PERFORMANCE, LEARNING & HERITAGE

A research project funded by the Arts & Humanities Research Council

July 2005 - November 2008

APPENDICES
November 2008

PERFORMANCE, LEARNING AND HERITAGE

Original title:
Performance as a Medium of Learning in Museums and at Heritage Sites – an investigation

APPENDICES

Written and compiled by
Anthony Jackson & Jenny Kidd
with members of the research team

Website for the Performance, Learning and Heritage research project, including access to the Project Database:
http://www.plh.manchester.ac.uk

Appendices

A. Scheme of research – extract from original application to AHRC, May 2004
[Note. Not included in the printed version.]

B. Detailed 'data trawls' for the four main case studies
*[Note. **These are large sections in separate PDF files**. If they are to be downloaded from the website edition, they should be done so separately. They are not included in the printed version.]*

B.1 The National Maritime Museum
B.2 Llancaiach Fawr Manor
B.3 Triangle Theatre Company/Herbert Art Gallery & Museum
B.4 The Manchester Museum

C. Case study research designs
[Note. Not included in the printed version.]

C.1 The National Maritime Museum
C.2 Llancaiach Fawr Manor
C.3 Triangle Theatre Company/Herbert Art Gallery & Museum
C.4 The Manchester Museum

D. Participant code breakdown

E. List of sites visited and organisations consulted

F. List of events in which research team members have participated

G. Dissemination

H. References

APPENDIX A

Extract from original application to AHRC (May 2004)

"Performance as a medium of learning in museums and at heritage sites – an Investigation"

(Now titled for operational and dissemination/website purposes: "Performance, Learning and Heritage")

AHRC Reference: B/RG/AN2200/APN19281

Scheme of research

This project constitutes Stage Three of a larger research programme into theatre in museums that began in 2000, continued (with AHRB support) in 2001/2 and aims to complete in Summer 2008. The successful inter-disciplinary and teamwork approach already established will be developed further through the active collaboration of colleagues in the fields of Drama, Art Gallery & Museum Studies, and professional museum practice. Their collective expertise includes research in theatre-in-education and museum education, professional museum evaluation and museum/historic-site interpretation. Based in the Drama Department's well-established and internationally-known Centre for Applied Theatre Research, the study will also benefit from close collaboration with the Centre for Museology (director, Helen Rees Leahy, originally a co-applicant, will continue to be a key member of the enlarged research team) and with the recently-enlarged Manchester Museum, an integral part of the university, committed to promoting research and learning within and beyond the museum.

Research questions or problems
1. How effective is the deployment of various styles of dramatic performance at museums and heritage sites in meeting – or challenging – the learning, access, and 'social inclusion' objectives of the host organisations?
2. If (as the earlier research demonstrated) museum theatre is a valuable means of supporting learning through complex cognitive and affective engagement among organised groups of schoolchildren, can it be similarly effective in supporting learning among *independent visitors* (including cross-generational groups)?
3. If Museum Theatre may best be understood as part of a spectrum of performative learning in museums – including role play, guided tours, etc – what are its distinctive features and strengths? When does it work – and when does it not? By drawing comparisons between different styles of dramatic performance across a range of sites, is it possible to extrapolate general conclusions (e.g. in relation to performance techniques, site-specificity and actor-visitor interaction) for wider application?
4. Are there differences between the effectiveness of theatre used in museums (in relation to collections) and at heritage sites (in relation to historic buildings/environments)? If so, what are they?
5. Can theatre be used to interpret collections more effectively than at present? How might the research be deployed to develop innovative approaches, and how might these be analysed and assessed?

Aims
1. to investigate and deepen understanding of the contribution that theatre and related performance techniques make to the experience of visitors to museums and heritage sites
2. to consider the effectiveness and appropriateness of different styles of museum theatre/performance in relation to the contexts of specific sites, institutional learning strategies and wider public policy agenda
3. to promote and evaluate innovative practice in museum theatre

Objectives – by the end of the research, to have:
i. investigated and compared performance practice at a further two museums and one heritage

site

ii. investigated and compared the experiences of organised school groups (primary & secondary) and the independent visitor or family group (in the context of 'lifelong learning')

iii. observed, documented and analysed a variety of performance styles in relation to their site-specific contexts

iv. initiated, analysed and assessed the value of, one experiment in innovative practice at a museum

v. developed and applied a number of qualitative research methods in relation to museum performance and visitor response

vi. facilitated the wider exchange of ideas and practice in Museum Theatre between scholars and practitioners through an international conference.

Research context

The field known generically as Museum Theatre has grown considerably during the past two decades, its use is sometimes contentious and its practice worldwide almost as diverse as the sites in which it takes place – but it is notably under-researched. Broadly defined as the use of theatre and theatrical techniques as a means of mediating knowledge and understanding in the context of museum education, it is generally presented by professional actors and/or interpreters in museums or at historic sites and may range from performances of short plays/monologues based on historical events or on-site exhibitions, to interactive events using 'first person' interpretation or role-play; it may be designed for the curriculum needs of visiting schoolchildren or for family groups and/or the independent visitor.

Theories of learning have recently advanced our understanding of how and in what forms learning in museums takes place, but, despite evaluation of individual programmes now being standard practice among museum educators, there is, to date, relatively little published on how theatre/performance contributes to that learning. In this context, there is a pressing need for **sustained, independent and practical research** into the benefits (or otherwise) of on-site, theatre-based, informal learning activities at museums and heritage sites – a need that our Stage 2 research amply confirmed, as did the considerable interest the research outcomes generated in the UK, USA, Eire, Finland, Italy and Australia. The rationale for extending the research was also endorsed in the AHRB evaluators' assessment of our final Stage 2 report. This project will therefore build on, and expand from, the limited but significant findings that emerged from the earlier research – e.g. the demonstrable ways in which performance was able to enhance children's recall and grasp of the personal stories connected to the historical material being studied; and its capacity to promote 'focused looking' at the exhibits. Applying and testing theories of learning based on constructivist and social/participatory models (Gardner, Hein, Hooper-Greenhill, Kolb, Vygotsky; the Museums, Libraries & Archives Council's 'Inspiring Learning for All' initiative), the research will seek to deepen understanding of the diverse ways in which performance may contribute to, and go beyond, sought-for learning outcomes. The research will, at the same time, aim to expand the knowledge base on which many of the current debates and developments in Theatre and Performance Studies are predicated: especially the growing interest in site-specificity (Kershaw, Kaye), the validity of 'cultural performance' as a term applicable to museum theatre (Schechner, Snow), and the place of practice in research.

Research methods

The project will involve the study of 4 distinct performance events at one heritage site and two museums. The following sites/museums have agreed in principle to participate: Quarry Bank Mill (The National Trust: Styal), the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, and Manchester Museum. Between them, they offer a suitably varied range of sites and styles of performance. An in-depth three-year study will allow more sustained and varied methods of research to be conducted than was possible in Stage 2.

Primary, interrelated research methods:

- **Longitudinal research:** sites and visitor groups will be observed, interviewed and re-visited over a 12 month period, to test perception, engagement, recall, and learning outcomes. For *organised school groups*, research methods will extend those successfully trialled in Stage 2 (small-group interviews and other formal/informal means of testing prior knowledge, recall, etc). Unlike the Stage 2 research, we will not attempt to compare directly the effectiveness of theatre and non-theatre pathways through each museum but allow for more fluid (and realistic) practices in which theatre and other 'non-theatre' techniques may be combined. For

independent visitor/family groups, existing methodologies (museum visitor-research, educational theatre research) will be developed, incl. 'snapshot' interviews immediately after the visit, focus groups, semi-structured interviews with selected visitors. Visitor-tracking will help to determine, e.g., whether visitors behave differently/have different conversations in relation to a performance event compared with other parts of their visit, and how the experience of a performance contributes to or changes the experience of the museum/site overall.

- **Comparative case study research:** detailed comparisons will be made between different sites and performance styles, allowing wider, more generalised conclusions to be drawn (part of the related doctoral study).
- **Action Research** and **Experimental Research:** will focus on the development of innovative practice. In collaboration with Manchester Museum and a specialist museum-theatre company, an experimental performance will be devised for the specific institutional context (e.g. a challenging, multi-vocal, interactive historical narrative, adaptable for both school groups and independent visitors), presented and adjusted according to visitor response. Differences in visitor response and in the effectiveness of different interpretative modes will be captured, analysed and compared.
- **Questionnaire surveys:** will provide a set of quantitative data to aid the triangulation of the qualitative research.

- Video and stills-camera recordings will be made of the sites, events and audience response – for archival purposes, to trigger recall/response if necessary 12 months on, and as a 'reality check' against visitor perceptions.

- The above studies will be complemented by a broader mapping of developments in museum theatre practice in the UK and abroad (part of the subject of the linked doctoral study) and surveys of relevant research literature and applications of museum-based learning theory.

Timetable:
Year One: detailed planning with partner museums/sites; first meetings of steering group and advisory board. Performance event (A) at Quarry Bank Mill for KS2 pupils (making direct comparisons with Stage 2) (Sept/Oct 05); performance event (B) at Maritime Museum for KS3-4 pupils (Feb/March 06).
Year Two: Performance event (C) at Quarry Bank Mill, for independent visitors (July/Aug. 06); re-visit participants from Events (A) and (B); experimental project (D) at Manchester Museum, designed for KS3-4 pupils *and* independent visitors (Feb/March 07).
Year Three: re-visit participants from Events (C) and (D); detailed review of whole project; international conference in Manchester (April 08).
Year Four: Final analyses; writing-up; dissemination; preparation of pilot DVD-resource.

Research Management
A full-time *research associate* (with appropriate research/interviewing skills), reporting to the Project Director, will
  - o conduct a majority of the pre-/post-event interviews
  - o help design the questionnaire survey
  - o process the collected data and assist with its interpretation
  - o assist in the writing up and dissemination of the report..
A *part-time administrator,* reporting to the Project Director, will
  - o assist with
    - ▪ liaison with museums/heritage site/schools/focus groups
    - ▪ implementation of the questionnaire surveys/data-processing/archiving
    - ▪ conference organisation
  - o create and maintain the website/database
  - o manage the budget
Training provided by Manchester Computing as necessary.
  Video-recording and related tasks (e.g. re 'release forms' for recorded performances) – undertaken by *University Media Centre staff*.
  The detailed design/development of the project will be actively managed by a *Steering Group* (SG), consisting of:
  - Project Director (Jackson) – will oversee and direct the research as a whole

- Helen Rees Leahy (Lecturer in Museum & Art Gallery Studies, Director of the Centre for Museology) – will ensure the research is firmly grounded in museological theory and practice
- Bernadette Lynch (Head of Public Programmes & Academic Development, Manchester Museum) – will advise on educational strategy issues and design/implementation of the experimental performance piece in Manchester Museum
- Peter Brown ('Inspiring Learning' Coordinator, Manchester Museum) – will advise on aspects of the research relating to the 'Inspiring Learning for All' initiative
- Research Associate
- Administrator
- Doctoral student and Media Centre staff to attend as/when appropriate.

The SG will meet on average once a month and monitor fieldwork on-site to ensure research objectives are being met. Time-commitment to the project by Rees Leahy, Lynch and Brown, will average 1-2 hours each per week.

The overall design/progress/dissemination of the project will be monitored and informed by an *Advisory Board*, comprising institutional partners, professional practitioners, academics in the field and a 'special consultant', Verity Walker, independent museum-education/interpretation consultant and member of the Stages One/Two research team, who will provide an ongoing practical and professional overview of the project. The Board will consist of a maximum of 10 members, be chaired by the Project Director and meet twice a year throughout the duration of the project.

APPENDIX B

Detailed case study 'data trawls' for the four main case studies

The following appendices (B1-B4) represent an initial trawl through the data for each of our case study sites. They show the ways in which we began to deal with the masses of interview, questionnaire and archival materials that we collected, and demonstrate how our analysis was informed. They remain works in progress however, and as the last of our interview materials are transcribed, they may be updated over the coming months.

Given the mostly qualitative nature of the data, and a desire on the part of the research team to represent that data as fully and honestly as possible, the following sections are extremely large. We would recommend you print them only if absolutely necessary. They appear in separate PDF files. If they are to be downloaded from the website edition, they should be done so separately. They are not included in the printed version.

B.1 The National Maritime Museum

B.2 Llancaiach Fawr Manor

B.3 Triangle Theatre Company/Herbert Art Gallery & Museum

B.4 The Manchester Museum

APPENDIX C. Case study research designs
[Note. Not included in the printed version.]

C.1 The National Maritime Museum
C.2 Llancaiach Fawr Manor
C.3 Triangle Theatre Company/Herbert Art Gallery & Museum
C.4 The Manchester Museum

APPENDIX C.1 *National Maritime Museum – DRAFT RESEARCH DESIGN 10/10/05*

Contents
Performances
Publicity
Audience
Methods for data capture
Data types for collection
Methodology as related to research themes
Timetable

Expectations of the site
Ethics and intellectual property
Daily timetables

Performances
It is anticipated that the research will encompass the following 'Trafalgar Voices' performances:

- Waiting for Nelson
- The Gunner's Tale
- The Pensioner's Tale
- (Possibly The Midshipman's Tale)

All pieces are single performer monologues, although with varying levels of audience interaction. They represent the research interest in traditional museum performance as a part of the case study approach. All pieces incorporate set factual data which it is the duty of the performer to interpret for their 'audience'. Some performance pieces involve the use of props or artefacts and reflect on the site of their setting. During the proposed data collection period (22/23 October), the performances are as follows:

Time	GUNNER 22nd	NELSON 22nd	PENSIONER 23rd	MIDSHIPMAN 23rd
	Propeller	**Lecture Theatre**	**South Parlour**	
1000				
1030				
1100				
1130	PERF			
1200	Film crew vox pops?	PERF	PERF	
1245	PERF		Film crew vox pops?	12.30: PERF
1300	Film crew vox pops?		PERF	
1330		PERF	Film crew vox pops?	PERF
1415		Film crew vox pops?	PERF (14.00)	Film crew vox pops?
1430	PERF			PERF
1500		PERF	PERF*	Film crew vox pops?
1545				15.30: PERF
1600	Interview		Interview	
1630				
1700				

(N.B. It is proposed that only those performances shaded grey will be filmed by the media centre.
Performance * may now be in QD, to allow for filming if SE Parlour light is too dark.)

(For locations, see the museum floor plan at
http://www.nmm.ac.uk/server/show/conWebDoc.1412)

Publicity

The performances are publicised through a variety of means, including the website (www.nmm.ac.uk). On the website, the performances are fairly easy to locate – if you are looking for them (on third level). At the site, some performances are announced over the tannoy and promoted on boards around the venue. In some instances, the performers themselves will actively recruit members of the public to make up an audience.

Audience

The performances that make up the 'Trafalgar Voices' programme are advertised as 'suitable for families with children aged 6+ years' (website). However, audiences for the different tales vary in themselves. For example, audiences for *The Gunner's Tale* (to be confirmed in the course of the research) are mostly adult, even though the subject matter of the Tale requires a young boy or girl in the audience to respond to several questions; how old? Could you do the job of the Powder Monkey? (the only moment of audience interaction in the piece). They also involve varying levels of interaction, *the Pensioner's Tale* involving more interaction between audiences and interpreter than that of the Gunner. Due to the different locations of the pieces, the level of commitment required by an audience is also variable. So for example, those performances underneath the Propeller can be watched for their entirety, or 'dipped into' by members of the public passing by. Conversely, and by necessity, the Quarter Deck inspires a more closed (intimate?) audience experience which requires presence from start to finish.

Methods for data capture

Data collection will take a variety of forms including visual recording (through observation and technical means), focus groups and interviews:

Visual recording
➢ Performance pieces will be filmed – once from the audience's perspective (performer as subject) and once in order to capture audience response. The performer will have a radio-microphone which will record onto a separate audio track from the ambient microphone (so 2 filmed performances, 4 sound recordings).
➢ As appropriate, still camera photography *might* be used to capture images of the audience response, and the geography of their presence within the performance space.
➢ The researcher will spend performances observing audience responses and making appropriate field notes. The researcher will also track and map the audience (although for the most part this will be captured on camera). On prior visits to the site, the performances themselves should become familiar, and be analysed as pieces of data themselves.
➢ The Media Centre are happy to film a number of vox pops for each performance letting members of the audience recording their views, in their own words, for use as part of the research. All those taking part will need to fill in Release Forms (and in the case of children only then if they are in the presence of a parent/legal guardian).

Focus Groups
➢ To be held around *The Gunner's Tale* and *The Pensioner's Tale* only.
➢ Prior to the performance, and in consultation with the Maritime Museum, 'friends' of the site will be approached, told about the project, and asked to participate in the study in the form of focus groups. The Marketing Department are confident that we should be able to identify more than enough volunteers from their list of 4,000. It will also be possible to approach non-'friends' through a Museum press release to the local papers. This way, a diversity of respondents should be located and signed up.
➢ It is hoped that one focus group will be carried out for each performance piece (although split into two subgroups depending on the ordering of their exhibition-performance experience). Both groups will be large (12 on Saturday, 16 on Sunday to include family groups).
➢ The draft schedule for the focus groups is as follows:

DAY 1: GUNNER				DAY 2: PENSIONER		
	1a	1b			2a	2b
1030	ALL MEET			1100	ALL MEET	

1045 – 1120	FOCUS GROUP			1115 – 1150	FOCUS GROUP	
1130	EX	PERF		1200	EX	PERF
1200	EX	EX		1230	EX	EX
1245	PERF	EX		1300	PERF	EX
1315	LUNCH			1330	LUNCH	
1345 -1500	FOCUS GROUP			1400 – 1515	FOCUS GROUP	
1600-1630?	Gunner Interview			1600-1630?	Pensioner Interview	

Focus Groups to take place in Meeting Room 7

> Questions will be asked about the performance, the exhibition, the site, and respondent's attitudes towards performance in museum spaces in general (and this one in particular)
> Questions might include the following:
>> o Pre-performance (including general introduction to the project, and each other)
>>> ▪ What is their relationship with the site?
>>> ▪ What is their relationship with the theme?
>>> ▪ What is the social setting for their typical museum visit?
>>> ▪ Have they seen the exhibition before? Or any of the performance pieces associated with it? (If yes, what do they remember?)
>> The above will be designed to give respondents an overview of the research intentions, but, at the same time, will not give too much away about the focus of the research on performance. It is hoped that this will prevent biasing individual's experiences of the exhibition and the performance by prioritising one over the other.
>> o Post-performance
>>> ▪ What were their favourite aspects of the Nelson/Napoleon experience?
>>> ▪ Do they feel that everything they saw was historically accurate? Have they any reservations? Where does 'authenticity' lie?
>>> ▪ How did they feel about the exhibition? Most/least interesting aspects, length?
>>> ▪ How did they feel about the performance? Most/least interesting aspects, length, character etc
>>> ▪ Comments on the audience, positioning, etc
>>> ▪ How 'authentic' do they feel it was?
>>> ▪ What did they think of the use of the space/props/theme?
>>> ▪ How relevant do they feel it was to the site? To the exhibition?
>>> ▪ Would they come back? Recommend to a friend? Bring family?

Questionnaires: Audience
> There may be scope for involving (non-focus-group) audience members from both the above performances and *Waiting for Nelson* by asking them a series of face-to-face questions about the performance (perhaps closed questions). This would help to triangulate those findings from the focus group research and to locate how representative focus groups members are of the audience as a whole.
> Perhaps 30 people over the course of two days would be a realistic target for these interviews.

Interviews: Site
> Interviews carried out at the site with members of staff including interpreters will allow conclusions to be reached about the barriers faced in carrying out performance work, and the intentions behind providing performance opportunities.
> These interviews could be carried out over a couple of days, possibly directly before or after the two day intensive data collection period.

Archive Research
> Ongoing
> Press releases, website
> Visitor Surveys
> Policy documents, house style documentation etc – These should be located and obtained during interviews on site.
> Press coverage

Data Types for Collection

In order to store data efficiently within the database it is important that we can identify from the start what types of data will be collected from (or about) the Museum. The following list is not exhaustive; please let us know if you feel anything is missing.

- Non-focus group interview transcripts/audio recordings
- Questionnaires
- Focus Group transcripts/notes/audio recordings
- Publicity materials, leaflets etc
- Filmed footage of performance
- Filmed footage of audience
- Still images of site/performance space/audience
- Policy documents
- Visitor Studies
- Newspaper articles
- Scripts

Methodology as related to research themes

Understanding the Site
- Site policy and mission statements – archive research (including press), website as a whole, interviews with employees/directors. By looking at the press and through interviewing, we can establish the attitude of the site and its employees towards its performance pieces.
- House-style – archive research, interviews with employees/directors, interviews with interpreters.
- The theatricalised space - how the Queen's House (for example) is approached by the audience. How does the relocation of the audience impact upon audience enjoyment, interpreter actions etc. Observational research (visual elements: video, photography, also tracking and mapping), interviews with audiences, interviews with interpreters.
- Denotation of performance space and audience-space, (explicitly or implicitly) – observational research including participant observation (video, photography, tracking and mapping).
- Site-specificity of performance – How has the Museum decided to use the site in the publicity? What are the views of employees and directors? (Interviews). How do the audience feel about the site? Is it another actor in the performance? (Interviews). Also, and crucially, analysis of visual records.

Addressing the above theme is vital in order to answer research questions related to the effectiveness of theatre between different sites, and between different types of sites. It is also crucial in order to map the objectives of the Museum site for their performance 'programme', and what (if any) strategies they are using to evaluate it.

Understanding the Audience
- Social context of visit – At the National Maritime Museum, independent visitors will be the focus of the research. Interview and focus group research will clarify in those cases where the social context is unclear (eg is it family group? Some other gathering?).
- Social positioning – Locating audience positioning in terms of level of education, occupation, ethnicity, gender, age, and their own views on their current relationship (or otherwise) with museums and heritage. Interviews, focus group research, possibly questionnaires. This will enable us to address the 'social inclusion', learning and access aspect of the research questions. Are the sites meeting/challenging/ignoring their written/stated objectives in actuality? (if indeed those objectives can be located).
- As far as possible, we would like to identify 'preferred learning styles' (cf Verity's multiple-intelligences questionnaire) when selecting focus group members.
- Audience positioning – over course of performance. Observation (video, photography, tracking and mapping). At the National Maritime Museum this should not represent too much of a problem but will involve addressing issues surrounding the capturing of images of children. This involves liaison between the Museum and the University, and the acquisition of written confirmation of all agreements/permissions.
- Audience Response – It might be desirable to capture facial responses in some way (e.g. video, or photograph), but will not be essential. Physical response will be captured by video,

tracking and mapping. Oral responses can (in part) be captured through video, and by the researcher in field notes. The above is slightly complicated by the practicalities of performances which involve the relocation and repositioning of audiences (as will perhaps be the case for *The Pensioner's Tale*). At all times it must be ensured that the gathering of data does NOT interfere with the experience of the audience/visitor. This could lead to a skewing of research results. Overall response (self-narratives, shock, etc) can be picked up in greater detail through interviewing, focus groups and (to a certain extent) questionnaires.

➢ *Primary research tool: focus group – one per performance. Some capture of spontaneous feedback from 'casual' audience members as they leave and/or questionnaires on seats will provide useful additional data.*

Understanding the Theme (or 'Content'? Subject Matter?)

➢ Subject-matter – Website research and prior visits will enable us to understand the subject matter and how it relates to the site, and to prepare questions for interviews/ questionnaires/ focus groups that can measure audience understanding of the subject-matter both before and after visits.

➢ Relationship to collections/exhibits – How and if performance locates itself in terms of the other collections on site (or even off site) either through dialogue, or use of props. Observation (using video and photography). Also looking at how the audience understand this relationship, through interviews, focus groups, questionnaires. Also, how do the actors and employees/directors place the work of performance in relation to the other collections? What connections do they make in the literature/publicity?

➢ Levels of meaning – Can be analysed through discussions with audience members, and (in the case of focus groups) cross referenced with their pre-identified preferred learning styles. Focus groups especially would engender discussion of the meanings of the performance to different people without a feeling that a 'correct' answer was necessary or desirable. Also, visual elements might capture those references that are made throughout to contemporary life. Again, observation will be key.

Understanding the Performance

➢ Induction – Observation, Video footage. Interviews with performers and audiences. For example – what were performers trying to achieve, and what did audiences take away from it? Were they prepared?
➢ Character Role
➢ Style of Performance
➢ Costume
➢ Exits and Entrances
➢ 'Register'
➢ Audience Interaction
➢ Audience Engagement
➢ Use of Storytelling
➢ Use of Surprise

All of the above can be observed, recorded to video and photographed (as and when appropriate). This will enable accurate recording of and detailed recollection of all elements of the performance. Many of these elements however cannot be assumed (eg audience engagement). Thus, interpreter interviews, audience focus groups and even questionnaires can be used in order to triangulate all conclusions.

Publicity materials again will allow for an exploration of the priorities of the site in relation to their performance pieces – are some pieces more widely publicised than others? How much is 'given away' in these resources about the nature/content of the performance and what will be expected of the audience throughout? Are some events not publicised at all?

Locating the style of the performance and the work of the interpreters, and coupling that with findings about the response of the audience, enables conclusions to be reached about the effectiveness of (a select example of) different performance techniques, and the various sites as backdrops for them.

Timetable

08 - 12 August
Researcher to visit site and meet with Kay Cowper (Marketing).
Finalise details of performance venues/times/exhibition entry.

20 – 31 August
Sign off memorandum of agreement and work on consent forms.
Meet with media centre.
Draw up recruitment message and press release to be signed off (and eventually sent out) by the Museum.
Design simple user-friendly questionnaire.

September – early October
Approach 'friends' and release local press advert (middle of September).
Select and finalise focus group members.
Write focus group agenda and interview questions.

10 - 15 October
Phone/Send reminder to focus group members.
Final arrangements.

15 – 20 October
Print consent forms/ interview sheets/ focus group materials/ project outlines.

20 October
Researcher on site.
Assess any barriers/ interviews with site staff.

21 October
Media Centre to set up.

22 - 23 October
Principal data collection; filming, focus groups, interviews, questionnaires and spot interviews where possible. The timetable for the researcher over the course of the data collection period will be as follows:

RESEARCHER TIMETABLE 22nd		RESEARCHER TIMETABLE 23rd	
1030	Meet FG	1100	Meet FG
1045 - 1120	Hold FG1.i	1115 - 1150	Hold FG2.i
1130	Watch Performance 1	1200	Watch Performance 1
	Watch WFN Performance 1	1300	Watch Performance 2
1230	Watch Performance 2	1330	Supervise lunch
1300	Supervise lunch	1400 - 15.15	Focus Group2.ii
1330 - 1445	Focus Group1.ii	1600	Interview Pensioner
1530	Watch Performance 3		
1600	Interview Gunner		

1 - 14 November
Revisit subjects (by phone)

9 - 12 months later
revisit subjects (by phone)

Expectations of the Site
➢ Access to 'friends' for focus group recruitment, to be approached by the museum. Also, possibility of press release to be sent out by museum (although written by the research team) – to be discussed.
➢ Space to carry out focus groups
➢ Back-up on the day (if required) including 'shepherds'
➢ Some input over the set up and delivery of the research

Ethics and Intellectual Property

The ethical implications of the study, and any ramifications for intellectual property should be located and dealt with well in advance of the data collection exercise. The ethics committee should have agreed to the stated positioning on ethics, and suitable 'forms' should be made available for agreement of consent:

- ➢ Site memorandum of agreement
- ➢ Signed permission of interpreters
- ➢ Signed permission of those in focus groups
- ➢ Signed permission of those interviewed (site staff and audiences)
- ➢ Locate and obtain permission to use the script
- ➢ Posted information about the filming outside the performance venues

Timetables (Saturday 22)

Time	Jenny Kidd + JC	Film Crew +Helper 1	AF	Helper 2	JC (when spare)
1000					
1015					
1030	Meet FG1				
1045	FG1.i				
1100					
1115			Arrange WFN int		
1130	Observe GT	Filming GT & Vox pops/RF	GT/questionnaires	GT/questionnaires/ RF	
1145					
1200	Observe WFN		WFN/questionnaires	WFN/ questionnaires/ RF	
1215					
1230	Observe GT	WFN vox pops/RF?			
1245		Filming GT & vox pops/RF		GT/questionnaires/RF	
1300	Supervise lunch				
1315					
1330	FG1.ii			WFN/ questionnaires/ RF	
1345					
1400		WFN vox pops/RF?			
1415		GT filming? And vox pops/RF?	Interview WFN?	GT/questionnaires/RF	
1430					
1445					
1500			Observe WFN/ questionnaires	WFN/ questionnaires	
1515					
1530	Observe GT				
1545					
1600	Interview Gunner				
1615					
1630					
1645					
1700					

WFN – Waiting For Nelson
GT – Gunners Tale
RF – release forms

(Sunday 23)

Time	Jenny Kidd +JC	Film Crew +Helper 1	AF	RR	JC (when spare)
1000					
1015					
1030					
1045					
1100	Meet FG2				
1115	FG2.i				
1130					
1145			Arrange Midshipman Int		
1200	Observe PT	Filming PT/vox pops/RF	PT/questionnaires	PT/questionnaire/RF	
1215					
1230					
1245					
1300	Observe PT	Filming PT/vox pops/RF	PT/questionnaires	PT/questionnaire/RF	
1315					
1330	Supervise lunch				
1345					
1400	FG2.ii				
1415					
1430					
1445					
1500		Filming PT/vox pops/RF	PT/questionnaires	PT/questionnaire/RF	
1515					
1530					
1545					
1600	Interview Pensioner				
1615					
1630					
1645					
1700					

APPENDIX C.2   *LLANCAIACH FAWR MANOR RESEARCH DESIGN*

Contents

Research Context
Llancaiach Fawr Manor (LFM) is a Seventeenth Century Manor House based in Nelson, near Caerphilly, South Wales. The visitor brochure (bilingual) advertises the site as one 'Where history comes alive'/'Ble mae hanes yn did yn fyw'). The usual site activities take place 'as' 1645 when Colonal Edward Pritchard and his family were in residence. There is thus much emphasis on the context of the Civil War as setting for the special events that take place (e.g. King's Day, 5th August annually), and the discussions that are had with the household servants one encounters. The site is an interesting one for discussion of issues surrounding Civil War and citizenship not least because Colonel Pritchard shifted his allegiance from the Royalist cause to that of Parliament as the war progressed.

Research to be carried out at the site reflects the project's interest in historic sites as well as museums, and school groups as well as individuals. We wish to include within the four case studies one example where the site itself forms an integral and central part of the visitors' experience. The research here also aims to document and follow the site's evolving educational strategy as it pilots a new scheme for cross-curricular, cross-year group learning through the use of organised 'in-character' debates.

Publicity
LFM publicises its activities in a number of ways. The Manor has a website which resides on the local Caerphilly Council site (www.caerphilly.gov.uk) (website to be re-launched in New Year 2006), and various publicity leaflets (see LFM archive box, bilingual). The site also has a 'Friends' programme costing £5/annum for individuals.

LFM also advertises itself as a place to explore the supernatural, offering ghost tours and night-time walks. In this guise, it is also 'advertised' through a number of other sites including South Wales Paranormal Research (http://www.swpr.co.uk/Discovering/Llancaiach/llancaiach.html) and the BBC website (http://www.bbc.co.uk/wales/southeast/sites/weird/form/ghostcam.shtml)

Audience
The audiences for the Manor House are varied. Visitors can be part of a school group (20,000 children annually), other large visitor group, or independent (i.e. family group, friend group, individual). The research team, through various visits to the site, have seen all of these groups in 'action' as visitors and audiences. Tony Jackson has tracked a school group through a day's visit, and Jenny Kidd has visited the site as an independent visitor on two occasions. On one of these occasions, King's Day at the Manor, other visitor groups were in evidence, namely large organised groups of visitors, and even groups of costumed volunteers from elsewhere in the UK.

However, the proposed audiences for this study are more limited (yet twofold). Primary school groups taking part in the 'normal' living history experience that LFM represents will make up one group under study (L.i). Alongside this, the research team will study one pilot 'Great Debate' with

Key Stage 3 (KS3) school groups (aged 11 to 14), facilitated by select pupils from KS5 (lower sixth). This latter set up will involve 70 pupils from KS3 and 12 from KS5 (L.ii). (All pupils will attend all three debates, and will encounter various exercises around the manor in between).

Navigation of the Manor without encountering a costumed interpreter is unlikely and, in order to partake in the entirety of the proffered visitor experience, undesirable. Visits thus involve a certain level of co-operation with the idea of performance as an interpretative tool that is unnecessary for visitors to other sites such as NMM (most visitors to LFM presumably know this is what they will encounter ahead of their visit). Some advance warning is also given to visitors at the visitor centre on arrival, including a personal 'good conduct' letter from Col. Pritchard's brother-in-law.

Therefore, the total number of subjects for the research will be:-
L.i. 60 – 70 pupils (in 2 class groups)
L.ii. 72 pupils
Totalling nearly 150 pupils of varying ages.

Curriculum links
L.i. KS2 pupils are encouraged to engage with a number of different historical agendas during their study. Such units as 'What were homes like a long time ago?' and 'What was it like to live here in the past?' (http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk) can be explored at LFM as a site that encourages both cognitive and affective development and exploration. The latter unit's description states that "In this unit, children are introduced to an enquiry-based approach to a local study. It is best to focus on an aspect of the local community in the immediate locality" (http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk). This is evident in the study of LFM by local school groups.

L.ii. As part of the Welsh National Curriculum, KS3 pupils study Britain from 1500 to 1750 with a specific emphasis on local history, and, under a 'Charles I and the Civil Wars' topic heading, look at issues of power, citizenship and social change through individual narratives and historical research and analysis. They are also, as a part of the wider 'history' agenda, encouraged to question representations and interpretations of the past, bearing in mind the circumstances within which they are 'made' (www.nc.uk.net). *(N.B. Monmouth school do not follow the Welsh National Curriculum as they are independent, but they are in broad agreement with these points for teaching).*

The Great Debate pilot project will link into this curriculum agenda for those at KS3, but will also prepare those KS5 pupils involved for their work on The Great Rebellion. It will take the form of a staged (but interactive) debate involving both pupils and the Manor's own costumed interpreters.

Dates for data capture
It is anticipated that the Great Debate (L.ii) will take place on the 1st March 2006 (St.David's Day), and will involve pupils from Monmouth School. Research L.i. will take place on 28th February with pupils from Ninian Park Primary school, Cardiff.

Methods for data capture
Data collection will take a variety of forms including visual recording (through observation and technical means), questionnaires, discussions and encouraging creative documentation (e.g. drawings). Methods chosen will differ in accordance with the age of the school group under study.

Visual recording
L.i.
➢ Exploration of the Manor for independent visitors is generally unchaperoned and multi-directional. Visitors are encouraged to use an exploratory approach to the house and discover for themselves what it holds. School groups, by necessity, are involved in a much more tightly structured process (in a number of ways). In this sense it will be easier to capture their experiences through visual means.
➢ However, even though it may be possible to pre-determine the route of the visiting group, that route will involve navigating a number of different rooms, staircases and performers. The process will thus be difficult to capture in sequence.

➢ For this reason, we will not try to capture on film the full tour of the manor in sequence, but will capture select portions of it. The pupils induction, experience of the Great Hall, and possibly their interaction in the armouries will be the priorities for filming.

➢ Observations will be made of the tour in its entirety by two or more researchers.

L.ii.

➢ For L.ii, the bulk of the activity will take place in the Manor's Great Hall. This should be fairly straightforward to capture on film, and to record with an ambient microphone. The Media Centre should be able to assist with this endeavour. This footage would thus be suitable for any further dissemination of the research through DVD.

➢ It is hoped that all three debates will be filmed (possibly with one from the front? [not the first]) and that snippets of the exercises around the manor can also be captured.

➢ At least two observers will be present for all debates, and one for each of the groups as they go to their exercises will be identified.

Discussions

L.i.

➢ The researcher will attend the schools before the research collection in order to meet pupils & teachers, assess expectations and observe preparatory work. This can be done through the use of observations.

➢ On the day, the researcher will travel to and from the manor with the school pupils/teachers on the coach in order to get a feel for the pupils' level of enthusiasm and immediate responses.

➢ After the event, a selection of pupils will discuss their experiences with the researcher. As with Phase One of the research, it will be desirable to hold taped discussions with pupils about their experiences in the week(s) following the visits that form the research. These discussions, with 3 pupils at a time, will enable the researcher to engender a discussion between the pupils that will (hopefully) highlight any empathetic response to what they have seen, vocalise any surprises, likes, dislikes etc. *[we'll test/develop the "OCRUISE" categories we used in previous research – in part because we now have to start thinking about the comparative dimension of the research].* This will be carried out with 18 pupils (9 from year 3, 9 from year 4).

➢ These 18 pupils will have a discussion with the researcher approximately nine months to one year after the research has been carried out asking them to reflect on their experience and testing their recall.

➢ N.B. 18 not 12 pupils chosen as Ninian Park School has a fairly high pupil turnover.

L.ii

➢ The researcher will spend time at the school in advance (Monmouth School) witnessing the preparation being carried out (the Great Debate will involve a great amount of pre-visit activity including the assignment of radical 'roles' and the development of characters) and questioning the children about their expectations for the day (possibly through discussions).

➢ 18 pupils will be selected to be trailed through the experience and asked to partake in taped discussions about the day (12 form 2, 6 form 6), and up to a year after the event. They will be identified before the research collection day, and partake in discussions with the researcher.

Creative documentation

➢ Those pupils involved in L.i (and possibly L.ii) will be encouraged (after the event) to provide drawings of what they have seen. These will enable a textual analysis of what the pupils remember, its accuracy, and their response to the site and/or its costumed interpreters.

➢ It may also be possible to look at pupils' imaginative writings about the site, its characters, or, indeed, their own characters (in the case of L.ii).

Interviews

➢ Interviews carried out at the site with members of staff including interpreters will allow conclusions to be reached about the barriers faced in carrying out performance work, and the intentions behind providing performance opportunities.

➢ It is also hoped that we will be able to interview those teachers involved in planning and attending the trips.

➢ These interviews will be carried out after the intensive data collection period (possibly the following week).

Archive Research
➢ Ongoing
➢ Press releases, website
➢ Visitor surveys
➢ Policy documents, house style documentation etc
➢ Press coverage
➢ Scripts ?
➢ Interpreter training manual or guidelines (as appropriate)

Data Types for collection
- interview transcripts/audio recordings (interpreters/staff?)
- Discussion transcripts/notes/audio recordings
- Publicity materials, leaflets etc
- Filmed footage
- Still images of site/performance space/audience
- Policy documents
- Visitor Studies
- Newspaper articles
- Field notes
- Drawings/creative writings

Timetable (general)
November
Researcher to visit site and school in order to discuss research design and implications
December – January
Detailed preparation
Design of questions
Finalising schools participation
8th February
Meeting at Ninian Park School to finalise participation
9th February
Monmouth School session with LFM interpreter (Steve)
15-17th Feb
Visit schools for preparatory sessions and pre-visit interviews.
20-25th Feb
Half Term – final preparation in Manchester
Feb 28/Mar 1
L.i and L.ii carried out (above date indicated by Monmouth school for L.ii)
March 3-9
Revisiting schools and discussing with pupils
Revisiting schools and carrying out creative documentation
Interviews with: Dorothy, Rowena, Steve, Alan Powell and Ian Gray. Also Diane Walker?

Expectations of the Site
➢ Access to schools who are signed up for visits to the Manor (including Monmouth School – already in agreement)
➢ Access to documentation leading up to the trial of The Great Debate (L.ii)
➢ Appropriate meetings between staff and researcher in the lead up to the event
➢ Space to carry out interviews/discussions (if necessary)
➢ Back-up on the day (if required)
➢ General assistance with the set-up and delivery of the research

Expectations of the Schools
o Where necessary, the schools will be responsible for ensuring parents of children receive and sign agreement to partake in the research (incl release forms for images)

- o Allowing the researcher to attend preparatory sessions in order to observe and/or speak with pupils
- o A willingness to co-operate with the research as a whole, and a commitment to ensuring the longitudinal nature of the research (for up to 12 months)

Ethics and Intellectual Property
The ethical implications of the study, and any ramifications for intellectual property should be located and dealt with well in advance of the data collection exercise. The ethics committee should have agreed to the stated positioning on ethics, and suitable 'forms' should be made available for agreement of consent:

- ➢ Site memorandum of agreement
- ➢ Signed permission of interpreters
- ➢ Signed permission of pupils parents
- ➢ Signed permission of those interviewed (site staff and audiences)
- ➢ Locate and obtain permission to use any scripts and/or teaching packs

Timetables
Monday 27th February
Arrival
3.30pm: Tour of the Manor for Media Centre crew and Jenny Kidd

28th February – Ninian Park School
The Manor House is opened by a caretaker in the morning at ~8.00. We can enter the house from 9.00 onward in order to set up.

	Jenny	Joel	Ruth	Media centre
9.15 – 10.30	Travel on coach to LFM. Discuss with pupils.			Set up
11.30 – tour starts. Three groups one starting on each floor. (G-candle making then tour) (F-tour then candle-making) (S-tour then candle-making) How do we film this? One camera with each group we film? Or set up cameras in two locations and film those interactions?	Observation Group 1	Observation Group 2	Assist MC	Camera 1: (inside room1) filming pupils' first impressions of house) Camera 2: (inside kitchen) Filming pupils' interaction with Dairy maid (Ground floor) (x 2 groups)
			Assist MC	Move to first floor
			Assist MC	Camera 1: Film pupils' interaction with interpreter in the Great Hall and exit from the room. (x 2 groups) Camera 2: Film pupils' interaction with interpreter in the parlour. (x 2 groups)
			Assist MC	Camera 1: Move to Study (top floor) Camera 2: Move to exit of the Manor
				Camera 1: Film pupils' interaction with

				interpreter in the Study (x 2 groups) Camera 2: Film pupils exiting the Manor (x 2 groups)
LUNCH				
p.m. Candle making with interpreters	Observation	Observation	Assist MC	Film candle making session with 2 groups
	Travel on coach to Ninian Park School. Discuss with pupils.			

1st March – Monmouth School

All to be at Manor from ~9.45 in order to set up.

	Jenny	**Joel**	**Ruth**	**Media Centre**
10.30 – school arrive				
Debate 1 – all pupils	Observation	Observation	Assist MC	Filming debate
Exercise 1 – 3 groups	Observation group 1 (ex 1)	Observation group 2	Assist MC	Some filming of exercises
LUNCH				
Debate 2 – all pupils	Observation	Observation	Assist MC	Filming debate
Exercise 2 – 3 Groups	Observation group 1 (ex 2)	Observation group 2	Assist MC	Some filming of exercises
Debate 3 – all pupils	Observation	Observation	Assist MC	Filming debate
Exercise 3 – all pupils	Observation group 1 (ex 3)	Observation group 2	Assist MC	Some filming of exercises
3.30 – END				

APPENDIX C.3   *TRIANGLE AT THE HERBERT: RESEARCH DESIGN*

Contents
Research Context
Audience
Outcomes
Dates for data capture
Methods for PLH data capture
Data types for collection
Timetable
Expectations of Triangle
Expectations of the site
Ethics and intellectual property
Contacts

Research Context
The Herbert…
The Herbert Museum and Art Gallery, Coventry, exists under the umbrella of the City Council's Arts and Heritage Service (alongside Lunt Roman Fort and the Priory Visitor Centre). The museum, which opened in 1960, is currently undergoing a multi-million pound redevelopment, due for completion early 2008. At that time, the museum will have a number of new galleries – history, art, science, peace and reconciliation, and temporary galleries – and will have two further education spaces, and a combined gallery and performance space. This performance space (it is envisioned), will be available for community use, visiting groups and performance installations, and will have its own seating and lighting arrangements. Whilst this redevelopment occurs, the museum is operating very limited opening/access to very few spaces (two gallery spaces, and display cases on the ground floor). With this in mind, the museum is likely to perceive benefit in the use of outreach projects, and the exploration of collections that reside in store (to be confirmed). Admission to the Herbert is free, and the museum has a lively, popular cafeteria area on the ground floor (for many a destination in itself).

Triangle…
Triangle Theatre Company is currently resident at The Herbert (although their offices are not in the main building). The Company was established by Carran Waterfield in 1988, and now involves regular collaboration with Richard Talbot. Triangle cite their current work at The Herbert as being 'engaged in performance and interactive projects using the gallery's collections'. Past projects at the museum have involved exploration of the museums wartime collections through the Little Herberts group (young people from the area), and the facilitation of 'training camps' where children have immersive, participatory experiences in different scenarios. Previous projects include Dugout!, War is Over and Coventry Kids in the Blitz' (see DVDs in PLH archive), where Carran and Richard take on the roles of Mr. Whissell and Mrs. Williams. The company have received the Museums and Heritage Award for Excellence for Best Educational Initiative (2005) and the Curiosity and Imagination Roots and Wings Award (2005).

Since 1997 Carran Waterfield and Richard Talbot have been operating as *Nina and Frederick*, creating site-specific performance that 'straddles theatre, film and live art' (website). *Nina and Frederick* have carried out work with young people, which, in turn has influenced the direction of the work Triangle has carried out as Whissell & Williams' (also with young people).

Chico Talks…
The Chico Talks project is a departure from the 'norm' for Triangle in a number of ways:
- It involves researching, documenting, expanding, and utilising collections within the museum which, until now, have been in store.
- It involves reaching a more disparate 'audience'/'audiences'.
- It is quite literally museum outreach work, starting at the museum, and moving into the community in a very differing set up to that of prior work which has used both on and off site locations, but not involved movement between the two in the same way.

The project is organic and transparent, and as such, the research team have been able to observe the process of planning, recruiting participants for, and devising of Chico Talks both through physical and virtual observation; on research trips to Coventry and on the various websites for the project (see contacts section).

The 'regime' within which the participatory museum theatre work operates for this project is the CMP Soc. The CMP Soc., specialists in research and entertainment, are focusing on the life of Irving Pollard (Chico the clown) over the next few months with a view to providing a tour-like opportunity in August for members of the public to find out more about Pollard, engage with the CMP Soc., and with the Herbert. Named after Pollard's amateur dramatics group, the Coventry Musical Play Society, the CMP Soc. frame themselves also as an amateur theatre company, but one which is trying to become in some way resident at the museum (as re-enactors or even curators).

Their aims and objectives are identified as follows: (Pollard's blog website)
1. To conserve, regenerate and pillage.
2. To honour the memory of Irving Pollard
3. To exist as a positive member of the communities of the world.

Subordinate Clauses.
1.i To put on Alfs Button
1.ii To make the Irving Pollard Trail
2. To exhibit our work in the New Pollard Gallery
4.To give the visitors a rewarding experience.

The museum's existing Chico collection, which has not previously been displayed, will be used for research input by the CMP Soc., but will also be supplemented by original materials collected by the CMP Soc. Through oral history interviews, and contact with Pollard's existing relatives, many more artefacts have been uncovered that will be used both within the Chico exhibition, and during August's tour.

Audience
It is likely that **most** of the following audiences will know at all stages that they are encountering a performance event, and that this event in some way has links with The Herbert Museum and Art Gallery. The museum advertises the exhibition (in May) as a 'video and live performance installation', August's happenings are promoted as a 'tour' or 'trail' indicating the movement and possible 'guided' (in some way) nature of the event, and the museum staff (reception) are quick to categorise the work of Triangle and the CMP Soc. as performance.

It remains to be seen what those audience members whose involvement with the tour is as a consequence of stumbling across it in the local community make of what they encounter.

It can thus be seen that the 'audiences' for the project are varied in their composition and recruitment. They exist as follows:

The Artists
The CMP Soc. consists of five professional actors. Carran (charac: Lance F. S.), Richard (Kurt Zarniko), Olivia (Alice Lesley Pocklington), Daniel (Mr. Farr 'Chump'), and Sam (Sam Charon). All have their own roles and responsibilities within the society, and contribute to devising, planning, rehearsing etc.
Two of the actors are new to the work of Triangle, and are undergoing a process of training in the methodology of the company as they devise, rehearse and perform Chico Talks.

The 'Immersed Participants'
~8 teenage boys were identified for participation in the project, representing a variety of backgrounds, performance experience, and knowledge of Triangle and their methodology. They were as follows:
Little Herberts (x3)

Hereward College (x2 work experience ~20yrs, no prior experience although interested in performance)
The Watch (x3 local teenagers, Hillfields, no prior experience of Triangle)
It was anticipated that these teenagers would form the bulk of our longitudinal study into the impact/experience/ongoing outcomes of partaking in a project such as this.
The situation in May 2006 is that two of these participants are actively involved in the project and preparations for August. Some of the other participants failed to materialise for devising, and so the CMP Soc. continues to seek teenagers who might want to be involved. They will be holding a further four day rehearsal/devising session in June which will perhaps bring in more interested parties. This session will be attended by members of the research team and the research design will be modified in accordance with its outcomes.

Audience in August
In August, the CMP Soc. will put on some kind of tour for the public of the Primrose Hill Street/ Hillfields area of Coventry. This is an area that at one time housed Irving Pollard and his Wondershop, and used to be the site of the St Peterside parade (1930s) which included the presence of a circus. It is now an area undergoing huge reconstruction, during which much of the local Kurdish population will be disrupted.
The tour will facilitate a dialogue between the museum and that local community by bringing the collection/stories of Chico out into the street. Local residents will be able to join in encounters with the CMP Soc., at the same time as museum visitors who have paid to attend the tour will see the sites of Primrose Hill Street perhaps for the first time. The life of Irving Pollard will be central to those stories told, and through different sites in Hillfields, different stages of his life will be represented. In some instances, they will be enacted at the site of their original occurrence, at others, sites will be used as physical metaphors for events/sites/stages in Pollard's life. The audience will be able to drop in and out of encounters, and (it is presumed) choose their own level of engagement, interaction, participation.

The PLH project and The Herbert
Both the PLH project team and The Herbert staff will be audiences for the work of the CMP Soc. at various stages over the coming months. Attending rehearsals, devising meetings, the exhibition and the final event in August will involve interaction with the CMP Soc. and the Chico Talks project that inevitably makes us an audience (this is after all the CMP Soc. and not Triangle we are observing in action).

Understanding the Site
The Herbert Art Gallery and Museum is a space undergoing immense transformation. It will continue to do so until 2008. At this time the museum has no designated performance space, although one is planned in the new design. Triangle's work with the Herbert often involves taking groups out of the museum to take part in immersive participatory projects off site (War is Over, Dugout and The Pollard Trail). Where possible, the museum's artefacts are used in preparatory work or performances themselves. In order to understand this relationship, it is important that we can reach an understanding of the aims of both organisations and where they overlap or clash. Collecting site policies and statements, as well as information from Triangle will be paramount (websites, interviews, press, archive research).

It is also crucial that we begin to understand the specific site of the performance itself – namely the Hillfields area of Coventry, including
- Understanding the theatricalised space – How does it become theatricalised? How do both performers and audience members approach the space?
- How are audience and performer space delineated? Is it implicit or explicit? And when are these boundaries (if they exist) crossed? Who crosses them?
- How site-specific is the performance?
- How does the use of space change over the course of the Trail?
- How do the audience feel about the Site?
- How does the performance (performers and audience) traverse the site? How do others using the space feel about the performance?

Understanding the Performance

- Induction – Observation, Video footage. Interviews with performers and audiences. For example – what were performers trying to achieve, and what did audiences take away from it? Were they prepared?
- Character Role
- Style of Performance
- Costume
- Exits and Entrances
- 'Register'
- Audience Interaction
- Audience Engagement
- Use of Storytelling
- Use of Surprise

Understanding the Content

- Subject-matter – Website research and prior visits will enable us to understand the subject matter and how it relates to the site, and to prepare questions for interviews/ questionnaires/ focus groups that can measure audience understanding of the subject-matter both before and after visits.
- Relationship to collections/exhibits – How and if performance locates itself in terms of the other collections on site (or even off site) either through dialogue, or use of props. Observation (using video and photography). Also looking at how the audience understand this relationship, through interviews, focus groups, questionnaires. Also, how do the actors and employees/directors place the work of performance in relation to the other collections? What connections do they make in the literature/publicity?

Outcomes

Triangle anticipate that the following can be achieved as a result of the Chico Talks venture (abbreviated):

- Devise a new project over a period of four weeks
- Create employment opportunities for artists
- Share methods with artists
- Develop the musical content of Triangle's work
- Develop new performance personae
- Explore clownesque strategies
- Work with designer with experiences of museum design/curation
- Identify and support performance participants
    - The older people identified for the project (oral histories)
    - Teenage participants and older people (August)
    - Introduce small group of teenagers to the devising process
- Documenting research and development period
- Work alongside The Herbert's curators

The Herbert Art Gallery and Museum anticipate the following outcomes for the Chico Talks project: [to be confirmed through Herbert documentation and interviews]

Learning

The Chico Talks documentation outlines the museum's learning team responsibilities as follows:

…"to develop new audiences for The Herbert by working with local people who may not have been regular users in the past" (March 2006 Triangle documentation)

In this instance, the new audience being developed includes teenage boys, a group notoriously hard for museums to engage with.

The museum's learning team is headed by Senior Lifelong Learning Officer Robin Johnson. The museum also has a Lifelong Learning Officer for Outreach who we may wish to talk with.

Collections

The history team's aim is to see the collection used in innovative ways and in order to attract new audiences. The history team is made up of those responsible for the curation and display of the museum's collections.

The members of the history team involved with the project are Martin Roberts (Curator) and Claire Hayhurst (Keeper of History).

Dates for data capture

Observation of the preliminary planning/devising stages is already underway (see timetable).
It is anticipated that the August tour will undergo detailed observation on the following dates:

> Tuesday 15th August*
> Friday 18th August*
> Saturday 19th August*

* These dates are preliminary suggestions and may be subject to change.

Methods for PLH data capture

Data collection will take a variety of forms including visual recording (through observation and technical means), interviews, and possibly questionnaires.

Observation

Observation of the various processes leading up to and including the tours in August will be invaluable to an understanding of Chico Talks. More so than in any other case study thus far, we are privy to the creative and institutional processes behind the final performance outcome. With this in mind, and given the emphasis of this case study on outreach, innovation and the processes that give rise to them, making sure that we are able to contextualise the final performance event within an open and honest narrative is crucial.
Given the fact that much of the action and audiences for the August happenings will be inherently improvisational in themselves, observation will also be key 'on the day'. Filming encounters (with suitable permissions in place), and asking observers to fill in questionnaires is feasible, but is liable to be patchy and incomplete. Observations will thus fill a number of gaps, but must be triangulated wherever possible (thus a large research team will be necessary, perhaps including members of the research steering group who may wish to come and observe some of the activity for themselves).

Technical means

Wherever possible, photographic and video evidence should be collected of the Chico Talks process. This will be captured through the use of digital cameras and handheld, portable DV Cams (less obtrusive and unwieldy than media centre filming). The use of two handheld film cameras would enable us to capture more of the various encounters than just one, and this can perhaps be supplemented with footage from camera phones etc where necessary. The nature of the Chico Talks tour proposition means that we can only anticipate capturing snapshots of the action, and thus observations will be paramount.
The CMP Soc. will be doing their own filming of events during the tour, and we in no way wish to interfere with or re-create that footage.

Questionnaires

It **may** be appropriate to ask members of the various audiences to fill in questionnaires detailing their thoughts on experiences (or perhaps vox pops would be more appropriate?). This will have to be carefully considered as we do not want to impact upon the flow of events, or make people feel uncomfortable. This is perhaps less of a concern for those people who sign up for the tour in advance, and who return to the museum/church hall at the end – at this point perhaps we could ask them to fill one in. However, this group is unlikely to include the local community members who

interact (if in fact they do) during the encounters. Careful consideration of how best to capture their responses will be necessary in order to avoid other narratives becoming the dominant record of events.

Focus Groups

Focus groups in this instance would be nigh on impossible to recruit given the spontaneous nature of much of the 'audience' involvement. Also, the fact that commitment to the tour in its entirety is not sought by the CMP Soc. we would end up with a very skewed sample which would not be representative of the cross section of people involved in the tour.

It *may* be desirable to carry out focus groups with teenage participants, but this will be decided nearer the time when final numbers are known.

Interviews
Interviews will be carried out with the following people:..

Archive Research
➢ Triangle documentation and project information
➢ The Herbert project information
➢ Press releases, various websites (Herbert, Triangle, CMP Soc., Pollard's blog)
➢ Visitor surveys
➢ Policy documents etc
➢ Press coverage
➢ Scripts? (Alf's Button etc)
➢ Actor training manual or guidelines (as appropriate)

Data Types for collection
- interview transcripts/audio recordings (artists/staff)
- Publicity materials, leaflets etc
- Filmed footage
- Still images of site/performance space/audience
- Policy documents
- Visitor Studies
- Newspaper articles
- Field notes/observations

Timetable (general)
Data capture will happen as follows:

29th March;   Visit to museum, meeting with Richard Talbot
13th April;   Observation of Tea Party
19-20th April;   Observation of Chico Talks devising/rehearsing process
23rd May;   Attendance at the Chico Talks exhibition
20th/22nd June;   Observation of Chico Talks devising/rehearsing process/interviews on site
8th August   Interview Roger Vaughan, Robin Johnson, observe training and planning meeting
                     with Carran and Richard
10-20 August;   Pollard Trail including three day data capture of Chico Talks tour, including
                     observation, filming, interviews.
                     15th – interview David Bancroft, observation, interviews etc
                     18th/19th observation, filming etc
Aug/Sept;   any follow up interviews

Expectations of Triangle
➢ Meetings with Carran and Richard in the lead up to the event (as necessary)
➢ Access to documentation behind the Chico Talks project

- ➢ Access to rehearsals/events/devising/meetings of the CMP Soc. to be arranged
- ➢ Access to participants for all levels of the project
- ➢ Agreement to filming/documentation by members of the research team in the lead up to and on the tour in August
- ➢ Access to filmed footage taken in August for research purposes
- ➢ Agreement to be interviewed

Expectations of The Herbert
- ➢ Access to individuals who sign up to the tour.
- ➢ Access to documentation.
- ➢ Appropriate meetings between staff and researcher in the lead up to the event
- ➢ Space to carry out interviews/discussions (if necessary)
- ➢ Back-up on the day (if required)
- ➢ General assistance with the set-up and delivery of the research

Ethics and Intellectual Property
Suitable 'forms' should be made available for agreement of consent:

- ➢ Site memorandum of agreement
- ➢ Signed permission of interpreters
- ➢ Signed permission of participants' parents (where appropriate)
- ➢ Signed permission of those interviewed (site staff and audiences)
- ➢ Locate and obtain permission to use any scripts and/or teaching packs etc

Notes

Technology requirements
2 x DV Cam + spare batteries
1 x Minidisc recorder
2 x digital cameras

Targets/day
(to be re-assessed after day 1)
10 vox pops per camera
10 interviews/questionnaires with museum audience
3 hours filming per camera (battery requirements?)
2 detailed interviews local community (shop owners, wardens etc)

Levels of questions
Museum audience (detailed)
Vox pops on street (museum audience and local community)
Local community (detailed)
CMP Soc
Triangle
Museum staff

Friday

TIME	TONY	RUTH	FIONA	RACHAEL	JENNY	ALAN
10.00	Meet and brief in Herbert coffee shop					
11.00 – Tours begin	At Primrose Hill observing any action	Camera at Primrose Hill observing any action	At Primrose Hill	Camera at Herbert filming gathering	At Herbert observing gathering	At Primrose Hill
	Observation	VOX pops	Observation/ Questionnaires/ interviews	VOX pops	Observation/ Questionnaires/ Interviews	VOX pops/ interviews to camera
Lunch	Monitoring of progress and discussion of any necessary change in approach. Coffee shop, Primrose Hill street.					
Pm	At museum observing any action					At Primrose Hill
TARGETS	Observations	10 vox pops (short interviews) 10 questionnaires 5 interviews (filmed or taped) Observations		10 vox pops (short interviews) 10 questionnaires. 5 interviews (filmed or taped) Observations		10 vox pops/interviews with shop owners etc. Observations
4.30 – 5.00	De-brief at the Herbert					

Team 1
Team 2

APPENDIX C.4 MANCHESTER MUSEUM RESEARCH DESIGN

Contents

Research context: Manchester Museum

Case study four at Manchester Museum represents a significant point in the Performance, Learning and 'Heritage' research project's timeline. As the last of the detailed case studies, this is an opportunity to both test and build upon findings from previous sites/audiences, and the last prolonged period of access to known audience members.

Manchester Museum (http://www.museum.man.ac.uk/), in its current physical location, was opened in 1890. In 2003, the Museum opened its newly redeveloped entrance and gallery spaces. It thus comprises two very differing aesthetic spaces, which are to be recognised and utilised as such through the performance piece.

The museum's mission is as follows:

> "The Manchester Museum enables people to explore, enjoy, question, understand and reflect on the diversity and inter-relationships of humanity and the natural world, working in partnership with local and global communities, in ways that help to achieve the international ambitions of the University of Manchester' (Strategic Plan 2004/05 to 2005/06)

The museum's position within the University structure is reflected not only in its mission, location and branding, but in its stated goal of 'Reflecting the world at the University of Manchester' (Annual Report 2002/3). This means that it has an obligation to 'satisfy both its academic and wider social constituents', responsibilities acknowledged simultaneously within the museum's various policy documentation.

The Academic Policy highlights an insistence on; 'undertaking, collaborating in and facilitating' teaching and learning; the generation of 'innovative research programmes'; and 'academic integrity'. A stated objective of the museum is to 'provide an [cultural] interface between the University of Manchester's research output and the wider public'. The strategic imperatives of the museum (in terms of academic strategy) are aimed at supporting and developing academic activity that:

- Contributes actively to the academic purposes of the University
- Meets the needs of the Museum's audiences
- Achieves the strategic goals of the museum

The proposed performance will acknowledge the aforementioned relationships and requirements, and hopes to provide a model for such 'interfacing' between research output and the public (not least PLH and Revealing Histories research output).

The Museum's Strategic Plan highlights the importance of 'developing new audiences' and 'widening participation in higher education' as one of its operational targets 'towards 2015'. This means attracting 180,000+ visitors/year (a 50% increase on 2002/3), including 3,800 additional visits/year from 5-16 year olds. There is special emphasis placed on increasing visits by 'socially disadvantaged and ethnically diverse users in line with the University's objectives' (but also referencing DCMS).

The Museum's Access Policy (~2000) defines access as 'something which is facilitated when physical, cultural, social, financial, intellectual, psychological and emotional barriers are removed or reduced', and states a long-term commitment to addressing 'barriers to access at all levels of the museum service'.

The emphasis of the Access Policy and Strategic Plan are crucial to an understanding of the focus and language employed in the museum's Learning Policy. In fact, the Learning Policy is described as a 'companion' to the museums access policy and Strategic Plan (amongst others). 'Learning' thus underpins many or all activities in the Museum, and 'is not restricted to the Education department alone'. Under the banner of Social Inclusion, the learning policy highlights the importance of access for all, diversity, collaboration with audiences, self-representation, debate and de-mystifying the institution. Again, the proposed performance is a perfect fit for the   Learning Policy of the Museum in this respect.

The Museum's learning provision is carried out through a range of activities outlined in the Learning Policy. These include illustrated talks and demonstrations, drama and role-play sessions, storytelling, and music/dance/drama performances (41 activities are listed in all). Thus, we see the link between learning, access and social inclusion, and various kinds of performance being framed within this context.

The Greater Manchester Museums Hub 'Revealing Histories' project is the specific context within which the performances will take place at Manchester Museum. 'Revealing Histories, Remembering Slavery' aims to explore the history, impact and legacy of the slave trade on the cultural institutions of the Greater Manchester area, an area greatly influenced by the slave trade (DCMS website). As part of the bi-centenary of the abolition of the slave trade, each museum has been researching its collections to locate links with the trade and uncover hidden narratives which will be variously articulated over the coming year [For further information visit www.revealinghistories.org.uk].

'This Accursed Thing': The performance

After the invitation to tender was circulated, the research team received 13 applications.[1] There followed a competitive interview process wherein four groups were invited to present their ideas and answer questions about them (July 2006). After completion of this

---

[1] Advertised on the PLH website, GEM and IMTAL mail lists and the Arts Council website. Tender applications are stored in the PLH archive.

process, the tender was offered to Andrew Ashmore and Associates and a contract was drawn up (see archive).

The latest version of the script plus the invitation to tender can be located in the PLH archive.

Publicity
The museum's various performance activities are advertised in the What's On guide. These include family fun days which occasionally involve actors on site, and the monthly Victorian Gentleman's tour around the museum. The performances are also advertised on the museum's website in the What's On area
(http://www.museum.man.ac.uk/whatson/january.htm)
 [PB to give further details of past drama activities at the museum including Collecting the World]

'This Accursed Thing' is being promoted through these usual channels, although in the What's On guide, details can be found in both family and adult sections of the booklet (picking up on previous project findings that performances are often targeted specifically at children and families). Alongside this, the performance is being promoted through a separate Revealing Histories leaflet, and singularly, through a promotional leaflet produced by the PLH team. The performances are also mentioned in the Martin Harris events guide, and will be promoted through Unilife, GEM and IMTAL.

Audience
The potential audiences for the research project are (at least) two-fold. Independent groups/visitors attending performances, and local schools groups (key stage three) who take advantage of the museum's formal learning programme will be looked at in depth. Each will be dealt with separately within this document as their specific needs dictate.

Audience 1: Independent visitors
A total of ~ [roughly] 25 individual audience members will in some way have their experiences of the performance tracked. These will be divided into two groups, the first involved only for the day of the performance (1:1), the second having its relationship with the performance followed over a nine/ten month period (1:2).

This will be done in a bid to limit the impact of the research itself on people's longer-term meaning-making and to maximise on incentive payments. The logic is that for group 1:1, we make the research process more 'formal' (in order to glean initial impact, facilitate group discussion and identify areas for further questioning of group 1:2), and that for group 1:2 we can then investigate long-term impact without having changed the nature of their experience too drastically. The details are as follows:

1:1: Saturday 31 March
Two groups of six volunteers [our research subjects] will be in attendance at Saturday's performances alongside the rest of the audience. One group will attend the 1.30 performance, the other the 3.00 event. It is hoped that one group will be populated by Community Advisory Panel members (and Collective Conversations) who have a prior knowledge of the museum and the Revealing Histories initiative. The other group will be made up from members of the public who self-select themselves as research subjects.

Each group will spend forty minutes with a member of the research team prior to encountering the performance. During this time, a meaning-mapping exercise will take

place which will establish general knowledge of and feelings toward the subject matter of the performance (without giving more 'away' than appears in official wording in promotions). These sessions will be taped in case of discussion within the group. At this point, if time allows, a general discussion within the group can be initiated.

The groups will be then be stewarded to the start of the performance, and then discreetly filmed as they traverse the museum (see section on filming). Notes will be taken of any actions/questions/responses of interest to the research (see section on Observations).

Post-performance, the group will re-convene, and will be asked to record their level of knowledge etc after having seen the performance (through the meaning mapping exercise). This will be done in order to supplement their initial responses, and in order to show how and in what ways their prior thoughts, feelings and level of knowledge have been superseded/built upon/disrupted. It may be possible to use other exercises within this session to capture emotional responses etc. (e.g. personal timelines tracking the performance event in retrospect). The session will end with a forty-minute focus group discussion to see how the group dynamic steers the conversation, and where it places emphasis.

Each group of six respondents will undergo the same routine. (N.B. this means more than one researcher will need to be running sessions simultaneously). It may be possible to follow up these individuals further down the line, but I think we should stress that what happens within these group sessions is the majority data collection.

[NB: *The basement of the museum has been booked as venue for these discussions.]*

1:2: Sunday 1 April [or Monday 2 April – depending on arrangements with the MM media crew]
12~15 audience members; three groups of individuals will watch three performances on the Sunday. These individuals will not undergo group sessions as group 1:1 but will undergo more 'normative' experiences. This might mean that they engage with the performance entirely on their own, or in couples/family groups – whichever is in line with their normal museum visitation strategy. Individuals will be briefed beforehand, but in as informal way as is possible to avoid changing the emphasis of the day (i.e. not taken away to a special room, but met individually in the foyer). These individuals will be observed in their interactions with the performance event, although not in an obvious intrusive manner. Post-performance, individuals will be briefly interviewed by members of the research team (approximately 10 minutes each). These interviews will be kept short to limit any unnatural solidification of what the performance has 'meant' to individuals, as this might impact on their longer-term ability to reflect and establish personal meaning. Interviewees will be asked two or three open-ended questions, enabling them to talk casually about their initial thoughts and responses to the performance experience. (N.B. again this means that more than one member of the research team will need to be on hand for interviewing).

Questions might include:
What did you think of the performance? [start with an open question]
How did it make you feel?
Was there anything you particularly liked?
Was there anything you particularly disliked?
What (if anything) do you think you will remember from or about the performance?
What did you think of the characters?
Did you interact with the characters? If yes, how did you feel about the interaction? If no, why not?

One week later, [after Easter weekend] participants will be followed up with a telephone conversation, with another nine months down the line. In this manner we can follow the narrative of their long-term relationship with the performance event, without the research itself changing the nature of that relationship too much. [*We could ask participants at some stage if they found the research element intrusive or distracting just to cover this?*]

N.B. Crucially, the above groups should be kept small in order to avoid vastly altering the nature of the performance. If we completely fill the audiences with our participants, the filmed/observed event becomes somewhat falsified, and we have little idea of the attraction to (and demographic of) 'normal' audiences

This separation of Audience 1 into two 'types' is intended to produce a variety of comparative data, and to eliminate problems associated with the ongoing impact of focus group activity evident in National Maritime Museum research.

Research participants for Saturday 31st March (focus groups) will be recruited through the PLH leaflet. It is vital (more so than Sunday's data collection) that these participants are organised in advance and their participation secured. 12 – 15 participants will be recruited through the CAP mail-out and leaflet distribution in local areas.

Volunteers to take part in the second data collection day (Sunday 1st April) will be approached by the research team after they have booked a place/places for the performance. The museum routinely collect information from people as they book (age, group size, contact number) but they will also be informed of the possibility of being contacted about involvement in the research.

Participants on Saturday will thus be self-selecting into the research process, on Sunday, participants will be self-selecting into the performance itself. This might provide a very different demographic makeup for both days (perhaps an interesting finding in itself). If this is the case, other audience members will be approached on the day to try and even things out.

Audience 2: Educational groups

Much of this is being continually adjusted in line with schools responses and recommendations.

Two very different schools have been chosen (by Manchester Museum) to take part in this study. They have been chosen because they have a prior record of engagement with the Museum, and are open to new opportunities.[2] Both schools are bringing Year 8 (Key Stage 3) pupils to the Museum and will be in attendance on different days.

Contact was made with teachers in January, and school visits took place soon after that. Further discussions during preparatory sessions in schools are feeding into the research process.

It is hoped that we will be able to map curricular links with the performance, and attend preparatory lessons etc at the school. At this point also, suitable permissions can be put in place to allow for filming etc on the research days.

At both schools

---

[2] For more information about the individual schools, their records and our contacts there, see the PLH archive.

A combination of the following methods will be used in relation to the school groups

Meaning Mapping and Timelines
Prior to the museum visit, a selection of pupils (of all abilities) will undergo a meaning mapping exercise (see Appendix 1) to provide a measure for post-performance analysis. This way, as with the adults in focus groups, we can identify the four dimensions of understanding: Breadth and Depth of understanding, Vocabulary used and level of Mastery (from novice ~ expert).[3]

Using timelines will enable pupils to represent their levels of engagement visually, (teachers have already expressed that drawing etc should prove more valuable than interviewing in some cases). Using two axes, one to represent time lapsed in the duration of the performance, the other (vertical) to represent level of engagement, allows the pupil to track their own individual narrative of the performance highlighting gradations of 'good', 'bad', 'entertaining', 'engaging' etc. They can then annotate their timeline with pictures/words highlighting noteworthy instances.

Observation
Of preparatory sessions, on coaches, of de-briefs back at school, and crucially, filming and observation on the day. Both research team observations and notes from the footage will be written up post performance.

Interviews
Interviews with a selection of pupils (~ 15 from each school?) will take place after the Easter break. Interviews with teaching staff will also be carried out.

Creative writings/Drawings
Perhaps we can ask them to write a response to one of the characters? Or to create a list of questions they would like to ask them? These would help to locate inspiration, learning, surprise, empathy etc. Perhaps this could be carried out as a cross-curricular activity with other departments in the school?

Use of Forum
The forum might act as a suitable portal for discussion amongst pupils both before and after their visit to the Museum. They might discuss their expectations, feelings, responses to images etc, and may provide us with debate between the different schools. This could even lead to a physical meeting of pupils from different schools which the museum could facilitate.

**AGMS students – Weds 28th
AGMS students, with the permission of Helen Rees-Leahy, will have their performance filmed also. Following the performance, there may well be opportunity to record interviews, film vox pops and pass around questionnaires – a valuable pilot for the data collection period the following weekend.

Curriculum links
Brian Maguire, Trinity School – visit in respect to History curriculum
Joanne McMurray, Brookway School – visit in respect to Citizenship curriculum

This difference in context in itself might make for interesting findings about response, recall, attitude, enjoyment etc. In both schools, preparatory sessions will be observed,

---

[3] See Falk et al.

and lesson plans for the term located. This way we can see in what way the visit is being framed, and where it sits in the timeline of their studies.

From PB and The Standards Site:
[Key stage 3 Citizenship
At the end of the key stage, pupils have a broad knowledge and understanding of the topical events they study; the rights, responsibilities and duties of citizens; the role of the voluntary sector; forms of government; provision of public services; and the criminal and legal systems show how the public gets information and how opinion is formed and expressed, including through the media; and how and why changes take place in society take part in school and community-based activities, demonstrating personal and group responsibility in their attitudes to themselves and to others.
Fits into Unit 4: Britain – a diverse society
In this unit pupils consider their identities and the different national, cultural, religious, regional and ethnic identities and communities to which they belong. The focus of this unit is on respect for diversity in our society. The activities help pupils to think about personal identities and to reflect on their own experiences. They consider how communities are interdependent. The school's equal opportunities policy and ethos is a useful starting point for discussion of issues of mutual respect and understanding. Staff and pupils should feel supported by the policy and it is helpful if pupils can be involved in any reviews of the policy and developing practical measures to ensure effective implementation. Sensitive issues will be raised in this unit.]

[Key Stage 3 History
During key stage 3 pupils learn about significant individuals and events in the history of Britain from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century. They also learn about key aspects of European and world history. They show their understanding by making connections between events and changes in the different periods and areas studied, and by comparing the structure of societies and economic, cultural and political developments. They evaluate and use sources of information, using their historical knowledge to analyse the past and explain how it can be represented and interpreted in different ways.
Fits into unit 15: Black peoples of America from slavery to equality
In this unit, pupils learn about black peoples within American society. They are encouraged to consider the changing experiences of the black community, as well as changes within America as a whole, as black peoples moved from slavery to freedom, and towards equality. There are opportunities to examine the varied part played by black peoples in American life and culture, and to reflect upon the nature of 'freedom' in America.]

Dates for data capture
Observations: 23/24/25 March
School groups: 26 – 30 March [26th/30th am – Trinity, 28th am – Brookway]
AGMS group: 28th pm
Independent Visitors 31 March – 1 April
Observations: 2 April

Data collection methods

Filming

To be carried out by Kooj, with help from Manchester Museum staff. This will however be supplemented with our own filming so that we have digital footage that we can access and edit immediately after the event. We will also use stills cameras to capture as much as is possible of the performance event. Perhaps we can also use our own cameras to film some of what happens on those other days when different audience groups are in

evidence (eg Community Advisory Panel, Undergraduate students, Advisory Board, 'normal' audiences).

As the performance promenades around the museum, it will be necessary that some cameras are moving either with audience groups, or to static locations further in the trail. This should be done as inconspicuously as is possible. Discussion with both Kooj and Andrew Ashmore about where best to film from [locations, viewpoints, angles etc] is ongoing. Both actors will need to wear radio-microphones for a few performances filmed. Some performances may involve the use of microphones placed within audiences in order to capture verbal interactions (between spectators themselves, and between spectators and performers).

We could also film some vox-pops with individuals at the end of the performance. These will need to be accompanied by a release form.

Observation/Tracking/Mapping

Members of the research team will have an opportunity to take part in the performance on 23/24/25 March. At this point they should make a note of their initial reactions and observations. This will include: Tony, Jenny, Ruth , Anna, Joel

It is important that notes are made prior to the data collection period as this may impact upon ability to recall, opinions of the piece etc.

During the data collection period, where possible, members of the research team should observe the performance as it traverses the museum, making special note of any particularly interesting questions/actions/comments/digressions/etc of both those audience members taking part in the research and those whose involvement is unofficial. Also, notes on body language, especially open/closed stances, and changes in this during the performance will be noted. We cannot rely on the cameras to capture everything, particularly because of the movement inherent in the piece, and the fact that audience members will not necessarily be up close to microphones.

Somebody [ideally two people] should always be responsible for mapping how the audience shifts during the performance – briefly illustrating how they are positioning themselves in relation to the 'action', how many are asking questions? Is it always the same individuals? Who are they asking them to? At what point? Are they interventions or invited interactions? Who is joining/leaving en route? Why are they joining/leaving? What is the demographic make up of the group? Observation forms can be prepared to help with this endeavour if necessary.

It is hoped that the research team will have access to response books and comments cards at the museum – this might give us access to comments of others who join the performance – positive and negative - and how they fit with comments given about the rest of the museum. Are they different in tone? focus? length? address? language? who are they addressing?. The first weekend of performances will be used as a pilot for this kind of research, and if insufficient, the approach can be altered for the following weekend (e.g. location of the book, questions for response)

Interviews

These will take place with both school groups (and teachers) and those independent visitors who make up audience 1:2. We will also carry out interviews with Manchester Museum staff and the actors in the piece.

Questionnaires
If appropriate during the data collection period, a questionnaire will be administered to individuals after performances (see Appendix 2)

Focus groups and activities including meaning mapping and timelines exercises
See outlines for Audience 1:1 and Audience 2

Collection of archival data including…
>   Museum policy documents
>   Draft scripts and final scripts
>   Correspondence
>   Lists of sources for script research
>   Publicity materials
>   Website
>   Andrew Ashmore materials (training? guidelines? objectives? character timelines/development?)
>   Visitor Surveys

Timetable

January:
Contact/visit schools, identify ways to contact independent visitors, confirm Media Centre, book equipment [PB to contact schools initially and then JK to contact and arrange visits]

8 February:
Community Advisory Panel [recording in archive]

Feb 19 onward:
Locate independent visitors (keeping track of museum bookings). Make contact to ensure participation on the day. If necessary, a letter of invite will be sent to CAP and Collective Conversations contacts to fill spaces. [A document keeping track of developments is with JK]

March:
Observation of preparatory sessions in schools, meaning mapping exercises, interviews with teachers/learning mentors.

14 March
Performance for MM staff

19th – 23rd March
Preparatory sessions at schools
(19th and 22nd – Trinity, 21st and 23rd – Brookway)

22/23 March
Andrew and Paul in Manchester for rehearsals

23/24/25 March:
Observation

26 – 30 March:
School groups

31 March – 1 April:
Independent visitors

2 April:
Observation/Filming

W/c 9 April:
Follow up interviews

January/February 2008:
Follow up interviews

Participation parameters: the site
- Access to schools who are signed up for visits.
- Access to documentation.
- Appropriate meetings between staff and researcher in the lead up to the event.
- Space to carry out interviews/discussions (if necessary).
- Back-up on the day (if required). *Especially liaison over stewarding & publicising the research/presence of cameras etc.*
- General assistance with the set-up and delivery of the research.

Participation parameters: individuals
- Individuals will be expected to partake in the research on the terms outlined in exchange for whatever incentives are on offer. All participants will be expected to sign a form agreeing to the use of data for research purposes.
- Where applicable, responsibility for any child's involvement in the research lies with their parent/guardian.

Participation parameters: schools
- Where necessary, the school will be responsible for ensuring parents of children receive and sign agreement to partake in the research (incl. release forms for non-commercial use of images).
- Allowing the researcher to attend preparatory sessions in order to observe and/or speak with pupils.
- A willingness to co-operate with the research as a whole, and a commitment to ensuring the longitudinal nature of the research (for up to 12 months).

Ethics and intellectual property
The ethical implications of the study, and any ramifications for intellectual property, should be located and dealt with well in advance of the data collection exercise. The ethics committee have agreed to the stated positioning on ethics, and suitable 'forms' will be made available for agreement of consent:

- Site memorandum of agreement
- Signed permission of interpreters
- Signed permission of pupils parents
- Signed permission of those interviewed (site staff and audiences)
- Locate and obtain permission to use any scripts and/or teaching packs

Detailed timetables: Saturday 31st March

	JK	TJ	RD + media	AF [FG1]	Fiona [FG2]	Becky
12.00		12.00 performance observations	12.00 film performance + vox pops	12.00 performance observations	12.00 performance observations	Mapping/ photos
12.45	Meet FG1 participants in foyer			stewarding		
12.55	To basement 1 for activity			Help with activity		
1.25	To start of performance			Stewarding		
1.30	FG1 watch performance		Film performance + vox pops	observations		
2.15		TJ meets FG2 in foyer			stewarding	
2.25		To basement 2 for activity			Help with activity	
~2.30	FG1 to basement for activity			Help with activity		
2.55		To start of performance			Stewarding	
3.00		FG2 watch performance	Film performance + vox pops		observations	
~3.30	FG1 ends - observations					
~4.00		FG2 to basement for activity			Help with activity	
~4.45		FG2 ends				

+ an extra 1 or 2 volunteers for the questionnaire

Sunday 1st, *no filming
NB If there are not enough research subjects signed up for this day, approaches can be made on the day and cash incentives paid to those who volunteer. Failing that, Monday's performances can be targeted (JK and AF?). We are looking for 12 – 15 all together.

	JK	TJ	AF	Fiona	Anna L	Becky N	RD
11.45	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	
11.55	Guide to start perf	Guide to start perf	Guide to start perf	Guide to start perf	Guide to start perf	Guide to start perf	photos
12.00	Observations		Observations		Watch performance	mapping	Photos / vox pops
~1.00	Individuals to be approached by members of research team and asked a couple of general exploratory questions (max. 10 mins) in foyer. Form to be signed saying we can contact again over coming months.						Vox pops
1.15	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	
1.25	Guide to start of perf	Guide to start of perf	Guide to start of perf	Guide to start of perf	Guide to start perf	Guide to start perf	photos
1.30		observations		observations	Any stewarding		Photos / vox pops
~2.30	Individuals to be approached by members of research team and asked a couple of general exploratory questions (max. 10 mins) in foyer. Form to be signed saying we can contact again over coming months.						Vox pops
2.45	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	Meet ind. visitors	
2.55	Guide to start of perf	Guide to start of perf	Guide to start of perf	Guide to start of perf	Guide to start of perf	Guide to start of perf	photos
3.00	observations		observations			Any stewarding	Photos / vox pops
~4.00	Individuals to be approached by members of research team and asked a couple of general exploratory questions (max. 10 mins) in foyer. Form to be signed saying we can contact again over coming months.						Vox pops

Monday 2nd
Two performances to be filmed and observed. No other intervention to be made. If not enough people from Sunday for follow ups – try to recruit some more.

Ask participants for home and mobile number to avoid COA problems for nine-month interviews.

APPENDIX D. Participant code break-down

CS1: National Maritime Museum

[NMM_F_PP1_117] – Saturday focus group featuring the following:
DB: [TGT] Male, 26-39, lives in Greater London. White British
BB: [TGT] Female, 60-69, lives in Kent, White Other, Retired Architect
BF: [TGT] Male, 60-69, lives in Surrey, White British, Business Consultant
CG: [WFN] Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, Black, PhD student
CK: [TGT] Male, 40-49, Lives in Greater London, White British, Head of Information Security
HK: [TGT] Female, 50-59, lives in Essex, White British, Proprietor of Company
TL: [TGT] Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, White British, Executive Assistant
JK: [TGT] Male, 60-69, lives in Essex, White British, Accountant
RM: [TGT] Male, 50-59, Lives in Greater London, White British, Technical Manager
GM: [TGT] Female, 50-59, lives in Greater London, White British, works in IT
HR: [TGT] Female, 70+, lives in Greater London, White British, Retired
JR: [TGT] Male, 70+, lives in Greater London, White British, PT University Lecturer
ES: [TGT] Male, 26-39, lives in Greenwich, White other, Student
BS: [TGT] Male, 60-69, lives in Kent, White British, Retired

[NMM_F_PP1_116] – Sunday focus group featuring the following:
HB: [TPT] Female, 26-39, lives in London, White British, Associate Professional
LB: [TPT] Female, 40-49, lives in Greenwich, Mixed Race, teacher
GB: [TPT] Male, 40-49, lives in Greenwich, White British, Project Manager
LiB: [TPT] Female, under 16, lives in Greenwich, Mixed Race, FT education
IC: [TPT] Female, 60-69, lives in Manchester, White British, Retired teacher
ID: [TPT] Female, 40-49, lives in Greenwich, British Asian, Professional (Science and Technology)
JD: [TPT] Male, under 16, lives in Greenwich, British Asian, FT education
LD: [TPT] Female, 50-59, lives in Greenwich, White British, Home Educator
FD: [TPT] Male, under 16, lives in Greenwich, White British, education (at home)
DE: [TPT] Male, 50-59, lives in Greater London, White British
ME: [TPT] Male, under 16, lives in Greater London, White British, FT education
DH: [TPT] Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, White British, Teacher
Is: [TPT] Female: 26-39, lives in Greenwich, White British, Associate Professional
RJ: [TPT] Male, 26-39, lives in Greater London, White British, Accountant
PM: [TPT] Male, 50-59, lives in Greater London, White British, teacher
BMH: [TPT] [TPT] Male, under 16, lives in Greater London, White British, FT education
KN: [TPT] Female, 26-39, lives in Greenwich, White British, Homemaker
TW: [TPT] Female, 70+, lives in Kent, White other, Retired Artist
G: [TPT] Male, 26-39, lives in Greater London, Black British, Unemployed

Interviews in the weeks following the visit:
NMM_I_PP2_29 - TPT: Male, under 16, lives in Greenwich, White British, education (at home)
NMM_I_PP2_30 - TGT: Male, 26-39, lives in Greenwich, White other, Student
NMM_I_PP2_31 - TPT: Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, White British, Teacher
NMM_I_PP2_32 - TGT: Male, 26-39, lives in Greater London. White British
NMM_I_PP2_33 - WFN: Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, Black, PhD student
NMM_I_PP2_34 - TGT: Male, 60-69, lives in Kent, White British, Retired
NMM_I_PP2_35 - TPT: Male, under 16, lives in Greater London, White British, FT education
NMM_I_PP2_47 - TPT: Male, 40-49, lives in Greenwich, White British, Project Manager

NMM_I_PP2_48 - TGT: Female, 50-59, lives in Essex, White British, Proprietor of Company
NMM_I_PP2_49 - TPT: Female, 26-39, lives in London, White British, Associate Professional
NMM_I_PP2_50 - TGT: Female, 70+, lives in Greater London, White British, Retired
NMM_I_PP2_51 - TPT: Female, 60-69, lives in Manchester, White British, Retired teacher
NMM_I_PP2_52 - TPT: Female: 26-39, lives in Greenwich, White British, Associate Professional
NMM_I_PP2_53 - TGT: Male, 60-69, lives in Essex, White British, Accountant
NMM_I_PP2_54 - TGT: Male, 70+, lives in Greater London, White British, PT University Lecturer
NMM_I_PP2_55 - TPT: Female, 26-39, lives in Greenwich, White British, Homemaker
NMM_I_PP2_56 - TPT: Female, under 16, lives in Greenwich, Mixed Race, FT education
NMM_I_PP2_57 - TPT: Female, 50-59, lives in Greenwich, White British, Home Educator
NMM_I_PP2_58 - TPT: Female, 40-49, lives in Greenwich, Mixed Race, teacher
NMM_I_PP2_59 - TPT: Male, 50-59, lives in Greater London, White British, teacher
NMM_I_PP2_60 - TGT: Male, 50-59, Lives in Greater London, White British, Technical Manager
NMM_I_PP2_61 - TPT: Male, 26-39, lives in Greater London, White British, Accountant
NMM_I_PP2_62 - TGT: Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, White British, Executive Assistant
NMM_I_PP2_63 - TPT: Female, 70+, lives in Kent, White other, Retired Artist
NMM_I_PP2_104 - TGT: Female, 50-59, lives in Greater London, White British, works in IT
NMM_I_PP2_105 - TPT: Female, 40-49, lives in Greenwich, British Asian, Professional (Science and Technology)
NMM_I_PP2_107 - TPT: Male, under 16, lives in Greenwich, British Asian, FT education
NMM_I_PP2_108 - TPT: Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, white British, IT team leader
NMM_I_PP2_109 - TPT: Male, 50-59, lives in Greater London, White British
NMM_I_PP2_110 - TPT: Male, under 16, lives in Greater London, White British, FT education

Interviews after ten months
NMM_I_PP3_13 - TGT: Male, 26-39, lives in Greater London
NMM_I_PP3_14 - TPT: Female, 26-39, lives in London, White British, Associate Professional
NMM_I_PP3_15 - TPT: Female, 60-69, lives in Manchester, White British, Retired teacher
NMM_I_PP3_16 - TGT: Male, 70+, lives in Greater London, White British, PT University Lecturer
NMM_I_PP3_17 - TPT: Female, 26-39, lives in Greenwich, White British, Homemaker
NMM_I_PP3_18 - TPT: Male, under 16, lives in Greater London, White British, FT education
NMM_I_PP3_19 - TGT: Male, 50-59, Lives in Greater London, White British, Technical Manager
NMM_I_PP3_20 - TPT: Male, 26-39, lives in Greater London, White British, Accountant
NMM_I_PP3_21 - TPT: Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, white British, IT team leader
NMM_I_PP3_22 - TPT: Female, under 16, lives in Greenwich, FT education
NMM_I_PP3_23 - TPT: Male, 50-59, lives in Greater London, White British, teacher
NMM_I_PP3_24 - TPT: Male, 40-49, lives in Greenwich, White British, Project Manager
NMM_I_PP3_25 - TPT: Male, under 16, lives in Greenwich, British Asian, FT education
NMM_I_PP3_26 - TPT: Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, White British, Teacher
NMM_I_PP3_27 - TGT: Male, 40-49, Lives in Greater London, White British, Head of Information Security
NMM_I_PP3_36 - TGT: Female, 60-69, lives in Kent, White Other, Retired Architect
NMM_I_PP3_37 - TGT: Female, 50-59, lives in Essex, White British, Proprietor of Company
NMM_I_PP3_38 - TPT: Female, 40-49, lives in Greenwich, British Asian, Professional (Science and Technology)
NMM_I_PP3_39 - TGT: Female, 50-59, lives in Greater London, White British, works in IT
NMM_I_PP3_40 - TGT: Male, 60-69, lives in Essex, White British, Accountant
NMM_I_PP3_41 - TGT: Male, 60-69, lives in Surrey, White British, Business Consultant
NMM_I_PP3_42 - TGT: Male, 60-69, lives in Kent, White British, Retired
NMM_I_PP3_43 - TPT: Female, 40-49, lives in Greenwich, Mixed Race, teacher
NMM_I_PP3_44 - WFN: Female, 40-49, lives in Greater London, Black, PhD student

NMM_I_PP3_45 - TGT: Female, 70+, lives in Greater London, White British, Retired

CS2: Llancaiach Fawr Manor

LFM_I_PP2_95 Interview with history teacher, visit 2 secondary school
LFM_O_PP2_140 Interview with two teachers from visit 1 primary school
LFM_P_PP1_118 Interview with interpreter AP
LFM_P_PP1_119 Interview with interpreter IG
LFM_I_PP1_120 Interview with Head of Interpretation, D
LFM_P_PP1_121 Interview with interpreter G
LFM_P_PP1_122 Interview with interpreter SG

School 1:
LFM_S_PP2_141 Mixed group of four pupils (3M 1F), year 3. In the weeks following the visit.
LFM_S_PP2_142 Group of three pupils (3M, mixed ethnicity), year 3. In the weeks following the visit.
LFM_S_PP2_143 Group of two, (1F (Chinese origin), 1M (White British), year 3. In the weeks following the visit.
LFM_S_PP2_147 Group of three, white British (2f, 1M), year 4. In the weeks following the visit.
LFM_S_PP2_148 Group of three, mixed ethnicity (2M, 1F), year 4. In the weeks following the visit.
LFM_S_PP2_149 Group of three, mixed ethnicity (2F, 1M), year 4. In the weeks following the visit.
LFM_S_PP3_144 Group of 3, mixed ethnicity, (2F, 1M), year 3. Ten months after visit.
LFM_S_PP3_145 Group of three, mixed ethnicity (3F), year 3. Ten months after visit.
LFM_S_PP3_146 Group of three, mixed ethnicity (3M), year 3. Ten months after visit.
LFM_S_PP3_150 Group of three, mixed ethnicity (2F, 1M), year 4. Ten months after visit.
LFM_S_PP3_151 Group of three, mixed ethnicity, (3F) year 4. Ten months after visit.
LFM_S_PP3_152 Group of three, mixed, year 4. Ten months after visit.
LFM_S_PP3_153 Group of three, mixed ethnicity, (2M +1anon), year 4. Ten months after visit.

School 2: The Great Debate [N.B> this was an all boys school so all participants are male.]
LFM_S_Pre_92 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, one week before visit
LFM_S_Pre_126 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, one week before visit
LFM_S_Pre_127 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, one week before visit
LFM_S_Pre_128 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, one week before visit
LFM_S_PP2_100 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, in weeks following the visit
LFM_S_PP2_101 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, in weeks following the visit
LFM_S_PP2_134 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, in weeks following the visit
LFM_S_PP3_137 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, nine months later
LFM_S_PP3_138 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, nine months later
LFM_S_PP3_139 Interview with two pupils, School 2, Year 6, nine months later
LFM_S_Pre_124 Interview with four pupils, School 2, Year 2, one week before visit
LFM_S_Pre_125 Interview with four pupils, School 2, Year 2, one week before visit
LFM_S_PP2_130 Interview with four pupils, School 2, Year 2, in weeks following visit.
LFM_S_PP2_131 Interview with four pupils, School 2, Year 2, in weeks following visit.
LFM_S_PP3_123 Interview with four pupils, School 2, Year 2, nine months later
LFM_S_PP3_132 Interview with four pupils, School 2, Year 2, nine months later
LFM_S_PP3_133 Interview with four pupils, School 2, Year 2, nine months later

CS3: Triangle Theatre Company at the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum

Two elderly people who had known Pollard in his youth (who had seen the Trail advertised in the local newspaper. One male and one female [TCC_I_PP2_174]. Interviewed again one year later (TTC_I_PP3_215 and TTC_I_PP3_214)

Brian Pollard, Irving's nephew who was present on most days of the Trail, and who himself was something of an artefact – sitting in one of the Kurdish cafe's and open to conversation with the Trail's audience [TTC_I_PP1_175]

Two University lecturers (neither from Manchester University or directly related to the research project, one male with a prior knowledge of Triangle's work, one female with no prior knowledge) [TCC_I_PP2_178] and [TTC_I_PP2_180]

One person responsible for publicity of the Trail [TCC_I_PP2_172], who was with her partner on one of the days the Research team was present [TTC_I_PP2_179]

Three audience members who had been invited by the Research Team, two of whom had prior experience of Triangle's method [TTC_observations_3], [TTC_observations_4] and one who did not [TTC_observations_2].

Audience member (attended with her daughter, who found out about the Trail from a flier [TCC_I_PP1_176]

Audience member (who had found out about the Trail from Triangle [TTC_I_PP1_173]

One male audience member who had found out about the Trail from the research team but attended independently [TTC_observations_5]

One Kurdish speaker who attended with the Research Team [TTC_I_PP1_171]

One Research Team member who contributed some observations [TTC_observationss_1]

Eleven Kurdish speakers in interview with research team member, in [TTC_O_PP1_177]

Members of staff at the museum

[TTC_M_Pre_184] Interview with City Arts and Heritage Manager, male, white British.

[TTC_M_PP1_181] Interview with Curating team (two interviewees one male, one female).

[TTC_M_PP1_182] Interview with Visitor Services Manager, male, white British.

[TTC_P_PP2_169] Interview with Triangle Theatre Company two interviewees, one male, one female).

[TTC_M_Pre_183] Interview with Head of Learning, male, White British.

CS4: the Manchester Museum

School groups: PP2
School one
MM_S_PP2_155: Mixed Group of 3, Year 9 Male, Mixed; Female, British Asian; female, Black British
MM_S_PP2_154: Mixed Group of 3, Year 9. Female, Black British; Female, White British; Male, White British
MM_S_PP2_156: Mixed Group of 3, Year 9. Male, British Asian; Male, White British; Male, White British
MM_S_PP2_157: Mixed Group of 3, Year 9. Male, Black British; Female, Black British; Male, Mixed.
MM_S_PP2_158: Mixed Group of 3, Year 9. Male; Female, British Asian; Male, White British
MM_S_PP2_159: Mixed group of 3, Year 9. Male, White British; Male; Female, White British
MM_S_PP2_160: Mixed Group of 3, Year 9. Male; Female; Female, Black British

School two
MM_S_PP2_161: Group of three females, Year 8. All White British.
MM_S_PP2_202: Group of four. Two male, two female (one mixed race), Year 8.
MM_S_PP2_203: Group of three. One male, two female, Year 8. All white British.

School Groups PP3
School one
MM_S_PP3_163: Mixed group of three, Year 9
MM_S_PP3_164: Mixed group of three, Year 9
MM_S_PP3_165: Mixed group of three, Year 9
MM_S_PP3_166: Mixed group of three, Year 9
MM_S_PP3_167: Mixed group of three, Year 9
MM_S_PP3_168: Mixed group of three, Year 9

Individuals: PP1
MM_I_PP1_64: Male, 60-69, White British, Moss Side, Councillor
MM_I_PP1_68: Female, 60-69, African, Longsight
MM_I_PP1_69: Female, 17-25, White European, Manchester, Student
MM_I_PP1_70: Male, 17-25, White British, Newton Heath
MM_I_PP1_72: Female, 40-49, European, Stockport
MM_I_PP1_73: Male, 50-59, White British, Newark
MM_I_PP1_74: Female, 17-25, Anglo-Caribbean, Fallowfield
MM_I_PP1_76: Male, 50-59, White British, Manchester
MM_I_PP1_81: Female, 40-49, European, M19, Lecturer
MM_I_PP1_83: Male, 26-39, White British, Crewe
MM_I_PP1_84: Male, 26-39, Nig. Yaruba, Nigeria

Focus Groups: PP1
MM_F_PP1_204 (Focus group 1: pre-performance. Interview with six members of the public)
MM_F_PP1_205 (Focus group 1: post-performance. Interview with six members of the public)
MM_F_ PP1_206 (Focus group 2: interview with six members of the public)

Individuals: PP2
MM_I_PP2_65: Male, 60-69, White British, Moss Side, Councillor
MM_I_PP2_67: Female, 40-49, White British, Newton Heath
MM_I_PP2_71: Female, 56+, Anglesey, Teacher
MM_I_PP2_75: Male, 31-55, White British, Rusholme
MM_I_PP2_77: Female, 31-55, White British, Altrincham
MM_I_PP2_78: Female, 31-55, Mixed, Manchester
MM_I_PP2_79: Female, African, Cheshire
MM_I_PP2_80: Female, 31-55, Manchester
MM_I_PP2_82: Female, 50, Black British, Manchester
MM_I_PP2_85: Male, 40-49, African-Caribbean, Ardwick
MM_I_PP2_87: Female, 17-25, Anglo-Caribbean, Fallowfield
MM_I_PP2_198: Male, 50-59, White British, Newark
MM_I_PP2_207: Female, 26-39, White European, Stockport
MM_I_PP2_208: Female, African, Manchester
MM_I_PP2_209: Female, White European, Manchester
MM_I_PP2_210: Male, 26-39, White British, Crewe
MM_I_PP2_211: Male, Afro-Caribbean, Stretford

Individuals: PP3
MM_I_PP3_162: Male, Stretford, Afro-Caribbean
MM_I_PP3_186: Male, 40-49, Kashmiri, Manchester, sales rep
MM_I_PP3_188: Female, 50-59, White British, Bangor, HE Lecturer
MM_I_PP3_189: Female, 50, Mixed ethnicity, not working due to illness
MM_I_PP3_190: Female, 40-49, White British, Manchester, NHS Administrator
MM_I_PP3_191: Female, 65, White British, Lancashire, Retired
MM_I_PP3_192: 30-39, Barrister, Black Caribbean, Bolton
MM_I_PP3_193: Male, 50-55, White British, Trafford, IT Manager
MM_I_PP3_195: anonymous
MM_I_PP3_197: 31-55, Caucasian, Macclesfield
MM_I_PP3_196: Male, 40-49, British Asian, Manchester, Community development worker
MM_I_PP3_194: Female, 30-39, White British, London, Florist
MM_I_PP3_187: Male, 60-69, White British, Moss Side, Councillor
MM_I_PP3_200: Male, Afro-Caribbean, Stretford
MM_I_PP3_162: Female, 17-25, Anglo-Caribbean, Fallowfield

APPENDIX E. List of sites visited and organisations consulted

Sites visited over the course of PLH *(UK except where otherwise specified):*
Armagh Folk and Transport Museum, Northern Ireland
Armagh American Folk Park, Northern Ireland
The British Museum, London
The British Empire & Commonwealth Museum, Bristol
District Six Museum, Cape Town, S. Africa
Espoo City Museum, Helsinki, Finland
The Galleries of Justice, Nottingham
The Herbert Art Gallery and Museum, Coventry
Imperial War Museum North, Salford
Jorvik, York
Llancaiach Fawr Manor, Nelson, South Wales
The Lowry Art Gallery, Salford
The Manchester Museum, Manchester
Maritime Museum, Liverpool
International Slavery Museum, Liverpool
The Melbourne Museum, Victoria, Australia
Musée de l'Armée & Dôme des Invalides, Paris
The Museum of Cultures, Helsinki
Museum of Science and Industry, Manchester
National Army Museum, London
National Football Museum, Preston
National Maritime Museum, Greenwich
National Railway Museum, York
The People's History Museum, Manchester
Port Arthur Historic Site, Tasmania
Robben Island, Cape Town, S. Africa
Royal Armouries, Leeds
Shugborough Hall and Estate, Stafford
St Fagans National History Museum, Cardiff
Sovereign Hill Historic Site, Ballarat, Australia
Warwick Castle, Warwick
Wigan Pier, Wigan
Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia, USA
The Workhouse, Southwell (near Nottingham)
The World Museum, Liverpool
Wythenshawe Hall, Manchester
York Castle Museum, York

Organisations consulted (in addition to museums and historic sites) have included:
English Heritage
IMTAL-Americas (International Museum Theatre Alliance)
IMTAL-Australasia
IMTAL-Europe
GEM (Group for Education in Museums)
The Museums Association
The Museums, Libraries & Archives Council
The National Trust
Renaissance North West (regional hub for museum networking, collaboration & regeneration)

APPENDIX F. List of events in which research team members have participated

Events attended by members of the research team which have helped us gain a detailed and international picture of the field and how it is changing:

'1807 Commemorated' conference: 18-19 September 2008 (University of York)

AATE conference: The American Alliance for Theatre and Education, Atlanta, 22-26 July 2008

English Heritage/National Trust conference: 'Your Place or Mine? Engaging New Audiences with Heritage' 2-3 November 2006 (Manchester Town Hall)

IDEA conference: 6th World Congress of International Drama/Theatre and Education Association, 16-22 July 2007 (Hong Kong)

IMTAL Conferences and AGM (Paris, June 2006 and Belfast, October 2007)

IMTAL Training days: Oxfordshire, 23 May 2005; York, 20 January 2006; Nottingham, 9-10 August 2005; London, 24 November 2006.

'In-heritage' Symposium, 30 October 2006 (University of Cape Town)

Kids in Museums: Great Museum Debates (Liverpool Maritime Museum, September 2007, 9 September 2008)

Leeds University: Museology series presentation, May 2008

Many Players, Many Parts: the 3rd National Forum on Performance in Cultural Institutions, 12-14 October 2006

MECCSA conference: Media, Communications and Cultural Studies Association Conference January 2008 (Cardiff University)

Museum Ethnographers Group: Feeling the Vibes: Dealing with Intangible Heritage, 18-19 May 2006 (Birmingham Museum and art Gallery)

Museums Association Conference: 6-8 October 2008 (Liverpool Maritime Museum)

PALATINE seminar: Unlocking the stories: exploring collaboration between HE performing arts and museums, 8 July 2005 (Museum of Science and Industry, Manchester)

Renaissance in the Regions: Live Interpretation Day, October 2007 (Manchester Museum)

TaPRA conference: Theatre and Performance Research Association Inaugural Conference, September 2005 (Manchester University) + **TaPRA Conference** (Birmingham University)**,** September 2007

Training & development weekend (learning through drama in museums): Institute for Arts, Development & Education, The Arts Universities, December 2006. (Helsinki) **Visitor Studies Group**: An introduction to Evaluation and Visitor Studies, 29 November 2007 (National Museum of Wales, Cardiff)

York Country House Partnership: the second policies, issues, and research Symposium, 2-3 February 2007 (University of York).

APPENDIX G. Dissemination

A variety of methods has been implemented to disseminate the findings of the research: conference papers/presentations; journal articles; website (including database); email newsletters to those registered on the PLH website; occasional updates via IMTAL organisations (newsletters etc) in UK/Europe, the Americas and Australasia; the international conference (see below); a forthcoming edited book; the final Report and an accompanying illustrative DVD.

Conference papers

Jenny Kidd, 'Performance, Learning and Heritage', Feeling the Vibes: Dealing with Intangible Heritage, Museum Ethnographers Group Conference, Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery, 18 May, 2006

Anthony Jackson, keynote presentation, 'Performance, Learning, Heritage – how well do they mix?', at 'Many Players, Many Parts: the Third National Forum on Performance in Cultural Institutions', Museum Victoria with The Sovereign Hill Museums Association & the State Library of Victoria, Melbourne, 12-14 October 2006.

Anthony Jackson and Jenny Kidd, 'This Accursed Thing: Research into Practice' at the 5th Biennial IMTAL conference, 20-23 September, 2007, Belfast.

Anthony Jackson and Jenny Kidd, 'Museum Theatre: Cultivating human ideas through drama' presentation to IDEA 2007, International Drama/Theatre in Education Association congress, 16-22 July 2007, Hong Kong.

Anthony Jackson and Jenny Kidd, 'Performance as a learning medium in museums: does it work?' at the American Alliance for Theatre and Education conference, Atlanta, 22nd – 27th July, 2008

Pete Brown, Tony Jackson and Jenny Kidd, presentation on the PLH research and its outcomes, at the Museums Association Conference, 6-8th October 2008, Liverpool

Also: various seminars including Leeds University Museology series, other IMTAL -Europe events, and Renaissance in the Regions Live Interpretation day, Manchester Museum

Written publications

Hughes, C, Jackson, A, and Kidd, J, 2007, 'The Role of Theater in Museums and Historic Sites: Visitors, Audiences, and Learners' in Bresler, D. *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education.*

Kidd, J., 2007. 'Filling the Gaps: Interpreting museum collections through performance' in *The Journal of Museum Ethnography*, pp. 57-69

Forthcoming

Hughes, J, with Kidd, J, and McNamara, C, 'Applied Theatre: Interdisciplinarity and the research of practice' in Kershaw, B, and Nicholson, H, *Research Methods in Theatre Studies.* Edinburgh University Press.

Jackson, A, and Kidd, J, 'Museum Theatre – cultivating audience engagement' in the International Drama/Theatre & Education Alliance (IDEA) publication – mid-2009.

Jackson, A, and Kidd, J, eds., ***Performing Heritage: research, practice and development in museum theatre and live interpretation****:* edited book (including chapters by Baz Kershaw, Laurajane Smith, Catherine Hughes, Mark Fleishman, Jane Malcolm-Davies), to be published by Manchester University Press in late 2009

Final Project Report and DVD

The DVD includes edited extracts from each of the four case studies and from the 'Performing Heritage' conference

- Complimentary copies to AHRC, University of Manchester (School of Arts, Histories & Cultures; John Rylands Library), partner museums and organisations, advisory board, IMTAL.
- Executive Summary & Main Report available via the PLH website.
- Executive Summary & Main Report + DVD available in combined DVD/CD-rom package, at cost – see PLH website for details.
- Executive Summary & Main Report (excluding appendices), available in hard copy in limited numbers.

International Conference: 3rd -5th April 2008

PERFORMING HERITAGE: RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

The Performance, Learning and Heritage project hosted an international conference in April 2008 at The University of Manchester, and aimed to provide a forum for discussing how research and practice in the field of museum performance/live interpretation can inform one another. 2008 marked the final year of the project, and presented a timely opportunity for debate and knowledge exchange in this fast developing area of performance and interpretive practice. Areas covered by the conference included:

o Making connections : the intersection of performance/performativity, site specific practice and notions of heritage;

o Gauging impact : audience response and longer-term impact, the place of interactivity, and community outreach;

o Reports from the field : accounts and findings from research and evaluation projects in the UK and abroad. Some sessions at the conference were devoted to the emerging findings of the PL&H research and the implications for future practice and policy making; others focused on completed or ongoing research projects across the globe;

o Developing practice : examples of practice - live and recorded – to illustrate the range of performance practice and provide opportunities to interrogate that practice; workshops from practitioners and academics were invited as a means of exploring how research and practice interconnect;

o 'research at the heart of practice' – a focus on research as it informs practice, practice as it informs research and (not least) practice as a means of research in the museum/heritage sector.

The conference consisted of a variety of presentations: keynote addresses; academic papers; performances; workshops by practitioners and academics; panel discussions; and round table discussions.

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Catherine Hughes is a museum theatre practitioner and scholar, who worked for many years at the Museum of Science, Boston. She wrote the first book on museum theatre, *Museum theatre: communicating with visitors through drama* (Heinemann 1998) and has just completed a major research project on the subject at Ohio State University.

Baz Kershaw is Professor of Drama at the University of Warwick and was formerly Director of the five-year research project PaRiP (Practice as Research in Performance). He has extensive experience as a director and writer in experimental, radical and community-based theatre, and recently mounted site-specific productions on the Bristol heritage ship, the SS Great Britain. He is the author of *The Politics of Performance* (Routledge 1992) and *The Radical in Performance* (Routledge 1999), and editor of *The Cambridge History of British Theatre, Vol 3 - Since 1895* (2004). His current research includes investigation of the nature of performance ecologies.

Laurajane Smith is Reader in Cultural Heritage Studies and Archaeology at the University of York. She previously taught Indigenous Studies and Cultural Heritage Management at the University of New South Wales, Sydney, and worked as a cultural heritage consultant for many years. She is author of *The Uses of Heritage* (Routledge 2006) and *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage* (Routledge 2004), and continues to publish on topics such as the cultural politics of identity and heritage management, community involvement, tourism and ethics.

KEYNOTE PERFORMANCES

There were 3 performances of **This Accursed Thing (Andrew Ashmore and Associates)** at The Manchester Museum. There were also performances/performance workshops by **Mark Wallis (Past Pleasures)** and **Triangle Theatre Company (Coventry)**.

APPENDIX H.   References

Bagnall, Gaynor (2003), 'Performance and performativity at heritage Sites' in *Museum and Society*, 1(2) 87-103

Bendix, Regina . 1997. *In search of authenticity* . Madison : University of Wisconsin Press

Bourdieu, Pierre (1987), *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste.* Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Bennett, Susan (1990), *Theatre Audiences* London: Routledge

Bicknell, S. & Mazda, X. (1993). *Enlightening or Embarrassing: An evaluation of drama in the Science Museum* . London : National Museum of Science and Industry.

Blau, Herbert (1990), *The Audience*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Bridal, Tessa (2004), *Exploring Museum Theatre* . Walnut Creek , CA: AltaMira Press.

Bradburne, James (2000) 'The Poverty of Nations: Should Museums Create Identity?' in Fladmark, (ed) *Heritage and Museums: shaping national identity.* Shaftesbury: Donhead. pp. 379-91

Brecht, Bertolt (1974), 'Theatre for Pleasure or Theatre for Instruction', trans. John Willett (written c. 1936), in Willett, ed., *Brecht on Theatre*. London: Eyre Methuen, pp. 69-76.

Cameron, Duncan F. (1971), 'The Museum, a Temple or the Forum', *Curator: The Museum Journal* reprinted in Gail Anderson (ed) *Reinventing the Museum*, Walnut Creek , CA: AltaMira Press, p.61-73.

Carlson (1996) *Performance: A Critical Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.

Counsell, C. & Wolf, L. (eds.), (2001), *Performance Analysis: An Introductory Course book* London: Routledge.

Cover, Rob, 2006, 'Audience inter/active: Interactive media, narrative control and reconceiving audience history' in *New Media and Society* Vol 8 (1) pp. 139-158.

Crane, S. (ed.) (2000). *Museums and Memory.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press .

Dewey, J. (1918), *Democracy and Education*. London: Macmillan.

Falk, J. (2006), 'An identity-centred approach to understanding museum learning', *The Curator*, 49.2, pp. 151-66.

Freire, Paulo (1996), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books (first pub. 1970, New York).

Gadamer, Hans Georg (1975), *Truth and Method.* London: Sheed & Ward.

Gardner, Howard (1983), *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967), *The Discovery of Grounded Theory.* Chicago: Aldine

Goffman, Erving (1974), *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.

Goodacre, Beth & Baldwin, Gavin (editors) (2002), *Living the Past.* London: Middlesex University Press.

Heathcote, Dorothy (1984), *Collected Writings on education and drama* (ed. L. Johnson & C. O'Neill). Cheltenham: Stanley Thornes.

Hein, George (1998), *Learning in the Museum* . London: Routledge.

Hewison, Robert (1987), *The Heritage Industry* London : Methuen

Hooper-Greenhill, Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean (1994/1999), *The Educational Role of the Museum.* London: Routledge.

Hughes, Catherine, 1998, *Museum Theatre: communicating with visitors through drama.* New York: Heinemann.

Hughes, C, Jackson, A, and Kidd, J. (2007), 'The Role of Theater in Museums and Historic Sites: Visitors, Audiences, and Learners' in Bresler, D. (ed.), *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education.* Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 677–693.

Hunt, Stephen J. 2004 'Acting the Part: 'living history' as a serious leisure pursuit' in *Leisure Studies* Vol. 23, 4, pp. 387-403.

Jackson, A. (2007), *Theatre, Education and the making of meanings.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Jackson, A. and Rees Leahy, H. (2005), '"Seeing it for Real?": authenticity, theatre and learning in museums', *Research in Drama Education*, 10.3 (November), pp. 303-26.

Jackson, A., Johnson, P., Rees Leahy, H, & Walker, V. (2002), '*Seeing it for Real: an investigation into the effectiveness of theatre and theatre techniques in museums.* University of Manchester: CATR (report on the Phase two research): http://www.plh.manchester.ac.uk/research/resources/Seeing_It_For_Real.pdf. (last accessed 1/8/08)

Jauss, H. R. (1982), *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception.* Trans.Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

Kaye, Nick (2000), *Site-Specific Art: performance, place, and documentation.* London and New York: Routledge.

Kershaw, Baz (1999), *The Radical in Performance* London: Routledge

Kidd, J. (2007), 'Filling the Gaps: Interpreting museum collections through performance' in *The Journal of Museum Ethnography*, pp. 57-69

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara (1998), *Destination Culture: tourism, museums & heritage.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kolb, David (1985), *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.

Macdonald, Sharon, and Fyfe, Gordon (eds.) (1996). *Theorizing Museums: Representing Identity and Diversity in a Changing World.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell

McMaster, Sir Brian (2008), *Supporting Excellence in the Arts: from Measurement to Judgement.* London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport (HM Government)

Museums, Libraries & Archives Council (2004), *Inspiring Learning for All* (ILFA): http://www.inspiringlearningforall.gov.uk/ (accessed 1/11/08)

____ (2007) *Generic Social Outcomes*: http://www.mla.gov.uk/website/policy/Communities/gso_overview (accessed 1/11/08)

Practice as Research in Performance (PaRiP), 2001-2006: http://www.bris.ac.uk/parip/ (accessed 1/11/07)

O'Toole, J. (1992), *The Process of Drama,* London: Routledge.

Pearson, Mike and Thomas, Julian, 1994, 'Theatre/Archaeology' in *The Drama Review.* Winter 1994 v.38 n4 pp.133(29)

Roth, Stacy (1998), *Past into Present: Effective techniques for first-person historical interpretation.* Chapel Hill, N.C: University of Carolina Press.

Rubridge, Sarah (1995), 'Does Authenticity matter? The case for and against authenticity in the performing arts' in Campbell, Patrick, 1995, *Analysing Performance: interpretations, issues, ideologies.* Manchester: Manchester University Press

Samuel, Raphael (1994), *Theatres of Memory:Past & Present in Contemporary Culture.* London: Verso

Sauter, Willmar (2000), *The Theatrical Event: dynamics of performance and perception.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Schechner, Richard (2002), *Performance Studies: An Introduction.* London: Routledge.

Snow, Stephen Eddy (1993), *Performing the Pilgrims: A study of ethnohistorical role-playing at Plimoth Plantation .* Mississippi : Jackson, University Press of Mississippi .

Smith, Laurajane (2006) *Uses of Heritage* London: Routledge.

Taylor, Philip and Warner, Christine (ed) (2006) *Structure and Spontaneity: the process drama of Cecily O'Neil.* Stoke on Trent, UK and Sterling, USA: Trentham Books

Tilden, Freeman (1967), *Interpreting Our Heritage.* Chapel Hill, N.C: University of Carolina Press.

Tivers, Jacqueline, 2002, 'Performing heritage: the use of live 'actors' in heritage presentations' in *Leisure Studies* 21 187-200

UNESCO (Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage), http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich [accessed 23/11/08]

Urry, J. (1996), 'How societies remember the past', in Macdonald, S., Fyfe, G. (eds), *Theorizing Museums*, Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. pp.45-65.

Vergo, Peter (editor) (1993 ed.), *The New Museology.* London: Reaktion Books

Vygotsky, L. S. (eds. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, E. Souberman), (1978), *Mind in Society: Development of Higher Psychological Processes.* Harvard: Harvard University Press

Walker, Verity (2001), 'Exploring evaluation techniques for live interpretation - towards a research methodology for live interpretation: a pilot project at Tower of London', *Journal of Education in Museums* (JEM) 22: 2001, pp 14-20.