CHAPTER **10**

MUSEUM PEDAGOGY AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS: ARCHAEOLOGY FOR EVERYONE

DIMITRA BOUZOUKA

DIMITRA BOUZOUKA

MUSEUM PEDAGOGY AND EDUCATIONAL
PROGRAMS: ARCHAEOLOGY FOR EVERYONE

———

Abstract

Archaeology, apart from its scientific and anthropocentric role, is responsible for communicating its scientific conclusions to the wider society in the context of "Public Archaeology". This communication can take different forms, such as Museum education, resulting in the creation of archaeological education programs with an emphasis on the public's needs, education, and entertainment. Through the educational activities of archaeological museums, the public is encouraged to actively participate, draw personal conclusions, and form connections with their previous experiences. Creating museum education programs to approach the material culture can be a complex process influenced by the archaeological content, various scientific interpretations, the target audience, and the hosting venue. In this article, an educational program's design and individual parts are analyzed in detail to present its creation. The temporary museum exhibition "Figurines. A Microcosmos of Clay", held between April 3, 2017, and December 31, 2018, at the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki, is used as a case study. The following analysis highlights the mutually beneficial relationship that the public and archaeology can build during their communication, putting the human factor at its very center.

Introduction

Archaeology, as an academic discipline related to humanities, consists of two pillars. Archaeologists are responsible for identifying and analyzing archaeological sites and finds, associating them with past civilizations, and consequently understanding and interpreting past societies. Beyond scientific research, archaeology also maintains a close relationship with

society. 'Public Archaeology' focuses on this field, analyzing the interaction of archaeology with society and the individual (Matsuda & Okamura, 2011; Skeates et al., 2012). As multiple audiences are interested in archaeology and its scientific research over time, communication between the two sides is essential to meet specific requirements (Grima, 2009, 54). Archaeology, committing to satisfy different social groups, plans thematic activities to present its research, adapting the content to the particular characteristics of each target group. Museum education promotes the communication between archaeology and various audiences, as visitors take part in activities that do not strictly intend to educate but also to entertain (Νάκου, 2001, 184; Νικονάνου & Κασβίκης, 2008, 15). Programs vary according to the target groups and participants' age, gender, socio-economic and educational background, the organizing parties (museums, Ephorates of Antiquities, educational institutes), and the included activities (Merriman, 2004, 90–2).

Creating a museum education program requires a combination of archaeological, educational, and communication theories and material culture approaches (Νικονάνου, 2011, 16). Such programs focus on the visitors joining in, their active participation, and engagement in the activities (Keen, 1999) while educating, entertaining, and making the most of their skills (Csikszentmihalyi & Hermanson, 1995, 70). Visitors are encouraged to explore the exhibition without following a specific path to reflect and draw their conclusions (Davis, 2005, 22–5; Black, 2009; Νικονάνου, 2011). Therefore, museum education programs include various activities to engage the participants (Gardner, 1993a), focus on examining archaeological finds, and present multiple research methods and interpretive approaches (Copeland, 2004, 134).

Every museum education program intends to fulfill educational and recreational objectives, combining various methods. Among the most frequent methods is storytelling (Νικονάνου, 2015, 53–6), which can take multiple forms such as the maieutic method, educational guided tours (Czech, 2007) and scientific presentations (Νικονάνου, 2015, 64). Also, discovery learning encourages visitors to interact directly with the artifacts (Hein, 1998, 38) and to explore freely the exhibition (Νικονάνου, 2015, 66). Moreover, experiential methods encourage visitors to collaborate with the museum, acquire new experiences, and form personal views and interpretations (Simon, 2010; Gesser et al., 2012). During the educational programs, activities can include theatre, dance, music, creative writing (Συμεωνάκη, 2013, 48), and archaeological research practices such as documenting, excavating recording, and conservation of artifacts (Sturm 1990, 99–114).

Activities often focus on material culture and artifacts analysis, intending to introduce the public to past societies and to create an experiential approach to archaeological research (Weschenfelder & Zachariah, 1992, 39–40; Merriman, 2004, 93–5). A museum education program's content and final form are determined by factors such as the presented subject, the museum exhibition, a specific artifact type, various target groups, and, in particular cases, archaeological theoretical approaches to the material culture.

Methodology

Regarding the current study, the process of creating a museum education program is presented below through the case study of the following educational activity. The given educational program is based on the temporary exhibition *"Figurines. A Microcosmos of Clay",* hosted at the Archaeological Museum of Thessaloniki between April 3, 2017 and December 31, 2018 (Αδάμ–Βελένη, 2017, 12) (Figure 1).

Figure 1. First room of the exhibition *«Idol. A Microcosmos of clay»* (Μπουζούκα, 2020, figure 54)

To present an alternative approach to the exhibition, the following educational program was formed targeting a specific audience group in the context of my master's thesis (Μπουζούκα, 2020). Through its analysis, we attempt to highlight the main components of a museum-pedagogical activity. Initially, such activities focus on a specific type of material culture, in this case, the prehistoric figurines of the museum exhibition (Figure 2).

Figure 2. The first part of the exhibition prehistoric section (Μπουζούκα, 2020, figure 59)

Moreover, the theoretical approach of the figurines as artifacts is based on the archaeology of the body, emphasizing the possibilities they offer to examine subjects related to the body. The archaeology of the body analyses the significance of the body in the past, combining various theoretical approaches, such as the division of the body into biological and social (Thomas, 2007; Robb & Harris, 2013). More recently, according to post-processual archaeological approaches, the body as a concept varies according to the social, economic, and ideological context (Shanks & Tilley, 1987; Pluciennik, 2002, 174). Moreover, considering perspectives such as constructivism and feminism, the body is addressed as a socially

constructed concept, which avails to the archaeological research (Robb, 2016), incorporating terms such as gender and sexuality (Koloski–Ostrow and Lyons, 1997). Furthermore, under the influence of phenomenology (Frank, 1991), ontology (Robb, 2016), and personhood (Fowler, 2004), emphasis has been placed on individuals' subjective experiences with their bodies (Meskell & Joyce, 2003; Robb, 2016). More specifically, the body, according to the Western perspective, is often divided into biological and social aspects. The biological body is regarded to be stable. At the same time, the social is linked to the construction of various social, gender, sexual, and age-related identities (Sofaer, 2006; Díaz–Andreu & Lucy, 2007; Meskell, 2007). Constructing an identity is influenced by gender, age, sexuality, education, personal experiences, family, and social context (Robb, 2002; Meskell, 2007). The body can be adorned with clothes and jewelry to express the preferred identity or adopt various postures and movements (Sørensen, 2000; Díaz–Andreu & Lucy, 2007). Considering the above perspectives, prehistoric figurines are used to approach intertemporal social issues about body manipulation and identity construction in the education program to be presented. The third component that contributes to the program's form is its target group, which, in this case, is teenage high school students. This age group was selected, as it was considered that intense psychosomatic changes, questions related to the body, and identity formation are common occurrences during this age.

To create a museum-pedagogical program, detailed planning must outline its theoretical and pedagogical framework and incorporate communication theories and activity forms. Also, throughout planning, details of the program, such as the objectives, subject, structure, target group, required supplies, evaluation process, and suggested follow-up activities, are determined.

Initially, the program's theoretical framework includes the archaeological interpretations that will be embedded into the program. For example, in the case under consideration, the theoretical approach to the archaeology of the body is analyzed and paralleled with the concerns of teenagers. Concepts such as the body changing, different body types depicted on figurines, and factors of identity construction, such as disability, age, and body manipulation, are analyzed throughout the program. More specifically, the program examines themes such as expressions of gender, sexual and social identities, the homogeneity or heterogeneity of identities within groups, the connection of different body postures, clothing, or activities with social roles and identities, and finally, expressing identity through clothing and jewelry. Examining these issues can result in compar-

ing social roles and stereotypes between the present and prehistory. Furthermore, the pedagogical framework is determined based on the target audience and the theoretical approach to the subject. It also includes the educational theories and supplies used during the program, such as photographic material and worksheets (Figure 3).

Work Sheet 1. Body.

Choose three figurines with an interesting body depiction:

Figurine number:	Description:
Figurine number:	Description:
Figurine number:	Description:

1. How is the body depicted in figurines compared to today? Are there any particular features emphasized?

....
....

2. Are there different concepts or ages represented in the figurines you have cho-sen?

....
....

3. What could the postures of the figurines mean?

Example 1.	Interpretation:
Example 2.	Interpretation:
Example 3.	Interpretation:

4*. Optional activity: Explain or dramatize the expression and/or posture of a figu-rine.

• Why do you think this expression was used?

• Why was it important enough to be depicted?

──────

Figure 3. Example of the worksheet with the theme "Body" (Μπουζούκα, 2020, 180)

Various educational theories are incorporated to adapt the program to the needs of the selected target group. Constructivism can be characterized as the most criti-cal theory, as during the program, the participants are expected to form personal conclusions depending on their experiences, socio-economic background, and educa-tion level (Black, 2009). In addition, the theory of multiple intelligences is essential (Gardner, 1993a) to bring out the participants' various interests, skills, and talents. This approach recognizes that different intelligence types often coexist in the mind of the individual without being equally devel-oped (Gardner, 1993b). Also, regarding the educational methods included in the program, through the "discovery learning" method, the participating teams focus on the most excit-ing artifacts, or the ones relevant to the topic of their worksheets, and wander freely in the exhibition (Hein, 1998, 38) (Figure 3). Moreover, the program focuses on material culture as an es-sential source of information. Consequently, by examining the artifacts closely, the participants can focus on their specific characteristics to consolidate new infor-mation and approach deeper the theoretical concepts (Νάκου, 2001, 231; Νικονάνου, 2011) (Figure 2). Different activities are included in the program, intended to fulfill the program's main objectives and incorporate the participants' various skills, talents, and interests. Thus, the activities promote teamwork, intending to introduce cooperation and mutual assis-tance. Among the groups, the participants are expected to express their points of view and discuss the program's main concepts with the archaeologist/coordinator and among each other. At the end of the program, the various teams aim to present their conclu-sions and form their own ideas about prehistory. Finally, the program design refers to the needed educational resources used during its implementation. In this particular case, worksheets and photographic material are used to introduce the basic concepts of the program and partially to guide the participants (Figure 3).

When planning a museum education program, it is essential to include the features and concerns of the participating target group. Thus, in the presented case study, common questions of the participating group, teenage high school students, are considered to compare social issues regarding the body throughout the present and prehistory. For example, during the museum educational program, students are encouraged to observe the depiction of the human form in the prehistoric figurines to spark their interest and express their thoughts. The prehistoric figurines are used to analyze various aspects of the body and appearance, such as their social aspect, their connection to the cultural and social belief systems of the Neolithic, Bronze, and Iron Age, the embodiment of

identities or roles and the person's personal or social status (Mina, 2007, 265).

In addition, the activities of the educational program aim to fulfill its general objectives. The objectives are analyzed during the initial planning and specify what the participants are expected to achieve by completing the program. In the present-ed case, the aim is for participants to get acquainted with prehistory, the variety of identities in different contexts and cultures, their construction and expression through the body, to increase their awareness about current social issues, following a different approach of the museum exhibition. Therefore, the program's planning determines the included activities, the place and time it will be implemented, the educational material, the objectives, and the description of each part. After com-pleting the program, a final activity often summarizes the program's main points. Such activities allow one to approach the subject through material means like creat-ing a vase or figurine, presenting and discuss-ing the participants' conclusions, or dramatizing the subject they examined.

Finally, participants evaluated the program regarding elements that should be added, removed, or improved.

Student evaluation sheet

Gender:	Age: ....
School:	Class: ....
Address:	City of residence: ....

1. Do you think the program helped you to approach the analyzed concepts from a different perspective?

Strongly ly agree disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strong

Provide some examples:

....

....

2. Which other concepts, regarding gender and identities would be interesting to include in the program?

....

....

3. Do you think the program was:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
a) tiring					
b) difficult					
c) easy					
d) interesting					
e) easy to understand					
f) complicated					
g) age-appropriate					
h) long and time consuming					

4. What did you like the most about the program?

....

....

5. What elements did you dislike or would prefer not to be included in the program?

....

....

———

Figure 4. Student evaluation sheet. (Μπουζούκα, 2020, 188-189)

Bibliography

Alberti, B., S. Fowles, M. Holbraad, Y. Marshall & C. Witmore. 2011. «Worlds Otherwise: Archaeology, Anthropology, and Ontological Difference». *CurrAnthr* 52(6): 896–912.

Black, G. 2009. *Το ελκυστικό μουσείο, Μουσεία & επισκέπτες.* Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Πολιτιστικού Ιδρύματος Ομίλου Πειραιώς.

Copeland, T. 2004. «Presenting Archaeology to the public: Constructing insights on-site». In *Public Archaeology,* edit. N. Merriman, 132–44. London: Routledge.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. & K. Hermanson. 1995. «Intrinsic Motivation in Museums: What Makes Visitors Want to Learn?». *Museum News* 74: No. 3, 67–77.

Czech, A. 2007. «Führung–Führungsgespräch–Gespräch». In *Museum Schule Bildung. Aktuelle Diskurse–Innovative Modelle–Erprobte Methoden,* edit. E.Wagner & M. Dreykorn, 159–60. Kopaed: München.

Davis, M. E. 2005. *How Students Understand the Past. From Theory to Practice.* Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Díaz –Andreu, M., & S. Lucy. 2007. «Introduction». In *Archaeology of Identity,* edit. M. Díaz–Andreu, & S. Lucy, 1–12. London: Routledge.

Fowler, C. 2004. *The Archaeology of Personhood: An Anthropological Approach.* London, New York: Routledge.

Frank, A. W. 1991. «For a sociology of the body: an analytical review». In *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory*, edit. M. Featherstone, M. Hepworth, & B. S. Turner, 36–102. London: Sage Publications.

Gardner, H. 1993a. *Frames of Mind. The Theory of Multiple Intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. 1993b. *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice.* New York: Basic Books.

Gesser, S., M. Handschin, A. Jannelli, & S. Lichtensteiger, edit. 2012. *Das partizipative Museum. Zwischen Teilhabe und User Generated Content.* Transcript Verlag: Bielefeld.

Grima, R. 2010. «A reply to what is public archaeology?». *Present Pasts,* 1 (1): 53–4.

Grosz, E. A. 1994. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism.* Indiana: University Press.

Hein, G. E. 1998. *Learning in the Museum.* London: Routledge.

Hodder, I. 2008. «Multivocality and social archaeology». In *Evaluating Multiple Narratives: Beyond Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist Archaeologies,* edit. J. Habu, C. Fawcett, & M. Matsunaga, 196–212. New York: Springer.

Holtorf, C., & A. Högberg. 2005. «Talking People: From Community to Popular Archae-ologies». *Lund Archaeological Review,* 11/12:9–88.

Keen, J. 1999. «The Ancient Technology Centre, Cranborne, UK: A reconstruction site built for education». In *The Constructed Past. Experimental Archaeology, Educa-tion and the Public,* edit. P. G. Stone & P. G. Planel,229–44. London: Routledge in as-sociation with English Heritage.

Koloski–Ostrow, A. O. & C. L. Lyons edit., 1997. *Naked Truths: Women, Sexuality, and Gender in Classical Art and Archaeology.* London: Routledge.

Matsuda, A. & K. Okamura. 2011. «Introduction: New perspectives in global public ar-chaeology». In *New Perspectives in Global Public Archaeology*, edit. A. Matsuda & K. Oka-mura, 1–18. London: Springer.

Merriman, N. 2004 «Involving the public in museum archaeology». In *Public Archaeology,* edit. N. Merriman,85–108. London & New York: Routledge.

Meskell, L., & R. A. Joyce. 2003. *Embodied Lives. Figuring Ancient Maya and Egyptian Experience.* London: Routledge.

Meskell, L. 2007. «Archaeologies of identity». In *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader,* edit. T. Insoll, 27–57. New York: Routledge.

Mina, M. 2007. «Figurines without sex, people without gender?». In *Archaeology and Women, Ancient and Modern Issues,* edit. S. Hamilton, R. Whitehouse, & K. I. Wright, 263–82. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Pluciennik, M. 2002. «Introduction Bodies in/as material culture». In *Thinking through the Body: Archaeologies of Corporeality,* edit. Y. Hamilakis, M. Pluciennik, & S. Tarlow, 173–77. New York: Kluwer Academic, Plenum Publishers.

Richardson, L. J., & J. Sánchez. 2015. «Do you even know what public archaeology is? Trends, theory, practice, ethics». *World Archaeology,* 47(2): 194–211.

Robb, J. & O. J. Harris, edit. 2013. *The body in History: Europe from the Palaeolithic to the Future.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robb, J. 2002. «Time and biography». In *Thinking through the Body: Archaeologies of Corporeality,* edit. Y. Hamilakis, M. Pluciennik & S. Tarlow, 201–16. New York: Kluwer Academic, Plenum Publishers.

Robb, J. 2016. «Introduction. The archaeology of bodies and the eastern Mediterranean». In *An archaeology of prehistoric bodies and embodied identities in the eastern Mediterranean,* edit. M. Mina, S. Triantaphyllou & Y. Papadatos, VII–XVI. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Schrübers, Ch. 2013. «Vom Referieren zum Moderieren». In *Moderieren im Museum. Theorie und Praxis der dialogischen Besucherführung,* edit. Ch. Schrübers, 161–68. Transcript Verlag: Bielefeld.

Shanks, M. & C. Tilley. 1987. *Re–constructing Archaeology: Theory and Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simon, N. 2010. *The Participatory Museum,* Museum 2.0: Santa Cruz. http://www.partici-patorymuseum.org/read/

Skeates, R., C. McDavid & J. Carman, edit. 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of Public Archaeology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, G. S. 2006. «The role of archaeology in presenting the past to the present». In *Images, Representations and Heritage,* edit. I. Russell, 122–37. New York: Springer.

Sofaer, J. 2006. *The Body as Material Culture: A Theoretical Osteoarchaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sørensen, M. L. S. 2000. *Gender Archaeology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sturm, E. 1990. «Museifizierung und Realitätsverlust». In *Zeitphänomen Musealisierung. Das Verschwinden der Gegenwart und die Konstruktion der Erinnerung,* edit. W. Zacharias, 99–114. Klartext Verlag: Essen.

Thomas, J. 2007. «Archaeology's humanism and the materiality of the body». In *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader,* edit. T. Insoll, 29–45. New York: Routledge.

Weschenfelder, K. & W. Zacharias. 1992. *Handbuch der Museumspädagogik. Orientierung und Methode.* Schwann Verlag: Düsseldorf.

Wicken, G. 2013. «Die Geister der eigenen Erwartungen. Visuelle Kommunikation als teil der allgemeinen Informationsaufnahme und–verarbeitung im Museum». In *Moderieren im Museum. Theorie und Praxis der dialogischen Besucherführung,* edit. Ch. Schrübers, 207–22.Transcript Verlag: Bielefeld.

Αδάμ-Βελένη, Π. 2017. «Προλογικά». In *ΕΙΔΩΛΙΟ. Ένας Μικρόκοσμος από Πηλό*, edit. Π. Αδάμ-Βελένη, Η. Ζωγράφου, Α. Κουκουβού, Ου. Πάλλη & Ε. Στεφανή, 11-2. Θεσσαλονίκη: Αρχαιολογικό Μουσείο Θεσσαλονίκης.

Μπουζούκα Δ. 2020. *Το σώμα στην προϊστορική Μακεδονία: Πρόταση μουσειοπαιδαγωγικής αξιοποίησης της έκθεσης «ΕΙΔΩΛΙΟ. Ένας μικρόκοσμος από πηδό».* Αδημοσίευτη μεταπτυχιακή εργασία, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης.

Νάκου, Ε. 2001. *Μουσεία: Εμείς, Τα Πράγματα και ο Πολιτισμός: Από τη Σκοπιά της Θεωρίας του Υλικού Πολιτισμού, της Μουσειολογίας και της Μουσειοπαιδαγωγικής.* Αθήνα: Νήσος.

Νικονάνου, Ν. 2011. *Μουσειοπαιδαγωγική: Από τη Θεωρία στην Πράξη.* Αθήνα: Πατάκης.

Νικονάνου, Ν. 2015. «Μουσεία και τυπική εκπαίδευση». In *Μουσειακή Μάθηση & Εμπειρία στον 21ο αιώνα,* edit. Ν. Νικονάνου, Ν. ΓιαννούIπυ, Α. Χουρμουζιάδη, Α. Φιλιππουπολίτη, Α. Μπούνια, & Ε. Νάκου, 89–112. Αθήνα, Σύνδεσμος Ελληνικών Ακαδημαϊκών Βιβλιοθηκών.

Νικονάνου, Ν., & Κ. Κασβίκης. 2008. «Εκπαιδευτικά ταξίδια στον χρόνο: παρελθόν–παρόν, μέλλον». In *Εκπαιδευτικά ταξίδια στον Χρόνο: Εμπειρίες & Ερμηνείες του Παρελθόντος,* edit .Ν. Νικονάνου & Κ. Κασβίκης, 10–29. Αθήνα: Πατάκης.

Συμεωνάκη, Α. 2013. «Η ποίηση ως δημιουργική γραφή στη Δευτεροβάθμια Εκπαίδευση». Διδ. Διατρ., Πανεπιστήμιο Δυτικής Μακεδονίας.