Interpreting Artifacts* worksheet, with the objective of securing the information that they were missing (by either direct examination of their artifact, interpreting the context of the exhibition, questioning the museum volunteers, or referring to the artifact accession sheet).

- Students’ second task was to map out the exhibit (containing their artifact) as a concept map.

- Their third task was to obtain any images that they wished to acquire, for their research group.\(^\text{103}\)

Actually, I was quite worried about this particular museum visit, because I was not certain if the students would remain on task. Given that it was their third trip to the museum, I had visions of individuals running through the halls and getting into mischief. These fears, however, were totally unfounded. It is significant to note that all of the students were intellectually engaged, knew where they were going, and were focused upon the reason for being there. For those whose artifacts were locked away in exhibit cases, they were particularly captivated by the experience of wearing gloves, and handling the artifacts like a curator (Figure 38). Each paid close attention to what they were doing, where they were placing the artifact for examination, and what information they could gather from the source itself (Figure 39).

\(^{103}\) One person in each group, who had not yet had the opportunity, was also in charge of the camera. See section 4.7 for details regarding the photovoice component of this research project.
Even more significantly, during this museum visit, it was apparent that students' attention was focused upon the artifacts. They were confident in their actions, and seemed to be drawing from prior knowledge (in historical inquiry) that they had acquired in the classroom. They were digging much deeper than in previous visits (Figure 40). They were also making full use of their time. Thirty minutes into the fieldwork experience (although it was time to leave), it was evident that students could have remained focused for another 10 to 15 minutes. No one was anxious to go, but when they did have to depart, they left the museum excited and fulfilled—ready to complete assignment II, and ready to prepare for an oral presentation the following Friday (February 22) when they would return to the museum for the last time.

After the students left, I took a few minutes to reflect with the museum volunteers (in Mary's heated office). Like myself, they were very positive about the experience:
Mary noted that her students (in the Acadian room and First Nations room) were full of excitement, yet respectful of the artifacts. She described the students as "awesome."

Ellen noted that, for her students, the files were a little bit beyond them, and that (in particular) the museum terminology was a bit difficult. Ellen likened their experience to learning a new language.

Overall, this particular museum visit seemed to be very effective for enabling historical inquiry. The experience provided the students with opportunities to talk with the volunteer curators, and "pick their brain." In this way, it seemed that they were modelling how to think like a material historian.

The following Friday (February 22), all returned for their last community history museum fieldwork experience. Having completed assignment II, the task for this day was for all of the students to provide an oral presentation about their artifact. In this way, we were “flipping the class” to empower the students to be the museum “experts.” In preparation, each student had prepared an artifact photocard (to be discussed in section 4.7.2) containing their 5W’s descriptive information on the reverse side. I had organised the photocards in advance, so that students could be called up to speak in order of their exhibit room. In this manner we proceeded through the museum, with the students giving brief presentations about their artifact. All but four of the students\textsuperscript{104} presented their findings within a timeframe of 30 minutes; the cooperating teacher was very pleased with the results.

\textsuperscript{104} Three had been absent the week before, so were not prepared; one did not wish to speak in front of the group.
All in all, this final museum activity seemed to be very successful. The only drawback was in hearing the speakers, since students’ voices were so mild; in a crowd of 24 (plus three chaperons and four volunteers) not everyone was able to hear the presentations. Space was also a problem, since as a group of 31 we were very crowded. Previous visits, in which students broke down into groups of three/four, worked much better. With smaller groups, all were engaged; with larger groups, not all could be attentive to the speakers.

4.6.4 Temporal context of learning (contextualising the artifact). Entering into phase three of the inquiry, many of the students found the process of building upon assignment II to be very difficult.

Material history analysis grid. This particular scaffolding tool (Appendix H, p. 397) proved to be particularly challenging for most of the students. When re-presented as an artifact photocard activity, however, (see section 4.7.2), all of the participants excelled in drawing evidence from their artifact source. The greatest difficulty rested in differentiating between what was observable, comparable, and contextual evidence.

Observable data. All but one of the students (96%) completed the “observable data” section of the grid. In so doing, they simply responded to the 5W’s (who, what, when, where, why) as best they could (see section 4.7.2).

---

105 One thing I would not do again, however, is the headline activity (Appendix G). Based upon Murray’s feedback after, it became apparent to me that reducing a message down to a "catchy title" may seem like a great activity, but it does not model historical thinking. Instead, students were led to attach presentist concepts to historical artifacts. For example, Tzhi’s headline of the (War of 1812 calvary)"Banana Sword"—although creative, and no doubt enabling him to remember the artifact—really bears no historical value.

106 This person did not complete the task simply because she was absent on the days we worked on the grids and artifact notecards.
Comparable data. Fourteen of the students (58%) completed the “comparable data” section, making comparisons to other objects within the museum exhibits relating to their artifact; however, when this task, was re-presented as an exhibit concept map activity (on March 15), all of the students demonstrated that they clearly understood how their artifacts related to other artifacts within specific exhibit themes\textsuperscript{107} (see section 4.5.4).

Contextual data. Only nine of the students (37%) completed the “contextual data” section, which involved introducing evidence from secondary sources. When this task, however, was re-presented (on March 25) as an Internet research activity, students became actively engaged in gathering contextual information.

During the March 22 class, it seemed that students were experiencing difficulties contextualising their artifact (i.e., connecting it to a bigger picture in history). This was significant, because contextualisation seemed to come very easily to the museum volunteers (as well as myself). The problem appeared to be that the students seemed to possess so little prior knowledge from which to re-construct a historical context for their artifact.\textsuperscript{108} For this reason, I decided to provide each student with one or more "clues"

\textsuperscript{107} Late in the project, it occurred to me that students would understand this concept of making comparisons better if they actually engaged in an artifact exchange. I tried this out with Henry (who had fallen behind, having missed several weeks of school). To gather comparative evidence about his War of 1812 calvary sword, I suggested that he talk to another student with a similar artifact (i.e., another sword, or another weapon relating to the War of 1812). His/her observable evidence would become Henry’s comparable evidence. This worked perfectly. In the end, Henry excelled in this activity.

\textsuperscript{108} With regard to students’ progress in acquiring additional background knowledge (during the days that I was not with them), on March 27 (2013) I noted in my observation journal: "In terms of their other social study classes… they do not seem to be progressing as well. [The cooperating teacher] reports that they are watching the War of 1812 movie, so they are only at Day 3 of the prepared lesson plans (three weeks in to the term). They do seem to enjoy the movies that I selected, however." At this point in the term, the class should have been at Day 8 in the formal lesson plans that had been prepared to support the project. Many social studies classes had been lost, however, due to winter storm closures, which also resulted in
(i.e., filling in a few blanks in their grid to give them a few puzzle pieces). I also decided to respond to their research questions with probing questions—with the intent of establishing a dialogic learning context, where they would be thinking about the questions I posed to them, and responding in their own way. Based upon the recommendations of Larmer and Mergendoller (2010), I was confident that this approach would be appropriate: "The classroom culture should value questioning, hypothesizing, and openness to new ideas and perspectives" (p. 3). In the end, this approach did seem to work, because my questions dissuaded most students from simply consulting Wikipedia (although some did anyway). Without these probing questions, I suspected that many would not have known how to proceed.

All in all, I was pleased with how the two classes on March 22 and 23 unfolded, although there were also a few problems:

- Some of the students (even after being presented with specific keywords for a Google search—that I had already tested out, so knew where it would take them) were reacting with "I can't find anything," or "there's nothing there";
- Most of the students really did not approach the activity as re-constructing the past, but rather as simply responding to my questions;
- It also seemed apparent that web sites that were heavy in text (i.e., Canadian Dictionary of Biography) were not appealing. Students quickly skimmed over the words and did not read any of the text in depth;

---

subsequent cancellations of social studies classes to recover lost days in other subjects. Movies were selected as a teaching resource mainly because the cooperating teacher expressed anxiety that she did not know where to begin to teach the subject of Canadian history. She did not possess a history background, the course had been "dropped" on her with no time to prepare, and she was severely lacking teaching resources.
• Images, however, attracted their attention. For students with short attention spans, their research strategy was simply to find images that looked like what they were looking for, and stop there.

Being able to revisit their work on the second day (March 25) seemed to be very effective. All but two students busied themselves with Internet research (although it was noticeable that a few wandered off task and spent much of their time on web sites that had nothing to do with their topic). For one student in particular (with an extremely short attention span), a War of 1812 game site\textsuperscript{109} seemed to be very engaging; he enjoyed spending time on the site, it kept him on task, and enabled him to think about the topic in history.

Conclusions data. Only five of the students (21\%) completed the “conclusions” section, which involved formulating summary ideas about their artifact’s 5W’s (who, what, when, where, why). For the remaining 79\% of students, their “observable data” came to serve as their summary ideas, and these later provided a starting point for the message and means exhibit storyboard activity that followed on April 4.

Message and means storyboard organiser. Commencing with their material history analysis grids, as well as exhibit concept maps from March 27, journal notes, Internet research notes, and anything else they had on hand, students were asked to complete a message and means storyboard organiser (see Appendix H, p. 398\textsuperscript{110}). This scaffolding tool was intended to assist them in isolating at least three key messages that they wished to convey about their artifact (based upon their own material history


\textsuperscript{110} Based upon feedback received from the students, this document was revised.
analysis). It was also intended to assist in focusing their messages around their research question. Hence, the “objective” was to respond to their research question with at least three messages relating to observable, comparable, and contextual analysis.

The keyword clues and probing counter-questions, which I had added to students’ artifact analysis grids two weeks previously, came to be very beneficial. These seemed to provide students with a focus for their three messages. Without them, I suspect that most everyone would have been lost. By the end of class, almost all of the participants (17 out of a total of 20 present) had achieved their three message statements. I also observed that many of the students now felt that they had knowledge to contribute to their classroom museum project. They seemed excited and/or puzzled, because (through their research) they had found contradictions or gaps within the community history museum’s narratives. For example:

- Aamir was grappling with whether his artifact was a “corn husker” or a “corn sheller,”
- April was grappling with who the parents really were for Sarah Peters Wetmore,
- Cathy was making detailed comparisons between different styles of butter churns,
- Chris was beginning to doubt the significance of his artifact,
- Diane was questioning herself as to who Mary Coy would have been mourning,

---

111 As noted in my observation journal on March 27 (2013): "In speaking with Aamir, I pointed out to him the distinction that he had uncovered between a "corn husker" and a "corn sheller." I asked him, if he could determine which his artifact was. To which he responded with certainty: "It's a corn husker" I asked him why. He responded that he had checked the museum web site, and there it is identified as a corn husker, so it is definitely a corn husker. This raises the point of truth. The museum says it is “true”—so it must be “true."
• Florence was beginning to wonder whether her “teapot” was actually a coffee pot (and why the artifact seemed to have no provenance linking it to “Boss” Gibson’s lumber camp operations),

• Maggie was excited because she had found new information about her rosaries, Mike was working with no information at all about his artifact (because the museum file had been lost),

• Patsy was expanding her research to examine different styles of washing machines,

• Sally was establishing lines of association between three different farming tools,

• and Tzhi was comparing fighting purposes for two different swords attributed to the War of 1812.

In the end, the resulting storyboard outlines represented students’ own personal choices about what messages they wished to convey about their artifacts, and how they wished to convey them.\(^\text{112}\) In the

section that follows, I will analyze the photography portion of this inquiry.

4.7 Photovoice photography

On January 31, in preparation for their second museum fieldwork

\(^{112}\) In hindsight, it would have been beneficial to provide the students with more guidance at this point in the project, helping them to refine their research question and think about historical significance, so that a response (based upon the data that they had gathered and the messages they wished to convey) would be more achievable.
experience (Appendix G), student participants were organised into research groups (three/four individuals per group), according to specific themes within the unit of study. These themes were assigned by the cooperating teacher, although all were given an opportunity to indicate their top five preferences.\textsuperscript{113} During the next three museum fieldwork visits, one student in each group would be responsible for documenting the artifact collection digitally (Figure 41).

Upon receiving their cameras in class on January 31, everyone seemed very excited. Some of the students chose specific colours of cameras that they liked, others said it did not matter. On this first day as well, free time was set aside to insert batteries, test out various camera functions, and generally “play” with the technology. Because of the cameras, students appeared to be particularly engaged, motivated, and happy. Those who previously seemed unattracted to the unit of study now seemed to take a greater interest in the topic, as well as in the upcoming museum visit. In particular, one of the students was very excited, explaining that she had switched the camera to black and white, so she could take images that would "look old." Henry was also excited, and was recording his research questions in his journal. This day’s class ended with an air of anticipation for the next day’s trek to the museum. As the bell rang to dismiss classes, the

\textsuperscript{113} Twelve of the students (50\%) were given their first choice, while four students received their second choice, two their third and fourth choices respectively, and four students did not indicate a preference. The most popular themes (by order of ranking) were as follows: *Alexander “Boss” Gibson, commerce, and the lifestyle of workers in Margaretville* (20 votes), *New Brunswick’s role in the War of 1812* (19 votes), *Rural life and farming in New Brunswick in the 1800’s* (17 votes), *A British soldier’s lifestyle in Georgetown in the 1800’s* (16 votes), *Lifestyle of the Loyalist elite (“Family Compact”) in Georgetown in the 1800’s* (14 votes), *First Nation (Wolastokqiyik, Mi’kmaq, and/or Passmaquoddy) lifestyles in the 1800’s* (13 votes), and *Lifestyle of Acadians in New Brunswick in the 1800’s* (13 votes).
cooperating teacher reminded everyone to dress warmly the next day, since the museum would be very cold.

4.7.1 Personal context of learning (selecting the artifact). The resulting images from students’ second museum fieldwork experience (on February 1) became the basis for personal choice in selecting an artifact for material history analysis. In total, 407 artifact images were captured on that day, although the quality of some was very poor, due to problems students encountered with camera settings. The resulting personal choices have been outlined and discussed in section 4.5.3 (Assignment II).

4.7.2 Sociocultural context of learning (describing the artifact). Having selected their artifact for inquiry, the images that students gathered during museum fieldwork visits on February 1, 15, and 22 became a key visual record for re-visiting the museum collection in class in various ways:

Artifact photocards. In preparation for artifact label writing assignment II (due on February 21114), as well as oral museum presentations (taking place February 22), students participated in an artifact photocards activity intended to give their voice to the museum collection (Figure 42).

114 Because there had been two school cancellations due to storm on Monday and Tuesday (February 18 and 19), plus the cooperating teacher had been absent on Wednesday (February 20), students had not had an opportunity to work on assignment II at all. A few had taken their journals home on the Friday before (and completed the assignment over the weekend), but most had not. As a result, few were ready to pass in assignment II on the due date, so the date was extended to March 1.
Approximately 35 minutes into class, students were asked to break down into their research groups. Working with their group research file (which contained additional photovoice snapshots from the two previous museum fieldwork experiences on February 1 and 15), they were provided with a recipe card, on which were printed the 5W prompts (what, where, when, who, and why). I then explained that the activity involved writing summary statements on the photocard, which would serve as speaking notes for their next day’s museum fieldwork experience. They were also asked to paste their image on the reverse side (Figure 42).

Although the cooperating teacher and I spent a great deal of the remaining 20 minutes circulating and making certain students were on task, the results were very positive. When the bell rang for dismissal, everyone had succeeded in completing the activity, and all seemed to be eagerly anticipating the next day’s oral assignment in the museum. All of the students were ready to talk about their chosen artifact source descriptively, using their own words, and without relying upon narrative information from supplementary sources. The resulting oral presentations have been discussed in section 4.6.3.

---

Three students were absent that day (Cathy, Diane, and Salem) so they did not participate.
Research questions (extending the artifact analysis). Phase three of this inquiry commenced upon students’ return from March Break, and involved preparing a final exposition (The William Street Middle School Museum of British North America), comprised of individual student exhibits, organised around the seven previously assigned research themes. The learning objectives, as well as benchmarks for production and assessment criteria (Appendix I), had been developed in consultation with D’Acquisto (2006), as well as Seixas and Morton (2013).

On March 15, I began the class by asking about the students’ March Break, and whether anyone had gone away for a vacation. Nearly two-thirds of the class raised their hand in affirmation. Then I asked if anyone had visited a museum or historic site during their vacation. No one raised their hand. In turn, I commented that I did not go away for the break, but used the time to prepare for their upcoming big assignment—which led the discussion into introducing the final exposition project.

First, I passed out the project description, and asked for volunteers to read it out loud (Matt raised his hand). Then I asked if there were any questions, to which several students raised their hand. I also explained that their museum exhibition would be like a heritage fair, but much more complicated than that, since each project served as an exhibit unit within each of the seven group research themes. Together, the exhibit units represented an exhibition within the classroom (The Museum of British North America). My objective in explaining the project assignment this way was to establish a link between their micro piece of history, and the big idea of Life in British North America in the 1800's¹¹⁶ (the unit of study).

¹¹⁶ See Shemilt, D. (2009) and his discussion on "big pictures" of the past.
Next, I asked students to turn the project description sheet over, because on the reverse I had listed the day's tasks:

1. Add your artifact to the exhibit concept map,
2. Sort museum artifact snapshots (and add these to your concept map),
3. Which artifacts relate? Why?
4. Record comparable data about your artifact,
5. Review questions on the Historic Space Map of the Georgetown Region Museum,
6. Draft your research question and record it on your artifact analysis grid.

Listing the tasks this way was a good idea, since it gave students a reference document to follow. Without it, I don't think they could have accomplished the day’s activities.

Items one through four on this task list have already been discussed in section 4.5.4. The latter two tasks (items 5 and 6), involved drafting a research question that would serve as the focus for their museum project. This proved to be much more difficult than expected, for three specific reasons: First, many of the students were stumped as to what they could ask. Second, referring to the museum historic space map (section 4.5) that they had created in January did not seem to be helpful, because many of the students simply took a question off the map (and since these questions had been developed at an earlier stage in their learning process, the questions now seemed irrelevant to students’ current artifact research\textsuperscript{117}). Third, the problem seemed to rest with students’ lack of prior knowledge about the context of their research theme. Without a historical context in which to place their artifact, it seemed difficult for them to develop probing questions that could frame their research.

\textsuperscript{117} This finding is significant, because it demonstrates change in students’ historical thinking.
Nevertheless, with a great deal of prompting, everyone managed to formulate a research question before the class ended. Unfortunately, however, because this task took so long, we did not have enough time to share the questions and build a storyline for the classroom _Museum of British North America_. As a result, in not bringing their individual research questions together (as a unified exhibition concept), students missed an important opportunity to see their individual (_micro_) projects as representing a portion of a (_big idea_) collective narrative (of their own sociocultural making). Instead, their museum storyboard simply comprised a series of isolated questions, with seemingly no shared narratives to link the questions together (Figure 43). This represents a significant shortfall in the anticipated outcomes of this particular classroom activity.

**4.7.3 Physical context of learning (re-membering the museum).** On March 27, students were introduced to the physical aspects of planning and designing museum exhibitions. The objective of this activity was to move the students beyond deconstructing the narratives that they had found within the community history museum, and to begin constructing their own exhibit concept maps.

*Figure 43: Museum of British North America student storyboard.*
This was the last class of the day, and the cooperating teacher commenced with a "warm-up" question about Canadian history. The students reported to her that they were at question number 56 (having started in September). The cooperating teacher then opened up her PowerPoint slide, displaying the substantive first-order question: “Who was Laura Secord?” Several students raised their hand to respond, and there seemed to be an air of excitement in the room. They seemed to like the fact that they knew the answer to this question. When the teacher then showed them the response, some of the students questioned the word "heroine," not knowing what it meant. They also groaned about the length of the caption (two sentences), to which the teacher added that if they liked, they could just take point-form notes.

Because of the warm-up activity, I was late commencing my portion of the classroom activity. Nevertheless, I proceeded by returning to the students’ journals and artifact analysis grids. I also passed out two sheets of paper: one containing criteria for marking their projects (Appendix I), and another describing the project (again), as well as outlining the tasks for the day. I then quickly reviewed the assessment criteria, focussing upon the first three sections (research question, research, and analysis of artifact source).

---

118 This was a teaching strategy that had been initiated by the cooperating teacher in September, and was not part of the design for this research project.

119 The response, which I had prepared, was: “Laura Secord was a Canadian heroine of the War of 1812. She is known for having walked 20 miles out of American-occupied territory in 1813 to warn British forces of an impending American attack.”

120 For this particular case study group, it seemed that a written response of 35 words was considered too long.
Noticing that interest in the class was quickly waning, I then switched to a discussion about storyboards. To begin, I showed them two Parks Canada examples that I had brought with me (Cyr & Soucy, 1997; Design + Communications Inc., 1997). I explained that each of these projects represented an investment of approximately $100,000.00, and that just like the designers of these exhibitions, they too could develop similar storyboards for their museum. I invited everyone to gather around the desk, so they could examine the storyboards more carefully. All seemed interested—except for two students who did not leave their desk (the cooperating teacher promptly spoke to them and demanded that they participate). The others, however, did not require any coaxing, and seemed genuinely interested. Many were amused by the cartoon sketches that they saw. These real-world Parks Canada examples seemed to clearly convey the intended message for today’s class: that within a museum exhibition there exist individual exhibits (or "zones") relating to specific themes—and within these zones exist individual units (Figure 44). I also pointed out how the exhibit designers had planned each exhibit unit around an intended “message and means.”

Next, I transitioned into a motivational discussion about their museum, explaining that a great deal of planning goes into these projects, but when it comes close to the time of installation (which for them would be in three weeks), there remains very little time for
discussion or second-guessing. I also explained that next week we would talk about writing labels, and after that they would have all the design knowledge that they required to develop their own exhibit units. Drawing comparisons to the Parks Canada examples (Cyr & Soucy, 1997; Design + Communications Inc., 1997), I explained that each of the students’ individual projects represented a unit, which together made up an exhibit relating to their research themes. In turn, these seven exhibits represented a museum in their classroom: *The William Street Middle School Museum of British North America.*

The students seemed to like this analogy—and now seemed to perceive their ultimate objective.

Having thus established a context to begin thinking about their own exhibit units, I then introduced the *message and means* storyboard organiser (Appendix H, p. 398; see also section 4.6.4 for a detailed discussion of this scaffolding tool). I also asked students to break down into their research groups, and to begin mapping out their individual storyboards (thinking about their own objective, message, and means). All were enthusiastic about the prospect of developing their own exhibit concepts, but (as usual) time was limited, and the dismissal bell seemed to ring too soon. Nevertheless, it is significant to note that students seemed to end the class confident in what they needed to do in order to complete the final assignment.

The actual physical plan for the classroom museum was completed one day before opening night (April 29), and only two of the students were involved in the planning process. On that day, it just so happened that one student had returned back to class—having been absent for three weeks. Because of this long absence, she did not have a project to work on, so she was asked to take on the role of developing the museum floor
plan. Her response was “sure,” and Diane (who was talking with her at the time) said "can I help?" The two then proceeded to congenially establish a floor plan for the classroom museum. Their first design was very traditional (desks around the wall, with no space for a food table, and with the public having to walk around the back of the projects in order to enter the maze); so, I asked them to try again. Their second design was much more functional: space was provided for a food table, with the public following a circular path around two center sections (Figure 45). Unfortunately, however, I did not have time to talk to them about why they chose the arrangement that they did for the projects; in hindsight, their conceptual plan seems to have been based upon current Georgetown (through their eyes), and works backward into seemingly more remote aspects of the past:

- Zone 1: Lifestyle of the Loyalist Elite in Georgetown in the 1800’s,
- Zone 2: Alexander “Boss” Gibson, Commerce, and the Lifestyle of Workers in Margaretville,
- Zone 3: Lifestyle of Acadians in New Brunswick in the 1800’s,
- Zone 4: A British Soldier’s Lifestyle in Georgetown in the 1800’s,
- Zone 5: Rural Life and Farming in New Brunswick in the 1800’s,
- Zone 6: New Brunswick’s Role in the War of 1812,
- Zone 7: Lifestyle of First Nations in the 1800’s.
This is how these two students envisioned *The William Street Middle School Museum of British North America* (Figure 45).

**4.7.4 Temporal context of learning (re-constructing the museum of British North America).** Over the two weeks leading up to opening night, students worked in groups to complete their individual project storyboards, and to transform their plans into final exhibit projects. Throughout this design process, their photovoice images proved to be beneficial in enabling participants to *re-view*, *re-think*, and *re-engage* in their museum fieldwork experience (both independently, as well as socioculturally). Students’ images also provided an important visual reference that aided in maintaining a focus upon the museum’s artifact collection.

On opening night (April 30), about half of the class was able to attend along with members of their family. The museum volunteer participants were also invited back, having not had an opportunity to speak with the students since March 1. The students were excited about the event, and seemed thrilled to see my images (documenting the inquiry), which were presented as a continuous slide show on the white board. They were chuckling amongst themselves, and did not seem to be aware of the visitors waiting outside for permission to enter. The students gathered together for the ribbon cutting ceremony, while visitors waited outside. This was a private moment for the students, and it seemed important that they have this time to celebrate their accomplishment together, with their cooperating teacher, and the school principal. After the ribbon cutting, the cooperating teacher turned to the visitors and invited them inside to join in the celebration.
Diane was the master of ceremony for the evening. Earlier in the day, she and Matt had volunteered for the responsibility, and had prepared a speech together. For some unexpected reason, however, Matt did not show on opening night—and he had the speech. So, Diane graciously agreed to continue solo, prepared a few quick notes of her own, and proved to be an excellent master of ceremony. In her opening remarks, she welcomed everyone to “our museum." This was a significant point in the inquiry, because the students seemed to be extremely proud of their end accomplishment. In bringing the projects together as a "museum" they now seemed to perceive their individual units as connected to a larger whole.

**Responding to the research question.** In analyzing the final project results, all but one of the participating students (96%) developed a research question (Figure 46). Of these 22 responses, nine of the students (41%) responded to their question directly, while an equal amount (41%) responded indirectly (by way of the information that they presented). The remaining four students (18%) did not respond to their research question at all.

**Establishing comparisons with other artifacts.** In addition, all but one of the students established comparisons with other artifacts within the museum collection. Of these comparative processes, 18 of the students (82%) drew lines of comparisons with
other artifacts within the same museum exhibition,\textsuperscript{121} while two students (Caleb and Chuck) expanded their analysis to include artifacts found in other locations within the museum, and only one student (April) introduced an artifact source from the Internet for comparison (a portrait painting of the artist A.G. Hoit). This finding is significant, because it demonstrates how clearly the students’ analyses were implicitly shaped by what was exhibited within the community history museum.

\textit{Drawing meaning from the artifacts.} With regard to the historical meaning that students appropriated from their community fieldwork experience, several unique (artifact-specific) narrative templates emerged from the final exposition projects relating to purpose and use:

\textbf{Research project theme - New Brunswick’s Role in the War of 1812:} \textit{Calvary sword} (Figure 47): It was used by soldiers in the War of 1812 to slash enemies while riding horses (Tzhi J., 2013); It was made in the War of 1812 for military officers and cavalry units to defend (Mark C., 2013); It was used in the War of 1812 for hacking and slashing, also defending (Henry B., 2013).

\textbf{Research project theme - A British soldier’s lifestyle in Georgetown in the 1800’s:} \textit{Brown Bess musket}: This (and the other selected artifacts) all relate to weaponry

\textsuperscript{121} Participants were requested to remain focused upon their research theme. For this reason, it is not surprising that students remained within the parameters of the museum exhibition when making comparisons.
used in the War of 1812 (Jun D., 2013). **Pianoforte:** It was an artifact with class and purpose (Chuck D., 2013). **War of 1812 arms chest:** It was used in the War of 1812, specifically the March of the 104th, for transporting muskets and weapons (Mike S., 2013).

---

**Research project theme - Rural life and farming in New Brunswick in the 1800’s:**

**Washing machine** (Figure 48): It shows how women washed clothes (Patsy M., 2013). **Corn sheller:** It represents the changing of the farm from hand to machines (Mod’d Aamir K., 2013). **Spike-tooth harrow:** It, as well as the scythe, seeder, and saw, are all tools that farmers used (Sally J., 2013). **Cradle butter churn:** It shows what life was like (Cathy A., 2013).

---

**Research project theme - Lifestyle of Acadians in New Brunswick in the 1800’s:**

**Stoneware jar:** It represents Canada (Caleb A., 2013). **Fiddle:** It was a big part of Acadian culture (Matt J., 2013). **Rosaries:** It shows a lot about what people’s past were like, and how important they actually were (Maggie K., 2013).

---

**Research project theme - Alexander “Boss” Gibson, commerce, and the lifestyle of workers in Margaretville:**

**Margaretville cotton mill:** It shows what working conditions were like (Sandy B., 2013). **Coffee pot:** The tea kettle is like the pot and ax because they were all used at the logging camp (Florence E., 2013). **Boss Buck:** It
honours Boss Gibson for the good working conditions that he established (Laurie A., 2013).

**Research project theme - First Nation (Wolastokqiik, Mi’kmaq, and/or Passamaquoddy) lifestyles in the 1800’s:**

*Fish trap:* It, as well as the fish basket and carved paddle, were all made of wood and relate to fishing (Salome H., 2013). *Crooked knife:* The crooked knife was one of the most popular tools of the Maliseet (Gregg K., 2013). *Carved paddle:* It was made by hand for decoration, so didn’t do anything important (Chris J., 2013).

**Research project theme - Lifestyle of the Loyalist elite (‘‘Family Compact’’) in Georgetown in the 1800’s:**

*Legislative Council Chamber chair:* It was made by Thomas Nesbitt (Owen T., 2013). *Executive Council Chamber chair:* It was made by Thomas Nesbitt (David B., 2013). *Mary Coy portrait:* It reveals who Mary Coy was (Diane D., 2013). *Sarah Peters Wetmore portrait:* It reveals who Sarah Wetmore was (April K., 2013).

These templates reveal how students re-constructed their museum fieldwork experience (over time). In keeping with the theoretical perspective of material history domain-knowledge, each of the students’ *micro* narratives was very clearly focussed upon the artifact source; yet, they also reflected bits and pieces of the museum’s official narratives.

**Connecting to big ideas in history.** In the end, only one student (Cathy A.) clearly extended her analysis by connecting to a *big idea* in history. Through an elaborate flowchart illustration, Cathy illustrated how her cradle butter churn contributed to a strong nation by sustaining healthy people, and thriving communities (Figure 49).
Resolving conflicts within the information. Ultimately, several of the students also discovered contradictions within the museum’s narrative, which they resolved in various different ways. These findings are significant, because they demonstrate how students either resisted or appropriated the narratives they encountered within the community history museum. For example:

- Aamir, who on March 27 was questioning whether his artifact was a “corn husker” or a “corn sheller,” resisted the narrative of the museum, and ultimately concluded that his was a corn sheller;

- April, who had grappled with who the parents really were for Sarah Peters Wetmore, seemingly rejected conflicting genealogical evidence that she had found on Ancestry.ca (2013), and appropriated the narrative of the museum;

- Diane had initially assumed that Mary Coy was wearing black because she was a widow, but upon comparing the dates of when the artist was active in New Brunswick, against the death date of her husband, Diane concluded that Mary Coy was actually mourning the loss of two of her sons;

- Although Florence had wondered whether her “teapot” was actually a coffee pot, and how it related to “Boss” Gibson’s lumber camp operations, in the end she appropriated the narrative of the museum, continuing to identify her artifact as a “teapot,”
and disregarding the problem that it actually did not relate at all to “Boss” Gibson’s lumber camp operations.122

In the two sections that follow, I will analyse participant interview data collected during all three phases of the inquiry.

4.8 Adult Participant Interviews

At specific points throughout the inquiry, I sat down with adult participants (n=five), to record their impressions of the museum fieldwork experience. In keeping with instrumental case study research (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2005), these conversations were later transcribed and analyzed qualitatively, according to a two-cycle coding technique (Saldaña, 2009). First Cycle analysis involved descriptive and in vivo coding, which focussed upon research sub-question #2: “Does student collaboration with older members of this volunteer heritage community deepen the historical consciousness of the older members themselves?” Second Cycle analysis involved a critical discourse method (Gee, 1999), which focussed upon two aspects of historical consciousness analysis: (a) social roles as an expression of group-identity,123 and (b) social goods as a way of thinking about the past.124 These findings were then structured for presentation according to Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning.

---

122 In actuality, the coffeepot had been included in the exhibit simply as a prop, because it was believed to be typical of what might have been found within one of “Boss” Gibson’s lumber camp operations. (Conversation with Lucy K., May 1, 2013).

123 What Gee (1999) describes as the social “role” of “identities” (p. 18).

124 What Gee (1999) describes as the “politics” of “social goods” (p.19).
4.8.1 Preparing for the museum experience (phase one). I first met with four of
the museum volunteers\textsuperscript{125} on January 11. The purpose of this introductory meeting
(which took place in the museum office), was to present adult participants with an
overview, as well as a schedule, for their involvement in the inquiry (Appendix G).
During this meeting, we also discussed how to approach students’ first museum visit,
which would take place the following week on January 18. Resulting statements reveal
some of the socially constructed personal identities (social roles)\textsuperscript{126} that volunteers held
upon entering into this inquiry.

\textit{Personal context of learning.} Initially what emerged from the orientation meeting
was a great deal of insecurity with regard to working with the students. At this point in
time, the museum volunteers had not yet met their student counterparts, so they were
filled with questions about the curriculum, as well as the textbook they were using. They
were also concerned about time, and the necessity to limit the entire museum visit to 45
minutes.

\textit{Personal experiences.} Throughout these initial discussions, it is significant to note
that adult participants seemed to draw heavily upon their own personal experiences in
order to validate their anticipated role in the inquiry. For example, Ellen, reflecting back
on her own schooling in England many years ago, expressed concerns about the students’
textbook, remarking that “there were no pictures” in her history books (Ellen E., 2013),
and that the current publication seemed “almost childlike.” This observation set off a

\textsuperscript{125} One of the volunteers was not able to attend this meeting, so I met with him separately, in another
location six days later. The data from this interview has been included with the group discourse analysis.
\textsuperscript{126} “Identities” in this context is defined as: “… how we recognise and act out different social roles or
different social positions in society” (Gee, 1999, p. 207). Specifically, this relates to historical
consciousness as acting out social roles within a community of inquiry.
considerable amount of discussion within the group regarding the educational value of imagery over words—to which both Charles and Mary recanted that “a picture’s worth a thousand words” (Charles B., 2013). “You’re probably right,” responded Ellen, “but you know, if you’re not given it, then you darn well get down and read it” (Ellen E., 2013).

Similarly, drawing upon his own experience of reading school textbooks, Murray also offered this evaluation about the teaching of British North American history in schools:

I recall reading [in a textbook] about the coming of Confederation that totally ignored the Fenian Raids... like they didn’t have it. But of course, defence was the major driver to forge people towards Confederation... Unfortunately you get political correctness coming in to play. The military is not nice. Conflict is not nice... however it's a fact... So, if you are looking for fact-based history, then you can't avoid it. (Murray G., 2013)

Through all of these discussions, it is important to note that none of the adult participants actually questioned the authority of the textbook. Those who were critical, simply wished to see more advanced content to guide students’ learning, while those who were uncritical, remained accepting of the current teaching resource.127 Such responses suggest that the museum volunteers perceived their role in this inquiry as supporting the existing school curriculum—not challenging it in any way.

*Time limitations.* With regard to their concerns about time, three of the adult participants expressed a great deal of anxiety around fitting all that they wished to say about the exhibits into a 45-minute guided tour. Mary, however, speaking from experience, explained that such a scenario was “realistic”:

127 One of the participants, however (Lucy K.), was noticeably silent throughout these discussions.
…and sometimes that’s all you get. Like we get groups of like 50 kids and we've got 30 minutes… And then you get a group of 30 students and you've got two hours on other days. So... So the teacher says, like, can you keep them for two hours?

[laughter]... OK... [laughing] SURE!... we'll do leapfrog in the square and whatever... [laughing] Yah, so that is realistic. Some days we have ‘em just like that [clicking her fingers] and other days you have them, and teachers don't want to go...

(Mary R., 2013)

In this sense, Mary was articulating her own challenges of adjusting on the fly to the immediate needs of a supervising teacher—without any prior knowledge of the students or their interests. Her description illustrates a typical gatekeeper role for museum tour guides, which involves simply leading large groups of students through the museum in a timely fashion. Such time pressures, as Mary also explained, often result in hurried walks through the building, during which students are presented with only the “highlights” of each room:

… like... in the nineteenth century gallery, we talk quickly about the portraits or the fire screen... melting makeup...um, sometimes we talk about photography in that room ...and not so much, now that the camera’s gone... In the War of 1812 room, I spend quite a bit of time over the muskets. So, because they love guns. The trench, we talk about trench foot, and getting your feet chopped off... In the Loyalist room we dress up. So, you know, you're just hitting the very... you know... specific things in each space. I never take them into the medical room. Cause, frankly, because I'm terrified one of them is going to ask me about the cervix dilator! (Mary R., 2013)
Such a scenario would provide very few opportunities for the types of learning described in section 2.4.3 of this dissertation. It also illustrates the significant educational shortfalls gained from a single museum visit, with no time to ask questions, no time for student engagement, and no time for in-depth discussions of any sort.

In discussing plans for the museum visit on January 18, it was decided that four of the museum volunteers would interpret their area of expertise by remaining stationed in their respective exhibit areas. Meanwhile, Mary would act as the museum gatekeeper, and would guide the group through the building, remaining ever watchful about time. This approach would serve to introduce the students to each of the adult participants—within the physical context of their areas of expertise. It would also enable the volunteers to establish their social role as curators by drawing upon their experience of having helped to develop the exhibits. This was a group-identity that the adults welcomed and accepted with sincerity.

**Sociocultural context of learning.** Just before closing the orientation meeting of January 11, participants were also presented with a copy of the Michael de Adder political cartoon (Figure 50), “Both gamer and WW II veteran defeat Nazi's in Holland” (2010). This illustration served to provide a stimulating point of reference for discussions around youth and their perspective on the past.

**Pre-assumptions about youth.** The political128 views that emerged from these preliminary discussions reveal two polar opposite assumptions that volunteers held upon

---

128 “Political” in this context is defined as: “…speaking, writing, or acting in ways that say or imply what is ‘appropriate,’ ‘normal,’ ‘natural,’ ‘good,’ or ‘acceptable’ (or their opposites) in regard to certain people, things, or activities” (Gee, 1999, p. 210). Specifically, this relates to historical consciousness as an “appropriate” way of thinking about the past.
entering into this inquiry. One was that youth were foreign and unknowing; the other was that youth were empathetic. When first presented with the de Adder (2010) cartoon, participants were asked whether they believed the artist’s statement to be accurate. In response, all but one of the volunteers agreed that they thought the illustration presented a valid interpretation of the current relationship between veterans and youth. In formulating their responses, each adult adopted a divergent line of reasoning to support their claim that youth were (or were not) alienated from elder veterans.

Amongst those who agreed with the message of the political cartoon, there existed a consensus that youth were foreign and unknowing of the military past. Ellen, for example, drawing from her own experience of having been a child in England during World War II, felt that the illustration did accurately portray youth and their understanding of war, because games had “nothing to do with it” (Ellen E., 2013). Harkening back to her own experiences, when she played imaginary “Cowboys and Indians” with her friends, she described today’s youth as “sanitised,” and “less aware of others.” Similarly, Charles agreed that the illustration “shows the generational gap for sure” (Charles B., 2013), because “the veterans were there, and our kids are sitting in
front of the TV playing war” (Charles B., 2013). Mary agreed as well, but attributed the generational differences to changes in modern warfare: “… we don’t put as many men on the ground. Almost everything is done from a distance… So we’re not necessarily in touch with the people that they are killing…” (Mary R., 2013). Lucy, however (also speaking from experience), addressed the educational benefits of war games, and explained how gaming had “exposed a lot of kids, a lot of gamers, to history” (Lucy K., 2013).

In opposition to these statements of agreement, the sole volunteer who reacted very differently to the de Adder (2010) cartoon was Murray. He did not see the illustration as accurate at all, because he felt that today’s youth are very aware of Canada’s military past: “… ever since we got ourselves into Afghanistan… in the last 10-12 years… There’s possibly a time that it was [accurate], but not, not in the last decade or so…” (Murray G., 2013). From Murray’s perspective, he felt that current affairs had heightened public sensitivities, and had thus made youth very empathetic towards war veterans.

4.8.2 Participating in the museum experience (phase two). Immediately following the museum tour on January 18—as well as after subsequent visits on February 1 and 22—adult participants were briefly re-interviewed (together as a group), about their experiences of working with the students. In keeping with the pre-established instructional outline for phase two of the inquiry (Appendix G), each museum visit was designed around specific learning experiences:

- The first visit, on January 18, followed a standard school tour format, with the added feature of having the volunteers present (in each of their respective rooms) to talk about the exhibits. In addition, students were taken into the collection storage areas of the
museum, including the upstairs attic. All of the adult participants were present on January 18, except Ellen.

- During the second museum visit, on February 1, students were given free-rein in the museum (as discussed in section 4.5.2 as well as 4.7), although they were also tasked with questioning the volunteers, as well as gathering documentary photographs. All of the adult participants were present on February 1, except Murray.

- Lastly, for the fourth and final museum visit, on February 22, museum roles were reversed, with each of the students speaking about their artifact, while adult participants simply listened. All of the volunteers were present for this final museum visit.

Interview statements gathered immediately following each of these events suggest a significant transition in both the personal identities, as well as pedagogical views, that adult participants co-constructed from the museum fieldwork experience.

**Personal context of learning.** With regard to social roles, after the first museum tour on January 18, museum volunteers (n=four) expressed a great deal of enthusiasm about the tour experience. Their personal rewards seemed to come from being able to make connections with the students—a task which several found, nevertheless, challenging due to generational differences. As Charles remarked: “It just kinda floored me that a child would not know what a typewriter was…” (Charles B., January 18, 2013); to which Mary also exclaimed in agreement: “They wouldn’t know what a dot matrix printer is!” (Mary R., January 18, 2013)

---

129 This *behind the scenes* feature was not part of a regular school tour format, but was included as a recommendation from the Executive Director.

130 Unfortunately, Ellen was not able to participate in the January 18 tour, due to illness.
Despite such generational gaps, however, Lucy found success in making connections with one particular student, through a chance remark while in the Margaretville exhibition room. During Lucy’s brief (4 minute) introduction to the exhibit space, one of the students spoke up that her grandfather had sold land in Margaretville to Alexander “Boss” Gibson. Upon hearing this, Lucy immediately knew exactly who the student was referencing, and became very excited with the prospect of being able to share her knowledge with the student. This *ah-ha* moment also did not go unnoticed by the other museum volunteers:

Murray: “But it was really neat that the Evans girl’s Grampa sold the land to Gibson.”

Mary: "Yes, Lucy was able to make a personal connection. It's really awesome when you can do that, but it doesn’t come up very often. But when you can, it really makes the history personal."

Lucy: "Yes… I thought it was great for her."

Mary: "It was really nice, because I think nobody else would have been able to make that connection in that room... Bill Acheson might have, or somebody like that, but it's fortunate that we had you in that room, so..."

Lucy: "Oh I was very pleased. I was very pleased. You know, because I knew his first name too and I could give her all kinds of information, you know, that's why, that's why I said, I'll talk to you again. I'll come with information for her. You know, the actual newspaper, you know, listing, you know...”

Mary: "Ya, making those personal connections is what often sells people on history. That's why I get so excited because it's starting to become personal to me in

---

131 This never actually happened.
my ancestry... So if you can make that personal connection it's like baiting a fish with a hook. Just like reeling them in nice and slow." (January 18, 2013)

Unfortunately, however, the likelihood of “reeling” students in during a 45-minute guided tour, was described as extremely difficult, since—as was typical of tours of this sort—students’ interests seemed often varied, and time was always limited (Mary R., January 18, 2013, Charles B., January 18, 2013).

*Time limitations.* With regard to time, all of the volunteers expressed frustration that they could not provide the students with all of the information that they wished to convey in the time that was allotted. As Mary explained:

The funny thing is that I'm chatty, I want to talk about everything, and it's really hard, I find it hard to edit myself down. Actually I could spend half an hour in the trench, just going through everything in there ... and spend lots of time, you know, dressing up in the Loyalist Room, and talking about the exhibits...things like that…

(Mary R., January 18, 2013)

Murray also agreed with Mary, adding his own concerns: "That's what I was going to say... you just ... you need more time... you just can't... either we don't have enough time, or we program too much in” (Murray G., January 18, 2013); to which Lucy also remarked: “But we knew that... I was saying upstairs... like four minutes max for me too, because it was like just to expedite, ‘cause you know, you can't, I mean since they're coming back, we don't have to give them everything... and it overwhelms..." (Lucy K., January 18, 2013).

Clearly, time was regarded as a barrier for these volunteers, which limited their ability to achieve the personal connections that they wished to achieve. Nevertheless,
they seemed hopeful that such opportunities would be forthcoming in the near future. As Charles remarked: “I think it's a good general introduction for them, but it's a good thing that they're coming back later on, to do more detailed work in some areas” (Charles B., January 18, 2013).

On February 1, when the students returned to the museum for their second visit, time was no longer a concern. In addition, social roles were changing, since students came to the museum prepared, with specific (probing) questions to ask of the museum collections (see section 4.5.2). After this museum visit, the volunteers continued to express a great deal of positive enthusiasm. As Mary summed up the experience: "I had fun [laughter] it's fun because they're engaged, they're asking questions, they're actively looking at the artifacts" (Mary R., February 1, 2013).

Personal connections – February 1. Overall, what was evident from remarks gathered after the February 1 museum visit was that making personal connections had become much easier for those who had participated in the previous guided tour. Significantly as well, the opportunities that arose from engaging with students through student-directed questioning made the second museum fieldwork experience much more rewarding for the volunteers. As Charles remarked:

I think it's good that they had an assignment to do. It puts them on task more... whereas, there's so many things to see in here, I can just see a middle school students' mind going from this to this to this, so it focuses them in on something and gives them something to concentrate on...I'd say that they were a little bit more familiar today, maybe because it's the second visit. (Charles B., February 1, 2013)

Lucy also noted how the students’ questions had provided her with a tool for engaging in
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132 Murray G. was not able to participate in the February 1 museum visit.
conversation with the group working in her exhibit area:

I'll just say that they had to be reminded to be engaged. They weren’t asking those questions until I reminded them and then they opened their scribblers [laughter]. I said I'm here for questions, and they were like what? And they looked around and they were making notes but it was only after you [Cynthia] came in and told them, you know, to ask questions that then they lined up, right in front of me, and sequentially asked their questions, but I found that interesting that, you know, they had to be reminded to ... [After,] Oh yes! They just shew! [gesturing that their notebooks were opened quickly] Scribblers came out, pages were turned to the right page, each one asked the different question, and you know, and it was good, you know… and I gave them ... beyond the information they were looking for, as I gave them the information on Knob Hill, ‘cause they asked about Boss Gibson's house, and I said that it was built close to Knob Hill and that stopped them cold, ‘cause they never heard that term before, because knob is not a good thing now, whereas in the 19th century a knob was the elite and so they got a kick out of that so, every time I said “Knob Hill” they were giggling. (Lucy K., February 1, 2013)

Ellen, on the other hand, who had been absent on January 18, was feeling quite distanced from the students working in her exhibit space. She struggled to make personal connections:

…I think once you got to know them, I mean that was my first exposure to them and their first exposure to me, so they probably thought, Oh GOD, what the... where the hell did they drag this one up from [laughter]…Yes, I tried to keep it, what I was doing too, and mix it sort of, and I think you were there when I was
trying to talk about Nesbitt and a little bit about the furniture and that kind of thing. You know, you can't, you don't know, you sort of say, do you know who I'm talking about, and hope that they will go back and look up who Nesbitt was, you know, same with Duncan Fyfe, I mean, do you know who Duncan Fyfe was? I mean he was one of the most famous, you know, names in furniture in North America… They probably thought I was weird [laughter]. (Ellen E., February 1, 2013)

Similarly, for those students who had been absent on January 18, they too seemed to feel lost and disconnected during the February 1 museum visit. As Mary observed:

There were a couple, who were, they weren’t here on the first visit, so this was their first visit in, so I found that they were kind of wandering around, like loose cannon balls, until they could get comfortable, but it could be that it's overwhelming, like they're trying to take this all in. (Mary R., February 1, 2013)

Thus, not having the benefit of a previous museum visit, resulted in students not being prepared to ask questions and to examine the collections. Instead, these students seemed more focussed on “getting to know the room,” and copying down information (Mary R., February 1, 2013; see also Ellen E., February 1, 2013):

With my Acadian guy, I didn’t get to engage with him as much, because we didn’t do that room on the first visit, so he was spending his time just getting to know the room, but there are some videos that are on Youtube, I told him that I would e-mail the link to his teacher, or I can e-mail it to you, and you can send it to his teacher, that he can watch about the Acadian Renaissance, Evangeline, and there's another one… ‘Cause he was listening to the videos, pausing, and taking notes, and taking
pictures of the video screen [laughter]...which is a shame, you know, he didn’t have enough time to do all that in, so this will give him something that he can work on at home, or in the classroom, and [he] can be a little bit more prepared next time with questions. (Mary R., February 1, 2013)

*Personal connections – February 22.* When students returned to the museum for the last time, on February 22, adult participants described a much more relaxed atmosphere. They seemed to be reaping personal rewards from witnessing a reversal of social roles within the museum (see section 4.6.3). It is also significant to note that time seemed no longer a concern, and the volunteers now expressed a great sense of personal connection to the students. They seemed to appreciate hearing *their* students present their findings. As Ellen summarised the day’s event:

> I was quite surprised and quite, you know, I was chewing my fingers, as you might say, wondering what they would do, but they did come through. Yah, I think they…enjoyed themselves in a way, and I think, I hope, they learned something about the museum. (Ellen E., February 22, 2013)

It was also noticeable that many of the adults now referred to the students by their first names\(^{133}\), and Mary in particular, actually identified her group as “her kids”: “I thought, my kids, I thought all did extremely well, but I'm biased, because they are my kids!” (Mary R., February 22, 2013)

Likewise, student participants were perceived as welcoming the reversal of roles, as Ellen observed:

> They were really into it this time, ‘cause they were also hearing what the others had

\(^{133}\) This may have been facilitated by providing the museum volunteers with assessment sheets (one for each student), with first names attached.
done. You know, witnessing, and ah, you know, they'll go back to the class all 
happed up a little bit [agreement]. I think today was a bit better, you know, there 
were a lot more communication between people [agreement]. (Ellen E., February 
22, 2013)

Mary also noted how students seemed to be transitioning into an active social role within 
the museum, although she also expressed caution over the need to “harness” their 
enthusiasm:

Definitely getting used to this place and much more relaxed [agreement] a little bit. 
The noise level I think was up a little bit more... which is great, because I want 
them to be relaxed, they should be comfortable, cause [that’s] when they'll do a lot 
more learning I think, if you can harness it [agreement]. (Mary R., February 22, 
2013)

In closing the interview (and thanking the volunteers for their participation in phase two 
of the inquiry), Mary piped out: "My heart's breaking!" and asked if the museum could 
“do something” special for the students at the end of the project (February 22, 2013).

Over the past six weeks, it was clearly evident that all of the adult participants had 
developed a personal connection with the class as a whole. Their sense of generational 
distance now seemed to be less vast, and all of the participants now seemed to share a 
common bond that was fuelled by the museum collections. Adult participants were 
saddened to see the museum visits come to an end.

Sociocultural context of learning. With regard to political views that emerged 
from adult participation in the museum fieldwork experience, after the first museum tour 
on January 18, some of the volunteers expressed concern over what students were
actually learning. In this sense, the volunteers seemed to be preoccupied with having students *listen* to what they had to say. Thus, the initial “social goods” (Gee, 1999, p. 210)—or expectations—of *appropriate* historical engagement, was being measured by how attentive students were to their words.

From the students’ perspective, however, on January 18 they had been tasked with gathering information about what life was like in 19th century British North America—based upon what they saw and heard during the museum tour (see section 4.4.3, Assignment I, pp. 151 - 152). This task seemed to lead adult participants to perceive students’ interests as divided between taking notes, and listening to the guided tour (Lucy K., January 18, 2013). As Mary commented:

Good bunch... Good questions, when they had the opportunity to ask them... um they were very keen. These ones were writing notes and I just wonder if that distracts from it? Because they are so busy, like some of them [were] bigger note-takers than others ... and they were so busy writing the notes that they couldn’t necessarily listen. But that's OK, I mean it's part of the project, so it's good, it's nice that they have notes to take back with them, but at the same time, I'm wondering what they're missing. (Mary R., January 18, 2013)

Attentiveness to the guided tour, however, as both Mary and Charles explained, was typically very fleeting:

Mary: "But we get that with every group too."

Charles: "That's true, with every group."

Mary: "That's normal with every group... sometimes they try to sneak off to the next room."
Charles: "Ya, and get ahead of ya" [laughter].

Mary: "That's normal because every kid has its own interest, right? You get your little budding military historian that's right up front in the trench or the Loyalist room and then, but they might fall back when you're in the Acadian room, or in the portrait gallery." (January 18, 2013)

Measures for historical engagement – February 1. When students arrived at the museum for the second visit on February 1, their assigned task was different. This time they were prepared to ask probing questions of the collections. As a result, museum volunteers were now assessing the social goods of appropriate historical engagement, by the types of questions students were asking. As Mary observed: “…they’re engaged, they’re asking questions, they’re actively looking at the artifacts” (Mary R., February 1, 2013). In turn, Ellen also added that she thought the students had been taught something about 19th century lifestyles, since those working in her exhibit area were “certainly interested in the background of the families, I think the heritage in the sense of familial heritage... my lot were interested in.” Ellen also categorised students’ interests along gender lines, adding that:

The girls were interested in the furniture, and [I] suppose being girls they would be, and the boys were more interested in the history. There was one little chap I had who spent a lot of time talking about musical instruments of the period... and various things like that... Yes they all have different... one, like we were talking about fabrics, one of the girls, you know… (Ellen E., February 1, 2013)

Such a transition in the social goods of engagement is significant, because it points to

134 This actually had not happened, because prior class time had been devoted to historic space mapping and learning how to ask probing questions about the past (Appendix G).
ways in which adult participants were changing their expectations of learning. By February 1, engagement was no longer measured according to students’ ability to listen; instead, engagement was now being assessed by students’ ability to ask questions.

*Measures for historical engagement – February 22.* The pedagogical views of adult participants continued to change during phase two of the museum fieldwork experience. By February 22, it was evident that the volunteers were now measuring *appropriate* historical engagement by how well students used their artifact research files (as well as information provided by the volunteers), to “accurately” interpret the museum collection. Because of this, student success became directly linked to the quality of the artifact accession files with which they had to work. As Charles remarked:

> Well my group went first, so they were quite nervous, I think, that they talked rather lowly, and I couldn’t hear them as well as I should have been able to, but I thought they had good information on the artifacts…Yes, yes, they used the files a lot, and we tried to use the question sheet, and answer your questions. From what I could hear [chuckle], cause it was very low, I think that they got quite a bit out of it actually, I think that they were able to give back quite a bit of the information.

(Charles B., February 22, 2013)

Similarly, Ellen also noted how well her group of students had used their accession files to obtain the “right answers”:

> Well I was surprised by how much my lot performed really, because they seemed to have taken what I told them, and they had used their files as well, and a reasonable presentation. They seemed to be, I mean they were the last to go on stage, as you might say, so they got more confidence, and they knew what to expect, so that may

---

135 See Material History Analysis Worksheet in Appendix H.
have had some effect, but I think they enjoyed the pieces that they looked at actually… David, who was away last time, he really surprised me because I didn’t expect that he was, ah, be able to do, make up, what he did, but he'd obviously looked at his file, and come up with the right answers…Chuck, who I believe is your young man, is he not? He was the piano chappy?… Well, I don't know whose he was [laughter]…Yes, well he sort of, he was also looking at some other instrument as well wasn’t he…But anyway, he did quite well. Yah, he went after the where it was made, and how, and all the rest of it, except he didn’t get the wood right, but that was… [chuckle]. (Ellen E., February 22, 2013)

Conversely, for those students who were less successful, the quality of their oral presentations was also linked to the quality of their accession files. As Murray evaluated one students’ work:

…little bit sketchy... well yah that sword, on a scale of one-to-a-very-bad-choice, it's right up there, because it's not documented, it's really not what it proports to be... it's just a real odd ball [general consensus in room]… It would have been far better to have used the infantry officer's sword. It's important, but...

Mary: "You see the infantry officer's sword is something that's more typical, so they want to go for something unique, something with a WOW factor."

Cynthia: "For some reason they were drawn to that, yes."

Murray: "Cause it's curvy."

Mary: "It's like a banana [laughter]. One called it the banana sword [laughter]. I could see you cringe!" [laughter]

There were exceptions to this correlation, however, between artifact files and student
success—as Mary pointed out—because two of the students in her group did not have accession files (or had only recently gained access), yet were very successful in their ability to talk about their artifacts:

Maggie rocked my world today; she didn’t have a file, so people who have files are the lucky ones. Maggie didn’t have a file, ‘cause it's not our artifact. And this is the first time this artifact has been studied, so everything she discovers about it is new information for us, and she did a really good job… so I thought that was really neat with her, she did a good job… And then Matt, he just got his file recently so he hasn’t had as much time with his file as everybody else did, but his file from Kings Landing ended up being a lot richer than he thought it would be, and I could tell right away that he has read his file. He's taken the time between getting his file, on Tuesday was it? And now, to actually read his file and he's gotten a lot out of it, so it will be interesting to see where he goes with that. I'm kinda encouraging him to look at the Acadian fiddle style, which is really unique, so it's fascinating. (Mary R., February 22, 2013)

What is significant in all of these examples is that none of the museum volunteers seemed to perceive the assignment (which was part of assignment II) as an exercise in drawing evidence from primary sources. Instead, they seemed to perceive the activity as an exercise in drawing information from accession files—or from the volunteers themselves.

4.8.3 Reflecting upon the museum experience (phase three). Upon completion of the student research projects, and immediately following opening night of *The William Street Middle School Museum of British North America*, I sat down with the four museum
volunteers\textsuperscript{136} on May 1, to record their final impressions of the museum fieldwork experience. All of the adult participants had attended opening night, and it had been six weeks since they had last interacted with the students.

\textbf{Temporal context of learning.} Reflecting back on the experience, all of the volunteers spoke positively about their role in the inquiry. Both Charles and Murray felt that the museum visits had served as an essential component to students’ learning:

Charles: "Well the whole thing is that I don't think that, without the museum experience, some of the kids would never have gotten into this at all, you know."

Murray: "Oh no."

Charles: "And without direction, they wouldn’t have… well they would probably want to do ten things in the museum if you hadn’t said that, you know, you have to focus in here and do it.”

Charles: “Yes, I think their visits to the museum really helped them, because well, like Cathy, she already knew a lot about, about it beforehand, but the other students, they only, like they were asking questions when they came, and taking notes, and keeping their journals, I think that was important, to help them put things together.” (May 1, 2013)

\textit{Changing social roles within a community of inquiry.} With regard to shifting social roles within the museum, it is also significant to note how the fieldwork experience led two of the adult participants to think differently about their identity as “experts.” Mary, for example, shared her thoughts with the group, speculating on ways of opening the

\textsuperscript{136} One individual, Ellen E., was not able to attend the final meeting, due to a miscommunication regarding the meeting time.
museum up to educational activities, so that students could become more actively involved in historical inquiry:

It would be fun to have a gallery in the museum with 24 little shelves and take, actually do this project in the museum, and give them each an object. And get them to interpret each object, and have the opening in the museum… And then give them each a shelf, say you have a shelf this big. Pick an object from the collection that would fit on that shelf, and we'll research it together, and some volunteers go in to help. That would be fun! And then we could do the opening in there. And that way they'd have more of a physical connection to the museum too [agreement]. (Mary R., May 1, 2013)

In turn, Mary also spoke of how the museum could provide teachers with resources for historical inquiry—thus expanding their educational services beyond the guided tour.

Similarly, while Lucy thought that the inquiry represented “a good step” towards “exposing” students to a museum, as well as to understanding how history happens, and how museums capture the past (Lucy K., May 1, 2013); she wondered how she might have changed her own role in the process. In this sense, although Lucy recognised that the museum could not control the “mental leaps” that students make, she speculated how a change in her own function in the learning process might enable students to think differently about the narratives they encounter:

…obviously there's something that would need to be different with us, you know, as facilitators, in terms of… how we would address the students, address the objects… I'd hoped I would see a little bit of this… I wanted them to question, you know, the images, you know, since we were in the Boss Gibson room… there's a
line drawing map, you know, that has the date 1885, and I was talking to them about that, and I said actually the date would be more about 1897, and I was explaining why, and I was trying to say to them, look… it's OK to question… if these artifacts, or if dates on them, are in fact not accurate… That was my hope, was that just knowing that… you can challenge, that not everything is, and …we do as curators, that's what we do as historians… (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

Thus, drawing critically from her own experience participating in this inquiry, Lucy felt that if she had perhaps been more focussed in her discussions with the students—had perhaps adopted a central inquiry theme to anchor her interactions—she could have been more effective as a facilitator:

…so you have to channel, you know, the way they would be viewing and thinking, like maybe almost have a theme myself, for how I would present the artifacts… who is this, and whose teapot is it, and you know, is it a case of the Sesame Street thing, which of these things doesn’t belong, or does it belong? [agreement] This kind of thing, or with the images, like I tried to talk to them or at least I wanted them to look at the things in the room differently, you know… I was trying to humanise the past, like I think I probably did too many things. (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

These statements point to ways in which adult participants were reconsidering their social role within a community of inquiry that increasingly included the students.

*Making personal connections.* Two of the adult participants also spoke of their desire to become better acquainted. Both Murray and Lucy (May 1, 2013), for example, suggested that a “getting-to-know-you” meeting would have been beneficial, since
Murray was never really introduced to the students who were assigned to his exhibit area. Likewise, Lucy felt that such a meeting would have established a stronger bond with the students:

Lucy: “I also think, this might sound crazy, I almost think we maybe would have needed almost a getting-to-know-you session, whether it's in their school or in the museum environment [Murray agrees] you know… cause [Murray agrees] like I don't think… I know that a lot of the students had no idea what any of our names were… like that creates the comfort level [Murray agrees] right there… I think [that] might have helped, in terms of them being a little bit more open, and wanting to ask questions… almost creating a different intimacy level.”

Murray: “But I like your idea Lucy of sort of an introductory one, cause I, I was never really introduced to the kids I was working with. So, I never did, really did not lock into names other than a couple who stood out.” (May 1, 2013)

It is important to note that the museum volunteers felt that they did not possess the same level of rapport with the students as their classroom teacher (since their teacher had been working with the students since the beginning of the school year). As a result, not knowing student interests, as well as simply not knowing (or remembering) their names, made it difficult for the volunteers to connect with individuals. This is significant, because it points to a barrier that distanced the museum volunteers from the students, and thus hindered their ability to make personal connections with one another. This sense of inter-personal bonding was something that all of the adult participants seemed to wish to achieve.
Time was also perceived as a barrier for making personal connections, since all of the volunteers felt that there was never enough time to do all that they wished to do. Murray, for instance, spoke of “the chaos factor” within such time constraints:

Cause you get four or five of them in there, and you got 20 minutes, and they're all running around taking pictures, and you try to talk to one or two about one artifact, and somebody’s over here doing something else, and I'm not really sure what I was saying really sunk in that much… (Murray G., May 1, 2013)

Murray later reiterated that more time was needed to simply "sit down, and actually discuss it with them, and work it out" (Murray G., May 1, 2013). As a result, the fast-paced structure of the school day (both in the classroom, as well as in the museum), combined with the active learning model adopted for this inquiry, seemed to make it difficult for volunteers to connect in ways that they wished. A possible solution (which all four participants suggested at various points in the interview) was to have the students visit the museum more frequently. Four visits, over six weeks, seemed to be not enough. Too much time elapsed between each museum encounter; thus, it was felt that condensing more visits over fewer weeks would have been beneficial in developing a better rapport, and making personal connections between adults and students.137

Social goods as “appropriate” ways of thinking about the past. Overall, however, adult participants were very positive about the final outcome of student work. Mary stated that she thought The William Street Middle School Museum of British North America was “well done,” adding: “Oh my, they were cute” (Mary R., May 1, 2013). Charles observed that the students “took pride in their work,” while Murray noted: “there

---

137 Similar recommendations have evolved out of Kydd’s (2005) research with museum classrooms (pp. 18-28).
was obviously a sliding scale… some did significantly better than others…But they all did it. Presumably, to the best of their ability or interest level” (Murray G., May 1, 2013). Lucy also added that she thought that the student project boards were “very very good”:

> Oh and some of them were fantastic! [agreement]. Oh my goodness! Tracy and I were like, LOOK AT THAT! You know [laughter]. Like the perspective of some of them was, you know, they weren’t just face on… they had you know, kind of creative angles, shall we say, and actually created a lot of interest, so far as I was concerned initially, and I'm not sure if that was how they viewed it particularly, or if they were just having fun with the camera, but it, it worked out nicely, I thought. (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

On the other hand, however, Lucy also pointed out that she thought there were obvious variances in the quality of the presentations:

And you probably must have noticed this as well, like you can see the learning difficulties, you know, apparent [agreement]. ‘Cause a lot of it is not just typographical errors, you know, that these are the errors of the student themselves… that someone was buried, b-e-r-r-i-e-d, [agreement] in the burying ground, with ‘burying’ spelled correctly [laughter]. They were straw-berried I think! [Laughter]… Oh, absolutely! And again, like I say, I'm just simply pointing out that, you know, you can see that there were struggles [agreement]. You know, and these are still, as you say, these are completed projects, of whatever calibre, it does reflect each individual student, and at their level… appropriate to their age or their ability level [agreement]. (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

In this context, “good” projects were measured on the basis of students’ literacy skills, as
well as their ability to create visually pleasing displays. There also emerged from the interview, however, more specific themes around assessing “good” student projects. These involved (a) assembling information, (b) linking artifacts, and (c) responding to the research question.

A) Assembling information. Mary spoke of how she was particularly impressed with the project created by “my rosary girl,” because the student had uncovered new information about the artifact (beyond what could be gathered from the artifact label and accession file):

[she] …taught the curator something about that object. ‘Cause that's not our object, so she had a longer road to travel to research that object. It was like getting a file with nothing in it, ‘cause it's not ours, so we don't have a file on that object. We just have what's on the label. So, when she examined that object, she was doing something to it that nobody's done yet. (Mary R., May 1, 2013)

“My rosary girl” was actually Maggie, and she had gained “new” information about the rosaries by researching the original owner on Ancestry.ca. With this knowledge, she was able to re-construct a response to her research question: “Who was Olive Marie Caissie?” (Figure 51).

In listening to the volunteers reflect upon the final student results, what became evident is that the information students chose to feature on their project boards was not
necessarily what the volunteers would have featured, had they been in the same situation.

As Mary explained:

Oh, I saw my information there, and I saw a lot of their own information. I find it interesting what, when you read their information, what they found important enough to be on the board, versus what I would have put on the board, like I find that interesting, and I like it. And I find the connections that they made interesting… (Mary R., May 1, 2013)

All of the volunteers expressed fascination about what knowledge students had appropriated from their fieldwork experience, even though it was not what volunteers expected. As Lucy explained:

Well, I mean that's always fascinating for, you know… what nugget… stays with them, and… it's like with anything, anytime you've given a lecture, or given a talk, or spoken to students, you think, you know, THAT’S what you took away? You know? [Murray agrees] It's, ah, it's really fascinating… you know, amongst all the bits of information…You fling things against the wall, what sticks? You know? …it's like flinging spaghetti and seeing if it sticks to the wall, you know… So I, I find that particularly fascinating, um, like you know…what moment… and what particular thing have you said that has resonated with the student [agreement], and that has created that residue. You know, that they haven’t forgotten. (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

Murray also expressed regret that some of the students in his group had pursued a dead-end research path, since the provenance of the War of 1812 calvary sword was unknown, and its history was highly questionable:
Yah, the only thing is, I missed one of the early key meetings at the museum [February 1] and had I been there, I think I would have tried to steer them towards other artifacts that had better documentation in the files, cause they choose the one curvy sword, and that's got basically nothing on it… Somebody came up with a Hungarian polished sword, which I have no idea where that came from. Never heard of the thing. (Murray G., May 1, 2013)

This observation is significant, because it points to the importance of accuracy and detail in museum recordkeeping. Without a specific artifact provenance, it becomes extremely difficult (if not impossible) to unlock the history an artifact holds. As a result, without detailed accession records to work with, students in this particular research group resorted to making “mental leaps” about the Calvary Sword, which were based mainly upon what Murray could discuss in general terms, as well as what students found on the Internet, and any loose associations they could make with other artifacts within the exhibit space.

B) **Linking artifacts.** With regard to establishing links with other artifacts, all of the May 1 interview participants seemed fascinated by the comparative associations students made by adopting the material history scaffolding tools. In particular, both Charles and Murray commented on how well Sally had assembled her information, and had responded to her research question—“How does the Seeder, Saw and Scythe Relate to the Spike-tooth Harrow?” (Figure 52):

Charles: I thought it was good to have the, you know, all the things that would have been used in the field put together and explained, somewhat.
Murray: "But you know, I can remember reading that, and there's sort of a subtlety in the interpretation [pause]. You know, I think she had [it] in pretty general terms [pause] sort of breaking up the ground or something [Charles agrees]; whereas to my understanding a harrow like that, first you plough it, and then you take the harrow over it to break up the clumps after the plough, 'cause you can't [Charles agrees], you know there's sort of levels of subtlety in the interpretation, and she was kind of up here [gesturing height], and somebody else could have gone down there, and, but you know, she told you what a harrow did." (May 1, 2013)

The measured strengths within Sally’s project (Figure 52) were that she was able to clearly explain the function of each artifact, as well as to establish how each related to the other. In addition, her research question (which she had changed at some point in the research process) clearly reflected the evidence that she presented. She also demonstrated a clear understanding about how the three artifacts functioned together on a farm. This was knowledge that she presumably had re-constructed, as a result of her fieldwork experience, since initially she did not know what any of the objects were, or how they functioned.\textsuperscript{138} This prompted Charles to describe the group’s learning curve\textsuperscript{139} as thus:

\textsuperscript{138} Very minimal informal was provided by either the artifact label or accession file.
"They mostly seemed to be city kids that stumbled upon some farm equipment" (Charles B., May 1, 2013). Charles also noted that he thought the material history scaffolding tools students used were very beneficial, because they “helped them to get organised,” and “helped them to put their displays together” (Charles B., May 1, 2013).

With regard to information that was appropriated from the four museum visits, volunteers were all intrigued by the links students made between artifacts within the exhibit spaces, and how these associations influenced their understanding of the past. As Mary explained:

…the way they connect objects is different than the way we connect them. It's like the sword. They took the picture of Smythe, and said this is the man that used the sword. I was like, no it's not, but that's kinda cool that you think he did! And somebody else did the same thing with the mannequin with the, with the jacket on. He said, this is the soldier that used the sword. Ah, well that's not a soldier, that's a mannequin, he's got no pants on... [laughter]… No, he probably didn’t use the sword either, I mean they, we have no proof to say who used the sword, but it was kind of important to them that they know who used the sword. You know, it's an interesting way of looking at it. (Mary R., May 1, 2014)

In such instances, the analytical process of comparing artifact sources led students to understand the past in ways that were originally unintended by the exhibition curators.

In other instances as well, the process of material history artifact analysis became problematic for some students, when the intended exhibition narrative did not correlate

139 With exception to Cathy in his group, who had benefited from the previous experience of being a Visiting Cousin at Kings Landing Historical Settlement.
with actual artifact evidence. For example, the Archibald Harrison "teapot,"\textsuperscript{140} exhibited within the Margaretville exhibition ("The Boss’s World"), led Florence to a dead-end in her research, because she could not find any connection between Archibald Harrison, and either Alexander “Boss” Gibson, or the town of Margaretville (Figure 53). Indeed (as was pointed out later during the interview on May 1) there was no connection. The coffee pot had simply been included in the exhibit as a prop. As Lucy explained:

> And of course, you know… her [the student’s] knowledge of how an exhibit has been put together… would… make her assume that a connection would be not just tenuous, but would be… that this was perhaps even… Poured coffee for Boss Gibson… this kind of thing… not really realising that, at times, you're using objects that are of the time, but not necessarily that Boss Gibson touched this, or that, you know, this guy was his employee… just someone had donated it. (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

As a result, when Florence undertook her own analysis, she discovered an obvious disconnect, which could not be easily resolved. She then had to grapple with the obvious contradiction that her artifact source really did not “fit” into the narrative she had initially appropriated from the museum exhibit.

This eventually led to problems in her final presentation, because she was unable to

\textsuperscript{140} Labeled a teapot, although it is actually a coffee pot.
respond to her research question ("Who was Archibald Harrison?") within the context of her research group theme (Alexander “Boss” Gibson, commerce, and the lifestyle of workers in Margaretville), because her artifact actually had nothing to do with Margaretville or “Boss” Gibson. In turn, the volunteers were left confused, and ultimately perceived her project as less cohesive than other student projects, because she did not seem to address her research question (Lucy K., May 1, 2013; Charles B., May 1, 2013). As Charles remarked: "The Harrison one there, in Margaretville, it told about him [Archibald Harrison], but it didn’t say how he was connected to Margaretville" (Charles B., May 1, 2013). Well (as others in the interview candidly admitted), Archibald Harrison was not known to be connected to Margaretville at all. Nevertheless, Florence did clearly respond to her research question, because she focused all of her written documentation upon Archibald Harrison, while establishing a very loose connection to how she imagined life in logging camps to be in the 19th century (since that was the historical context in which she had encountered the artifact). She also settled with labelling her coffeepot a "Tea Kettle."

This is a significant finding, because it demonstrates how Florence re-constructed a narrative around the “teapot” that was based partly upon her own evidence, and partly upon the museum narrative. Hence, like the hybrid responses that students constructed when remembering Canada’s and New Brunswick’s past (section 4.4.1), Florence pieced together a narrative that became uniquely her own. Indeed, all of the examples discussed in this section, point to the “mental leaps” that students made within the museum—based upon the physical context of where they encountered the artifacts, what other artifacts shared the same exhibit space, what understandings they gained from the volunteers,
what they found in the artifact accession files, and what they found on the Internet.

C) **Responding to the research question.** On May 1, a considerable amount of discussion emerged around the topic of research questions. In this sense, stronger projects were identified as those in which students were able to clearly respond to their research question; while weaker projects appeared to be more indecisive. As Mary observed:

The question for that was how long would it take to make a carved paddle. I don't think he ever managed to get that out [agreement]. Instead, he made connections with other objects. And then, would every common family have a crooked knife? … I don't think he ever really answered that question. (Mary R., May 1, 2013)

Interestingly as well, the topic of research questions opened up broader epistemological discussions around the nature of “historical truth” (Lucy K., May 1, 2013), as well as the challenges associated with developing “good” research questions. These were discussions that the volunteers could relate to personally, having experienced similar difficulties themselves. In this sense, they seemed to be empathising with the students. As Lucy explained:

…they're having the same struggle as high school students, university students, that I see, which is unfortunately they start with a sassy, sexy kind of question and the evidence can't bear out an answer. And I see this, like I say, ALL the time at university, and I will tell students you gotta let the research guide you. Cause they'll come to me at university, and ask can I do a topic on, and then fill in the blank, and I'll say, when you've done some research you can generate a question from there. And I think maybe at some point, a question came before they knew enough [agreement] and [it] stuck, and you know how it is, it's too late. You stay with the
question [laughter], and you just kind of put stuff. (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

Drawing from her own personal experience as a researcher, Lucy offered a solution to the problem of pursuing unanswerable research questions:

Research needs to guide the question, and if you go in [agreement] with certain assumptions, this is also what's going to cloud, cause, you know… the point being that I still think that this is, ah, it's just part of you know, the mind traps that all students [agreement], you know, experienced, and experienced researchers too [agreement]. (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

Murray also suggested that it would have been beneficial to engage the students in follow-up dialog about their research (and any questions that remained unanswered), since it would have provided volunteers with an opportunity to discuss how some research questions are unanswerable, and how many aspects of the past remain unknown (Lucy K., May 1, 2013):

But actually what you could do, is have a [pause], how to describe this, an after-action meeting, a post-project meeting with the kids and say, OK here's what we did, do you have any questions, are there any answers that you didn’t get resolved? You know, and just get their feedback [placing himself in the mindset of the student]: well I was doing this, but I couldn’t quite figure out how the teapot related to Boss Gibson. OK, well that's because it doesn’t, it's sort of a [pause] what a typical piece, not necessarily, you know. And that might be a useful dialogue to have with them, I don't know. (Murray G., May 1, 2013)

What is particularly significant about these discussions is that the volunteers were demonstrating a sense of empathy with the students. As such, they were suggesting to ask
students for their “feedback,” in an “after-action meeting,” and to enter into a “dialogue” about “mind traps” that all historians experience.

Overall, Murray summarised his experience as: “Interesting. Different. Unique” (Murray G., May 1, 2013). He also added: “it's good because you have to find your own answers; you just don't take somebody else's pre-programmed answers” (Murray G., May 1, 2013).

**Cartoon post-response.** Near the end of the interview, adult participants were asked to re-visit the Michael de Adder political cartoon (Figure 50, p. 222), “Both gamer and WWII veteran defeat Nazi’s in Holland” (2010). This time, although their reactions were somewhat similar to those of January, since all of the adults-present now agreed with the cartoon’s message, their responses were also somewhat different, since the discussions were now more focused on the topic of “gamification” rather than on youth as foreign and unknowing of the past.

Amongst those who agreed with the message, Charles spoke of how the cartoon illustrated students’ interest in video games, adding that (as was evident from his museum fieldwork experience) the students he worked with did not demonstrate any “familial connection with the past” (Charles B., May 1, 2013). Mary also pointed out that the museum’s past seemed “new to them” (Mary R., May 1, 2013). Hence, drawing from their experiences of working with the students, both Charles and Mary emphasised that they felt the de Adder (2010) cartoon was very relevant, because students did not seem to possess a great deal of prior knowledge about the history they encountered within the museum.

141 Murray had disagreed with the message in January, but was now in agreement for very different reasons, which will be discussed in this section.
Building upon the group discussion, Lucy added that she interpreted the de Adder (2010) cartoon as illustrating how gaming can help students learn about the past, by providing them with an “accidental” encounter. Thus, reflecting upon her experience of working with the students (and trying to transmit information to them), Lucy noted:

…we really didn’t have too many students who had something to already attach to, whether or not it was [Charles agrees] let's say, in the television world, in the gaming world, I don't think they had a parallel, you know, or an equal… this cartoon [agreement], I think it's absolutely fantastic… because it… is speaking to the fact that … there is this, let's say, incidental, or accidental knowledge, but it's through a very circuitous and strange means… it doesn’t mean they know about, you know, the Nazis in Holland because of X-Box, they have a gamification… representation [Charles agrees]. And, I just don't know, I think that was maybe a bit of our struggle with our students, is that they didn’t, you know, they didn’t even have this kind of parallel, they didn’t even have kind of an accidental [knowledge]...(Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

On the other hand, however, Lucy also emphasised that gamification poses insidious risks—a point to which Murray also agreed:

Of course, we run the risk of something like this, that it cartoonises the past [Murray agrees], that it is… let's say… a storyline from a game, rather than real events. I mean, I suppose that would be one, ah, problem that you might encounter, but I really do think... games… and doing things on line… it is a way to, to lay some foundation… they're able to get exposure to the past in a way that feels like they're not learning. It's almost incidious. (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)
Hence, in the context of this particular inquiry, the benefits of students not possessing “accidental knowledge” of the museum’s history meant that they entered into the inquiry with fewer assumptions—and this was perceived as beneficial:

Definitely, it’s something that they don't have to, let's say, unlearn [Charles agrees]. You know, that they were actually building, that we were able to give them scaffolding, whereas something like this, you have to you know, unlearn it, or at least shift the focus, um, so again it has… it's negatives and positives… whereas we were kind of [working] from the ground up [agreement]. (Lucy K., May 1, 2013)

In this sense, while adult participants still recognised that students may be foreign and unknowing of the past, they now seemed to acknowledge that students were very capable of knowing how to “build” history “from the ground up.” This points to an important distinction between information knowledge and design knowledge (Perkins, 1986).

In comparing before and after reactions to the de Adder (2010) cartoon, it is evident that although adult participants were fascinated by how little their student counterparts seemed to know about history (i.e., the information volunteers wished to convey), it was also exciting for them to re-encounter the past through students’ eyes. In this sense, the material history framework for artifact analysis provided adult participants with common ground for making personal connections with students, which the adults seemed to crave. At the same time, it was also evident during this inquiry that the “we-versus-them” relationship changed dramatically. By May 1, adult participants were now perceiving the students as junior researchers, capable of encountering the past “in their own reality” (Murray G., May 1, 2013). This transition is significant, because it points to subtle ways
in which adult participants were shifting their pedagogical views toward students’ abilities to think historically about the past.

4.9 Student Participant Interviews.

Near the end of phase three of this inquiry, focus group interviews were conducted with all remaining student participants (n=22). These interviews took place between April 8 and 12, 2013, and were organised around seven random-purposeful groups, organised according to research themes that had been established at the beginning of the inquiry. At this point in time, students were actively involved in re-interpreting their museum fieldwork experience, by preparing exhibit storyboards for their classroom Museum of British North America. They were busy selecting their photovoice images for their project boards, organising their evidence, establishing historical significance, and mapping out connections between artifact sources.

During the student interviews, a conversational protocol was adapted from Levstik and Barton (2008), so that each group would be presented with ad hoc variations on the same seven questions (see section 3.5.3, pp. 78 - 79). In keeping with instrumental case study research (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2007; Stake, 2005), the conversations were later transcribed and analyzed qualitatively, according to the same two-cycle coding technique adopted for adult interviews. First Cycle analysis involved descriptive and in vivo coding, which focussed upon research sub-question #1:

“Can formal classroom instruction, adopting The Historical Thinking Project concepts for historical thinking, enable middle school students to think historically about the narratives they encounter within their community history museum?”
Second Cycle analysis involved a critical discourse method (Gee, 1999), which focused upon the same two aspects of historical consciousness: (a) social roles as an expression of group-identity,\(^{142}\) and (b) social goods as a way of thinking about the past.\(^{143}\) The findings were then structured for presentation according to Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) *Contextual Model of Learning*.

4.9.1 **Personal context of learning.** In listening to students’ explanations as to why they selected specific artifacts for their research project, several motivating factors became evident. Among these factors there emerged three primary themes: (a) curiosity and wonder, (b) personal identity or prior experience, and (c) project assignments.

**Curiosity and wonder.** Out of a total of 33 responses, the largest proportion of student references (20 in total), related to curiosity and wonder. In this instance, students selected artifacts simply because they looked interesting and provoked their curiosity. As Patsy explained, although she chose the washing machine because it seemed potentially useful for the assignment (i.e., the accession number was legible in the image), what motivated her the most, was that the object looked “really cool”:

… Um, I don't know really why, it just looked more antique, and it had the accession number on it, so then I looked at the other one, but it didn’t have it, so I saw the washing machine had it on there, so I was like, PUFF! [gesturing with her hands by waving them in the air] I'm gonna take that one… it looked really interesting, cause it had lots of gears in the middle and stuff, so, yah, it looked really cool. (Patsy M., April 12, 2013)

---

\(^{142}\) What Gee (1999) describes as the social “role” of “identities” (p. 18).

\(^{143}\) What Gee (1999) describes as the “politics” of “social goods” (p. 19).
Likewise, Mike selected the War of 1812 arms chest because it had “character”: “well I chose this one because it looked old, and it had a bit of character to it… Yah… it kinda had character the way it was scratched up” (Mike S., April 8, 2013). Similarly, Diane chose the portrait of Mary Coy, because she wondered why Mary Coy’s clothing was less colourful than the others:

…I was wondering why she wore just like, just black, and like with a little bit of green, because like the little girl she wore all white, and like the other people wore like blue, and like blue and green…Ya, it was like, she was the only one that was wearing it, and I was wondering, because like, was it like a style, or just like because she picked it, or something? (Diane D., April 10, 2013)

In all of these responses, it was mainly a visual interest that guided students’ artifact selection.

**Personal identity or prior experience.** Some students, however, (seven in total) based their choices upon personal identity or prior experience. Matt, for example, chose the fiddle (in the Acadian exhibit), because his ancestry is Acadian, and he enjoys listening to music: “Well, I chose the fiddle because… I'm part Acadian, so that's why I picked this group, and then I'm really into music, so I thought doing the fiddle would be pretty fun” (Matt J., April 8, 2013). Likewise, Chuck chose a pianoforte, because of his prior experience: “I used to play piano, so I chose the piano; it's kinda like something good… (Chuck D., April 10, 2013). Similarly, Cathy chose the cradle butterchurn, because she had already experienced churning butter as a *Visiting Cousin* at Kings Landing Historical Settlement, so already knew a great deal about the function of the object:
Ah, well for me it was because, um, you know, I knew a lot, um, well actually, I wasn’t there for the actually taking pictures, and everything, so, well, all of the pictures had already been taken, and so there were lots of pictures of cradle churns from lots of different angles, and I had churned butter before, and I knew a lot about it, so, I just decided to choose it so. (Cathy A., April 12, 2013)

In these instances, students selected artifacts that seemed remotely familiar to them—and thus sparked their interest.

**Project assignment.** In addition to these clearly articulated factors for student-driven inquiry, some students also explained that completing the assignment was their central motivation. Of these responses (five in total), their reasoning ranged from selecting an artifact that would be easy to "look at" (Henry B., April 11, 2013; Caleb A., April 8, 2013), to simply thinking that the object looked like "something fun to do" (Maggie K., April 8, 2013), or that it had something in common with other artifacts in the exhibit (Salome H., April 11, 2013). One student stated that she simply did not know why she had made specific choices—she just "chose it" (April K., April 8, 2013).

Together, these three motivating factors are significant, because they indicate that personal identities were not the greatest driving force for making artifact choices. Instead, visual interest directed nearly two-thirds of students’ decisions (20 out of 33 responses). This finding warrants further investigation, because it suggests that museum collections have great potential to inspire students to explore historical topics outside their zone of
proximal development (Holzman, 2010; Wertsch, 2002a), since visual interest was much more influential than personal identity.\footnote{For a broad discussion on creativity, meaning-making, and L.S. Vygotsky’s theoretical “zone of proximal development” (ZPD), see John-Steiner, Connery, & Marjnovis-Shane (2010), as well as Holzman (2010, pp. 30-31).}

### 4.9.2 Sociocultural context of learning

It is important to note, that at the time of conducting these focus group interviews, students were still preoccupied with planning their artifact exhibits. As a result, they had not yet fully developed their classroom Museum of British North America, and were still focussed upon the what and how of interpreting their artifact source. They also had not yet been introduced to assignment III (statements of significance), which was undertaken later on April 23 (Appendix G). Hence, at this juncture in the inquiry, students were still very actively engaged in reconstructing the pasts that they had encountered during their museum fieldwork experience.

**Artifact significance.** When asked whether they thought their artifact belonged in a museum, and whether they thought it was important (or not), out of a total of 17 students who responded to this question, all but two indicated that they thought their artifact was important—and that it should be kept in the museum. Of the two students who thought otherwise, one explained that he did not think it was important because it was not one-of-a-kind—but that it still belonged there (Caleb A., April 8, 2013). The other student provided a contradictory yes/no response, suggesting that it may be important enough to be in a museum today, but in the future they might decide to sell it to someone else and pass it on (Tzhi J., April 11, 2013).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns of Significance</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Artifact significance (oral interview) narrative templates</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statement of significance (Assignment III) narrative templates</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revealing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>They don’t make them anymore (Gregg, Salome)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shows their technology (Cathy, Florence, Sally, Maggie, Gregg, Aamir, Mike)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shows how people lived (Caleb, Cathy, Mike, Owen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reveals to her descended family what she looked like (Diane, April)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Helps us figure out the past (Diane, Jun, Mike, Cathy)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did not do anything important (Chris)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Without it they would not have been able to fight the war (Mike)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not important to my people, but would be important to others (Maggie)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Represents the culture of the people (Cathy, Maggie)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Represents Canada (Sally)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Represents changing technology (Aamir)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associates with a historic event (Mike, Jun)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belonged to/ honours an important person/event (Laurie, David, Owen, Henry)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honours an important person (Laurie, David, Owen)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We’re keeping history - that we won the war (Mark)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Represents (or not) Canadian history (Jun, Chris)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>It’s not really unique (Caleb)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not important (David)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It’s just a trophy (Chris)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not important (Chris)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Has been in the community for so long (Sandy)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has been passed on – but could sell it in the future (Tzhi)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adds character to the museum exhibit (Chuck)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9: Student responses to interview question #3, versus statements of significance later developed in Assignment III*

In addition, students’ reasoning as to why they thought their artifact belonged in the museum (Table 9), varied from traditional narrative templates: “Well, I think it does, like, cause it goes in with the room that it's in, like with all the paintings and stuff. I think it kinda gives the room a little bit of character” (Chuck D., April 8, 2013); to exemplary reasoning about what the artifact represented: “We're keeping history for the… that we
won. The Canadian and British” (Mark C., April 11, 2013); or genetic rationalisations that linked past with present:

I think it most definitely is, because, if you look more closely at like how music developed, it went through fiddle music and it developed music today, so it is important because we wouldn't have the same music without, um, the kinds of music that we had before, so fiddle music is part of that. (Matt J., April 8, 2013)

Furthermore, within the typology of genetic reasoning, it was also evident that some of the students were engaged in more than simply rationalising significance (as in the example above). Some were digging deeper into the artifact source, to draw out evidence, empathise with the original owner, and establish significance in that way. As Maggie explained with regard to the rosary beads:

I think the rosaries are important, but like that religion, like Roman Catholics, it'd be important to them, because what they did with them was like they'd pray over each bead that they were rubbing, and on the rosaries you can tell that they've been worn out because whoever had been using them, like you could see that the details were kind of worn [pause]. They're probably not important to like [pause] MY people, but to anybody like Roman Catholic... (Maggie K., April 8, 2013)

Other students also demonstrated a critical response to the question of artifact importance—establishing significance in the seemingly insignificant. As Mike reasoned with regard to his War of 1812 arms chest: “Umm, I think mine does [belong in a museum], cause without it they wouldn’t have been able to carry weapons as easily, and without weapons they wouldn’t be able to fight in the war” (Mike S., April 8, 2013).

These latter examples demonstrate ways in which some of the students were constructing
sophisticated lines of reasoning around the historical significance of the museum collection, based upon evidence that they had drawn from the artifact source.

**Patterns of significance.** Upon making comparisons with statements of significance developed later in the inquiry (for assignment III, section 4.4.3), it is evident that nearly half of the students (seven in total) had already established symbolic patterns of significance about their artifact (Table 9, p. 260); while slightly less than half (five in total) had established revealing patterns of significance. By assignment III, however, proportionately fewer students (less than half) had adopted symbolic patterns of significance about their artifact, while proportionately more students (more than half) had adopted revealing patterns of significance. These findings are significant, because they indicate ways in which students’ thinking about the past became more source-based over the timeframe of the inquiry, since by assignment III more students found their artifact to be revealing. Furthermore, with regard to Rüsen’s (2005) typology of historical consciousness, by assignment III, significantly more responses (21 out of 29; versus 6 out of 17 during student interviews) demonstrated a genetic relationship with the past, linking past with present.

**4.9.3 Temporal context of learning.** Near the end of each focus group interview students were invited to reflect upon their experience over the past 12 weeks, and to explain what they liked the most—as well as the least—about the learning activities.

145 Out of a total of 17 student interview responses.
146 See section 4.4.3 for explanations on symbolic patterns of significance.
147 See section 4.4.3 for explanations on revealing patterns of significance.
148 Of the eight students who did not complete assignment III (but provided interview responses to question #3), three demonstrated a genetic relationship with the past (Salem, April, and Matt), while three others provided exemplary responses (Henry, Mark, and Sandy), and two were traditional in nature (Tzhi and Chuck).
What students liked the most. In listening to students’ explanations as to what they liked the most, several themes became evident. Out of a total of 42 interview responses, the largest proportion of student statements (40 in total) indicated that they liked the museum fieldwork experience the best. Their reasons for this were grounded in three elements of learning: (a) wonder and discovery, (b) experiencing the real thing, and (c) re-constructing the past.

Wonder and discovery. Students particularly liked being able to explore the museum at will, to venture beyond public exhibition spaces, and to discover the attic storage area (25 responses in total). This freedom seemed to provide them with a sense of wonder and discovery, which was driven by individual curiosity. As one group explained:

Maggie K.: “… [I] liked it when we were just going round the whole, um, museum, and like when we got to go up in the attic to see what else is up there. I just liked looking at everything in general… I like to kinda just get around…”

Matt J.: “Yah, the attic was like really interesting. There were like things from like swords to petroleum jelly.”

Maggie K.: “Yah. Wasn't there like a cake up there or something? But how old was it? Like 300 years old?”

Matt J.: “I don't know.”

Maggie K.: “It might have been older than that, but I thought that was either disgusting or really cool [laughter]... that they actually preserved that cake” (April 8, 2013).

Experiencing the real thing. Coupled with this sense of discovery, nine of the students also remarked that they liked being able to experience the “real thing,” and to
handle the artifacts. They noted that this was much better than relying upon pictures or
written text for historical information. One group also explained how being able to
witness the artifact in person made the learning experience unlike previous heritage fair
projects, since they were able to approach their research differently:

Mike S.: “Well I liked going to the museum and being able to see the object in
person instead of just looking at a picture or something…It was really nice to be
able to see it, and touch it, and see what it looks like in person. So, I liked that.”

Jun D.: “Well, this assignment has been really fun, to go to the museum and see all,
see all the artifacts, and actually take a closer look at it, rather than looking at
pictures, and I think I'm really gonna like, um, putting the pictures together on the
poster board and getting it ready for display…we're dealing with allot of artifacts
and...”

Mike S.: “With the heritage fair all we had was the internet, and books, and things
to look up. We didn’t have the artifact itself, so it's different in that way.” (April 8,
2013)

Re-constructing the past. As an extension of this, three students added how they
enjoyed being able to re-construct the past, either visually or orally, using their own
words. As Salome explained: “What I liked the most was doing this assignment, ‘cause I
like to take everything, and put it in my own words” (Salome H., April 11, 2013), and as
Mike also clearly articulated:

… [I liked] going, and like hearing everybody present their project…Yeah that was
fun, because then I could get to know what our classmates were doing. Yeah …And
it kinda gave us ideas on what we could do to improve our projects at the same
time. So, if, umm, they gave us a little piece of information that I could kinda do with my, I would kinda take a slice from that, and kinda try to add a bit to mine. So, it was nice that way…And it's, umm, it's a lot nicer to take information from someone that you KNOW, than from a teacher or someone. It's different when you take in information. (April 8, 2013)

**Aspects of active and dialogic learning.** Together, these statements describe various aspects of active and dialogic learning in the museum (discussed in section 2.4.3). They also illustrate different levels of engagement: ranging from the simple pleasures of wonder and curiosity, to the more challenging tasks of taking everything in and generating conclusions. Interspersed between these two poles of activity, each student seemed to find specific aspects of the experience more engaging than others, for a wide variety of different reasons. One student, for example, remarked that she liked taking pictures of the artifacts the best, while another said he liked being able to purchase a book for one dollar. Four students remarked that they liked handling the artifacts the best, while three others said that being able to see—and witness—artifacts for themselves was their favourite part of the experience, and two stated that they enjoyed researching their artifact on the Internet.

Aspects of dialogic learning were also apparent in some of these student remarks, since Mike (as quoted above) indicated that he liked being able to take information in from his peers; while Owen said that he liked being able to interact with the museum volunteers (personally referring to his assigned volunteer by name): “Ellen in the museum, she was nice” (Owen T., April 10, 2013).
Overall, these statements are significant, because they demonstrate ways in which students seemed to enjoy breaking down their passive social role as knowledge-receivers—by actively engaging in discovery, observation, interaction, and reconstruction. In this sense, students’ recollections of their museum fieldwork experience might best be summarised by this student’s forthright observation: “Well, at first I thought that it was gonna suck and be boring, but then when we actually went, I thought it was pretty fun” (Henry B., April 11, 2013).

**What students liked the least.** In listening to students’ explanations as to what they liked the least about the inquiry, two specific themes became evident. These involved finding information about their artifact, and not having enough free choice outside of their research group.

*Finding the information.* Out of a total of 29 interview responses, the largest proportion of student references (11 in total) indicated that they disliked the scaffolding worksheets simply because they seemed “hard” at first, and the Material History Framework for Historical Thinking was very unfamiliar. In particular, many found the research process challenging, because they could not locate the types of narrative information they were used to gathering. As Patsy described her experience:

…when we just started, and we had a bunch of stuff to do, that might of been the least… Right then like it took a long time. It was really kinda confusing a little bit, but it was good though. [Is it starting to come together for you now? Is it starting to make sense now?] Yah, yah… Plus I couldn’t even find any information for the old one… I tried to find it, but... I went on the student portal which is like for the
government's information. Yah, I searched it, and it said no, like... yah, so.... But, it's good [stretching her arms out]. (April 12, 2013)

What seemed to make the worksheets particularly difficult was that none of the students were used to working with artifact sources, or sifting through museum accession files. As Chris explained:

…I just thought that like getting the information was hard. That was really difficult...it was easier with the computers to find the information, but when we were at the museum trying to find the information, that was quite difficult. Just going through the whole file. (Chris J., April 11, 2013)

In each of these examples, both Patsy and Chris seemed more accustomed to searching out answers on the Internet, than actually piecing together (and evaluating) bits of evidence—in order to re-construct a response to their own research question.

Other students, however, did not experience as many difficulties (although they still found the scaffolding tools to be challenging)—as Diane remarked: “No, I mean, the worksheets were a handful, but I didn’t mind them” (Diane D., April 10, 2013). Mike also added (when asked if he thought the assignments were challenging):

Umm, they've been OK, they haven’t been too hard so, and they helped with the project so, without those it would be hard to do the project so... it helped to understand the artifact, and everything. Everything we've done has kinda helped so, I can't really think of anything else, like, to change about it. (Mike S., April 8, 2013)

Not enough free choice. In addition to the challenges associated with learning research skills within a museum setting, seven of the students also remarked that they
would have preferred to have had more “free choice” in their artifact selection. In this sense, they wished to focus their attention upon more than a single artifact, and not devote as much instructional time to that object. As one group elaborated:

Maggie K.: “Umm, [pause] I think it was just sticking to one thing, and like having to just be in the Acadians the whole time, then just having to look at one object, and then, I think it would have been pretty cool to just like do a couple, and... yah...”

Caleb A.: “Um, yah, I didn't really like sticking to one object either, if like, I could go to like, if I could have just done this like for a month, and then gone to another one, I think that would be, like, just starting fresh, and discovering new things...”(April 8, 2013)

One of the students also added that he would have liked to have spent more time in the museum—and less time in the classroom:

I really liked going, and actually looking at it [the artifact] and stuff, but I think that I would have really liked to have less things in class, like I would have liked to go there more often and stuff, so yeah…Yeah I think we would have got allot more information, and known more about it maybe. Yeah, but I did like going and like hearing everybody present their project. (Mike S., April 8, 2013)

Miscellaneous factors. Other aspects of the inquiry that individual students disliked included the cold (five responses), as well as completing the Canadians and their Pasts survey (three responses), volunteer participants talking too long at the very beginning of the inquiry (one response), camera malfunctions (one response), and having to prepare a final project (one response). On this latter point, the student so graciously confessed (with

149 Although the Material History Framework for artifact analysis included making comparisons with other artifacts, these particular students did not seem to see the correlation.
a chuckle): “I hate projects. Anything that has a due date. Just terrible” (Mark C., April 11, 2013).

**Student evaluation of scaffolding tools.** Together, these responses are enlightening, because they describe some of the tensions students were experiencing, as they transitioned from an information-transmission approach to history education, to an inquiry-based approach to thinking about the past. Nevertheless, despite the likes and dislikes, all but one of the students completed a final project in time for opening night on April 30. Likewise, student-feedback evaluations (undertaken on a regular bi-weekly basis until week 11 of the inquiry) indicated a high level of student satisfaction (Figure 54) until phase three of the inquiry, when they were restricted to the classroom and tasked with developing their final museum project. It is significant to note that on days when students were actively engaged with the museum volunteers (either in the museum or in

![Figure 54: Student feedback with regard to organization, level of interest, speaking time, and learning value, of activities outlined in Appendix G (January 17 – April 4, 2013). 6=well and 1=poor.](image-url)
their interest level peaked. At the same time, student recognition of the learning value associated with scaffolding tools remained high—as well as relatively stable—over the same seven-week time period. It is also significant that while the scaffolding tools were admittedly challenging for all students, the inquiry tasks were also universally achievable by all students.

In the chapter that follows, I triangulate my data against each of the procedural sub-questions that have guided this inquiry. I do this by re-constructing the data sets according to Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning (personal, sociocultural, physical, and temporal). I also summarise how these findings inform the question. Then, in response to the central research question, I provide practical recommendations for community-based learning in history education, and explain how my findings have led me to redefine what is meant by the concept of “deepening historical consciousness.” I conclude chapter 5 by discussing how my findings contribute to the existing body of research, thus raising points for future empirical research.

---

150 Museum volunteers visited the classroom on January 17 and 25, as well as February 8 and March 1. Students visited the museum on January 18, as well as February 1, 15, and 22. On all of these days, except January 17, the learning activities were student-driven. The only exception to this pattern occurred on February 15, when students were tasked with independently sifting through the accession files in the museum, and gathering more information about their artifact (a task which many found difficult to do, as already discussed in this section).

151 January 17 to March 1, 2013.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

“Well, at first I thought that it was gonna suck and be boring, but then when we actually went, I thought it was pretty fun.”
(Henry B., 2013 - student)

“…it's good because you have to find your own answers; you just don't take somebody else's pre-programmed answers.”
(Murray G., 2013 - volunteer)

5.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 of this dissertation presented specific research findings from data collected in response to three procedural sub-questions:

1. Can formal classroom instruction, adopting The Historical Thinking Project concepts for historical thinking, enable middle school students to think historically about the narratives they encounter within their community history museum?

2. Does participation in history museum fieldwork activities deepen the historical consciousness of middle school students?

3. Does student collaboration with older members of this volunteer heritage community deepen the historical consciousness of the older members themselves?

Within each subset of data, the findings were organised around Falk and Dierking’s (2000, 2013) Contextual Model of Learning, and were presented in chronological order as events occurred. The rationale for this arrangement was to document any possible transformations in participants’ historical consciousness—across four possible contexts of learning.

In this final chapter, I triangulate all of the data relating to each sub-question, and summarise how these findings inform the central research question of my dissertation: “How can a heritage community assist middle school students in deepening their historical consciousness?” I also provide practical recommendations for community-
based learning in history education, and explain how these findings re-define what is meant by the concept of “deepening historical consciousness.” I then conclude by discussing how the overall findings contribute to the existing body of research within four specific literature review themes: (a) trust in authority, (b) knowledge beliefs, (c) engaging in a community of inquiry, and (d) historical thinking in museums.

5.2 Can Formal Classroom Instruction, Adopting The Historical Thinking Project Concepts for Historical Thinking, Enable Students to Think Historically About the Narratives They Encounter Within the Community History Museum?

This inquiry was focussed upon the historical thinking concept of Evidence and Sources (Seixas & Morton, 2013). Through formal classroom instruction in source-based inquiry, students were provided with scaffolding tools designed to deconstruct the narratives they encountered within the community history museum (Appendix H). This was achieved by analyzing the artifact sources that supported the museum narratives, and drawing evidence from these sources. Over the course of this inquiry, students engaged in material history domain-knowledge, by adopting a Material History Framework for Historical Thinking, designed to support the premise that students could be empowered to do material history as museum curators, but that such a scenario would require teaching students how to read—and critically analyze—museum artifacts for the evidence that they contained.

Over a period of 14 weeks (totalling 22 hours) of formal classroom instruction (Appendix G), students became accustomed to working with primary and secondary sources found both inside and outside of the museum. During this instructional time, ample opportunities were made available to pose questions to the museum volunteers
about specific artifacts and collections, to draw contextual information from the museum accession files, exhibition panels, and print material; and to consult with history reference books as well as the Internet. During this formal learning process, students were also introduced to how narratives are presented within museums (both textually and visually), and how they could construct their own narratives. Upon completion of the fieldwork experience, it was hoped that students would be empowered to think historically about the narratives they encountered within their community history museums.

The mediational tools and techniques that were adapted for this inquiry included historic space mapping, a Material History Framework for Historical Thinking, and photovoice. Through the use of these tools, participants were prompted to focus their critical attention upon museum evidence drawn from artifact sources. This approach was found to be very beneficial, since it provided students with a great deal of freedom to make individual research choices, and to direct their own learning. The inquiry culminated in a classroom museum project (Appendix I), which provided a visual record of students’ personal choices when re-constructing the artifact collections encountered within the community history museum.

5.2.1 **Personal context of learning.** When making personal choices about artifact research, student participants demonstrated specific motivating factors. These motivators represented three primary themes: (a) curiosity and wonder, (b) personal identity or prior experience, and (c) project assignment. The largest proportion of students (61%) based their initial research decisions upon a visual interest in the artifact, which provoked their sense of wonder and curiosity. Alternatively, a lesser percentage of students (21%) based
their choice upon personal identity or prior experience, while a smaller number (15%) based their selection upon simply completing the assignment.

With regard to their final museum projects, all but one of the students found success in developing a research question, although only 41% actually responded to their question within their final project. In addition, while 82% of the students were successful in establishing lines of comparisons with other artifacts within the same museum exhibit (demonstrating an ability to compare and corroborate sources), their narratives remained implicitly shaped by the exhibits that they had encountered within the museum. Hence, while students’ projects reflected their own personal choices about what messages they wished to convey (and how they wished to convey them), their research choices were nevertheless limited by the parameters of the museum collections (and what was recorded in accession files about each artifact provenance).

Clearly, it was also evident that many of the students experienced difficulties in contextualising their artifact (a component of evidential historical thinking which seemed to come very easily to adult participants). This problem seemed to be associated with students’ lack of background knowledge around the broader historical topic. Hence, without a historical context in which to place their artifact, many students experienced difficulties in developing probing questions to frame their research. In addition, only five of the students were able to formulate summary conclusions about their research findings, and only one student successfully extended her analysis by connecting her research to a big idea in history. Furthermore, as a class, it was evident that students experienced difficulties in perceiving each of their micro projects as joined together to a big idea museum narrative. This perception of a “museum” seemed to become more apparent,
however, on opening night, when students witnessed their completed projects assembled together as *The Museum of British North America* (thus placing each individual project within the context of a larger *big idea* in history).

Overall, these findings are significant, because they indicate that for student participants, personal identities were not the greatest driving force for historical research. Instead, visual interest and curiosity directed nearly two-thirds of their personal choices. In addition, while the museum collections clearly inspired students to think about the narratives they encountered, they were also limited by the evidence and sources with which they had to work. These findings warrant further investigation, because they suggest that museum collections hold great potential for inspiring students to explore historical topics outside of their sociocultural zone of proximal development. At the same time, however, these findings also demonstrate the vital importance of maintaining detailed, historically accurate, and well documented artifact accession files, since the practise of curatorship—and critical inquiry—depends upon the existence of such primary source information.

**5.2.2 Sociocultural context of learning.** Through the adoption of material history domain-knowledge, student participants became actively engaged in source-based historical thinking. This engagement became evident in several tangible ways, as students became increasingly more confident in their social role as members of the museum’s community of inquiry. For example, after their first visit to the community history museum (on January 18), and upon completion of assignment I (on January 31), two-thirds of students organised their narrative responses around a basic *then-versus-now* first impression argument. Likewise, only two students adopted a strategy of drawing
evidence from museum artifacts to support their narrative claims, and nearly one-third simply appropriated versions of the narratives that they had encountered during their museum visit. In addition, several students (39%) integrated narratives from secondary sources that were obviously not present within the museum. With repeat visits to the museum, however, combined with formal classroom instruction in material history domain-knowledge, these narratives became much more complex.

Over a series of five brief lesson periods, organised around a strategy for differentiating between narrative claims and primary sources (combined with three museum visits), students became familiar with the historical thinking concept of *Evidence and Sources*. As a result, upon completion of assignment II, all of the students were now focussing their attention upon a specific artifact source, drawing evidence, asking questions, corroborating the source, and establishing interpretations—to various degrees—by employing a combination of description, inference, or comparison processes. These narratives were no longer simple *then-versus-now* statements, but were focussed upon the artifact—as a source of evidence to support their narrative claims.

Clearly as well, what had been appropriated from the museum fieldwork experience was information drawn from observing their artifact, questioning the curators, and sifting through the museum accession files. As a result, the largest majority of students (84%) organised their paragraph around an evidence-based description of their chosen artifact. This represents a significant change from assignment I, in which none of the students described the museum artifacts, and only two students adopted a strategy for drawing evidence from artifact sources.
In addition, while more students (53% versus 30% in assignment I) now incorporated bits and pieces of official museum narratives into their claims, substantially fewer (5% versus 39% previously) integrated secondary narratives from elsewhere into their individual claims. It was now evident that students were formulating narrative reconstructions that were artifact-specific, and within each research-group theme there appeared to be no shared narrative claims.

Later in the inquiry, when asked whether they thought their artifact belonged in a museum, and whether they thought it was important (or not), out of a total of 17 students who responded to this question, all but two indicated that they thought their artifact was important—and that it should be kept in the museum. Their reasoning for this varied from traditional narrative templates (three in total), to exemplary reasoning (six in total) about what the artifact represented, or genetic rationalisations (six in total) that linked past with present. Within the typology of genetic reasoning, it was also evident that three of the students were engaged in more than simply rationalising significance. These students were digging deeper into the artifact source, to draw out evidence, empathise with the original owner, and establish historical significance.

Upon completion of assignment III, which involved writing a statement of significance for their artifact, it was evident that students were adopting patterns of significance that reflected their own experience of material history analysis. These statements were also clearly focused upon students’ chosen artifact source. In addition, although only 14 of the entire 24 student case study group actually completed assignment III, students were clearly employing genetic (72%), exemplary (24%), and critical (3%) narrative templates about how their artifacts helped them to remember Canada’s past.
Moreover, within these templates, there emerged two distinct patterns of significance: (a) the artifact is important (or not) because of what it reveals about the past (55% of responses), and (b) the artifact is important (or not) because of what it represents symbolically (38% of responses). While these patterns of historical significance were not as robust as the guideposts described by Seixas and Morton (2013, p. 12), it is important to note that students were not provided with any formal classroom instruction around the historical thinking concept of Historical Significance (Seixas & Morton, 2013, pp. 12 – 39).

Ultimately, on opening night of The Museum of British North America, it was evident that students now perceived themselves as active members of a community inquiry. They demonstrated familiarity with the methods of historical inquiry that curators use in museums, and were also aware of the problematic nature of historical research. Likewise, it was evident that all of the students had become intellectually engaged with the community history museum in three specific ways: (a) they were familiar with the museum collections, (b) they were focussed upon their research, and (c) they perceived their artifact as a valid source of evidence. Within their final museum projects, it was also evident that students were actively modelling the historical thinking concept of Evidence and Sources by describing\textsuperscript{152} (96% student achievement rate), comparing\textsuperscript{153} (58% achievement rate), and—to a lesser extent—contextualising\textsuperscript{154} (38% achievement rate) their artifact source. In addition, through the process of their research, several students had discovered contradictions or gaps within the museum narratives, to

\textsuperscript{152} What Seixas & Morton describe as “Sourcing” (2013, p. 47).

\textsuperscript{153} What Seixas & Morton describe as “Corroboration” (2013, p. 48).

\textsuperscript{154} What Seixas & Morton describe as “Context” (2013, p. 47).
which an equal proportion of the students either resisted or accepted the authority of the museum.

These findings are significant, because they indicate ways in which students’ historical thinking was becoming more source-based over the period of this inquiry. With repeat visits to the community history museum, combined with formal classroom instruction in material history domain-knowledge, students’ narratives became much more complex and artifact-specific. They were no longer sharing common narrative claims, but were re-constructing their own unique claims about the past. In turn, these narrative re-constructions represented hybrid responses that were unique to each student. They were based upon the physical context of where they encountered the artifacts, what other artifacts shared the same exhibit space, what understandings they gained from the volunteers, what they found in the artifact accession files, and what they found from consulting secondary sources. Overall, students enjoyed being actively engaged with the museum collections. Through the experience of adult collaboration in artifact analysis, they learned how to dig deeper into the artifact source, draw out evidence, make comparisons, place artifact sources within a broader historical context, and construct their own narrative claims.

5.2.3 Physical context of learning. The physical learning objectives associated with photovoice and historic space mapping were found to be particularly beneficial in enabling students to physically connect the dots between isolated images, exhibition themes, and historical time. These learning tools also helped in preparing for each museum visit, by providing a visual point of reference for formulating precise questions and identifying contradictions within the museum narratives.
Through historic space mapping, students became consciously aware that they were examining someone else’s conceptualisation of the past. As a result, their maps provided an important point of reference for self-reflection upon what they understood the museum exhibit to be about, and where they saw their artifact fitting into the constructed museum narrative. The maps also provided a visual point of reference for classroom dialogue with adult participants regarding what the adults understood the exhibits to be about. On a practical level, the maps were useful for classroom work, since they enabled students to revisit their museum experience, and return to their previous thoughts—thus picking up where they left off—from one day to the next.

Moreover, through the extended process of combining this learning tool with photovoice, students were able to re-live—and discuss—the museum experience with their peers in the classroom, by visually re-constructing museum narratives, re-visiting the museum collections, and closely re-examining the artifacts that they had encountered. It was apparent that this aspect of intrinsic learning (combined with repeat visits to the community history museum) enabled students to become more deliberate in their learning—to look beyond the exhibit narratives—and drive their own learning.

For example, arriving at the museum for the first visit (on January 18), students attentively followed the tour guide, listening to the curators’ words, and taking notes. Arriving at the museum for the second visit (on February 1), it was obvious that all of the students were now prepared to engage in dialogue with the exhibits and/or curators. They seemed to be focused, they seemed armed with a mission, and knew where they were going; they also seemed to be happy, and were enjoying the experience. This sense of “a mission” continued with each repeat visit, as students became increasingly more
accustomed to their informal learning environment, and seized upon each opportunity to
direct questions to the museum volunteers by “picking their brain.” By the fourth and
final museum visit (on February 22), museum roles were reversed. As a result, instead of
simply following the tour guide and taking notes from adult participants, students were
now fully in charge of the tour—with each of the students speaking about their artifact,
while adult participants simply listened. This extended role-reversal process was found to
be very effective, since—over time—students themselves adopted the social role of
museum experts.

Interview data collected at the end of this inquiry indicate that students particularly
enjoyed these aspects of active and dialogic learning. Their reasoning for this was
grounded in three elements of pedagogy: (a) wonder and discovery, (b) experiencing the
real thing, and (c) re-constructing the past. Students particularly enjoyed being able to
explore the museum at will, to venture beyond public exhibition spaces, and to discover
the attic storage area. This physical freedom seemed to provide them with a sense of
wonder and discovery that was driven by their own sense of curiosity. Others also
remarked that they liked being able to experience the “real thing,” and to actually handle
the artifacts in the museum. They noted that this was much better than simply relying
upon pictures or written text for historical information. Moreover, one group of students
explained how being able to witness the artifact in person—through actual observation—
made the learning experience unlike previous heritage fair projects, since they
approached their research differently, using a material history framework for analysis.
Some students also remarked how they enjoyed being able to take information in from
their peers, and interact with the museum volunteers. In this sense, they enjoyed being able to re-construct the past—either visually or orally—using their own words.

Overall, these findings are significant, because they demonstrate ways in which students were breaking down their passive social role as knowledge-receivers—by actively and physically engaging in discovery, observation, interaction, and re-construction. In so doing, they were also engaging in close reading of evidence—by discovering the source behind the narrative, closely examining that source by asking questions, inferring evidence, and corroborating with other artifact sources. All of these learning activities reflected specific aspects of thinking historically about evidence and sources (Husbands, 1996; Nokes, 2013; Seixas & Morton, 2013).

5.2.4 Temporal context of learning. The Material History Framework for Historical Thinking was found to be very effective in engaging participants in source-based inquiry. By adopting a scaffolding tool for material history domain-knowledge, students were introduced to the social role of being part of a community of inquiry. Correspondingly, as part of their formal classroom instruction, they were also empowered to question the authority of the museum, and to ask probing questions about the artifact evidence that supported each official museum narrative. In so doing, they encountered knowledge as something that was re-constructed from incomplete sources, which were open to re-interpretation—and hence actually experienced what Rüsen (2005) describes as a genetic historical consciousness “in which forms of life change” (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29; Table 3). Within a temporal context of learning, it was also evident that this experience

155 It is interesting to note that Nokes (2013) has also adopted a somewhat similar approach to historical literacy using artifact sources (pp. 15-20).
brought about significant transformations in students’ epistemological beliefs around authority and the nature of historical knowledge.

For example, upon commencing this inquiry, students’ epistemological beliefs were firmly grounded in the authority of museums. In this sense, slightly more than half of all student participants believed that museums were “most trustworthy” (a comparatively larger percentage than within national or provincial adult samplings). Their reasoning for this was based upon the belief that museums present “real things,” or “artifacts,” and safeguard “knowledge,” or “proof.” Overall, these explanations varied in sophistication, from a “just because” faith in the institution itself (25%), to recognizing the function of museums as part of a critical community of inquiry (13%). In addition, within the framework of Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness, half of the students demonstrated an exemplary relationship to reasoning—grounded in “regularities and principles,” while a quarter expressed a traditional relationship—grounded in “pregivenness.” Likewise, only 13% of the students demonstrated a genetic relationship to reasoning, suggesting pluralism or contextualisation of sources—grounded in “different standpoints within a comprising perspective of common development” (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29).

Moreover, with regard to beliefs in the nature of historical knowledge, students proposed a variety of different strategies for resolving disagreements about the past. These included consulting with museums (33%) or books (33%), doing research with various sources (17%), searching the Internet (17%), or visiting historic sites (13%). In this sense, a large majority of students (67%) demonstrated an exemplary orientation to knowledge, as “regularities” constructed by experts. Conversely, only a few students
(13%) expressed a traditional orientation to knowledge, as “pregiven” from social groups, while slightly more (17%) demonstrated a genetic orientation to knowledge, as drawn out of differing standpoints, perspectives, and sources of evidence.

Hence, upon commencing this inquiry, most of the student participants believed that when people disagree about what happened in the past, it was simply a matter of turning to museums or books—in order to consult with the experts, or secondary sources—to find out—the “regularities” of what actually happened. Such a strategy would leave very little space for coping with conflicting historical narratives. It also suggests that many of the students did not see themselves as part of the expert community of inquiry. Instead, history was something that someone more knowledgeable did for them.

By contrast, however, one month after 14 weeks of formal instruction in a Material History Framework for Historical Thinking, several changes were evident within these epistemological beliefs. With regard to trust in the authority of museums, while the majority of students (65% versus 67% previously) continued to believe museums to be "very trustworthy", slightly more students now believed fact-based history books (57% versus 38% previously) and their school history teacher (52% versus 42% previously) to also be “very trustworthy.” This suggests a complexity in students’ beliefs about sources, since they were no longer trusting in a singular secondary source.

In addition, students’ reasoning for why they continued to rank museums as most trustworthy, had changed somewhat significantly. This is because, while the belief that museums present “real things,” or “proof” about the past, continued to dominate their beliefs, fewer students now carried a blind faith in people, or institutions, while more
recognized the strength of a critical community of inquiry. Hence, within the framework of Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness, fewer students now demonstrated a traditional relationship to reasoning about the past (9% versus 25% previously), while the largest proportion continued to express an exemplary relationship (52% versus 50%), and slightly more now conveyed a genetic relationship (26% versus 13%). Such shifts in student epistemological belief, although slight, are nevertheless significant since they indicate that while this group of seventh-graders continued to place a high level of trust in the authority of their museum, such trust had become less grounded in the traditional authority of “pregivenness” (Rüsen, 2005, p.29).

Furthermore, with regard to beliefs in the nature of historical knowledge, student participants continued to suggest a variety of strategies for resolving disagreements about the past that were predominantly exemplary. What had changed, however, is that slightly more students now proposed doing research using multiple sources (22% versus 17% previously), and more students also suggested a strategy of comparing and corroborating information (30% versus 8% previously). Furthermore, none of the students now expressed a traditional orientation to knowledge—as something that is “pregiven” from social groups (versus 13% previously); while slightly more students now demonstrated a genetic orientation to knowledge—as something that is drawn out of differing standpoints, perspectives, and sources of evidence (22% versus 17% previously).

Upon completion of this inquiry, there is evidence to suggest that when faced with a disagreement about the past, more students would adopt a strategy of doing research, or comparing and corroborating information (52%)—as a way of consulting with primary sources—to try to re-construct—a perspective, or standpoint, on what happened. Such a
strategy, although not shared by a majority of students, suggests that an ability to cope with conflicting historical narratives was beginning to become evident within the student case study unit. Such a scenario also suggests that student strategies for coping with conflicting historical narratives had shifted towards perceiving themselves as agents within a critical community of inquiry. Thus, for students participating in this inquiry, history became no longer something that someone more knowledgeable did for them, but rather something they could do for themselves.

5.2.5 Summary. Clearly, the scaffolding tools adopted for this inquiry enabled students to deconstruct the narratives that they encountered within the community history museum. By focusing their attention upon evidence and sources, students learned to ask probing questions of the museums’ narrative claims, and to examine artifact sources more closely for the evidence that they contained. In addition, by adopting a Material History Framework for Historical Thinking, all of the students became competent in drawing evidence from the source through description and inference. A large majority of students (82%) also demonstrated an ability to compare and corroborate sources, by establishing lines of comparison between other artifact sources. Through historic space concept mapping, students were able to physically engage in connecting the dots between isolated images, exhibition themes, and historical time. They were also able to prepare for each museum visit by re-visiting their narrative understandings, formulating precise questions in advance, and identifying contradictions within the museum narratives. The end result was that students’ narrative claims became more focussed upon the artifact as a source of evidence to support their assertions. Students also adopted revealing/symbolic patterns of that reflected their own experience of material history analysis. At the same time,
however, their narrative claims remained implicitly shaped by the exhibits that they encountered within the museum.

With the experience of repeat museum visits, students became increasingly engaged in their research. They particularly enjoyed the physical freedom of discovery, observation, and interaction. All of these aspects of active and dialogic learning were grounded in three specific motivating factors: (a) wonder and discovery, (b) experiencing the real thing, and (c) re-constructing the past. In this sense, the museum collection inspired most students (61%) to explore historical topics a priori—purely out of visual interest and curiosity. At the same time, however, most students (62%) also experienced difficulties in contextualising their artifact sources. These limitations seemed to be linked to the quality of the museum’s artifact accession files, as well as students’ lack of background knowledge around the broader historical topic. Nevertheless, bringing the projects together at the end of the inquiry, as The Museum of British North America, seemed to enable students to place their individual projects within the context of a big idea in history.

Upon completion of the final museum project, it was evident that students were actively modelling historical thinking, by describing (96% student achievement rate), comparing (58% achievement rate), and—to a lesser extent—contextualising (38% achievement rate) their artifact sources. In addition, interview results also indicate that students’ thinking had become more source-based, and more students were demonstrating a genetic relationship with the past—linking the artifact with relevancy to the present. As active members of a community inquiry, they confidently demonstrated familiarity with the methods of historical inquiry that curators use in museums, and were aware of the
problematic nature of historical research. Their epistemological beliefs shifted towards recognizing a process of historical inquiry in which they too could be a part. Thus, for students participating in this inquiry, *history* became no longer something that someone more knowledgeable did for them, but rather something they could do for themselves.

Overall, there is strong evidence to suggest that changes did occur in most of the students’ ability to think historically about the narratives they encountered within the community history museum. Through active participation, all of the students became intellectually engaged with the community history museum. They also became familiar with the museum collections, were focussed upon their own research, and perceived their artifact as a valid source of evidence about the past. As a result, students were found to re-construct their own narratives around their chosen artifact source. These narratives, however, were based upon the physical context of (a) where they encountered the artifact (the exhibit context), (b) what other artifacts shared the same exhibit space, (c) what understandings they gained from interacting with the adult participants, (d) what they discovered in the artifact accession files, and (e) what secondary information they were able to locate. Through this source-based inquiry process, none of the students appropriated the official museum narrative in its entirety. Instead, their re-constructions represented hybrid interpretations based partly upon their own evidence and partly upon the museum narratives that they encountered.

### 5.3 Does Participation in History Museum Fieldwork Activities Deepen the Historical Consciousness of Middle School Students?

When considering historical consciousness as an aspect of everyday life, the experience of participating in the museum fieldwork seems to have had a positive effect
upon students’ relationship with the past. In general, slightly more students were inspired to actually think about the past, although commencing this inquiry student participants already demonstrated a high level of engagement as part of living their everyday lives.

5.3.1 Personal context of learning. Entering into this case study, few students reported a high level of interest in history—be that history in general (17%), Canadian history (21%), or family history (21%). These percentage figures were significantly lower than provincial and national adult samplings from *Canadians and Their Pasts*. Also unlike larger samplings, almost two-thirds of student participants indicated that they were only “somewhat” interested in history in general, and slightly less than half ascribed a similar level of interest in either Canadian or family history.

Over the previous 12 months, however, three-quarters of the students had engaged with the past by looking at old photographs, and two-thirds had also engaged in the past by watching history movies or using the Internet. Likewise, more than half had participated in family oriented activities related to documenting their family’s past, or had visited museums. In this regard, student percentage figures surpassed provincial and national adult samplings in their use of the Internet, as well as in visiting museums. In addition, most of the history activities students had engaged in had been outside-of-class time, although during classroom studies students reported mainly exploring the past via the Internet (63%) or by reading history books (54%).

Of all of the options provided, half of the students initially considered museums to be helpful a “great deal” in understanding the past, although only a quarter considered museums to be “very” helpful in connecting with the past. In addition, half of the students agreed with the statement that they think about history and the past mostly when
in museums or when watching a history documentary. Very few students (8%) agreed with the statement that they think about history and the past as part of their everyday life.

More than a month after participating in this community history museum fieldwork experience, although fewer students now reported that they were “very” interested in history in general or Canadian history, slightly more now indicated that they were "very" or "somewhat" interested in family history, and slightly more also reported that they were now "somewhat" interested in Canadian history. In addition, more students now agreed with the statement that they think about history and the past mostly when in museums, or when watching a history documentary. What was also significant to note is that nearly a quarter of the students now agreed with the statement that they think about history and the past as part of their everyday life (versus 8% previously).

5.3.2 Sociocultural context of learning. Initially, students entered into this inquiry with several well-formulated narrative beliefs about their nation’s past; many students, however, did not adopt a single template when constructing their responses to the question of what they wished to remember. Instead, they presented hybrid responses to the question, drawing upon two (or sometimes three) of the narratives that could be identified.

With regard to remembering Canada’s past, one-third of the student responses initially reflected traditional narratives, representing two distinct templates: “Our privileged nation,” and “Those who made sacrifices in war.” Alternatively, some students (17%) adopted an exemplary template of “Wars my country took part in,” and nearly a quarter chose to employ genetic narratives (24%) for remembering Canada’s past. These
represented two very closely related (yet slightly different) templates: “What was before what we have today,” and “When life was better than today.”

By comparison, the narrative templates that students adopted for remembering New Brunswick’s past were far less elaborate. One-third of the students indicated that they did not know what they wished to remember—or that they either simply wanted to learn more, or that they wanted to remember everything. Nevertheless, slightly more than one-quarter of the students chose to employ an exemplary narrative template of the “Founding of a province.” These responses reflected a desire to remember the provincial flag, as well as how New Brunswick came to be named, when it was first “discovered,” and the people who “worked hard to create this province.” Alternatively, a slightly lesser number of students (22%) adopted a genetic narrative template of “How people lived back then”— wishing to remember what New Brunswick was like, and what people did, in the “olden days.” With regard to the history of Atlantic Canada, more than half of the students responded with statements that they did not know what they wished to remember.

More than a month after participating in the museum fieldwork experience, however, more than half of the students had appropriated exemplary narratives (54% versus 24% previously) for remembering their nation’s past, and all but two of these narratives represented a similar template: “The wars my country took part in.” Within this narrative, the War of 1812 was clearly a dominant theme (10 out of 11 responses).\textsuperscript{156} In addition, fewer students had appropriated traditional narratives (12% versus 34%)

\textsuperscript{156} This was a featured exhibition within the museum at the time, and the Government of Canada was also actively promoting this theme through a wide variety of commemorative events, public programming, Internet resource development, and paid advertising across Canada (War of 1812, n.d.)
previously); at the same time, however, fewer students (17% versus 24% previously) also employed genetic narratives for remembering their nation’s past, and of these responses, all but one adopted a “How people lived back then” template.

Correspondingly, while the percentage of students who stated that they did not know what they wished to remember about New Brunswick’s past increased very slightly (36% versus 30% previously), slightly fewer students now demonstrated exemplary narratives (20% versus 28% previously) for remembering their province’s past. It is also significant to note that none of the students (versus 14% previously) now employed traditional narratives for remembering, while slightly more students now employed genetic narratives (36% versus 22% previously). These genetic narratives represented three distinct templates: “How people lived back then,” “Specific historic places or people,” and “Comparing New Brunswick with other places.” People was clearly a predominant theme within all of these provincial narratives.

These findings suggest that over the timeperiod of this inquiry slight changes occurred in some of the students’ narratives for remembering. Overall, student responses about their nation’s past shifted from predominantly traditional templates of privilege and war, to exemplary narratives about the War of 1812. Correspondingly, student responses about New Brunswick’s past shifted ever more slightly, with fewer students employing exemplary narratives about the founding of a province, and more students adopting genetic narratives about people. In both aspects of remembering, traditional narratives decreased (down 12% and 14% respectively).

Overall, these changes (although slight) suggest that—over time—students’ beliefs were shifting away from what Rüsen (2005, p. 29) describes as a traditional template,
reflecting “consent about a valid common life,” toward an exemplary template, “relating peculiar situations to regularities of what had happened” [in Canada’s past], as well as a genetic “acceptance of different standpoints within a comprising perspective of common development” [in New Brunswick’s past]. At the same time, however, the museum appears to have greatly influenced students’ beliefs about Canada’s past, since the War of 1812 theme clearly dominated their narratives after participating in the fieldwork experience.

5.3.3 Temporal context of learning. When asked to rank the importance of their family’s past against various other pasts (including Canada and New Brunswick), nearly three-quarters of the students ranked their family’s past as “most important” to them. In this regard, student participants were similar to adults in Canadians and Their Pasts (both across Canada and in New Brunswick)—although even more students placed such a high level of importance upon their family’s past. Students’ reasoning for this choice ranged from simple emotional connections, to knowing how particular individuals were interconnected, or establishing connections to broader aspects of history. Only two of the student participants ranked Canada’s past as “most important” to them, and none ranked New Brunswick’s past as “most important.”

Nevertheless, while none of the seventh-graders valued New Brunswick’s past as “most important,” more than half identified this past as “somewhat important,” followed (in lesser degrees) by Canada’s past, and the past of the country where they were born. It is also significant to note that two-thirds of the students indicated that they did not identify with Atlantic Canada’s past at all.
More than one month after participating in this inquiry, when again asked to rank the importance of various pasts, the largest proportion of students (although fewer in number) continued to rank their family’s past as “most important.” Students’ reasoning for this ranking had not changed a great deal; what had changed, however, is that a slightly larger proportion of students (65% versus 58% previously) now identified New Brunswick’s past, as well as Canada’s past (57% versus 42%), as “somewhat important.” Likewise, the proportion of students who identified the past of the country where they were born as “somewhat important” had also increased slightly to 48% (versus 38% previously).

In addition, when comparing overall student pre- and post-survey results, a slight pattern of increase became evident (across all categories of pasts) within the values of “very” and “somewhat” important. Similarly, a slight pattern of decrease became evident (across all categories except ethnic or culture group), within the values of “not very important” and “not at all important.” Furthermore, slightly fewer students reported in the post-survey that they did not identify with Atlantic Canada as a region (48% versus 63% previously).

These post-survey findings are significant, because they suggest—over time—how students were placing an increased importance upon a wider variety of pasts. Even though the patterns of increase were slight, changes were nevertheless evident. Hence, after participating in this inquiry, while their family’s past remained “most important” to more than half of student participants, the same percentage now considered their provincial past to be “somewhat important,” followed closely by their national past.
5.3.4 Summary. On a personal level, participation in this inquiry seemed to benefit students, by inspiring more of them to think about the past—when in museums, when watching history documentaries, or as part of their everyday lives. A slight increase was also found in students’ interest in family history. Likewise, the experience also appears to have influenced the sociocultural narratives students constructed for remembering Canada’s and New Brunswick’s past, since by the end of the inquiry substantially more students demonstrated exemplary narratives for remembering their nation, while slightly more adopted genetic narratives for remembering New Brunswick’s past. In both instances, traditional narratives for remembering decreased by 12 % and 14% respectively. Likewise, with regard to patterns of interest in the past, overall increases became evident, in that, two-thirds of student participants now considered their provincial past to be somewhat important—followed closely by their national past.

5.4 Does Student Collaboration with Older Members of a Volunteer Heritage Community Deepen the Historical Consciousness of the Older Members Themselves?

With regard to adult participation in this inquiry, their historical consciousness seemed to be affected in a variety of ways. Most notably, as the adults became active participants in the experience of student collaboration, they began to include students into their community of inquiry.

5.4.1 Personal context of learning. Entering into this case study, all five of the adult participants reported a very high level of interest in history—be that history in general, Canadian history, or family history. In this sense, the adults were very unlike their student counterparts; they were also very unlike other adults across Canada, who
reported a significantly lower level of interest in history in general, as well as Canadian history.

Adult participants in this inquiry also reported high levels of participation in activities relating to the past, and these too were somewhat dissimilar to provincial and national adult samplings from *Canadians and Their Pasts*. Over the previous 12 months, all of the adult participants had engaged in looking at old photographs; watching history movies; reading history books; visiting museums, archives, and historic sites; and participating in other activities that included history research and exhibit preparation. With exception of family oriented activities (such as passing on family heirlooms and documenting their own family’s history), adult participants surpassed provincial and national standards in all categories of engagement. Furthermore, all but one of the adults agreed with the statement that they think about history and the past as part of their everyday life.

More than a month after participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience, very little had changed for adult participants. All of the adults continued to report that they were “very interested” in history in general, as well as their family’s history. In addition, all of the adults agreed that they think about history and the past as part of their everyday lives. These findings suggest that participating in the inquiry had very little effect upon adults’ interest in history. They entered into this research with a keen interest the past and exited equally so.

Over the course of their participation in the community history museum fieldwork experience, however, inter-personal changes did become apparent with regard to social roles within the museum community. Initially, adult participants demonstrated a great
deal of insecurity with regard to working with the students. Having not yet met their student counterparts, the adults were filled with questions about the curriculum, as well as the textbook. Adult participants also seemed to draw heavily upon their own personal experiences to validate their anticipated role in the inquiry. In addition, they did not question the authority of the textbook, and those who were critical, simply wished to see more advanced content to guide students’ learning. Hence, upon commencing this inquiry, although adult participants found the textbook to be lacking, they perceived their role as supporting the existing curriculum—not challenging it in any way.

Throughout the museum fieldwork experience, adult participants also seemed to seek personal rewards from being able to make connections with the students. This was a task that several found to be very challenging, since not knowing students’ interests, as well as simply not knowing (or remembering) student names, made it difficult for the adults to connect with individual students. Time was also a key barrier, which limited their ability to forge the personal connections that they wished to attain. This time barrier became particularly apparent during our first meeting, when adult participants expressed concern over limiting each museum visit to 45 minutes. Three of the adults expressed a great deal of anxiety about fitting all that they wished to say into the allotted time slot; two of the adults, however, described such a scenario as typical, since (speaking from personal experience) they often assumed a gatekeeper role as museum tour guides. This meant adjusting on the fly to the immediate needs of a supervising teacher, with no prior knowledge of the students, or their interests, and thus simply leading large groups through the museum in a timely fashion. It was evident that adult participants in this inquiry wanted to be able to share their knowledge with the students—but never seemed
to have enough time. Nevertheless, with repeat visits to the museum—as well as the classroom—making personal connections became easier, as social roles gradually became reversed.

For example, returning to the museum for the second time (on February 1), students arrived prepared, with specific (probing) questions to ask of the museum collections. As a result, the opportunities that arose through student-directed questioning made the second museum fieldwork experience much more rewarding for adult participants. Students’ questioning provided adults with a tool for engaging in relevant conversation about the artifacts, as well as the exhibits. It was also evident that making personal connections was easier for returning participants (both adults and students), since those who had not been there previously seemed distanced and disoriented.

Ultimately, during their fourth and final visit to the museum on February 22, adult participants described a much more relaxed atmosphere. They seemed to be reaping personal rewards from witnessing a reversal of social roles within the museum. Time was no longer a concern, and the museum volunteers now expressed a great sense of personal connection to the students. This sense of inter-personal connection was something that all of the adult participants seemed to crave over the course of their museum fieldwork experience—and it permeated all aspects of the inquiry.

5.4.2 Sociocultural context of learning. Like their student counterparts, adult participants entered into this inquiry with several well-formulated narrative beliefs about what they wished to remember about their nation’s past. All of the adults chose to employ exemplary narratives for remembering, which represented four distinct templates: “The path to self-governance,” “Westward expansion,” “How people have made a difference,”
and “Military history has shaped the nation.” Clearly, however (like the students) adults in this inquiry did not adopt a single schema when formulating their responses. As a result, seemingly similar exemplary narratives soon became dissimilar, as each of the adults incorporated traditional, critical, or genetic twists into their beliefs about Canada’s past. Students’ hybrid responses, however, did not share these same exemplary threads.

The narratives adults adopted for remembering New Brunswick’s past were much more critical than those relating to their nation. All of the adults chose critical narratives for remembering, and these represented beliefs that “New Brunswick played an important role in Canadian history,” “Family ties” were important, or that “What has been forgotten” needs to be remembered.

With regard to remembering the history of Atlantic Canada, three of the adults adopted genetic narratives, representing the templates of “Similarities/differences between provinces/regions,” or “How people lived back then.” Alternatively, one participant presented a critical narrative of “A richer history than often given credit,” and another opted to not differentiate between regional, provincial, or national narratives at all.

More than a month after participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience, very little had changed. Among the three adults who provided post-responses, two maintained the same narrative templates for remembering their national and provincial pasts as before, while one transitioned into a variance that also reflected the same schema as previously. Hence, participation in this inquiry seems to have had no significant effect upon adults’ narrative beliefs about the history of Canada or New Brunswick that they wished to remember.
Significant changes did occur, however, within generational relationships. Entering into this inquiry, adults’ sense of generational distance appeared to be very immense, and membership in the museum’s community of inquiry did not include the students in any way. Nevertheless, through the photovoice experience of student collaboration, the adult participants began to include students in their community of inquiry, by recognising the social goods of historical inquiry within students’ work, and empathising with the students as historical researchers.

Initially, adults accepted their social role of museum curators as a group-identity that they welcomed with sincerity. At this point in time, their pedagogical views about youth reflected two polar opposites, in that while most of the adults shared a belief that youth were foreign and unknowing of the past, one adult demonstrated an opposing belief that today’s youth were very aware of Canada’s military past. After the first student visit to the museum, some of the adults expressed concern over what students were actually learning from the experience, since the adults seemed to be preoccupied with having students listen to what they had to say. Thus, in this context, the initial “social goods”—or expectations—of appropriate historical engagement were being measured by how attentive students were to adults’ words. Over time however, this changed, as the pedagogical views of adult participants transformed from information-transmission to collaborative inquiry.

Over time, adult norms for appropriate historical engagement began to alter somewhat, as social roles became increasingly more reversed, and learning became more student-driven. With repeat visits to the museum, students became more familiar with the exhibit spaces, and adopted scaffolding tools designed to focus their attention upon
asking probing questions, examining the artifact source, and re-interpreting evidence in their own words. This shift in social roles became increasingly more rewarding for adult participants, as they became more familiar with the students and were able to anticipate student learning needs—by focusing their attention upon a common set of scaffolding tools. In turn, adult participants were no longer measuring appropriate historical engagement by how well students listened. Instead, they were evaluating students’ ability to ask challenging questions, respond to the artifact source, and use of the artifact accession files—as well as students’ own observations, and information provided by the volunteers—to inquire into the museum collections.

By February 22, it was evident that adult participants were reaping personal rewards from witnessing this reversal of roles within the museum. It seemed exciting for them to re-encounter the past through students’ eyes. As a result, adults’ sense of generational distance now seemed less vast, and all of the participants now seemed to share a common bond that was fuelled by the museum collections.

With regard to students’ final museum projects, adult participants reacted very positively—and with surprise—to the student work. All of the adults expressed fascination about what understandings students had appropriated from the museum fieldwork experience, since the re-interpretations were not what they had expected. In this sense, some of the adults now measured good museum projects on the basis of literacy skills, as well as students’ ability to create visually pleasing displays. Nevertheless, there also emerged more specific themes around evaluating student work. These involved recognising historical inquiry—as reflected in students’ ability to (a) assemble information, (b) link artifacts, and (c) respond to the research question. In this
context, adult participants now clearly empathised with the students as historians. They also seemed to be open to new interpretations of the past—provided that the interpretations were based upon accurate information and not mere mental leaps.

By May 1, when adult participants reflected back on their experience, it was also evident that social roles had changed significantly, since adults’ sense of generational distance in thinking about the past appeared to have substantially diminished. Adults were re-thinking their role as experts, and were considering ways of including students in their community of inquiry. They were also perceiving the students as junior researchers—capable of encountering the past “in their own reality.” Although adult participants continued to express fascination in how little their student counterparts seemed to know about history (i.e., the information adults wished to convey), it was nevertheless exciting for them to re-encounter the past through students’ eyes. In this sense, while adult participants continued to perceive students as foreign and unknowing of the past, they now acknowledged that students were very capable of knowing how to “build” history “from the ground up.” Adult participants were also demonstrating a sense of respect for student knowledge, and were suggesting to ask students for their “feedback” in an “after-action meeting,” in order to enter into a “dialogue” about “mind traps” that all historians experience. In this sense it was evident that adults were beginning to include students in their community of inquiry, since the we-versus-them relationship had changed dramatically during the museum fieldwork experience.

5.4.3 Temporal context of learning. Upon commencing this inquiry, when asked to rank the importance of their family’s past against various other pasts (including that of Canada and New Brunswick), three out of five of the adults ranked their family’s past as
“most important.” In this regard, adult participants were very similar to their student counterparts (as well as other adult samplings from *Canadians and Their Pasts*, both across Canada and within New Brunswick). Like their student counterparts, adults’ reasoning for ranking their family’s past as most important ranged from simple value clauses, to knowing how individuals are interconnected, or establishing connections to broader aspects of regional history.

With regard to trustworthiness of sources of information about the past, adult participants were equally divided in ranking both fact-based history books and museums as "most trustworthy." Their reasoning for this trust was based upon a belief that both sources of information were based upon primary sources. Within the framework of Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness, two of the adults demonstrated an exemplary relationship to the past, while the other three expressed a genetic relationship.

With regard to resolving disagreements about the past, all of the adult participants commenced this inquiry with very similar strategies for resolution. When people disagree about the past, they explained, it was simply a matter of turning to the sources, and researching various perspectives. Thus, within the framework of Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness, all of the adult participants demonstrated a genetic orientation to knowledge—as drawn out of differing standpoints, perspectives, and a variety of primary sources. Clearly, for these museum volunteers, *history* was something that they did for themselves. In this sense, the adults positioned themselves as part of a critical community of inquiry.

More than one month after participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience, very little had changed. When again asked to evaluate the
importance of various pasts, adult respondents continued to ascribe a similar ranking of "most important" to their family, followed by “very important” to New Brunswick’s as well as Atlantic Canada’s past, and “somewhat important” to Canada’s past.

Moreover, with regard to trust in sources of information about the past, adult participants continued to be equally divided in ranking fact-based history books and museums as "most trustworthy." Both sources of information about the past, adults continued to explain, were trustworthy because they were based upon primary sources, and involved research. In this sense, within the framework of Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness, adult participants continued to express either an exemplary or genetic reasoning about the past—and the same individuals continued to demonstrate these beliefs.

Similarly, with regard to adult beliefs in the nature of historical knowledge, adult participants continued to adopt similar strategies for resolution as previously. All suggested doing research by returning to the original sources, and all made reference to knowledge as something that is established through corroboration of multiple sources. Hence, within Rüsen’s (2005) typology of historical consciousness, all of the adult participants continued to demonstrate a genetic orientation to knowledge—drawn out of differing standpoints, perspectives, and a variety of primary sources.

Clearly then, more than a month after participating in the community history museum fieldwork experience, adult case study participants continued to trust in primary sources, and historical research. For these adults, when people disagreed about the past, it was simply a matter of doing research, or comparing and corroborating information—as a way of consulting with primary sources—to try to construct, or re-construct—either the
regularities of what actually happened, or a standpoint on what happened. For these adults, *history continued* to be something that they did for themselves.

**5.4.4 Summary.** Participating in the museum fieldwork experience seems to have had very little effect upon adult participants’ interest in history. As might be expected of community history museum volunteers, the adults in this case study reported a significantly higher level of interest in history in general, as well as Canadian history (compared to provincial and national adult samplings from *Canadians and Their Past*). They also reported higher levels of participation in most all activities relating to the past, with exception of family oriented activities and playing computer games.

Unlike their student counterparts, adult participants entered into this inquiry with very well formulated narrative beliefs about what they wished to remember about their national, provincial, and regional pasts. In addition, across all three questions of remembering (Canada, New Brunswick and Atlantic Canada), there emerged a pattern of dominant templates, representing exemplary, critical, and genetic schema respectively. Participation in the community history museum fieldwork experience seemed to have no significant effect upon these narrative beliefs. It also seemed to have no apparent effect upon the values adult participants placed upon their various pasts, or upon their epistemological beliefs regarding the authority of sources and the constructed nature of historical knowledge.

Nevertheless, participation in the community history museum fieldwork experience did seem to bring about meaningful changes in social relationships between adult and student participants. Initially, adults’ sense of generational distance from the students appeared to be very immense, and membership in the museum’s community of inquiry
did not include the students in any way. With repeat visits to the museum and classroom, adults and students alike seemed to benefit from the tools for engagement that accompanied this inquiry. The Material History Framework for Historical Thinking also seemed to provide adult participants with common ground for making personal connections with students.

Through the experience of student collaboration, social relationships began to change over time, as social roles became reversed, and museum volunteers began to include students in their community of inquiry. This change was particularly apparent at the end of the inquiry, when adult participants openly recognised the social goods of historical thinking within students’ work, and empathised with the students as historical researchers. This transition is significant, because it points to subtle ways in which adult participants were shifting their pedagogical views regarding students’ abilities to think historically about the past.

5.5 Implications for Community-based Learning in History Education.

In responding to the central research question that has guided this inquiry, it is necessary to address two distinct groups of practitioners: (a) classroom teachers, and (b) community history museum educators. This distinction is necessary, because community-based learning involves close collaboration between these two groups of professionals. As such, the findings from this inquiry have direct implications upon how a history education program could be more effectively delivered to seventh-grade students. In addition to this delivery distinction, responding to the research question also requires approaching historical consciousness as a complex phenomenon involving three discrete dimensions: (a) history in everyday life, (b) history as a way of looking at the past, and (c) history as shared narratives. In this sense, recognising (and assessing) learning in
community history museums involves much more than simply “knowing the facts.” As such, the findings from this inquiry have direct implications upon how history education practitioners assess _learning_ within a heritage community.

**Implications for classroom teachers.** Findings from this inquiry suggest that seventh-grade students are not oblivious of the past. Students participating in this inquiry reported that they engaged in history as part of living their everyday lives—primarily through looking at old photographs, watching history movies or documentaries, and surfing the Internet. They also participated in family activities, and visited museums, as well as historic sites. This finding would suggest that if formal history education is intended to be relevant to students in their everyday lives, then students need to be given ample opportunities to integrate these aspects of everyday history into their classroom experience.

Among these ways of engaging in history, however, most students considered museums and historic sites to be most helpful in understanding the past. This points to the high potential that museums (and historic sites) hold in enabling students to learn about the past. Nevertheless, as this case study suggests, while museums can provide powerful environments for understanding narratives about the past, scaffolding tools are required to enable students to carefully examine the constructed narratives they encountered—by asking questions, comparing evidence, drawing meaning, and making connections to broader aspects of history. In order to do this, students must arrive at the museum with a clear mission and purpose that relates to a specific topic in history. Students also require ample amounts of free choice in the museum, and need to be able to undertake repeat visits. In this inquiry, sequential visits enabled students to become active participants in
the museum’s community of inquiry. This was achieved by adopting a material history domain-knowledge approach to historical thinking. Hence, with each visit, students were provided with opportunities to become familiar with the artifact collection, maintain a student-driven research focus, and work with artifacts as primary sources of evidence. When provided with the freedom to make their own artifact research choices, many students preferred exploring the collection storage area—over actual exhibit spaces. In addition, their research decisions were based primarily upon visual interest and curiosity. For these reasons, museums hold great potential for inspiring students to explore historical topics that are outside of their sociocultural zone of familiarity.

In considering historical consciousness as a way of thinking about the past, classroom teachers need to be cognisant of the signs: when challenged by conflicting historical information or disagreements about the past, genetically minded students will undertake their own research. This will involve close examination of the primary source evidence supporting each claim, as well as corroboration and comparison of this evidence against other sources (both primary and secondary), and contextualisation of the evidence source—all to determine validity. With this evidence, genetically minded students will attempt to draw meaning by re-constructing their own perspective or standpoint. By comparison, an exemplary minded student, in the same situation, will simply turn to a secondary source to find the answer, and construct a response based upon the “expert” advice of others. As this research suggests, scaffolding tools, as well as formal instruction and assessment rubrics for history education, need to be designed to nurture the former—rather than latter—approach to historical inquiry.
Students participating in this inquiry experienced difficulties in contextualising their artifact source. They also experienced difficulties in developing, and responding to, a research question—as well as constructing a statement of significance. These problems seemed to be associated with their lack of background knowledge around the broader historical topic, as well as their lack of familiarity in formulating critical (probing) questions about the past. Initially, many of the students also found the inquiry-based process to be very challenging, since they were more accustomed to simply finding answers, rather than re-constructing their own answers. This points to the need for a concerted effort of adopting inquiry-based learning (and the use of historical thinking concepts) across all grade-levels, so that—over time—students can develop the habits of mind associated with probing for evidence to re-construct knowledge (rather than simply finding knowledge as a “fait-accompli”).

With regard to this particular case study, it would also have been particularly beneficial if students had gained more background knowledge prior to the museum fieldwork experienced, as well as more specific instruction in methods for establishing historical significance. In addition, greater attention also needs to be directed towards learning about big ideas in history, which involves linking micro inquiries with macro historical topics. Museum collections can be particularly useful for this purpose, since students can become actively engaged in developing their own museum labels, and constructing their own museum exhibits—thus re-constructing (from evidence) their own statements of historical significance. As was evident from this case study, however, it was only at the end of the inquiry, when students witnessed their research projects
assembled together as a museum, that they began to perceive how their micro inquiries were linked together as a big idea in history.

In terms of historical consciousness as shared narratives, this inquiry suggests that community-based learning can be beneficial, because it enables students to make personal connections to shared community narratives. At the same time, however, great care and attention needs to be addressed toward such narratives, since they are embedded within the museum both explicitly and implicitly (as exhibition text, artifactual evidence, and physical arrangement of exhibit space). In the case of this particular inquiry, while students’ projects reflected their own personal choices about what messages they wished to convey (and how they wished to convey them), their research choices were nevertheless limited by the parameters of the museum. Since all museum exhibitions are designed to convey a specific message, this message may be biased or exclusive of alternative perspectives. For this reason, students need to be provided with access to alternative/additional sources of information about their research topic, so that they can look beyond the authority of the museum to include diverse perspectives.

Overall, students participating in this inquiry found the museum experience to be particularly motivating for specific reasons. Many enjoyed the sense of wonder and discovery; others were excited by having access to real things. Thus, providing students with ample opportunities for self-directed exploration, as well as access to actual artifacts, needs to be a central component of the community history museum experience. Likewise, being able to purchase mementos, as well as to capture images (and to conduct follow-up research with these images), are important aspects of the students’ fieldwork experience.
**Implications for museum educators.** What is strikingly evident from this inquiry is that the volunteers who participated were very unlike other adult Canadians. They reported much higher levels of interest in history, and engaged with the past in a wide variety of ways. These findings point to the uniqueness of working with community history museum volunteers. It also points to the potential that museum volunteers hold in modelling a genetic historical consciousness. As individuals, community history museum volunteers have a great deal to offer formal history education—although scaffolding tools are required to enable their participation in a way that opens up the community to include the unique perspectives that middle school students can bring to their community.

For adults in this inquiry, two key barriers initially limited their ability to engage with student visitors: (a) being able to make personal connections, and (b) not having enough time. One simple way to break down this first barrier is by having all participants (students as well as volunteers) wear nametags. This way, all participants can address each other by name. In addition, repeat visits to the community site will enable more in-depth engagement over time, so that the hurried sense of trying to convey large amounts of information within a brief timespan can be eliminated. For example, in this particular inquiry, repeat visits enabled students to become active members of the museum’s community, and over time, more students demonstrated a perception that history was something they could do for themselves. Similarly—over time—students’ social roles transformed from passive listeners to active historians, while the role of adult participants transformed from information-transmitters to collaborative agents.

While the museum collections clearly inspired students to think about the narratives they encountered within the museum, students were also limited by the evidence and
sources that were made available to them. Because of these limitations, students’ re-
constructed narratives remained implicitly shaped by the exhibits (and collections) that
they encountered. For this reason, great care and attention needs to be directed towards
enabling students to access alternative/additional sources of information about the past,
so that they can look beyond the authority of the museum, to include a diverse variety of
alternative perspectives. This limitation also points to the vital importance of maintaining
detailed, historically accurate, and well documented artifact accession files, since the
practise of curatorship—and critical inquiry—rests upon the existence of such essential
primary source information. Without adequate documentation, students in this inquiry
resorted to making mental leaps or pursuing research dead-ends.

During the museum exhibit design phase, more attention also needs to be directed
towards enabling historical inquiry, by integrating pathways to historical thinking
concepts into the actual exhibit design (see Gosselin, 2011). In this sense, students need
to be able to closely examine the artifact as a source of evidence. They also need to be
able to formulate their own sophisticated sense of historical significance, and to link this
significance to a big idea within the social studies curriculum. In particular, students
participating in this inquiry experienced difficulties in contextualising their artifact, even
when it was part of an exhibit. This problem seemed to be associated with their lack of
background knowledge around the broader historical topic, as well as the museum’s lack
of explicit connections to historical topics outlined in the social studies curriculum. By
explicitly designing the museum exhibitions to link to a big idea within the social studies
curriculum (and also to support historical thinking), perhaps students would be more able
to bridge this difficulty.
As was also evident during this inquiry, students needed to be provided with ample freedom to make their own choices within the museum. When making research decisions, the majority of students were motivated by curiosity and wonder. In this sense, their choices were based upon visual interest. They also based their sense of significance upon two factors: (a) whether the artifact revealed evidence about the past, or (b) whether it symbolised aspects of the past. Hence, these learning motivators could serve as effective points for opening up group discussions around artifacts found within a community history museum. In this context, students require ample opportunities for small-group/one-on-one discussion in the museum—with their peers, as well as with museum volunteers. It is also critical that these discussions be student driven—rather than adult driven.

Ultimately, students in this inquiry particularly enjoyed role reversal activities in which they became the “experts”, and adults simply listened. Through student-driven inquiry, students were found to adopt more complex narratives for remembering their national and provincial pasts, thus shifting away from traditional templates, towards exemplary, and genetic narratives for remembering. These findings suggest that a heritage community has much to offer the field of history education, by providing students with ample freedom to carefully examine and ask critical questions about the historical narratives they encounter. To achieve this, however, students require time for wonder and discovery in the museum, as well as access to real artifacts, and other primary sources. They also require ample time after the museum experience to conduct follow-up research using museum Internet resources that are devoted to critical inquiry (historical thinking). To achieve this, museum educators must devote great care and
attention toward ensuring that such Internet materials do not simply reinforce the museum’s authority by presenting a one-dimensional collective memory narrative.

5.5.1 Re-defining a genetic historical consciousness. Upon commencing this inquiry, the term “deepening” of a students’ historical consciousness was broadly drawn from Rüsen’s (2005) genetic description as:

[not] simply be[ing] a case of filling a student’s head with facts, and expecting them to know history. It is more a case of empowering students with the intellectual ability to reach their own understandings about the past, to reflect upon how this relates to the present, and to consider how such understandings are relevant to the future. (re. this dissertation, p. 4)

This suggests a formulation of historical interpretation, in which “forms of life change in order to maintain their permanence” (Table 3, p. 111). In addition, as Billmann-Mahecha and Hausen (2005) have explained, Rüsen’s typology of historical consciousness does not represent a progressive (four-step) learning model, but rather isolates specific competencies of historical interpretation as social-cognitive processes that are phenomenological in nature:

The development of historical consciousness is certainly to be understood as a life span process, which is dependent on the development of social-cognitive basis competencies, takes place in a social environment, is dependent on access to and exploitation of educational opportunities and which also includes emotional and motivational factors. This list of essential components does not, of course, represent a developmental model. It must be taken into account that the “development process is not a simple process of the accumulation of abilities, but rather it must be
understood as the process of acquiring the competency of historical interpretation.”

[as cited in Rüsen, 1994, p. 23] (pp. 164-165)

Having had the experience of exploring the phenomenon of historical consciousness through empirical research, my opening definition of a “deep” (or complex) historical consciousness can now be refined to include the following social-cognitive factors:

(a) In *everyday life*, a genetic historical consciousness reflects a high level of engagement in a wide variety of communication mediums: old photographs, movies and documentaries, history web sites, computer history games, history books, museums and historic sites, archives, family places, family documentation activities, and heritage hobbies.

In this sense, a heritage community can assist middle school students by making more of these heritage resources easily and readily available to students in meaningful ways—for use both inside and outside of the classroom. More specifically, in making narrative claims, these heritage resources must be well researched, referenced, and draw upon a wide variety of primary sources. The end user must be able to access and examine the primary sources, in order to witness and critically evaluate the narrative claims. The end user also needs to be able to establish personal connections to the resource, by becoming actively involved in their own learning process.

(b) *As shared narratives*, a genetic historical consciousness reflects the use of complex templates for remembering, which incorporate a wide variety of standpoints, or perspectives, from multiple individuals or groups of people.

In this sense a heritage community can assist middle school students by developing heritage resources and learning opportunities that respect a plurality of points of view,
diversity, and conflicting perspectives. For students participating in this inquiry, making connections to people who lived in the past also became a common theme within the genetic narratives that they constructed.

(c) As a way of thinking about the past, a genetic historical consciousness recognises the complexity of a critical community of inquiry, in which knowledge or understanding is re-constructed from a variety of differing standpoints and perspectives, using multiple primary and secondary sources that are often incomplete—in order to infer, corroborate, and contextualise evidence drawn from these sources.

In this sense a heritage community can assist middle school students by opening up their community to include students as active participants (rather than passive learners) in the process of historical inquiry. This involves reversing the lines of communication, to embrace student-driven historical inquiry that is based upon historical thinking (rather than information-transmission)—using artifacts (and other types of primary documentation) as sources of evidence. Students must be given the freedom to challenge and question the narratives presented as truth by the heritage community, and to voice these new understandings as re-interpretations in tangible ways. As such, students must be recognised and respected by the heritage community for their intellectual ability to reach their own understandings about the past, to contribute to discussions on how these findings relate to the present, and to carry a widely applicable methodology for historical thinking into the future. It is hoped that by educating both students and adults in these aspects of historical consciousness, all will be better equipped to deconstruct—and think more critically about—the heritage resources they encounter in living their everyday lives.
5.6 Implications for Educational Research.

Findings from this inquiry also have implications for research in history education. In chapter 2 of this dissertation, I reviewed existing empirical literature regarding middle school students’ thinking about historical narratives, evidence, and sources. I discussed this within the context of linking historical thinking to historical consciousness, by exploring the potential for interplay between formal and informal learning. In the sub-sections that follow, I will expand upon this discussion, by exploring how my findings contribute to the current body of research, within four specific strands of interest: trust in authority (5.6.1), knowledge beliefs (5.6.2), engaging in a critical community of inquiry (5.6.3), and historical thinking in museums (5.6.4).

5.6.1 Authority and historical narratives. As discussed in section 2.4.1, researchers have identified several factors that influence students’ uncritical acceptance of historical narratives. In particular, Levstik (2008b) has found that a learning context can have great impact upon students’ responses in history education (p. 24). When presented with an authoritative single narrative in which the author (and sources) remain anonymous (e.g. school textbook or museum exhibit) Levstik (2008b) has posited that students approach such official narratives as the final authority. Likewise, the impact of familiar narratives (to which students may easily relate) can also be problematic, since such familiarity may mislead students to fixate on their initial response, and not examine alternative perspectives (p. 26). Levstik found, however, that by changing the learning context through a reversal of social power, thus situating students as active members of a community of learners, they became more interested in history, and engaged in deeper exploration of their topic (p. 27). While these findings appear to be beneficial, they also raise certain limitations, since Levstik has also found that, as active learners, only a few
students in her inquiry became “spontaneously critical” of the interpretations they encountered, and most continued to accept such narratives as “unimpeachable” (p. 27).

To this end, Wineburg (2001) has argued that by demonstrating history to be complex and contradictory, students may become more critical of the narratives they encounter. Thus, by adopting a disciplinary approach to historical inquiry (Wineburg, 2007)—using primary and secondary sources—students and educators alike may be moved beyond the familiarity of what they think they know (and the historical narrative they wish to accept), to recognise the impeachable nature of such narratives. Without such a disciplinary approach to history education, Wineburg (2001, 2007) and others (Husbands, 1996; Létourneau, 2014; Levesque, 2008; Nokes, 2013; Seixas, 1993a, 1993b, 1994; Shemilt, 1983, 1987) have all argued that students will continue to appropriate simplified historical narratives—both inside and outside of the classroom—without question.

In drawing comparisons to the findings from this inquiry, the adoption of a material history disciplinary framework seemed to enable participants to formulate more complex narratives about the past. As a result, their re-constructed narrative claims became individually unique hybrid responses, rather than direct appropriations. Likewise, over time, students extended their purview beyond the authority of the museum, by focussing their attention upon a specific artifact source, drawing evidence from the source, asking questions, corroborating the source, and making inferences—to various degrees. As a result, their narratives were no longer simple then-versus-now first impressions, but were focussed upon the artifact, as a source of evidence to support their narrative claims. In
this sense, findings from this inquiry seem to support Wineburg’s (2001, 2007) argument.157

At the same time, however, the narratives students re-constructed remained implicitly shaped by the museum’s authority, since their claims (although individually unique) were shaped by several contextual factors: (a) the physical location of where they had encountered the artifact within the museum, (b) what other artifacts shared the same exhibit space, (c) what understandings they gained from the museum volunteers, (d) what information students found in the artifact accession files, and (e) what students found from consulting with secondary sources. These findings challenge researchers to consider the implicit nature of primary and secondary sources, which may inevitably lead students to trust in the authority of an assemblage of evidence that ultimately represent a specific constructed narrative. For example, in the case of this particular community history museum, students encountered very few instances of explicitly contradictory, or alternative evidence. Such a scenario falls short of the historical thinking environment that Wineburg (2007) has described. It also points to an avenue for further research, as to how museum exhibits might be better designed—as Gosselin (2011) has proposed—to facilitate more critical analysis of the narrative authority.

Nevertheless, in establishing parallels with Levstik’s (2008b) study of a sixth-grade learning environment, adult participants in this inquiry initially adopted an authoritarian role that reflected an information transmission model for learning. In this sense, students

157 These findings also support the hypothesis of Canadians and Their Pasts that “[c]itizens exposed to these practices [of questioning primary sources such as archival documents, first-hand testimony, and artifacts] are more likely to understand the necessity of consulting multiple sources, the value of interrogating the traces of the past, and what to do when confronted with conflicting accounts” (Conrad et al., 2014, p. 66).
were initially expected to accept a passive role as *listeners*. Over time, however, as student participants became increasingly more familiar with the museum learning environment, adults became more at ease with surrendering their position of authority. Concurrently, as students became more familiar with curatorial methods of historical inquiry, adults began to transition towards a collaborative inquiry model. Within this transition process—much like Levstik (2008b) has described—students became their own agents for learning. In turn, students’ trust in museums became less grounded in a traditional authority, and more grounded in a genetic authority of common development. Likewise, adult participants came to include students in their community of inquiry, and the *we-versus-them* generational distance had changed dramatically. This social phenomenon warrants further empirical research, since it points to larger sociocultural benefits derived from community-based learning in museums—what Silverman (2010) has referred to as the “social work of museums” (pp. 113-137).

### 5.6.2 Knowledge and historical narratives

As discussed in section 2.4.2, students often experience difficulties in reaching a sophisticated way of thinking about the past. Yet, as Ashby (2011) has postulated, visual objects and artifacts hold the potential to support sophisticated thinking about the past (more so than written documents), since the visual element of such sources of evidence can initially prompt students to ask “what is it” as opposed to “what does it say” (p. 140). In this sense, Ashby speculates that students can be motivated to look beyond the face-value of the written source—to more closely examine the historical context of the source. In her own study involving students within grades 2, 5, 6 and 8, Ashby (2004) found that the largest proportion (nearly 40%) of
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158 Years 3, 6, 7 and 9 of schooling in England.
sixth-grade participants (n=75) turned to the authority of books and/or experts to validate a historical narrative. Likewise, only 10% attempted to re-construct the context of the historical narrative by actually questioning and validating evidence within the narrative itself (p. 5). This points to a distinction in epistemological beliefs: between knowledge that is found, and knowledge that is re-constructed.

By comparison, the findings from this case study indicate that initially only a combined quarter of the students proposed a strategy of doing research (17%) or comparing and corroborating information (8%)—as a way of validating disagreements about the past. Upon completion of this inquiry, however, more than a combined half of the students now proposed doing research (22%\textsuperscript{159}), or comparing and corroborating information (30%\textsuperscript{160}). These increases, although slight, suggest changes were occurring in some of the students’ epistemological beliefs. These findings also lend support to Ashby’s more recent (2011) postulations regarding the pedagogical value of using artifacts to teach about evidence and sources. This points to an area for more research, since Ashby’s (2004) inquiry did not involve artifacts, was much more focussed upon the problem of validating historical claims, and also suggested that age was a factor in students’ ability to question the credibility of sources (pp. 9-10).

Hence, while participation in this inquiry appears to have improved some students’ epistemological beliefs around the constructed nature of historical narratives, the question still remains: What parameters may have been framing (and thus limiting) students’ narrative re-constructions? As Foster and Yeager (1999) have pointed out, historical thinking can be restricted in a formal learning setting, when students are presented with

\textsuperscript{159} Representing an increase by one student participant.
\textsuperscript{160} Representing an increase by five student participants.
pre-selected sets of sources for analysis, which lead to pre-determined narrative outcomes (p. 311). In this sense, evidence is perceived as neatly fitting together, like a jigsaw puzzle, with no contradictions or gaps. In the case of this inquiry, however, students encountered the problematic nature of historical inquiry, since the artifact sources were often found to provide limited evidence relating to their research question. In some cases, as well, the artifact sources provided contradictory (or irrelevant) evidence. Nevertheless, in re-constructing their claims about the past, students’ narratives were intrinsically shaped by the museum itself. Hence, in keeping with Foster and Yeager’s (1999) argument, while students were actively engaged in historical inquiry, they were also limited by the parameters of the museum collection. This raises questions for future research, as to how the informal learning environment of a museum collection might be opened up to alternative perspectives, thus incorporating contradictory, critical, and/or controversial elements into the exhibition narrative. Certainly, there is evidence to suggest that an inquiry-based method for learning in the museum enabled students to think more critically about the historical narratives they encountered; nevertheless, more research in this area might enable students to become more critical, and more analytical, of the intrinsic relationship between sources and museum narratives.

As was clearly evident within the final research projects, students participating in this inquiry experienced difficulties in contextualising their artifact source (that is to say, placing their micro-investigations within the context of a larger big idea in history). Both Nokes (2011) and Shemilt (2000, 2009), as well as others (Barton, 2008a, 2005; Billmann-Mahecha & Hausen, 2005; Cannadine, 2011; Husbands, 1996; Nokes, Dole & Hacker, 2007; van Drie & van Boxtel, 2003, 2008; Wasson, 2001) have noted similar
difficulties. Nokes (2011) attributes this problem to students’ limited historical background knowledge, as well as misapplication of the knowledge they possess (p. 382). Likewise, Shemilt (2009) attributes this difficulty to an inability to link “little pictures” from the past with other “little pictures” in complex ways, in order to form “big pictures” (pp. 179 – 180). At best, Shemilt (2009) has asserted that students in this age group can be expected to construct “packets of events” that are joined by episodes of dramatic action (p. 184); at least, they can be expected to perceive the past as isolated from their own personal past (including their friends and relations), representing “empty bits of time” (p. 183). The findings from this inquiry confirm such assertions. It was apparent that students became very confident in creating “little pictures” of the past, which were focussed upon their artifact source. Unequipped (it seemed) with the same level of background knowledge as adult participants (who had been active in the field for many years), they struggled to draw meaning beyond what Wasson (2001) has described as “facts from sources” (p. 28). Just as Wasson (2001) found, the students in this inquiry seemed to regard the collecting of evidence as “the ending point of historical discourse”—rather than the beginning (p. 28).

While Colby (2010) and others (Cannadine, 2011; Nokes, 2011; Reisman & Wineburg, 2008), have all presented similar recommendations on how to overcome barriers to contextualisation, the distinct challenges associated with reading three-dimensional artifacts suggest further investigation is required. This is particularly evident, since even though students were provided with additional background information, as well as classroom instruction in asking probing questions, and were given ample opportunities to pursue their own paths of inquiry (as well as to model historical thinking
with museum volunteers), they still experienced difficulties in contextualising their artifact source. Yet, as Corbishley (2011, 2015), Hood (2009), Jordanova (2012), Lemire (2010), Murphy (2012), and Thatcher Ulrich (2001) have pointed out, artifacts present their own sets of challenges for historians, since material history represents a unique approach to the past. What is clearly evident from this inquiry is that further research is required in ways to enable students to contextualise museum collections beyond the museum narrative they encounter. Indeed, while Shemilt (2009) has indicated that “big picture” contextualisation is driven by second-order historical thinking, his belief remains purely conjecture at this point in time (Shemilt, 2009, pp. 196-199).

5.6.3 Engaging in a critical community of inquiry. As discussed in section 2.4.3, very little empirical research currently exists that bridges the gap between formal and informal learning in history education (van Boxtel, 2010, p. 1). Yet, as Barton (2001) has found, there exists an interesting correlation between formal classroom instruction and how students use informal knowledge to expand their understandings about the past. In his comparative study involving students within a similar age group in Northern Ireland and the United States, Barton (2001) has observed that in Northern Ireland the informal experiences students encounter outside of school, combined with formal lessons they receive in class, enable students to “create a more sophisticated understanding of the role of evidence in historical enquiry” (pp. 4-5). Moreover, Barton (2005, p. 751) and others (Marcus, Stoddard, & Woodward, 2012; McRainey & Russick, 2010; Snelson, 2011) have also noted how museum artifacts can be particularly useful in provoking curiosity and wonder. Unfortunately, in North America both Barton (2001) and Trofanenko (2014)
have remarked that such a relationship between formal and informal learning exists more as an ideal than a reality in most schools.

By contrast, in the Netherlands the divide between formal and informal learning is reportedly non-existent (van Boxtel, Klein & Snoep, 2011). This is because, as Savenije, van Boxtel, and Grever (2014) have explained, teachers in the Netherlands are encouraged to incorporate remnants of the past into their history education lessons by (among other things) using historical objects in the classroom, visiting museums and historic sites, and interviewing elder members of their communities (p. 519). In this context, van Boxtel (2010) has proposed a “dynamic” approach to heritage education, which involves providing students with six points of engagement: (a) to explore and reflect on heritage practises “by becoming active players in interpreting, using and preserving heritage,” (b) to become “meaning makers” by assuming active roles in establishing historical significance for themselves, (c) to commence with their own “entrance narratives” about the past, (d) to explore a plurality of perspectives, (e) to employ historical thinking concepts to “deconstruct invented traditions and recognise historical inaccuracies and simplifications,” and (f) to participate in the process of sharing knowledge, through open dialogue about meaning and significance (pp. 55-59).

All of these areas of engagement point to a transformation in student roles—from passive listeners, to active participants—who share an authority to re-write historical narratives.
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161 “The [2011] annual survey on cultural education in the Netherlands reports that 83 percent of primary schools and 91 per cent of secondary schools reserve part of their curriculum for heritage education. The term “heritage education” refers to a broad array of educational activities and to the use of material and immaterial heritage in an educational setting. The survey shows that pupils regularly visit historical museums and monuments and, to a lesser extent, archives and archeological sites. They also explore their cultural and historical environment. Teachers use physical artefacts, stories, and legends in the classroom” (van Boxtel, Klein, Snoep, 2011, p. 6).
Indeed, one of the most significant findings drawn from this inquiry is the transformation that occurred in social roles within the community history museum. As Silverman (2010) has pointed out in her treatise on the social work of museums, the interaction within a museum context between museum artifacts, and other people can enable individuals to “express and affirm key roles” in society, as well as “develop new ones” (p. 56). Findings from this inquiry support Silverman’s claim, since by the end of this inquiry it was evident that students perceived themselves as active members of a community of inquiry.

Upon completion of this inquiry, students also demonstrated more complex aspects of historical consciousness, since fewer employed traditional narratives for remembering. In addition, the overall pattern of transformation seemed to shift from traditional—to exemplary—narratives for remembering Canada’s past, and from exemplary—to genetic—narratives for remembering New Brunswick’s past. Over time, students also came to place an increased importance upon their national and provincial pasts. This transition supports Barton’s (2001) findings regarding the correlation between formal learning and informal experiences, since there is evidence to suggest that a formal source-based approach to exploring the informal museum experience actually correlated with more sophisticated expressions of historical consciousness.

Nevertheless, such transformations were limited, since fewer students adopted genetic responses for remembering than was originally hoped. This finding points to two areas for further research: (a) the role of extended formal instruction, and (b) the role of museum exhibit design in enabling source-based historical thinking. In this case study, students were introduced to a historical thinking pedagogy for the first time, as part of
their fieldwork experience. The approach was very new to them. Likewise, the museum exhibits had not been designed, as Gosselin (2010, 2011) has recommended, with “historical wayfinders” (Gosselin, 2010, p. 33) that might have enabled students to develop their historical thinking more fully. The exhibits also had not been designed to either support (or challenge) the social studies curriculum in any way. More research is required to establish how (and if) these factors would have resulted in different results.162

As other researchers have also noted in similar empirical investigations (Cormier & Savoie, 2011; Davies, 2005; Kydd, 2005; McRainey, 2010; Nakou, 2001; Savenije, van Boxtel & Grever, 2014; Snelson, 2011; Marcus, Stoddard & Woodard, 2012; Weinert, 2000; Wood & Latham, 2014) students participating in this inquiry were highly motivated by a sense of wonder and discovery. They particularly enjoyed being able to explore the museum at will, to venture beyond public exhibition spaces, and to discover the attic storage area. Through, what van Boxtel (2010) has labelled “dynamic heritage” (p. 55), participants in this inquiry also became actively involved in six points of engagement163 by deconstructing the museum exhibits through historic space mapping, modelling curatorial historical thinking, engaging in dialogue with their peers, and re-constructing the museum on their own terms. The benefits derived from these forms of engagement—as Levesque (2006) set forth as a challenge to museums more than ten
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162 For a discussion on the role of museums in constructing and re-constructing heritage, see Kidd et al. (2014), as well as Savenije, van Boxtel, and Grever (2014), and van Boxtel, Klein and Snoep (2011).

163 (1) Explore and reflect on heritage practises “by becoming active players in interpreting, using and preserving heritage”, (2) become “meaning makers” by assuming active roles in establishing historical significance for themselves, (3) commence with their own “entrance narratives” about the past, (4) explore a plurality of perspectives, (5) employ historical thinking concepts to “deconstruct invented traditions and recognise historical inaccuracies and simplifications”, and also (6) participate in the process of sharing knowledge, through open dialogue about meaning and significance (van Boxtel, 2010, pp. 55-59).
years ago—are that students engaged “in the story (or stories) that relics are supposed to tell, and ultimately (re)construct[ed] their own narrative accounts of the collective past” (p. 46). There is also evidence to suggest that students’ strategies for coping with conflicting narratives shifted towards seeing themselves as agents within the community of inquiry, capable of deconstructing the narratives they encountered. This transformation warrants further investigation, since it points to the potential of a material history framework for enabling more sophisticated historical thinking in museums—in ways that are student-driven and respectful of students’ social role as “meaning makers” (van Boxtel, 2010, p. 56).

5.6.4 Historical thinking in museums. Given such complex dynamics of meaning-making within a community history museum, I have argued (see section 2.4.3) that what is required is a slightly different set of organizing procedures for historical thinking in museums—procedures that reflect the domain-knowledge of material history inquiry. Indeed, as Jones (2014, p. 232) and Savenije et al. (2014, p. 536) have found, when museum collections are used simply to support a particular narrative claim (rather than reflect critically upon that claim), students in this age group accept the authority of the museum, while selectively adapting portions of the narrative to reinforce their own pre-existing understandings of the past. In this way, they re-interpret and rationalise portions of the museum narrative to accommodate their own world-view. As counter-balance to this phenomenon, van Boxtel (2010) has recommended that scaffolding tools be adopted to enable students to “critically question and evaluate how the past is represented… in order to deconstruct invented traditions and recognize historical inaccuracies or simplifications” (p. 59). In a similar vein, Marcus et al. (2012) have emphasized the
importance of close collaboration with museum staff in designing fieldwork experiences that provide students with freedom and choice, while also supplying structure to support specific learning experiences (p. 51). Likewise, Nakou (2006, 2001) and Husbands (1996) have emphasised the role of museum education in providing students with opportunities to decode meaning from museum collections (Nakou, 2001, p. 94). According to Husbands (1996) and Nakou (2001), this decoding can be achieved by commencing with the “minitheories” (Husbands, 1996, p. 80) students bring to the museum, and then focussing upon museum artifacts, as a way of going “beyond the historical interpretation that each museum implies” (Nakou, 2006, p. 87). Such a learning dynamic has also been identified by Rowe et al. (2002) as a complex relationship between vernacular and official narratives, and is attributed to creating an individual sense of belonging to a particular societal group (p. 97). As Rowe et al. (2002) have pointed out, this dynamic is not simply a process of direct appropriation. Instead, visitors draw upon their “personal experience to illustrate, support or potentially deny the truth or authority of the official account” (p. 109).

As such, the promise of historical thinking in museums rests with enabling students to interact with official museum narratives, using more than pre-existing (vernacular) “minitheories” as their single point of comparison—for validating or denying such historical claims (Husbands, 1996; van Boxtel, 2010; van Drie & van Boxtel, 2008; Létourneau, 2014; Nakou, 2006; Trofanenko, 2008). To this end, Seixas and Morton

---

164 Husbands borrowed this idea from Claxton (1993) and his research in science education. Similarly, Nakou (2006) has adopted the term “microtheories” (p. 86) to describe the same concept.

165 “Vernacular” is defined as “little” narratives “told by visitors as they engage with an exhibit,” while “Official” is defined as “big” narratives “provided by history museums” (Rowe et al., 2002, p. 108).

166 What Létourneau has also labeled as “Mythistories” (2014, p. 17; 2006, pp. 162-164).
Seixas and Morton (2013) have proposed that museums serve as useful learning environments for teaching the historical thinking concepts of Historical Significance, as well as Evidence and Sources. For each of these historical thinking concepts Seixas and Morton (2013) present four (sometimes five) specific guideposts, illustrating two extremes in student ability, ranging from “limited” to “powerful” understandings (pp. 8-9).

With regard to Historical Significance, students are expected to learn that events, people, or developments have historical significance if: (a) they resulted in change, (b) they are revealing about issues in history or contemporary life, (c) they are shown to occupy a meaningful place in a narrative, and (d) this significance varies over time from group to group (Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. 24). With regard to Evidence and Sources, students are expected to learn that: (a) history is interpretation based on inferences made from primary sources, (b) asking good questions about a source can turn it into evidence, (c) sourcing often begins before a source is read, with questions about who, when, and why a source was created, (d) a source should be analyzed in relation to the context of its historical setting, and (e) inferences made from a single source should always be corroborated against other sources. Seixas and Morton (2013) also conclude their discussion of the historical thinking framework by stating that “[d]oing history should be fun and serious, difficult and rewarding, meaningful and creative. If some of those elements are missing, students are not getting the whole package” (p. 9).

In comparing Seixas and Morton’s (2013) criteria for historical thinking against findings from this inquiry, it is broadly apparent that students found the fieldwork

---

167 Seixas and Morton (2013) have also recognised museums as useful for teaching the Ethical Dimension, but this Historical Thinking concept is not discussed in this dissertation because it was outside the parameters of the inquiry.
experience to be difficult as well as rewarding, fun as well as serious, creative as well as meaningful. During post-interviews, students indicated that they enjoyed the museum experience for three specific reasons: (a) wonder and discovery, (b) experiencing the real thing, and (c) re-constructing the past. At the same time, however, many also indicated that they found the research process challenging, since many could not locate the types of narrative information they were used to gathering. In this sense, they experienced history as intriguing, yet problematic and incomplete.

With regard to the historical thinking concept of Evidence and Sources, all of the students became competent in focussing their attention upon a specific artifact source, and drawing evidence from that source—by employing a combination of description, and inference processes. As to whether the resulting inferences were “insightful” (Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. 49) is a matter of subjectivity, although, if the students had been provided with conflicting sources of evidence for comparison and corroboration, we may have been able to assess “insightfulness” more precisely.

Clearly, however, many of the students experienced difficulty in asking “good” questions (Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. 49) about their artifact source. Nevertheless, all but one of the students found success in developing a research question, although less than half (41%) ultimately responded to their question. While it is apparent that more formal instruction in enabling students to develop research questions would have been beneficial (a procedure which adult participants described as an evolutionary process), students did become competent in asking information—as well as convergent—questions (Husbands,
Likewise, the museum fieldwork experience seemed to lend itself well to asking who-what-when-where-why questions about a source. All of the students became competent in this sourcing activity.

As discussed in section 5.6.2, many of the students experienced difficulties in contextualising their artifact source (that is, making connections to a big idea in history, or by placing their artifact within a context of historical time). Yet, despite this limitation, the museum fieldwork experience did provide students with ample opportunities to actively corroborate sources and evidence. As a result, a large majority (82%) demonstrated an ability to compare and corroborate sources, by establishing lines of comparison between other artifact sources. In turn, their narrative claims became focussed upon the artifact as a source of evidence to support their assertions.

In establishing historical significance, students adopted revealing and/or symbolic patterns of understanding that reflected their own unique experience of material history analysis. As a result, while few students demonstrated significance as stemming from change (Seixas & Morton, 2013, p. 24), the museum fieldwork experience did appear to impact students’ epistemological beliefs (as discussed in section 5.6.1) regarding the authority of sources of information about the past. In this sense, students’ explanations for significance shifted towards recognizing a process of historical inquiry in which they had been active participants. As a result, artifacts became significant for what they revealed, or what they symbolised—for them. In this sense, students seemed to establish their own personal sense of relevancy to the present.

---

168 Husbands (1996) has adapted the Saxton and Morgan (1994) model for asking questions about sources, which identifies four types of evidential questions: information (accretion), opinion (judgmental), divergent, and convergent (p. 24).
Through the museum fieldwork experience, students also came to understand the constructed nature of museum narratives. Hence, the resulting narrative re-constructions, although limited by the parameters of the museum collection (and artifact accession records), were source-specific, and did not reflect the intended expectations of the museum volunteers. This points to an area for further research, since although there is no evidence to suggest that the “decoding” process of the Material History Framework for Historical Thinking enabled participants to “go beyond the historical interpretation that each museum implies” (Nakou, 2006, p. 87), the learning dynamic did seem to mirror what Rowe et al. (2002) have described as a complex relationship between vernacular and official narratives. Although isolated, and seemingly disconnected from a shared big idea in history, the individual “little narratives” (Rowe et al., 2002) that students created could be interpreted as personal narratives that linked each student to the community history museum in some way. This hypothesis requires further empirical research.

Overall, as Nakou (2006) has found—and this inquiry also confirms—students’ ability to think historically about the narratives they encountered within the community history museum related specifically to the level of difficulty that the artifacts presented for historical inquiry. This finding has led Nakou (2006) to conclude:

Carefully organized educational programmes that relate history education and museum education, aiming to enable children from early ages to use and interpret museum objects and collections as works open to several alternative interpretations, could have very important educational results: they could enable children to develop both their historical knowledge, thinking and skills and their potential to interpret and approach creatively material culture in general. (p. 90)
While the Material History Framework for Historical Thinking adopted for this inquiry was found to be very beneficial in enabling students to work creatively with sources and evidence, four specific factors seemed to limit their ability to achieve what Seixas and Morton (2013) have described as “powerful understandings” (p. 3). First, without sufficient artifact documentation to work with (in some instances), students resorted to making mental leaps or pursuing research dead-ends. Second, without sufficient background knowledge to establish historical context for their artifact source, many students experienced difficulties in developing probing questions to frame their research. Third, this deficiency in background knowledge also resulted in students ultimately failing to fully perceive each of their micro projects as connected to a big idea in history. Lastly, limited by the community history museum sources with which they had to work, few students adopted alternative perspectives by incorporating contradictory, critical, and/or controversial elements into their narrative re-constructions. These limitations are not insurmountable, however, since each could be addressed through further refinement of the material history framework. Further empirical research is required, working with a broad range of history museums (and various styles of museum exhibitions)—including museum exhibitions that are explicitly designed to support historical thinking.

5.7 Conclusion
One of the central premises of historical thinking is that students can be empowered to “read the texts that structure their lives” (Seixas, 2001, p. 561; see also Conrad et al., 2013; Levesque, 2008; Nokes, 2013; Seixas & Morton, 2013; VanSledright, 2011; Wineburg, 2001). In this case study, historical thinking commenced with students’ critical examination of the narratives that they encountered within the museum. They
then sought to investigate the artifact evidence and sources behind these official narratives, and to reinterpret their findings as exhibit projects. As a result, the findings from this inquiry provide strong evidence to support Seixas’ (2001) assertion. At the same time, however, it is also apparent that dramatic intellectual empowerment does not occur rapidly. Changes in students’ epistemological beliefs around historical knowledge, authority, and the practise of historical meaning-making require more than one unit of study in one social studies class. As David Cannadine (2011) has pointed out:

For anyone who cares about the teaching of history in schools… the main concern must be to do more to ensure that there is sufficient time in the classroom, and the necessary continuity across the years from five to sixteen, to make it possible to convey not only the excitement and allure of the subject, but also to establish some broad chronology and to outline at least some part of the big picture. (p. 236)

In examining the historical narratives that students constructed by doing material history with a community history museum, it is apparent that they continued to formulate hybrid narratives for remembering the past. Over time, however, these narratives for remembering Canada’s past shifted away from what Rüsen (2005) has described as a traditional template—reflecting “consent about a valid common life”—toward an exemplary schema, “reflecting peculiar situations to regularities of what happened” (p. 29). Similarly, students’ narratives for remembering New Brunswick’s past also shifted away from traditional templates, toward a genetic “acceptance of different standpoints within a compromising perspective of common development” (Rüsen, 2005, p. 29). Within these transitions, students’ narrative re-constructions remained implicitly shaped by the museum learning environment.
Nevertheless, by adopting a Material History Framework for Historical Thinking, students extended their purview beyond the authority of the museum narrative. In this way, they were freely and independently focusing their attention upon a specific artifact source, drawing evidence from that source, asking questions, corroborating the source, and making inferences that were evidence-based. As a result, their narrative re-interpretations became more than simple then-versus-now first impressions, but were instead explicitly focused upon the artifact—as a source of evidence to support their narrative claims.

In re-constructing their narrative claims, it was evident that students experienced difficulties in linking their micro research to big ideas in history. This phenomenon is also something that other history education scholars have found to be particularly problematic, since what Shemilt (2009, 2000) has described as a kaleidoscopic sense of the past—full of complex patterns and alternative interpretations—was an interpretive stance with which many students struggled. Many sought to find clear (definitive) answers to their questions about the past.

Overall then, returning to the introduction of this dissertation, where we sat in the fictional kitchen of the Soprano family, the findings from this case study suggest that had the family patriarch (Tony Soprano), and his son (A.J.), participated in a museum fieldwork experience such as this, Tony’s belief about Christopher Columbus probably would not have changed all that much. What might have changed, however, is his tolerance for an alternative perspective on the subject. Given such a script revision, A.J. may also have understood that truth lies not in any singular narrative, but in his own ability to carefully examine, compare, and contextualise the evidence behind such
narrative claims. In this sense, simply confronting his father’s historical truth, with yet another piece of textbook historical truth, would not constitute sophistication in historical thinking.

As this case study suggests, in order for the two Sopranos to actually listen and learn from each other, both father and son would have to relinquish their positions of authority. This is an important first step in enabling historical thinking within a sociocultural community. By opening up the community of inquiry—as happened in this inquiry—students were empowered to challenge and re-write the claims that they encountered within the community history museum. While the experience did not lead many students to relinquish their trust in the authority of the museum, many adopted more sophisticated strategies for investigating—and exploring—the narratives that they encountered. They also came to place their trust in multiple sources of information about the past.

Through participation in the museum fieldwork experience, students began to realise the challenges historians face in piecing together (and validating) remnants of the past. They began to recognise that narratives are constructed, and that they too can be a part of that construction process. Thus, through the extended learning experience, history became something that students envisioned doing for themselves. It was this sense of intellectual freedom…wonder…and discovery…that made the community history museum fieldwork experience so enjoyable for both students and adults.
REFERENCES


Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (December, 2010). *Tri-council policy statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans*. Ottawa: Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada.


Conrad, M. (October 20, 2012). E-mail correspondence.


historical consciousness: A THEN/HiER publication project, Vancouver, British Columbia.


Learning conversations in museums (pp. 167-211). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fine, M. (1993). ‘You can't just say that the only ones who can speak are those who agree with your position’: Political discourse in the classroom. Harvard Educational Review, 63(4), 412-434.


Seixas (Ed.), *Theorizing historical consciousness* (pp. 109-128). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.


Osborne, K. (2012a). ‘If I’m going to be a cop, why do I have to learn religion and history?’: Schools, citizenship, and the teaching of Canadian history. In N. Neatby & P. Hodgins (Eds.), *Settling and unsettling memories: Essays in Canadian public history* (pp. 135-187). Toronto: University of Toronto.


Province of New Brunswick (n.d.). Community museums assistance program. Retrieved from


APPENDIX A

Definition of Terms

1.6.1 Case study: Case study involves a two-fold method of design logic and data collection techniques that:

- investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when
- the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (Yin, 2009, p. 18),

and:

- copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result
- relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result
- benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. (Yin, 2009, p. 18)

1.6.2 Community museum: Community museum is defined by the Province of New Brunswick (n.d.) as:

...a non-profit community institution which acts as a custodian to maintain, conserve, study, and interpret a permanent collection of heritage resources. These resources may be objects or historical data. Such an organization holds its collection in trust for the public. It tries to ensure that the community derives maximum benefit from the collection it holds.

Museum collections may illustrate natural or human phenomena or their interrelationships. A [community] museum adds to its collection in an orderly fashion. Generally stated, the purpose of a [community] museum is to help New Brunswickers understand themselves and their ties with the past, to strengthen their sense of pride and identity, and/or to better appreciate their links with the environment.

The dedicated efforts of volunteers and community supporters are essential to a [community] museum's operation. By applying their museological knowledge, volunteers and supporters can achieve the organization's mandate (p. 1).

In addition, a community museum must meet the following criteria:

- Possess legal title to the permanent collections it conserves;
- Own the building in which the museum is housed, or have an agreement for long-term occupancy;
• Be recognized as a Charitable Organization under the *Federal Income Tax Act* or be able to show that an application for this status has been sent to Revenue Canada;
• Maintain a basic accounting system which shows all revenues and expenses related to museum operation, and is the basis for the annual financial statement;
• Maintain a standard system of registration for its collection, thus ensuring proper documentation and control;
• Follow a Collections Management Policy consistent with its organizational objectives;
• Maintain proper attendance records (individuals, groups, etc.), educational program records, records of answers to collection research requests;
• Demonstrate community interest in the institution by showing an active membership, active working committees, and the support of local people for its programs;
• Be open to the public for at least eight weeks annually. (Province of New Brunswick, n.d., pp. 1-2).

1.6.3 **Contextual Model of Learning:** Falk and Dierking (2000) have developed this model as a way of analyzing the way the public interacts with museums. It details four broad contexts for learning that occur within informal learning settings:

- **Personal Context:**
  - Motivation and expectations,
  - Prior knowledge, interests, and beliefs,
  - Choice and control.
- **Sociocultural Context:**
  - With-in group sociocultural mediation,
  - Facilitated mediation by others.
- **Physical Context:**
  - Advance organizers and orientation,
  - Design.
- **Time Context:**
  - Reinforcing events and experiences outside the museum,
  - Learning continues over time.

1.6.4 **First-order thinking:** First-order thinking is defined by VanSledright and Limón (2006) as foreground conceptual, narrative ideas, and knowledge that come from “who, what, where, when and how questions” (VanSledright, 2011, p. 50). These are the substantive narratives, arguments, themes, and explanations of history (VanSledright & Limón, 2006): the subject matter of history (Seixas, 2006). Most often, as well, these are the themes and narratives students encounter within community history museums.

1.6.5 **Formal and informal learning:** Falk, Dierking, and Foutz (2007) use the term “informal learning” to describe institutional settings other than (formal) classroom settings. For example, museums are informal settings. Informal, however, is not
used to describe the nature of the learning occurring in the setting, since the fundamental processes of learning do not differ solely as a function of institutional setting (p. xix).

1.6.6 **Free-choice and compulsory learning:** Falk, Dierking, and Foutz (2007) use this term to describe the learning that occurs in settings in which the learner is largely choosing what, how, where, and with whom to learn. It is a generic term that captures the intrinsically motivated nature of most museum-based learning. It is important to note, however, that although free-choice learning describes the learning of most casual visitors in museums, not all museum-based learning is free-choice. For example, when children in school groups take field trips where there is a pre-defined lesson with limited, or no choice and control over goals and activities, the learning is best described as compulsory. (p. xix)

1.6.7 **Historical consciousness:** “Historical consciousness” is a term that appears often within debates about history education in Canada. Undoubtedly, however, The Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness, located at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, stands in the forefront of such debates. Established in 2001, to facilitate “research on the understanding and teaching of history.”\(^{169}\) The Center defines historical consciousness in very broad terms, as the study of how people understand the past in the present:

… individual and collective understandings of the past, the cognitive and cultural factors which shape those understandings, as well as the relations of historical understandings to those of the present and the future (Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness, 2012).

Similarly, the national research project *Canadians and Their Pasts* (which is closely aligned with The Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness) defines historical consciousness as the way in which “ordinary Canadians engage the past in their everyday lives” (Conrad et al., 2009, p. 15). This definition places a greater emphasis upon the informal nature of learning outside of the history classroom, and is focused upon adult respondents’:

…general interest in and understanding of the past; activities related to the past; and trustworthiness of sources of information about the past. (Canadians and Their Pasts, 2010).

By international contrast, however, German theoretician, Rüsen (1993, 2004) has defined historical consciousness in a more hermeneutic sense, as an intellectual operation by which an individual’s temporal orientation (and sense of change with relation to the future) is revealed through past experience:

\(^{169}\) Centre for the Study of Historical Consciousness. Retrieved from [http://www.cshc.ubc.ca/about/](http://www.cshc.ubc.ca/about/).
Historical consciousness serves as a key orientational element, giving practical life a temporal frame and matrix, a conception of the ‘course of time’ flowing through the mundane affairs of daily life. That conception functions as an element in the intentions guiding human activity, our ‘course of action.’ Historical consciousness evokes the past as a mirror of experience within which life in the present is reflected and its temporal features revealed.

Stated succinctly, history is the mirror of past actuality into which the present peers in order to learn something about its future. Historical consciousness should be conceptualized as an operation of human intellection rendering present actuality intelligible while fashioning its future perspectives. Historical consciousness deals with the past qua experience; it reveals to us the web of temporal change in which our lives are caught up and (at least indirectly) the future perspectives toward which that change is flowing.


Nonetheless, given these three inter-related (yet slightly different) variations upon “historical consciousness,” for the purposes of this study I wish to adopt a more pragmatic definition which flows from the theoretical research of Rüsen, but is also more firmly based upon the empirical history education research of Billmann-Mahecha and Hausen (2005):

The development of historical consciousness is certainly to be understood as a life span process, which is dependent on the development of social-cognitive basis competencies, takes place in a social environment, is dependent on access to and exploitation of educational opportunities and which also includes emotional and motivational factors. This list of essential components does not, of course, represent a developmental model. It must be taken into account that the “development process is not a simple process of the accumulation of abilities, but rather it must be understood as the process of acquiring the competency of historical interpretation” [as cited in Rüsen, 1994, p. 23] (Billmann-Mahecha & Hausen, 2005, pp. 164-165).

At this point in time, I believe this definition lends itself well to the context of this particular case study, because it encompasses the experience of both formal and informal learning within a community history museum setting.

1.6.8 Historical thinking: When considering middle school students’ understanding of historical narratives, many would agree that it is appropriate to begin by acknowledging the large body of research findings that have resulted from the British Schools Council Project “History 13-16” (VanSledright & Limón, 2006; Wineburg, 2001; Stearns, Seixas, & Wineburg, 2000; Wineburg, 1996; Booth, 1994; Boddington, 1984; Dickson, Gard, & Lee, 1978). Established in the early 1970s, this curriculum reform project had a profound influence upon history education in Great Britain (Boddington, 1984, p. 137; Booth, 1994). A primary aim of the Project was to re-think the philosophy of teaching history in British schools, by introducing students to “the language and meanings of historians” (Shemilt,1983, p. 2; Schools History Project, 1976; Booth, 1994). In so doing, the
proponents of the “new history” curriculum drew heavily upon the "forms of knowledge" theory of British sociologist Paul Hirst (1965, 1970) which emphasised teaching the logic, methods and perspectives of a discipline (Shemilt, 1983). Turning to the discipline of history itself, the researchers initially looked to the historiography of R. G. Collingwood (1946), G.R. Elton (1967) and J.H. Hexter (1971a, 1971b) to identify the historian’s disciplinary craft (Dickinson, Gard, & Lee, 1978; Edwards, 1978; Lee, 1983; Schools History Project, 1976; Sansom, 1987; Booth, 1983, 1994; Lee, 2004). In quoting Collingwood, historical thinking was thus conceived by the Project (1976) as “an exercise in imagination” that personally engaged students in the experience of others:

You are thinking historically when you say about anything, ‘I see what the person who made this (wrote this, used this, designed this, etc.) was thinking.’ (p. 15)

Collingwood’s definition of historical thinking has since been elaborated upon and refined through history domain-specific cognitive research; indeed, research within this field has been prolific over the past 40 years—leading Barton to estimate in 2008 that over 200 empirical studies had been published world-wide since the 1970s (Barton, 2008a, p. 239). No doubt this estimate has increased substantially in the three years since Barton published this statement. Stemming from these many cognitive studies, researchers have established a variety of frameworks for defining the process of thinking historically. They have also attempted to identify what it means to “understand” the past.

For the purposes of this phenomenological case study, I have adopted the history domain-knowledge framework of VanSledright and Limón (2006; VanSledright, 2011), which differentiates between substantive and procedural knowledge in a way that is very similar to Osborne’s (2012a) description of historical mindedness (p. 175). It is also very closely aligned with Duquette’s (2011) definition of historical thinking, which differentiates between historical perspective (perspective historique) and historical approach (demarche historique) as two necessary (and parallel) components of historical thinking.

---

170 All of these historians are representative of a British Idealist school of thought that rejected Marxism as well as relativism. Both G.R. Elton and J.H. Hexter have been described as “straight-line professionals,” who did not agree with the blend of social science theory in history. (See: Harrison, 2004, pp. 144-145; Dray, 1987, p. 133; and Sacks, 1985). Hexter (1979) labeled the differences between empiricism and social science as a distinction between “lumpers” (History-with a capital H-synthesis methodology) and “splitters” (histories-with a small h-analysis methodology). Noticeably missing from the British Schools Council History Project sources of references is the British Marxist historian E.H. Carr, whose highly influential 1961 publication What is History? rejected the von Rankian tradition of historicism for relativism and social science theory (see: Walsh, 1963, pp. 587-588). For an interesting discussion on Collingwood’s avoidance of relativism, see Bevir, 1999.
Figures 1 and 2 outline in detail the relationships and characterizations of VanSledright and Limón’s (2006) framework for historical thinking. This philosophical alignment is significant, because I believe it points to a potential for pragmatic interplay between formal and informal learning within a community history museum setting.

**Substantive Knowledge Types**

1. **Foreground/First-Order Conceptual and Narrative Ideas and Knowledge:**
   - Interpretations of the past that come from who, what, where, when, and how questions. Often rendered chronologically in narrative, explanatory, or expository style.
   - Examples: Stories of nation building, capitalism, socialism, economic production, military exploits, democracy, political parties, names, dates, etc.

2. **Background/Second-Order Conceptual Ideas and Knowledge:**
   - Concepts and organizing ideas that investigators impose on the past in the practice of researching, interpreting, and making sense of it.
   - Examples: Causation, significance, change over time (i.e., progress, decline), evidence (i.e., author perspective, source reliability, nature of sources), historical context, human agency, colligations (i.e., the American Revolution Period, the Progressive Era).

**Procedural Knowledge Type**

3. **Strategic Practices:**
   - Knowledge of how to research and interpret the past. This knowledge is rule-bound and criteria laden. It is subject to decisions about its proper practice from within the community of historical inquirers, but also remains open to ongoing debate.
   - Examples of procedures:
     - Assessing status of sources: identifying and attributing sources, assessing perspective, judging reliability;
     - Building mental maps or models;
     - Using historical imagination while interpreting within historical context;
     - Constructing evidence-based arguments;
     - Writing an account.

**Figure 1:** Bruce VanSledright’s model for how understandings are produced and assessed through historical thinking (2011, p. 158). This figure illustrates the reasoning framework of historical thinking that has been adopted for this case study.

**Figure 2:** A characterization of history domain-knowledge (VanSledright & Limón, 2006, p. 547). This figure outlines distinctions within VanSledright’s model for historical thinking. It clearly differentiates between substantive knowledge—first-order thinking and second-order thinking—as well as procedural knowledge.
1.6.9 **History museum:** For the purposes of this study, a history museum is differentiated from a gallery, exhibition center, historic site, or zoo by virtue of its status as a non-profit institution which possess legal title to a permanent collection of three-dimension objects (artifacts) relating to the past.

1.6.10 **History versus the past:** The past is not history. The past is merely a series of random events. History is the study of these random events, and historians try to make sense of the past by adopting standardized methods of historical inquiry that strive to achieve some measure of objectivity. In this way, historians interpret and shape the past into history, while adopting their own particular lens of inquiry. As Conrad (2011) has noted, today’s historians are modest in their claims of objectivity, because a “good” historian strives:

… to examine their own motivations, take pains to understand the context of earlier efforts to write history of their topic, and concede that exploring the past from a variety of perspectives is the closest they can come to the ideal of objectivity (Conrad, 2011, p. 33).

This is the historian’s craft—to be both historiographers (who study how history is written) and to be historians (who re-shape and re-interpret the past).

1.6.11 **Informal learning:** Also drawing upon the research of Falk, Dierking, and Foutz (2007), informal learning describes the learning that occurs in settings in which the learner is largely choosing what, how, where, and with whom to learn. It is a generic term that captures the intrinsically motivated nature of museum-based learning. It is important to note, however, that although free-choice learning describes the learning of most casual visitors in museums, not all museum-based learning is free-choice. For example, when children in school groups take field trips where there is a pre-defined lesson with limited, or no choice and control, over goals and activities, the learning is best described as compulsory. (Falk, Dierking, & Foutz, 2007, p. xix)

1.6.12 **Instrumental case study:** Instrumental case study is defined by Stake (1995) as a type of case study which positions the issue (Θ : theta) as dominant over the case (Θ : iota). Thus, the case:

…is examined mainly to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization. The case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else. (Stake, 2005, p. 437; as cited in Merriam, 2009, p. 48).

1.6.13 **Learning:** For this term, I draw upon the cognitive research of Falk, Dierking, and Foutz (2007), who define learning as a personally and socially constructed mechanism for making meaning in the physical world. The definition is a broad one, and includes changes in cognition, affect, attitudes, and behavior (p. xix).
1.6.14 **Material history** (also referred to as material culture): is defined by Pearce (1989) as the study of artifacts “constructed by human beings through a combination of raw material and technology, which for practical purposes can be distinguished from fixed structures because they can be moved from place to place” (p. 2)

1.6.15 **Museum:** The Canadian Museums Association (2012) broadly defines a museum as a public institution, created in the public interest:

They engage their visitors, foster deeper understanding and promote the enjoyment and sharing of authentic cultural and natural heritage. Museums acquire, preserve, research, interpret and exhibit the tangible and intangible evidence of society and nature. As educational institutions, museums provide a physical forum for critical inquiry and investigation.

Museums are permanent, not-for-profit institutions whose exhibits are regularly open to the general public. This definition encompasses institutions that pursue similar objectives and accomplish most or some of a museum’s functions. Accordingly, the following are also recognized as museums:

- Exhibition places such as art galleries and science and interpretation centers;
- Institutions with plant and animal collections and displays, such as botanical gardens, biodomes, zoos, aquariums and insectariums;
- Cultural establishments that facilitate the preservation, continuation and management of tangible and intangible living heritage resources, such as keeping houses and heritage centers;

1.6.16 **Second-order thinking:** Second-order thinking is defined by VanSledright and Limón (2006) as background organizing concepts and ideas that investigators impose upon the past in the practice of researching, interpreting, and making sense of it (VanSledright & Limón, 2006, p. 547; see figures 1 and 2). Similarly, in *The Historical Thinking Project*, second-order thinking is identified as six “structural” concepts (Seixas, 2006) that shape the practice of history (The Historical Thinking Project, 2012).

According to VanSledright and Limón (2006), these concepts and ideas can be categorized into two sub-types: substantive knowledge, and procedural knowledge; whereas, Seixas (2006; 2011) and *The Historical Thinking Project* do not seem to draw these same lines of distinction. For the purpose of this case study, I have adopted the second-order thinking concepts as defined by Seixas (2006; 2011) and *The Historical Thinking Project* (2012):
historical significance: why we care, today, about certain events, trends and issues in history;

evidence: how to find, select, contextualize, and interpret sources for a historical argument;

continuity and change: what has changed and what has remained the same over time – also involving the related ideas of progress and decline;

cause and consequence: weighing how and why certain conditions and actions led to others;

historical perspective: understanding the “past as a foreign country,” with its different social, cultural, intellectual, and even emotional contexts that shaped people’s lives and actions;

and ethical dimensions of historical interpretations: understanding how we, in the present, judge actors in different circumstances in the past; how different interpretations of the past reflect different moral stances today; when and how crimes of the past bear consequences today.

These structural concepts represent many of the same cognitive interactions outlined by VanSledright and Limón (2006) as second-order organizing ideas and procedural practices (Figures 1 and 2).

1.6.17 Typology of Historical Consciousness: Rüsen’s (1987, 1993, 2004) typology of historical consciousness can be briefly summarized as:

Traditional – Historical narratives are pre-given, and furnish us with the origins of our values and form of life. The past is significant to the present as a continuity of obligatory cultural and life patterns over time. Time is experienced as repetition of an obligatory form of life;

Exemplary – The past embodies rules of change and human conduct that remain valid for all times. Historical narratives exist as cases, or examples, providing lessons for the present. Time is experienced as representing general rules of conduct, or value systems. Change follows timeless rules;

Critical - Traditional narratives are challenged, and deviations are made from exemplary rules. Counter-stories are produced, to provide a critique of moral values. Time is experienced as problematizing actual forms of life and value systems; and

Genetic - Change is considered central to the past, and gives history its meaning. Differing standpoints are accepted as integrated into a perspective of temporal change. Time is experienced as change of alien forms of life into proper ones. (Rüsen, 1987, 1993, 2004; Lee, 2004; Seixas & Clark, 2004).
Dear: The purpose of this letter is to invite one seventh-grade classroom in your school to collaborate with me on a doctoral research project. This research aims to provide a rich portrayal of how a heritage community can assist middle school students in developing their historical consciousness, by exploring the link between historical thinking and historical consciousness at middle school level. All of this research is intended to take place during regular class time, as part of a formal unit of instruction within New Brunswick’s social studies curriculum.

Research Procedures: I would like to collaborate with one seventh-grade class (approximately 30 students) and their teacher, to enable students to do historical inquiry within a community history museum. This inquiry - at this grade level - is particularly significant, because it is in seventh grade that students are first formally introduced to the concept of empowerment in Canadian history. This inquiry is also particularly significant because it is the only study of its kind (involving middle school students, historical thinking, and museums) currently underway in Canada.

This research will be limited to exploring informal learning within a local community history museum, but will also involve working collaboratively (within a formal classroom setting) to design procedural tools intended to engage seventh-grade students in the act of historical thinking within a museum. Participants will include one seventh-grade class of students (approximately 30 in total), as well as a convenient sampling of adult volunteer members of the community history museum (maximum 4 in total). All of the participants will be actively involved in all three phases of the proposed research commencing in December 2012, and ending in April 2013:

During the research, data documentation will be collected through a combination of interviews, pre and post surveys, and student work of various kinds. I will volunteer my services to work with the cooperating teacher to enable these activities to take place. All adult participants will be required to provide proof of police clearance for association with the vulnerable sector, as
well as validation of having studied and successfully completed New Brunswick’s Policy 701: Policy for the Protection of Pupils.

Confidentiality: All identities will be kept strictly confidential. All participants will be given a code number and no names will appear in any research documents, including transcriptions of interviews. Images containing people will not be coded, so they will remain independent and unlinked to other data.

All documents will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in room 119 of Marshal d’Avary Hall (University of New Brunswick). Students will not be identified by name in any reports of the completed study. Research assistants will comply with the University of New Brunswick Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants, and will sign a confidentiality agreement. Other research participants (such as transcriptionists) will also sign a confidentiality agreement.

I have enclosed the following material to better explain the work:

1. A one page outline of the research (Appendix I);
2. Samples of the pre and post survey, as well as a material history framework for artifact analysis, four questions I will ask both students and adult volunteer participants to respond to in writing, and photovoice interview questions (Appendices A2, B, F, & G);
3. Samples of the information and consent form that will be provided to parents/students (Appendices K, L & M);
4. Confirmation of Ethics Review approval from the University of New Brunswick Research Ethics Board;

Contact for concerns about the rights of research subjects: This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick and is on file as REB 2012-141. It has been approved for its adherence to ethical guidelines and certified by the Research Ethics Board, as well as by the Faculty of Education Research Ethics Committee at the University of New Brunswick. If you wish to contact someone not associated with this study to ask questions or raise concerns, please contact Dr. David Wagner, Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, UNB, dwagner@unb.ca, 506-447-3294. With your approval, I would like to commence working with you to secure a cooperating seventh-grade teacher and class for this exciting project.

I would also be pleased to meet with you at your convenience to provide further information or to respond to any questions or concerns. I can be contacted at the following daytime phone number (453-2915 or 476-1905) or by email (cynthia.wallace-casey@gnb.ca or t8cmf@unb.ca)

Yours sincerely,

Cynthia Wallace-Casey
PhD Candidate
Education, UNB
Study Background: This research aims to provide a rich portrayal of how a heritage community can assist middle school students in developing their historical consciousness, by exploring the link between historical thinking and historical consciousness at middle school level.

Research Procedures: Participants will include one 7th-grade class of students (approximately 30 in total), as well as a convenient sampling of adult volunteer members of a community history museum (maximum 4 in total). Data documentation will be collected in the form of a pre and post survey, four open-ended essay questions (pre and post), historic space mapping; material history artifact analysis; photovoice imagery; principal investigator observations (both journal entries as well as photography); and phenomenographic interviews. All participants will be actively involved in all three phases of the proposed research - commencing in December 2012, and ending in April 2013:

Phase 1 (December 2012): I will work collaboratively with the classroom teacher, museum executive director, and museum volunteers, in preparation for the community history museum fieldwork experience, to ensure that students will be prepared to actively engage with the exhibits.

Phase 2 (January and February 2013): I will work with participants to engage students in the museum fieldwork experience (both inside and outside of the classroom). This will entail bi-weekly student visits to the museum, alternating with bi-weekly museum volunteer visits to the classroom - over a period of eight weeks. During this phase of the research, students will be invited to document their inquiry through historic space mapping, material history research, and photovoice. This will unfold as a sequence of activities (designed in collaboration with the teacher, museum executive director, and museum volunteers) - framed around two key questions: How do curators do history in a museum? and How can I do history in a museum? Students will also be asked to keep a personal journal of their experience (this data will not be analyzed as part of this inquiry) in order to generate reference notes for their photovoice project assignment in phase three.

Phase 3 (March and April, 2013): I will continue to work with the cooperating teacher to assist students in re-thinking their museum fieldwork experience through project-based learning (photovoice). The primary objective of this phase of the research will be to enable participants to reflect upon their community history museum fieldwork experience, and to re-interpret their historical consciousness in ways that are meaningful to them. Students will be actively working in groups (during class time), preparing their photovoice projects: working in thematically-based groups to analyze their artifact photographs (using a material history framework for historical thinking), as well as organizing evidence, establishing historical significance, and mapping out connections; preparing storyboards for their photovoice exposition; writing artifact labels according to museum standards; preparing oral explanations based upon the original research question; and preparing for final exhibition day (approximately the end of April).

Confidentiality: All identities will be kept strictly confidential and any identifiable features within images (i.e. faces, school emblems) will not be made public. All participants will be given a code number and no names will appear in any research documents, including transcriptions of interviews. Images containing people will not be coded, so they will remain independent and unlinked to other data. All documents will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in room 119 of Marshal d’Avary Hall (UNB). Participants will not be identified by name in any reports of the completed study. Other research participants (such as transcriptionists) will also sign a confidentiality agreement.
Dear Parent/Guardian:

The purpose of this letter is to invite your child to collaborate with me, on my doctoral research. This research aims to provide a rich portrayal of how a heritage community can assist middle school students in developing their historical consciousness. I am currently a doctoral candidate, who has worked for more than twenty years in the museum field. I started my career as curator of the Fredericton Region Museum (where the research will be taking place), and am now a provincial government employee within the department of Tourism, Heritage and Culture, where I have worked as a provincial liaison with schools for the past eleven years.

**Project Description:** This research involves exploring learning within the Fredericton Region Museum. It also involves working collaboratively with students in a seventh-grade class to engage in the act of historical inquiry. With your permission, I would like to invite your child to become one of these participants.

As part of the regular classroom instruction, your child will have the opportunity to work with volunteers from the Fredericton Region Museum, and be actively involved in four exciting months of history education research. Commencing in January 2013 and ending in April 2013, the study will unfold according to two specific phases of learning:

- Phase 1: Preparation and engagement in the museum fieldwork experience, both inside and outside of the classroom; and
- Phase 2: Re-interpretation of the museum fieldwork experience, within the classroom.

During these phases of the research, data documentation will be collected in the form of a pre and post survey, pre and post essay questions; historic space mapping; material history artifact analysis; student photovoice projects; researcher observations; and interviews focused upon students' projects.

All of these activities will take place during regular class time, as part of the regular unit of instruction in New Brunswick's social studies curriculum.

**Time Commitment:** Volunteers who commit to participating in this research will spend approximately a total of **2 hours of their class time (over a period of 16 weeks)**, completing the activities as outlined above.

**Objective:** The objective of this research is to explore the link between historical thinking and historical consciousness at middle school level.
**Benefits:** This study will provide your child with the opportunity to participate in the first Canadian inquiry of its kind that investigates how middle school students can do history in their local community museum. As a result, teachers and school administrators will be able to design more effective ways of teaching Canadian history in meaningful ways. Also, upon completion of the project, students will have the opportunity to present their projects to parents, guardians, and interested family members, as part of a final school exposition in the spring of 2013.

**Risks:** There are no real risks. Every effort will be made to ensure that all students involved in the research find it fun and interesting.

**Confidentiality:** The information we collect will be for research and educational purposes only, and will be destroyed five years following the completion of the last publication relating to this research. Your child will not be identified by name when information is analyzed, nor in any findings that are made public. All participants will be given a code name and no real names will appear in any research documents. Images containing people will not be coded, so they will remain independent and unlinked to other data. All research documents will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in room 119 of Marshal d’Avary Hall (UNB). Research assistants will comply with the University of New Brunswick Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants, and will sign a confidentiality agreement.

**Authorisation:** Although school authorities have approved this research, whether your child participates is entirely a matter for you and your child to decide. The plan for this study has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick, and is on file as REB 2012-141.

I am very excited about this research, and hope that you can entrust me with your confidence, by giving consent for your child’s active participation. Please be assured, however, you are under no obligation to give consent, and your child will not be penalised in any way for choosing not to participate. Your child will also be free to withdraw at any time (taking with them their information), without prejudice or academic penalty. If you wish to contact someone not associated with this study to ask questions or raise concerns, please feel free to contact Dr. David Wagner, Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, UNB, dwagner@unb.ca, 506-447-3294. You are also welcome to contact me, or my supervisor, at any point of time to discuss any details:

Cynthia Wallace-Casey  
PhD Candidate, Education  
University of New Brunswick  
(O) 453-2915; (H) 457-1237; (Cell) 476-1905  
t8cmf@unb.ca or  
Cynthia.wallace-casey@gnb.ca

Dr. Alan Sears  
Professor, Faculty of Education  
University of New Brunswick  
(O) 453-5178  
ssears@unb.ca

Yours sincerely,

Cynthia Wallace-Casey  
PhD Candidate  
Education, UNB
CONSENT/ASSENT FORM – PARENT OR GUARDIAN AND STUDENT

Title of Project: Deepening Historical Consciousness Through Museum Fieldwork: Implications for Community-Based History Education

Researcher: Cynthia Wallace-Casey, PhD Candidate, Education, University of New Brunswick, (O) 506-453-2324, (H) 506-457-1237, (Cell) 476-1905 t8cmfs@unb.ca or Cynthia.wallace-casey@gnb.ca

PARENT/GUARDIAN CONSENT:

I agree to my child __________________________ participating in this study.

(please print name of child)

Parent/guardian signature: __________________________ Date: __________

STUDENT ASSENT:

I agree to __________________________ participate in this study.

(please print your name)

Student signature: __________________________ Date: __________

If you would like a summary of the results of this research, please provide your mailing address below:

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick and is on file as REB 2012-141

Thank you very much. Please return this signed form to your child’s homeroom teacher, before December 21, 2012.
Parental Media Consent

Student Name: ____________________________

I hereby consent that all photographs, stills or videos, taken of my child/ward, ____________________________ (student name) for the research project Deepening Historical Consciousness Through Museum Fieldwork may be used for the purposes of research and public education.

Confidentiality: The information collected will be for research and educational purposes only and will be destroyed five years following the completion of the last publication relating to this research project. Your child will not be identified by name when information is analyzed, nor in any findings that are made public. Students' identities will be kept strictly confidential, and any identifiable features (i.e. faces, school emblems) will not be made public.

I understand that my child/ward's name and contact information will not be released, and their identity will be kept strictly confidential:

( ) I provide consent that my child/ward's image ONLY (no name or any identifiable features) be captured as part of this research project;

( ) I do not wish to have my child/ward's image captured as part of this research project;

Signature of parent/ legal guardian ____________________________ Date ____________________________

If you wish to contact someone not associated with this study to ask questions or raise concerns, please feel free to contact Dr. David Wagner, Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, UNB, dwagner@unb.ca, 506-447-3294. You are also welcome to contact the researcher or her supervisor:

Cynthia Wallace-Casey
PhD Candidate, Education
University of New Brunswick
(O) 453-2915; (H) 457-1237;
(Cell) 476-1905
t8cmarf@unb.ca or
Cynthia.wallace-casey@gnb.ca

Dr. Alan Sears
Professor, Faculty of Education
University of New Brunswick
(O) 453-5178
asears@unb.ca

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick and is on file as REB 2012-141

Thank you very much. Please return this signed form to your child's homeroom teacher, December 21, 2012.
Dear Museum Volunteer:

The purpose of this letter is to invite you to collaborate with me on my doctoral research. This research aims to provide a rich portrayal of how a heritage community can assist middle school students in developing their historical consciousness.

**Project Description:** This research involves exploring history education both inside and outside of the classroom. It also involves working collaboratively with students in a seventh-grade class to engage in the act of historical inquiry within the Fredericton Region Museum. I would like to invite you to become one of these participants.

As part of the regular classroom instruction, one seventh-grade class will have the opportunity to work with you, as well as three other volunteers, and be actively involved in four exciting months of history education research. Commencing in January 2013 and ending in April 2013, the study will unfold according to two specific phases of learning:

- Phase 1) Preparation and engagement in the museum fieldwork experience, both inside and outside of the classroom; and
- Phase 2) Re-interpretation of the museum fieldwork experience within the classroom.

During these phases of the research, data documentation will be collected from you in the form of a pre and post survey, four open-ended essay questions; principal investigator observations (both journal entries as well as photography); and a final debriefing group discussion.

**Time Commitment:** Volunteers who commit to participating in this research will spend approximately a total of 5 hours of their time (extended over a period of 16 weeks), completing the activities as outlined above, and working periodically with student participants (either in their class or in the museum).

**Objective:** The objective of this research is: to explore the link between historical thinking and historical consciousness at middle school level.
Benefits: This study will provide you with the opportunity to participate in the first Canadian inquiry of its kind that investigates how middle school students can do history in their local community museum. As a result, teachers and school administrators will be able to design more effective ways of teaching Canadian history in meaningful ways that involve community history museums. You will also be rewarded with the rich opportunity to work with a group of students over an extended period of study to help deepen their historical consciousness.

Risks: There are no real risks. Participants involved in the research will find it fun and interesting. In keeping with school policy, all adult participants will be required to provide proof of police clearance for association with the vulnerable sector, as well as validation of having studied and successfully completed New Brunswick’s Policy 701: Policy for the Protection of Pupils.

Confidentiality: The information we collect will be for research and educational purposes only and will be destroyed five years following the completion of the last publication relating to this research. You will not be identified by name when information is analyzed, nor in any findings that are made public. All participants will be given a code number and no names will appear in any research documents, including transcriptions of interviews. Images containing people will not be coded, so they will remain independent and unlinked to other data.

Participants’ identities will be kept strictly confidential. All research documents will be kept in a locked filing cabinet in room 119 of Marshall d’Avery Hall (University of New Brunswick). Research assistants will comply with the University of New Brunswick Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants, and will sign a confidentiality agreement.

I am very excited about this research, and hope that you can join me on this learning journey as a volunteer participant. Please be assured, however, you are under no obligation to participate, and, if you do choose to volunteer, you are free to withdraw at any time (taking your information with you). The plan for this study has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick, and is on file as REB 2012-141.

If you wish to contact someone not associated with this study to ask questions or raise concerns, please feel free to contact Dr. David Wagner, Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, UNB, dwagner@unb.ca, 506-447-3294. You are also welcome to contact me, or my supervisor, at any point of time to discuss any details:

Cynthia Wallace-Casey  
PhD Candidate, Education  
University of New Brunswick  
(O) 453-2915; (H) 457-1237; (Cell) 476-1905  
t8cmff@unb.ca or  
Cynthia.wallace-casey@gnb.ca

Yours sincerely,

Cynthia Wallace-Casey  
PhD Candidate  
Education, UNB

Dr. Alan Sears  
Professor, Faculty of Education  
University of New Brunswick  
(O) 453-5178  
asears@unb.ca
CONSENT FORM – ADULT MUSEUM VOLUNTEERS

Title of Project: Deepening Historical Consciousness Through Museum Fieldwork: Implications for Community-Based History Education

Researcher: Cynthia Wallace-Casey, PhD Candidate, Education, University of New Brunswick, (O) 506-453-2915, (H) 506-457-1237, (Cell) 476-1905 t8cmf@unb.ca or Cynthia.wallace-casey@gnb.ca

Volunteer Name: ____________________________

RESEARCH CONSENT:

I have read and understand the conditions under which I will participate in this study and give my consent to be a participant. I understand that I will keep one copy of this form for my records and another will be kept by the researcher.

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________

Researcher signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________

If you would like a summary of the results of this research, please provide your mailing address below:

______________________________

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick and is on file as REB 2012-141
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Museum Volunteer Media Consent

Volunteer Name: ________________________________

I hereby consent that all photographs, stills or videos, taken of me, (volunteer name) for the research project Deepening Historical Consciousness Through Museum Fieldwork may be used for the purposes of research and public education.

Confidentiality: The information collected will be for research and educational purposes only and will be destroyed five years following the completion of the last publication relating to this research project. You will not be identified by name when information is analyzed, nor in any findings that are made public. Participants' identities will be kept strictly confidential, and any identifiable features (i.e. faces, group emblems) will not be made public.

I understand that my name and contact information will not be released, and my identity will be kept strictly confidential:

(____) I do provide consent that any photographs, stills or videos taken of me be captured (without my name or any identifying features) as part of this research project;

(____) I do not wish to have any photographs, stills or videos taken of me as part of this research project;

Signature of volunteer participant ________________________________ Date __________

If you wish to contact someone not associated with this study to ask questions or raise concerns, please feel free to contact Dr. David Wagner, Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, UNB, dwagner@unb.ca, 506-447-3294. You are also welcome to contact the researcher or her supervisor:

Cynthia Wallace-Casey
PhD Candidate, Education
University of New Brunswick
(O) 453-22915; (H) 457-1237;
(CELL) 476-1905
t8cmf@unb.ca or
Cynthia.wallace-casey@gnb.ca

Dr. Alan Sears
Professor, Faculty of Education
University of New Brunswick
(O) 453-5178
asears@unb.ca

This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick and is on file as REB 2012-141
APPENDIX D: LETTER TO POLICE AUTHORITIES

Project Title: Deepening Historical Consciousness Through Museum Fieldwork: Implications for Community-Based History Education

Principal Investigator: Cynthia Wallace-Casey, PhD Candidate, Education, University of New Brunswick, (O) 506-453-2915, (H) 506-457-1237, (Cell) 476-1905 t8cmuf@unb.ca or Cynthia.wallace-casey@gnb.ca

Supervisor: Dr. Alan Sears, Professor, Faculty of Education, University of New Brunswick, 506-453-5178, asears@unb.ca

UNB Contact: Dr. David Wagner, Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, University of New Brunswick, 506-447-3294, dwagner@unb.ca

To Whom It May Concern: This letter is to certify that the applicant presenting this letter will be donating his/her time as a volunteer for a University of New Brunswick research project. He/she has consented to volunteering 5 hours of their time (extended over a period of 16 weeks), to work with a group of seventh-grade students - inside and outside of the classroom.

As a condition of their volunteer service, each adult participant is required to obtain a proof of police clearance for association with the vulnerable sector.

Project Description: This research involves exploring history education both inside and outside of the classroom. It also involves working collaboratively with students in a seventh-grade class to engage in the act of historical inquiry within the Fredericton Region Museum. I would like to invite you to become one of these participants.

As part of the regular classroom instruction, one seventh-grade class will have the opportunity to work with you, as well as three other volunteers, and be actively involved in four exciting months of history education research. Commencing in January 2013 and ending in April 2013, the study will unfold according to two specific phases of learning:

- Phase 1) Preparation and engagement in the museum fieldwork experience, both inside and outside of the classroom; and
- Phase 2) Re-interpretation of the museum fieldwork experience within the classroom.

During these phases of the research, data documentation will be collected from you in the form of a pre and post survey, four open-ended essay questions; principal investigator observations (both journal entries as well as photography); and a final debriefing group discussion.

Time Commitment: Volunteers who commit to participating in this research will spend approximately a total of 5 hours of their time (extended over a period of 16 weeks), completing the activities as outlined above, and working periodically with student participants (either in their class or in the museum).
**Objective:** The objective of this research is: to explore the link between historical thinking and historical consciousness at middle school level.

**Benefits:** This study will provide you with the opportunity to participate in the first Canadian inquiry of its kind that investigates how middle school students can do history in their local community museum. As a result, teachers and school administrators will be able to design more effective ways of teaching Canadian history in meaningful ways that involve community history museums. You will also be rewarded with the rich opportunity to work with a group of students over an extended period of study to help deepen their historical consciousness.

**Risks:** There are no real risks. Participants involved in the research will find it fun and interesting. In keeping with school policy, all adult participants will be required to provide proof of police clearance for association with the vulnerable sector, as well as validation of having studied and successfully completed New Brunswick’s *Policy 701: Policy for the Protection of Pupils.*

The plan for this study has been reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick, and is on file as REB 2012-141.

If you wish to contact someone not associated with this study to ask questions or raise concerns, please feel free to contact Dr. David Wagner, Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, UNB, dwagner@unb.ca, 506-447-3294. You are also welcome to contact me, or my supervisor, at any point of time to discuss any details:

Cynthia Wallace-Casey  
PhD Candidate, Education  
University of New Brunswick  
(O) 453-2915; (H) 457-1237; (Cell) 476-1905  
t8cmft@unb.ca or  
Cynthia.wallace-casey@gnb.ca

| Dr. Alan Sears  
| Professor, Faculty of Education  
| University of New Brunswick  
| (O) 453-5178  
| asears@unb.ca |

Yours sincerely,

Cynthia Wallace-Casey  
PhD Candidate  
Education, UNB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>Observable data (examination of the single artifact)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>Comparative data (comparison made with similar artifacts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td>Supplementary data (other sources of information introduced)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4:</td>
<td>Conclusions (comparisons made, single artifact examined, data obtained)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canadians and Their Pasts
This survey duplicates the large-scale national study "Canadians and Their Pasts", which was undertaken within Canada between 2006 and 2011. The groundbreaking research project was conducted on behalf of a number of Canadian historians, led by Dr. Jocelyn Létourneau (Université Laval). Funding was provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada.

The original PASTS survey was designed for three key purposes: to explore the importance ordinary Canadians ascribe to the past and history of their family, their country, and other aspects of their life; to inquire into the level of trust they have in various sources of historical information; and to document the way in which they engage with the past in their every day lives.

This duplicated version adheres to the same objectives, although some of the questions have been slightly modified in the interest of time. Access to the original survey can be found here: http://www.isr.yorku.ca/projects/pasts/survey.html

Welcome! This survey will take about 20 minutes of your time to complete.

There are 103 questions in this survey

Demographics:
1 Today’s Date *
2 Gender *
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Female
   o  Male

3 Age *
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Younger than 11 years
   o  11 to 14 years
   o  Older than 14 years
   o  Older than 55 years

Section A: General Interest in the Past
We'd like to start by asking you some questions about the past.

By "past" we mean everything from the very recent past to the very distant past, from your personal and family history to the history of Canada and other countries.

4 In general, how interested are you in history? *
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Very interested
   o  Somewhat interested
   o  Not very interested
   o  Not at all interested

5 How interested are you in your family’s history? *
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Very interested
   o  Somewhat interested
   o  Not very interested
   o  Not at all interested

6 How interested are you in Canada’s history? *
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Very interested
   o  Somewhat interested
   o  Not very interested
   o  Not at all interested

Section B: Activities Related to the Past
Now some questions about activities related to the past that you may have done.

7 During the last 12 months, have you looked at old photographs of buildings, places, family members, friends, and so on?*
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Yes
   o  No

"Old" means more than 10 years old. "Buildings" and "places" can be near to home or anywhere in the world. "Family members" includes immediate and extended family, e.g., grandparents, aunts and uncles, etc.
"Looked at" does NOT mean just happening to see pictures hanging on a wall as you pass by them, but rather ACTIVELY looking at and thinking about the pictures. Videos and slides can be included, too.

8 Have you looked at these old photographs as part of your classroom studies?*
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Yes
   o  No

"Old" means more than 10 years old. "Buildings" and "places" can be near to home or anywhere in the world. "Family members" includes immediate and extended family, e.g., grandparents, aunts and uncles, etc.
"Looked at" does NOT mean just happening to see pictures hanging on a wall as you pass by them, but rather ACTIVELY looking at and thinking about the pictures. Videos and slides can be included, too.

9 Can you please tell us about the last time you looked at these old photographs. For example, did you do this by yourself or with other people? Who were these people? What was the occasion?
   Please write your answer here:

10 Is there something important or meaningful that your family member or guardian is keeping to pass on to you, other family members, or close friends, as a reminder of your past?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Yes
   o  No

11 If yes, what is it?
   Please write your answer here:

12 If no, why not?
   Please write your answer here:

13 Is someone in your family (or extended family) preparing one (or more) of the following:
   Please choose all that apply:
   o  Family scrapbook
   o  Family Cookbook
   o  Keeping a diary
   o  Writing a family history
   o  Making home movies
   o  Other:

14 And why is this meaningful to you?
   Please write your answer here:

15 Now a question about watching movies, videos, DVDs or TV programs ABOUT THE PAST. This could include movies about a past event or a person, documentaries, biographies, dramas and so on. Have you watched any of these in the last 12 months?
   These movies or programs could be fictional or based on fact.
   Fictional work can be based on imagination or fact.
   Do NOT include movies or programs if they were part of your classroom studies, work or profession.
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Yes
   o  No

16 Have you watched any of these in the last 12 months - as part of your classroom studies?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Yes
   o  No

   These movies or programs could be fictional or based on fact.
   Fictional work can be based on imagination or fact.

17 If yes (to either questions above), how many?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  One
   o  Two or three
   o  Four or five
   o  More than five

18 In the last 12 months, have you used the Internet to look up or post information ABOUT THE PAST?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Yes
   o  No

   This includes looking up your family history, searching for information about an historical person, event or place, or posting information about these topics on the web.
   Do NOT include activities undertaken as part of your classroom studies, work or profession.

19 In the last 12 months, have you used the Internet to look up or post information ABOUT THE PAST - as part of your classroom studies?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Yes
   o  No

   This includes looking up your family history, searching for information about an historical person, event or place, or posting information about these topics on the web.

20 If yes, about how many times have you used the internet to explore the past in the last 12 months?
   Please choose only one of the following:
   o  Only once
   o  Two or three times
   o  Four or five times
   o  More than five times
21 What about playing HISTORY GAMES on video or on the computer. Have you played any computer HISTORY GAMES in the last 12 months?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

Video history games can be played on Xbox, PlayStation, etc.
Examples include Age of Empires, Civilization 1, 2, 3 and 4, games about WWII and Vietnam, and so on.
This includes online computer history games.

22 Have you played any computer HISTORY GAMES in the last 12 months - as part of your classroom studies?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

Video history games can be played on Xbox, PlayStation, etc.
Examples include Age of Empires, Civilization 1, 2, 3 and 4, games about WWII and Vietnam, and so on.
This includes online computer history games.

23 Now we want to ask about reading books ABOUT THE PAST. This includes books about historical events or persons, biographies and memoirs, historical novels and so on.
In the last 12 months have you read any books like this?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

The books could be fictional or based on fact.

24 In the last 12 months have you read any books about the past - as part of your classroom studies?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

The books could be fictional or based on fact.

25 If yes, about how many of these kinds of books have you read in the last 12 months?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o One
  o Two or three
  o Four or five
  o More than five

26 During the last 12 months, have you visited any museums in Canada or elsewhere?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

Including visiting museums anywhere in the world, and ALL kinds of museums whether they are large urban museums or small rural museums, etc.

27 During the last 12 months, have you visited any museums in Canada or elsewhere - as part of your classroom studies?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

Including visiting museums anywhere in the world, and ALL kinds of museums whether they are large urban museums or small rural museums, etc.

28 How many times have you gone to museums in the last 12 months?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Once
  o Two or three times
  o Four or five times
  o More than five times
  o Never

29 Now a question about visiting historic sites. Historic sites include pioneer villages, forts, cultural and archeological sites, monuments, aboriginal heritage sites, and so on. Have you visited any of these places in the last 12 months?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

Includes visiting historic sites anywhere in the world. Also includes historic farms, battlefields, ruins and memorials.

30 Have you visited any of these places in the last 12 months - as part of your classroom studies?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

31 How many times have you visited these places in the last 12 months?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Once
  o Two or three times
  o Four or five times
  o More than five times
  o Never

32 What about places from your family’s past that may have special meaning to you (and your family), such as an old house or neighbourhood, a family farm, a cemetery or burial ground, schools, old fishing or hunting places, and so on. Have you been to any of these places in the last 12 months?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

Do NOT include your current home or property.

33 During the last 12 months, have you worked on your family tree or completed any other genealogical research?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

34 During the last 12 months, have you worked on your family tree or completed any other genealogical research - part of your classroom studies?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

35 Have you written to or visited a public archive, or looked up information on an archive's web site, over the past 12 months?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

An archive is a place that holds documents related to the past.

36 Over the past 12 months, have you written to or visited a public archive, or looked up information on an archive's web site - as part of your classroom studies?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

An archive is a place that holds documents related to the past.

37 Over the last 12 months, have you done any OTHER activities related to the past, such as crafts, hobbies or collections, or taken part in groups which study or preserve the past, and so on?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

CRAFTS includes such things as collecting stamps, electric trains, old quilts and cookbooks, etc.
GROUPS includes such things as historical re-enactments and theatre, music and dance performances designed to preserve traditional culture.
Does NOT include just paying dues or making a donation, must involve ACTIVELY taking part in this activity.

38 Over the last 12 months, have you done any of these activities (crafts, hobbies or collections, or taken part in groups which study or preserve the past, and so on) - as part of your classroom studies?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Yes
  o No

CRAFTS includes such things as collecting stamps, electric trains, old quilts and cookbooks, etc.
GROUPS includes such things as historical re-enactments and theatre, music and dance performances designed to preserve traditional culture.
Does NOT include just paying dues or making a donation, must involve ACTIVELY taking part in this activity.

39 If yes, can you tell us about these activities or events? What was the activity or event about? Did it relate to you and your family?
  How?

Please write your answer here:

Section C: Understanding the Past

We would now like to ask how the activities you do that are related to the past help you to understand the past, understand yourself, and help you to feel connected to the past.

By the past, we mean everything from the very recent past, to the very distant past, from your personal and family history, to the history of Canada and other countries.

40 When you look at old photographs of buildings, places, family members, friends, and so on ... does this make you feel:
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o Very connected to the past
  o Somewhat connected to the past
  o Makes no difference
  o It depends
  o Don't know

41 When you look at old photographs of buildings, places, family members, friends, and so on ... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
  Please choose only one of the following:
  o A great deal
  o A lot
  o Some
  o A little bit
  o Not at all
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42 When you look at old photographs of buildings, places, family members, friends, and so on ... how much does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

43 When you watch movies, videos, DVD's or TV programs ... how much does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

44 When you watch movies, videos, DVD's or TV programs ... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don't know

45 When you watch movies, videos, DVD's or TV programs ... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

46 When you use the internet ... how much does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

47 When you use the internet ... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don't know

48 When you use the internet ... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

49 When you play video or computer HISTORY GAMES ... how much does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

50 When you play video or computer HISTORY GAMES ... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don't know

51 When you play video or computer HISTORY GAMES ... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

52 When you read books about the past ... how much does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

53 When you read books about the past ... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

54 When you read books about the past ... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don't know

55 When you visit museums ... how much does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

56 When you visit museums ... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don't know

57 When you visit museums ... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

58 When you visit historic sites ... how much does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

59 When you visit historic sites ... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don't know

60 When you visit historic sites ... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

61 When you visit places from your family's past ... how much does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

62 When you visit places from your family's past ... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all
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63 When you visit places from your family’s past ... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don’t know

64 When you research your family’s history... how much does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

65 When you research your family’s history... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

66 When you research your family’s history... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don’t know

67 When you do historic crafts, or collect old things... How does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

68 When you do historic crafts, or collect old things... How does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

69 When you do historic crafts, or collect old things... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don’t know

70 When you go to lectures and presentations by organizations like the York-Sunbury Historical Society... How does this help you to understand the past?
Please choose only one of the following:
- A great deal
- A lot
- Some
- A little bit
- Not at all

71 When you go to lectures and presentations by organizations like the York-Sunbury Historical Society... how much does this help you to understand who you are?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don’t know

72 When you go to lectures and presentations by organizations like the York-Sunbury Historical Society... does this make you feel:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very connected to the past
- Somewhat connected to the past
- Makes no difference
- It depends
- Don’t know

73 Now we would like you to think about a time IN YOUR LIFE when a person, event, or something else about the past might have been very important or very meaningful to you. Is there a time like this that you can tell us about?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
This may have been something dramatic, memorable, something that changed your life, etc. It may be a positive or negative experience.

74 If yes, please tell us about this time, person or event
Please write your answer here:

75 When you studied HISTORY at school, was there a teacher, class or event that you found particularly interesting?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
We are asking about history teachers, classes, or events related to your studies in history.

76 If yes, could you tell us who or what that was?
Please write your answer here:

77 Was this a teacher at an elementary school, middle school, high school, college or university?
Please choose only one of the following:
- Elementary school (grades 1 to 6)
- Middle school (grades 7 to 8)
- High school (grades 9 to 12)
- College
- University
- Other

Section D: Trustworthiness of Sources of Information about the Past
Now some questions regarding how trustworthy, in general, different sources of information ABOUT THE PAST are for you.

78 What about school history teachers (includes teachers at any level)? In general, would you say they are:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very trustworthy
- Somewhat trustworthy
- Not very trustworthy
- Not at all trustworthy
- Depends on the teacher
- Don’t know

79 What about family stories? In general, would you say they are:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very trustworthy
- Somewhat trustworthy
- Not very trustworthy
- Not at all trustworthy
- Depends on who is telling the story, giving the oral history, the topic, etc.
- Don’t know
Family stories can include "oral histories." By oral history we mean historical information that is passed from person to person, from one generation to the next.

80 What about internet web sites? In general, would you say they are:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very trustworthy
- Somewhat trustworthy
- Not very trustworthy
- Not at all trustworthy
- Depends on the web site, topics covered, etc.
- Don’t know

81 What about information provided in fact-based history books? In general, would you say they are:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very trustworthy
- Somewhat trustworthy
- Not very trustworthy
- Not at all trustworthy
- Depends on the book, author, subject, etc.
- Don’t know

82 What about museums? In general, would you say they are:
Please choose only one of the following:
- Very trustworthy
- Somewhat trustworthy
- Not very trustworthy
- Not at all trustworthy
- Depends on museum, material presented, etc.
- Don’t know
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83 What about information provided at historic sites such as the information on plaques, written materials, and so on? In general, would you say it is:

Please choose only one of the following:
- Very trustworthy
- Somewhat trustworthy
- Not very trustworthy
- Not at all trustworthy
- Depends on the historical site, who prepare the materials, etc.
- Don’t know

84 Of these sources of information about the past, which is the most trustworthy? *

Please choose only one of the following:
- School history teacher
- Family stories
- Internet web sites
- Fact-based history books
- Museums
- Historic sites

85 Can you please tell us why you consider your most trustworthy source to be so very trustworthy?

Please write your answer here:

86 People do not always agree about what happened in the past. When people disagree about something that happened in the past, how do you think they can find out what is most likely to have really happened?

Please write your answer here:

87 Can you think of any time when you tried to find out what is most likely to have really happened in the past?

Please write your answer here:

Section E: The Importance of Various Pasts

Next, we’d like to ask you about some areas of history and the past that might be important to you.

For each, please tell us if it is very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not at all important to you.

88 How important is the past of your family to you? *

Please choose only one of the following:
- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not at all important

89 How important is the past of your ethnic or cultural group? *

Please choose only one of the following:
- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not at all important
- I do not identify with a particular ethnic or cultural group

90 How important is the past of New Brunswick to you? *

Please choose only one of the following:
- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not at all important

91 How important is the past of Canada to you?

Please choose only one of the following:
- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not at all important

92 Is there a particular region of Canada that you identify with or feel a part of?

Please choose only one of the following:
- Yes
- No

93 If yes, what is this region?

Please write your answer here:

94 If yes, how important is the past of this region to you?

Please choose only one of the following:
- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not at all important

95 Were you born in Canada?

Please choose only one of the following:
- Yes
- No

96 How important is the past of the country where you were born?

Please choose only one of the following:
- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not at all important

97 Are there any other places, or groups of people, related to the past that are very important to you? Please tell us about this past:

Please write your answer here:

98 Which of the following pasts is MOST important to you?

Please choose only one of the following:
- My family
- My ethnic or cultural group
- My province of New Brunswick
- My country Canada
- My region of Canada - Atlantic Canada
- My country where I was born
- Other

99 Can you please tell us why this past is most important to you?

Please write your answer here:

Section F: The Sense of the Past

Now a few questions on your views about history and the past.

100 First, please tell us which of the following two statements comes CLOSEST to describing you.

1. You think about history and the past as part of your everyday life; OR
2. You mostly think about history and the past when you go to museums or see a documentary, and so on? *

Please choose only one of the following:
- Statement 1: You think about history as part of your everyday life.
- Statement 2: You mostly think about history when you go to museums or see a documentary film.
- Both statements reflect what I think about history.
- Neither is close to what I think about history.

101 People believe different things about history and the past and the way the world has changed over time. Some people believe things have improved over time, others think things have become worse, or that there has not really been that much change. What do you think?

Have things improved, become worse, or stayed the same over time? *

Please choose only one of the following:
- Things have improved
- Things have become worse
- Not much has changed
- Some things have gotten better, some things have gotten worse

102 Could you please tell us what kinds of things have improved, and what has become worse?

Please write your answer here:

103 Some people think it is important for the next generation to know about history and the past. What is it about history and the past that you think should be handed down to the next generation?

Please write your answer here:

It could be anything, from your personal past to the past of your community or even the world. Just anything that you think, in any aspect of life, that should be handed down to the next generation.

Thank you for completing this survey.
**Appendix G: Instructional Outline for Phases 1, 2 & 3 of the Community History Museum Fieldwork Experience**

**Deepening Historical Consciousness through Museum Fieldwork**

**Implications for Community-Based History Education – Phases 1, 2 & 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 11, 2013</td>
<td>Lucy &amp; Murray</td>
<td>Post Q&amp;A: “Tell me about your life in 1800s”</td>
<td>Research question: “What was life like in British North America?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40 – 10:40</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>How to read a shoe; Journals</td>
<td>Historical space mapping; Historic space map of the museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 2013</td>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Review; Sources and evidence-Organizing</td>
<td>Historic space mapping; Historic space map of the museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55 – 11:55</td>
<td>Mary &amp; Murray</td>
<td>Q&amp;A: “Tell me about your life in 1800s”</td>
<td>Research question: “What was life like in British North America?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 18, 2013</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>How to read a shoe; Journals</td>
<td>Historical space mapping; Historic space map of the museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55 – 11:55</td>
<td>Lucy &amp; Murray</td>
<td>Review; Sources and evidence-Organizing</td>
<td>Historic space mapping; Historic space map of the museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 2013</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Assignments to students</td>
<td>Sources and evidence-Organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40 – 10:40</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Describe the museum cold</td>
<td>Sources and evidence; Historic space mapping; Historic space map of the museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 25, 2013</td>
<td>Mary &amp; Murray</td>
<td>Review; Sources and evidence-Organizing</td>
<td>Historic space mapping; Historic space map of the museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:55 – 11:55</td>
<td>Lucy &amp; Murray</td>
<td>Prepare for the history cold; Journals</td>
<td>Sources and evidence; Historic space mapping; Historic space map of the museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2013</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Research question: “What was life like in British North America?”</td>
<td>Sources and evidence; Historic space mapping; Historic space map of the museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40 – 10:40</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Describe the museum cold; 1800s British North America in the research question: “What was life like in British North America?”</td>
<td>Sources and evidence; Historic space mapping; Historic space map of the museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Teaching Props**

- 7 shoes
- Textbook
- Journals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Two:</th>
<th>Phase Two:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 31</strong></td>
<td><strong>February 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9:40 – 10:40</strong></td>
<td><strong>10:55 – 11:55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia + Mary</td>
<td>Cynthia + Mary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Museum visit**

- **Photovoice Preparation**
  - Project themes:
  - Group work: Material history analysis: Photographs of research artifacts; choosing artifacts to photograph; students asking questions about what they did or didn’t see; museum visitor!

**Phase Two**

**Photovoice Fieldwork (1)**

- **Exploring the museum collection**;
- **Examine objects and exhibits more carefully**;
- **Documenting the collection with cameras**;
- **Posing questions to obtain information for their projects**;
- **More cameras (8) – Need extra**;
- **Journals and pencils; clipboards**;
- **Digital cameras (7) – Project checklist sheets**;
- **Historic space map**;
- **More extra cameras (for group)**;
- **Photovoice Fieldwork (1)**;

**Phase One**

- **Formulating Probing Questions**;
- **Photovoice Group Work: Material History Analysis**;
- **Sources and evidence organizing strategy**;
- **Photovoice: Organizing artifact snapshots**;
- **Selecting an artifact**;
- **Group work: Material history analysis (‘What’ questions)**

**Phase One**

- **Formulating Probing Questions**;
- **Photovoice Group Work: Material History Analysis**;
- **Sources and evidence organizing strategy**;
- **Photovoice: Organizing artifact snapshots**;
- **Selecting an artifact**;
- **Group work: Material history analysis (‘What’ questions)**

**Phase One**

- **Formulating Probing Questions**;
- **Photovoice Group Work: Material History Analysis**;
- **Sources and evidence organizing strategy**;
- **Photovoice: Organizing artifact snapshots**;
- **Selecting an artifact**;
- **Group work: Material history analysis (‘What’ questions)**

**Phase One**

- **Formulating Probing Questions**;
- **Photovoice Group Work: Material History Analysis**;
- **Sources and evidence organizing strategy**;
- **Photovoice: Organizing artifact snapshots**;
- **Selecting an artifact**;
- **Group work: Material history analysis (‘What’ questions)**

**Phase One**

- **Formulating Probing Questions**;
- **Photovoice Group Work: Material History Analysis**;
- **Sources and evidence organizing strategy**;
- **Photovoice: Organizing artifact snapshots**;
- **Selecting an artifact**;
- **Group work: Material history analysis (‘What’ questions)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journals and pencils; Students' snapshots; Sources and evidence organizing strategy; Material history analysis worksheet; Volunteer resource people; Exhibition Web Worksheet; Digital cameras (7); Need one digital camera (for 4th person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13</td>
<td>1:40 - 2:40</td>
<td>Historical thinking concept - Sources and evidence; Introduction: Artifact label writing assignment (artifact label writing assignment due Feb 21); Material history analysis - Observable data combined into statement (&quot;What&quot;, &quot;Where&quot;, &quot;When&quot;, &quot;Who&quot;, and &quot;Why&quot;&quot;); Practise writing cameras more efficiently (did not have enough time for this)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journals and pencils; Students' snapshots; Sources and evidence organizing strategy; Material history analysis worksheet; Photovoice Fieldwork (2); Cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Museum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>10:55 - 11:55</td>
<td>Photovoice Fieldwork (2); Material history analysis - Observable data; Mapping the exhibition narrative (thinking like the curator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journals and pencils; Clipboards; Material history analysis worksheet; Exhibition Web Worksheet; Digital cameras (7) - Need one digital camera (for 4th person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Museum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G: Instructional Outline for Phases 1, 2 & 3 of the Community History Museum Fieldwork Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Materials/HANDOUTS</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>February 22</td>
<td>10:55 - 11:55</td>
<td>Museum narrating on paper; Historic Space Map of the Museum; Exhibition Web Work and Resource Books</td>
<td>Presentations on Friday; 5W Observations (1st Draft); Material History Analysis Worksheet Journals and Portfolio</td>
<td>Student Presentations; Student Artifact Presentations; Peers and Museum Volunteers provide feedback; Retakes for Photos; Digital Cameras (7) - Need one extra camera for 4th person in some groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>February 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Material History Analysis for Artifact Label Writing Assignment</td>
<td>Material History Analysis Worksheets; Journals and Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>10:55 - 11:55</td>
<td>Historic Space Map; Map the Exhibition Narrative (Museum exhibit historic space map); Journals and Portfolio</td>
<td>Presentations; Articulate the Exhibitor's Experience; Material History Analysis Worksheets; Exh. Web Worksheet (Feb 15); Historic Space Map of the Museum Narrative (on paper); Markers</td>
<td>Student Presentations; Student Artifact Presentations; Peers and Museum Volunteers provide feedback; Retakes for Photos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX G: INSTRUCTIONAL OUTLINE FOR PHASES 1, 2 & 3 OF THE COMMUNITY HISTORY MUSEUM FIELDWORK EXPERIENCE

#### Phase Three:

- **March 15**
  - 10:55–11:55
  - **Cynthia + Cooperating Teacher**
  - Material history analysis – Comparable data; Photovoice Project planning – Exhibit concept mapping & research questions;
  - Review – Museum exhibit historic space mapping; Museum project assignment III introduced; Analysis of comparable artifact snapshots; Exhibit concept mapping; Formulating project research questions;
  - Conclusions; Material history analysis – Exhibit concept map; Museum project assignment II;
  - Post-it notes; Students' snapshots; Markers/glue sticks etc.; Message & means worksheet; Sample exhibition design plan; Museum project criteria;
  - Reference books; Journals and portfolio (of work to date);
  - Additional museum artifacts;

- **March 22**
  - 10:55–11:55
  - **Cynthia + Cooperating Teacher**
  - Material history analysis – Contextual data; Review – Research questions;
  - Contextual Internet Research Computer lab Journals and portfolio (of work to date); Material History Analysis Grid;
  - Historic space map (take down);

- **March 25**
  - 10:55–11:55
  - **Cynthia + Cooperating Teacher**
  - Additional computer lab time;
  - Material history analysis – Contextual data; Internet Research Worksheet Journals and portfolio (of work to date);
  - Material History Analysis Grid;

- **March 27**
  - 1:40–2:40
  - **Cynthia + Cooperating Teacher**
  - Photovoice Museum project planning – Student exhibit concept map;
  - Material history analysis – Conclusions; Review; Museum project work: Mapping their exhibit in detail;
  - Teacher Cooperating Museum planning – Exhibit concept;
  - Reference books; Journals and portfolio (of work to date); Museum Project Criteria;
  - Sample exhibition design plan; Message & means worksheet Markers, gluesticks etc.; Students' snapshots; Post-it notes;
### APPENDIX G: INSTRUCTIONAL OUTLINE FOR PHASES 1, 2 & 3 OF THE COMMUNITY HISTORY MUSEUM FIELDWORK EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>10:55</td>
<td>11:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td>Cynthia + Cooperating Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Phase 1: Photovoice Museum Project Work
- **April 8-26**
  - Students' snapshots
  - Markers, glue sticks, etc.
  - Identity labels, labels, etc.
  - Message & means worksheet
  - Museum project criteria
  - Journals and portfolio (of work to date)

#### Phase 2: Establishing the Exhibit
- **April 15-19**
  - Preparing storyboards
  - Interviewing sources
  - Mounting images
  - Conducting think alouds
  - Establishing exhibit storylines
  - Project work: Establishing exhibit storylines
  - Responsibility program & boards: Prepare project work project
  - Museum label examples

#### Phase 3: Project Work
- **April 23**
  - Writing a statement of significance
  - Completing museum projects
  - Journals and portfolio (of work to date)

---

**Note:**
- The table above outlines the activities for each phase of the museum project work. Each phase includes specific tasks and materials required for each day.

---

**Appendix G:** Instructional Outline for Phases 1, 2 & 3 of the Community History Museum Fieldwork Experience
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project/Assignment Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 25</td>
<td>Completing projects; Journals and portfolio (of work to date); Students’ snapshots; Markers, glue sticks etc.; Statement of historical significance; Message &amp; means worksheet; Museum Project Criteria;</td>
<td>Teacher + Cynthia Cooperating</td>
<td>Museum project assignment III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26</td>
<td>Completing projects; Journals and portfolio (of work to date); Students’ snapshots; Markers, glue sticks etc.; Statement of historical significance; Message &amp; means worksheet; Museum Project Criteria;</td>
<td>Teacher + Cynthia Cooperating</td>
<td>Museum project assignment III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27</td>
<td>Completing projects; Journals and portfolio (of work to date); Students’ snapshots; Markers, glue sticks etc.; Statement of historical significance; Message &amp; means worksheet; Museum Project Criteria;</td>
<td>Teacher + Cynthia Cooperating</td>
<td>Museum project assignment III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29</td>
<td>Designing invitations; Completing projects; Journals and portfolio (of work to date); Students’ snapshots; Markers, glue sticks etc.; Statement of historical significance; Message &amp; means worksheet; Museum Project Criteria;</td>
<td>Teacher + Cynthia Cooperating</td>
<td>Museum project assignment III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates activity taking place in the museum
Indicates activity taking place in the classroom

April 30: Exhibition Day for students’ projects; Museum Project assignment III due.
Looking for Evidence in the Museum
January 18, 2013

What was life like in British North America in the 1800’s?
Doing History with Objects

Museum objects have much to reveal (when one knows how to read them)…Discover how museums document their collections by using a material history framework of inquiry.

This method, which relies essentially upon artifact observation, involves extending the inquiry to other sources of information.

Attached is an analysis grid, which can be used to read objects. It is accompanied by a series of exploratory questions\(^1\), intended to help identify the observable properties of any artifact, make comparisons, and establish a broader context of time and place.

In this way, material historians are able to make claims about the past that are based upon evidence drawn from artifact sources.

**1. WHAT?**

What are the properties of your artifact?

Possible questions:

1. What is the accession number?
2. What materials were used to produce the artifact?
3. How was the artifact produced and finished?
4. What methods of production (and tools) were required to produce that artifact?
5. Does the artifact bear any markings or inscriptions?
6. Is the artifact a copy?
7. Why was the artifact produced?
8. What is it for?
9. How was it used?

**Summary:**

What does this tell you about your research topic?

---

2. WHERE?

Where is your artifact from?

Possible questions:

1. Where was your artifact produced?
2. Where was it used?
3. Where was it found?

**Summary:**

What does this tell you about your research topic?

---

3. WHEN?

What was your artifact's journey through time?

Possible questions:

1. When was your artifact produced?
2. When was your artifact used?
3. When was your artifact found?

**Summary:**

What does this tell you about your research topic?
4. WHO?

With what people is your artifact connected?

Possible questions:

1. Who produced your artifact?
2. Who used it? Why?
3. Who kept it? Why?

Summary:

What does this tell you about your research topic?

5. WHY?

What does your artifact mean?

Possible questions:

1. What values were given to your artifact?
2. By those who made it?
3. By those who used it?
4. By those who saved it?
5. Why does the museum keep this artifact?
6. What is the significance of this artifact in light of local, regional, or national history?

Summary:

What does this tell you about your research topic?
# Material History Analysis Grid

**Research Topic:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Grid</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Analysis Steps

**Step 1:** Observable data
- **What:** What can you see?

**Step 2:** Comparable data
- **What:** What can you compare?
- **How:** Does it compare?

**Step 3:** Contextual data
- **What:** What can you add?

**Step 4:** Summary
- **What:** What can you infer?

**What are you still uncertain about?**

---

**APPENDIX H: SCAFFOLDING TOOLS - MATERIAL HISTORY ANALYSIS GRID**
Classroom Museum Project – Life in British North America in the 1800’s

Research Question: ____________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Observable Data**  
(that answers the research question) |         |       |
| **Comparable Data**  
(that answers the research question) |         |       |
| **Contextual Data**  
(that answers the research question) |         |       |

Statement of Significance:
Classroom Museum Objective: Working as a classroom unit, you are a member of a curatorial research team developing a museum exhibition about Life in British North America in the 1800’s.

Over the next seven weeks, each member of the research team has a specific mission to develop an interesting and informative exhibit for the classroom museum.

This mission includes the following components of museum curatorship:

- Develop a museum storyline (March 15);
- Develop a research question for each exhibit unit (March 15);
- Research a specific museum artifact (March 22 and 27);
- Plan and design the exhibits (March 27);
- Write museum labels for a museum audience (April 5);
- Construct the exhibits (April 12 – 26);
- Organise a Museum Opening for April 30 (6:30 pm);
- Present your exhibits to a visiting public (April 30).

Exhibit topics about Life in British North America in the 1800’s:

- Lifestyle of Acadians in New Brunswick in the 1800’s.
- New Brunswick’s Role in the War of 1812
- Lifestyle of the Loyalist Elite (“Family Compact”) in Georgetown in the 1800’s.
- First Nation (Wolastokquiyik, Mi’kmaq, and/or Passamaquoddy) Lifestyles in the 1800’s
- Alexander “Boss” Gibson, Commerce, and the Lifestyle of Workers in Margaretville
- A British Soldier’s Lifestyle in Georgetown in the 1800’s.
- Rural Life and Farming in New Brunswick in the 1800’s

Tasks - March 27, 2013:

1. Sort and select the images you would like to include in your exhibit unit;
2. Map out a concept storyline;
3. Establish at least 3 objectives – with Messages – and Means
4. How will you present these in your exhibit? (add these notes to your concept map)
Classroom Museum Project – Life in British North America in the 1800’s

Criteria for assessment¹:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a limited degree</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understood my research question before beginning my project, and tried to answer it as I did my research.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stayed focused on my research question</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gathered information about my artifact source and used a material history framework to analyze this evidence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recognized where I needed more evidence and looked for additional sources to compare and contextualise my artifact.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recorded any additional information references.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis of Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I described all of the key details from my artifact source.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I included at least three references to comparative artifacts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I analyzed the possible purpose and values of the creator(s) of my sources (author, photographer, etc.).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I drew conclusions about how these sources answered my questions and what they did not tell me.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wrote notes in my own words and did not copy directly unless I quoted the reference source.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Source: *The big six historical thinking concepts* (Seixas & Morton, 2013); adapted from D’Acquisto, L. (2006). *Learning on display: Student-created museums that build understanding* (p. 92-93)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I drew thoughtful conclusions about my inquiry based on a review of my research findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I evaluated how well my research conclusions answered my research question.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I developed a statement of historical significance for my artifact.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content and Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My exhibit title communicates the big ideas of my exhibit and captures visitors’ attention.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My title engages viewers because it relates to their personal experience, asks a provocative question, or includes a quotation that draws them into the content.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My artifact description is written in the format of an artifact label that is organized around a summary statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each of my paragraphs draws the attention of viewers to key elements of the source and helps them understand the big idea of my exhibit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Label Writing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My artifact label identifies the name of the artifact in the label title.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within my label I respond to the 5 W’s of: What, Where, When, Who, and Why</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing is grammatically correct.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I included the artifact accession number in the lower right corner of each artifact label.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I created a storyline for visitor learning about my exhibit</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I presented my research findings to the visiting public.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I compiled a portfolio of my research notes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 3, 2012

Cynthia Wallace-Casey
Department of Education
University of New Brunswick
UNBF - Campus Mail!

Dear Dr. Wallace-Casey:

RE: Deepening Historical Consciousness Through Museum Fieldwork: Implications for Community-Based History Education,
    REB File # 2012-141

The above project is approved as submitted.

Approval is valid for a period of three years from this date.

The Board requires annual reports and a brief report at the completion of the Project.

Although your application was processed via Expedited Review, for your information we are providing a list of current Research Ethics Board members.

Sincerely,

R. Steven Turner, Chair
Research Ethics Board

REB Members: Maurice Gallant, Community Representative
Barbara Burnett, Community Representative
Jeff Landine, Faculty of Education
Patricia Seaman, Faculty of Nursing
Chris McGibbon, Faculty of Kinesiology
Jula Hughes, Faculty of Law
R. Steven Turner (Chair), Faculty of Arts, Department of History
Renée Audet-Martel, REB Coordinator
CURRICULUM VITAE

Cynthia Dawn Wallace-Casey

Universities attended:
2009 – 2015 PhD candidate in Education, University of New Brunswick
2014 Historical Thinking Summer Institute (July), University of British Columbia
2011 Project Zero Classroom Summer Institute (July), Harvard
1993 Master of Arts (Material History), University of New Brunswick
1982 Bachelor of Arts, University of New Brunswick

Publications:
Articles Published (Peer reviewed)

Articles Submitted for Consideration (Peer reviewed)

Articles Published (Editor Reviewed)

Conference presentations (Refereed contributions)
(2014) "Re-imaging heritage communities: An exploration of how community museums can assist middle school students in deepening their historical consciousness." Atlantic Canada Studies Conference, Fredericton, Saint Thomas University, May 2, 2014.


Conference presentations (Non-refereed contributions)


