ED 413 517   CE 075 242

AUTHOR   Courtney, Sean
TITLE   The Sixth Floor: Museum Experiences as Learning
                Environments.
PUB DATE   1995-00-00
NOTE   21p.
PUB TYPE   Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Adult Education; *Educational Environment; Educational
                Resources; Educational Theories; *Experiential Learning;
                *Instructional Design; *Learning Processes; *Museums
IDENTIFIERS   *Authenticity; *Sixth Floor Museum TX

ABSTRACT
                The Sixth Floor museum in Dallas, Texas, is dedicated to the
memory of the assassination of John F. Kennedy. The museum's success as a
learning/instructional environment may be explained through a theory of
learning and instructional design based on three components: authentic
presence, collective design, and sacred connection. "Authentic presence"
refers to the museum's authenticity as a context for learning because it
includes the actual site where the assassin allegedly stationed himself.
"Collective design" refers to the fact that the museum's contents have been
organized in a deliberate manner to ensure that patrons' visits are
meaningful despite the absence of teachers/instructors to ensure correct and
interesting presentation of facts. "Sacred connection" refers to the fact
that, because the museum is an authentic context for the event it
memorializes, it becomes more than the site of a profound learning
experience. The implications of these observations for the design of learning
environments are as follows: (1) "being there" is both a geographical and
temporal reality with real existential dimensions; (2) planning is most
crucial in cases where the learning environment is least easily controlled;
and (3) true knowing involves a fusion of experience and learning. (Contains
43 references) (MN)

THE SIXTH FLOOR:

Museum Experiences as Learning Environments

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

"The Sixth Floor"

Sean Courtney, Ed.D.

Associate Professor of Adult and Continuing Education

University of Nebraska-Lincoln
526B East Nebraska Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0515

ABSTRACT

While visiting the Sixth Floor museum in Dallas, dedicated to the memory of the assassination of John F. Kennedy, the author experienced intense cognitive and emotional reactions to the various aspects of the designed displays and exhibits. Based on an analysis of this experience, the author presents and explore dimensions of the museum experience as a learning environment. The analysis, which is intended to serve as the basis for a theory of learning and design, has three major components: authentic presence, collective design and sacred connection. The paper discusses each of these in turn, ending with a discussion of their implications for the process of instructional design.

THE SIXTH FLOOR:

Museum Experiences as Learning Environments

John F. Kennedy died from an assassin's bullet on Friday November 22, 1963. The place was Dealey Plaza in Dallas. The shooting occurred a little after 12:30 pm. He was allegedly shot twice by Lee Harvey Oswald from a corner window of the sixth floor of the Texas School Book Depository. There is much more I could recount about this fateful day but it will suffice to make my point. Before I visited the Book Depository now turned into a museum to Kennedy and his times I knew a variety of facts about that terrible event, but mostly my mind was a swirl of images mixed with a small battery of facts and misinformation. I couldn't for example have told you how many bullets were supposed to be involved. I didn't know how many other assassins were present according to the various conspiracy theories. Most importantly, at least from the perspective of the theory to be explored here, I couldn't have told you where, apart from Dallas, he was shot, the date or the time of the shooting. Before my visit to the Depository I knew very little but thought I knew more. After the visit, my knowledge of this defining event of modern history is significantly advanced and at the time of writing (November 26, 1993) feels secure and irreversible.

What I want to explore in this paper is a theory of learning and design, with specific implications for adult education and training, based on a series of observations I have made about the perceived success of the Dallas Sixth Floor as a learning/instructional environment. The theory is intended to advance our knowledge of how we might approach the design of instruction and education for adults, though it may have some applicability to children. The data for this paper--my own observations and reflections--might be summed up in this way. First, there is the amount of information I acquired in this once-off visit: I learned more in two hours of a visit to this historic spot than I might have learned in half a semester of course work. This says something to me about where we put emphasis in our design of instruction for adults. Second, I am struck by a feeling of coming-together. From isolated facts, albeit significant ones, I experience a movement to integration and coalescence of the various historic impressions I have hitherto held. This says something to me about how learning occurs and the role of memory in the process. Third, this learning, this 'education', rests on a series of experiences, the most important of which are

contrived or artificially constructed. This says something to me about how we construe the nature of experience in our modern approaches to experiential learning.

Based on this set of observations and reflections I explore a theory of learning and instructional design which has three components. After the analysis of these components in the light of contemporary educational theory, the last part of the paper addresses some specific implications for the instructional design process.

The ideas being presented here do not occur in a vacuum. They represent an attempt to integrate into our perspective on learning and the design process a number of diverse theoretical domains: schooling and its lack of connection to significant forms of informal learning (Balfanz, 1991; Resnick, 1987); reconfiguring the design of workplace learning (Marsick & Watkins, 1991; Marsick, Cederholm, Turner & Pearson, 1992); research and theory in the area of practical thinking and knowledge (Rogoff & Lave, 1984), particularly the role of the environment in the solution of task-generated problems (Scribner, 1984); the ongoing dialogue concerning the different forms that learning takes (Phillips & Soltis, 1991), particularly for adults (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991); some of the recent work on 'hot' conceptual change (Pintrich, Marx & Boyle, 1993); and, finally and perhaps most critically, the exciting work being conducted by a group of scholars linking situated learning and cognition to instructional design and training (Suchman, 1987; Streibel, 1989).

A SPECULATIVE THEORY OF LEARNING AND DESIGN

For present purposes I define learning as a process, cognitively, and emotionally situated, occurring within parameters defined by the nature of the individual as both a biological and civil unity, according to which a significant change occurs in knowledge and/or orientation not attributable to psychopharmacological or maturational factors[1]. In order for learning of this kind to occur, I would claim, we must look for the presence of the following components:

---

[1] This definition assumes that the learning of skills also involves knowledge, as in Ryles's distinction between knowing that and knowing how, so it is unnecessary to invoke the popular "knowledge, attitudes, skills" (KAS) classification. The importance of orientation however as a separate category is intended to highlight the fact that we can learn without knowing how we have learned or can learn something that guides knowledge but is not knowledge itself, e.g. attitudes.

   1. Authentic Presence

   2. Collective Design

   3. Sacred Connection

Authentic Presence: Recreating the Classroom

The first component refers to the importance of <u>being there</u> or <u>going somewhere</u>. Regarding my visit to the Sixth Floor, it was not sufficient that I have seen programs about the Kennedy assassination in the past nor read books about the subject (neither of which I have done with any consistency). The most important thing I could do was to go to the place where the assassination occurred. This existential domain or what I term authentic presence, in its ability to create the grounds for a 'connected' or sacred experience, cannot be overemphasized. The design of the Sixth Floor includes the actual site where the assassin allegedly stationed himself and took aim. It is an authentic context for the learning. Such a context could be recreated or reconstructed somewhere else; clearly it would be a most inefficient theory if we required that the connection of the design to the historical context be <u>absolutely real</u>. However, there is no gainsaying the profundity of the emotion you experience as, unrestrained by person or barrier, you approach one of a number of windows which affords a would-be assassin barely interrupted visual passage to the street and plaza below.

   If the theory requires that you 'go/be somewhere', then where are you going to and where did you come from? The answers to these questions involve us in an apparent paradox. Clearly, in this case, we are coming from the real world, which is essentially the everyday business of life, which we are temporarily stepping out of in order to visit this recreation of our history. (Is it, incidentally, merely a coincidence that our recreation/leisure involves a <u>re-creation</u>). At the same time, and this is where some of the paradox is experienced, for this element of the design to work, it is important that the Sixth Floor museum be no mere collection of the stuffy cluttered artifacts of old. The museum works precisely because it is of the real world: this is really where Lee Oswald fired the fateful bullets.

   As a species of education, what does this do to the inviolability of the classroom? First, it is clear that the Sixth Floor <u>is</u> indeed a classroom, and a very unusual classroom at that. More than that, it is the entire area, including Dealey Plaza that becomes the classroom. Rodin's doors into

Hell are on display at a major museum in Paris. While fascinating and frightening in its own right, there is something lacking in the whole artistic configuration of the art object and its context. The elegant, fluky fountain which surrounds the sculptor somehow damages the integrity of the whole, reminds us that the work lacks a cultural-historical context. That is not the case with the Sixth Floor. For at any moment, we may cease our 'class work', the surveying and scrutinizing of the various exhibits, and repair to a window to remind us of the reality that was visited here that fateful day in late November, 1963. The old-style classroom does not permit this.

The classroom dominates the teaching-learning contract more than the much-maligned lecture does, if we but think about it a little. For a presenter, trainer, facilitator may vary how he or she approaches the diffusion of information. What he cannot or will rarely if ever do is vary the site in which the learning is to take place. That is the given. Might it not, therefore, be the classroom and not the lecture that constitutes the dominant mode of knowledge transmittal writers of the genre so love to excoriate? That it is less the abstracted presentation of disembodied knowledge which is the culprit, when students chaff at being presented with "theory" bereft of "practice"? It is rather the fact that these same students are <u>nowhere</u>, existentially speaking; the classroom represents the final retreat from the messy business of life.[2]

Could this also be why educational innovations, particularly those designed to reach the hard-to-reach adult, quickly move the site of learning closer to the real life contexts of the individual learner (Lovett, 1989; Lovett, Clarke & Kilmurray, 1983; O'Sullivan, 1989; 1993)? Could this, finally, be why <u>Educating Rita</u> turns out to be the travesty of true learning we secretly knew it to be all along, hinging as it does on a woman's retreat from life (her real life), first into the perverted chambers of her tutor/mentor, and later into the pastoral beaded fiction which is the middle class embrace of higher education. Rita escapes the <u>classroom</u> that is her community into a

---

[2] This reminds us of the difference between William James's first visit to Chautauqua and his second. The first time through, according to Grattan's history of adult education, James was enthralled by the place, by the coteries of good Protestants carving out their high-minded culture and education along the banks of the lake in upper New York state which gave the Chautauqua movement its name and beginning. The second time, however, was a different story. Now James railed against an environment which seemed critically cut-off from the real world back to which he hastened with alacrity.

class-based room, the "other room"[3], that knows no community except the community of the disembodied mind?

The challenge then, at the very beginning of the design process, is how to recreate the real in the artificial since, clearly, all education and training cannot suddenly move to particular authentic sites (though a recent issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education suggests ways in which this might be accomplished)[4]. And even if it could be so arranged, it might not be at all obvious where that site or sites are to be located. Nevertheless, the significance of that 'being there'–of authentic presence–for truly interested and motivated learning cannot go unremarked. The literature is full of both the problem of motivating learners and the theoretical solutions to that problem (e.g. Wlodkowski, 1987; Hidi, 1990). Rarely, it seems, do the solutions require that administrators and teachers do anything with the four walls hemming in the learner other than decorate them with sweet posters.

I will leave to another occasion to explore what I believe will turn out to be a series of graduated recreations of learning sites, ranging from the really being there, e.g. learning to solve organizational problems in groups established for that purpose (Marsick et al, 1992), to the being there wholly in spirit, e.g. acting in a play which provides occasion for a fictional rendering of educational content, or partially in spirit, e.g. ordinary games, role-plays and simulations. It is important to stress here, however, that the realization of authentic presence in the form of multiple 'arrangements' for learning activity, cannot be given a priori. Where and how these sites are to be constructed needs to be experimented with based on, among other things, research into how learners really experience learning sites (e.g. Courtney, Jha and Babchuk, 1993).

Collective Design: The Teacher less Classroom.

I cannot learn unless I am 'authentically present' at the event. At the same time, I cannot learn unless there is a deliberate organization of the environment to ensure that I have a meaningful visit.

---

[3] Phrase used by adult working-class student of Ruskin College, Oxford, to describe where he thought his university-styled education was leading him (Blumler, 1963).

[4] An issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education published, I believe, in 1993 detailed the adventures of a professor of American literature who brought the works of the relevant authors alive by taking his students on the road (the selection included Jack Kerouac).

In other words, I could not accumulate the various facts about the Kennedy assassination unless the museum had been so organized as to ensure the meaningfulness or impact of the experience. In some ways this is the more relevant component of the theory, since it is this component more than the others that directly impacts on our tasks as instructional designers. We cannot ensure that you will come to the museum, much as the trainer cannot dictate your presence in his or her training (though of course the company can and does; Stalker, 19??). Likewise, we cannot guarantee connection or engagement. But we can and must do something about design and how and why the Sixth Floor museum "works" as a learning experience is worth considering in detail. Following is a discussion of the most salient characteristics of the Dallas Sixth Floor as an exemplar of significant design.

a. Teacher as stranger.

First, there is no one present as teacher or instructor, no trainer or educator, no one person or persons whose job it is to ensure the correct and interesting presentation of facts. With the proper design, we do not need to have someone to tell us about the event. Indeed, I would guess that the presence of such a person in the context of the Sixth Floor might amount to a distraction. Now a teacher or docent could be present to elaborate on facts, to draw our attention to interesting bits of history or to otherwise alert us to other items of interest in the museum or city. However, he or she would be doing this in an adjunct role, much as a presenter might offer us some literary or historical context for a symphony concert we are about to experience. They are not necessary however to the main learning experiences, which is the concert; at best they are supportive.

Naturally, this raises the question of whether we are learning the 'right' facts, one of the myriad normal tasks of the instructor, without his or her presence and intervention; whether amidst the plethora of images and information we come away with a correct assessment of all that took place on this fateful day, what preceded it and what came later. In other words, if the learner is free to move among the 'facts', as it were, picking and choosing what he will consume, much like a seal among a school of fish, how are we to ensure that the right facts are assimilated? How do we know that the education is correct? But what is the right question here?

What would an instructor do that is different? What is the right or correct way to perceive the Kennedy assassination? There is none, I would submit. There is no right or wrong here, no incorrect facts, only a more or less complete view of the truth, incomplete now at the time of the

visit but capable of being expanded upon and developed at a later date (which is what I have done: I returned home and went looking for Manchester's <u>Death of a President</u>, purchased some years ago at a book sale but lying unread up until this year). The implications for design appear to be these. There are but a small portion of tasks, jobs and skills which require that there be a correct way to do them and that this correct way be transmitted under specific conditions by direct explicit instruction, e.g. safety maintenance at a nuclear plant. Most of what passes for training are in reality efforts to persuade us of important ideas concerning, e.g. management and supervision, leadership style, active listening, adult learning theory. It is not that we ought not to have correct and up-to-date information as far as possible. The point is that with the proper (curriculum) design elements we can be left to ourselves to acquire the <u>substance</u> of the content, free to pick and chose as fits our own learning agenda, quite capable of following up at a later date with further self-directed information searches, etc. etc. (Long and Associates, 1991; Merriam and Caffarella, 1991)

But in all of this no instructor is needed. We do not need someone telling us what we ought to know. What we really need, in terms of personnel, is a design <u>team</u>, a group of specialists, experts of various kinds, and the learners themselves, brought together to ensure that an optimum learning experience is possible. In this scenario, the instructor does return, but this time as mentor or coach, whose job it is to motivate and sympathize, to clarify and to connect, rather than to evaluate, to punish and to assign grades.

<u>b. Issues of Control</u>

In his framework for a theory of participation in adult education, Bagnall (1989) contrasts "presence", with "involvement" and "control". Theories of participation tend to focus on presence, he complains, meaning that they stop when the person 'reaches' the program or class. Bagnall argues that for real learning to occur there must be involvement and, most important of all, control. The would-be learner must not only become involved in the learning; he/she must also have a degree of control over what is to be learned, how it is to be learned, etc., among the tenets of modern adult learning theory.

As a 'participant' in the Sixth Floor learning environment, I am partially controlling the 'flow' of material I experience. I can stay within the line of slow-moving visitors/other learners or I can step outside. I can watch whatever is currently on the TV monitors about a particular phase of the whole exhibit and move on from there when the piece has reached the end of its loop or I can

remain and push the button to start the whole sequence again. I can go backwards and forwards as the whim or a thought, idea, association strikes me. I am in control, but only partially.

Clearly, the degree of my control is in part determined by the amount of design. For example, had there been merely a room with some collection of randomly strewn material then my control of how and what I learned would be near complete, within the (significant also for this issue) parameters set by the managers of the museum. By contrast, had room been organized into little passageways or corridors severely restricting backward movement, I might not have felt able to step outside of the line to follow my own immediate learning interests or desires. In that sense, the design would have been wholly confining or defining. It is important to note, for a theory of instruction which is based on absence of the teacher and the shifting of responsibility for learning to the learner, that the maximization of my learning does not seem to depend on either full outside control or full lack of it. In other words, my ability to gain the most I can from my experience has to do with some optimum balance both of information and freedom of movement. In other words, the success of the Sixth Floor as a learning environment is a function of other and own control in some always-to-be-enhanced combination. Total control by self, flowing from the absence of design on the part of the organizers, would result in a diminished not enhanced learning experience on my part.

c. The Centrality of the Image.

Visual imagery, its drama, shock-value, a certain sense of really revisiting even haunting the past are most important ingredients in the success of the Sixth Floor as a learning site. Who can forget the Zapruder video, the frames ticking away the last seconds of the President's life? Indeed, it is the power of the image to at once 'connect' us literally to this huge history while at the same time distorting for ever our perception of the event. More than one colleague (I was attending a conference at the time) with whom I discussed my visit told a similar story. The realization that the area captured fortuitously and distortedly on film was not a portion of an open vista came as a surprise to many. Equally telling was the realization that the motorcade had but a small distance to travel, in fact some fifty yards, perhaps, and the President would have escaped his fate.

All of these as well as the converted TV images of the President's smilingly intelligent visage as he tells stories to the press, converses with his wife and children or otherwise holds his destiny at bay coalesce to make the learning that occurs here dramatically visual. Words are important too;

visitors read the legends surrounding the individual exhibit stands. And of course in order to understand what happened and why a second assassin might or might not have been possible, one has to read very closely written text. There is no underestimating the power of the word for this and the myriad other facts which add up to the day that changed a nation and the world. But right here in this site, at this time, it is the picture which tells the story (Wittgenstein, 1922/72)[5]; it is the picture that intersects with the word to make the learning occur, and finally it is the picture, or rather the series of them, arranged with incredible power to suddenly come up on one so that one is between the Zapruder frames and one small step takes one from life to death in that real instant, it is the picture that constitutes the experience of which the learning is an integral and defining dimension.

It seems then a curious kind of overkill to stress how important images are to the design of the Sixth Floor. There is no learning without the image; words and pictures are integral to each other. And yet in the normal adult classroom or training environment, images, pictures are often starkly missing, though curiously enough, to learners it does not appear obvious that this is so. From the moment of their waking to the last moments before retirement at night, men and women live among a sea of images, from which they partially distill the meaning of their day. And yet when they enter educational settings the sheer abundance of these pictorial elements vanishes to be replaced by the dull, the gray, the unchanging, the professor in his unchanging dark colors, the cheerful trainer in her unchanging brights. This lack of connection with the real world, which television and the visual image affords, is what finally robs the classroom of its power to move us by virtue of its link to the real.

Sacred Connection: The Crucible of Experience

I was authentically there; the museum was designed to push me back into time, and I went. Ultimately, and perhaps the reason why I am writing this today, I was intensely moved by my experience, by the whole, by the strangeness of this loft as a site for a museum, with its extraordinary blend of the cozy and the deadly; I was electrified by a sense that I had joined in, that I was part of something sacred, that I was not outside anything--the truth of so much of our

---

[5] "We picture facts to ourselves" and "A picture is a model of reality" (Wittgenstein, 1922/72, p.15)

contrived learning designs--but truly sharing with others an intensity of my emotion. I have wanted to call this "connected knowing", invoking a phrase made popular in a recent work on female cognition (Belenky et al, 1986). In avoiding that phrase, though I believe it captures something of the truth, I want instead to highlight a separate issue, that which has to do with the nature of the experience that so moved and thrilled me. I want in particular to examine whether the intensity of the experience, and its varying properties--suddenness, overwhelmingness, and the sense of its a happening-to-me rather than being a reflection-by-me--has to do with a phenomenon which if correct might dethrone the current separation of experience from learning, and might in its wake undermine one of the remaining tenets of andragogy (Knowles, 1984; Tennant, 198?; issues of Adult Education during the late 1970s).

First, it is important to recognize that not everyone who has visited the museum may have felt as I did, nor did I share my experiences with others present at that time, something that might have shown many of us to be experiencing a similar powerful emotion (incidentally, an encounter which a teacher less learning design cannot accommodate). I was in the company of another professor, however, and though we used the occasion to talk about our lives in the 1960s, I did not sense any emotion comparable to mine.

Clearly, then, and assuming for a moment that the range of possibilities here is substantial, designers of the Sixth Floor--designers of instruction--cannot (perhaps might not wish to) guarantee that a learner will experience so intense a reaction to the learning environment. For this is the serendipitous element, spoken of by researchers (Bandura, 1986, for example), that leads to the profound, mostly unplanned for, alteration of the life course. In other words, what I experienced may have been unique to that place and to a particular time (e.g. there may have been conditions in my life which made me 'vulnerable' to this unplanned, natural intervention). Nevertheless, it was the palpable impact of something which ultimately made this visit to a museum more than just a very profound learning experience, though that surely what it was also. I want now to briefly explore what it is that may have happened to me in the light of some of the major assumptions of modern adult learning theory.

The received view is that as adults we bring enormously rich and complex experiences with us into the classroom and that, in the right kind of andragogical environment, the teacher-as-facilitator works these into the learning plan. It is in the realm of experience, as has been noted

(Feuer & Geber, 1989), that andragogy continues to claim distinction as a theory of adult learning and instruction. It has been counter-argued that the experience of children, while limited compared with that of adults, can also be distinctive, striking and colorful, and even more likely to become traumatic as compared with that of adults, e.g. child abuse. Correspondingly, the same critics have argued, the life experiences of some adults can take on the quality of a well-worn coat permitting few twists and turns, few matters new, finally lacking the kind of complexity that some have argued is necessary for "optimal experience" or happiness in life (Czickzentmahaly, 1993).

In all of this however our theories permit a separation of experience from learning (e.g. Kolb & Fry, 1973). There is experience which may or may not be interesting, unique, unusual, varied, etc. And there is the learning which may or may not be extracted from that experience by the processes of reflection. In some modern theories, indeed, experience counts for little without the intervention of the reflective process (Mezirow, 1991; Brookfield, 1987; Burnard, 1988; Jarvis, 1987). But what then of experience in and of itself? Is it really just the concrete happening without some clarification or dissection of which there would be no "transformation of knowledge into learning" (Kolb's definition cited in Jarvis, 1987)? I suggest the following answer to this question.

Recent perspectives on learning and cognition have presented us with a constructivist paradigm of knowledge acquisition (Phillips & Soltis, 1991). Among its many characteristics and assumptions, constructivism works with the idea of theory-laden perception to persuade us that we do not experience anything in its raw form. Knowledge is constructed from the world by us, rather than being presented and inhaled full-blown, as it were. All of our perceptions, and all of our most intense encounters, are filtered via prior assumptions, perceptual filters, cultural expectations, etc., the prior knowledge that many have argued convincingly greets our everyday social interaction (Brookfield, 1987; Jarvis, 1987; Giddens, 1984). In the Giddens world view, for example, we 'negotiate' each and every social practice, though so many of our everyday behaviors, e.g. taking the train to work, greeting the secretary, answering the phone, are so routinized and habituated that we do not perceive the possibility that things might be otherwise, that we might behave differently and as a result learn something new. Jarvis's model of learning, interestingly enough, permits this kind of 'non-learning' to occur, whereby we, commonly, pass up the opportunity to learn because we have other things which command our attention and take up our time or because the power of the new to challenge existing world assumptions is too daunting.

But if our perceptions are theory-laden, why not our experiences also? If our perceptions are structured such that they guide us as to what we shall see (though it is of course possible to see differently), then why are experiences not of such-and-such a nature, already indeed impregnated with prior knowledge, assumptions, other experiences, and so forth. If this is acceptable, why not then grant that it is when experiences are at their most intense, emotional, laden, full and heavy with a rich new set of meanings, a new coalescence of perceptions, possibly even a perspective transformation--as was my experience at a certain moment up on the Sixth Floor of the Texas School Book Depository--that what we have is not a uniform concrete experience, to be later given meaning and substance by observation and abstract reflection, ala Kolb, but an <u>existential fusion</u> where learning and experience are one and the same thing, happening at one and the same time. Or rather where the power of the experience lies precisely in the new reconfiguration of our immediate and concretized perceptions, a transformation of the everyday that does not need to await the pale ghost of reflection to give it meaning. It is the intensity of the experience that is the meaning. And of what is this intensity constituted if not of a sudden and profound heightening of consciousness, made possible by the sudden and momentary realization of insight, a realization itself constituted of knowledge, learning and experience in inseparable fusion.

In sum, modern adult learning theory gives pride of place to experience without ever telling us of what it is made. That matter, that re-constitution, is assumed to be the 'work' of observation and abstract reflection. If that is the case, then the position of the teacher or trainer remains inviolate, because he or she is needed to help the learner digest the meaning and quality of the experience. But on the Sixth Floor I do not need an instructor or teacher to tell me that I have not a major qualitative experience. And once I have had it, it is not at all certain that a teacher can tell me why I felt as I, at that point in the process, in that particular configuration of time and space. The job of the teacher--such as it is--lies somewhere else entirely.

Implications for the Design of Learning Environments

At its most speculative the theory nascent in this learning experience would call for a reformulation, if not replacement, of current adult learning theory, particularly that which we call andragogy. My aim here is to state some of more significant implications logically flowing from what has been described under the three headings and subheadings above. While some of these

may appear to fly in the face of current educational theory the point here is to explore what they mean and why they are the way they are.

1. *Being there is both a geographical and temporal reality. It has real existential dimensions.* The place for learning is in some way a real entity. This suggests for example that if teaching an instructional design course or preparing the trainers of trainers, there has to be some connection with a real world. For me, this means, that when we speak about the gap between so-called "theory" and "practice" we are not speaking about two types of discourse, as is sometimes imagined. We really are talking about a gap, in the sense of a real physical and/or psychological <u>distance</u> between where the trainee is being prepared to train and where they will end up doing the training. The distance could be geographical, in the sense that we remove the person from the physical dimensions of the 'world' in which they will practice. Or it could be temporal, in the sense that we prepare the person for an <u>eventual</u> world of practice, one that is removed from the here-and-now, one that may or probably will occur, but one that has no certainty of occurring and so misses a vital element of personal or real life certainty for the would-be trainee. Kant, I suspect, would feel the logic of this position.

If operationalized, the theory presented here would require that our education and training occur where people live and work. Right now the paradigm for both requires that a person be selected for training and leave a natural site, e.g. home or workplace. The training-learning that follows is almost by definition a-contextual and non-situated. In other words, the focus becomes knowledge and skills bereft of the environment which will ultimately give them meaning. (See, for example, Scribner's, 1984, point about the incorporation of the environment into the solution of practical problems).

The new-found emphasis on "just-in-time" education and training (Hudspeth, 1992), action-reflection learning, which deals with learning around a set of real organizational problems, the dimensions of practical thinking, the reconsideration of instructional "plans" in the context of "situated actions", as well as the general concern about the mismatch between learning "in-school" and "out" (Resnick, 1987) all testify to the intuitive appeal of an instructional design theory which re-connects learning to the world of real problems and real mysteries.

2. *The less we can plan for the more we need to plan.*

Paradoxically, because the ability to control the learning environment in a real world setting is weakened, this bespeaks the need for considerable planning at a necessary 'pre-site' stage. But is this not a call for the further 'magerizing' of the instructional planning process? It is the case that we have arrived at a time when to utter the word "objective" is to simultaneously evoke the name of the guru of objectives-setting, Robert Mager (e.g. Mager, 1984). And to speak of a "systematic" design process is to infer that there is a scientific rigor to instructional design (Andrews & Goodson, 1980; Dick & Carey, 1978), even at a time when the very assumptions on which this process rests are being called into question (Streibel, 1989).

At the same time, our ability to control or somehow order the real world of discursive learning has been attacked by some who demand that for true dialogue, i.e. learning, to occur there must be no pre-established agenda or who point out that to control learning with pre-set behavioral objectives is to destroy the informal, unplanned serendipitous element which it is argued may ultimately constitute the real learning (Brookfield, 1986; Mealman, 1993). I have argued above however that my capacity for learning from the Sixth Floor exhibit had to do with a <u>balance</u> being struck between the total freedom to design my own learning in an otherwise social--and thereby normative, rule-governed--context and the limited freedom afforded me had the designers done the exhibit differently.

In other words, learning contexts no matter how real are constrained or bounded in some fashion. Indeed, it could be argued that the very essence of learning--and thus of meaning--depends on some delimiting, and thus stabilizing or routinizing of the environment (Giddens, 1984). Brookfield's (1990) wish for an agenda-free dialogue is not merely idealistic, it does not bear any resemblance to the real world of learning as we encounter it in our everyday existence.[6]

---

[6] Arguing against the notion of "guided discussion", Brookfield writes, quoting himself from an earlier publication, "'a necessary condition of discussion is that there be no preconceived agenda, no cognitive path to be charted, no previously specified objectives...Hence, guided discussion is conceptual nonsense in that discussion is free and open by definition'"(Brookfield, 1990, p.189). Even in situations of "open and undominated dialogue" (Strike & Soltis, 19), there is nothing that says we ought not to have rules and conditions, if the discussion is to remain truly <u>open</u> and <u>undominated</u>.

But the kind of planning that a real-world instructional design requires is not something that need return us to a magerized world-view. Suchman's conclusions based on her research with Xerox photocopier users, if I am interpreting Streibel's exegesis correctly, has for all practical purposes, dealt a death-blow to the teaching of instructional design as a set of pre-established, logically sequential and abstracted, context-less steps and stages (e.g. Gilley & Eggland, 1989). But that is the planning that we are used to. If we must now work in the trenches with real users of our products, if we must teach and educate even as we do, in a real sense, then we need a new set of skills, terms, curricular frames of reference in order to turn the real world context into one that is imbued with a meaning-for-learning also.

3. _In true knowing there is a fusion of experience and learning._

In closing I want to touch briefly on a matter than is far more complex and profound than I can give space to in the present context. In discussing the third component of the model I spoke about particular kinds of experiences--like the kind I believe I had in Dallas--being what they are precisely because they are something more than mere concrete happenings. To consider the implications of such experiences for a theory of design, I want to return to the definition of learning presented at the outset of this paper.

While we are becoming accustomed to thinking of learning without the intercession of the self, emotions and motivations, as incomplete (Pintrich et al., 1993), nevertheless, we remain undeniably fixed to a view of learning as conceptual change, knowledge acquisition, a cognitive processing of some kind. The emphasis on cognition excludes by implication, I would argue, the dimension of the moral. And that is not something that is too complex to grasp. The Shuttle astronauts who accomplished the amazing feat of multiple space walks to repair a damaged telescope have spoken on more than one occasion about the amount of training they did for the mission. Without the benefit of details, we can surmise that most, if not all, of this training is of a technical nature. It does not involve moral issues.

But imagine the case of the U.S. Marine who is trained to kill. He is technically adept at knowing all of the vulnerable areas of the human anatomy in order to strike effectively: he may get only one change to fell his enemy. Does his training involve morality? Yes, to the degree that he must be persuaded of the rightness of his actions. But no, in the sense that causing the death of another in battle requires a set of technical-rational skills and reflections-in-action which must,

probably, exclude morality if the deliverer of another man's death is not to become himself the victim.

Learning then in many of its most essential forms does involves a morally-, even emotionally-, neutral orientation to knowledge acquisition (Courtney, 1992). But in the circumstances of which I have just spoken--my visit to a museum--the learning is of such-and-such a nature precisely because it is deeply imbued with the emotional and the moral. I would go further than this however and argue, though the exact details of the argument must await another occasion, that the success of my experience as a learning-experience depends essentially on its non-egotistical nature. I am convinced that, as with Herrigel's (1953/71) learning at the hands of his Zen master, for me to have gained what I did from my experience my <u>self</u> had to be excluded, indeed was missing. My ability to fuse, in other words, with the object of my learning (the death of a president) required that my own ego or self, my own identity as stated, for example, on my birth certificate go into temporary abeyance.

This, to some degree, causes problems for current learning and educational theory, which in its attempts to re-integrate motivation into the discussion of learning must make an constant appeal to the self and the ego. But if my theory is correct, it may be precisely in our capacity both as other- and self-instructors to get the would-be learner to 'drop' his or her self from the picture, where lies the true success of our teaching, training and instructional design.

In conclusion, I have presented what I have termed a <u>speculative</u> theory of learning and design. It is speculative not just in the sense that it is incomplete or reductionistic of a complex and dynamic reality. It is speculative because it attempts to generalize from reflections on a single experience to a prescription for education that goes beyond the usual parameters of the debate on what is good instruction based on what we accept as learning. I am most interested in hearing from others regarding, (a) what is right and wrong with this theory, (b) what other sources in learning theory and design would serve to strengthen the theory, and (c) what kinds of precise empirical implications might the theory have for the construal of classroom learning and instructional design.

REFERENCES

Andrews, D.H. & Goodson, L.A. (1980). A comparative analysis of models of instructional design. Journal of Instructional Development, 3(4), 2-16.

Bagnall, R. (1989). Researching participation in adult education: A case of quantified distortion. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 8(3), 251-260.

Balfanz, R. (1991). Local knowledge, academic skills, and individual productivity: An alternative view. Educational Policy 5(4), 343-370.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social-cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.McV., Goldberger, N.R. & Tarule, J.M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing. New York: Basic Books.

Blumler, J. (1963). The effects of long-term residential adult education in post-war Britain, with particular reference to Ruskin College, Oxford. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oxford University).

Brookfield, S. (1987). Developing critical thinkers: Challenging adults to explore alternative ways of thinking and acting. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, S. (1990). "Discussion". In M. Galbraith (Ed), Adult learning methods. Malibar, FL: Robert Krieger.

Burnard, P. (1988). Experiential learning: Some theoretical considerations. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 7(2), 127-133.

Courtney, S. (1992). Why adults learn: Towards a theory of participation in adult education. London and New York: Routledge.

Courtney, S., Jha, LaD., & Babchuk, W. (1993). Like school?: A grounded theory of life in an ABE/GED classroom. (Submitted for publication.)

Csickszentmihalyi, M. (1991). Flow: The psychology of optimal experience. New York: Harper.

Dick, W. & Carey, L. (1978). The systematic design of instruction. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Feuer, D. & Geber, B. (December, 1988). Uh-oh...second thoughts about adult learning theory. Training, 31-39.

Giddens, A. (1984). The constitution of society: Introduction of the theory of structuration. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Herrigel, E. (1953/71). Zen and the art of archery. New York: Vintage Books.

Hidi, S. (199). Interest and its contributions as a mental resource for learning. Review of Educational Research, 60, 549-571.

Hudspeth, DeL. (June, 1992). Just-in-time education. Educational Technology, 7-11.

Jarvis, P. (1987). Adult learning in the social context. London: Croom Helm.

Knowles, M. (October, 1984). The world of andragogy: Wandering through a theory. Training News.

Kolb, D. & Fry, R. (1973). Towards an applied theory of experiential learning. In D.A. Kolb, I.M. Rubin & J.M. McIntyre, Organizational psychology: A book of readings. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Long, H. & Associates (1992). Self-directed learning: Application and research. Norman, OK: Oklahoma Research Center for Continuing Professional and Higher Education.

Lovett, T. (1975). Adult education, community development and the working class. London: Ward Lock.

Lovett, T., Clarke, C. & Kilmurray, A. (1983). Adult education and community action. Beckenham: Croom-Helm.

Mager, R. (1984). Preparing instructional objectives. (revised 2nd edition). Belmont, CA: Pitman Learning.

Marsick, V. and Watkins, K. (1990). Informal and incidental learning in the workplace. London: Routledge.

Marsick, V., Cederholm, L., Turner, E. and Pearson, T. (1992). Action-reflection learning. Training and Development, August, 63-66.

Mealman, C. (1993). Incidental learning by adults in a nontraditional degree program: A Case study. In K. Freer & G. Dean (eds), Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference, Columbus, OH.

Merriam, S. & Caffarella, R. (1991). Learning in adulthood. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1991). Transformative dimensions of adult learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Sullivan, D. (1989). Social commitment and adult education. Cork, Ireland: Cork University Press.

O'Sullivan, D. (1993). Commitment, educative action and adults. Aldershot, U.K.: Avebury.

Phillips, D.C. & Soltis, J.F. (1991). Perspectives on learning (2nd edition). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Pintrich, P.R., Marx, R.W. & Boyle, R.A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. Review of Educational Research, 63(2), 167-199.

Rogoff, B. and Lave, J. (1984). Everyday cognition. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University press.

Resnick, L. (1987). Learning in school and out. Educational Researcher, 15(9), 13-20.

Scribner, S. (1984). Thinking in action: Some characteristics of practical thought. In B. Rogoff & J. Lave (Ed.), Everyday cognition (chapter two).

Streibel, M. (1991). Instructional plans and situated learning: The challenge of Suchman's theory of situated action for instructional designers and instructional systems. In G.J. Anglin (Ed.), Instructional technology: Past, present and future. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Suchman, L. A. (1987). Plans and situated actions. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tennant, M. (1986). An evaluation of Knowles's theory of adult learning. International journal of lifelong education, 5(2), 113-122.

Wittgenstein, L. (1922/1972). Tractatus-logico philosophicus. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wlodkowski, R. (1987). Enhancing adult motivation to learn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

CE 075 242

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:		
The Sixth Floor: Museum Experience As Learning Env.		
Author(s): Sean Courtney		
Corporate Source: University of Nebraska		Publication Date: 1995

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 1** documents

☒

Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) **and** paper copy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all **Level 2** documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

_____ Sample _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐

Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title:
[signature]	Assoc. Professor Sean Courtney
Organization/Address: 526 B Nebraska Hall Lincoln 685 86-0515	Telephone: 402 472 5927 FAX: 402 472-5907
	E-Mail Address: Courtney@unlinfo. UNL.EDU Date: 10/8/97

(over)