



HAL
open science

Modification of a School Program in the German Museum to Enhance Students' Attitudes and Understanding

Olga Stavrova, Detlef Urhahne

► **To cite this version:**

Olga Stavrova, Detlef Urhahne. Modification of a School Program in the German Museum to Enhance Students' Attitudes and Understanding. *International Journal of Science Education*, 2010, 10.1080/09500690903471583 . hal-00564788

HAL Id: hal-00564788

<https://hal.science/hal-00564788>

Submitted on 10 Feb 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Modification of a School Program in the German Museum to Enhance Students' Attitudes and Understanding

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2009-0169.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	museum, learning, attitudes, secondary school
Keywords (user):	guided tour



1
2
3 Modification of a School Program in the German Museum to Enhance Students' Attitudes
4
5
6 and Understanding
7
8
9

10 Abstract
11

12 The study examines the nature, conditions and outcomes of student learning from an
13 organised guided tour in the German Museum in Munich. The instructional methods that best
14 support student cognitive and affective learning were investigated as well as how students'
15 motivational and emotional states influence their achievement. A sample of 96 secondary
16 school students took part in two different versions of a guided tour on an energy topic. The
17 tours varied in the degree of support of student's active involvement, group work and the
18 variety of general activities offered during the tour. The data collected indicate that both tour
19 versions led to an increase in student understanding of the visit topic to nearly the same
20 extent. However, the version stimulating students' active participation, group work and
21 including a larger variety of activities aroused more positive attitudes. Students of the
22 modified school program showed higher interest and intrinsic motivation, felt more
23 competent and were less bored after the guided tour. In addition, the results suggest that
24 students' visit-related emotional states predict the degree of their post-visit topic
25 understanding, even when demographics and prior knowledge are taken into consideration.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Keywords:* museum, learning, attitudes, secondary school, guided tour
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

It is widely recognised that students learn from a variety of sources outside of school classrooms – museums, science centres, biological gardens, zoos and other institutions of informal learning. The nature of learning in informal settings is typically found to differ from classroom-based learning. A pertinent description of the features of informal learning is provided by Wellington (1990) who emphasizes the voluntary, open-ended, learner-led, non-assessed, less structured and more social character of informal learning. School learning, on the other hand, can be characterised as more teacher-controlled, well structured, and compulsory with expected and measurable outcomes.

These distinctions bring with them further informal learning properties frequently mentioned in the museum learning literature: the motivating and engaging character of exhibits (Falk & Dierking, 2000; Gardner, 1991; Griffin, 2004; Griffin & Symington, 1997; Paris, 1997; Russell, 1990), the support of sense of aesthetic appreciation and critical standards (Schauble, Leinhardt, & Martin, 1997), and the promotion of discovery learning (Falk & Dierking, 2000; Griffin, 2004; Griffin & Symington, 1997). Finally, teachers can look at their students from a different angle, in which a classroom ‘bad’ child may become a museum ‘good’ child (Falk & Dierking, 1992).

The characteristics of the informal learning location, such as exposure to authentic exhibits, gives informal learning environments a chance to engage students in a way schools never can. However, this is only if the museum educators and developers of the guided tour do not restrict themselves to classroom-like instruction. Therefore, the development of organised school tours has become a challenge for teachers and museum educators as well as the focus of the present study.

We made several methodological changes to a program for secondary school students offered by the German Museum in Munich. Our goal was to find out which kinds of instruction would foster better conceptual understanding of a scientific topic as well as

Modification of a school program

3

1
2
3 support more positive attitudes towards science and technology – affective learning. The
4
5 implementation of a quasi-experimental repeated measures design allowed us to investigate
6
7 how specific motivational and emotional states influence student achievement in an informal
8
9 learning setting.
10
11

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

Conceptual framework

Despite the previously described differences, museum and classroom-based learning have in common that students are expected to make gains in their understanding of the topic in both environments. The majority of studies indicate that visits to museums or other informal educational institutions lead to knowledge gained by schoolchildren (Bamberger & Tal, 2006; Gilbert & Priest, 1997; Lucas, 2000; Mortensen & Smart, 2007; Tuckey, 1992) as well as adults (Falk & Storksdieck, 2005; Falk & Adelman, 2003; Stevenson, 1991). Informal learning is also known to have ‘a staggering degree of effectiveness’ in arousing positive attitudes toward science and technology or in other words, affective learning (Russell, 1990, p. 260). The motivational aspect of field trips can be referred to as a ‘unique type of self-motivating learning’ (Rennie & McClafferty, 1995, p. 179). Wollins, Jensen, and Ulzheimer (1992) found out that children’s most extensive memories were related to the emotional rather than the cognitive component of their visit. Another study of primary school children visiting the UK National Space Centre determined an immediate although transient increase in children’s interest in and respect for space and science as well as a long-term drop in schoolwork-related anxiety (Jarvis & Pell, 2005).

Having acknowledged that museum visits contribute to learning, the further challenge is to discover which factors enhance or inhibit knowledge acquisition. Previous research has shown that they include student individual characteristics, environmental settings (lighting, temperature, crowdedness etc.), and exhibit design (Falk & Dierking, 2000). The most frequently mentioned are visitor’s motivation, prior knowledge, degree of choice and control

Modification of a school program

4

1
2
3 over the visit, and the amount and quality of student communication during the visit. These
4
5 influential factors, grouped within personal, social and physical contexts, have been organised
6
7 into a theoretical framework – the Contextual Model of Learning – by Falk and Dierking
8
9 (2000). Several factors in the personal context that are relevant for the present study are
10
11 reviewed in the following.
12
13

14
15 *Visitor's prior knowledge.* The influence of prior knowledge on museum learning has
16
17 been widely examined (Beiers & McRobbie, 1992; Falk & Adelman, 2003; Falk &
18
19 Storksdieck, 2005; Lucas, McManus, & Thomas, 1986; Tully & Lucas, 1991). Most
20
21 researchers agree that prior knowledge seems to support learning in museums. Tuckey (1992)
22
23 in her interview-based study of primary school pupils in an interactive science centre
24
25 concluded that while museum exhibits can increase understanding, they appear to not be able
26
27 to teach unfamiliar concepts. Thus, a certain level of prior knowledge is desirable for learning
28
29 to occur. Beiers & McRobbie (1992) also found prior knowledge to be important in their
30
31 study of seventh graders visiting a sound section of an interactive science centre. Similar
32
33 findings were reported in terms of the role of prior experience in learning from informal
34
35 sources: In a study by Tully and Lucas (1991), interactive science centre visitors were asked
36
37 to assemble and reassemble a lock. The procedure was videotaped and the participants were
38
39 randomly interviewed afterwards. The results indicate that the group of visitors, who watched
40
41 others trying to assemble the lock before they attempted, had a significant advantage over
42
43 those who didn't have the prior experience of watching.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 *Visitor's motivation and expectations.* People have different reasons for attending
52
53 museum or science centre exhibitions as well as expectations for those visits. The impact of a
54
55 visitor's motivation and expectations on learning is dependent on individual factors such as
56
57 prior knowledge or interest. Falk and Storksdieck (2005) studied learning of different
58
59 motivation groups, which either had the intent to entertain family or friends, to learn about the
60
world, or to have a good time. Learning of motivation groups was examined with respect to

1
2
3 varying degree of prior knowledge and interest. The results indicate that motivation to
4 entertain with friends or family was positively correlated with learning in the case of low
5 prior knowledge and high interest. The motivation to learn about the world was associated
6 with learning in case of high prior knowledge and high interest. The motivation of having a
7 good time did not show any positive connection to learning. Surprisingly, in contrast to
8 school learning, little research has been conducted on the impact of intrinsic versus extrinsic
9 motivation on achievement in informal learning settings. Nevertheless, as intrinsic motivation
10 is considered to be a reliable predictor of school success (Parkenson, Lomax, Schiller, &
11 Walberg, 1984; Schiefele & Schreyer, 1994; Uguroglu & Walberg, 1979), we assume that it
12 should be related to museum learning as well.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *Visitor's emotions.* In terms of emotions, the majority of studies about museum learning
28 only examine enjoyment and interest (e.g., Falk & Adelman, 2003; Henderlong & Paris,
29 1996; Rennie, 1994). Only a little research on other emotions experienced during a museum
30 visit has been conducted and was focused on either emotional components of knowledge such
31 as awareness, personal attitudes, or concerns about the topic (Adelman, Falk, & James, 2000)
32 or exhibit arrangements as determinants of visitor emotions from a marketing and consumer
33 satisfaction perspective (Caldwell, 2002; Legrenzi & Troilo, 2005). A large amount of other
34 learning emotions, especially negative ones like boredom or anger, and their relation to
35 learning in the context of a museum visit is left unnoticed. Empirical studies suggest that
36 learning-related emotions such as anxiety, fear, boredom, anger, and others are indirectly –
37 through learning strategies and attention – and directly related to school success (Derryberry
38 & Tucker, 1994; Isen, Daubman, & Nowicki, 1987; Pekrun & Hofmann, 1999; Trope &
39 Pomerantz, 1998). Even though docent-led museum visits can be to a certain extent compared
40 to school learning, not all achievement emotions listed above would influence learning
41 success during museum visits. We suggest that among negative achievement emotions,
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

boredom and anger would be more influential in free-choice settings than anxiety or fear that are rather associated with school-related assessment situations.

Obviously, the most important factor influencing learning from organised school group visits is the educational program designed for the schools (Falk & Dierking, 1992). As groups visiting museums or other informal learning settings have been the subjects of numerous studies (e.g., Griffin, 2004; Kisiel, 2006; Rennie, 1994), various recommendations for the optimization of school visits can currently be found in the museum learning literature. The most frequently mentioned ones are summarised below:

- Use a variety of activities targeting the different sensory modes (reading, listening, using maps etc.) (Falk & Dierking, 1992; Price & Hein, 1991).

- Offer well-designed group worksheets: worksheets should represent a basis for post-visit activities, include meaningful questions directed toward exhibits themselves, include different types of questions, present questions in an easy to handle format, provide orientation clues about where the information can be found, and support social peer interactions (Kisiel, 2003; Krombaß & Harms, 2008; Mortensen & Smart, 2007; Price & Hein, 1991; Wilde & Urhahne, 2008).

- Provide an appropriate level of structure: experimental research indicates that most learning occurs when there are no extremes in choices and control over the visit; successful school programs should include some structure and scaffolds in the student activities but also schedule some time for free exploration (Wilde, Urhahne, & Klautke, 2003).

- Encourage group work: topic-relevant social interactions, especially in dyads, support children learning on school field trips (Borun, Chambers, & Cleghorn, 1996; Matsusov & Rogoff, 1995; Tuckey, 1992).

- Promote interactions with docents: the guides are recommended to provide cues by asking questions to help students to concentrate on significant aspects of the material (Martin, Brown, & Russell, 1991).

Modification of a school program

7

1
2
3 - Use advance organizers and pre-orientation activities extensively: providing students
4 with information about the museum building, the exhibition nature, floor plan, purposes of the
5 excursion as well as telling students how the content is related to their school curriculum
6 (Anderson & Lucas, 1997; Burnett, 1996; Falk & Balling, 1982).
7
8
9

10
11
12 - Reinforce classroom-based follow-ups: arranging subsequent reinforcing events after
13 the visit (correction of the worksheet or trip-based tasks in the classroom) and making
14 connections to the school curriculum is crucial for ensuring long-term impact of museum
15 visits (Anderson, Lucas, Ginns, & Dierking, 2000).
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Several of these recommendations focusing on encouraging active student participation,
23 group work, increasing the variety of activities and sensory modes were applied to the school
24 program 'Energy forms and their use' within the present study. Besides this, the impact of
25 specific motivational and emotional variables on student achievement was analysed. The
26 study hypotheses are formulated as follows:
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 1) While contents of the school program remain unchanged, both programs should
35 contribute to cognitive learning approximately to the same amount.
36
37

38
39 2) The modified school program leads to higher intrinsic motivation, improves
40 situational interest, enhances perceived competence, and reduces negative emotions more than
41 the original guided tour.
42
43
44

45
46 3) What is the meaning of motivational and affective states in museum learning? We
47 assume that student motivation and emotions can explain student learning outcomes over and
48 above student demographics and prior knowledge.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Method

56 57 *Participants*

58
59 The study was conducted with four 8th and 9th grade secondary school classes,
60 consisting of a total of 96 students from Munich and the surrounding areas. Two randomly

Modification of a school program

8

1
2
3 selected classes (42 students) constituted the control group and the other two (54 students) the
4
5 experimental group. The students' age ranged between 13 and 16 with the mean of 14.14 (SD
6
7 = .83) years and was nearly the same across the classes. Fifty-four percent of the sample were
8
9 males. Groups were fairly homogeneous in terms of prior knowledge as shown by t-test for
10
11 independent samples, $t(94) = -1.17$, n.s.
12
13
14

15 16 17 *Setting*

18
19 The study took place at the German Museum in Munich, which is one of the biggest
20
21 world science museums. The German Museum promotes public understanding of science by
22
23 offering a large collection of operational technology, science-related exhibits as well as
24
25 interactive elements like push buttons or participatory experiments.
26
27

28
29 The museum has an excellent educational department that focuses on guided tours for
30
31 schools, which is also the focus of the present study. The school programs were developed
32
33 within the educational department of the German Museum. The programs are offered to all
34
35 types of schools ranging from primary school to gymnasium, the German equivalent to
36
37 English grammar school. The duration of a typical school program is about two hours and
38
39 includes a practical section.
40
41
42

43
44 The present study focuses on the program 'Energy forms and their use' for 7th to 9th
45
46 grade secondary school students. The program's content covers different power machines as
47
48 well as the development of the use of energy sources. The program was designed to fit the
49
50 school curriculum: the topics energy, power, capacity etc. are discussed in the eighth grade.
51
52 The program begins with the oldest machines that used human and animal muscle power, then
53
54 continues with windmills and waterwheels used in the Middle Age as well as steam engines
55
56 from the eighteenth century. Finally, the classes are guided to the new energy sources
57
58 department, where students learn about how energy is produced nowadays, which
59
60 technologies are used, and which are more efficient and environmentally friendly. Students

Modification of a school program

9

1
2
3 participating in the program usually spend about two hours in the German Museum with
4
5 about half of the time allocated for the power engines section and another half for the new
6
7 energy sources section. The power engines gallery houses mostly large size exhibits,
8
9 including wind- and waterwheels as well as steam engines, whereas the new energy sources
10
11 gallery contains more information tables, diagrams and computer information systems.
12
13
14

17 *Instruments*

18
19
20 *Knowledge.* Following the recommendations of other studies about learning in out-of-
21
22 school settings (Falk & Storksdieck, 2005; Rennie, Feher, Dierking, & Falk, 2003; Rennie &
23
24 McClafferty, 1996; Rennie & Williams, 2002), multiple instruments were employed to assess
25
26 changes in student understanding of the program's topic. The assessment procedure was
27
28 based on two different assessment tools: Personal Meaning Mapping and a multiple-choice
29
30 test.
31
32

33
34 Personal meaning mapping (PMM) is a relatively new approach to assessing knowledge
35
36 gains about a topic over time (Falk & Storksdieck, 2005). It asks the participants to
37
38 brainstorm a concept or a topic and put everything down that comes to their mind in relation
39
40 to this topic. Then, the individuals are encouraged to explain why they wrote what they did to
41
42 an interviewer with the goal to open up individual's conceptual framework about the cuing
43
44 word. The PMM allows measuring individual's conceptual change along four dimensions –
45
46 extent (changes in the number of appropriate words), breadth (changes in the number of
47
48 conceptual categories used), depth (changes in degree of understanding within each breadth
49
50 category) and mastery (overall assessment of changes in individual's understanding). We
51
52 adapted the original method of PMM to our study's time and setting constraints: the
53
54 procedure was restricted to recording words or phrases associated with the cuing word and
55
56 thus measuring the extent of changes in the number of appropriate words. The children were
57
58 given about one minute to complete the PMM on the topic 'energy'. Then, the appropriate
59
60

1
2
3 words recorded by the children were counted. These words fall within the category “energy as
4
5 scientific concept” and do not include individuals’ subjective associations like physics teacher
6
7 name or similar. As the “extent” dimension of the PMM method reflects “the most basic
8
9 aspect of an individual’s understanding of a concept or topic” (Falk & Storksdieck, 2005,
10
11 p.752) student answers were given a smaller weight (0,5 points for every word) in the total
12
13 knowledge score. Giving students one point for every correct word would have inflated some
14
15 students’ PMM scores.
16
17

18
19
20 A multiple-choice instrument consisting of 11 questions was especially developed for
21
22 this study. The multiple-choice measure was chosen due to time constraints; after the tour, the
23
24 students are usually tired and motivated to fill in only a short multiple-choice test. The
25
26 questions were related to the exhibits, the content of the tables and diagrams, and what the
27
28 guide said. The questions were directed at either factual knowledge or conceptual knowledge.
29
30 Factual knowledge questions asked for specific details or elements of the exhibition, while
31
32 conceptual knowledge questions targeted at scientific principles or generalizations (Anderson
33
34 & Krathwohl, 2001). A sample item for factual knowledge is: ‘When was the first steam
35
36 engine constructed?’ a. Beginning of 18th century (correct), b. Beginning of 19th century, c.
37
38 Beginning of 17th century, d. Beginning of 20th century. This item requires retrieving from
39
40 memory a fact about the history of steam engines. Conceptual knowledge was measured with
41
42 items like: ‘What can the functioning of a steam engine be compared with?’ a. cooking pot, b.
43
44 air pump (correct), c. bicycle, d. steam iron. This item requires understanding of a steam
45
46 engine’s functioning and is targeted at scientific principles understanding.
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 The validity of the knowledge test was established through consultation with the
54
55 museum educational and university staff. The museum educational staff helped in controlling
56
57 the content of the test. They checked for scientific correctness of items and avoidance of
58
59 ambiguity in wording. Furthermore, a pilot test was done on a group of university students,
60
who also checked for the clarity of the questions and the approximate completion time. The

Modification of a school program

11

1
2
3 item difficulty indexes in the pre-test were between 20% and 80% for all items. Each correct
4
5 answer on the test was scored with 1 point, except for one item where multiple answers were
6
7 possible and 0.5 point was given for each.
8
9

10
11 Finally, to obtain an overall knowledge score, the points obtained in both the PMM and
12
13 the multiple-choice test were summed together. To establish the change in knowledge from
14
15 pre- to post-test, the knowledge measurement procedure was not changed and was applied
16
17 after the visit in the same order.
18
19

20
21 *Motivation.* Many activities in museums can be described as intrinsically motivating
22
23 because visitors take part in these activities for their own sake. A visitor's perception of
24
25 competence, which is nurtured by the belief of being able to exert control over the
26
27 environment and fulfil task requirements, influences their engagement in activities. For
28
29 measuring intrinsic motivation and perceived competence short scales from the Intrinsic
30
31 Motivation Inventory (IMI) by Deci and Ryan (2008) were applied. The variables were
32
33 measured by three items each on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 - 'not at all true' to 5 -
34
35 'totally true'. Reliabilities and sample items of these scales are given in Table 1.
36
37
38

39 -----
40
41 Please insert Table 1 about here
42
43 -----
44

45
46 *Positive emotions.* The momentary state of being interested in a museum task or activity
47
48 can be labelled as situational interest (Krapp, Hidi, & Renninger, 1992). The frequent
49
50 stimulation of situational interest should in the long term lead to a stable interest disposition.
51
52 The measure used for evaluating situational interest was taken from the Perceived Interest
53
54 Questionnaire (PIQ) developed by Schraw, Bruning, and Svoboda (1995). This questionnaire
55
56 was originally designed for assessing student interest in literary texts and provided a general
57
58 measure of situational interest in the content and events described by the text. The wording of
59
60 initial item set of PIQ was slightly modified to suite the setting and purpose of the present

1
2
3 study. In order to see if the school program satisfied students' desires and demands, a second
4
5 positive emotion was considered. The satisfaction scale provided a measure of general visit
6
7 satisfaction and was especially developed for this study by the authors. The satisfaction scale
8
9 items and statistical parameters are presented in Table 2.
10
11

12 -----
13
14 Please insert Table 2 about here
15
16 -----
17
18

19
20 *Negative emotions.* Modified extracts of the Achievement Emotions Questionnaire –
21
22 Mathematics (AEQ-M) developed by Pekrun, Goetz, and Frenzel (2005) were applied to
23
24 measure negative emotions associated with the visit. AEQ-M is a multidimensional self-
25
26 report instrument designed to assess student emotions (enjoyment, pride, anger, anxiety,
27
28 shame, hopelessness and boredom) in different learning-related contexts (attending the class,
29
30 studying and doing homework, and taking tests and exams). Since among the three learning
31
32 contexts, the classroom is the most similar to museum learning, three anger and three
33
34 boredom items from the respective section of the AEQ-M were selected to assess negative
35
36 emotions related to learning in a museum. For all emotions, 5-point Likert scales were used as
37
38 a means to indicate emotional impressions. Reliabilities and item examples of the measured
39
40 emotions can be found in Table 1.
41
42
43
44

45 46 47 48 *Treatment*

49
50 The program 'Energy forms and their use' is a two-hour guided tour through the power
51
52 machines and modern forms of energy use sections. The program begins with greetings and
53
54 introductory words from the guide. Then, self-selected student groups (2-3 students in each)
55
56 are given 15-20 minutes to explore and complete a three-page worksheet. Each page of the
57
58 worksheet refers to a subsection or sub-theme of the power machine section: waterwheels,
59
60 windmills and steam engines. Altogether, the worksheet contains 15 open-ended questions

1
2
3 that the students are supposed to answer using information from the labels and their own
4
5 observations. After this exploratory phase, the program continues with the guided tour, during
6
7 which the exhibits included in the worksheets are discussed first. The class is then taken to the
8
9 new energy sources department. This second part does not include any group work; rather the
10
11 program is continued in a docent-led manner.
12
13

14
15 -----
16
17 Please insert Table 3 about here
18
19 -----
20
21

22 Taking into account the recommendations for developing school programs, the original
23
24 program's design was modified in the following ways. After the greeting and introductory
25
26 words, students were divided into groups that were kept constant through the whole program.
27
28 The groups were not self-selected, rather nominated by a simple procedure: the students each
29
30 took a piece of candy from a bag and those with the same colour formed a group. This
31
32 nomination procedure was chosen in order to increase group diversity, give students the
33
34 possibility to work with students they usually do not work with and avoid the concentration of
35
36 'troublesome' students in the same group. After this, as in the original program, students were
37
38 given 15 to 20 minutes time to complete the worksheets in their nominated groups. The
39
40 worksheets, however, were modified: taking into account the recommendations concerning
41
42 the question format (Wilde & Urhahne, 2008), open questions were replaced by multiple-
43
44 choice ones. The correct answers to the worksheet questions led, as in a puzzle, to a 'solution'
45
46 word. The new worksheets included ten questions and covered the waterwheels and windmills
47
48 sections. In addition, students were told that their group would be given a point for every right
49
50 solution word. The points for all group activities were accumulated and a winning group was
51
52 determined. After the completion of the worksheets, the guide, as in the original program,
53
54 presented the exhibits to the students in more detail. After the docent-led phase, the students
55
56 as a group had put together a paper-puzzle representing the most important parts of the first
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 steam engine developed by Newcomen, as well as to name these parts correctly. This activity
4
5 was scheduled in the middle of the program to give the students a break from passive
6
7 listening and compensate for not including steam engine-related questions on the worksheet.
8
9
10 Afterwards the class was taken to the new energy sources department, where the docent-led
11
12 tour was combined with a quiz. The guide asked different multiple-choice questions that were
13
14 also presented on a flip chart and after a short reflection time, the groups were told to provide
15
16 their answers. Each question was then accompanied by the guide's short analysis of the
17
18 students' answers and clarifications. At the end of the program, the groups' points were
19
20 accumulated and the winning group was congratulated. However, no prize was awarded so
21
22 that the joy of receiving the prize would not interfere with the enjoyment of the program due
23
24 to the methodological changes. All changes to the program were methodological, the
25
26 program's content or duration was not changed. An overview comparing the two programs is
27
28 provided in Table 3, whereas Table 4 summarizes the new elements of the program and
29
30 relates them to the recommendations for designing a successful program mentioned in
31
32 museum learning research.
33
34
35
36
37

38 -----
39
40 Please insert Table 4 about here
41
42 -----
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Procedure*

49
50 The impact of the methodological changes in the school program 'Energy forms and
51
52 their use' was assessed on the basis of quantitative tests by using a repeated measures design
53
54 with an experimental and a control group. The pre-test addressed only topic-related
55
56 knowledge, whereas the post-test encompassed both knowledge and attitudes. The following
57
58 affective variables were included in the post-test: intrinsic motivation, situational interest, and
59
60 perceived competence for the visit, satisfaction with the visit, visit-related boredom and

1
2
3 anger. In order to control for the effect of possible intervening variables, demographic data
4
5 such as age or gender were also collected.
6
7

8 All the measurements took place on the day of the visit. After arriving in the museum
9
10 the classes were led to the museum's coat check hall (equipped with enough chairs), where
11
12 the students filled in the knowledge pre-test questionnaire. The knowledge post-test and
13
14 affective variables questionnaires were filled in directly after the visit. The complete
15
16 assessment procedure was about 30 to 40 minutes in length.
17
18
19
20
21

22 Results

23
24 Participation in both programs resulted in student knowledge gains. Table 5 indicates
25
26 that in the case of the experimental group all knowledge measures applied yielded significant
27
28 gains from pre- to post-test. Whereas the control group showed significant knowledge gains
29
30 only as measured by the multiple-choice test alone and in combination with the PMM.
31
32
33

34 -----
35
36 Please insert Table 5 about here
37
38 -----
39
40

41 As predicted by our first hypothesis, both programs contributed to student learning
42
43 about the energy topic to nearly the same extent. As can be seen in Table 6, the comparison of
44
45 the overall knowledge level change from pre- to post-test yielded no significant difference
46
47 between the treatment groups. This, however, did not apply to the sub-test level: the
48
49 experimental group showed significantly better learning results on the PMM part of the test,
50
51 whereas the control group – on the multiple-choice test (see Table 6).
52
53
54

55 -----
56
57 Please insert Table 6 about here
58
59 -----
60

1
2
3 In the second hypothesis, it was assumed that the modification of the school program
4 would have a positive impact on students' attitudes towards museum learning. The
5 comparison of the treatment groups in terms of affective learning in Table 7 indicates that the
6 students in the experimental group were significantly more intrinsically motivated, found the
7 visit more interesting, felt themselves more competent in relation to program tasks and were
8 less bored than the control group. As can be seen from the results in Table 7, the experimental
9 group was also more satisfied with the visit and experienced less anger than the control group
10 – both findings were however not significant.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 -----
23
24 Please insert Table 7 about here
25
26 -----
27
28

29 In order to test the third hypothesis, the correlations between cognitive and affective
30 variables for both treatment groups together were analyzed. First, the Pearson correlations in
31 Table 8 reveal that knowledge post-test results correlated most strongly with knowledge pre-
32 test scores, which suggests a positive impact of prior knowledge on learning outcomes.
33 Somewhat weaker, but still significant correlations were detected between knowledge post-
34 test scores and anger, age and satisfaction. This means that students tended to score higher on
35 the knowledge post-test if they already had some knowledge on the visit topic, experienced
36 minimal anger during the visit, and were older and more satisfied with the program.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 -----
51 Please insert Table 8 about here
52
53 -----
54

55 It was assumed in hypothesis 3 that student motivation and emotions contribute to
56 learning outcomes when prior knowledge and demographic information are taken into
57 consideration. By means of a hierarchical multiple regression analysis the effects of prior
58 knowledge, demographic and affective variables on the knowledge post-test score were
59
60

1
2
3 determined. The multicollinearity diagnostics revealed that the variance inflator factor (VIF)
4
5 for all predictor variables was below 1.0, which according to Kleinbaum, Kupper, and
6
7 Mueller (1988) indicates that there was no multicollinearity between the predictor variables.
8
9 To minimize the possibility of suppression effects, only the variables that were found to
10
11 correlate with the criterion variable were considered in the regression analysis. This led, e.g.,
12
13 to the exclusion of boredom (see Table 8). The independent variables were introduced into the
14
15 model in three steps. In order to control for a possible effect of demographic variables, age
16
17 was entered first. In the second step, prior knowledge as measured by the pre-test knowledge
18
19 scores was entered into the regression equation. In the third step, the affective variables
20
21 satisfaction and anger were introduced into the model. The overview of the introduced
22
23 variables and the results of multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 9. The
24
25 proposed model yields three significant predictors explaining 25 percent of the variance of the
26
27 knowledge post-test scores ($F(4, 85) = 6.91, p < .001$). The two strongest predictors are
28
29 student age ($\beta = .31, p < .01$) and prior knowledge ($\beta = .31, p < .01$), followed by anger ($\beta = -$
30
31 $.24, p < .05$). The direction of the relationship suggests that being older, having more prior
32
33 knowledge and having experienced less anger during the visit significantly contribute to
34
35 learning.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 -----
44
45 Please insert Table 9 about here
46
47 -----
48
49

50
51 In addition, including affective variables into the model in the third step improved the
52
53 overall model fit (the amount of explained variance raised by 7%). Thus, as expected by our
54
55 third hypothesis, emotional variables, and namely, anger, explains some variance in student
56
57 post-test knowledge score over and above student demographics and prior knowledge.
58
59
60

Discussion

1
2
3 The present study contributed to museum learning research in several ways. First, it
4 provided further evidence of student cognitive learning from organised museum
5
6
7

8
9
10 visits. Second, it established that the frequently mentioned recommendations in the
11 museum research literature, such as providing more opportunities for group work or
12 supporting active student participation, can significantly improve student motivational and
13 emotional states during the visit and are successful in promoting student understanding.
14
15 Third, the results provide further insights into factors influencing student museum learning:
16 thus, specific emotional states, and namely, anger experienced during the visit, were found to
17 explain student learning outcomes when other previously established predictors are
18 considered.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The comparison of the effects of two quite different instructional strategies on student
30 affective learning indicates that providing more room for socialization, introducing activities
31 involving various sensory modes as well as supporting student active participation were more
32 beneficial in terms of student attitudes: the modified guided tour increased student intrinsic
33 motivation and perceived competence, and was seen to be more interesting and less boring
34 than the traditional docent-led tour. We believe that the modifications to the program fulfilled
35 their purpose in making the visit more enjoyable and enhancing students' positive attitudes
36 towards science and technology, which is the primary goal of informal learning institutions
37 (Russell, 1990). Increasing students' positive attitudes toward science and technology
38 museums is especially important during the adolescent age, as teenagers are generally not
39 very excited about museum field trips – a regrettable fact, since museums are increasingly
40 recognised to possess a very wide range of relevant resources. Therefore, the program
41 modifications that increase students' positive attitudes and motivation to take part in further
42 museum visits would contribute to enhancing students' learning of science in the long run.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As the content of the program was not changed, the modified program had the same
4 impact on learning as the original school program. However, there were some noteworthy
5 differences between the treatment groups at the sub-test level. The control group improved
6 their knowledge significantly more as measured by the multiple-choice test, whereas the
7 experimental group showed higher gains in Personal Meaning Mapping. An explanation to
8 this could be that the control group received most of the information from the guide. The
9 experimental group, in contrast, acquired their knowledge mainly from group work, free
10 exploration and active participation during most phases of the museum visit. This might have
11 enabled them to construct meaning on the basis of their prior knowledge, recall the newly
12 acquired information more easily and consequently, reproduce more energy-related concepts
13 in the Personal Meaning Mapping. The increase of topic-related vocabulary in the PMM
14 extent dimension can be regarded as a sign of improved understanding (Falk & Storksdieck,
15 2005). However, as only a short PMM version was used to capture students' meaning
16 construction, the results have to be interpreted with care and need further validation.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The findings on individual factors determining student learning from organised museum
37 tours generally support those of past studies (Beiers & McRobbie, 1992; Tuckey, 1992) in
38 that student prior knowledge contributes to better understanding of the visit topic. This
39 finding can be explained from the constructivist perspective on knowledge acquisition, which
40 says that the new knowledge is generated on the basis of existing knowledge through
41 assimilation and accommodation (Driver, 1989). Besides prior knowledge emotional factors
42 like anger, can explain some variance in student learning. In the past, negative affect was
43 rarely examined in museum learning research. It is not considered within the Contextual
44 Model of Learning and has hardly been examined among the factors influencing museum
45 learning. This may be traced back to the original free-choice nature of informal learning:
46 museum visitors engage on their own free will and in most cases can leave whenever they
47 want. The situation with class visits is quite different: Children do not always willingly attend
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 museums and offering them worksheets to fill in does not usually cheer them up. Even on
4
5 unstructured free exploration fieldtrips, children do not have as much free choice as adults
6
7 usually have and, thus, are more likely to become subjects to anger and other negative
8
9 emotions. For example, in the original program the strongest emotion experienced by the
10
11 students was boredom. Consequently, negative affect should be taken into account while
12
13 considering factors influencing learning during class visits and a high priority for teachers and
14
15 museum educators should be finding ways to reduce it.
16
17
18

19
20 The study's limitations consist of a relatively large number of methodological changes
21
22 applied to the school visit, which may preclude us from telling what exactly accounts for the
23
24 students' enhanced motivation and enjoyment: new worksheets, a fun quiz or doing a steam
25
26 engine puzzle? Multiple changes, however, were necessary to make a large impact on student
27
28 experiences in the open learning environment of a science and technology museum. If only
29
30 one detail of the guided tour had been changed, it is likely that random noise would impede us
31
32 from detecting its effect on student learning. However, all the changes made were aligned in a
33
34 general overarching theme: enhancing variety in proposed activities and supporting student
35
36 active participation. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that instructions sharing these
37
38 qualities would contribute to heightened attitudes.
39
40
41
42

43
44 Further research should concentrate on the analysis of the long-term impact of organized
45
46 museum visits on student learning, motivation and emotions, as Rennie et al. (2003) suggest.
47
48 It would be of interest to find out if the established positive impact on student attitudes is of
49
50 long-standing nature and can be measured even weeks later. Museums are recognised to have
51
52 potential of eliciting lasting impressions and long-term memories that stand the test of time.
53
54 These impressions and memories can be used as a basis for integrating museum experiences
55
56 in the school curriculum. For example, a museum visit can be used to introduce a new
57
58 scientific topic to a class.
59
60

1
2
3 Other challenges pertain to developing new analytical methods that would enable the
4 investigation of the process of learning per se. Interviews, think-aloud protocols, or video
5 studies have the potential to explore learning from a learner's perspective and thus, give an
6 even better understanding of instructional modifications in guided museum tours. Obviously,
7 investigating informal learning is connected to a number of challenges that we encourage
8 future research to examine. The potential benefit of museums offering better guided tours that
9 enhance the students' attitudes and understanding, is worth the effort.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Adelman, L. M., Falk, J. H., & James, S. (2000). Assessing the National Aquarium in Baltimore's impact on visitor's conservation knowledge, attitudes and behaviors. *Curator, 43*(1), 33-62.
- Anderson, D., & Lucas, K. B. (1997). The effectiveness of orienting students to the physical features of a science museum prior to visitation. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 27*(4), 485-495.
- Anderson, D., Lucas, K. B., Ginns, I. S., & Dierking, L. D. (2000). Development of knowledge about electricity and magnetism during a visit to a science museum and related postvisit-activities. *Science Education, 84*, 658-679.
- Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing. A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Bamberger, Y., & Tal. T. (2006). Learning in a personal context: Levels of choice in a free choice learning environment in science and natural history museums. *Science Education, 90*, 75-95.
- Beiers, R. J., & McRobbie, C. J. (1992). Learning in interactive science centers. *Research in Science Education, 22*, 38-44.
- Borun, M., Chambers, M., & Cleghorn, A. (1996). Families are learning in science museums. *Curator, 39*, 123-138.
- Burnett, J. (1996). Small group behaviour in a novel field environment: Senior science students visit a marine theme park. *Australian Science Teachers Journal, 42*(4), 59-65
- Caldwell, N. (2002). (Rethinking) the measurement of service quality in museums and galleries. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 7*(2), 161-171.

Modification of a school program

23

1
2
3 Cox-Peterson, A. M., Marsh, D. D., Kisiel, J., & Melber, L. M. (2003). Investigation of
4
5 guided school tours, student learning, and science reform recommendations at a
6
7 museum of natural history. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(2), 200-218.

8
9
10 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). *Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI)*. Retrieved November
11
12 23, 2008, from <http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/measures/index.html>

13
14
15 Derryberry, D., & Tucker, D. M. (1994). Motivating the focus of attention. In P.M.
16
17 Neidenthal & S. Kitayama (Eds.), *The heart's eye: Emotional influences in perception*
18
19 *and attention* (pp. 167-196). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

20
21
22 Driver, R. (1989). Students' conceptions and the learning of science. *International Journal of*
23
24 *Science Education*, 11(5), 481-490.

25
26 Falk, J. H., & Adelman, L. (2003). Investigating the impact of prior knowledge, experience
27
28 and interest on aquarium visitor learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*,
29
30 40(2), 163-176.

31
32
33 Falk, J. H., & Balling, J. D. (1982). The field trip milieu: Learning and behavior as a function
34
35 of contextual events. *Journal of Educational Research*, 76(1), 22-28.

36
37 Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (1992). *The museum experience*. Washington, DC: Whalesback.

38
39 Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2000). *Learning from museums: Visitor experiences and the*
40
41 *making of meaning*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

42
43
44 Falk, J. H., & Storksdieck, M. (2005). Using the contextual model of learning to understand
45
46 visitor learning from a science center exhibition. *Science Education*, 89(5), 744-778.

47
48
49 Gardner, H. (1991). *The unschooled mind*. New York: Basic Books.

50
51
52 Gilbert, J., & Priest, M. (1997). Models and discourse: A primary school science class visit to
53
54 a museum. *Science Education*, 81(6), 749-762.

55
56
57 Griffin, J. (2004). Research on students and museums: Looking more closely at the students
58
59 in school groups. *Science Education*, 88, 59-70.

Modification of a school program

24

1
2
3 Griffin, J., & Symington, D. (1997). Moving from task-oriented to learning-oriented strategies
4
5 on school excursions to museums. *Science Education*, 81(6), 763-780.

6
7
8 Gumora, G., & Arsenio W. F. (2002). Emotionality, emotion regulation, and school
9
10 performance in middle school children. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40(5), 395-413.

11
12 Henderlong, J., & Paris, S. G. (1996). Children's motivation to explore partially completed
13
14 exhibits in hands-on museums. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21, 111-128.

15
16
17 Isen, A. M., Daubman, K. A., & Nowicki, G. P. (1987). Positive affect facilitates creative
18
19 problem solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1122-1131.

20
21
22 Jarvis, T., & Pell, A. (2005). Factors influencing elementary school children's attitudes
23
24 toward science before, during, and after a visit to the UK National Space Centre.
25
26 *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 42, 53-83.

27
28
29 Kisiel, J. (2003). Teachers, museums, and worksheets: A closer look at a learning experience.
30
31 *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 14(1), 3-21.

32
33
34 Kisiel, J. (2006). An examination of fieldtrip strategies and their implementation within a
35
36 natural history museum. *Science Education*, 90(3), 434-452.

37
38
39 Kleinbaum, D. G., Kupper, L. L., & Muller, K. E. (1988). *Applied regression analysis and*
40
41 *other multivariate methods*. Belmont, CA: Duxbury Press.

42
43
44 Krapp, A., Hidi, S., & Renninger, K. A. (1992). Interest, learning and development. In A.
45
46 Renninger, S. Hidi, & A. Krapp (Eds.), *The role of interest in learning and development*
47
48 (pp. 3-25). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

49
50
51 Krombaß, A., & Harms, U. (2008). Acquiring knowledge about biodiversity in museum – are
52
53 worksheets effective? *Journal of Biological Education*, 42(4), 157-163.

54
55
56 Legrenzi, L., & Troilo, G. (2005). *The impact of exhibit arrangement on visitors' emotions: A*
57
58 *study at the Victoria & Albert Museum*. Paper presented at the eighth international
59
60 conference on arts & cultural management. Retrieved March 12, 2009, from
http://neumann.hec.ca/aimac2005/PDF_Text/LegrenziL_TroiloG.pdf

Modification of a school program

25

1
2
3 Lucas, K. B. (2000). One teacher's agenda for a class visit to an interactive science center.
4
5 *Science Education*, 84, 524–544.

6
7
8 Lucas, A. M., McManus, P., & Thomas, G. (1986). Investigating learning from informal
9
10 sources: Listening to conversations and observing play in science museums. *European*
11
12 *Journal of Science Education*, 8, 341-352.

13
14
15 Martin, M., Brown, S., & Russell, T. (1991). A study of child-adult interaction at a natural
16
17 history centre. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 17, 355-369.

18
19
20 Matsusov, E., & Rogoff, B. (1995). Evidence of development from people's participation in
21
22 communities of learners. In J. H. Falk & L. Dierking (Eds.), *Public institutions for*
23
24 *personal learning* (pp. 97-104). Washington, DC: AAM.

25
26
27 McManus, P. M. (1988). Good companions: More on the social determination of learning-
28
29 related behaviour in a science museum. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 7(1),
30
31 37-44.

32
33
34 Mortensen, M. F., & Smart, K. (2007). Free-choice worksheets increase students' exposure to
35
36 curriculum during museum visits. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44(9),
37
38 1389-1414.

39
40
41 Paris, S. G. (1997). Situated motivation and informal learning. *Journal of Museum Education*,
42
43 22, 22-27.

44
45
46 Parkenson, J. A., Lomax, R. G., Schiller, D. P., & Walberg, H. J. (1984). Exploring causal
47
48 models of educational achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(4), 638-46.

49
50
51 Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., & Frenzel, A. C. (2005). *Achievement Emotions Questionnaire –*
52
53 *Mathematics (AEQ-M). German Version. User's Manual*. Munich: University of
54
55 Munich.

56
57
58 Pekrun, R., & Hofmann, H. (1999). Lern- und Leistungsemotionen: Erste Befunde eines
59
60 Forschungsprogramms [Learning and achievement motivation: research program's first

Modification of a school program

26

1
2
3 findings]. In M. Jerusalem & R. Pekrun (Eds.) *Emotion, Motivation und Leistung* (pp.
4 247-267). Göttingen: Hogrefe.
5
6

7
8 Price, S., & Hein, G. E. (1991). More than a field trip: Science programs for elementary
9 school groups at museums. *International Journal of Science Education*, 13, 505-519.
10
11

12 Rennie, L. J. (1994). Measuring affective outcomes from a visit to a science education centre.
13
14 *Research in Science Education*, 24, 261-269.
15
16

17 Rennie, L., Feher, E., Dierking, L. D., & Falk, J. H. (2003). Toward an agenda for advancing
18 research on science learning in out-of-school settings. *Journal of Research in Science*
19 *Teaching*, 40(2), 112-120.
20
21
22
23

24 Rennie, L. J., & McClafferty, T. P. (1995). Using visits to interactive science and technology
25 centers, museums aquaria, and zoos to promote learning in science. *Journal of Science*
26 *Teacher Education*, 6(4), 175-185.
27
28
29
30

31 Rennie, L. J., & McClafferty, T. P. (1996). Science centres and science learning. *Studies in*
32 *Science Education*, 27, 53-98.
33
34
35

36 Rennie, L. J., & Williams, G. F. (2002). Science centers and scientific literacy: Promoting a
37 relationship with science. *Science Education*, 86(5), 706-726.
38
39
40

41 Reschly, A. L., Huebner, E. S., Appleton, J. J., & Antaramian, S. (2008). Engagement as
42 flourishing: The contribution of positive emotions and coping to adolescents'
43 engagement at school and with learning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(5), 419-431.
44
45
46
47

48 Russell, I. (1990). Visiting a science center: What's on offer? *Physics Education*, 25, 258-
49 262.
50
51
52

53 Schauble, L., Leinhardt, G., & Martin, L. (1997). A framework for organizing a cumulative
54 research agenda in informal learning contexts. *Journal of Museum Education*, 22, 3-8.
55
56

57 Schiefele, U., & Schreyer, I. (1994). Intrinsische Lernmotivation und Lernen. Ein Überblick
58 zu Ergebnissen der Forschung [Intrinsic motivation to learn and learning. A review of
59 recent research findings]. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogische Psychologie*, 8(1), 1-13.
60

Modification of a school program

27

Schraw, G., Bruning, R., & Svoboda, C. (1995). Sources of situational interest. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 27, 1-17.

Stevenson, J. (1991). The long-term impact of interactive exhibits. *International Journal of Science Education*, 13(5), 521-31.

Trope, Y., & Pomerantz, E. M. (1998). Resolving conflicts among self-evaluative motives: Positive experiences as a resource for overcoming defensiveness. *Motivation and Emotion*, 22, 53-72.

Tuckey, C. (1992). Children's informal learning at an interactive science centre. *International Journal of Science Education*, 14(3), 273-278.

Tulley, A., & Lucas, A. M. (1991). Interacting with a science museum exhibit: Vicarious and direct experience and subsequent understanding. *International Journal of Science Education*, 13, 533-542.

Uguroglu, M. E., & Walberg, H. J. (1979). Motivation and achievement: A quantitative synthesis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 16(4), 375-389.

Wellington, J. (1990). Formal and informal learning in science: The role of the interactive science centres. *Physics Education*, 25, 247-252.

Wilde, M., & Urhahne, D. (2008). Museum learning: A study of motivation and learning achievement. *Journal of Biological Education*, 42(2), 78-84.

Wilde, M., Urhahne, D., & Klautke, S. (2003). Unterricht im Naturkundemuseum: Untersuchung über das „richtige“ Maß an Instruktion [Education in a natural history museum: Investigation on the right level of instruction]. *Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften*, 9, 125-134.

Wollins, I. S., Jensen, N., & Ulzheimer, R. (1992). Children's memories of museum field trips: A qualitative study. *Journal of Museum Education*, 17(2), 17-27.

Modification of a school program

28

Table 1.

Scales used in the study to measure motivation and emotions

Scale	Items	Sample item	Cronbach's α
Intrinsic motivation	3	The guided tour in the museum was fun to me.	.86
Perceived competence	3	I think I was fairly good at the tasks in the museum.	.85
Situational interest	6	This guided tour is one of the best that I have ever taken part in.	.87
Satisfaction	4	I am very satisfied with the guided tour.	.84
Anger	3	I was angry that I had to attend the guided tour.	.77
Boredom	3	To tell the truth I found the guided tour boring.	.92

Modification of a school program

Table 2.

Satisfaction scale

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>r</i> _{it}
All in all, the guided tour ran well.	3.00	1.11	.67
I felt well during the guided tour.	2.60	1.31	.65
The atmosphere in the exhibition was pleasant.	3.08	1.30	.67
I am very satisfied with the guided tour.	2.57	1.24	.70

Note. *r*_{it}: item-total-correlation

Modification of a school program

30

Table 3.

Comparison of original and modified school program

Original program	Modified program
Self-selected groups	Nominated groups
Open-ended worksheets	Multiple-choice worksheets with solution word
Guided tour in the power machines section	Guided tour in the power machines section
No puzzle	Steam engine puzzle
Guided tour in the new energy sources section	Quiz questions with guide clarification in the new energy sources section

Modification of a school program

31

Table 4.

Research recommendations implemented in the modified school program

Research recommendation for designing school programs	Corresponding elements of the modified school program
Support group work and socializing activities - Borun et al., 1996 - McManus, 1988 - Cox-Peterson, Marsh, Kisiel, & Melber, 2003 - Price & Hein, 1991	Group activities are provided through the complete program, not only at the beginning
An appropriate level of structure: instructional-constructivist-oriented learning environment - Bamberger & Tal, 2006 - Wilde et al., 2003	Combination of guided tour with group work Worksheets including a free-choice element (not every question has to be answered to get the solution word)
Variation in activities during the visit and in sensory modes used - reading, listening, practical work etc. - Falk & Dierking, 1992 - Price & Hein, 1991	Listening to guide's explanations Reading labels and worksheets during group work Talking for answering guide's questions and during group work Practical fine-motor skills during the steam engine construction puzzle
Encouraging interactions with docents in guided tours by means of questions - Martin et al., 1991 - Price & Hein, 1991 - Russell, 1990	The guide stimulated students' participation using the quiz questions

Modification of a school program

32

Table 5.

Comparison of knowledge pre- and post-test results of experimental and control group by t-tests for paired samples

	Pre-test		Post-test		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> <
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Control group							
PMM	2.73	.92	2.84	1.32	.49	41	<i>ns</i>
Multiple Choice	4.99	1.83	6.90	1.88	7.52	41	.001
Overall	7.71	1.85	9.74	2.55	5.89	41	.001
Experimental group							
PMM	2.54	.96	3.17	.95	4.28	53	.001
Multiple Choice	5.66	1.47	6.65	1.73	3.62	53	.001
Overall	8.19	2.09	9.81	2.01	4.71	53	.001

Note. PMM: Personal Meaning Mapping.

Modification of a school program

33

Table 6.

Comparison of knowledge gains of experimental and control group by t-tests for independent samples

Knowledge test	Experimental group		Control group		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> <
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
PMM	.63	1.08	.11	1.45	2.01	94	.05
Multiple Choice	.99	2.01	1.92	1.65	2.41	94	.05
Overall	1.62	2.23	2.03	2.53	.82	94	<i>ns</i>

Note. PMM: Personal Meaning Mapping.

Modification of a school program

34

Table 7.

Comparison of attitudes of experimental and control group by t-tests for independent samples

Scale	Experimental group		Control group		<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> <
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Intrinsic Motivation	2.65	1.18	2.19	.80	2.22	92	.05
Perceived Competence	3.92	.91	3.15	.91	4.11	92	.001
Situational Interest	2.55	1.10	2.15	.75	2.10	92	.05
Satisfaction	2.91	1.11	2.69	.93	1.01	90	<i>ns</i>
Anger	2.48	1.23	2.67	1.10	.79	93	<i>ns</i>
Boredom	3.28	1.38	3.89	1.19	2.26	92	.05

Modification of a school program

Table 8.

Zero-order correlations of cognitive, affective and demographic variables

Variable	Knowledge pre-test	Knowledge post-test	Intrinsic motivation	Perceived competence	Situational interest	Satisfaction	Anger	Boredom	Age	Gender
Knowledge pre-test	—	.37***	.12	-.00	.19	.19	-.23*	-.15	-.05	-.22*
Knowledge post-test		—	.16	-.05	.02	.21*	-.26*	-.08	.25*	.04
Intrinsic motivation			—	.39***	.74***	.68***	-.59***	-.69***	-.13	-.13
Perceived competence				—	.32**	.35**	-.10	-.22*	-.13	-.18
Situational interest					—	.73***	-.49***	-.59***	-.15	-.24*
Satisfaction						—	-.50***	-.57***	-.08	-.09
Anger							—	.70***	.21*	.03
Boredom								—	.21*	.21*
Age									—	.04
Gender										—

Modification of a school program

36

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$; Gender-coded: 0 - female, 1 - male.

For Peer Review Only

Modification of a school program

37

Table 9.

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis on knowledge post-test scores

	Knowledge overall post-test scores			
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	ΔR^2
Step 1: Control variables				.046*
Age	.58	.28	.21*	
Step 2: Cognitive variables				.134***
Age	.71	.27	.26*	
Prior knowledge	.42	.11	.37***	
Step 3: Affective variables				.066*
Age	.83	.26	.31**	
Prior knowledge	.35	.11	.31**	
Satisfaction	.03	.06	.05	
Anger	-.15	.07	-.24*	
Total R^2				.245***

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.