



Museum Visitor Studies, Evaluation & Audience Research

Randi Korn & Associates, Inc.
118 East Del Ray Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22301

Summative Evaluation

RACE ARE WE SO DIFFERENT?

Prepared for

American Anthropological Association

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
Principal Findings I: Timing and Tracking.....	iii
Principal Findings II: Rubric Scored Interviews.....	vi
Principal Findings III: Exit Interviews.....	viii
Principal Findings IV: Telephone Interviews	ix
DISCUSSION	xi
INTRODUCTION	I
Methodology.....	1
Data Analysis	3
Reporting Method.....	4
PRINCIPAL FINDINGS I: TIMING AND TRACKING	6
Data Collection Conditions.....	6
Visitor Descriptions.....	7
Overall Visitation Patterns	8
Visitation to Each Exhibition Section.....	10
Visitation to Each Exhibit Type.....	12
Visitation to Individual Exhibits	15
Visitor Behaviors.....	20
PRINCIPAL FINDINGS II: RUBRIC SCORED INTERVIEWS	23
Introduction.....	23
Demographic and Visit Characteristics	24
Exhibition Objectives.....	27
PRINCIPAL FINDINGS III: EXIT INTERVIEWS	35
Visitor Demographics	35
Reasons For Visiting the Exhibition.....	35
Reactions to the <i>Race Are We So Different?</i> Exhibition.....	36
Understanding of Exhibition Content.....	38
PRINCIPAL FINDINGS IV: TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS	42
Visitor Demographics	42
Most Interesting Aspects of the Exhibition	42
Understanding of Exhibition Content.....	43
Impact of Exhibition.....	46
APPENDICES	49

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1:	Data Collection Conditions	6
TABLE 2:	Visitor Demographics.....	7
TABLE 3:	Visitors' Approach to Describing Racial or Ethnic Background.....	7
TABLE 4:	Visitor Characteristics.....	8
TABLE 5:	Total Time Spent in <i>Race Are We So Different?</i>	8
TABLES 5a:	Differences in Total Time Spent in Exhibition by Time of Visit	8
TABLE 6:	Total Number of Exhibits Stopped at in <i>Race Are We So Different?</i>	9
TABLE 6a:	Differences in Total Number of Exhibits Stopped at By Time of Visit.....	9
TABLE 7:	Number of Sections Visited in the Exhibition	11
TABLE 8:	Visitor Use of Each Section	11
TABLE 9:	Stops Made in Each Section	12
TABLE 9a:	Differences in Number of Stops Made in Each Exhibit Section by Demographic and Visit Characteristics (SMM only)	12
TABLE 10:	Time Spent in Each Exhibit Type	13
TABLE 11:	Stops Made at Each Exhibit Type	14
TABLE 12:	Exhibits at Which Visitors Spent Longer Than 60 Seconds	15
TABLE 13:	Exhibits at Which Visitors Spent 31 to 60 Seconds.....	16
TABLE 14:	Exhibits at Which Visitors Spent 30 Seconds or Less.....	17
TABLE 15:	Exhibits at Which More Than 20 Percent of Visitors Stopped	18
TABLE 16:	Exhibits at Which 20 to 10 Percent of Visitors Stopped	19
TABLE 17:	Exhibits at Which Less than 10 Percent of Visitors Stopped	20
TABLE 18:	Percentage of Visitors Who Exhibited Behaviors in <i>Race Are We So Different?</i> ..	21
TABLE 19:	Total Number of Behaviors Exhibited in <i>Race Are We So Different?</i> (SMM only)	21
TABLE 19a:	Differences in Use of Moveable Panels by Gender (SMM only).....	22
TABLE 20:	Number of Visitors Who Exhibited Misuse at Individual Exhibits	22
TABLE 21:	Exhibition Site	23
TABLE 22:	Interview Group by Exhibition Site.....	23
TABLE 23:	Demographic Characteristics by Exhibition Site.....	25
TABLE 24:	Visit Characteristics by Exhibition Site (In Percent)	26
TABLE 25:	Self-Reported Time in the Exhibition by Exhibition Site.....	27
TABLE 26:	Exhibition Objective 1 by Interview Group (In Percent).....	29
TABLE 27:	Exhibition Objective 1 by Gender (In Percent)	29
TABLE 28:	Exhibition Objective 2 by Interview Group (In Percent).....	30
TABLE 29:	Exhibition Objective 3 by Pre-And Post- Exhibition Interview Group 31 (In Percent)	31
TABLE 30:	Exhibition Objective 3 By Personal Identity (In Percent)	31
TABLE 31	Exhibition Objective 4 By Pre-And Post- Exhibition Interview Group (In Percent)	32
TABLE 32:	Exhibition Objective 4 By Personal Identity (In Percent)	33
TABLE 33:	Exhibition Objective 4 By Personal Identity (In Percent)	33
TABLE 34:	Exhibition Objective 5 By Post- Exhibition and Telephone Interview Groups (In Percent)	34
TABLE 35:	Exhibition Objective 5 By Personal Identity (In Percent)	34

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents findings from a summative evaluation conducted by Randi Korn & Associates, Inc. (RK&A), for the American Anthropological Association (AAA). RK&A designed the study to examine visitors' responses to concepts, themes, and interpretive approaches presented in AAA's *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition at two host locations, the Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM) in St. Paul, Minnesota and the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History (MAAH) in Detroit, Michigan.

**Selected highlights of the study are included in this summary.
Please consult the body of the report for a detailed account of the findings.**

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS I: TIMING AND TRACKING

At SMM, observers timed and tracked visitors for 10 days in April 2007. At MAAH, observations were collected for six days during June and July 2007. The evaluators observed a total of 116 drop-in visitors, ages 12 years and older (100 at SMM and 16 at MAAH).

Most findings discussed in this section pertain *only* to the data collected at SMM due to data collection limitations at MAAH (see the Limitations section of the Introduction on page 3).

VISITOR DESCRIPTIONS

- ◆ The total sample of visitors observed was 55 percent female and 45 percent male. Most observed visitors were adults: 45 percent were between the ages of 18 and 34 years, 35 percent between the ages of 35 and 54 years, and 16 percent 55 years of age or older.
- ◆ When asked to describe their racial or ethnic background, 63 percent of visitors used terminology such as “Black,” “White,” “Asian,” or “African American;” 53 percent described their background geographically; 28 percent described a mixed racial or ethnic background; and 18 percent used qualifiers that identified themselves as American.
- ◆ Visitors reported that 52 percent came in groups of adults, 39 percent came in multigenerational groups, and 9 percent came to the museum alone. Eight percent of visitors had visited the exhibition previously.

OVERALL VISITATION PATTERNS

- ◆ At SMM, visitors spent a median time of over 22 minutes in *Race Are We So Different?*; at MAAH, visitors spent a median time of over 32 minutes. The shortest time a visitor spent in the exhibition was 42 seconds and the longest time was over two hours—both observed at SMM.
- ◆ At SMM, the median number of exhibits visitors stopped at was 14, at MAAH it was 16.5. The minimum number of exhibits visitors stopped at was one, observed at SMM; the maximum number of exhibits stopped at was 60, observed at MAAH.

- ◆ The Sweep Rate Index (SRI) for *Race Are We So Different?* at SMM is 169 square feet per minute*. The SRI for *Race Are We So Different?* at SMM is lower than Serrell's average SRI for both large non-diorama exhibitions (>3,900 sq. ft.) and science museums.† This means visitors in *Race Are We So Different?* are moving more slowly than visitors in exhibitions of similar size and museum type.
- ◆ The Percent Diligent Visitor Index (%DV) for *Race Are We So Different?* at SMM is 3 percent‡. Three visitors stopped at more than one-half of the exhibits.§ While *Race Are We So Different?* garnered a low %DV, its visitors tended to use a few components for an extended time, matching the behavioral objectives of the development team.

VISITATION TO EACH EXHIBITION SECTION

- ◆ One-quarter of visitors stopped at all five sections of the *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition, 56 percent stopped at between three and four sections, and 17 percent stopped at one or two sections.
- ◆ Ninety-one percent of visitors stopped in the Contemporary Experience section and spent a median time of 8 minutes there. Eighty-three percent stopped in the Science section and spent a median time of 8 minutes there, too. Three-quarters of visitors stopped in the History section, spending a median time of just over 2 minutes.
- ◆ Less popular were the Introductory Experience and the Resource Center, stopped at by 65 percent and 51 percent, respectively. The median time visitors spent at these two sections was less than two minutes.
- ◆ The Science section experienced the highest number of stops by visitors (median = seven stops), followed by the Contemporary Experience section (median = five stops) and the History section (median = four stops). Visitors stopped at a median of one exhibit in both the Introductory Experience and Resource Center.
- ◆ Female visitors made an average of 8 stops in the Science section, while male visitors made an average of six stops. In the Resource Center, repeat visitors stopped at more exhibits than first-time visitors.

VISITATION TO EACH EXHIBIT TYPE

- ◆ Panels were used by 93 percent of visitors. Ninety percent used videos and 73 percent used interactive exhibits. Computer interactives were used by 64 percent of visitors, artifact cases by 61 percent, and moveable panels by 32 percent. One-quarter of visitors used feedback stations.
- ◆ Data show that visitors spent a median time of 8 minutes at panels, which is considered a long time in museum visitor studies. In comparison, visitors spent a median of 4 minutes at videos; almost 3 minutes each at interactive exhibits and computer interactives; and over one minute each at feedback stations and moveable panels. Visitors spent less than 1 minute (median = 58 seconds) at artifact cases.

* SRI (Sweep Rate Index) is calculated by dividing the exhibition square footage by the average time spent in the exhibition. The lower the SRI, the more time visitors spent per square foot of space.

† Serrell reports an average SRI of 400.5 (±191.5) for large non-diorama exhibitions and 285.1 (±142.4) for science museums.

‡ %DV (Percent Diligent Visitor Index) is the percentage of visitors who stopped at more than one-half of the exhibits. The higher the %DV, the more thoroughly the exhibition is used.

§ The total number of exhibits (89) was determined by RK&A.

- ◆ Visitors used a median of 7 panels during their visit—more than any other exhibit type. Visitors stopped at a median of 3 videos while they were in the exhibition. Interactive exhibits, computer interactives, and artifact cases were each used by visitors a median of two times; moveable panels and feedback stations were each used a median of one time.
- ◆ Statistical analysis found no significant relationships among visitors’ use of exhibit types according to either their demographic or visit characteristics.

VISITATION TO INDIVIDUAL EXHIBIT COMPONENTS

- ◆ Visitors used 25 exhibit components for a median time of over one minute. They spent the most time at the Video Sampler computer kiosk in the Resource Center (median = 5 minutes, 59 seconds) and the Census reading boards (median = 5 minutes, 18 seconds). They also spent considerable time at the Tuffet Dolls activity table (median = 3 minutes, 27 seconds) and the Reading area (median = 3 minutes, 8 seconds), both in the Resource Center. Some of the exhibits at which visitors spent the most time also were visited by the fewest people, such as the Tuffet Dolls activity table and Census reading boards (each 2 percent).
- ◆ Visitors spent between 31 and 60 seconds at 40 exhibits, including the Traveling Genes computer interactive (median = 60 seconds), Sports Mascot artifact case (median = 58 seconds), and How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? panel (median = 56 seconds).
- ◆ Visitors spent 30 seconds or less at 24 exhibits. The exhibits at which visitors spent the least time were the Human (Mis)measure 1700-1850 panel (median = 15 seconds), Acknowledgement panel (median = 12 seconds), and the Beaded Vest artifact case (median = 10 seconds).
- ◆ Over one-half of visitors stopped at the Hapa Project panels, the How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? panel, and the Does Skin Color Equal Race? interactive exhibit. Thirty exhibits were used by more than 20 percent of visitors.
- ◆ Between 10 and 20 percent of visitors stopped at 38 exhibits, including the We Are All African panel, the Human (Mis)measure 1850-1900 panel, the One Person’s Mascot panel, and the How Are People Like Avocados? panel (each 20 percent).
- ◆ Less than 10 percent of visitors stopped at 21 exhibits, however, no exhibit was overlooked by all visitors.

VISITOR BEHAVIORS

- ◆ Ninety percent of visitors watched a video, 69 percent read aloud or discussed exhibit content, 66 percent did activities, 22 percent looked at an artifact, and 12 percent read or wrote feedback.
- ◆ Visitors watched a median of three videos and also read aloud or discussed the contents of a median of three exhibits. They did two activities and looked at images or artwork at a median of two exhibits each. Visitors were observed participating in the other behaviors—using moveable panels, using computers, looking at artifacts, reading or writing feedback, and noticing—at a median of one exhibit. Female visitors used moveable panels more than male visitors.

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS II: RUBRIC SCORED INTERVIEWS

RK&A conducted 178 interviews of visitors to the exhibition *Race Are We So Different?* (ten interviews were excluded from the analysis for various reasons, resulting in a final sample of 168 interviews.) Approximately one-third each of the interviews were conducted before visitors went into the exhibition (pre-exhibition respondents), after visitors left the exhibition (post-exhibition respondents), and a few weeks after visitors had been to the exhibition (telephone respondents). The final sample consisted of 88 interviews with visitors to the SMM and 80 interviews with visitors to the MAAH.

Verbatim transcripts of visitor interviews were scored using a rubric designed to measure visitor learning outcomes (see page 27 for Scoring Rubric). To avoid potential biases, evaluators who had not conducted the interviews and did not know the exhibition objectives scored the interviews.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND VISIT CHARACTERISTICS

- Females outnumbered males by a ratio of 3:2.
- Interviewees ranged in age from 15 to 86 years with a median age of 41 years.
- At SMM, most respondents identified themselves as White (84%). At MAAH, most respondents identified themselves as African American-Black (70 percent).
- 58 percent of respondents visited the Museum as part of a group of two or more adults, 25 percent visited the museum as part of a group of adults and children, and 17 percent visited alone.
- At MAAH, most respondents were visiting for the first time (70 percent). At SMM, the majority of respondents were repeat visitors to (64 percent).

EXHIBITION OBJECTIVES

RK&A reviewed each respondent's interview data and rated the respondent's accomplishment of the exhibition objectives according to specific criteria. Based on the criteria for each objective, RK&A classified the respondent's accomplishment of each objective into one of three categories: 1) Naïve-Misconception, 2) Developing, or 3) Accomplished. If the respondent's interview data did not address the objective or fall within the identified criteria, RK&A gave the respondent a "Non-response" listing for that objective.

OBJECTIVE ONE: VISITORS WILL UNDERSTAND THAT RACE IS A HUMAN INVENTION.

- Post-exhibition and telephone respondents have a more accomplished understanding of Objective one than pre-exhibition respondents. Most pre-exhibition respondents have a rating of either Naïve-Misconception (30 percent) or Developing (47 percent). Most post-exhibition respondents and telephone interview respondents have a rating of Accomplished (both 63 percent).
- Accomplishment of Objective one is significantly associated with gender. Males are more likely than females to have an Accomplished rating on this objective (62 percent vs. 39 percent).

OBJECTIVE TWO: VISITORS WILL UNDERSTAND THAT ALL HUMANS ARE MUCH MORE ALIKE THAN DIFFERENT; HUMAN DIFFERENCES ARE A RESULT OF A UNIQUE COMBINATION OF GENES, ENVIRONMENT, AND EXPERIENCES AND BEING OF A PARTICULAR RACE DOES NOT PREDISPOSE ONE TO UNIQUE ABILITIES, DISEASES, OR CHARACTERISTICS.

- Post-exhibition and telephone respondents have a more accomplished understanding of Objective two than pre-exhibition respondents. Two percent of pre-exhibition respondents have a rating of Accomplished, while 31 percent of post-exhibition respondents and 44 percent of telephone respondents have a rating of Accomplished.

OBJECTIVE THREE: VISITORS WILL UNDERSTAND THAT RACISM IS INSTITUTIONALIZED IN AMERICA.

- Only respondents in the pre-exhibition and post-exhibition interview groups were rated on Objective three. The two groups have similar ratings on this objective. Overall, 11 percent of pre-exhibition and post-exhibition respondents have a Naïve-Misconception rating, 45 percent have a Developing rating, and 44 percent have an Accomplished rating.
- Accomplishment of Objective three is significantly associated with personal identity. Respondents from both test groups who identified themselves as White have a less accomplished understanding of Objective three than other respondents. Of respondents who identified themselves as White, 31 percent have an Accomplished rating, 50 percent have a Developing rating and 19 percent have a Naïve-Misconception rating. Of respondents from both test groups who identified themselves as African American-Black/Other, 57 percent have an Accomplished rating, 43 percent have a Developing rating, and none has a Naïve-Misconception rating.

OBJECTIVE FOUR: VISITORS WILL REALIZE THAT, IN THE U.S., RACE AND RACISM AFFECTS HIS/HER PERSONAL IDENTITY AND HOW HE/SHE THINKS ABOUT AND RELATES TO OTHERS.

- Respondents in the pre-exhibition and post-exhibition interview groups were rated on Objective four. The two groups have similar ratings on this objective. Overall, 30 percent of pre-exhibition and post-exhibition respondents have an Accomplished rating, 33 percent have a Developing rating, and 37 percent have a Naïve-Misconception rating.
- Of the five Exhibition Objectives, Objective 4 has the highest percentage of respondents in the Naïve-Misconception category.
- Younger respondents (under 30 years of age) in both test groups are more likely to have a Naïve-Misconception rating on Objective 4 than either middle-aged (30 to 49 years) or older respondents (50 years and older). More than one-half of younger respondents have a Naïve-Misconception rating on this objective (59 percent), compared to 30 percent of middle-aged respondents and 27 percent of older respondents.
- Respondents from both test groups who identified themselves as White are more likely to have a Naïve-Misconception rating (48 percent) on Objective 4 than other respondents (24 percent). Also, respondents from both test groups who identified themselves as African American-Black/Other are more likely have an Accomplished rating (40 percent) on Objective 4 than respondents who identified themselves as White (23 percent).

EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE FIVE: VISITORS WILL LEAVE THE EXHIBITION FEELING ENERGIZED BY THE THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS THEY HAVE EXPERIENCED AND WILL REALIZE THAT THEIR IDEAS OF RACE, HUMAN VARIATION AND RACISM HAVE CHANGED.

- Most post-exhibition and telephone respondents have a rating of either Developing (62 percent) or Accomplished (30 percent) on Objective five.
- Regardless of personal identity or test group, the majority of respondents have a Developing rating on Objective five (56 percent of White respondents and 67 percent of African American-Black/Other respondents.)
- Respondents from both test groups who identified themselves as White are more likely to have a Naïve-Misconception rating on Objective five than respondents who identified themselves as African American-Black/Other (15 percent and 0 percent, respectively).

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS III: EXIT INTERVIEWS

RK&A conducted in-depth interviews in April 2007 with people who visited the *Race Are We So Different?* after they exited the exhibition. Among a total of 59 interviewees, 29 visited the exhibition at the Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM), while 30 visited it at the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History (MAAH).

VISITOR DEMOGRAPHICS

- Among individuals interviewed onsite at both SMM and MAAH, male interviewees (53 percent) outnumbered female interviewees (47 percent). The median age of interviewees was 40.

REASONS FOR VISITING THE EXHIBITION

- Most interviewees—both at SMM and at MAAH—indicated that they happened upon the exhibition during their visit rather than specifically going to the respective museum to see *Race Are We So Different?*
- Many interviewees said the exhibition title and topic of the exhibition were provocative and that they were interested in finding out more about the exhibition. Several interviewees at SMM said the newspaper publicity about the exhibition piqued their interest

REACTIONS TO THE EXHIBITION

- When asked their overall opinion of *Race Are We so Different?*, most interviewees responded favorably to the exhibition, using terms including “excellent,” “well done,” “interesting,” and “informative.”
- Many interviewees said the exhibition made them think about the concept of race differently. Some others said they appreciated the diverse personal and academic perspectives represented in the exhibition.
- When RK&A asked interviewees what aspects of the exhibition interested them most, interviewees cited five exhibits most frequently, including the How Do You Experience Race? Video, the What’s Race Got to Do with It? high school lunchroom video, the Who’s Talking? linguistic profiling

interactive, the Hapa Project image panels, and the history of slavery outlined in the Creating Race and Inventing Whiteness exhibits.

UNDERSTANDING OF EXHIBITION CONTENT

- Most interviewees said the main message of the exhibition is that we are all human and more alike than different. When asked what in the exhibition best conveyed that message, interviewees cited several exhibits including the What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You? interactive, the Hapa Project installation, and the Science of Skin interactive. A few also referred to "DNA exhibits" without being more specific.
- Many interviewees also went on to say that the exhibition is trying to show that race is socially constructed or invented. Interviewees cited a range of Human Variation, History, and Contemporary Experience exhibits when asked which exhibits best conveyed the main message.
- When asked to describe science exhibit components visited in the exhibition and how those exhibit components may have affected their understanding of race, most interviewees described specific interactive exhibit components in the *Science of Human Variation* area including How Are We Alike and Different? (African Origins), Why Do We Come in Different Colors? (Science of Skin), Does Skin Color Equal Race? (Colors We Are), What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You?, and Not for Blacks Only (Sickle Cell) exhibit.
- Of the *Science of Human Variation* exhibit components recalled, interviewees cited African Origins most frequently. Most who said they stopped at African Origins reiterated the message that the human species originated in Africa. Of those interviewees, many said that humans are genetically more alike than they are different.

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS IV: TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

RK&A conducted telephone interviews in May 2007 with people who visited *Race Are We So Different?* in April 2007 and completed a screener form upon exiting the exhibition. Among a total of 50 interviewees, 25 visited the exhibition at SMM, while 25 visited it at MAAH.

VISITOR DEMOGRAPHICS

- Among telephone interviewees (including SMM and MAAH visitors), female interviewees (74 percent) outnumbered male interviewees (26 percent). The median age of interviewees was 44.

MOST INTERESTING ASPECTS OF THE EXHIBITION

- The How Do You Experience Race? personal stories video, the What's Race Got to Do with It? high school lunchroom video, and the Hapa Project image panels were cited most frequently by telephone interviewees as the most interesting aspects of the exhibition.
- Many interviewees described the personal stories shared in the How Do You Experience Race? video as "moving" and "compelling." Others noted that the personal stories touched on issues of racism encountered every day.

UNDERSTANDING OF EXHIBITION CONTENT

- Most interviewees said the main message of the exhibition is that humans are all one race and are more similar than different. The What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You? interactive, the face-morphing opening video installation, the Science of Skin component, and the African Origins interactive were the elements interviewees said best conveyed that message in the exhibition.
- Many interviewees also went on to say that the exhibition is trying to show that race is socially constructed or invented.
- When asked to describe science exhibit components visited in the exhibition and how those exhibits may have affected their understanding of race, one-half of the telephone interviewees said they could not specifically remember any of the science exhibit components. This is not surprising given the length of time that passed since their visit—it may have been difficult for visitors to recall distinctly science exhibits versus all the others.
- Of those interviewees who could recall specific science exhibit components, several cited African Origins and indicated that this exhibit helped reinforce the message that humans originated in Africa and are genetically more alike than different. Additionally, some interviewees mentioned the Science of Skin microscope interactive and said that from this exhibit they gleaned the message that humans are more alike than different.

IMPACT OF THE EXHIBITION

- When asked if they had discussed the topics of race or racism since they visited the exhibition, most interviewees said yes. Many said they talked to people about *Race Are We So Different?* and encouraged them to visit the exhibition.
- RK&A asked interviewees if they had searched out more information on race or racism since they visited the *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition. Most said they had not; however, a few interviewees from both SMM and MAAH said they had.
- When asked if they were aware that there is a Web site (www.understandingrace.org) associated with the exhibition, about two-thirds of the SMM interviewees said yes and about one-third said no. In contrast, all but three of the MAAH interviewees said they were aware of the Web site. Of those interviewees who said they were aware of the *Race Are We So Different?* Web site, most said they had not visited it, citing lack of time.

INTRODUCTION

In 2001, the American Anthropological Association (AAA), with funding from the Ford Foundation and the National Science Foundation, undertook the difficult task of developing a comprehensive traveling exhibition that asked, “What is race?” aiming to open public discourse on the topic. As public spaces, museums, including art museums, science centers, and natural history museums, have long explored the topic of race with varying degrees of success. Taking a strong stance on a controversial subject matter can be daunting for any major public institution, as Tracy Teslow said in an article for *Museums and Social Issues: A Journal of Reflective Discourse*. As Teslow states, “Americans don’t seem ready to acknowledge . . . the central role of racism in American history and life” (2007). No doubt, the endeavor was bold and risky for AAA, the exhibition developers, and others.

Yet, the risk has reaped rewards. Findings from the summative evaluation for *RACE Are We So Different?* show that the exhibition is successful in several ways. Most notably, the exhibition had a statistically significant impact on the way visitors conceived of the idea of race—more visitors who had seen the exhibition understood that race is a recent human invention that is not biological and that humans are much more genetically alike than different than did visitors who had not seen the exhibition. These findings are remarkable when one considers how firmly rooted most people’s ideas of race are. Further, tracking data indicates that visitors spent a relatively long time in the exhibition, particularly when compared to exhibitions of similar size; and no exhibit component was neglected by visitors, indicating that the exhibition as a whole served a broad range of visitors. Also of note, in telephone interviews conducted with visitors weeks after their visit, interviewees could still talk about their experience in specific detail and maintained their enthusiasm for the exhibition and their understanding that race is a recent human invention.

Nevertheless, findings also indicate that even though many visitors left the exhibition understanding the big idea, some did not as fully understand the supporting ideas about institutional racism. The exhibition did not fully change visitors’ understandings of the ways racism affects American society and informs our identities. Visitors’ understanding of the big idea but lack of understanding of supporting ideas presents a paradox of sorts. This paradox suggests a tension in visitors’ understanding—although most visitors certainly grew in their understanding of race, their deeper understanding remained somewhat conflicted. This is not surprising given the complexity of the ideas presented in the exhibition and how incongruous these ideas are with ideas and opinions of race in conventional American society.

CONVEYING THE BIG IDEA

As evidenced by the findings of this study as well as from the two front-end evaluations conducted for this exhibition, visitors enter museums familiar with the concept of race—if not personal experience, strong opinions, and/or knowledge about it—even if their ideas are incorrect or ill-conceived (RKA, 2001 and 2005). Yet, findings demonstrate that the AAA exhibition helped many visitors reach *a new understanding of race* (that race is a recent human invention with no biological basis). This is especially notable, because often people remain “fixed” in their ideas about subject matters they believe to already know a lot about, and convincing them otherwise through an exhibition is extremely difficult. For

example, in a front-end study of an exhibition on evolution, RK&A learned that people cannot easily change their thinking about evolution (2005a; 2005b). Other studies in museums confirm that the public's passion for their beliefs about evolution often impede any attempts at changing them (Scott and Guisti, 2006). Similarly, another study shows that museum visitors have strong, fixed ideas about gravity—even after a science demonstration, visitors held the same incorrect notions of gravitational pull (Borun, 1993). Communicating new ideas is problematic in all subjects. In a front-end evaluation for an exhibition about the American Flag, RK&A learned that people's strongly held ideas about the meaning of the American Flag were unwavering. People were simply unwilling to accept alternative ways of knowing the flag (2002).

Findings of the summative evaluation of *Race Are We so Different?* suggest that one reason visitors shifted to a new understanding of race was because they were somewhat ready to do so. Pre-exhibition interviews indicate that few visitors believed that race is strictly based on distinct physical characteristics. Rather, most visitors seemed to have entered the exhibition with a somewhat conflicted understanding—saying that race is based on culture more than on physical characteristics, indicating a hunch that “race isn't real,” yet unable to articulate where ideas of race originate or what they are based upon. Some were even convinced that “races” are predisposed to certain characteristics and abilities even though they also believed that race is not real. These visitors did not say they were conflicted about race, but a close examination of the way they talked about race revealed unresolved questions. The AAA exhibition provided these visitors with the information, evidence, and thinking tools necessary to make the leap from vague, confused beliefs about race to more sophisticated understandings of race.

To repeat, it is quite remarkable for a museum exhibition to have such a strong impact on visitors. Changes in attitudes and understanding typically require repeated exposure and facilitation by a live person, yet most visitors attended *Race Are We so Different* only one time for an average of 22 minutes. How did the exhibition have such a powerful impact on visitors' ideas on race? Timing and tracking findings provide some clues. All three exhibition areas—science, history, and lived experience—were visited by a majority of visitors and not one single exhibit component was overlooked, indicating that the exhibition had broad appeal and provided something for everyone.

Findings show that visitors spent a majority of their time reading text panels, followed by watching videos. Typically, in science exhibitions text panels are the *least* visited type of exhibit; often they are ignored. As evaluators we argue against the use of too many text panels. But obviously something about the way the text was written was accessible and resonated with visitors enough to motivate them to continue reading. Further, the two most heavily visited exhibit components (and components mentioned often in interviews) were large graphic image panels featuring everyday people—the Hapa project photographs and How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? These exhibits quickly and effectively conveyed the notion that “race” is arbitrary, fluid, and complicated. And finally, videos were the second most heavily visited type of exhibit, most of which featured everyday people talking about their experience with race and racism. Overall, the exhibition has strong content that is emotionally evocative, accessible, and strikes a personal chord with many visitors.

PERSONAL IDENTITY

The exhibition was less successful at impacting visitors' understanding of the complexity of racism in America. The exhibition hoped to demonstrate to visitors that racism exists at the societal level, not only at the individual level, and that each individual's personal identity, (regardless of what “race” one identifies as) is embedded within the broad context of institutional racism. Findings show that there were no statistically significant differences between pre-exhibition and post-exhibition interviewees

when it came to understanding that racism is institutionalized in America and that racism affects their personal identities. However, significant differences were seen between visitors who identified themselves as white and those who identified themselves as non-white as well as between older and younger visitors, with non-white and older visitors having a more complex understanding of these two ideas. This finding suggests that one's lived experience is an important variable and may have the greatest impact on how one conceives of racism in America.

Again, these findings are not surprising. Most non-white Americans experience the implications of racism in more tangible, consistent ways than do most white Americans, and visitors to the AAA exhibition were no exception. Non-white interviewees said that race and racism is something they contemplate frequently, and while the exhibition did not necessarily enhance their views in these areas, it did validate many of their feelings and experiences. While it is less apparent why visitors older than 30 years old had a more complex understanding of race and racism, their understanding may be more associated with lived experiences and possibly wisdom, which often comes with age.

Findings show that the majority of visitors who identified themselves as white (as well as some who identified themselves as non-white), both pre and post-exhibition, conceived of racism in America as existing primarily at the individual level of discrimination and prejudice, and only one-quarter of them were aware of the ways in which their identity is tied to racism at the societal level—such as with “white privilege.” Interestingly, many of these same visitors also left the exhibition having learned that race is a human invention with no biological basis. This contradiction in understanding suggests that many exhibition visitors are still somewhat unsettled in their understanding of race: perhaps they have not reconciled their own lived experience, facts presented in the exhibition, and racial issues that exist outside of or beyond their daily lives.

Encouraging people to look at *themselves* and *others* in a new way is difficult, and even more so in a public environment. As mentioned previously, attitude change often requires repeated exposure. Even more difficult is achieving attitude change about a sensitive, controversial topic such as race. The fact that most visitors did not come to a new understanding about connections between their identity, racism, and society at large is not unexpected and supports concepts of meaning-making and entrance narrative popular in museum literature. Visitors to museums actively create meaning through their own contexts—their perspective, frameworks, past experiences (Silverman, 1997). Similarly, Zahava Doering writes about “entrance narrative,” an internal storyline different for each museum visitor that impacts the way he or she looks at and interprets information (Doering, 1999). Visitor to the AAA exhibition each brought with them their own stories, recollections, opinions, and ideas about race and racism. For those with little direct and explicit experience with racism, it may have been too difficult or too painful to see themselves reflected back in the exhibition.

CONCLUSION

Regardless of the fact that the exhibition had little impact on visitors' understanding of institutional racism and identity, more significantly this evaluation proved that the exhibition helped a great number of visitors—many of whom entered the exhibition with conflicted ideas of race—to understand that race is a recent human invention and has no biological basis. This finding is extraordinary and indicates that *Race Are We so Different* provided visitors with the information, evidence, and thinking tools necessary to make the leap from vague, confused beliefs about race to more sophisticated understandings of race. Conceivably, this new understanding will provide visitors a starting point from which, over time, they may ponder how their identities develop within institutional racism and/or consider the science behind their new understanding.

REFERENCES

- Borun, M., C. Massey, and T. Lutter. (1993). "Naïve Knowledge and the Design of Science Museum Exhibits." *Curator* 36, No. 3 (1993): 201-19.
- Doering, Z. (1999). "Strangers, Guests, or Clients? Visitor Experiences in Museums." *Curator*, 42(2): 74-87.
- Randi Korn & Associates, Inc. (2005). *Concept Testing: Understanding Race and Human Variation*. Unpublished manuscript. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association.
- _____(2005a). *Concept Testing*. Unpublished manuscript. Martinsville, VA: Virginia Museum of Natural History.
- _____(2005b). *Past Worlds Front-end Evaluation*. Unpublished manuscript. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Museum of Natural History.
- _____(2002). *For Which It Stands: The American Flag in American Life, Results from Focus Groups*. Unpublished manuscript. Washington, D.C.: National Museum of American History, Behring Center.
- _____(2001). *Front-end Evaluation of Understanding Race and Human Variation*. Unpublished manuscript. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association.
- Scott, M. and E. Giusti. 2006. "Designing Human Evolution Exhibitions: Insights from Exhibitions and Audiences." *Museums and Social Issues: A Journal of Reflective Discourse*, 1(1): 49-68.
- Silverman, L. 1997. "Personalizing the Past." *Journal of Interpretation Research*. 2(1): 1-10.
- Teslow, Tracy. 2007. "A Troubled Legacy: Making and Unmaking Race in the Museum." *Museums and Social Issues: A Journal of Reflective Discourse*, 2(1): 11-44.

INTRODUCTION

This report presents findings from a summative evaluation conducted by Randi Korn & Associates, Inc. (RK&A), for the American Anthropological Association (AAA). RK&A designed the study to examine visitors' responses to concepts, themes, and interpretive approaches presented in AAA's *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition at two host locations, the Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM) in Minneapolis, St. Paul and the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History (MAAH) in Detroit, Michigan.

RK&A conducted in-depth interviews and timing and tracking observations with visitors to the exhibition. The evaluation objectives were to:

- ◆ Examine the *degree to which* visitors to the exhibitions understand that race is a social construct and that humans are more alike than different;
- ◆ Identify how the exhibition affects/challenges visitors' pre-exhibition ideas about race and human variation;
- ◆ Identify the range of emotions visitors experience as a result of seeing the exhibition, from visitors who leave the exhibition feeling invigorated by the subject matter to those who may feel confused or unsure of these new ideas;
- ◆ Identify how visitors experience the exhibition and how it affects their understanding of the subject matter (i.e., what aspect[s] of the exhibition solidified their understandings, piqued their curiosity, aroused their anger, etc.);
- ◆ Determine the length of time visitors spend in the whole exhibition and at individual exhibits; and
- ◆ Determine how the exhibition affects visitors' long-term understanding of and experiences with race.

METHODOLOGY

RK&A used multiple data collection strategies to assess visitors' experiences in *Race Are We So Different?*: timing and tracking observations, uncued entrance interviews, uncued exit interviews, and follow-up telephone interviews.

TIMING AND TRACKING OBSERVATIONS

Visitor observations provide an objective and quantitative account of how visitors behave and react to exhibition components. Observational data indicate how much time visitors spend in an exhibition and the range of visitor behaviors.

All visitors ages 12 and older were eligible to be unobtrusively observed in the exhibition. The evaluator selected visitors to observe using a continuous random sampling method. In accordance with this method, the observer stationed herself at the exhibition's entrance and observed the first eligible visitor to enter. The observer followed the selected visitor through the exhibition, recording the exhibits used, select behaviors, and total time spent in the exhibition (see Appendix A for the observation forms).

When the visitor completed his or her visit, the observer returned to the entrance to await the next eligible visitor to enter the exhibition.

Unlike past RK&A timing and tracking studies, RK&A intercepted observed visitors once they had exited the exhibition and asked them key demographic information such as age, visiting group, and racial or ethnic identity. At the request of AAA, the question regarding racial or ethnic identity was open-ended, allowing visitors to describe themselves using their own words.

IN-DEPTH INTERVIEWS

In-depth interviews encourage and motivate interviewees to describe their experiences, express their opinions and feelings, and share with the interviewer the meaning they constructed from an experience. In-depth interviews produce data rich in information because interviewees talk about personal experiences. For the *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition evaluation, RK&A conducted three types of in-depth interviews: entrance interviews, exit interviews, and telephone interviews. All three interview guides were intentionally open-ended to allow interviewees the freedom to discuss what they felt was meaningful. All interviews were audio-recorded with participants' permission and transcribed to facilitate analysis.

ENTRANCE INTERVIEWS

Prior to entering the exhibition, visitors ages 12 and older were eligible to be selected (following a continuous random sampling method, as described above) to answer several questions about their pre-existing notions and prior experiences regarding issues of race (see Appendix B for the entrance interview guide).

EXIT INTERVIEWS

In addition to interviewing visitors prior to their *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition experience, RK&A also conducted interviews with visitors upon exiting the exhibition. Following a continuous random sampling method, visitors ages 12 and older were eligible to be selected to answer several questions about their exhibition experiences (see Appendix C for the exit interview guide).

TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

RK&A conducted post-visit telephone interviews with visitors a few weeks after their visit to determine longer-term effects of their visit to *Race Are We So Different?* and their use of the exhibition Web site. To find visitors to participate in these interviews, evaluators systematically intercepted visitors as they exited each museum and showed them a list of exhibitions and asked which ones they had visited. If they indicated they had visited *Race Are We So Different?*, they were asked to participate in a telephone interview about the Museum. Visitors were not told that they would be interviewed about *Race Are We So Different?* to avoid cueing them to remember their experiences in the exhibition and biasing the data.

If visitors had visited *Race Are We So Different?* and were willing to receive a telephone call in a few weeks, their telephone number was collected. If they had not visited *Race Are We So Different?* or were unwilling to provide a telephone number, they were thanked for their time and the data collector intercepted the next eligible visitor. Only visitors ages 18 and older were approached for a telephone interview (see Appendix D for the telephone interview guide).

LIMITATIONS

DROP IN VISITORS VS. ORGANIZED GROUPS

At MAAH, high commercial tour group and school group visitation and low drop-in visitor visitation prevented data collectors from both effectively observing visitors to the *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition and from recruiting an adequate number of visitors to participate in the telephone interviews. After ten days of data collection, data collectors had not conducted a satisfactory number of observations*. Therefore, RK&A ended all further timing and tracking data collection and focused all remaining data collection resources towards recruiting participants for telephone interviews.

SITE INSTALLATION

Installation of the *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition at the two sites selected for this evaluation—the Science Museum of Minnesota and the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History—differed greatly. At SMM, the *Race Are We So Different?* installation was contained within one large gallery, whereas the MAAH installation was divided among two mid-sized galleries and a connecting hall. During the initial stages of data collection at MAAH, data collectors informally observed visitors' tendency to explore only one of the two galleries in which the exhibition was installed. Therefore, RK&A concluded that visitor behaviors at the two sites could be neither fairly compared nor responsibly combined during data analysis.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data for the *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition included interviews and observations. The interviews were audio-recorded, then transcribed, and these transcriptions were analyzed using both qualitative methods and quantitative methods. The timing and tracking observations were analyzed using quantitative methods.

RUBRIC DEVELOPMENT

To capture the nuances in visitors' experiences and to guide the design of instruments and the analysis of data, RK&A developed a scoring rubric that describes, on a continuum, visitors' understanding of race and human variation. For each visitor outcome, the rubric includes a continuum of understandings on a scale from 1 to 3, with 1 being a naïve or misunderstanding to 3 being an accomplished understanding (see page 27 for the Interview Scoring Rubric). To develop the rubric, RK&A used the data from the open-ended interviews conducted during the remedial evaluation (the actual language used by visitors to talk about race).

QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

The interviews were qualitative, meaning that results are descriptive. In analyzing qualitative data, the evaluator studies the data for meaningful patterns and trends, and, as patterns and trends emerge, groups similar responses. Quotations in this report illustrate interviewees' thoughts and ideas as fully as possible. The quotations give the reader the flavor of visitors' experiences. Information identifying each interviewee's location, age, and gender is included in brackets after each quotation.

Trends and themes in the interview data are presented from most- to least-frequently occurring.

* Data collectors observed 16 visitors to the exhibition.

QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

Numerical interview and observation data were analyzed using SPSS 12.0.1 for Windows, a statistical package for personal computers.

The open-ended visitor interviews were *also* analyzed quantitatively. Verbatim transcripts were scored using a rubric designed to measure visitor outcomes. Two individuals scored a subset of the interviews independently to gauge inter-rater reliability; they agreed 87 percent of the time, a highly acceptable inter-reliability rating. To avoid potential biases, evaluators—who had not conducted the interviews—scored the interviews using the rubric. The resulting interview scores were entered into a spreadsheet. The data from the timing and tracking observation forms were also entered into a spreadsheet. Descriptive and inferential statistics were run for both data sets. All statistical analyses run are listed in Appendices E and F.

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

For the observation data, frequency distributions were calculated for all categorical variables, such as gender, level of accomplishment on an exhibition objective, or use of an exhibit. Summary statistics, including the mean (average), median (50th percentile) and standard deviation (spread of scores: “±” in tables), were calculated for interval and ratio level variables such as age, self-reported time in the exhibition, or observed total time spent in the exhibition.

INFERENCE STATISTICS

For all inferential statistical tests, a standard 0.05 level of significance was used.* To examine the relationship between two categorical variables, cross-tabulation tables were computed to show the joint frequency distribution of the variables, and the chi-square statistic (χ^2) was used to test the significance of the relationship. For example in the visitor interviews, level of accomplishment on an exhibition objective was tested against gender to determine if the two variables are related. For the observation data, use of an exhibit was tested against age to determine if the two variables were related. To test for differences in the means of two or more groups, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed and the F-statistic was used to test the significance of the difference. For example in the visitor interviews, ANOVA tested self-reported time in the exhibition by exhibition site to determine if average time in the exhibition differed at the Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM) and the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History (MAAH). For the observation data, ANOVA tested “total time spent in the exhibition” by “gender” to determine if men and women differed in the time spent in the exhibition.

REPORTING METHOD

RK&A presents quantitative data in tables. Percentages within tables may not always equal 100 owing to rounding. Findings within each topic are presented in descending order, starting with the most frequently occurring.

* When the level of significance is set to $p = 0.05$, any finding that exists at a probability (p -value) ≤ 0.05 is “significant.” When a finding (such as a relationship between two variables) has a p -value of 0.05, there is a 95 percent probability that the finding exists; that is, in 95 out of 100 cases, the finding is correct. Conversely, there is a 5 percent probability that the finding would not exist; in other words, in 5 out of 100 cases, the finding appears by chance.

Interview data are presented in narrative. The interviewer's remarks appear in parentheses and the identification code or group membership appears in brackets following the quotation. Trends and themes in the interview data are also presented from most- to least-frequently occurring.

**PRINCIPAL FINDINGS ARE ORGANIZED
AROUND THE FOLLOWING FOUR AREAS:**

1. Timing and Tracking
2. Rubric Scored Interviews
3. Exit Interviews
4. Telephone Interviews

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS I: TIMING AND TRACKING

Data were collected at the Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM) in St. Paul, Minnesota and the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History (MAAH) in Detroit, Michigan. The evaluators observed a total of 116 drop-in visitors, ages 12 years and older (100 at SMM and 16 at MAAH).

Most findings discussed in this section pertain *only* to the data collected at SMM due to data collection limitations at MAAH described earlier (see the Limitations section in the Introduction on page 3). Data from MAAH are presented for data collection conditions, demographics, total time visitors spent in the exhibition, and the total number of exhibit components visitors used.

DATA COLLECTION CONDITIONS

At SMM, observers timed and tracked visitors for 10 days in April 2007. At MAAH observations were collected for 6 days during June and July 2007. Slightly more observations took place on weekend days (56 percent) than on weekdays (44 percent); and most (83 percent) occurred in the afternoon, as opposed to the morning (17 percent). More than one-half of observed visitors experienced a low level of crowding (52 percent), 43 percent experienced a moderate level, and 5 percent experience a high level (see Table 1).

TABLE I
DATA COLLECTION CONDITIONS

CONDITIONS (n = 115)	SMM (n = 99) %	MAAH (n = 16) %	TOTAL %
Day of the week			
Weekend day	57.6	50.0	56.5
Weekday	42.4	50.0	43.5
Time of day			
PM	84.8	68.8	82.6
AM	15.2	31.2	17.4
Level of Crowding			
Low	48.5	75.0	52.2
Moderate	45.5	25.0	42.6
High	6.1	0.0	5.2

VISITOR DESCRIPTIONS

Data collectors intercepted visitors as they exited the exhibition and asked them to self-report age and racial or ethnic background. As shown in Table 2, the total sample of visitors observed included more females than males (55 percent and 45 percent, respectively). Almost all visitors (96 percent) were adults ages 18 years or older; of those, 45 percent were between the ages of 18 and 34 years, 35 percent were between the ages of 35 and 54 years, and 16 percent were 55 years of age or older.

TABLE 2

VISITOR DEMOGRAPHICS

CHARACTERISTIC	SMM %	MAAH %	TOTAL %
Gender	(<i>n</i> = 97)	(<i>n</i> = 15)	(<i>n</i> = 112)
Female	53.6	66.7	55.4
Male	46.4	33.3	44.6
Age group	(<i>n</i> = 99)	(<i>n</i> = 14)	(<i>n</i> = 113)
17 or younger	4.0	0.0	3.5
18 to 34	46.5	35.7	45.2
35 to 54	36.4	28.5	35.4
55+	13.1	35.7	15.9

When asked to describe their racial or ethnic background, observed visitors responded using a variety of approaches (see Table 3)*. The majority of visitors used terminology (63 percent), such as “Black,” “White,” “Asian,” or “African American.” One-half of visitors described their background geographically (53 percent), using nationalities or regional identifiers. More than one-quarter described a mixed racial or ethnic background (28 percent), while 18 percent used qualifiers identifying themselves as American. Appendix H contains a more detailed account of visitor descriptions.

TABLE 3

VISITORS' APPROACH TO DESCRIBING RACIAL OR ETHNIC BACKGROUND

APPROACH (<i>n</i> = 112)	SMM (<i>n</i> = 97) %	MAAH (<i>n</i> = 15) %	TOTAL* %
Used standard terminology (e.g., White, Black, Hispanic, Asian)	57.7	93.3	62.5
Used geographic descriptor (e.g., Swedish, African, Asian)	54.6	40.0	52.7
Described mixed background	28.9	20.0	27.7
Used American qualifier (e.g., African American, Asian-American, European-American, Irish-American, Vietnamese-American)	15.5	33.3	17.9

* Visitors may have used a combination of approaches listed above, therefore the total percentage exceeds 100.

* At the request of AAA, the question regarding racial or ethnic identity was open-ended, allowing visitors to describe themselves using their own words.

Visitors also self-reported visit characteristics, such as group composition and whether they had visited the *Race Are We So Different* exhibition previously. More than one-half of observed visitors came in groups of adults (52 percent), while more than one-third visited in multigenerational groups (39 percent). Less than ten percent of visitors came to the museum alone (9 percent). Almost all the visitors observed in the *Race Are We So Different* exhibition said it was their first visit to the exhibition (92 percent) (see Table 4).

TABLE 4

VISIT CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTIC	SMM %	MAAH %	TOTAL %
Group Composition	(n = 100)	(n = 15)	(n = 115)
Adults only group	54.0	40.0	52.2
Family/multigenerational group	39.0	40.0	39.1
Alone	7.0	20.0	8.7
Prior visits to Race	(n = 99)	(n = 15)	(n = 114)
First-time visitor	92.9	86.7	92.1
Repeat visitor	7.1	13.3	7.9

OVERALL VISITATION PATTERNS

TOTAL TIME SPENT IN THE EXHIBITION

At SMM, visitors spent a median time of over 22 minutes in *Race Are We So Different?*; at MAAH the median time spent in the exhibition was over 32 minutes. The shortest time a visitor spent in the exhibition was 42 seconds and the longest time was over 2 hours—both observed at SMM (see Table 5). Statistical analyses of the average time SMM visitors spent in the exhibition revealed that afternoon visitors spent twice as much time in the exhibition (mean = 32 minutes) compared with morning visitors (mean = 14 minutes) (see Table 5a).

TABLE 5

TOTAL TIME SPENT IN RACE ARE WE SO DIFFERENT?

SITE	MEDIAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	±
SMM (n = 100)	22 min., 21 sec.	42 sec.	2 hrs., 11 min., 27 sec.	29 min., 30 sec.	26 min., 2 sec.
MAAH (n = 16)	31 min., 32 sec.	7 min., 21 sec.	2 hrs., 3 min., 39 sec.	40 min., 19 sec.	30 min., 33 sec.

TABLE 5A

DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL TIME SPENT IN EXHIBITION BY TIME OF VISIT

TIME OF DAY (SMM ONLY)	n	MEAN	±
Afternoon visitors	84	32 min., 6 sec.	27 min., 17 sec.
Morning visitors	15	14 min., 19 sec.	9 min., 2 sec.

F = 6.198; p = 0.014

To further compare the total time spent in *Race Are We So Different*, RK&A used Serrell’s “Sweep Rate Index” (SRI) (Serrell, 1998). The SRI is one measure to compare exhibitions at various museums. It is calculated by dividing the exhibition’s square footage* by the average total time spent in the exhibition.† The lower the SRI, the more time visitors spent per square foot of space. The SRI for *Race Are We So Different* at SMM is 169 square feet per minute. The SRI of *Race Are We So Different* at SMM is lower than Serrell’s average SRI for both large nondiorama exhibitions (>3,900 sq. ft.) and science museums.‡ This means visitors in *Race Are We So Different* are moving more slowly than visitors in exhibitions of similar size and museum type.

RK&A did not calculate the SRI of *Race Are We So Different* at MAAH because the exhibition was installed in three separate gallery spaces and therefore, was not comparable to the SMM installation of *Race Are We So Different* or other typical exhibition installations.

TOTAL NUMBER OF EXHIBITS AT WHICH VISITORS STOPPED

Race Are We So Different included 89 exhibits at which visitors could stop and one panel for visitors to notice. For this evaluation, a “stop” was defined as a visitor standing for three seconds or longer in front of a component. If a visitor returned to a component at which s/he had previously stopped, this return was not counted as an additional stop, but the amount of time spent was included in the total time spent at the component.

At SMM, the median number of exhibits *Race Are We So Different* visitors stopped at was 14, at MAAH it was 16.5. The minimum number of exhibits visitors stopped at was 1, observed at SMM; the maximum number of exhibits stopped at was 60, observed at MAAH (see Table 6). Further analysis of SMM visitors shows that afternoon visitors stopped at more exhibits (mean = 18) than did morning visitors (mean = 11) (see Table 6a).

TABLE 6

TOTAL NUMBER OF EXHIBITS STOPPED AT IN RACE ARE WE SO DIFFERENT?

SITE	MEDIAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	±
SMM (<i>n</i> = 100)	14.0	1.0	49.0	16.6	11.58
MAAH (<i>n</i> = 16)	16.5	2.0	60.0	20.4	16.65

TABLE 6A

DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL NUMBER OF EXHIBITS STOPPED AT BY TIME OF VISIT

TIME OF VISIT (SMM ONLY)	<i>n</i>	MEAN	±
Afternoon	84	17.5	11.81
Morning	15	10.9	8.73

F = 4.310; *p* = 0.041

*The *Race* installation at SMM measured 5,000 sq. ft. (measurements provided by SMM exhibition development team).

† Mean total times were used in the SRI calculation in accordance with Serrell’s methods. Throughout the rest of the report, median times are reported, as the median is standard for time data unevenly distributed across its range.

‡ Serrell reports an average SRI of 400.5 (±191.5) for large nondiorama exhibitions and 285.1 (±142.4) for science museums.

To compare the number of stops visitors made in *Race Are We So Different* with those of exhibitions of similar size and venue, RK&A used Serrell’s “Percentage Diligent Visitor Index” (%DV)*. The %DV is obtained by calculating the percentage of visitors who stopped at more than one-half of the exhibits. The higher the %DV, the more thoroughly the exhibition was used. The %DV for *Race Are We So Different* at SMM is 3 percent—that is, a total of three visitors stopped at more than one-half of the exhibits.† This %DV is much lower than Serrell’s average %DV for both large nondiorama exhibitions (>3,900 square feet) and science museums,‡ indicating visitors stopped at fewer exhibits in *Race Are We So Different* compared to exhibitions of similar size and museum type.

Some developers object to Serrell’s %DV model, which bases the success of an exhibition on the quantity of exhibits stopped at versus the quality of an individual experience. Findings from other SMM-developed exhibitions show the success of promoting high dwell times at individual components rather than a high percentage of components used§. While *Race Are We So Different* garnered a low %DV, its visitors tended to use few components for an extended time, matching the behavioral objectives of the development team.

As mentioned earlier, the unusual installation of *Race Are We So Different* at MAAH was not conducive to a fair and accurate comparison against a larger body of data. Therefore, RK&A did not calculate %DV for the MAAH *Race Are We So Different* installation.

**Findings presented beyond this section pertain only to data collected at SMM.
Data from the sample of visitors observed at MAAH are not presented.**

VISITATION TO EACH EXHIBITION SECTION

Race Are We So Different featured five main sections: the Introductory Experience, the Science of Human Variation (Science), the History of the Idea of Race (History), the Contemporary Experience of Race and Racism in the United States (Contemporary Experience), and the Resource Center.

* Serrell, B. (1998). *Paying Attention: Visitors and Museum Exhibitions*. Washington, DC, American Association of Museums.

† The total number of exhibits (89) was determined by RK&A.

‡ Serrell reports an average %DV of 23.4 percent (± 20.4) for large nondiorama exhibitions and 28.9 percent (± 23.4) for science museums.

§ Randi Korn & Associates, Inc. (2006). “Summative Evaluation: Amazon Voyage: Vicious Fishes and Other Riches.” Unpublished manuscript. Miami, FL: Miami Museum of Science and Planetarium; Randi Korn & Associates, Inc. (2006). “Summative Evaluation of Invention at Play.” Unpublished manuscript. Washington, D.C.: Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation, Smithsonian Institution.

TOTAL NUMBER OF SECTIONS VISITED

As shown in Table 7, more than one-quarter of visitors stopped at all five sections of the *Race Are We So Different* exhibition (27 percent), while more than one-half stopped at between three and four sections (56 percent). Seventeen percent stopped at one or two sections.

TABLE 7
NUMBER OF SECTIONS VISITED IN THE EXHIBITION

NUMBER OF SECTIONS (<i>n</i> = 100)	SMM VISITORS %
5	27.0
3-4	56.0
1-2	17.0

VISITOR USE OF EACH SECTION

Table 8 shows both the percentage of visitors who stopped at each section and the time they spent there. Almost all visitors stopped in the Contemporary Experience section (91 percent) and spent a median time of 8 minutes there. Over four-fifths of visitors stopped in the Science section (83 percent) and spent a median time of 8 minutes there, too. Three-quarters of visitors stopped in the History section, spending a median time of just over 2 minutes. Less popular were the Introductory Experience and the Resource Center (stopped at by 65 percent and 51 percent, respectively). The median time visitors spent at these two sections was less than 2 minutes (1 minute, 50 seconds at the Introductory Experience and 1 minute, 12 seconds at the Resource Center).

TABLE 8
VISITOR USE OF EACH SECTION

SECTION (<i>n</i> = 100)	% SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	MEDIAN TIME
The Contemporary Experience of Race and Racism	91	8 min., 6 sec.
Science of Human Variation	83	8 min., 4 sec.
History of the Idea of Race	75	2 min., 10 sec.
Introductory Experience	65	1 min., 12 sec.
Resource Center	51	1 min., 50 sec.

STOPS MADE IN EACH SECTION

The Science section experienced the highest number of stops by visitors (median = 7 stops), followed by the Contemporary Experience section (median = 5 stops) and the History section (median = 4 stops). Visitors stopped at a median of one exhibit in both the Introductory Experience and Resource Center (see Table 9).

TABLE 9

STOPS MADE IN EACH SECTION

SECTION	<i>n</i> (SMM ONLY)	POSSIBLE # OF STOPS	MEDIAN # OF STOPS
Science of Human Variation	83	25	7.0
The Contemporary Experience of Race and Racism	91	32	5.0
History of the Idea of Race	75	21	4.0
Introductory Experience	65	3	1.0
Resource Center	51	7	1.0

When the number of stops made in each section was examined among demographic and visit characteristics, two statistically significant relationships emerged (see Table 9a). Female visitors made an average of 8 stops in the Science section, while male visitors made an average of 6 stops. In the Resource Center, repeat visitors stopped at more exhibits than first-time visitors (means = 2.2 stops and 1.3 stops, respectively).

TABLE 9A

DIFFERENCES IN NUMBER OF STOPS MADE IN EACH EXHIBIT SECTION BY DEMOGRAPHIC AND VISIT CHARACTERISTICS (SMM ONLY)

EXHIBIT SECTION	SIGNIFICANT VARIABLE	MEAN # OF STOPS	±
Science of Human Variation	Gender¹		
	Male	6.0	3.94
Resource Center	Female	8.0	4.54
	First-time visitor²		
	Yes	1.3	0.56
	No	2.2	1.17

¹ F = 4.392; *p* = 0.039

² F = 8.647; *p* = 0.005

VISITATION TO EACH EXHIBIT TYPE

The exhibition included seven main exhibit types: panels with text and/or images, moveable panels (such as reading boards or flip panels), videos, interactive exhibits, computer interactives, artifact cases, and feedback stations.

VISITOR USE OF EACH EXHIBIT TYPE

Table 10 shows the percentage of visitors who used each type of exhibit and the total amount of time they spent using them. Panels were most heavily used by the largest percentage of visitors (93 percent), followed by videos (90 percent) and interactive exhibits (73 percent). Almost two-thirds of visitors used computer interactives (64 percent) and artifact cases (61 percent). One-third of visitors used moveable panels (32 percent); and one-quarter used feedback stations (26 percent).

Interestingly, the data show that visitors spent a median time of 8 minutes at panels—much longer than earlier SMM-developed exhibitions*. In comparison, visitors spent a median of 4 minutes at videos; almost 3 minutes each at interactive exhibits and computer interactives; and over one minute each at feedback stations and moveable panels. Visitors spent less than 1 minute (median = 58 seconds) at artifact cases.

TABLE 10
TIME SPENT AT EACH EXHIBIT TYPE

EXHIBIT TYPE (n=100)	# OF EXHIBITS AVAILABLE	% SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	MEDIAN TIME
Panels (images and/or text)	46	93.0	8 min., 3 sec.
Video	13	90.0	4 min., 4 sec.
Interactive exhibits	6	73.0	2 min., 46 sec.
Computer interactives	7	64.0	2 min., 44 sec.
Artifact cases	8	61.0	58 sec.
Moveable panels	4	32.0	1 min., 17 sec.
Feedback stations	5	26.0	1 min., 18 sec.

* Randi Korn & Associates, Inc. (2006). “Summative Evaluation of Invention at Play.” Unpublished manuscript. Washington, D.C.: Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation, Smithsonian Institution.

STOPS MADE AT EACH EXHIBIT TYPE

Not only did visitors spend the longest amount of time at panels, they used a median of 7 panels during their visit—more than any other exhibit type (see Table 11). Visitors stopped at a median of 3 videos while they were in the exhibition. Interactive exhibits, computer interactives, and artifact cases were each used by visitors a median of two times; moveable panels and feedback stations were each used a median of one time.

TABLE 11
STOPS MADE AT EACH EXHIBIT TYPE

EXHIBIT TYPE	# OF EXHIBITS AVAILABLE	# SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	MEDIAN # OF STOPS
Panels (image and/or text)	46	93	7.0
Video	13	90	3.0
Interactive exhibits	6	73	2.0
Computer interactives	7	64	2.0
Artifact cases	8	61	2.0
Moveable panels	4	32	1.0
Feedback stations	5	26	1.0

Statistical analysis found no significant relationships among visitors' use of exhibit types according to either their demographic or visit characteristics.

VISITATION TO INDIVIDUAL EXHIBITS

TIME SPENT AT EACH EXHIBIT

In terms of specific exhibits, visitors spent the most time at the Video Sampler in the Resource Center (median = 5 minutes, 59 seconds) and the Census reading boards (median = 5 minutes, 18 seconds). They also spent considerable time at the Tuffet Dolls activity area (median = 3 minutes, 27 seconds) and the Reading area (median = 3 minutes, 8 seconds), both in the Resource Center. Table 12 lists the median times for all exhibits at which visitors spent more than one minute.

TABLE 12

EXHIBITS AT WHICH VISITORS SPENT LONGER THAN 60 SECONDS

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n = 100)	% SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	MEDIAN TIME (SEC.)
Video Sampler	14.0	359.0
Census reading boards	2.0	318.5
Tuffet Dolls activity area	2.0	207.0
Reading area	12.0	187.5
How Do You Experience Race? video	42.0	162.5
Why Talk About Race? video	33.0	159.0
Newspaper Box video	12.0	143.0
How Do You Experience Race? feedback station	2.0	142.5
Who's Talking computer interactive	24.0	132.0
Hapa Project image panels	59.0	129.0
Who is White? computer interactive	10.0	128.5
What Do Scientists Say About Race? video	12.0	126.0
High Blood Pressure interactive	35.0	112.0
Research on Race computer kiosk	10.0	106.0
What's Race Got to Do With it? video	45.0	101.0
What is Whiteness? text panel	16.0	90.0
Creating Race video	14.0	89.5
How Are We Alike and Different? computer interactive	38.0	77.0
What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You? interactive	45.0	77.0
Why Is Race a Question on the U. S. Census? text panel	7.0	68.0
Rowhouse reading boards	4.0	64.5
How Are People Like Avocados? text panel	20.0	63.0
Does Skin Color Equal Race? interactive	52.0	61.0
Why Do We Come in Different Colors? interactive	41.0	61.0
Geography, Not Race... text panel	30.0	60.5

Table 13 lists the exhibits at which visitors spent between 31 and 60 seconds, including the Traveling Genes computer interactive (median = 60 seconds), Sports Mascot artifact case (median = 58 seconds), and How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? panel (median = 56 seconds).

TABLE 13**EXHIBITS AT WHICH VISITORS SPENT 31 TO 60 SECONDS**

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n = 100)	% SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	MEDIAN TIME (SEC.)
Traveling Genes computer interactive	13.0	60.0
Sports Mascots artifact case	19.0	58.0
How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? image panel	54.0	56.0
The Boy or Girl Next Door text panel	25.0	54.0
Racism's Affect on Health text panel	23.0	54.0
One Person's Mascot text panel	20.0	53.5
Vote for the Census of the Future computer interactive	21.0	53.0
Measuring Housing Segregation flip panels	28.0	52.0
Ancestral Molecules text panel	32.0	51.5
Not for Blacks Only text panel*	18.0	51.0
Inventing Whiteness 1650-1850 text panel	6.0	49.5
Affirmative Action text panel	23.0	49.0
Playing Indian text panel	8.0	48.5
The GI Bill text panel	26.0	47.0
Does Race Have a Place in Medicine? text panel	21.0	47.0
Hapa Project feedback station	6.0	46.5
Creating Race 1550-1800 text panel	14.0	46.5
Separate and Unequal video	19.0	46.0
Sports Mascots feedback station	9.0	45.0
Investigating Race text panel	18.0	45.0
Standardized Test Scores text panel	6.0	44.0
School Segregation text panel	8.0	44.0
School Lockers artifact cases	30.0	43.5
Discrimination Calling text panel	28.0	42.0
Bone and Race text panel	18.0	42.0
Separate and Unequal 1650-1850 text panel	12.0	41.5
Got Questions About Race? feedback station	8.0	41.5
Who's Land Is It? text panel	13.0	40.0
Inventing Whiteness 1900-2000 text panel	21.0	40.0
A History of Moving and Mixing text panel	10.0	39.0
White: the Color of Money text panel	26.0	39.0
RACE Web computer kiosk	11.0	39.0
Human (Mis)measure video	12.0	36.5
On the Move text panel	26.0	35.5
Pictures and the Television Camera Tell Us... text panel	10.0	35.5
We Are All African text panel	20.0	34.0
Pharmacy video	18.0	34.0
Lake Electronics image panel	19.0	33.0
Race It Doesn't Add Up text panel	13.0	31.0
Does Where We Come From Tell Us Who We Are? image panel	19.0	31.0

* Exhibit component was available to 63 of observed visitors.

Table 14 lists the exhibits at which visitors spent 30 seconds or less, including the There Goes the Neighborhood panel (median = 30 seconds), the Inventing Whiteness 1850-1900 panel (median = 29 seconds) and the Human (Mis)measure 1850-1900) panel (median = 28 seconds). The exhibits at which visitors spent the least amount of time were the Human (Mis)measure 1700-1850 panel (median = 15 seconds), Acknowledgement panel (median = 12 seconds), and Beaded Vest artifact case (median = 10 seconds).

TABLE 14

EXHIBITS AT WHICH VISITORS SPENT 30 SECONDS OR FEWER

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n = 100)	% SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	MEDIAN TIME (SEC.)
There Goes the Neighborhood text panel	19.0	30.0
Inventing Whiteness 1850-1900 text panel	8.0	29.0
Human (Mis)measure 1850-1900 text panel	20.0	28.0
Sickle Cell Maps interactive*	12.0	27.5
Separate and Unequal 1850-1900 text panel	23.0	27.0
Creating Race 1400-1550 text panel	15.0	27.0
Human (Mis)measure 1900-2000 text panels	14.0	26.5
Race and the Wealth Gap artifact cases	17.0	25.0
Shackles artifact case	8.0	24.5
Going Down the Wrong Track text panel	7.0	24.0
Wooden Bowl artifact case	2.0	23.5
Race is a Recent Human Invention text panel	27.0	23.0
Pharmacy reading boards	2.0	23.0
Caliper and Hair Color Table artifact case	28.0	22.0
Ain't No Mountain High Enough text panel	13.0	20.0
School Lockers video	15.0	20.0
Face-Morphing video	44.0	19.5
Pottery artifact case	2.0	19.0
Separate and Unequal 1900-2000 text panel	27.0	19.0
Census Categories Shape ... text panel	5.0	18.0
Inventing Whiteness video	13.0	18.0
Human (Mis)measure 1700-1850 text panels	13.0	15.0
Acknowledgement panel	3.0	12.0
Beaded Vest artifact case	8.0	9.5

* Exhibit component was available to 63 of observed visitors.

STOPS MADE AT EACH EXHIBIT

Visitors could stop at 89* exhibits. The three exhibits at which the greatest number of visitors stopped were the Hapa Project panels (59 percent), the How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? panel (54 percent) and the Does Skin Color Equal Race? interactive exhibit (52 percent). Table 15 lists all the exhibits at which more than 20 percent of visitors stopped.

TABLE 15
EXHIBITS AT WHICH MORE THAN 20 PERCENT OF VISITORS STOPPED

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n = 100)	% SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED
Hapa Project image panels	59.0
How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? image panel	54.0
Does Skin Color Equal Race? interactive	52.0
What Does a Person’s Appearance Really Tell You? interactive	45.0
What’s Race Got to Do With it? video	45.0
Face-Morphing video	44.0
How Do You Experience Race? video	42.0
Why Do We Come in Different Colors? interactive	41.0
How Are We Alike and Different? computer interactive	38.0
High Blood Pressure interactive	35.0
Why Talk About Race? video	33.0
Ancestral Molecules text panel	32.0
Geography, Not Race... text panel	30.0
School Lockers artifact cases	30.0
Discrimination Calling text panel	28.0
Caliper and Hair Color Table artifact case	28.0
Measuring Housing Segregation flip panels	28.0
Race is a Recent Human Invention text panel	27.0
Separate and Unequal 1900-2000 text panel	27.0
On the Move text panel	26.0
White: the Color of Money text panel	26.0
The GI Bill text panel	26.0
The Boy or Girl Next Door text panel	25.0
Who’s Talking computer interactive	24.0
Separate and Unequal 1850-1900 text panel	23.0
Racism’s Affect on Health text panel	23.0
Affirmative Action text panel	23.0
Does Race Have a Place in Medicine? text panel	21.0
Vote for the Census of the Future computer interactive	21.0
Inventing Whiteness 1900-2000 text panel	21.0

* There were 90 exhibits in *Race*. However, one exhibit (Title panel) was considered “notice only.”

Table 16 lists the exhibits at which between 10 and 20 percent of visitors stopped, including the We Are All African panel, the Human (Mis)measure 1850-1900 panel, the One Person’s Mascot panel, and the How Are People Like Avocados? panel (each 20 percent).

TABLE 16

EXHIBITS AT WHICH 20 TO 10 PERCENT OF VISITORS STOPPED

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n = 100)	% SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED
We Are All African text panel	20.0
Human (Mis)measure 1850-1900 text panel	20.0
One Person’s Mascot text panel	20.0
How Are People Like Avocados? text panel	20.0
Does Where We Come From Tell Us Who We Are? image panel	19.0
Lake Electronics image panel	19.0
Sports Mascots artifact case	19.0
There Goes the Neighborhood text panel	19.0
Separate and Unequal video	19.0
Not for Blacks Only text panel*	18.0
Pharmacy video	18.0
Investigating Race text panel	18.0
Bone and Race text panel	18.0
Race and the Wealth Gap artifact cases	17.0
What is Whiteness? text panel	16.0
School Lockers video	15.0
Creating Race 1400-1550 text panel	15.0
Human (Mis)measure 1900-2000 text panel	14.0
Creating Race 1550-1800 text panel	14.0
Creating Race video	14.0
Video Sampler	14.0
Race It Doesn’t Add Up text panel	13.0
Ain’t No Mountain High Enough text panel	13.0
Traveling Genes computer interactive	13.0
Human (Mis)measure 1700-1850 text panel	13.0
Who’s Land Is It? text panel	13.0
Inventing Whiteness video	13.0
Sickle Cell Maps interactive*	12.0
What Do Scientists Say About Race? video	12.0
Human (Mis)measure video	12.0
Newspaper Box video	12.0
Separate and Unequal 1650-1850 text panel	12.0
Reading area	12.0
RACE Web computer kiosk	11.0
A History of Moving and Mixing text panel	10.0
Pictures and the Television Camera Tell Us... text panel	10.0
Who is White? computer interactive	10.0
Research on Race computer kiosk	10.0

Table 17 lists the exhibits at which fewer than 10 percent of visitors stopped. Interestingly, some of the exhibits at which the least number of visitors stopped, the Tuffet Dolls activity area and Census reading boards (each 2 percent), are also among the exhibits at which visitors spent the most time. Also, none of the exhibits were completely bypassed by visitors.

TABLE 17
EXHIBITS AT WHICH LESS THAN 10 PERCENT OF VISITORS STOPPED

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n=100)	% SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED
Sports Mascots feedback station	9.0
Playing Indian text panel	8.0
Beaded Vest artifact case	8.0
School Segregation text panel	8.0
Inventing Whiteness 1850-1900 text panel	8.0
Shackles artifact case	8.0
Got Questions About Race? feedback station	8.0
Going Down the Wrong Track text panel	7.0
Why Is Race a Question on the U. S. Census? text panel	7.0
Hapa Project feedback station	6.0
Standardized Test Scores text panel	6.0
Inventing Whiteness 1650-1850 text panel	6.0
Census Categories Shape ... text panel	5.0
Rowhouse reading boards	4.0
Acknowledgement panel	3.0
Census reading boards	2.0
Pottery artifact case	2.0
How Do You Experience Race? feedback station	2.0
Pharmacy reading boards	2.0
Wooden Bowl artifact case	2.0
Tuffet Dolls activity area	2.0

VISTOR BEHAVIORS

Observers noted nine behaviors. Total incidences of each behavior are provided in Table 17. Detailed information about behaviors at individual exhibits is provided in Appendix I.

SUMMARY OF BEHAVIORS

Almost all visitors watched a video (90 percent), while more than two-thirds read aloud or discussed exhibit content (69 percent). Two-third also did activities. Less than one-quarter of visitors looked at an artifact (22 percent) or read or wrote feedback (12 percent) (see Table 18).

TABLE 18
PERCENTAGE OF VISITORS WHO EXHIBITED BEHAVIORS IN RACE ARE WE SO DIFFERENT

BEHAVIOR (<i>n</i> = 100)	SMM VISITORS %
Watched video	90.0
Read aloud/discussed content at any exhibits	69.0
Did activities	66.0
Used flip panel or reading boards	59.0
Used computer	47.0
Looked at image (pointed to/touched)	45.0
Noticed*	35.0
Looked at artifact (pointed to/touched)	22.0
Read/write feedback	12.0

* Museum visitors often glance at panels to ascertain the identification of an object rather than stopping for seconds or longer to read them. For this evaluation, a “notice” was defined as looking at the Title panel for less than 3 seconds.

Visitors watched a median of three videos and also read aloud or discussed the contents of a median of three exhibits. They did two activities and looked at images or artwork at a median of two exhibits each. Visitors were observed participating in the other behaviors—using moveable panels, using computers, looking at artifacts, reading or writing feedback, and noticing—at a median of one exhibit (see Table 19).

TABLE 19
TOTAL NUMBER OF BEHAVIORS EXHIBITED IN RACE (SMM ONLY)

BEHAVIOR	# OF EXHIBITS AVAILABLE	<i>n</i>	MEDIAN	MIN.	MAX.	MEAN	±
Watched video	13	90	3.0	1.0	9.0	3.2	2.03
Read aloud/discussed content at any exhibits	84	69	3.0	1.0	19.0	5.2	4.84
Did activities	7	66	2.0	1.0	6.0	2.1	1.21
Looked at image (pointed to/touched)	50	45	2.0	1.0	9.0	2.8	2.01
Used moveable panels	12	59	1.0	1.0	6.0	1.9	1.31
Used computer	7	47	1.0	1.0	5.0	1.7	1.01
Looked at artifact (pointed to/touched)	14	22	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.3	0.46
Read/write feedback	5	12	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.2	0.58
Noticed*	1	35	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

* Museum visitors often glance at panels to ascertain the identification of an object rather than stopping for seconds or longer to read them. For this evaluation, a “notice” was defined as looking at the Title panel for less than 3 seconds.

Further analysis shows that female visitors used moveable panels more than male visitors (see Table 19a). Women flipped panels and used reading boards an average of 2.4 times, whereas men exhibited the same behavior a mean of 1.5 times.

TABLE 19A

DIFFERENCES IN USE OF MOVEABLE PANELS BY GENDER (SMM ONLY)

GENDER	MEAN	±
Male	1.5	0.99
Female	2.4	1.47

F = 6.852; p = .011

EXHIBIT MISUSE

Evidence of exhibit misuse among *Race Are We So Different* visitors was minimal. At the *How Are We Alike and How Are We Different?* interactive, observers witnessed two instances of misuse; at *Why Do We Come in Different Colors?* interactive, they witnessed one instance (see Table 20). Detailed definitions of misuse or broken exhibits are provided in Appendix J.

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO EXHIBITED MISUSE AT INDIVIDUAL EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT (n = 100)	# SMM VISITORS STOPPED AT EXHIBIT	# SMM VISITORS MISUSED EXHIBIT
How Are We Alike and How Are We Different? interactive	38	2.0
Why Do We Come in Different Colors? interactive	41	1.0

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS II: RUBRIC SCORED INTERVIEWS

INTRODUCTION

RK&A conducted 178 interviews of visitors to the exhibition *Race Are We So Different?* Ten interviews were excluded from the analysis, resulting in a final sample of 168 interviews.* The final sample consists of 88 interviews with visitors to the Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM) and 80 interviews with visitors to the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History (MAAH) (see Table 21).

TABLE 21

EXHIBITION SITE

SITE (<i>n</i> = 168)	<i>n</i>	%
Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM)	88	52
Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History (MAAH)	80	48

Of 168 interviews, 64 were face-to-face interviews with visitors who were about to enter the exhibition (38 percent), 59 were face-to-face interviews with visitors who had just exited the exhibition (35 percent), and 45 were telephone interviews with visitors about two to four weeks after they visited the exhibition (27 percent) (see Table 22).

TABLE 22

INTERVIEW GROUP BY EXHIBITION SITE

INTERVIEW GROUP (<i>n</i> = 168)	EXHIBITION SITE					
	SMM		MAAH		TOTAL	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Pre-exhibition	34	39	30	38	64	38
Post-exhibition	29	33	30	38	59	35
Telephone	25	28	20	25	45	27

* Reasons for exclusion: two respondents were under the age of 12 years and therefore did not fit the age criteria for selection, three interviews did not record the interviews on the tape recorder, and five interviews were excluded because the respondents discussed their entire Museum visit rather than the particular exhibition *Race Are We So Different?*.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND VISIT CHARACTERISTICS

This section describes respondents' demographic and visit characteristics and compares respondents at the two exhibition sites.

Table 23 shows the demographic characteristics of interviewees. Overall, females outnumber males by a ratio of 3:2. Interviewees' ages range from 15 to 86 years with a median age of 41 years. Gender and age characteristics are statistically similar at SMM and MAAH.

One-half of visitors self-identified as "White," one-third as "African American-Black."* Personal identity differs significantly at the two sites. At SMM, most respondents identified themselves as "White" (84 percent). At MAAH, most respondents identified themselves as "African American-Black" (70 percent).

* As requested by the AAA, the question regarding racial or ethnic identity was open-ended, allowing visitors to describe themselves using their own words. When asked to describe their racial or ethnic background, visitors responded using a variety of approaches, including standard terminology (i.e., African-American, Asian-American), color (i.e., white, black), and nationality (i.e., Scandinavian, Italian). Visitors also referred to themselves by color, race, and ethnicity within the interviews. For the sake of clarity, the evaluator used interviewees' self-reported race/ethnicity as well as information directly from the interviews to categorize interviewees into one of six categories: African-American-Black; Asian; White; Hispanic-Latino; Mixed; and Not Identified. To avoid the perpetuation of racial categories, we have labeled these categories as Personal Identity.

TABLE 23**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS BY EXHIBITION SITE**

CHARACTERISTIC	EXHIBITION SITE		
	SMM	MAAH	TOTAL
	%	%	%
GENDER (n = 168)			
Female	65	58	61
Male	35	42	39
PERSONAL IDENTITY¹ (n = 168)			
African American-Black	3	70	35
Asian	3	1	2
White	84	15	51
Hispanic-Latino	2	1	2
Mixed	2	4	3
Not Identified	5	9	7
AGE CATEGORY (n = 168)			
Less than 20 years	7	4	5
20 – 29 years	27	19	23
30 – 39 years	16	22	19
40 – 49 years	23	24	23
50 – 59 years	16	15	16
60 or more years	11	16	14
AGE IN YEARS (n = 168)			
	SMM	MAAH	TOTAL
Mean age (years)	38.9	43.1	40.9
Median age (years)	39.5	43.0	41.0
Range (years)	15 – 75	16 – 86	15 – 86
± Standard deviation (years)	±15.0	±15.9	±15.5

¹ $\chi^2 = 94.493$; $df = 5$; $p = .000$

Table 24 describes the visit characteristics of respondents. More than one-half of respondents visited the Museum as part of a group of two or more adults (58 percent), one-quarter visited the museum as part of a group of adults and children, presumably a family group (25 percent), and 17 percent visited alone. Visit group characteristics are statistically similar at SMM and MAAH.

First and repeat visits differ significantly at the two sites. At MAAH, most respondents were visiting the museum for the first time (70 percent). At SMM, the majority of respondents were repeat museum visitors (64 percent).

TABLE 24
VISIT CHARACTERISTICS BY EXHIBITION SITE (IN PERCENT)

CHARACTERISTIC	EXHIBITION SITE		TOTAL
	SMM	MAAH	
	%	%	%
VISIT GROUP (n = 123)			
Group of two or more adults	59	57	58
Group of adults and children	21	30	25
Solo adult	20	13	17
FIRST-REPEAT VISIT¹ (n = 168)			
First	36	70	52
Repeat	64	30	48

¹ $\chi^2 = 19.008$; $df = 1$; $p = .000$

Post-exhibition and telephone interview respondents reported the time they spent in the exhibition (see Table 25). Interviewees spent between 10 minutes and 5 hours in the exhibition, with a median time of 60 minutes. Exhibition time is statistically similar at the two sites.

Self-reported exhibition time was tested against respondents' demographic and visit characteristics to determine whether differences exist based on gender, age group, personal identity, visit group, or first-repeat visit. Exhibition times are similar across demographic and visit characteristics.

TABLE 25
SELF-REPORTED TIME IN THE EXHIBITION BY EXHIBITION SITE

SELF-REPORTED TIME (POST-EXHIBITION AND TELEPHONE INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS ONLY)	EXHIBITION SITE		
	SMM	MAAH	TOTAL
	%	%	%
TIME CATEGORY (n = 99)			
Less than 30 minutes	20	18	19
30 – 59 minutes	22	31	26
60 – 89 minutes	20	25	22
90 – 119 minutes	10	16	13
120 or more minutes	28	10	19
TIME IN MINUTES (n = 99)	SMM	MAAH	TOTAL
Mean time (Minutes)	78	59	68
Median time (Minutes)	60	60	60
Range (Minutes)	10 – 300	10 – 180	10 – 300
(±) Standard deviation (Minutes)	±59.9	±36.8	±50.5

EXHIBITION OBJECTIVES

This section explores respondents' accomplishment of five exhibition objectives and compares the results based on interview group (pre-exhibition, post-exhibition, telephone). This section also identifies demographic and visit characteristics related to respondents' accomplishment of the exhibition objectives.

RK&A reviewed each respondent's interview data and rated the respondent's accomplishment of the exhibition objectives according to specific criteria. (See Illustration 1 on the next page for the Interview Scoring Rubric and page 4 for a description of the interview scoring procedure.) Based on the criteria for each objective, RK&A classified respondents' accomplishments of each objective into one of three categories: 1) Naïve-Misconception, 2) Developing, or 3) Accomplished. If the respondent's interview data did not address the objective or did not fall within the identified criteria, RK&A gave the respondent a "Non-response" score for that objective. (See Appendix K for Verbatim Examples of Indicators for Naïve-Misconception, Developing, and Accomplished responses for each exhibition objective.)

Illustration 1: AAA Race Are We So Different Exhibition Interview Scoring Rubric

Outcome Objectives				
Objective	Naïve/ Misconceptions (1)	Developing (2)	Accomplished (3)	Score
1. Visitors will understand that race is a human invention.	The visitor believes race is a biological fact, based on skin color or some other physical characteristics.	The visitor thinks that the categories of race are primarily based on culture, nationality, or some other non-physical characteristic. OR The visitor thinks that the categories of race are not real or do not make sense, but seems unsure and cannot provide evidence.	The visitor firmly believes that race is a human invention (or social construct) and backs up his/her belief with evidence.	
2. Visitors will understand that all humans are much more biologically alike than different, and having specific physical characteristics does not predispose one to unique abilities, diseases, or characteristics.	The visitor explains that distinct physical characteristics are the dividing lines for race. The visitor believes that being of a particular race predisposes individuals to unique abilities, diseases, and characteristics.	The visitor has a conflicted understanding; he/she explains that human beings are biologically and/or genetically the same, yet also believes that distinct physical characteristics predisposes individuals to unique abilities, diseases, and characteristics. OR The visitor has a superficial understanding and says simply, “we are all the same” without being able to elaborate.	The visitor explains that human beings are biologically and/or genetically the same but vary in their outward appearance, and s/he is able to provide evidence . The visitor understands that distinct physical characteristics have nothing to do with abilities, characteristics, or diseases.	
Outcome Objectives				
Objective	Naïve/ Misconceptions (1)	Developing (2)	Accomplished (3)	Score
3. Visitors will understand that racism is institutionalized in America.	The visitor blames societal inequities on something other than racism (i.e., religion or social class) and may view racism as an individual problem. Believes the solution to racism is that we “all need to get along.”	The visitor understands that racism is embedded in our everyday lives and institutions, but does not understand the implications at the societal level. Instead, the visitor talks about institutional racism as explicit discrimination or hate.	The visitor understands that racism is embedded in our everyday lives and institutions and can explain the implications of racism at the societal level (such as trends in the places we live; date and marry; things we buy; and sports we play).	
4. Visitors will realize that, in the U.S., race and racism affects his/her personal identity and how he/she thinks about and relates to others.	The visitor makes no personal connections to race or racism and denies that his or her identity has anything to do with racism, explaining that he/she is not a racist and does not support racism. (“buries head in sand”; “color blind”; “that it is someone else’s problem.”)	The visitor says that his/her identity is impacted by race and racism, but does not make connections between his/her experiences and the broader context of institutional racism (instead talks about it on a smaller scale, personal level).	The visitor explains that his/her identity is embedded within race and racism and situates this understanding with the broader context of institutional racism.	
Outcome Objectives				
Objective	Naïve/ Misconceptions (1)	Developing (2)	Accomplished (3)	Score
5. Visitors will leave the exhibition feeling energized by the thoughts and feelings they have experienced and will realize that their ideas of race, human variation and racism have changed. (NOT APPLICABLE FOR ENTRANCE INTERVIEWS)	The visitor does not display an emotional response to the exhibition and has little to say about it. The visitor interviewed by telephone weeks later can hardly recollect the experience or has a negative impression of the exhibition.	The visitor’s response to interview questions is thorough but does not go beyond what is required. The visitor does not express emotions brought up by the experience unless prompted. The visitor interviewed by telephone weeks later talks positively about the experience but has not followed up with anything beyond talking about it.	The visitor talks in-depth in response to interview questions and displays emotions brought up by the experience. For example, the visitor expresses an “Ah-ha” moment -- “I don’t look at people the same way.” The visitor interviewed by telephone weeks later talks excitedly about the exhibition and says he/she has followed up the experience doing further investigation on the topic (i.e., reading a book).	

EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE ONE: VISITORS WILL UNDERSTAND THAT RACE IS A HUMAN INVENTION.

Table 26 shows respondents’ ratings on Objective One, understanding that race is a human invention. The post-exhibition and telephone respondents have a more accomplished understanding of this objective than pre-exhibition respondents. Most pre-exhibition respondents have either a Naïve-Misconception rating (30 percent) or a Developing rating (47 percent). In contrast, the majority of post-exhibition respondents and telephone interview respondents have an Accomplished rating (both 63 percent).

TABLE 26
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE ONE BY INTERVIEW GROUP (IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> =160)	INTERVIEW GROUP			TOTAL
	PRE	POST	TELEPHONE	
	%	%	%	%
Naïve-Misconception	30	4	2	13
Developing	47	33	35	39
Accomplished	23	63	63	48

$\chi^2 = 34.684$; $df = 4$; $p = .000$

Respondents’ accomplishment of Exhibition Objective One was tested against demographic and visit characteristics (gender, age group, personal identity, visit group, first-repeat visit, time in the exhibition) to determine if any are related to respondents’ accomplishment of the objective. Only gender is significant. As Table 27 shows, males are more likely to have an accomplished understanding of this objective than females (62 percent and 39 percent, respectively).

TABLE 27
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE ONE BY GENDER (IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> =160)	GENDER		TOTAL
	MALE	FEMALE	
	%	%	%
Naïve-Misconception	15	12	13
Developing	23	49	39
Accomplished	62	39	48

$\chi^2 = 10.663$; $df = 2$; $p = .005$

EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE TWO: VISITORS WILL UNDERSTAND THAT ALL HUMANS ARE MUCH MORE ALIKE THAN DIFFERENT; HUMAN DIFFERENCES ARE A RESULT OF A UNIQUE COMBINATION OF GENES, ENVIRONMENT, AND EXPERIENCES AND BEING OF A PARTICULAR RACE DOES NOT PREDISPOSE ONE TO UNIQUE ABILITIES, DISEASES, OR CHARACTERISTICS.

Table 28 shows respondents’ ratings on Exhibition Objective Two, understanding that humans are much more alike than different. Post-exhibition and telephone respondents have a more accomplished understanding of this objective than pre-exhibition respondents. Two percent of pre-exhibition respondents have a rating of Accomplished, while 31 percent of post-exhibition respondents and 44 percent of telephone respondents have a rating of Accomplished.

TABLE 28
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE TWO BY INTERVIEW GROUP (IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> = 165)	INTERVIEW GROUP			
	PRE	POST	TELEPHONE	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%
Naïve-Misconception	8	0	2	4
Developing	90	69	54	73
Accomplished	2	31	44	23

$\chi^2 = 33.229$; *df* = 4; *p* = .000

Respondents’ accomplishment of Exhibition Objective Two was tested against demographic and visit characteristics (gender, age group, personal identity, visit group, first-repeat visit, time in the exhibition) to determine if any are related to respondents’ accomplishment of the objective. No significant relationships were found.

OBJECTIVE THREE: VISITORS WILL UNDERSTAND THAT RACISM IS INSTITUTIONALIZED IN AMERICA.

For Objective Three, understanding that racism is institutionalized in America, only respondents in the pre-exhibition and post-exhibition interview groups were rated. Respondents interviewed by telephone were not rated on this objective because the telephone interview guide did not address this issue directly (see Interview Guide in Appendix D).*

* The pre- and post-exhibition interviews included questions that addressed this objective directly. The pre-exhibition interview included the question, “In what ways, if any, do you see race or racism playing a role in our everyday lives in America?” and the post-exhibition interview included the question, “How did the exhibition affect the way you think about race and racism and their roles in everyday life and our society?” The telephone interview did not include any direct questions about this issue.

Table 29 shows pre- and post-exhibition respondents' ratings on Exhibition Objective Three, understanding that racism is institutionalized in America. The two groups have similar ratings on this objective; that is the two groups did not differ at a statistically significant level. Overall, 11 percent of pre- and post-exhibition respondents have a Naïve-Misconception rating, 45 percent have a Developing rating, and 44 percent have an Accomplished rating.

TABLE 29
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE THREE BY PRE-AND POST-EXHIBITION INTERVIEW GROUP
(IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> =110)	INTERVIEW GROUP		TOTAL
	PRE	POST	
	%	%	%
Naïve-Misconception	13	8	11
Developing	37	54	45
Accomplished	50	38	44

$\chi^2 = 3.432$; $df = 2$; $p > .05$

Pre- and post-exhibition respondents' accomplishment of Exhibition Objective Three was tested against demographic and visit characteristics (gender, age group, personal identity, visit group, first-repeat visit, time in the exhibition) to determine if any are related to respondents' accomplishment of the objective. Accomplishment of this objective is significantly associated with personal identity.

Respondents in both test groups who identified themselves as "White" have a less accomplished understanding of institutionalized racism than other respondents (see Table 30). Of respondents who identified themselves as "White," 31 percent have an Accomplished rating, 50 percent have a Developing rating, and 19 percent have a Naïve-Misconception rating. Of respondents from both test groups who identified themselves as "African American-Black/Other," 57 percent have an Accomplished rating, 43 percent have a Developing rating, and none has a Naïve-Misconception rating.

TABLE 30
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE THREE BY PERSONAL IDENTITY (IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> =101) PRE- AND POST-EXHIBITION GROUPS ONLY	PERSONAL IDENTITY		TOTAL
	WHITE	AFRICAN AMERICAN- BLACK/ OTHER IDENTITY ¹	
	%	%	
Naïve-Misconception	19	0	10
Developing	50	43	46
Accomplished	31	57	44

¹African American-Black/Other identity includes: African American-Black, Asian, Hispanic-Latino, Mixed Identity
 $\chi^2=12.892$; $df=2$; $p=.002$

OBJECTIVE FOUR: VISITORS WILL REALIZE THAT, IN THE U.S., RACE AND RACISM AFFECTS HIS/HER PERSONAL IDENTITY AND HOW HE/SHE THINKS ABOUT AND RELATES TO OTHERS.

Only respondents in the pre-exhibition and post-exhibition interview groups were rated on Objective Four, understanding how racism affects personal identity. Respondents interviewed by telephone were not rated on this objective because the telephone interview guide did not address this issue directly (see Interview Guide in Appendix D).*

Table 31 shows pre- and post-exhibition respondents’ ratings on Exhibition Objective Four. The results are similar in the pre-exhibition and post-exhibition groups. Overall, 30 percent of respondents have an Accomplished rating, 33 percent have a Developing rating and 37 percent have a Naïve-Misconception rating. Of the five Exhibition Objectives, this one has the highest percentage of respondents in the Naïve-Misconception category (37 percent overall).

TABLE 31
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE FOUR BY PRE-AND POST-EXHIBITION INTERVIEW GROUP
(IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> = 116)	INTERVIEW GROUP		TOTAL
	PRE	POST	
	%	%	%
Naïve-Misconception	34	40	37
Developing	38	27	33
Accomplished	28	33	30

$\chi^2 = 1.458; df = 2; p > .05$

Pre- and post-exhibition respondents’ accomplishment of Exhibition Objective Four was tested against demographic and visit characteristics (gender, age group, personal identity, visit group, first-repeat visit, time in the exhibition) to determine if any are related to respondents’ accomplishment of the objective. Accomplishment of this objective is significantly associated with age group and personal identity.

* The pre- and post-exhibition interviews included questions that addressed this objective directly. The pre-exhibition interview included the question, “In what ways, if any, does race affect you personally?” and the post-exhibition interview included the question, “How did the exhibition affect the way you think about yourself? About others?” The telephone interview did not include any direct questions about this issue.

Table 32 shows respondents' ratings on Exhibition Objective Four by age group. Younger respondents (under 30 years of age) in both test groups are more likely to have a Naïve understanding of how racism affects personal identity than either middle-aged (30 – 49 years) or older respondents (50+ years). More than one-half of younger respondents have a Naïve-Misconception rating on this objective (59 percent), compared to 30 percent of middle-aged respondents and 27 percent of older respondents.

TABLE 32
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE FOUR BY PERSONAL IDENTITY (IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> =116) PRE- AND POST-EXHIBITION GROUPS ONLY	AGE CATEGORY			TOTAL
	YOUNGER < 30 YEARS	MIDDLE-AGED 30 – 49 YEARS	OLDER 50+ YEARS	
	%	%	%	
Naïve-Misconception	59	30	27	37
Developing	22	38	35	33
Accomplished	19	32	38	30

$\chi^2 = 9.814$; $df = 4$; $p = .044$

Accomplishment of Objective Four is also associated with personal identity. Respondents from both test groups who identified themselves as “White” are more likely to have a Naïve-Misconception rating (48 percent) than other respondents (24 percent). Also, respondents in both test groups who identified themselves as “African American-Black/Other” are more likely have an Accomplished rating (40 percent) than respondents who identified themselves as “White” (23 percent) (see Table 33).

TABLE 33
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE FOUR BY PERSONAL IDENTITY (IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> =106) PRE- AND POST-EXHIBITION GROUPS ONLY	PERSONAL IDENTITY		TOTAL
	WHITE	AFRICAN AMERICAN- BLACK/ OTHER IDENTITY ¹	
	%	%	
Naïve-Misconception	48	24	37
Developing	29	36	32
Accomplished	23	40	31

¹African American-Black/Other identity includes: African American-Black, Asian, Hispanic-Latino, Mixed Identity
 $\chi^2 = 7.055$; $df = 2$; $p = .029$

EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE FIVE: VISITORS WILL LEAVE THE EXHIBITION FEELING ENERGIZED BY THE THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS THEY HAVE EXPERIENCED AND WILL REALIZE THAT THEIR IDEAS OF RACE, HUMAN VARIATION AND RACISM HAVE CHANGED.

Table 34 shows post-exhibition and telephone respondents’ ratings on Objective Five, feeling energized by the exhibition experience and realizing that one’s ideas of race and racism have changed. The results are very similar in the post-exhibition and telephone interview groups. Most respondents have a rating of either Developing (62 percent) or Accomplished (30 percent). Eight percent have a Naïve-Misconception rating.

TABLE 34
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE FIVE BY POST-EXHIBITION AND TELEPHONE INTERVIEW GROUPS (IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> =104)	INTERVIEW GROUP		TOTAL
	POST	TELEPHONE	
	%	%	%
Naïve-Misconception	7	9	8
Developing	63	62	62
Accomplished	30	29	30

$\chi^2 = 0.171$; *df* = 2; *p* > .05

Post-exhibition and telephone respondents’ accomplishment of Exhibition Objective Five was tested against demographic and visit characteristics (gender, age group, personal identity, visit group, first-repeat visit, time in the exhibition) to determine if any are related to respondents’ accomplishment of the objective. Once again, accomplishment of the objective is significantly associated with personal identity.

It is interesting to note that, regardless of personal identity, the majority of respondents have a Developing rating on this objective (56 percent of “White” respondents and 67 percent of “African American-Black/Other” respondents). Nonetheless, respondents from both test groups who identified themselves as “White” are more likely to have a Naïve-Misconception rating on this objective than respondents who identified themselves as “African American-Black/Other” (15 percent and 0 percent, respectively) (see Table 35).

TABLE 35
EXHIBITION OBJECTIVE FIVE BY PERSONAL IDENTITY (IN PERCENT)

RATING CATEGORY (<i>n</i> = 97) (POST-EXHIBITION AND TELEPHONE GROUPS ONLY)	PERSONAL IDENTITY		TOTAL
	WHITE	AFRICAN AMERICAN-BLACK/OTHER IDENTITY ¹	
	%	%	
Naïve-Misconception	15	0	8
Developing	56	67	61
Accomplished	29	33	31

¹African American-Black/Other identity includes: African American-Black, Asian, Hispanic-Latino, Mixed Identity
 $\chi^2 = 6.993$; *df* = 2; *p* = .030

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS III: EXIT INTERVIEWS

RK&A conducted in-depth interviews in April 2007 with people who visited *Race Are We So Different?* after they exited the exhibition. Of 59 interviewees, 29 visited the exhibition at the Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM), while 30 visited it at the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History (MAAH).

VISITOR DEMOGRAPHICS

Overall, male interviewees (53 percent) outnumbered female interviewees (47 percent). The median age of interviewees was 40. More than one-half (53 percent) of all interviewees had visited in a group of adults only (18 and older). Slightly less than one-quarter (22 percent) visited in a group of adults and children while almost an equal number (19 percent) visited alone. Among the interviewees who visited the exhibition at SMM, about one-half (52 percent) were repeat visitors to the Museum, whereas nearly three-quarters (70 percent) of MAAH visitors interviewed were first-time museum visitors.

REASONS FOR VISITING THE EXHIBITION

RK&A asked interviewees their reasons for visiting the exhibition. Most interviewees—both at SMM and MAAH—indicated that they happened upon the exhibition during their visit rather than specifically visiting *Race Are We So Different?* Many interviewees said the exhibition's title and topic were provocative and they were interested in finding out more about the exhibition (see the first quotation below). In addition, several interviewees at SMM said the newspaper publicity about the exhibition piqued their interest, including one interviewee who indicated the exhibition's sponsorship by the American Anthropological Association was a draw (see the second quotation).

I saw the title and a picture with all the different faces morphed into one face. I was curious what [the exhibition] had to say about race. [MAAH: male, 25]

[What about the exhibition made you want to see it?] The publicity in the paper brought it to our attention. The outside sponsorship by the Anthropological Society with the Science Museum made it sound like it was a good, well-invested effort. [SMM: female, 58]

Some interviewees who identified themselves as students said they came to see the exhibition either with a class or for a history or political science course assignment. A few interviewees indicated that they visited the exhibition because of the topic's personal relevance (see the first and second quotations below). Two interviewees said they visited the exhibition as a workplace diversity training because they work at "racially diverse" schools or other not-for-profit organizations (see the third quotation).

I'm interested...just because I'm black. I experience firsthand how racism plays out in the world. [MAAH: female, 65]

[The exhibition] seemed interesting to me. I date interracially, and in a city like Detroit, I find a lot of conflicts around that. People have actually made comments on the street about being a white woman dating a black man. I attend a university that prides itself on issues of diversity, and yet...there still seems to be some barriers around interracial relationships. . . . I wanted to see if that was addressed here. [MAAH: female, 39]

I work for a non-profit organization that is in racially diverse inner-city schools. Our group came to learn more about the topic [of race]. [SMM: female, 23]

REACTIONS TO THE *RACE ARE WE SO DIFFERENT?* EXHIBITION

OVERALL OPINIONS OF THE EXHIBITION

When asked their overall opinion of *Race Are We so Different?*, most interviewees responded favorably to the exhibition, using terms including “excellent,” “well done,” “interesting,” and “informative.” Many interviewees said the exhibition made them think differently about the concept of race (see the first and second quotations below). Moreover, some interviewees said they appreciated the diverse personal and academic perspectives represented in the exhibition (see the third and fourth quotations).

(Overall, what’s your opinion of the exhibition?) I thought it was excellent. I will definitely tell everyone I know to come see this. It made me think a lot more about what race is and even if I want to use that word. I really do not want to. I want to throw that word [race] out of the dictionary. [SMM: female, 22]

I think the exhibition is very well planned and informative. . . . It helped debunk a lot of stereotypes and social constructions of race that I and some of my friends are familiar with. It broke it down into scientific terms. [MAAH: female, 23]

I think it [the exhibition] was good. It gives you a diversity of cultures and backgrounds. Although this is an African American museum, it’s not centered just on the African American perspectives. You get the perspective on everybody’s background. [MAAH: male, 36]

I liked the different perspectives—the different fields of biology, sociology, and the implications of American history and law, and the income distribution and housing disparity. . . . It was cool. It touched on how race affects all aspects of life. [SMM: female, 22]

Some interviewees praised the exhibition’s video content and the use of multimedia (see the first quotation below). However, a few SMM interviewees said there were not enough hands-on, interactive exhibits in the exhibition (see the second and third quotations).

[The exhibition] is a good mixture. Being able to just read and sometimes watch a video and sometimes more actively participate adds variety and helps communicate more of the exhibit. [SMM: female, 58]

I thought there was a little too much video of people talking and not enough things where you look at your skin tone in the camera and other stuff you could do. [SMM: male, 55]

I do not like to read big blocks [of text]. I would rather interact with things. There was too much reading involved. It would be more fun if it was interactive. [SMM: female, 20]

MOST INTERESTING ASPECTS OF THE EXHIBITION

RK&A asked interviewees which aspects of the exhibition interested them most. Interviewees' responses included exhibits from each of the three main content areas in the exhibition (Human Variation, History, and Contemporary Experience). Interviewees' cited five exhibits most frequently, including the How Do You Experience Race? video, the What's Race Got to Do with It? high school lunchroom video, the Who's Talking? linguistic profiling interactive, the Hapa Project image panels, and the history of slavery outlined in the Creating Race and Inventing Whiteness exhibits.

Many interviewees used terms such as “compelling” and “insightful” to describe the How Do You Experience Race? video and indicated that the stories were personally relevant (see the first quotation below). Similarly, some interviewees said they could personally relate to the What's Race Got to Do with It? video and the Who's Talking? exhibit (see the second and third quotations). When asked why the Hapa Project was most interesting, several interviewees said that the exhibit reinforced the lesson not to make assumptions about a person's ethnic background (see the fourth quotation). Several interviewees said the “history of slavery” exhibits were “informative” and cited the slave shackles and Jim Crow era segregation artifacts as most interesting (see the fifth quotation).

On the far side there is a large video screen with several people talking about their personal experiences. Those people talking were the most interesting part [of the exhibition]. I spent more time there than anywhere else. I could relate to a lot of those stories, but I suspect a lot of people who are in the majority haven't got a clue how this all [racism] affects other people. [SMM: female, 58]

I like the interviews with the teens. (Why were those most interesting?) I do not know. Maybe just because it is sort of my reality. I teach ESL in St. Paul schools. [SMM: female, 42]

That one [exhibit] about telling the race of people by their voices was interesting because I have had to deal with that [linguistic profiling] myself. I work in social service, and people often think I am white when they hear me on the phone. And then when they meet me, they are like, ‘Oh.’ [MAAH: female, 57]

I liked the portraits of all the different people where you see that they are not one race but a blend of different backgrounds. (Why do you think you like that one the most?) Because it shows you cannot judge a book by its cover. [SMM: female, 10]

I saw those plaques that said “whites here” and “blacks here” and those chains [shackles], and I wondered to myself why people actually [en]slaved other people? I think nobody should be nobody's slaves—period. [MAAH: female, 20]

Some interviewees said they enjoyed the interactive elements of the exhibition including looking at their skin under the microscope at the Does Skin Color Equal Race? (Colors We Are) exhibit and taking their blood pressure in the Pharmacy area (see the first quotation). A few interviewees said they found the racial categorization in the How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? image interesting (see the second quotation). Others offered idiosyncratic responses when asked what interested them most about the exhibition: one interviewee said the How Are People Like Avocados? text panel “drove home the point that categorization is subjective.” One interviewee said the “baby doll test” in the video entitled *A Girl Like Me* was “fascinating” and “heart-breaking.”

I liked all the [exhibits] where you could actually do something like see your skin under the microscope, take your blood pressure, rotate that dial and see those dots move—you know, the interactive stuff. [SMM: male, 34]

I guess the most interesting thing to me was seeing how people are categorized by different races throughout time. Like on the t-shirts in that big photo. [MAAH: female, 25]

UNDERSTANDING OF EXHIBITION CONTENT

CONVEYING THE MAIN MESSAGE

RK&A asked interviewees what they thought *Race Are We So Different?* is trying to show visitors. Most said the main message of the exhibition is that we are all human and more alike than we are different. When asked what in the exhibition best conveyed that message, interviewees cited several exhibits including the What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You? interactive, the Hapa Project installation, and the Science of Skin. A few also mentioned “DNA exhibits” without being specific (see the three quotations below).

I think it is trying to show that we are really all a lot more alike than we think. (What in the exhibition best conveyed that idea to you?) The one [exhibit] where they showed a bunch of different people's pictures and you had to push a button, and it showed what they have alike like blood type and stuff. [SMM: male, 15]

It's really just saying we are really not that different. We are really only one race, and our differences have to do with like vitamin D and the climate our ancestors are from. We all came from the same place, and we adapted in different ways. We may look different on the outside like all those photographs of the mixture of different looking people [Hapa Project], but on the inside those people, like you and me, are the same. [MAAH: female, 21]

It is showing us that we may look different, but we are not in the long run. We have different skin colors, but, like if you look under the microscope, they are really not that different. You may consider someone to be black, but somewhere else they may be white. It is like the avocado they were talking about in that poster. [SMM: female, 42]

Many interviewees also went on to say that the exhibition is trying to show that race is socially constructed or invented. Interviewees cited a range of Human Variation, History, and Contemporary Experiences exhibits when asked which exhibits best conveyed the main message (see the two quotations below).

I think the exhibition is trying to say that race is kind of an abstract creation. It is a fluid concept that we kind of artificially put on people. . . . I think it is more of a social abstract than any thing cemented in real facts. (What in the exhibition best conveyed that to you?) I think the exhibits that talked about the history of race and the migration of skin colors. Also the personal perspectives in the videos. [SMM: female, 22].

If you want to boil it down to just a few things, then I think the main point is that race is not inherited. It is a social construction. But even though it is artificially construct, it does really exist—it is a real, felt experience for people. . . . (What in the exhibition best conveyed that point?) It was a combination of things—the history, the videos, all of that. I think it is good

there are different media being used. Because some people respond to visual things and others respond better to oral things. [MAAH: female, 52]

Some said the exhibition was trying to promote racial tolerance and respect for diversity and that the personal stories in the exhibition helped reinforce that message (see the first quotation below). Additionally, some said the exhibition is trying to show that race is not about the color of one's skin, and is based, instead, on the arbitrary categorization of people. A few interviewees said that the Who's White? computer survey best helped communicate that message (see the second quotation).

(What do you think this exhibition is trying to show or tell visitors?) That it does not really matter what color a person's skin is. We all have things in common as well as differences, and we need to try and respect and understand that. Understand our differences. Accept each other. We are all human. (What in the exhibition best conveyed that to you?) The group of youths dialoging in the cafeteria. They were trying to understand each other. . . . When you discuss things with each other and see each other as individuals, that is where the understanding comes from and [where] mutual respect [comes from]. [MAAH: female, 54]

I guess it is saying that race is more than just color. It is viewed as just color, but that is not a very accurate way to categorize people. People are from mixed cultures like black and white and Asian and white, and we can't really label people. (What in the exhibition best conveyed that to you?) It was one of those computerized [exhibits] where you guess if people are white. At the end it shows that there are no right and wrong answers. It is hard to categorize different cultures in terms of race. [MAAH: female, 25]

Several said the exhibitions' main message was about the inequities in our society and institutional racism (see the quotation below).

It is showing that there is a lot more we and the government can do to equalize things. I did not know about the GI bill and stuff like that. I knew there were housing issues with mortgages and the like, but I did not realize how prevalent it is. [Discrimination] is really woven into how the system works. We still have a long way to go to make a more even base for people. (What in the exhibition best conveyed that message to you?) Probably the area where there were stacks of money with the mortgage stuff and the GI Bill and so forth. [SMM: male, 42].

A few interviewees said the point of the exhibition is to encourage visitors to question their assumptions about race by presenting firsthand accounts of people's experiences of racism (see the first quotation below). Others commented that everything in the exhibition helped encourage visitors to think differently about race (see the second quotation).

It is trying to make visitors question their assumptions [about race] and confront them with things they might not have ever experienced personally. (What in the exhibition best conveyed that to you?) A lot of things were first person like the video of people talking about their experiences. . . . It invites you to kind of get into it yourself. [MAAH: female, 42]

What it was about was for people to look at race and say, 'You thought this is what it was? Well, think again. Let me give you a little history and then tell me what you think [race is].' (Was there anything in particular that conveyed that message to you?) The entire thing as a whole. The way it was put together, and the sequence of exhibits. . . . I would ask myself something at one station and then at another say, 'Hold on a second! That ties in with that, so then let me ask myself this.' It all unfolds. [SMM: female, 22]

A few interviewees simply said the exhibition was “about race.” In contrast, a few interviewees offered the more specific message that “we all came from Africa,” which they said they gleaned from the *How Are We Alike and Different?* (African Origins) interactive exhibit.

USE OF AND RESPONSES TO SCIENCE EXHIBITS

RK&A asked interviewees to describe some of the science exhibits they visited in the exhibition and how those exhibits may have affected their understanding of race. Most interviewees described specific interactive exhibits in the *Science of Human Variation* area including *How Are We Alike and Different?* (African Origins), *Why Do We Come in Different Colors?* (Science of Skin), *Does Skin Color Equal Race?* (Colors We Are), *What Does a Person’s Appearance Really Tell You?*, and *Not for Blacks Only* (Sickle Cell) exhibit. However, many interviewees did not delineate the exhibition into three distinct content areas; rather, they referred to components throughout the exhibition as science exhibits including the Human (Mis)Measurement video and text panels in the History section and the Pharmacy and High Blood Pressure exhibits in the Contemporary Experiences section. Some interviewees indicated that they did not stop at the science-related exhibits due to lack of interest or lack of awareness that the exhibition included science exhibits (see the three quotations below).

(Can you recall any of the science exhibits you saw?) The medical area [Pharmacy] is, I guess, where the science comes in. I wish there was more of it [science]. I really wish there was more discussion about genetics. [SMM: male, 58]

To tell you the truth, I was not that interested in the science. I am more interested in the political stuff and what is happening in the world now. [MAAH: female, 24]

I did not see any of the science ones. (They were mostly on this wall here [points to the human variation section].) We kind of just went through the middle [of the exhibition] and back around. We did not spend that much time. [SMM: male, 38]

Of the Human Variation exhibits, interviewees cited African Origins most frequently as affecting their understanding of race. Most interviewees who said they stopped at African Origins reiterated the message that the human species originated in Africa. Of those interviewees, many said that humans are genetically more alike than they are different (see the first quotation below). Additionally, a few interviewees’ comments indicated that they gleaned an understanding that genetic variation in populations such as Europeans and Asians are subsets of the variation in the African population (see the second quotation). In contrast, a few interviewees’ responses revealed that they held the misconception that humans evolved from one race in Africa into many different races around the world (see the third quotation).

The science piece helped me see that we are all related to each other. The concept of race does not add up; it’s under a false pretense that cannot be backed up scientifically. (Which exhibit helped you understand that?) The one about the black woman being the mother of all people in the world. That exhibit shows that genes originated in Africa and . . . spread across the globe. [MAAH: male, 53]

I noticed that the colors of the dots become less diverse as they spread. . . . In Australia, for example, there are mainly blue dots whereas Africa has lots of [different] colored dots. I guess I always assumed there is less genetic diversity in Africa because most Africans are black skinned. [SMM: female, 20]

(Can you tell me about some of the science exhibits you visited in the exhibition?) I have seen an exhibit where they have shown how race has evolved from first being African to being African American. . . . Where you see the evolution of different regions and the effect that had as far as race. Basically every race evolved from Africans. [MAAH: male, 25]

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS IV: TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

RK&A conducted telephone interviews in May 2007 with people who visited *Race Are We So Different?* in April 2007 and completed a screener form upon exiting the exhibition. Of 50 interviewees, 25 visited the exhibition at the Science Museum of Minnesota (SMM), while 25 visited it at the Charles H. Wright Museum of African American History (MAAH).

VISITOR DEMOGRAPHICS

Overall, female interviewees (74 percent) outnumbered male interviewees (26 percent). The median age of interviewees was 44. Among the interviewees who visited the exhibition at SMM, most (76 percent) were repeat visitors to the Museum; in contrast, more than two-thirds (68 percent) of the MAAH visitors interviewed were first-time visitors.

MOST INTERESTING ASPECTS OF THE EXHIBITION

When conducting the post-visit telephone interviews, RK&A asked interviewees what aspects of the exhibition interested them most. Telephone interviewees most frequently cited *The How Do You Experience Race?* personal stories video, the *What's Race Got to Do with It?* high school lunchroom video, and the Hapa Project image panels. Many interviewees described the personal stories shared in the *The How Do You Experience Race?* video as “moving” and “compelling.” Others noted that the personal stories touched on issues of racism encountered every day (see the first quotation below). Similarly, some interviewees who identified themselves as either teachers or parents said they have witnessed their students and children grapple with the types of identity issues presented in the *What's Race Got to Do with It?* video (see the second quotation). A few interviewees who identified themselves as “multi-racial” said they could identify with the comments presented in the Hapa Project installation and personal videos (see the third quotation). One interviewee said she appreciated that the exhibition created a safe environment in which to discuss personal experiences of racism (see the fourth quotation).

I like the film clip that interviewed the students and then the others that featured adults in the community like one young woman who was a Korean adoptee. . . . I am a refugee myself, and some of it brought back memories of what happened to me when I first came here. I think the [videos] really bring out the issue of race and just the different things we face every day. [SMM: female, 42]

I liked how they had all different colors and races represented in the exhibition. I liked the part where they had the kids from high school talking about what lunch table they sit at. (Why do you think that was memorable?) Probably because I am a teacher, and I work at a very diverse school. But still there is the black table and the white table. It is sad but true. [MAAH: female, 36]

(What aspects of the exhibition interested you the most?) Well, the one with all the photos on the wall was really great. I could definitely relate to it because I am mixed. I appreciated the feeling of belonging [the exhibit] created. [SMM: female, 26]

The videos of the experiences of racial minorities. That was really fascinating to me. Being white, it is difficult to ask how people [of color] feel without fear of hurting or offending them. So it was great that it [the exhibition] was a safe environment where people could share their experiences and you could get your questions answered. [SMM: female, 50]

Some interviewees said they found the Who's Talking? linguistic profiling interactive, the Colors We Are skin exhibit, and the What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You? interactive interesting and said that they were surprised by the inaccuracy of their responses when trying to determine race by physical or auditory features (see the first and second quotations below). Additionally, a few said the Pharmacy exhibits were interesting, particular the controversy over developing racially targeted medicine (see the third quotation).

What was most interesting was the one [exhibit] where you had to guess the voice. That one really surprised me because the woman with a Jamaican accent ended up being the Korean woman. It is so weird how you cannot really identify people over the phone. It really freaked me out because I was figuring out for myself how I treat people differently because of the way they look and sound. [MAAH: female, 16]

I liked the pictures of different people's skin colors . . . where you could see the continuum of colors. It was hard to tell my color amidst the others. And the exhibit about trying to match people's features with a certain race was fascinating. I was surprised how inaccurate I was. My kids liked that [exhibit] too. It was conversation provoking. [SMM: female, 45]

The area where they were talking about medicine and race was interesting. I am in the animal medical field. I find it funny that we totally profile animal based on breed and how certain breed are predisposed to certain things. But when you start talking about that with the human race, then people are a little more sensitive. [SMM: female, 50]

UNDERSTANDING OF EXHIBITION CONTENT

CONVEYING THE MAIN MESSAGE

When asked what they thought *Race Are We So Different?* is trying to show visitors, most interviewees said the main message of the exhibition is that humans are all one race and are more similar than different. The What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You? interactive, the face-morphing video installation, the Why Do We Come in Different Colors? exhibit, and the African Origins interactive were the elements interviewees said best conveyed that message in the exhibition (see the three quotations below).

(What do you think this exhibition is trying to show or tell visitors?) That skin color does not make a difference. I mean, we are all the same. And we are equal. We are all just human. (What in the exhibition best conveyed that message to you?) Well, I guess a few things stand out. There was that map of the world that explains why white and black people have different colored skin and how it is related to their closeness to the Sun. And that one about us being African—that Adam and Eve were African. Oh, and then the last thing might be the faces that change into each other. [SMM: female, 49]

I think [the exhibition] is trying to show that we are not as different as we think. . . . (What in the exhibition best conveyed that idea to you?) The one [exhibit] that shows how we all started

out in Africa and then expanded. And then there was the bit about how we adapted to sunlight and that is why we have different skin colors. [SMM: female, 19]

Basically, we are all the same. We are all human. (What in the exhibition best conveyed that point?) When they gave that test. That is what really got me. There was this test that showed different parts of people and you had to guess what race they were. I got everyone wrong, which I think might have been the point. [MAAH: female, 50]

Many interviewees went on to say that the entire exhibition conveys the message that race is a socially constructed concept (see the first quotations below). Moreover, some said the exhibition was trying to point out that racism is institutionalized in American society as illustrated by the personal stories presented in the exhibition, *A Girl Like Me* and the *What's Race Got to Do with It?* videos (see the second and third quotations).

I think the whole exhibition is trying to communicate the idea that race is socially constructed concept and that it is really important that our society start to sit down and talk about these issues. . . . (What in the exhibition best conveyed that idea to you?) Well, the film at the beginning that talks about the history of race and then the video clips of different professors and specialists talking about their ideas on the concept of race and how it has influenced their lives. [SMM: male, 44].

(What do you think this exhibition is trying to show or tell visitors?) Even though race really does not exist, it does. (What in the exhibition best conveyed that to you?) People's stories. The experiences of the kids in the cafeteria. Their confusion about who they were and who they fit in with. That really helped me see how some people's lives have been affected by race. [SMM: female, 52]

The exhibit is trying to show that race is still part of the American experience even though it should not be. The vignettes [videos] really point out how race affects peoples' everyday lives. [MAAH: female, 45]

Additionally, a few interviewees said the point of the exhibition is to provoke conversation and encourage visitors to reevaluate their misconceptions about race (see the first quotation below). Two interviewees indicated that they thought the aim of the exhibition was to make white people feel guilty about the inequities people of color experience in American society (see second quotation).

I think it [the exhibition] was trying to make people reevaluate their way of thinking about race and ethnicity. And maybe to have people realize that they do have prejudices even though they may think they do not. [MAAH: female, 25]

I got the point [the exhibition] was trying to show that there are not any differences between us biologically speaking. But then it turned around and showed the stacks of money and how wealth is distributed, and it almost felt like the exhibit was trying to make me feel guilty about being white. Like that white people have all the money. There is something about that that really bothered me. [SMM: female, 50]

USE OF AND RESPONSES TO SCIENCE EXHIBITS

Interviewees asked interviewers to describe some of the science exhibits they visited in the exhibition and how those exhibits may have affected their understanding of race. One-half of the telephone

interviewees said they could not specifically remember any of the science exhibits in *Race Are We So Different?* (see the first quotation below), which is not surprising given the amount of time that had passed since their visits. Of those interviewees who could recall examples of science in the exhibition, several cited African Origins and indicated that this exhibit helped reinforce the message that humans originated in Africa and are genetically more alike than different (see the second quotation). Additionally, some interviewees mentioned the Science of Skin microscope interactive and said that from this exhibit they gleaned the message that humans are more alike than different (see the third quotation).

Oh, god, I really cannot remember any of the science exhibits. It has been awhile since I was there [at the exhibition], and it is all a little fuzzy. [MAAH: female, 45]

(Can you tell me about some of the science exhibits you visited?) Let's see. You know the one that shows we can all be traced back to one ancestor, one woman? The genes in everyone can be traced back to one common ancestor. And that map shows that there are a lot of similarities between us even though we are scattered all over the world. [MAAH: female, 50]

I remember on the right as you walk in [the exhibition], there was that microscope and the explanation that peoples' skin color has to do with living near the sun over a long period of time. (Can you tell me how those science exhibits affected your understanding of race?) Yeah, they show that we are much more alike than we are different. [SMM: male, 44]

Some interviewees referred to what they described as "medical" exhibits including Sickle Cell and High Blood Pressure. A few interviewees indicated that the Sickle Cell exhibit conveyed the message that diseases are not racially determined (see the first quotation below). Additionally, a few interviewees noted the High Blood Pressure exhibit helped them understand the relationship between race and disease (see the second quotation). However, a few interviewees noted the controversy presented in the Pharmacy exhibits about the appropriateness of race-based medicine (see the third quotation).

(Can you recall any of the science exhibits you saw?) There were the ones that talk about malaria and sickle cell anemia, which I thought were very interesting. (In what ways, if any, did they affect your understanding of race?) People developed based on where their ancestors lived. You might be more susceptible to sickle cell anemia if you grew up in Africa where there is a lot of malaria. And then so, your race does not have to do with what kind of diseases you get. It really depends on where you lived or where your ancestors are from. [SMM: male, 44]

I guess the medical ones were science exhibits like about blood pressure and diabetes. Diseases like hypertension are not really genetic but are, you know, environmental. Black people in Africa do not have much high blood pressure like we do here. It is a cultural thing. It is stressful being an African American. [MAAH: female, 52]

That Pharmacy study comes to mind. The one that was talking about the implications of creating medicine for different races. . . . It really brings up issues of whether race based medicine is okay. If the medicine is more effective at treating heart diseases in certain populations, then I guess that brings the whole thing into question. [SMM: male, 31]

IMPACT OF THE EXHIBITION

DISCUSSION OF RACISM

Most interviewees said they had discussed the topics of race or racism since they visited the exhibition. Many said they talked to people about *Race Are We So Different?* and encouraged them to visit the exhibition (see the first and second quotations below). Additionally, some interviewees indicated that they discussed multi-racial issues influenced by the face-morphing artwork, the *How Do You Experience Race?* video, and the *What's Race Got to Do with It?* high school lunchroom video (see the third and fourth quotations).

I was talking to some folks about the Civil Rights and suggested that they see the exhibit. I felt that there were some facts that blacks who have grown up in the North have no appreciation for in terms of the Civil Rights issues that came up in the South. [MAAH: female, 65]

(In the time since you visited the exhibition, have you discussed race or racism with anyone?) Black people talk about race all the time. (What did you talk about?) I talked about the exhibit and how impressed I was. I talked about how the [exhibits] were able to show that we're all the same. [MAAH: female, 40]

(In the time since you visited the exhibition, have you discussed race or racism with anyone?) Nearly every day. For example, just this morning I had a postcard from the exhibit with the different faces that are put together in a collage. . . . My nine-year old daughter noticed it and asked me about it. So we talked about the different faces and the overall message. She is multi-racial, so she can relate to that image. [MAAH: female, 45]

My kids are both from Korea; they are adopted. . . . That incident with the Virginia Tech gunman really stirred up the South Korean community. . . . I know two [children] have talked with me about it. It is interesting; we really did not talk much about all of this [race] when they were little, but now it comes up a lot. The videos in the exhibit of people sharing their stories sparked a lot of honest communication around here. [SMM: female, 52]

A few interviewees said they participated in formal discussion groups about race after attending the exhibition (see the first quotation below). A few interviewees said they had conversation in their workplace about race after visiting the exhibition (see the second quotation).

Well, I am an orientation leader for a local university, and we all do different cultural immersion groups. My group went to the *Race Are We So Different?* exhibit and afterwards we had interesting discussions on race and that it is socially created, but how it really defines people in terms of socio-economic class. And we talked about how racism is still prevalent today even in our educational system. [SMM: female, 22]

I am an EMT, so [race] comes up a lot at work. We see a lot of heavy stuff and a lot of inequities in terms of who has access to medical care and drugs, and violence. The list goes on and on. [SMM: male, 34]

RESEARCH OF THE TOPIC

The interviewers asked interviewees if they had searched out more information on race or racism since they visited the *Race Are We So Different?* exhibition. Most interviewees said they had not; however, a few interviewees from both SMM and MAAH said they had. A few said they researched information on

race for a school assignment (see the first and second quotations below). The rest gave idiosyncratic answers: One interviewee said her visit to the exhibition inspired her to register for a college course that focused on the issues of racism in America. One interviewee said the What's Race Got to Do with It? video in the exhibition prompted her to research information about racial identity and to purchase a book entitled *Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?*. One interviewee who said she was in the process of adopting a child from Korea said the How Do You Experience Race? video in the exhibition prompted her to research the issues of adopted children raised in multi-racial families.

(In the time that has passed since you visited the *Race Are We So Different* exhibition, have you searched out more information on race or racism?) Yeah, actually, I have. I decided to do a school project for one of my classes on the health disparities in communities of color. . . (What aspects of the *Race Are We So Different* exhibition prompted you to research that topic?) The biological aspects of the exhibit, especially the pharmaceutical ones. Like the ones about high blood pressure and certain drugs. [SMM: female, 21]

I wrote a paper on the 'one drop rule' and the stratification of race in Brazil and how people based on their profession were considered white. Like a person who would be considered black in America would be considered white there, if they were, say, a lawyer. For instance, Tiger Woods is as Asian as he is African American, but the media pegged him as black. So I researched that kind of thing. (What aspect of the exhibition prompted you to research that topic?) That piece [video] in the exhibit about the doll test—that one that talked about identity of African American girls. . . . There was also a poster that talked about how they categorize race in Brazil. [MAAH: male, 22]

USE OF WEB SITE

When asked if they were aware that there is a Web site (www.understandingrace.org) associated with the exhibition, about two-thirds of the SMM interviewees said yes. In contrast, nearly every MAAH interviewee said they were aware of the Web site. Of those interviewees who said they were aware of the *Race Are We So Different?* Web site, most interviewees said they had not visited it and cited lack of time as their reason (see the first quotation below). One interviewee said she had not visited the Web site because the topic of race was not a pertinent issue to her (see the second quotation).

(Is there any particular reason you had not visited the Web site?) I am just totally swamped all the time. Between the laundry, groceries, and the screaming kids, I really do not have time to surf the Web. [SMM: female, 40]

No, I have not looked at it [the Web site]. Race has not really been a big issue to me. It is not something I am focused on. I am not saying racism does not exist and that I have not been discriminated against. . . . I guess I just look at it from a different perspective. God does not distinguish race, and I do not either. [MAAH: female, 52]

Of those few interviewees who said they had visited the *Race Are We So Different?* Web site, all responded favorably, using terms including “excellent,” “well done,” and “comprehensive” to describe the site. Most interviewees who had visited the site said they did so before they visited the physical exhibition to prepare for their visit (see the first quotation below). One interviewee, who commented that he liked the organization of the Web site, said he visited the site to do research for a school assignment (see the second quotation). One interviewee she said “breezed through” the Web site after reading about it in the SMM membership newsletter.

(Have you visited the Web site?) Yes, I did before I went to see the exhibit. I was bringing a group and wanted to know what to expect. (In what way did the Web site compliment your experience with the exhibit in the Museum?) It introduced the things and just sort of prepared me. [SMM: female, 45]

Yeah, I checked it [the Web site] out. I was doing a paper for my class about the stuff in the exhibit. (What was your opinion of the Web site?). I thought it summed the whole thing up pretty well. I liked how they had different paths to follow—like one for students and one for researchers. [SMM: male, 19]

APPENDICES

SOME APPENDICES REMOVED FOR PROPRIETARY PURPOSES

APPENDIX F

LIST OF STATISTICAL ANALYSES RUN ON THE *RACE ARE WE SO DIFFERENT* TIMING AND TRACKING DATA

ANOVA

Gender		Total time
Ages (4 groups)		Total stops
Visiting with children		Total stops made in each section of the exhibition
Prior visits to <i>Race Are We So Different</i>	x	Total time spent in each section of the exhibition
Level of crowding		Time spent at each type of exhibit
		Total stops made at each type of exhibit
		Total incidence of each behavior
Time of visit (AM or PM)	x	Total time
		Total stops

Chi-square Statistic

Gender		
Ages (4 groups)		Total number of sections visited (3 groups)
Visiting with children		Incidence of each behavior
Prior visits to <i>Race Are We So Different</i>	x	Use of each type of exhibit
Level of crowding		

APPENDIX G

STATISTICS RUN ON RUBRIC DATA

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

CATEGORICAL VARIABLES: FREQUENCIES

Exhibition site (SMM, MAAH)
Interview group (Pre-exhibition, Post-exhibition, Telephone)
Gender (Male, Female)
Age - 6 categories (<20 years, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60 or more years)
Age - 3 categories (<30, 30-49, 50+)
Personal identity (African American-Black, Asian, White, Hispanic-Latino, Mixed)
Personal identity - 2 categories (White, African American-Black and all Others)
Visit group (Solo adult, 2+ adults, Adults and children)
First-Repeat visit (First, Repeat)
Exhibition time (<30 minutes, 30-59, 60-89, 90-119, 120+ minutes)
Category rating of exhibition objectives (Naïve-Misconception, Developing, Accomplished)

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

INTERVAL VARIABLES: MEAN, MEDIAN, STANDARD DEVIATION

Age (in years)
Self-reported time in the exhibition (in minutes)

INFERENCE STATISTICS

CROSSTABS

Interview group		
Gender		
Age - 3 categories	by	Exhibition site
Personal identity - 2 categories		
Visit group		
First-Repeat visit		
Category rating of exhibition objectives	by	Interview group Gender Age - 3 categories Personal identity - 2 categories Visit group First-Repeat visit

INFERENCE STATISTICS

ANOVAS

Age in years		
Self-reported time in the exhibition	by	Exhibition site
Self-reported time in the exhibition	by	Gender Age - 3 categories Personal identity - 2 categories Visit group First-Repeat visit Category rating of exhibition objectives

APPENDIX H

Listed below are descriptions used by visitors when asked to describe their racial or ethnic background. In order to present the general demographic make-up of *Race Are We So Different* visitors at each site, RK&A

loosely categorized visitor responses into five standard groups: White/European, African American/Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, American Indian, and Other/Mixed/Unknown.

SMM VISITOR DESCRIPTIONS OF RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND (N=97)

White/European

White (21)
Caucasian (10)
Norwegian (3)
Caucasian, white (2)
German (2)
European Mix (2)
White: German, Irish
White, Irish, German, Scotch
Swedish, Norwegian
Russian, Jewish, Irish, German
Polish, Swedish, Norwegian, Irish
Irish, German, English, European
Irish, Bohemian, German
German, Scandinavian
German, Jewish, Welsh, Swedish, Irish
French, German
French, English, Scotch
Europe, Denmark, Sweden
Irish-American
European American
White privileged American
European/Caucasian
Scandinavian
Northern European
European
Czech
White/Caucasian
Mixed-white

Asian/Pacific Islander

Chinese (2)
Mixed, Shen, Burmese, Korean
Vietnamese-American
Asian American
Indian/Asian
Asian/Pacific Islander
Asian
Chinese
Hmong

African American/Black

African American (4)
Kenyan-American
African
Black
Kisii

Hispanic/Latino

Hispanic (3)

American Indian

South American Indian

Other/Mixed/Unknown

Mixed (2)
Bi-racial (African American & White)
Asian-American, White
Norwegian, Native American
Korean, white
Irish, Swedish, Norwegian, Indian
Irish, German, Norwegian, Canadian Indian
French Canadian, Irish, Indian, Native American
English, Spanish
White, Hispanic
Hispanic, white
Americanized
Other

MAAH VISITOR DESCRIPTIONS OF RACIAL/ETHNIC BACKGROUND (N=15)

African American/Black

Black (4)
African American (3)
Afro-American
Totally Black

White/European

White European
White
Caucasian

Other/Mixed/Unknown

English/Irish/African American
Black/Indian/White

APPENDIX I
VISITOR BEHAVIOR

TABLE i
NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO DISCUSSED AND/OR READ EXHIBIT CONTENT ALOUD

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n=100)	# SMM VISITORS STOPPED	# READ ALOUD/ DISCUSSED CONTENT
Does Skin Color Equal Race? interactive	52	22
Why Do We Come in Different Colors? interactive	41	21
Hapa Project image panels	59	20
What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You? interactive	45	18
How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? image panel	54	14
High Blood Pressure interactive	35	13
Ancestral Molecules text panel	32	11
How Are We Alike and Different? computer interactive	38	10
How Are People Like Avocados? text panel	20	10
Who's Talking computer interactive	24	9
Sports Mascots artifact case	19	9
What's Race Got to Do With it? video	45	9
Face-Morphing video	44	8
School Lockers artifact cases	30	8
Geography, Not Race... text panel	30	7
The Boy or Girl Next Door text panel	25	7
What is Whiteness? text panel	16	7
Why Talk About Race? video	33	6
On the Move text panel	26	6
White: the Color of Money text panel	26	6
Bone and Race text panel	18	6
Who is White? computer interactive	10	6
Sickle Cell Maps interactive*	12	5
Discrimination Calling text panel	28	5
How Do You Experience Race? video	42	5
The GI Bill text panel	26	5
Separate and Unequal 1850-1900 text panel	23	5
Vote for the Census of the Future computer interactive	21	5
Inventing Whiteness 1900-2000 text panel	21	5
Video Sampler	14	5
Race is a Recent Human Invention text panel	27	4
Not for Blacks Only text panel*	18	4
Does Where We Come From Tell Us Who We Are? image panel	19	4
Caliper and Hair Color Table artifact case	28	4
Race and the Wealth Gap artifact cases	17	4
Measuring Housing Segregation flip panels	28	4
Separate and Unequal 1650-1850 text panel	12	4

TABLE i cont.**NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO DISCUSSED AND/OR READ EXHIBIT CONTENT ALOUD**

What Do Scientists Say About Race? video	12	3
Human (Mis)measure 1700-1850 text panels	13	3
Lake Electronics image panel	19	3
One Person's Mascot text panel	20	3
Human (Mis)measure 1850-1900 text panels	20	2
Human (Mis)measure 1900-2000 text panels	14	2
Newspaper Box video	12	2
Separate and Unequal video	19	2
Separate and Unequal 1900-2000 text panel	27	2
Racism's Affect on Health text panel	23	2
Pharmacy video	18	2
Standardized Test Scores text panel	6	2
School Segregation text panel	8	2
Affirmative Action text panel	23	2
Inventing Whiteness 1650-1850 text panel	6	2
RACE Web computer kiosk	11	2
Research on Race computer kiosk	10	2
A History of Moving and Mixing text panel	10	1
Ain't No Mountain High Enough text panel	13	1
Traveling Genes computer interactive	13	1
Pictures and the Television Camera Tell Us... text panel	10	1
Who's Land Is It? text panel	13	1
Playing Indian text panel	8	1
There Goes the Neighborhood text panel	19	1
Does Race Have a Place in Medicine? text panel	21	1
Going Down the Wrong Track text panel	7	1
School Lockers video	15	1
Census Categories Shape ... text panel	5	1
Inventing Whiteness 1850-1900 text panel	8	1
Inventing Whiteness video	13	1
Creating Race 1550-1800 text panel	14	1
Tuffet Dolls activity area	2	1
Acknowledgement panel	3	1
We Are All African text panel	20	0
Race It Doesn't Add Up text panel	13	0
Pottery artifact case	2	0
Human (Mis)measure video	12	0
Rowhouse reading boards	4	0
Beaded Vest artifact case	8	0
Pharmacy reading boards	2	0
Census reading boards	2	0
Investigating Race text panel	18	0

TABLE i cont.**NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO DISCUSSED AND/OR READ EXHIBIT CONTENT ALOUD**

Why Is Race a Question on the U. S. Census? text panel	7	0
Creating Race 1400-1550 text panel	15	0
Shackles artifact case	8	0
Creating Race video	14	0
Wooden Bowl artifact case	2	0

* Exhibit component was available to 63 of observed visitors.

TABLE ii**NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO LOOKED AT (POINTED TO) IMAGES ON PANEL**

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n=100)	# SMM VISITORS STOPPED	# LOOKED AT IMAGES
Hapa Project image panels	59	12
How Would the U.S. Census Have Counted You? image panel	54	10
Does Skin Color Equal Race? interactive	52	9
What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You? interactive	45	9
How Are We Alike and Different? computer interactive	38	6
Why Do We Come in Different Colors? interactive	41	5
High Blood Pressure interactive	35	5
How Are People Like Avocados? text panel	20	5
Race is a Recent Human Invention text panel	27	4
The Boy or Girl Next Door text panel	25	4
Does Where We Come From Tell Us Who We Are? image panel	19	4
Measuring Housing Segregation flip panels	28	4
On the Move text panel	26	3
We Are All African text panel	20	3
Discrimination Calling text panel	28	3
Lake Electronics image panel	19	3
Separate and Unequal 1850-1900 text panel	23	3
Geography, Not Race... text panel	30	2
Ancestral Molecules text panel	32	2
Human (Mis)measure 1900-2000 text panels	14	2
Who's Land Is It? text panel	13	2
The GI Bill text panel	26	2
Separate and Unequal 1650-1850 text panel	12	2
Separate and Unequal 1900-2000 text panel	27	2
Racism's Affect on Health text panel	23	2
Vote for the Census of the Future computer interactive	21	2
Bone and Race text panel	18	2
Creating Race 1550-1800 text panel	14	2
Not for Blacks Only text panel*	18	1
Race It Doesn't Add Up text panel	13	1
Human (Mis)measure 1700-1850 text panels	13	1

TABLE ii cont.**NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO LOOKED AT (POINTED TO) IMAGES ON PANEL**

Human (Mis)measure 1850-1900 text panels	20	1
Does Race Have a Place in Medicine? text panel	21	1
School Segregation text panel	8	1
Why Is Race a Question on the U. S. Census? text panel	7	1
Inventing Whiteness 1900-2000 text panel	21	1
Creating Race 1400-1550 text panel	15	1
What is Whiteness? text panel	16	1
Ain't No Mountain High Enough text panel	13	0
Pictures and the Television Camera Tell Us... text panel	10	0
One Person's Mascot text panel	20	0
Playing Indian text panel	8	0
There Goes the Neighborhood text panel	19	0
Going Down the Wrong Track text panel	7	0
Standardized Test Scores text panel	6	0
Affirmative Action text panel	23	0
Census Categories Shape ... text panel	5	0
Investigating Race text panel	18	0
Inventing Whiteness 1650-1850 text panel	6	0
Inventing Whiteness 1850-1900 text panel	8	0

* Exhibit component was available to 63 of observed visitors.

TABLE iii**PORTION OF VIDEOS WATCHED**

VIDEO (n=100)	# SMM VISITORS WHO WATCHED	
	PARTIAL VIDEO	WHOLE VIDEO
What's Race Got to Do With It?	42	2
How Do You Experience Race?	40	2
Why Talk About Race?	20	13
Pharmacy	18	0
Separate and Unequal	16	3
School Lockers	14	1
Human (Mis)measure	12	0
Inventing Whiteness	11	2
Creating Race	11	3
A Girl Like Me (Video Sampler)	3	4
Race is the Place (Video Sampler)	3	2
Power of One (Video Sampler)	3	5
Chasing Daybreak (Video Sampler)	1	2

TABLE iv**NUMBER OF VIDEOS SELECTED AT MULTIPLE VIDEO COMPONENT**

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n=100)	# SMM VISITORS WHO WATCHED	TOTAL # VIDEOS WATCHED			
		1	2	3	4
What Do Scientists Say About Race? video	12	4	6	0	2
Newspaper Box video	12	8	1	3	n/a
Video Sampler	10	3	3	2	2

TABLE v**NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO USED MOVEABLE PANELS (FLIP PANELS/READING BOARDS)**

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (n=100)	# SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	# USED MOVEABLE PANELS
Does Skin Color Equal Race? interactive	52	22
Measuring Housing Segregation flip panels	28	18
The Boy or Girl Next Door text panel	25	17
Inventing Whiteness 1900-2000 text panel	21	13
Creating Race 1400-1550 text panel	15	12
Ancestral Molecules text panel	32	9
Separate and Unequal 1900-2000 text panel	27	7
Creating Race 1550-1800 text panel	14	7
Human (Mis)measure 1850-1900 text panels	20	6
Rowhouse reading boards	4	4
Census reading boards	2	1
Pharmacy reading boards	2	0

TABLE vi**NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO LOOKED AT (POINTED TO/TOUCHED) ARTIFACT**

EXHIBIT COMPONENT (N=100)	# SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	# POINTED TO/ TOUCHED ARTIFACT
Caliper and Hair Color Table artifact case	28	6
School Lockers artifact cases	30	6
Ancestral Molecules text panel	32	5
Race and the Wealth Gap artifact cases	17	5
Sports Mascots artifact case	19	3
Separate and Unequal 1850-1900 text panel	23	1
Beaded Vest artifact case	8	1
How Are People Like Avocados? text panel	20	1
Pottery artifact case	2	0
Playing Indian text panel	8	0
Inventing Whiteness 1850-1900 text panel	8	0
Creating Race 1400-1550 text panel	15	0
Shackles artifact case	8	0
Wooden Bowl artifact case	2	0

TABLE vii**NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO USED FEEDBACK STATIONS**

EXHIBIT (N=100)	# SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	# USED STATION TO	
		READ ALOUD FEEDBACK	PROVIDED FEEDBACK
Hapa Project	6	1	0
How Do You Experience Race?	2	0	0
Sports Mascots	9	4	0
What's Race Got to Do With it?	45	7	1
Got Questions About Race?	8	0	0

TABLE viii**NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO USED COMPUTER INTERACTIVES**

COMPUTER INTERACTIVE (N=100)	# SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	# USED COMPUTER	
		ALONE	WITH GROUP
How Are We Alike and Different?	38	13	12
Who's Talking	24	4	11
Traveling Genes	13	5	3
Vote for the Census of the Future	21	6	5
Who is White?	10	3	5
RACE Web	11	8	1
Research on Race	10	5	1

TABLE ix**NUMBER OF VISITORS WHO USED INTERACTIVE EXHIBITS**

INTERACTIVE EXHIBITS (N=100)	# SMM VISITORS WHO STOPPED	# USED INTERACTIVE	
		ALONE	WITH GROUP
Does Skin Color Equal Race? interactive	52	11	27
Why Do We Come in Different Colors? interactive	41	12	18
Sickle Cell Maps interactive*	12	3	4
What Does a Person's Appearance Really Tell You? interactive	45	14	19
High Blood Pressure interactive	35	8	13
Reading area	12	5	5
Tuffet Dolls activity area	2	1	1

* Exhibit component was available to 63 of observed visitors.

APPENDIX K

VERBATIM EXAMPLES OF INDICATORS

Objective 1: Visitors will understand that race is a human invention.

Naïve/Misconceptions (1)

(Based on what you experienced in the exhibition, how would you define the term, ‘race?’) I don’t know! I guess the color of skin.

Developing (2)

(Based on what you experienced in the exhibition, how would you define the term, ‘race?’) Probably someone’s culture, identity, or what they identify with. Something like that. Not necessarily color but, I do not know. (What do you mean by culture?) How someone lives. What they eat.

Accomplished (3)

(Based on what you experienced in the exhibition, how would you define the term, ‘race?’) I think race is a social concept. It is not a reality. We are all human. We come from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds but race is a man-made term. It is a systematic way of dividing people by categories. Race white, black, Hispanic. All those different connotations. Again it is really to separate people.

Objective 2: Visitors will understand that all humans are much more biologically alike than different, and having specific physical characteristics does not predispose one to unique abilities, diseases, or characteristics.

Naïve/Misconceptions (1)

(In terms of human biology and genetics, are people more alike or different?) I think more different. Because we do not look alike.

Developing (2)

(In terms of human biology and genetics, are people more alike or different?) Alike. (Can you give me an example?) We all bleed. We all have blood. We all have certain types of cells that make our bodies work and when those certain types of cells break down, our bodies break down whether we are Black, White, Blue, Purple. So biologically we are more alike than we are different.

Accomplished (3)

(In terms of human biology and genetics, are people more alike or different?) I would say we are more alike . . . I think genetically we are all pretty much the same. Like our differences are based upon where we were born and raised. As one of the exhibits pointed out, our ability to absorb Vitamin D because of sunlight or the lack of sun, that more so determined our skin tone than any idea of race.

Objective 3: Visitors will understand that racism is institutionalized in America.

Naïve/Misconceptions (1)

(How did the exhibition affect the way you think about yourself or others?) I did not like the money part because there is more to it than race when you get a mortgage. A lot more. And I thought it was a little simple, to say that, 'Oh, you are being discriminated against.' That White is the Color of Money [exhibit] is insulting to me because I know plenty of Whites who do not qualify for mortgages, just as I know plenty of other people who do qualify for mortgages. The definer is not skin color, it is economic. If you did not pay your credit card bill for five years, you are not going to get a mortgage. I do not care what color you are.

Developing (2)

Some racism is just taught, and then sometimes people go through experiences and they just hate a whole race because of it. They probably should not be judged based on that. (Okay. How did the exhibition affect the way you think about race and racism and their roles in our everyday life in our society?) How ignorant people can be, especially the commercials. I think the commercials had the biggest impact on me.

Accomplished (3)

(How has the exhibition affected the way you see racism in our everyday lives?) I would say that it has really broadened my understanding of it. [The exhibition] helped me to understand that racism is so systematically entrenched in so many aspects of what happens in America from government benefits, privileges, etc. And it has helped me to understand behind the most obvious, the defining moment for many [people] was race. Education. Privileges. Our representation in government.

Objective 4: Visitors will realize that, in the US, race and racism affects his/her personal identity and how he/she thinks about and relates to others.

Naïve/Misconceptions (1)

(How did the exhibition affect the way you think about race and racism and their roles in everyday life in society?) I am way ahead of what the exhibition is talking about with my relation to races. Racism is a flaw that other people have. Not me.

Developing (2)

The most interesting [exhibit] was that voice one, where you had to guess the voice . . . that really surprised me.... How people hear people over the phone, the way they sound. It freaked me out because it was figuring out for myself like how do I treat people differently by the way they look and by the way they sound. You know what I mean? It is like a feeling you get . . . you treat them differently, something clicks inside you. It is unintentional.

Accomplished (3)

[The exhibition] taught me to redefine myself as I am part of a racist culture by the very fact that I am White. Even if I grew up in a relatively integrated situation, I still have always benefited from being White. Regardless of what my class or monetary status is in this culture, which is another piece I guess I would have the blinders on a little bit about how much I benefit.

Objective 5: Visitors will leave the exhibition feeling energized by the thoughts and feelings they have experienced and will realize that their ideas of race, human variation, and racism have changed.

Naïve/Misconceptions (1)

I normally enjoy coming to the Science Museum but the Race exhibit I actually kind of found offensive. There were a couple of areas set up where it almost felt like somebody was trying to make me feel guilty about being white. And it was something that just really bothered me. The showing of how white people have all the money, all the resources, the white neighborhood after Katrina were re-built faster than black neighborhoods. Things like that just really agitated me because it was not necessarily the full story.... But at the same time I enjoyed the fact that they were pointing out that there are not any biological differences really between the different races and things like that. It was really educational. I just do not think that it was unbiased.

Developing (2)

I thought [the exhibition] was interesting, and I probably did learn a couple things, and see what I really thought about race and issues regarding it. But I do not think it was something that like turned my life around and what I thought about race or change anybody else to not be racist anymore.

Accomplished (3)

I have been [to the Race exhibition] three times.... And each time I walked away with both a feeling of excitement and provocativeness, wanting to talk more about what I had seen there. And I went ahead and recommended the exhibit to many friends. Also I felt kind of uncomfortable, which I kind of went in there expecting, wanting to be uncomfortable and to learn something that I did not know. Or to break me out of my stupor of just kind of assuming things are how they are based on how I live and where I am from.