

Appendix B**Survey Methodology**

The majority (85%) of the interviews were conducted by telephone, taking one hour on average, with the smaller percentage completed by mail. Participants were selected from articles, reports, and informal recommendations by interviewees, based on any mention of experience with interactive technology in their exhibits. As the participants were not selected at random from the museum population, the external validity of the findings are questionable; the results presented should not be generalized as true for the entire museum community, but instead as possible indicators of museum industry activity and interest.

Once the interviews were completed, results were tabulated for the three largest categories which had the most conclusive results - museums, associations and experts, and interactive media designers. Results from the educational media producers, and hardware and software manufacturers were either too varied to clearly summarize, or incomplete. However, selected results from those last three categories have been included when pertinent throughout the report.

The status of individuals interviewed in each type of organization could generally be represented by the following categorical titles:

Museums: Exhibit Directors and Exhibit Designers/Developers

Associations: Presidents and Media Specialists

Experts: Authors, Scholars, and Consultants

Interactive exhibit design firms: Interactive Exhibit Designers, Owners

Educational media design firms: Educational Media Designers

Hardware and software firms: Multimedia Designers, Engineers, or Sales Executives.

In all cases, participants represented the individuals in the organization who had a close relationship with, and substantial information on, the exhibit or multimedia design process and related issues.

Tabulation Procedures

The interviews were summarized by tallying similar or identical responses to each question for the three categories mentioned above - museums, associations and experts, and interactive media designers, and in this way the important issues were identified. It is important to note that had "yes" or "no" questions been asked, the results may have been quite different; participants who did not happen to use a certain phrase or convey a certain idea were not recognized and tabulated as having that opinion or idea. Most of the ques-

tions were open-ended in order to avoid imposing preconceived ideas. Due to the nature of some questions, the same interviewee could give multiple responses, leading to for example, more than 24 answers per question in the museum section, and consequently percentage totals of over 100%. While this can make it difficult to rank the importance of each response to the interviewee, it more importantly highlights the issues that are on the minds of museums. Museum responses are presented in tables throughout the text, while responses from other participants are integrated with the museum discussions; the response tables for the other two categories of tabulated responses (Associations and Experts, and Independent Exhibit Designers) are included this Appendix in their entirety. Responses are ranked by the most frequently cited responses (not including those that were not applicable or available -- n/a). Aside from the question actually being inapplicable, time constraints and incomplete interviews were the other reasons for "n/a" counts.

Museum responses have been categorized by type - art, history, children's, science & technology, and other, which includes the zoo and corporate museum (abbreviated in the table headings as "art," "hist," "chld," "sci," and "oth") in order to show the perspectives of the various categories. The last three (occasionally four or five) column headings on all tables are also abbreviated to save space in the tables as follows: "dep" stands for depends, marked when the respondent was uncomfortable giving a rating; "ttl" stands for total; and "avg" stands for the average rating given.

Additional comments made by interviewees have been included through the text where appropriate as they often added significant insight to the information tabulated. Since they are not necessarily verbatim quotes, they have been italicized instead of placed in quotations with the type of organization making the comment indicated following the remark. In the museum summaries, for example, the type of museum making the comment might be indicated as "a children's museum." In the association summaries, "association," "consortium," or "expert" is indicated, and in the interactive exhibit designer summaries the comments stand alone as all the participants in that category are similar organizations. Although every attempt was made to accurately convey the comments made by participants, names have been omitted to avoid any direct connection with the individual in the case of researcher errors. Comments made are recognized as the opinions of the individuals who were interviewed at the organizations listed in Appendix A.

Where two participants said virtually the same thing, a notation of two or more individuals in concurrence has been indicated after the comment (e.g., "a science museum and a children's museum"). Given the highly qualitative nature of the interviews and the relatively small sample sizes, statistically significant conclusions cannot be made. Percentage responses in particular can be misleading given the sample size. Nonetheless, many of the results are interesting and relevant to the museum community.