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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The solution, it would appear, lies neither in becoming showmen like Barnum nor in retreating behind the closed doors of secluded offices, but in charting a path somewhere in between, where the dignity of serious scholarship combines with the nobility of public service.

Michael M. Ames (1986)
Museums, the Public, and Anthropology: A Study in the Anthropology of Anthropology. p. 25.

University anthropology museums are moving in the direction of engaging new audiences. These museums, especially the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology on the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) campus, have a long and proud history of academic achievements and were integral to the development of the discipline of anthropology as a whole. Yet, since the 1980’s there has been a call in the university museum community for an increased focus on serving the public and reaching out to new audiences. This call was not heeded by university anthropology museums until about 2000, when they became more visible in this movement. The Hearst Museum, the case study for this masters project, is an example of a museum poised to enter this movement.
In response to the call for an emphasis on audience development, university anthropology museums must first engage the audience in their own backyard, the university community, with undergraduates comprising the largest part of that audience. My masters project focuses on the Hearst Museum and the UCB undergraduate community as a primary audience to be researched and developed.

I approached this study through a literature review that lays out the history and background of university anthropology museums and audience development. It explains the overall university museum community struggle between the traditionally embedded focus on academic research and the call for a focus on audience development. My research examines a subsection of that debate where I have chosen university anthropology museums as my focus, and the undergraduate students as the target audience. I also surveyed the greater university anthropology museum community, interviewed members of the Hearst Museum staff, and conducted a UCB student questionnaire session. These proved to be very useful in understanding the state of the field, and the attitudes of the Hearst staff and the undergraduate population. I found that the university anthropology museum community is indeed in the beginning stages of audience development, and some are approaching this new focus with creativity and success. The Hearst staff agreed that undergraduates should
be involved with the museum via internships and museum offerings tied to curriculum. And the undergraduates, while aware of the museum, generally did not visit. All three sources agreed that a major challenge for university anthropology museums is their lack of physical visibility.

The recommendations to the Hearst Museum in this report encompass four areas: physical characteristics, student involvement, marketing and leadership. The museum must increase its visibility. The administration already has plans to move the museum entrance from inside Kroeber Hall, an academic building, onto Bancroft Way, a major thoroughfare. It is important that the administration follow through with these plans. Apart from increased curricular ties, the Hearst Museum must provide programming and events that are more relevant to the student population. Prototyping is very important here in trying to understand what students need to feel a sense of ownership of what is really their museum. Marketing is key to getting the students to come to the museum. Announcing events and programs in the campus newspaper, in classrooms, and in various other locations is extremely important. My study makes it very clear that the students will not visit if they do not know what the museum has to offer, or even that it’s there. The most important component to increased audience engagement of undergraduates is the support and leadership of the museum’s administration. It is the
responsibility of the leadership to make sure that all the different voices of
the staff are heard, and that all are involved in the museum’s pursuit of
audience development. One interesting means to that end is to have all
staff, including the administration, spend one day a month on the gallery
floor interacting with visitors. Furthermore, I recommend the creation of a
new staff position. This person can serve as a coordinator for
undergraduate involvement, and even audience development in general.
He or she can help to create partnerships with departments and
organizations on campus, serve as a volunteer/internship coordinator, and
conduct continued audience research.

Finally, it must be emphasized that my recommendation for
increased development of the student audience will enhance the rich
tradition of academic research and the impressive collection of the Hearst
Museum. These two foci can co-exist and complement each other,
especially when the parent university sees that the museum is participating
in the efforts of education and student support.
PURPOSE OF STUDY

I have investigated how to better connect university anthropology museums with the undergraduate university student audience. Essentially, the question framing this study was: how can these museums design programming, marketing, and involvement plans to attract the undergraduate student, and serve their needs and learning styles? I believe that these students should be a primary audience because an on-campus museum can help fulfill not only its own educational mission, but also the university’s. Moreover, it can shape students’ museum going habits for the future. University museums in general are caught in an historic struggle between a focus on academic research versus one on public education. However, the academic does not need to be abrogated in deference to audience development, rather these foci should complement one another.

The traditional museum mandate is to educate with regards to the subject of its collection, and undergraduates attend universities to improve their lives via higher education. The university anthropology museum can make greater use of this ideal situation. I sought to understand what challenges confront this type of museum, focusing on the Hearst Museum of Anthropology and create a final product, a formal presentation to the
Hearst staff. Included are findings and recommendations intended to highlight the need and show the benefits of student engagement.
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

I. Goal: Develop a psycho-demographic profile of the college student audience.

Objectives:
- Conduct in class student questionnaires at UCB
- Gather demographic information
- Consult relevant literature

II. Goal: Develop an understanding of the current atmosphere of the university anthropology museum.

Objectives:
- Consult relevant literature
- Interview Hearst Museum staff to understand the current approach of reaching undergraduates, and what challenges the museum faces
- Conduct a survey of other university anthropology museums to understand how they currently serve their undergraduate audience

III. Goal: Develop programming, marketing and involvement recommendations appropriate to the undergraduate audience on behalf of the Hearst Museum of Anthropology using relevant educational methodology and data gathered during research.

Objectives:
- Consult relevant literature
- Compile data from research
- Using the data, develop programming, marketing and involvement recommendations
METHODOLOGIES

I limited the methodological approach to my study to four different techniques in order to produce focused results and a focused product. First and foremost, I conducted a literature review of the relevant and informative texts. This informed my study as to previous research and where my thesis fits into the greater framework of museum studies. I gathered information on the history of the Hearst Museum and the history of audience development and public education at university anthropology museums in general. I also investigated current and relevant educational theories and methodologies that can be employed when attempting to serve an undergraduate audience.

My second methodological approach involved interviews of Hearst Museum Staff members. I interviewed ten staff members from different departments about the current approach to the undergraduate audience. For the list of the interviewees, see Appendix A. For a list of the questions asked, see Appendix B. Interviewing a range of staff members provided a diversity of perspectives towards serving the undergraduate audience.

Third, student evaluations provided some of the most useful and important information. By questioning undergraduates, I gathered
information on that audience first hand. To do this I distributed questionnaires in a University of California at Berkeley campus classroom. This anthropology class was chosen primarily as a matter of convenience based on a previously existing relationship with professor Rosemary Joyce, who teaches the class. However, considering that just over half of the class consisted of anthropology majors, my questionnaire results proved to be particularly insightful. From this potential museum audience I gathered information on their interests and issues specific to the Hearst Museum and to museums in general (see Appendix C for the questionnaire). My ultimate goal was to understand why the greater student audience does not visit the museum, and what would help them take advantage of this valuable resource.

Finally, to round out the study, I conducted an email survey of university anthropology museums across the United States. To learn what university anthropology museums, apart from the Hearst Museum, have done to attract and serve their own undergraduate audience and, of that, what they saw as the most successful program. For a list of the responding museums, see Appendix E. For a list of the questions they were asked, see Appendix F.
LIMITATIONS OF METHODOLOGIES

While a study on audience development has the potential to benefit many audiences and many different types of museums, limitations had to be set in order to conduct focused research, report understandable data, and create a viable product. The first and most important limitation is that of the audience or the main subjects of my research. I chose to focus on university undergraduates of the traditional college going age 18-25. I conducted a survey via questionnaire on the UCB campus. While surveying a larger university audience including faculty, staff, and graduate students would provide additional ideal audiences, that research is outside of the scope of this study. Likewise, a study of older, returning students would prove to be interesting, but I limited my project to younger students more recently out of high school. Additionally, as stated in the Methodologies chapter, one class of undergraduates in particular was chosen primarily as a matter of convenience. A larger, introductory class would have provided greater breadth of respondents and data. However, as a result of the problems encountered with the attempted student focus groups (further discussed in the Findings chapter) the time allotted to conduct the research became limited.
A second, almost equally important, limitation is that of the museum where the study was conducted. I chose to focus on anthropology museums not only because of my background and interest in anthropology, but also because of the recent shift in focus towards audience development and partnerships that this type of institution is undertaking. I chose the Phoebe A. Hearst Museum of Anthropology on the U. C. Berkeley campus. Rather than conduct a cross comparative analysis of United States university anthropology museums, I conducted a case study focusing on the Hearst Museum’s current methodologies and challenges. As a graduate of the U. C. Berkeley anthropology bachelor’s program, I was familiar with both the department of anthropology and the Hearst Museum. The results of this study hopefully have wider application to other university anthropology museums, or any museum attempting to attract the undergraduate audience. Additionally, a deep investigation of other U. C. Berkeley museums such as the Berkeley Art Museum would provide valuable information; however the present project is limited to the Hearst Museum.

To gather information on the undergraduate audience and research the Hearst Museum, I focused on specific methodologies. First, I conducted a literature review of previous and relevant research to inform my study. This helped me to understand where my research could help the
museum field. It also helped me in understanding how to utilize the best current educational theory and methodology. The literature review is, of course, limited in scope. While the entire history of university anthropology museums, from their inception in the latter half of the 19th century to today, is relevant, only their founding and more recent issues are addressed in depth. Also, the events and issues of repatriation and incorporation of the Native American voice, which university anthropology museums have dealt with during the 1980’s and 1990’s, are significant; however, my focus is on the more recent history of audience engagement.

I additionally limited my research to the production of an educational and marketing approach to the undergraduate university student audience. I tried to assist in the creation of an environment that would give students a valuable visitor experience that would encourage repeat visitation across the museum spectrum. While my focus is on university anthropology museums, the results can be useful to museums both on and off campuses when trying to develop and serve that audience.
LITERATURE REVIEW

University anthropology museums, with their origins in the late nineteenth century, have had a long and respected history. Coupled with university anthropology departments, they are responsible for major advances in the field. The historical focus of these institutions has been inward, existing as research centers, making their collections available primarily to an academic audience of scholars and researchers. Recently, however, the museum field has called on these museums to broaden their focus beyond this internal community and establish themselves as centers of public learning for a variety of audiences. Clearly, this outward focus should include what would seem an obvious audience: undergraduate students.

In researching the relationship between university anthropology museums and the undergraduate audience, I identified three areas of importance that will be discussed in this chapter. The first area involves the history of the university anthropology museum. In this history, I have highlighted the Hearst Museum of Anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley, which is the subject of this project’s case study. Also included in this discussion are the issues surrounding university museums as a whole, especially those issues that have become evident in
the last ten to twenty years. The second area of importance deals with the recent (since 2000) call for audience development in university museums, including student involvement. In this section, I give examples from other museums that try to engage the university student audience. The last section discusses the student audience itself. Here I highlight the attitudes and concerns that govern undergraduate students as well as relevant demographics.

UNIVERSITY ANTHROPOLOGY MUSEUMS

As historian Stephen Conn informs us, the university anthropology museum developed simultaneously with the field of anthropology:

American anthropology first took institutional root in museums. Museums, in fact, may have literally created ‘anthropology’ by helping to consolidate the mid-nineteenth-century endeavors of linguistics, ethnology, and archaeology under the same terminological umbrella and under the same institutional roof.²

Museums also contributed to the development of scholarship in anthropology by serving as repositories for the items anthropologists collected during their fieldwork or for the private collections of major benefactors such as Phoebe Hearst.

However, in the late 1880’s the display and treatment of artifacts related to human cultural development was first associated with natural
history museums. This is because the field of anthropology began as a scientific endeavor, the cultural objects being categorized and analyzed in the same way that specimens were treated at natural history museums. This approach began to be questioned in the early 1890’s as the anthropological component of natural history collections became more significant, but were still seen merely as an adjunct. In 1899 the University of Pennsylvania was one of the first universities to create a separate and permanent space for a museum of anthropology. The roots of the anthropology museum were thus firmly planted in universities and natural history museums, which in turn engendered their largely academic and researched-focused museum culture.

The foundation of anthropology as a discipline and its immediate marriage with museums is due, in large part, to the work of three scholars: Frederic Putnam, Franz Boas, and Alfred Kroeber, all of whom were instrumental in the founding of the Hearst Museum. As a director of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University and, later, the Hearst Museum, Frederic W. Putnam was one of the main forces behind the genesis of the discipline of anthropology in the late nineteenth century. David L. Browman writes that the Peabody Museum, founded in 1866, was one of the few successful anthropology museums of its time. A large part of this success is due to Putnam. He
integrated ethnology (socio-cultural) and physical anthropology into the museum’s focus, helping to establish anthropology as a multi-focused discipline. From 1891 to 1893 Putnam led the charge to develop anthropological displays for the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago. He hired Franz Boas, a major contributor to the nascent field of anthropology, to assist in the development of these displays. The Columbian Exposition in Chicago essentially gave rise to what would be later known as the Field Museum.

When Putnam left Chicago, Boas remained in charge of the Field Museum’s anthropology collection. From 1894-1903, Putnam was employed by the American Museum of Natural History (AMNH) in New York City where he codified the Division of “Archaeology and Ethnology” as the “Anthropology” Division. Boas soon followed Putnam to the AMNH. In 1901 Putnam moved to California where he was named to an advisory committee assembled to establish an anthropology department and museum at the University of California at Berkeley (UCB). Among the members of the committee were Boas and benefactor Phoebe Hearst, who, as a regent, was one of the proponents of the new program. This coming together of Boas, Putnam and Hearst culminated in the establishment of both the anthropology department and museum of anthropology at UCB in 1901. The committee recruited Alfred Kroeber
and Pliny E. Goddard to build the new department, with Putnam as supervisor.

When Putnam retired in 1909, Boas and Kroeber became the torchbearers of his legacy. Kroeber had been Boas’s first student at Columbia University and the second person in the United States to receive a Ph.D. in anthropology. Kroeber conducted his research out of the museum at UCB, making both the museum and department of anthropology significant contributors to the discipline. Kroeber began as a curator at the museum and later became its director. Current Hearst Museum curator Ira Jacknis underlines Kroeber’s importance, stating that he was: “…involved in institution building, beginning major academic and museum programs.”

Through the initial involvement of Putnam and Boas, and the subsequent leadership of Kroeber, the anthropology department and museum at UCB were instrumental in the national growth of anthropology as a discipline.

Putnam, Krober, Boas, and Hearst’s efforts at the Hearst Museum ultimately resulted in the present accumulation of nearly four million objects from all over the world, one of the largest and most significant anthropological collections nationally and possibly globally. A quarter of this collection is related to California Native Americans, the largest and most important assemblage of its kind in the world.
For many years after their founding, university anthropology museums, including the Hearst, focused solely on the expansion of and research on their collections. That is not to say they were only inwardly-focused, as they did offer occasional educational programs. However, it seems that university anthropology museums paid more attention to academic pursuits and interests than serving the needs of a larger public.

It took until the early 1980’s for a shift in sentiment to occur, dovetailing with a general move in the entire museum field towards reaching out to new and previously ignored constituencies. In 1984, Craig C. Black, professor at the University of Kansas and Texas Tech University and director of, among others, the Texas Tech University Museum before his passing in 1998, published a benchmark article calling on university campus museums to choose between a research-only or purely academic focus, or to go further and become centers of public learning. Black wrote that campus museums should look at the greater context of offerings to the public, specifically programs and exhibitions. He went on to state that this effort requires university administrative and faculty support; without it, the campus museum will not be successful. To garner necessary support, it is necessary for the university museum to demonstrate that they are “valuable components of the institution.” Black stated the primary programming need for the campus museum belongs to
its own university community: faculty and students. He writes that for university museums to be completely successful they must meet both functions, as research institutions and centers of learning for their communities, which include undergraduates.

Black’s admonishment went largely unheeded. An article written in Museum Anthropology in 1991 by Burton Benedict, UCB professor, anthropologist, and then director of the Hearst Museum, notes the lack of student visitation, but does not express a plan for engaging this clearly underserved audience: “the public, and even students at the Berkeley campus, scarcely know it exists.” It is significant that although he notes the dearth of student interest, he goes onto discuss the Hearst’s extensive collections, the extremely limited amount of exhibition space and the obscure location of the museum.

In 2000, Peter B. Tirrell, associate director of the Sam Noble Oklahoma Museum of Natural History at the University of Oklahoma at Norman, raised the issue of public service again, pointing out some of the major challenges that university museums as a whole face in their struggle for existence and relevance. Tirrell identified two conferences held in 2000 that discussed this struggle: “The Death of Museums?” at the University of Glasgow in Scotland, and “Management of University Museums” at the Finnish Cultural center in Paris, France. These
conferences focused on the needs for university museums to engage the
greater “public” for the sake of survival. The main challenges to
university museums, as Tirrell points out, are financial and leadership
issues and a lack of “singular vision, direction, or purpose.” As he
explains, university museums have been dealing with dwindling financial
support from their parent institutions since the 1980’s. Directors have also
had to divide their attention between general museum operations and, in
the case of university anthropology museums, professorships, something
that has changed only recently at the Hearst Museum. By appointing a
dedicated director who is not expected to also teach at the university,
anthropology museums such as the Hearst can focus on effective fund
raising and dedicated leadership. This is a clear departure from the
beginnings of university anthropology museums, where the anthropology
departments and museums were inextricably intertwined, and were funded
by millionaires like Mrs. Hearst without regard to external forces.

As previously mentioned, a conclusion drawn by the 2000
conferences held that university museums overall lacked direction or
purpose. Participants observed that these institutions had not undergone a
strategic planning process in order to chart that direction or articulate that
purpose. Tirrell agrees with Black’s initial assessment that university
museums need to support a broadly defined university community: “The
university museum’s principal charge was to serve the university community. University museums that fail to meet this charge lose the support of faculty and administrators.”

AUDIENCE ENGAGEMENT

In 1986 Michael M. Ames, anthropologist and former director of the University of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology in Canada, suggested that university anthropology museums start focusing outward by serving a broader public interest:

It no longer seems to be sufficient to say that scholarly work is justified provided it serves the interest of “theory” or “the progress of sciences”; it now must also serve broader public interest.

Ames echoes Black and Tirrell’s call not just for a resolution of the struggle between ivory tower and open door foci, but for an inclusion of public education within academic research:

That bridge between theory and practice, between academic interest and socially responsive performance, still needs to be constructed if anthropologists hope to convince others of their value and necessity.

Like Tirrell, Ames believes that expanding their focus outward to include public education will not only increase the university museums’ relevance to the public, but will also result in a more supportive parent institution.
Such museums do not need to leave behind their tradition of academic research and leadership in engaging the public, but they do need to expand their focus and share that tradition of academic research with a larger audience. Ames, now regarded as a pioneering educator, was well ahead of his time in calling for university museums to engage the public.

In 1992 the American Association of Museums (AAM) published a report targeted to all museums titled: *Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums*. Led by Bonnie Pittman, then deputy director of the Berkeley Art Museum at UCB, the AAM Task Force on Museum Education created this crucial and influential publication that brought into focus the educational role of museums within different communities and contexts. The report recommended that museums should be actively engaged in creating and serving diverse audiences, initiating collaborative relationships, and recognizing that the primary role of museums is on education as part of public service. These recommendations are pertinent to the neglected undergraduate audience of the university anthropology museum. Many different sizes and types of museums took this report to heart and worked towards active changes within their visitation and relevance to the surrounding communities.

It was not until 2001, however, that anthropologists became visible in this movement. The journal of *Museum Anthropology*, published by the
Council for Museum Anthropology, did not publish a single article that discussed community engagement until then, instead focusing only on collections issues (such as conservation and preservation), and later repatriation and Native American cultural representation, the latter only appearing when the issue was forced by the signing of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act in 1990.

A 2001 article by Tamara L. Bray, Associate Professor of Anthropology and Director of the Museum of Anthropology at Wayne State University (WSU), in Detroit, Michigan, and Andrea Sankar, Professor of Anthropology also at WSU, is titled “Exploring Issues of Importance to the Local Community through the University Museum: The Exhibition Facing HIV/AIDS: Reality and Response.” Bray and Sankar discuss the importance of the university museum’s connections to the greater community and the distance these museums often have from the general public:

One might think that the relationship of museums to educational aspirations and political ideals would naturally be exemplified in the concept of the University museum. Yet University museums, where they exist, are typically an under-utilized resource with few connections to the general public. Often they are perceived as little more than complements to the research and instructional efforts of one or two academic departments.¹⁹

They go on to emphasize the crucial role of the university museum:
Given their unique position, however, University museums have the potential to impact both the campus and the local community on many different levels.²⁰

Bray and Sankar highlighted an exhibition that “addressed the critical issues surrounding the AIDS epidemic by situating the disease within its local, historical, and cultural contexts.”²¹ The exhibition was created by the Museum of Anthropology at Wayne State University in 1998 in an effort to build bridges between the campus and the urban community. This article was a departure from the journal’s previous articles, because it discusses the importance of the community outside of the museum. Adding to the outward focus by anthropology museums, the Fall 2003 issue of Museum Anthropology is dedicated to educational practices in anthropology museums. Included in that issue is an article that discusses an exhibition created by an undergraduate anthropology class at UCB for the Hearst Museum on Canadian Inuit art. It was a course designed specifically to educate the students about native peoples of Canada and their contemporary art form and subsequently resulted in an exhibition.²²

A Museum Studies master’s thesis and a recent article in Museum News provide further insights about and examples of student engagement with university anthropology museums, specifically the Hearst Museum.
In 1996, current Stanford University administrator Sylvia P. Wohlmut conducted a survey asking what university art museums have done to engage and better serve their faculty and student audiences. In attracting the student audience, Wohlmut found that university art museums offer student art exhibits, student advisory groups, internship and docent opportunities, student membership programs, social events hosted by the museum, and even competitions with cash prizes. One survey respondent stated that:

Food and music are irresistible attractions to most students, and these events are even more successful if free.

Wohlmut also reports the methods employed by the museums to let students know what they have to offer. Included among these methods were inclusion of museum materials with new student packets and tuition materials and distribution of museum materials at orientations and student fairs. Even though at the time of Wohlmut’s study, electronic mail distribution was relatively new, it had also been employed. The best method observed by Wohlmut, however, was direct communication:

Word of mouth, or personal contact, in both student and faculty contexts, was regarded as being the most successful method of contact.

Wohlmut lastly gives recommendations to university museums on the best methods to facilitate faculty and student engagement. She
suggests that museums create a dedicated staff position for faculty and
student audience development and engagement and that university
museums keep better visitor statistics, as many of her respondents did not
know the percentage of visitors from the university.\textsuperscript{26}

In a 2004 article in \textit{Museum News}, Bonnie Pitman and Ellen Hirzy
discuss what the Berkeley Art Museum/Pacific Film Archive (BAM/PFA)
at UCB recently did to engage their students. Echoing some of
Wohlmut’s findings, they created academic and student advisory
committees, academic liaison and outreach coordinator staff positions, and
a graduate student tour guide program. They also included a new
marketing and branding effort:

\begin{quote}
A new, widely marketed admissions policy makes the
museum free to students, faculty, and staff. New and eye-
catching signage gives the museum and film theater more
visibility and a livelier, more accessible image.\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quote}

After the implementation of their initial efforts they realized what their
overall goal was:

\begin{quote}
By the second year, a clear and organic design was
emerging as the museum’s staff discovered their focus:
encouraging and utilizing the student voice.\textsuperscript{28}
\end{quote}

Ultimately, it is a model for experimentation and success:

\begin{quote}
The initiative inspired some productive experiments-
engaging directly with students, giving the museum a
higher profile among the student population, bringing
students together with artists-in-residence, and initiating relationships with faculty across a variety of disciplines that will sustain the BAM/PFA’s presence in students’ lives.\textsuperscript{29}

These recommendations and examples can only help to serve the university anthropology museum’s recent focus on audience development, specifically the undergraduate audience.

\textbf{THE UNDERGRADUATE AUDIENCE}

The University of California (UC) as a whole, and the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) in particular, make efforts to keep regular statistical information on their student, faculty, and staff bodies. The UC Office of the President (UCOP) keeps statistical information on each of its ten campuses.\textsuperscript{30} In addition to the statistical information, UCB keeps apprised of the general attitudes and issues governing their undergraduate population each spring via the “University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey” (UCUES). The UCOP and the UCUES gathered the following information in 2005.

According to the UCOP, UCB had 23,482 enrolled undergraduates for the Fall 2005 semester. Nearly 54 percent were female, and just over 46 percent were male. The largest ethnic groups were identified as white and Asian, constituting 31 percent and 38 percent, respectively, of the
undergraduate population.\textsuperscript{31} The largest declared discipline, or major field of study, is engineering at 13 percent of total undergraduates. Just over 40 percent, however, identified their majors as undeclared/unknown.

More revealing, perhaps, is information on the student experience as gathered by the UCB Office of Student Research by means of the UCUES each spring.\textsuperscript{32} The UCUES gathers information from undergraduates all over the UC system, consisting of a total of ten campuses. The 2005 survey, on the other hand, gathered information only from UCB students. The following information is from that survey. Approximately 2500 undergraduates responded to the survey. Among several other questions, the students were asked where they went for their news information, campus-related and otherwise. Overwhelmingly, they stated that they read the free campus newspaper, the \textit{Daily Cal}.\textsuperscript{33} Of note here, is that they do not frequent online UCB sources such as the UCB NewsCenter or the UCB online campus-wide calendar. Considering this, the best information dissemination method appears to be the \textit{Daily Cal}.

Also contained in the UCUES are questions regarding campus resources, including museums. The Hearst Museum is not listed as an option or point of interest anywhere in this survey. A campus organization that is prominently listed, however, is the Berkeley Art Museum (BAM), the university’s on-campus art museum. Among the
several questions that were asked, one asked where the students had heard of or learned about BAM. The students were asked to check all the applicable methods, and over 77 percent indicated that they had learned of it simply by walking by. The second and third methods were word-of-mouth (over 53 percent) and flyers (34 percent), respectively. Interestingly, only 15 percent had heard of it through class assignments.

Students additionally felt it important to participate in community service, and therefore are willing to volunteer their time. This finding is confirmed by Eric Hoover in his 2006 survey conducted on college (university) students nationwide. Sponsored by the University of California at Los Angeles, more than 263,000 incoming freshmen from all over the United States were surveyed. Hoover points out that they are poised to contribute to their communities:

The largest-ever proportion of freshmen – 26.3 percent – said there was a very good chance that they would volunteer while attending college, up 2.2 percentage points from last year. And 25.6 percent said it was essential or very important for them to participate in community service, the highest proportion since 1996.34

University anthropology museums can be an ideal place for students to contribute their time, especially considering that many are inclined to do so. The combination of this information with that assembled from UC and UCB can inform some of the necessary methods to expanding student
involvement at the Hearst Museum. Gathering demographic information, however, is only part of the means towards that end. Understanding the learning patterns of today’s undergraduates is also critical.

Montana State University museum educator Bonnie Sachatello-Sawyer and her colleagues have summarized some of the salient needs and characteristics of adult learners, which apply to the undergraduate audience, who are emerging adults. They state that adults:

- want to learn, regardless of age;
- are more receptive to learning when they feel both physically and psychologically comfortable;
- prefer to be actively involved in the learning process rather than passive recipients of knowledge;
- are generally pragmatic and want to apply their learning to current situations;
- tend to learn best when their experience is acknowledged and new information builds on past knowledge and experience;
- learn in both independent, self-reliant modes and in interdependent, connected, and collaborative ways.\(^{35}\)

They also discuss the best, and perhaps most important, method in designing programs utilizing academic knowledge:
Learning involves the negotiation of meaning as adults make sense of scholarly interpretation through the lens of their own experience.³⁶

The previous list and comment suggests that the best programs designed for the undergraduate first take into account their previous experiences and knowledge. From there, the other needs can be fulfilled. In other words, the undergraduate will be fully incorporated into the museum experience when museums acknowledge that this audience has something to offer, and the museum isn’t viewed as a singular authority.

Sachatello-Sawyer and her colleagues draw attention to one of the most familiar programs provided by university anthropology museums:

Lectures are the most common adult program offering. But from an adult program participant’s perspective, dull lectures are out, unique and active learning experiences are in³⁷.

Ultimately, Sachatello-Sawyer and colleagues’ recommendations for the best programs for adults, and by inference undergraduates, include instructors who relate to the needs and interests of the learners, presenting the content and knowledge enthusiastically, utilizing a participatory setting.

This idea of students actively participating in their own learning was also explored by Peter Sacks in the 1990s when he began his career as
a college instructor, and attempted to understand his new constituency through informal surveys and observation.\textsuperscript{38} One of his first realizations concerned the expectations of the students. Sacks’ survey asked students, “in addition to being knowledgeable,” what qualities should an instructor posses?\textsuperscript{39} The students were asked to rank a number of choices in order of importance. The top three responses were: “entertaining”, “friendly and warm”, and “accommodates individual learning styles and abilities”.

From this survey, the students also saw themselves as involved in an economic exchange:

> From what I had ascertained, it seemed that most students these days saw themselves as consumers and the teacher taking the role of their employee or service provider.\textsuperscript{40}

The overall result of his survey showed a shift in the student perspective from Sacks’ own days as a student. They believe that the responsibility for their success, in many ways, resides with the professor and the college.

Sacks does, however, offer his perspective on this shift:

> I came to conclude that many of my students were torn about these matters of responsibility, expectations, grades, and so on, reflecting the confusion of a changing culture. On one hand, they knew that their generation was profoundly ill at ease with the rules of the game they’d been taught, because,…they’d seen that following the rules guaranteed nothing in the America they grew up in.\textsuperscript{41}
Modern (or post-modern, as Sacks put it) students state that they want to be entertained and accommodated. In pursuing the undergraduate audience, university anthropology museums must make sure they design the undergraduate programs and events with these attitudes in mind.

**LITERATURE REVIEW CONCLUSION**

University anthropology museums are ready to make strides in reaching a greater audience outside of the academic community that uses their collections for research. Their history points to the foundation of their inward focus. The need for an outward focus of audience development and “public” service has since been called for. Furthermore, in understanding the undergraduate audience, there are effective ways that museums can engage and maintain them as visitors, and hopefully as lifelong museum patrons. To that end, gathering information on student demographics and learning needs is necessary when designing programs for this audience.
FINDINGS

I analyzed three data sets, as outlined in the methodology chapter of this report. I surveyed the greater university anthropology museum community, interviewed members of the Hearst Museum staff, and administered a questionnaire to undergraduate students at the University of California at Berkeley (UCB). All three sources provided significant findings.

Eight university anthropology museums responded to the four questions posed in my email questionnaire. (For a complete set of respondents and questions see appendices D and E.) The first two questions asked about the types of programming and events targeting undergraduates. Five of the eight respondents indicated that they offer internship/docentry/volunteering opportunities. Only four offered curriculum tied to museum offerings. Half also offer independent study or museum studies related academic courses. It is interesting to note that only three museums offer student specific programming and events independent of class requirements, curricular ties or independent study/museum studies classes. Gillian Wakely, Associate Director for Programs at the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and
Anthropology in Philadelphia, provides an example of such a student specific event:

We have a large freshman party at the beginning of the academic year to welcome the incoming students. The museum staff all attend and there are tours of the collections, games, etc.

Keni Sturgeon, Curator of Programs and Education at the Haffenreffer Museum of Anthropology at Brown University in Bristol, Rhode Island contributes another good example:

One of our 5 lecture topics from 2005-2006 was generated by students, and drew our largest student audience – about 60% of the audience was students—from 3 Providence-area universities/colleges.

The second survey question asked which of the undergraduate offerings they listed were the most successful in engaging the undergraduate audience. A large variety of responses were received, providing no standout agreement amongst the university anthropology museum community. The top three answers, however, were internships/docentry/volunteering, lectures, and student specific programs and events, each with two responses (twenty five percent). Wakely is emphatic on the success of her museum’s previously mentioned student event:

I would say the Freshman party is the most successful. We also have a reception for about 800-1000 international
students from all over the tri-state area in October which is highly successful. Parties work!

Amy Grochowski, Curator of Education of the Maxwell Museum of Anthropology at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, New Mexico enthusiastically adds: “Our lectures and demonstrations attract a fair number of students. Very affordable ethnic lunches are a big hit too!”

The third question on the survey asked about the biggest challenge facing the museum. Three of the eight respondents indicated that limited funding was the most important issue they were facing. Grochowski highlights the most common response: “Having enough funding for everything we would like to do [is the biggest challenge].” Limited space and location/visibility followed with two responses each. Adrienne Scott, curator of the Museum of Anthropology at the California State University at Chico, discusses this common challenge to campus museums including the Hearst Museum:

Location! We are located in the engineering building on the 3rd floor on the far side of campus. This means no one just stumbles into our facility. We must engage the public and the campus with lots of programming to bring them to our doors. We have improved our visibility on campus and locally by offering a wide array of new programs... Still our obscure location is always a challenge.
Gillian Wakely echoes the symptomatic struggle mentioned in the literature review:

The biggest challenge our museum faces is the fact that it is a research center and a public exhibit space in the same building. The academic side doesn’t really understand the nature of public exhibitions, and the public side has to translate the academic research into something comprehensible to the general public in order to for them to come. It very rarely works well, although we are occasionally lucky. The public regards us as an academic institution and the academics regard us as a public institution. The integration of the two without losing too much along the way is a huge challenge.

This issue of the tension between being an academic and a public institution was mentioned only once as a challenge, but I believe that it is emblematic of all university anthropology museums’ internal struggle between academic research and public education.

The last question asked respondents to report their total yearly attendance, as well as their student attendance. What is interesting to note is that only one of the eight tracks student data in conjunction with their yearly attendance, although I must mention that one is not an exhibiting museum. An additional three could only offer estimates of student attendance. Yet most of the respondents were unambiguous that funding or issues related to funding (staffing, limited space) were challenges to their institution, support that is primarily provided by the parent
Stephen L. Whittington, director of the Wake Forest University Museum of Anthropology in Winston-Salem, North Carolina discusses the challenge of limited space while illustrating the common theme of a lack of resources:

We have outgrown our facility in terms of exhibit space, staff offices, programming space, and especially space for collections storage. Although sympathetic to our plight, the University administration has not agreed to build us new facilities, and will raise funds for us to do so only if we are able to get major federal grant support.

By combining quantitative visitor attendance data with an expression of this lack of resources, the parent university would then be able to see where it could help through how the museum is or is not serving the student population. In turn, as with the undergraduate population, this shows that the university administration will not simply approach the museum with offers of interest, kinship and support. Rather, the museum leadership has the responsibility to develop an effective relationship with the administration.

To get a more in-depth perspective on my case study, in April 2006 I conducted ten interviews of Hearst Museum staff from various departments. For a complete list of staff interviewees and questions see appendices A and B. I first asked each interviewee what they saw as the biggest challenges currently facing the museum. Echoing email responses
I received from the greater university anthropology museum community, the top answers were limited funding, space, and location/visibility.

Regarding visibility, Ben Peters, Principal Museum Preparator related a story where some undergraduates came to the museum for a class assignment and were looking at the display cases in the entryway to the museum, thinking that those cases alone comprised the museum: “They didn’t know there was [more] in the museum. They thought that was the museum.” He goes further to state: “The issue isn’t whether or not they like it, but do they know it exists? The museum has much to offer, but the first goal is being known.” A less frequent, but nonetheless important and related challenge was that the museum didn’t seem to have a direction.

Sandra Harris, Deputy Director, stated the need for a strategic plan with measurable goals:

Because of the lack of a plan, the staff doesn’t feel like they are all on the same page, which breeds internal competition. [The museum] needs strong leadership and structure to effect change. The leadership has to create a cooperative culture and make sure it has a plan and put it into practice.

Current leadership holds promise. Prior to the current museum’s administration, professors from the anthropology department filled the director’s position, dividing their attention between running the museum, conducting research and teaching. Now there is a dedicated director at the
helm, who can develop and implement a new strategic direction for the museum. Madeline Fang, Head Conservator, also stressed the need for strategic planning within the context of the often-mentioned struggle: “We need to develop a plan for what we really are. We have to decide to go public or stay a research/academic institution, or become a combination.”

The staff was further asked what the museum could do to engage the undergraduate audience. Overall, they agreed that undergraduates should be a part of the museum. Six of the ten indicated that the best method to undergraduate participation was through university curriculum tied to museum offerings; as Douglas Sharon, former Director, stated: “If they don’t have an academic program reason with a grade attached, they won’t come.” Victoria Bradshaw, Coordinator of Collections, seconded the importance of curricular ties:

There should be classes in the museum driven by the faculty. Some members of the Native American Studies department did not know that the museum existed.

Staff also felt that the museum should create and support more internship/docentry/volunteer positions and design programming and events relevant to the student audience. Some ideas offered include: parties, awards competitions, film programs, student curated exhibits, and tours of the collection. In terms of student relevance, Kim Preciado, Coordinator of Programs, had this to say: “We have to become cool,
become relevant to them. We have to get past the dowdy anthropology museum image.” Another staff member sums up the importance of student relevancy: “We have an obligation to students--they pay our salary.” Ira Jacknis, Research Anthropologist and curator, discusses the difficulty of anthropological relevance:

Anthropology is not recognizable, people don’t know what it is. It’s not natural for them to be interested in it, [they’re] dealing with foreignness. The task of anthropology is cultural mediation, as opposed to art where you don’t have to deal with [that]; the problem is relating objects to people. We’re never going to have a huge crowd. [However,] we have a moral obligation to present them.

Kim Preciado discusses a partial solution to this problem raised by Dr. Jacknis: “We should have a museum person introduce the collections to classes. [Currently,] there is no museum face for [visiting] classes or groups.”

Less frequently mentioned, but still significant, two staff members discussed new strategies of exhibit design as additional methods to facilitate student engagement. Victoria Bradshaw had this to say:

The exhibits are too object oriented, they don’t feel contemporary. We tend to be conservative in our exhibits. Visitors need more of a story; they need to see commonalities and contrasts.
She suggests the dead, food (“very attractive”), and puberty as possible exhibit themes. Ira Jacknis agrees, stating that “exhibits could be more exciting.” He puts forward drugs as a potentially engaging topic.

In trying to understand the student perspective, I initially set out to conduct four focus groups of ten students each. I posted fliers in conspicuous places on the UCB campus, posted on a local online community bulletin board service, and asked the undergraduate anthropology advisor to email the anthropology undergraduates my request for focus group participants. The turnout was disappointing. A total of two students attended my sessions. From this, I found that it is difficult to get undergraduates to come to you, even with incentives such as a free meal. I then turned the intended focus group questions into a questionnaire, and, with a professor’s permission, administered it at an anthropology class. This was very successful, and I received back forty-five qualifying questionnaires.

The questionnaire posed a total of sixteen questions, including age, gender and major area of study (see Appendix C for the complete questionnaire, and Appendix D for a reporting of the results of the questions that were not discussed in this chapter). Of the forty-five respondents, thirty-seven (eighty-two percent) are 18-21 years old. Additionally, thirty-seven (eighty-two percent) identified as female. Last
of all, a broad variety of majors were represented, but fifty-one percent (twenty-three respondents) specified their major as anthropology.

To become more relevant to students, it is important to understand more about them. My survey results here were revealing. Two of the questions gathered information on the students’ free time and campus event information sources. When asked about their free time, the undergraduates were instructed to check as many of the options that applied from the provided choices or to add one of their own. Three of the choices had high response rates. Sixty-four percent of respondents indicated that they spend their time shopping near campus. Additionally, fifty-six percent spent their free time going to the movies. The third most common response was sporting events (forty-two percent).

Surprisingly, when asked where they get their campus event information, sixty-nine percent said they get their information from fliers or posters, which is contrary to the findings of the 2005 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). Some of the undergraduates indicated that the fliers were gathered from people handing them out or the fliers or posters were hung in what I term “trusted locations.” These would be places such as the dormitories or near Sproul Hall (the administration building and main plaza), rather than in other conspicuous locations around campus, as I had originally done with the
focus group fliers. Regarding this, one student stated that they gathered their information “through fliers passed around on Sproul.” Another said, “I’m a resident assistant [at the dormitories], so mostly through the fliers we receive and word-of-mouth.” As a campus event information source, word-of-mouth came in at forty-two percent. As discussed in the literature review portion of this master’s project, these two responses agree with two of the top three responses to a similar question to the information gathered from the UCUES in relation to the Berkeley Art Museum (BAM). It is interesting to note that the free student newspaper, The Daily Cal, which was the other of the top three UCUES responses to the question, was mentioned less frequently in my survey. Finally, according to my questionnaire, the second most popular method is email or listserves as an information source (forty-four percent). This contrasts with the UCUES, which indicated the primary method undergraduates became aware of BAM was as a result of walking by its rather large and noticeable structure. However, the Hearst Museum staff, as previously reported, and the undergraduates indicated that location/visibility is a major challenge to the museum.

Eleven of the survey questions dealt with the Hearst Museum directly. The first asked the students about their visitation habits regarding the Hearst Museum. Out of forty-five respondents, ninety-eight percent
had previously heard of the museum. Yet, despite the high name recognition, amazingly, only fifty-three percent had actually visited. This is significant as fifty-one percent of the surveyed students are anthropology majors!

Dovetailing with that finding were their feelings about what was welcoming and unwelcoming about the museum. Interestingly, the location of the museum was seen as a plus and a minus. Both questions were open-ended questions so there was a range of responses. What the students (eleven percent) specified was most welcoming about the museum was its location, presumably that it is on campus: “it being located in Kroeber Hall.” Conversely, what they stated was the most unwelcoming (thirteen percent) was that they felt the museum was obscure and/or difficult to enter. Some typical responses were: “It is kind of hidden. First time I went I had a hard time finding it.”; “Not clear how to enter it.”; “There’s no real draw to it…its hidden away.”; and “Location; I don’t think most non-anthro[pology] majors even know where it is or that it even exists.” It is important to note that these statements are in agreement with the responses from the university anthropology community and the Hearst staff.

Continuing with what the students saw as unwelcoming about the Hearst Museum, size and use of space were the second most common
response (nine percent). Students had this to say: “It’s like a hole in the wall.”; “Poor use of space.”; “It’s too damn small. I would love to see more of our collection on display as opposed to being stuck in the basement.” and “The size…it’s tight and cramped.” It is interesting to note that the last response came from a student who had heard of the Hearst Museum, but had never visited. Finally, customer service was not frequently mentioned, but it is important to note that one student stated: “Sometimes it feels as if having people view the exhibitions is inconvenient for the staff.” One student did mention, however, that “the people behind the counter are always friendly.”

Some of the less frequent answers to the question of what students found unwelcoming are important to reiterate. They state: “It always seems closed.”; “The fact that it costs $ to get in. Shouldn’t it be free?”; “The days/hours it is open…very limited.”, and “I’ve been a little intimidated about going because I don’t know if it costs anything.” These statements point to the simple need for better dissemination of basic museum information to the student body.

When asked what they saw as the most welcoming aspect of the museum, only a few students replied, and a variety of answers were listed. Of the students that did respond, they indicated, after location (as previously mentioned), that they liked the cases lining the entrance to the
museum and the collection itself, each receiving seven percent of the responses. Two students had this to say regarding the collection: “I know there are a lot of awesome artifacts.” and “I like its contents.” However, equal to those responses, which also received seven percent of the responses, three students asserted that they found “nothing at all” welcoming about the museum. This punctuates the need to redress student engagement and relevance, as will be stated in the next chapter.
CONCLUSIONS

As seen in both the Literature Review and Findings chapters of this report, it is clear that university anthropology museums—even those that are over a century old—are in the early stages of audience development. A portion of the literature review covered the field wide call for university museums of all disciplines to include public offerings along with their academic research focus, starting with those that would serve university student audiences. And they are doing so. As seen in an article in *Museum News* in 2004, university art museums, specifically the Berkeley Art Museum (BAM), have enacted programs to engage students. Yet, from reviewing over three decades of *Museum Anthropology* journals, we can see that university anthropology museums have only recently begun to consider public offerings, which, at present, are very limited in scope.

The findings of my national survey of eight university anthropology museums corroborate the slow awakening of these institutions. Tracking visitor data is crucial in understanding which audiences are coming to which offerings and which are truly underserved. However, only one of the eight surveyed museums tracked such data visitor data and has a sense of the size of their total (graduates and undergraduates) student audience. Hard numbers tracking who visits the
museums are proof of undergraduate attendance. This data is easy to collect and can be an important tool to curry support from the parent institution. Furthermore, it is significant that audience development or public relevance did not rank as a high priority challenge to university anthropology museums. What did rank were factors like funding, space problems and location/visibility. Only half of the museums offered student-centric programming, and these primarily consisted of internships and volunteering opportunities. This reflects the significance of Burton Benedict’s 1991 article in the *Museum Anthropology* journal, where he mentioned students as an underserved audience, but then goes on to describe the Hearst Museum collections and the lack of space without noting the link between these phenomena.

My interviews with the Hearst Museum staff echo the data I gathered from the greater university anthropology museum community. The biggest challenges they identified to the Hearst Museum also had to do with funding, space, and location/visibility. A large percentage of the staff, however, did state that the museum should design more events and programming relevant to the undergraduate audience. The staff’s first response to the question of student engagement, however, was to tie museum offerings to existing undergraduate curriculum. This response, I believe, is limiting because it still subsumes the student-museum
relationship in an academic world. Ties to curriculum certainly are important, but I believe a larger goal is at stake. Museums need to become relevant to the students outside of academics, as suggested by one staff member, and thus promote the value of lifelong learning. A diversity of approaches including both academic and non-academic offerings can ensure a diversity of engaging experiences for the undergraduate and a wider range of student visitors. This provides them with the opportunity to see the value of the Hearst Museum and other museums outside of the academic arena, hopefully engendering a lifelong relationship.

The most important information I gathered comes from undergraduates themselves. It should be first noted, however, that this audience is not going to automatically visit just because the museum offers directed programming and salient events. How the museum communicates with students is vitally important. When I originally set out to conduct four focus groups, only two students attended. I posted fliers all over the UCB campus, emailed all anthropology undergraduates, and even posted on a community electronic bulletin board. However when I converted the focus groups into student questionnaires, and administered them in a class, I had more than enough respondents to quantify the student voice. Most of the respondents were anthropology majors and almost all of them had heard of the Hearst Museum. Only half, however,
had visited the museum. From this lack of visitation, despite awareness, we can see that it is just as important, if not more so, to know how and where to disseminate the information to the student audience about museum events and offerings and to convert those who are aware of the institution’s existence into visitors.

Some of the most important findings of this study indicated that students get their information from fliers that were handed out, email, and word-of-mouth. The UCUES survey results, discussed in the Literature Review chapter, found that the Daily Cal was a primary source of information for the students and that fliers were a little used source, which initially seems to conflict with my survey results. However, several students had specified that the fliers were handed out, rather than simply hung on bulletin boards, which may account for this discrepancy. Regardless, both survey results thus provide the Hearst Museum with information on additional marketing outlets.

Location and visibility are key issues for the Hearst Museum. Interestingly, all three information sources that I investigated agree that location and visibility are important to museum visitation. The UCUES overwhelmingly found that undergraduates became aware of BAM and its events by simply walking by the museum building, which does indeed have a striking presence. This only underscores the importance of
physical visibility and presence in garnering interest from the undergraduate audience. BAM is almost directly across the street from the Hearst Museum, and students and staff agree that physical location/visibility is a problem for the Hearst Museum. Furthermore, the students had much to say regarding the physical location and conditions of the Hearst Museum. While they found it convenient that the museum is on-campus, they found that it was difficult to enter and the size and use of space to be unwelcoming. Clearly, physical location/visibility has an effect on audience awareness and visitation.

Student responses were very revealing on the subject of what they additionally found welcoming about the museum. Here, a significant opinion of the students bears repetition. One of the most frequent responses to my survey was that the students found nothing at all welcoming about the museum. This highlights the need for the Hearst to create a welcoming atmosphere. The museum must invite the students rather than wait for them to visit on their own.
RECOMMENDATIONS

It is clear that the Hearst Museum has much to do in order to develop the student audience. It must be said, however, that the museum administration already has plans to improve the Hearst Museum, and I would be remiss if I did not mention the plans or emphasize the necessity of following through. Thus follow four main types of recommendations: physical conditions, student involvement, marketing, and administrative leadership.

As we have seen, the physical parameters of the museum have a big effect on student visitorship. In terms of visibility and access, the museum administration plans on moving their entrance from inside an academic building to an entrance off of Bancroft Way, a main thoroughfare for cars and pedestrians. As has been shown with the Berkeley Art Museum across the street, this simple act will certainly increase museum traffic and visibility. The senior staff is additionally looking at expansion plans within the same building as well as into a new building, which addresses the space concerns of the staff and the students’ sense of an unwelcoming space. Completing these plans is crucial to increasing visibility. Expansion could include dedicated classroom space, exhibit space for professors’ research and class projects, a student gallery,
increased gallery space overall, space for food sales, a “hang-out” area for students and visitors, and an orientation space.

Even before these physical improvements are made, encouraging student involvement is one of the most important steps in the process of activating the student voice within the Hearst Museum. Three approaches towards this end can be taken. First, student research needs to be conducted in more depth than this project has provided, which will give more insight into the needs and ideas of this audience. To be cost effective, this research should ideally be conducted in-house, by someone who has had experience with audience research in cooperation with different campus departments. The staff member conducting the research should remember to go directly to the student audience. A second approach to increasing student involvement includes prototyping events and programs. After gathering information from the student audience, a variety of programs and events should be tested to see if they have the desired effect of increased student engagement and involvement. Events can include those with which other university anthropology museums have had success, such as a welcome party for new students, events involving food (both tied and not tied to exhibition themes), and film series (again, both tied and not tied to exhibition themes). Third, involvement opportunities for the students as interns, docents, and volunteers should be
emphasized and well organized. The Hearst’s education department is currently developing a docent program for the undergraduates. Based on my research, this docent program would give students from different disciplines university credit for participation. Furthermore, through this direct involvement, students would be able to design tours and engage other students in a relevant manner. In providing undergraduates a forum for direct involvement with the staff and projects, the museum provides a good experience and fosters a sense of pride and ownership. This, in turn, gets word of mouth going, which, as we have seen, is one of the main ways that students hear about events.

As one Hearst staff member noted, well-designed programs and events do not simply get undergraduates to come through the door. Marketing, or effective dissemination of information, is paramount when attempting to increase undergraduate attendance. The students themselves suggested several ways to do this. Apart from word-of-mouth, three of the primary methods include advertising in the *Daily Cal*, email (which I suggest should not simply be generated by the museum but distributed through university wide email lists), and having students pass out event fliers at Sproul Plaza. One strategy employed by one of the surveyed university anthropology museums included introductory information with new student orientation packets. What the museum can additionally do is
network with university professors and academic departments. This might include an orientation session with faculty to help them integrate museum offerings into their curriculum. Or, to go beyond academic requirements, the professors can announce events like openings and parties in classes, which as I found with my research, is an effective way to reach undergraduates.

The fourth and final area of recommendations involves museum leadership. Effective leadership is critical to any organization’s success. One of the leadership’s key responsibilities is making sure the staff identifies with and is invested in the future of their museum. From my interviews, most staff is excited about new possibilities and opportunities. In addition, they may have many ideas to offer, if their voices are heard. Otherwise, they may be fearful of any new plans and they are likely to resent new changes such as expanding the museum focus to include the public dimension. Fortunately, an attitude of improvement and change has already taken root at the top administrative level of the Hearst Museum. The administration plans to enact a strategic planning process with realistic goals. A strategic plan will give the staff direction and an investment in the museum’s goals and outcomes.

How can leaders allay the fears of their staff and increase their interests and contributions? At the 2006 Association of American
Museums conference on April 29th, I discussed the issue with one of the authors cited in this study, Peter B. Tirrell, Associate Director of the Sam Noble Oklahoma Museum of Natural History at the University of Oklahoma at Norman. He suggests that from the beginning, staff be involved with the decision-making and planning process. By doing this, the staff will gain and ownership in the process and develop a greater trust for the leadership. Their fears about marginalization of academic research and conservation and preservation of the collections will be reduced. The staff also needs to see they have a stake in sharing the museum’s resources with undergraduate students. By integrating students as volunteers and interns in all departments of the museum, the staff is more likely to see that the students have something to contribute.

The leadership also needs to make sure the staff identify with the Hearst’s mission of “promoting the understanding and appreciation of global cultural diversity and cultural history.” They also have to make sure that the museum supports the parent institution, the University of California, with its tripartite mission of teaching, research and public service. When the leadership and staff demonstrate that they are fulfilling the museum’s mission, in addition to that of the University, they are in a more favorable position to gain increased support from their parent institution.
Another suggestion for staff equanimity is to have all staff members, including administrators, spend time with the museum visitors—undergraduates as well as the general public. At a talk on May 9, 2006 at John F. Kennedy University in Berkeley, Ian Wedde, arts project manager at the Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, in Wellington, discussed a struggle between the curators’ need for academic independence and rigor and the museum’s need for improved community relations. He summed up this need best when he simply stated: “You have to remember you’re a museum.” A method his museum uses to keep the staff aware of their role is to have every member of the staff, including the director, spend one day a month on the gallery floor interacting with the visitors. This would be an effective tool for the Hearst Museum administration to utilize to align the staff with the need and benefit of audience engagement, especially with undergraduates. This in turn improves the museum’s public image and relationship with its visitors.

I have developed three additional recommendations for the museum leadership. One is for the museum to create partnerships with other museums. These should include other UC campus museums, museums in the local communities, and other university anthropology museums around the nation. These partnerships can involve the sharing of ideas and methods of success. They also help by sharing the financial
burden of mutual events and research. A second administrative task that is paramount to the Hearst’s success involves tracking attendance. The leadership has expressed a need to understand who is and who is not coming into the museum. Tracking attendance would involve the staff making sure that visitor data like age, university affiliation, etc. are tabulated via a central museum database when entering the museum, and when attending programs and events.

My final recommendation to the Hearst leadership concerns the creation of a dedicated staff position. Some current staff members suggested that additional personnel would help with management of student volunteers/interns. The Berkeley Art Museum, sister campus museum to the Hearst, has created an academic liaison staff position to actively pursue the student audience. The effects of a dedicated staff member have been an effective means of organizing and executing campus partnerships with professors, academic departments, student groups, etc. At the Hearst, such a staff member would assist professors in aligning curriculum to museum offerings, and with dissemination of event and program information to academic departments and student groups. This staff member would also be a central hub for undergraduate volunteers/interns, matching them with the appropriate staff person/department. Furthermore, as was suggested by some of the staff as
a component for student involvement, this person would introduce and orient visitors to the museum and its collections.

These recommendations do beg the question of where the funding will come from for all these changes. The museum must first show what it can do with what it has before the university and other potential sources of funding will take notice; essentially, the museum must show results to get results. If the museum efficiently demonstrates what it capable of doing and shows that it is serving university students (via visitor tracking, audience research), the university administration is more likely to take notice and see that the museum is a critical part of university operations.

Much work remains to be done to effectively develop the student audience and include their voices at the Hearst Museum. Museum leadership has already expressed solid interest and plans to move in that direction. This drive coupled with the recommendations discussed in this report, will serve to improve the student presence and show the university that the Hearst can go beyond its historic role of being an obscure, hard to find “gem” and evolve into a vital member of the campus community, contributing to lifelong learning.
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HEARST MUSEUM STAFF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is/are the biggest challenge(s) that the museum now faces?

2. What can the museum do to increase student involvement?
APPENDIX C:
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HEARST MUSEUM OF ANTHROPOLOGY STUDENT INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Age: _______ Gender: _________ Major:__________

1. Before this questionnaire, were you aware of the Hearst Museum of Anthropology? (please circle one) Y/N

2. If so, have you ever visited the museum? (please circle one) Y/N

3. If YES, how often? Please check one:
   _____ 1-2 times per year
   _____ 3-4 times per year
   _____ 4+ times per year

4. Which exhibitions do you remember? Please list:

6. Where do you like to spend your free time? Please check the ones that apply:
   _____ Sports events
   _____ Other campus museums (please list)__________
   _____ Cal Performances events
   _____ Pacific Film Archives
   _____ Shopping near campus
   _____ Movies (downtown Berkeley)
   _____ Other (please explain) ____________________

7. How or where do you learn about on campus events?
8. Is there anything about the museum that you find welcoming?

9. Is there anything about the museum that you find not welcoming?

10. What themes or topics you would like to see in an exhibit?

11. What types of events (related to the museum or not) would you like to see take place at the museum?

12. Would you be more likely to visit the museum if it were to stay open later on Thursdays (9pm)?

13. Which of the following items do you prefer to go together with an exhibition at a museum? Please check as many as three and circle your first choice*:

   ____ Video
   ____ Docent tour
   ____ Real life participants
   ____ Reading material-handouts
   ____ Self-guided tour
   ____ Audio guide
   ____ Lecture
   ____ Program/class
   ____ None of the above

14. If you attend a museum tour, around what age would you prefer your tour guide to be?

*This question was adapted from M. Elaine Davis’ book: How Students Understand the Past: From Theory to Practice.
APPENDIX D:
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS
Note: The results of the student questionnaire presented here are those of the questions that were not reported out in the Findings chapter. Percentages are based on the total number of responses (n=45). Only the top answers are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Top Answers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1-2 times/year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>California Indians</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>This theme is part of a permanent exhibit room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cross-cultural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>This is similar to a Hearst staff response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender/sex</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>This is similar to a Hearst staff response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Cultural events</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>This includes such events as dance and music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movies/screenings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events involving food</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory/interactive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>One indicated that longer hours on the weekend would be preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>One indicated that longer hours on the weekend would be preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>One indicated that longer hours on the weekend would be preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Real life participants</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading material/handouts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Doesn’t matter, as long as they have experience</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doesn’t matter</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNIVERSITY ANTHROPOLOGY MUSEUM QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

- Wake Forest University Museum of Anthropology, Winston-Salem, North Carolina
- University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia
- California State University, Chico Museum of Anthropology, Chico
- University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology, Ann Arbor
- Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Haffenreffer Museum of Anthropology, Brown University, Bristol, Rhode Island
- Maxwell Museum of Anthropology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque
- University of Denver Museum of Anthropology, Colorado
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UNIVERSITY ANTHROPOLOGY MUSEUM SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Dear X,

My name is Jonathan Goodrich, and I am a Museum Studies masters student at John F. Kennedy University in the San Francisco Bay Area. I would be very grateful if you could help me with my masters thesis research by responding to the few short questions below. I am trying to understand what university anthropology museums are doing to engage and serve the undergraduate student audience from their same campus.

If there is someone at your museum that you feel would be better suited to answer these questions, please forward this message onto them.

If you could respond to the few, short questions below, it would greatly help me out. (You can just reply to this email, inserting your responses.) I would be more than happy to share my results and/or thesis with you if you like.

Also, if you prefer, your responses can be used anonymously.

If you have any questions, please email me (XX@XX.com) or call me at 510-XXX-XXXX.

If you can, please respond by April 14, 2006. It would be a tremendous help.

Thank you very, very much, your help is greatly appreciated,

Jonathan Goodrich
Questions:

1.) What programs/events/other do you have geared towards attracting/serving the undergraduate student audience at your university?

2.) Which of those programs/events/other were the most successful in engaging the undergraduate student audience?

3.) What is the biggest challenge your museum faces?

4.) What is the yearly attendance of your museum, and what percentage of your yearly attendance is comprised of undergraduate students from your university?
PRODUCT:

A PRESENTATION TO THE HEARST MUSEUM STAFF
Note: The following is adapted from the presentation as given to the staff of the Hearst Museum on June 21st, 2006. Included are the notes used for the presentation.
LISTENING TO THE
STUDENT VOICE

University Anthropology Museums

&

Development of the
Undergraduate Audience

Jonathan Goodrich
The Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology is on the UC Berkeley campus. Because of my background in anthropology and having attended UC Berkeley, I conducted a case study of the Hearst Museum to understand how they could better attract and serve the undergraduates on the same campus. I chose undergraduates, aged 18-25, because they are largest part of the greater campus community.
To conduct my research, I focused on four main areas.

- Literature Review
- Survey of University Anthropology Museums
- Hearst Staff Interviews
- Undergraduates Questionnaire
Point #1: Anthropology museums have historically had a long and rich history of academic research and were integral to the founding of anthropology as a discipline. In 1901 The Hearst Museum was founded alongside UC Berkeley’s anthropology department. In the 1980s there was a call for all university museums to focus on public offerings in addition to academic research, which highlighted the historic struggle between academic research and public service. Only recently have anthropology museums begun addressing public audiences.

Point #2: Students see the university experience as an economic exchange not just a learning experience, they’re aware they’re paying a lot for their education. As the museum is part of the university, the students perceive it as a commodity in their university experience.

Point #3: I see undergraduates as emerging adults, and Adults seek active learning experiences; prefer to be actively involved in the learning process rather than passive recipients of knowledge.
Results: Anthropology Museum Survey

- **Their student offerings:**
  - Lectures
  - Internship and volunteer opportunities
- **Main challenges:**
  - Visibility
  - Space
- Virtually no tracking of visitor data

Point #1: I first asked the museums what programming and events they offered their students. Their number one offering was lectures, which is an example of a passive learning experience, and as I said in the last slide, students are seeking active learning experiences.

Point #2: I also asked what they saw as the biggest challenge to the museum. Apart from funding, visibility was a common problem.

Point #3: I asked them what their yearly student attendance was, and only one could offer concrete data.
One of the questions I asked the staff was what they saw as a challenge to the museum overall.
I also asked the staff how the museum could better serve the student audience, and they all supported student involvement. However most of them suggested an academic approach to student involvement emphasizing that the way to get students to the museum is to have professors require it for class work.
Point #1: I administered my questionnaire in an anthropology class, and had 45 respondents. 98% had heard of the museum, but only 53% had visited. Which means that the students are aware that the museum is there, and they’re not going in.

Point #2: Where they get their campus event information: Fliers, Word-of-mouth, Email, Daily Cal (the campus newspaper)

Point #3: Equally important is where the students spend their free time: shopping, Movies, Sports events. Visiting museums weren't high on the list, which shows that museums are competing with these activities as sources of entertainment.
Point #1: One student said: “There’s no real draw to it, it’s kind of hidden away”. Here is the main entrance to the Museum.
**Results: Undergraduate Questionnaire**

- Is there anything about the museum that you find unwelcoming?
  - Obscure
  - Poor use of space
  - Hours and cost

You have to go down this corridor to the double doors....
Results: Undergraduate Questionnaire

- Is there anything about the museum that you find unwelcoming?
  - Obscure
  - Poor use of space
  - Hours and cost

And you’re still not in the museum! You have to go around the corner.
Point #2: Student comments: “It’s like a hole in the wall” and “It’s too damn small, I would love to see more of our collection on display as opposed to being stuck in the basement.”

Point #3: There was also complaints of cost and confusion over hours of operation: “It always seems closed” and “The fact that it costs $ to get in. Shouldn’t it be free?” It IS free to the students. This just points out that the museum Isn’t getting the basic operating information to the students.

And I have to point out that one student even said “Sometimes it feels as if having people view the exhibitions is inconvenient for the staff”. This is an important point because of the historic focus on research and the students are stating that they feel like the museum on their campus is not serving them.
The museum is located in a prime spot on campus. It’s near a main student pedestrian corridor, on a busy street, across from the Berkeley Art Museum and a major café. Even though, the museum is still difficult to find.
The students know it’s a fantastic collection of more than 4 million objects.
And thirdly, the students stated that they found NOTHING AT ALL welcoming about the museum. Some students actually wrote that in response to the question.
Slide 16

WHAT IT MEANS

- Physical appearance is key to visibility
- You have to go to them, they won’t come to you
- Listen to them

Point #2: Originally I set out to conduct four focus groups of ten students each instead of the questionnaire. I advertised on campus, a local electronic bulletin board, and sent email to the undergraduate student organization, and told them that food would be provided. Only two students showed up! Not even food brought the students in. I quickly contacted a professor I knew, and she was gracious enough to let me conduct the questionnaire in her class. This proved to be extremely successful. This just shows that you have to go to the students to let them know what is happening at the museum, they will not come to you.
Before going into my recommendations, I have to say that the leadership is already making changes and I point these suggestions out to stress the importance of completing these projects.

Point #1: Improve physical conditions. Dedicated museum entrance off of the main street, Classroom, Gallery space for professors’ use. Expansion (Increased gallery space, Student gallery for student driven exhibitions)

Point #2: Continued student research; Improved information outlets (Email, Daily Cal, Partnerships with campus departments and organizations, creating personal contacts with faculty and students, word of mouth is fostered)

Point #3: Encourage student involvement. New student welcoming parties, Prototyping of programs and events (make sure that evaluation is part of the prototyping process), Increased involvement opportunities (Internships, Docent program)
Recommendations:

**Leadership**

- Develop a strategic plan
- Incorporate all staff members with student involvement
- Require all staff to spend time in the gallery

Point #1: and see that the plans get completed

Point #2: Involve the staff (especially the reluctant ones) with the decision making process. Really listen to all the voices in the museum and help them to see that they benefit from student involvement.

Point #3: Require all staff to spend time interacting with visitors in the gallery
Point #1: let them know you’re there, and that you are fulfilling the university mission while fulfilling the Hearst’s. Show them that your goals are the same. By tracking how many students are coming through the doors, you show the university that you are serving their students.

Point #2: To continue audience research, to ensure the proper dissemination of information to the public, and can act as a hub to student involvement as a volunteer coordinator (of sorts) for interns, volunteers.
The solution, it would appear, lies neither in becoming showmen like Barnum nor in retreating behind the closed doors of secluded offices, but in charting a path somewhere in between, where the dignity of serious scholarship combines with the nobility of public service.

Michael M. Ames (1986) Museums, the Public, and Anthropology: A Study in the Anthropology of Anthropology. p. 25

In the end there doesn’t have to be a struggle between academic research and public service. They’ll benefit each other.