

How and Why Heritage Performers Represent the Past in the Present

By

Lizzie James

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honours in Social Anthropology

at

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
April 2021

© Copyright by Lizzie James, 2021

ABSTRACT

This study explores the motivations of heritage performers to take on their roles and how they understand their representation of history. While there is a wide array of literature on visitor experience at heritage sites, there is a lack of research regarding the experience of the heritage performer. This study uses literature on the benefits and limitations of performance, controversies surrounding authentic performances, and the role heritage performers play as cultural intermediaries to explore this gap in the research. By conducting semi-structured interviews, this study looks at why Nova Scotian heritage performers go into the positions they do and what, if any, are the implications for the representation of history in the 21st century. The results show that heritage performers take on their roles because of passions for local and familial history as well as the desire to work in a job they enjoy. This aids them in recognizing themselves as the linking factor between the past and the present through their knowledge of history and their skill in engaging with visitors to make the past accessible for them.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank the heritage performers who took time out of their days to share their passions with me. If there is one thing I will take away from this experience, it is that I have a newfound love of listening to people express their passions. I am greatly appreciative of my supervisor Martha Radice, and my thesis cohort. I am incredibly proud of what we have achieved in such a bizarre and unprecedented school year. Thank you to my roommates, as well as Alex and Lydia for spending numerous hours listening to me ramble on about explanations and theories; I bet you're excited to never hear the title "heritage performer" again!

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	1
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	2
INTRODUCTION.....	4
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	5
<i>PERFORMATIVE HERITAGE TERMINOLOGY</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>AN AUTHENTIC PERFORMANCE?</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>MOTIVATIONS.....</i>	<i>10</i>
METHODS	12
FINDINGS	15
MOTIVATIONS	15
<i>Life fulfillment.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Passion.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Financial incentive.....</i>	<i>18</i>
MULTITUDES OF AUTHENTICITY	19
<i>Cosmetic authenticity.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Staged authenticity.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Object authenticity</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Hot authenticity.....</i>	<i>21</i>
REPRESENTING THE “PAST AND PRESENT”.....	23
<i>Cultural intermediary.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Benefits and limitations of interpretation.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Wider history.....</i>	<i>27</i>
CONCLUSION.....	29
REFERENCES	31
APPENDIX A: EMAIL INQUIRY FOR RECRUITMENT SENT TO NOVA SCOTIAN HERITAGE SITES.....	33
APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM	34
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDE	36
APPENDIX D: FOLLOW-UP EMAIL SENT TO PARTICIPANT AFTER INTERVIEW	38
APPENDIX E: REB FINAL REPORT.....	38

INTRODUCTION

When I was nine years old, I went to summer camp at a Pioneer Village in Ontario. We arrived at the village every morning and changed into our frocks and bonnets, spending the days helping in the tin shop, the tannery, the village shop and more. I remember having so much fun and loved getting to spend all day in “pretend play”. Looking back at this experience I was completely unaware of the influence heritage performers have on the visitor experience. This inspired me to conduct research for my honours thesis on heritage performance and the representation of history in the 21st century.

From an anthropological and heritage studies background, this study explores what motivates heritage performers in taking on their roles and how, if at all, they see themselves as influencing the representation of history. Living history is an interpretation tool used to portray history and maintain cultural heritage, where individuals represent and tell a selected story of the past through re-enactments and first-person or third-person performance (Tivers, 2002, p.189). First-person narrative is when a performer takes on a specific role and speaks in character while third-person narrative is a form of performance where the individual describes and demonstrates methods of the past to visitors, for example “I am cleaning my rifle as soldiers did in 1815”.

My research is important to carry out to determine and understand who is producing and representing Nova Scotian history. It addresses performers’ job motivations and their decision-making processes for character formation and engagement with authenticity.

My research questions are as follows:

- How do heritage performers understand their role(s) as representing history?
 - o What motivates an individual to take on the role of a heritage performer?

- How do heritage performers engage with authenticity in their work?

I designed these questions based on exploration of previous literature to determine what has been left unexplored in the discipline. I answered them through semi structured interviews with heritage performers working at Nova Scotian heritage sites. Moreover, I used the themes of authenticity and cultural intermediaries to broaden my scope of research.

This is a significant topic of study as the role of heritage performers influences the production and consumption of knowledge and in turn the experience and history a visitor will encounter. The broader significance of this study is that it helps explore the ever-expanding studies of museum and heritage engagement and participation as well as the rising popularity of experiential learning.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWROK

This literature comes from sociological, anthropological, tourism and leisure, heritage, and performance journals. I have drawn on three major themes: performative heritage, authenticity and performance, and motivations.

Performative Heritage Terminology

The first theme is how different researchers focus on different types of performative roles in the field. The terms which will be discussed below are performance, heritage and living history. I will then discuss the benefits and limitations of performative heritage as well as background information on the anthropology of history (Tivers, 2002; Palmer & Jankowiak 1996; Roth, 1998; Palmié & Stewart, 2016).

For a research study conducting data collection on heritage performance, I must start by defining “performance”. For Jaqueline Tivers (2002), performance is the moment where an

audience and the performer occupy the same space and time but create distance between them in order to promote interpretation (p.189). Performers use voice, gestures and movements to create a narrative which forms a character (Tivers, 2002, p.189). Tivers (2002) further argues that because we live in a performative society, we can enhance lived experience through performance (p. 190).

Similarly, in their study of the anthropology of performance, Garry Palmer & William Jankowiak (1996) further highlight this concept of society as performance. They write that “it is through performances, whether individual or collective, that humans project images of themselves and the world to their audiences” (p. 226). This is significant as it conveys how performative culture developed from mundane social actions projected onto others. Thus, heritage performance can be seen as an extension of performing the heritage “world”.

“Heritage” is the second concept to discuss. Tivers (2002) comments on a definition of heritage writing that the past is not an independent object, as it is a “selective interpretation based on the way in which we view ourselves in the present” (p. 187). This implies that heritage is structured and represented by modern thoughts and values and that heritage sites use living history to portray selected representations of the past for an audience (Tivers, 2002, p. 188). Living history is one form of interpretation used to portray “heritage”. The baseline definition of living history is that actors participate in and tell a selected story of the past through re-enactments and first and third person roles (Tivers, 2002, p.189).

Stacy Roth (1998) writes that living history is a simulation of life in a different time through “research, interpretation and/or play” in order to educate and create experiences (p. 9). She goes on to explore the strengths and drawbacks of first-person performance. On the one hand, Roth (1998) writes that it is a thought provoking, emotional, entertaining and educational tool that can

be used to enhance historical education (p. 26). On the other hand, it is claimed that the living history approach is unrealistic, inaccurate, incomplete and too theatrical (p. 23). Similarly to Tivers' definition of heritage, Roth (1998) points out that living history can become enraptured by the "spell" (p.23) of the past and that this influences representations and reconstructions of the past, as seen through performance. This shows that performance enhances lived experiences, therefore we can explore whether it enhances consumption of heritage experiences.

The last piece of background information to consider is how living history sites perpetuate western narratives of history. Stephan Palmié and Charles Stewart (2016) write that the western concept of "historicism" prevents other frameworks of history from producing major narratives (p. 210). Historicism is defined as the Western form of teaching history through methods such as written text, school systems, and higher education (p. 210). This western narrative of conveying history is often prioritized over inclusion of other ways of knowing such as Indigenous histories, thus limiting in scope. Palmié and Stewart claim that historicism is assumed to have stemmed from an individual's desire to relive and connect with the past through events, people, places and objects, and that this is why people still study history (Palmié & Stewart, 2016, p. 238). In connection to this claim, at the end of the paper they use the examples of child centered learning and historical re-enactors to show how hands-on experiential learning of history is on the rise and how this is one method for combatting historicism (Palmié & Stewart, 2016, p.228). In light of these tools being used as innovative ways for approaching history production, I wonder if heritage performance can also be used as a way to alter the narrative and framework of historicism to be more inclusive and exploratory.

An Authentic Performance?

A great deal of literature pertains to authenticity and its relationship with heritage performance (Kidd, 2011; Waitt, 2000; Jackson & Leahy, 2006).

Jenny Kidd (2011) conducted qualitative research over a three-year period in a number of heritage sites and museums to grasp how visitors who engaged with performative experiences remembered their visits up to a year later (p. 23). She found that educational retention in museums is influenced by how individuals assessed the authenticity of performances they witnessed (Kidd, 2011, p. 23). The study reinforced the claim that an object itself is not inherently authentic, it is instead an attribute which is ascribed to it (Kidd, 2011, p. 23). Visitors therefore considered a performance as “authentic” through different measures of authenticity. The first being “cosmetic authenticity,” accuracy in presentation through costume and language, “staged authenticity,” how the past may have been through scenery, “object authenticity,” the validation of experience through object use and “hot authenticity,” when the visitor feels emotional connections towards the narratives and history presented to them (Kidd, 2011, p. 26-30). Ultimately, Kidd concluded that when the visitor considers these as well done, they find the experience authentic and thus remember it for a longer period of time. This is important for my study because it conveys how there are multiple forms of authenticity and therefore ways to define it as well as ways for performers to engage with it.

A different perspective comes from Gordon Waitt’s (2000) study of authenticity in relation to space and environment. Waitt (2000) believes authenticity is used as a “promotional device” which influences cultural tourism. He agrees with Kidd in believing that what an individual defines as authentic is based on personal experience, consequently not separable from current “belief and knowledge systems” (Waitt, 2000, p. 836). This bolsters his view of heritage as a

commercial endeavour as sites portray what the managerial staff view as authentic in terms of what tourists want to see. Waitt (2000) writes that there has been a rise in engaging with heritage when travelling and that this has resulted in greater commodification of the past (p. 838).

Cultural tourism undoubtedly influences how a heritage site presents itself, and in turn how heritage performers are told to represent the site and the history.

Anthony Jackson and Helen Rees Leahy (2006) are two well-known figures in theatre studies. Like Kidd, who explored adult's memory retention, Jackson and Leahy (2006) explored whether museum theatre enhances childhood understanding of school curriculum (p. 303). Their results showed that the children showed signs of empathizing with performers' narratives. Moreover, they found that the children considered museums a space of truth, therefore, by default projecting this belief onto all museum objects and experiences (Jackson & Leahy, 2006, p. 319). This notion of truth bolsters authenticity and was in turn projected onto performance as it was also performed in the same environment (Jackson & Leahy, 2006, p. 319). This is significant as it shows that when a visitor is captivated by an "unreal" experience such as performance, they can take the experience too literally. Then is this a good or bad reaction to the experience? On the one hand, a benefit of this outcome is that it increases visitor engagement and interpretation, but on the other hand, this fake performative experience replaces a more accurate, historical narrative.

Throughout this process I created a synthesized understanding of authenticity. Authenticity is ascribed by an individual or collective onto an experience or object and is influenced by environment and context.

Motivations

This section of the review focuses on factors that influence heritage performers' motivations to take on their role (Handler & Saxton, 1988; Tivers, 2002; Negus, 2002).

Richard Handler and William Saxton (1988) suggest that authenticity refers to an individual wanting to feel in touch with a "real" world and their "real selves" (p. 243). They write that post-modern individuals are constantly looking to be fulfilled through an experience which they can define as "authentic" (Handler & Saxton, 1988, p. 251). However, they claim this is never possible as culture is constantly evolving and living histories cannot fill this gap because the narrative is made up and incomplete (Handler & Saxton, 1988, p. 251). Handler and Saxton (1988) use an example of living historians acting specific eras and periods but not representing a broader timeline, thus limiting fulfillment (p. 251).

Moreover, the individual is never separate from modern values, so the narrative is never fully representative of an accurate past. This point of view matters because it evokes questions concerning deeper meanings as to why individuals choose to be heritage performers. An example of a deeper meaning can be seen through Handler and Saxton's (1988) idea of "magic moments" (p. 254) where performers share moments of "realness" they have experienced when performing. For example, they share the experience of a woman who claims that she knows performers who "slip into the 'real' frame of mind", meaning that they are fully absorbed by their role and forget they are acting (Handler & Saxton, 1988, p. 246). These individuals tend to be living history "buffs", but outside the museum world do not care for history (Handler & Saxton, 1988, p. 246). This is an interesting parallel as it conveys to me how important it is to understand their motivations.

Jacqueline Tivers (2002) came to a similar conclusion where she found that heritage performers were seeking a simple life. She further wrote this is one of the most intriguing aspects for further study, thus showing a gap in research (Tivers, 2002, p. 197). Tivers mentions that despite having strong educational ties, not all performers go into the role to share historical education. This is significant for my research project as one of the aims of performative heritage is to educate visitors, but if performers are not going into the position for that reason, it is interesting to explore why they go into it.

Similarly to Tivers, Cecilia Morgan (2016) discusses the shaping of Canadian history through tourism and mentions that Nova Scotia was one of the first provinces to specifically build a bridge between tourism and history (p. 140). She writes that this is a negative correlation as the province built on simplifications of the history and denied accurate representations of all individuals other than white individuals (Morgan, 2016, p. 142). This is significant in relation to Tivers because a heritage performer may seek a simple and fulfilling life through their position but their view of what is “simple” does not accurately represent the history.

In more of an abstract way, Jennifer Smith Maguire and Julian Matthews (2014) explore the concept of “cultural intermediaries” by looking at Pierre Bourdieu’s analysis. According to Bourdieu, a cultural intermediary is a person who manipulates individual’s “taste” in culture and by being in this position they influence social reproduction of goods and services (Maguire & Matthews, 2014, pg.16). Keith Negus (2002) also explores the role of “cultural intermediaries” and their relationship with production and consumption of culture (p. 501). This relates to the theme, as even though it does not directly explore motivations of individuals to be heritage performers, it explores how the role takes shape based on an individual’s motivation. If a heritage performer is motivated by their desire to live a simple life, they are going to produce and

share the history and culture in a different way to an individual who is more motivated by the desire to educate others. Therefore, they become cultural intermediaries with different goals and shape the production of history differently.

As I have discussed, much of the previous research on authenticity focuses on the experience of the visitor, so I am interested to expand on this topic in light of the performer's perspective in Nova Scotia.

To recap, my research questions are as follows:

- How do heritage performers understand their role(s) as representing history?
 - o What motivates an individual to take on the role of a heritage performer?
 - o How do heritage performers engage with authenticity in their work?

METHODS

For this study I conducted nine semi-structured interviews through online platforms (zoom and phone call) with individuals who work as heritage performers at Nova Scotian heritage sites. To recruit participants, I emailed Nova Scotian heritage sites (Appendix A) informing them of my research inquiring if they would be willing to pass on a description of my project to their employees. After scoping interest from potential participants, I sent them the consent form to sign (Appendix B) and found a date and time that worked well for both of us to chat. When recruiting I outlined my interest in speaking with anyone in heritage performance positions and did not exclude individuals based on different roles (military personnel, baker etc.).

I interviewed individuals who are part time and full-time seasonal staff as they each have unique experiences and reasons for taking on the job, allowing for further exploration of my

research question. I interviewed a variety of interpreters who worked in the capacity of either first person, third person and a few who choose to switch between the two (as seen in table 1).

Pseudonym	Heritage site	Role	Interpretation
Abigail	1	Lady of a house	1 st person
Benjamin	1	Farm hand	1 st person
Callum	1	Farm hand	1 st & 3 rd person
Jacqueline	1	Lady of a house	1 st person
Evelyn	2	Lady of a house	1 st person
Freya	2	Print shop	1 st & 3 rd person
Georgia	2	Visitor services	1 st & 3 rd person
Harriet	3	Military personnel	3 rd person
Declan	3	Military personnel	3 rd person

Table 1 Participant list

I chose to conduct interviews for a couple of reasons. Firstly, interviews have much to offer the researcher as we gain information not from one person, but multiple persons to understand broader themes and narratives, therefore understanding the individual in connection to the collective (Luker, 2008, p.167). Secondly, interviews evoke thick descriptions which help the researcher engage with experiences, beliefs, and thoughts through direct communication, flow of conversation and picking up on tone of voice (Kvale, 1996, p.125).

This approach was useful for my study as it was exploratory and I wanted to learn from these individuals on a broad range of ideas to gain an understanding of their motivations for heritage performance. My interview guide (Appendix C) started with introduction questions, and questions concerning the individual's motivations for becoming a heritage performer. I then moved on to ask questions about the performer's understanding of, and engagement with

authenticity in their role. Lastly, I engaged my interviewees in conversation about the term “cultural intermediaries” to see how they perceive it. The purpose of asking questions focusing on these themes was to evoke their awareness of their role in representing history and how they experience their job. Throughout this process I used probing as a method to engage with my participants to help them feel comfortable to continue conversations with me. Kvale Steinar writes that probing questions such as “could you say something more about that?” and “do you have further examples of this?” are important ways to engage the interviewee with specific material without influencing their thoughts (Kvale, 1996, p. 133).

After conducting my interviews, I transcribed the audio-recordings and uploaded my transcriptions to NVivo for coding. Along with the transcriptions I took my written notes and analyzed them together to find major patterns, and departures from the patterns. I made sure to keep an open mind while looking at the transcriptions separately as it is not possible to know what is “idiosyncratic to individual people and what are the social patterns that of theoretical interest” until multiple interviews can be cross referenced (Luker, 2008, p.173).

This study posed low levels of risk, however there is a small possibility that participants felt emotional distress as I may have triggered memories of negative experiences such as poor treatment in the workplace or harassment from visitors when I asked them to share an example of a story or experience. To mitigate this risk I made sure my participants were aware they were allowed to take a break from the interview at any point, and that they did not have to answer any questions they felt uncomfortable with. There was also a risk of loss of personal privacy from the use of internet-based communications. In order to mitigate this risk, I took specific precautions to ensure participant privacy and confidentiality. I saved all documents and audio-recordings to a password protected folder on my personal desktop. I also anonymized participants personal

information in a key code and referred to them in my study with pseudonyms. This information is included in the consent form (Appendix B) to increase transparency with my participants.

There are a couple of limitations in regard to my sampling method. Firstly, I emailed the staff coordinators to forward on my message to their employees. One of the sites replied back saying they would contact individuals they felt would be most likely to show interest in talking with me. This is a limitation because I am not able to account for the selection bias on part of the employee I contacted. I cannot be sure as to what criteria they used to choose who to contact; who they thought would represent the site well, their best employees etc. Secondly, individuals who reached out to me likely want to engage with me because they enjoy their jobs and want to share their passion with me. This is a limiting factor for my research because their motivations for working at the site may not be all encompassing. This is moreover reflective of the small sampling size which cannot be made representative of the wider heritage performance experience in Nova Scotia. Lastly, six of the nine interviewees identify as women once again limiting breadth of findings.

FINDINGS

Motivations

Understanding why individuals choose to take on roles in living history is important in assessing how they reproduce history. The main motivations for interpreters to take on their roles were seeking life fulfillment, passion for history and financial incentive.

Life fulfillment

Only two individuals directly expressed life fulfillment as their reason to work in the sector. Abigail mentioned “I applied for the job on a whim! Because I was in a job I really did not like. I was really done with it.” She further told me that she finds the role a lot of fun and enjoys being

part of the community and learning and working with the other interpreters. Jacqueline had a similar experience. Before working as a heritage performer, she worked as a corporate employee for close to 30 years. She wanted to move away from working in finance and decided to do something different. Her previous experience of working as a tour guide taking cruise ship tourists to Nova Scotian Heritage sites sparked her interest in the field and aided in her decision to pursue a new career. Despite coming from backgrounds unrelated to the heritage industry, and not having much knowledge of history before working at the site, both women expressed many times how fulfilling working in this sector has been for them.

While only Abigail and Jaqueline gave life fulfillment as a reason for starting to work as heritage interpreters, others expressed how fulfillment in their positions kept them motivated to continue working at their heritage sites. Most of the interpreters told me that the community and friendships they have formed at their sites make them feel supported. When Evelyn has questions about historical facts, she speaks to a colleague who is a researcher for the site. This is significant because as by having an approachable environment to work in, she stays motivated to work at the site.

Another concept that struck me as intriguing is what Handler and Saxton call the “magic moment” (Handler & Saxton, 1988, p.254). They write that some interpreters have moments of “realness” when performing because they are so involved in their experience that they lose sight of what is real and fall into their character (Handler & Saxton, 1988, p.246). Jacqueline shared with me that she brought a visitor to tears because she has such a convincing character and was asked by the visitor, “when you go home at night, do you know who you are?” I asked Jacqueline how she felt about this question and she told me, “if you’re going to do first-person interpretation, you have to be willing to let yourself go and become that person”. Stacy Roth

writes that this full immersion has limitations, because a fully consumed interpreter loses sight of the historical facts deterring from accuracy (Roth, 1998, p.23). However, Jacqueline conveyed this experience as a success to me. Bringing a person to tears through her interpretation aids her in knowing her full immersion has had a strong impact on the visitor, as their tears signify a meaningful connection to the history. Therefore, for Jacqueline, falling into the magic moments she experiences in her job enhances the experience for the visitor and ultimately her desire to stay in the role as it reinforces her success and ability to perform well in the role.

Passion

Having a passion for history and a personal connection to it are important motivations for individuals to become interpreters and to continue working in their roles. A handful of interpreters expressed a passion for history when asked if they felt it is an important trait for a heritage performer. Only two interpreters shared being passionate for history without being asked, while four others expressed a passion for history after I asked if they feel that it is important. They cultivated their passions for history through previous jobs, formal education, reading books and watching informative videos.

Another way which interpreters engaged with a passion for history is through personal connections to the sites. Evelyn and Jacqueline grew up in the area which their heritage site is located so they have known about it for most of their lives. Abigail and Callum also grew up near their sites, but in addition, they use their personal history to shape their characters. Callum told me that he knows the history of the site well because it is his ancestors history. When he works, he says, "I put myself in my ancestors role" and uses stories from both sides of his family to incorporate into his character. The home his father grew up in was built by his grandfather and his cousins still live there today. When Callum has questions about the history of his site, he can

go to his grandparents' house and "see pictures on the wall three generations back. And it might be a question related to something of clothing or tools or something like that. The personal side is very much a part of it." Callum's role is built on his own research and is enhanced by his ability to connect more deeply with his ancestors and feel that he is continuing their legacy. The opportunity to learn about their own history is a motivating factor for becoming interpreters.

Financial incentive

Of course, people tend to start jobs because they need to make money to live, but only two interpreters mentioned financial incentive as motivation for taking on their roles. Evelyn took the job because she was a local to the area so knew the site well but also needed a job. Freya also felt the same way as she wanted a second familial income to support her growing family. Some interpreters took on the role because they were not ready to retire. Freya mentioned to me "...summer students for example, they're there for income, right? and it's something that is available in the area." She made sure to point out that not all students are monetarily driven, but her view is that "being an employee there for that many years, you want to make sure when a visitor leaves that they're leaving with a good impression." Her view implies that taking on the role for a short period of time, as summer students do, and sometimes only to make money is not what makes a good interpreter.

The interpreters I spoke with are motivated through good intentions. Having a passion for history and seeking life fulfillment are important of their motivations. They go into heritage performance as they want to share their excitement and passions with others. This is important to them in how they understand their role in representing history. Evelyn told me she enjoys doing guided tours in character because, "you get to be on a personal level with your visitors. Because you meet them and by the end you know a lot about them, and they know a lot about you,"

showing the necessity of personal connection and passion going into motivating her to working at her heritage site. Ultimately, the interpreters want the visitor experience to be like their own and go in with the best intentions to make this reality.

Multitudes of Authenticity

None of the interpreters mentioned the word “authentic” until I brought it up to them, when I asked if it resonated with them. All of them agreed it resonates with them. Despite not using the word authentic directly, they talked about making experiences realistic for themselves as well as realistic for the visitors in order to represent the history of their heritage sites. I noticed the four concepts of authenticity: cosmetic, staged, object and hot authenticity.

Cosmetic authenticity

Jenny Kidd describes cosmetic authenticity as an accuracy achieved through presentation of costume and language (Kidd, 2011, p.26). In this vein, interpreters told me how they alter their appearance to get into character. As she showed me her bright pink plastic glasses, Abigail told me that each morning before going to work she puts in contacts and says “I prefer to not have my glasses on, because for some folks it can break the focus a little bit. Because I don’t know if you can see, but they’re pink!” She went on to describe how she learnt different hair styling techniques on YouTube to be accurate for the time period, and to get into character. Georgia and Harriet both underlined the importance of costumes as they form their characters. They find altering their physical appearance allows them to engage with the past better as it enables them to be absorbed in the time period. This in turn helps them to feel they are representing the history accurately. Evelyn told me, “it’s hard for me to talk to you right now as Mrs. Williams because I’m not in costume,” showing the extent to which the costume helps her embody her character and envision herself submerged in the culture of her time period.

Costumes are important for these interpreters to feel connections to the history, as well as help keep the visitors engaged.

Staged authenticity

Staged authenticity is the emphasis interpreters place on setting the scene for how the past may have been (Kidd, 2011, p.27). In her description of the house she works in at her heritage site, Jacqueline told me “I am in a house with the fire in the centre of the floor, box bed, space for the animals, a few artifacts, not very much by our standards,” and said that this is important for visitor’s engagement with the environment. The objects, space and size of the room contribute to recognition and transportation to a new space. This provides a sense of separation between the visitor and the performer to connect to the feeling of being in an unfamiliar time and place, but also allowing them to feel welcome and thrown back in time (Tivers, 2002, p.189).

Abigail further said that at her heritage site “[we] try to give as much context as we can to make it more human for folks”. She goes on to tell me that one way they do this is by burning peat moss inside one of the houses she works in because “they burnt peat...and it has a distinct smell. So, it’s... a lot of that which helps people get into that little train of thought”. This is a tangible experience and sets the stage for interpretation to help the visitor feel immersed and ready to learn. Jacqueline and Abigail’s experiences convey the importance they place on using the space around them to engage the visitor and share what they perceive to be a realistic experience. This is significant as it shows that the interpreters regard sensory experiences highly as a way to help a visitor believe something to be “real” and in turn authentic.

Object authenticity

A second way which some of the interpreters feel that they make an experience authentic for the visitor is through object engagement. Freya works with a printing press at her heritage

site and keeps it running as it would have been used in the time period. She finds it useful for interpretation because it helps her engage with visitors in a more tangible way. She provided me with an example where at the printing shop they have a 100-year-old paper cutter and said,

“if I can get [the visitors] to actually help do that task, they’re amazed, getting themselves into that ‘wow I just cut paper in that old paper cutter’ sort of thing... It’s something they’re going to remember by doing it instead of just walking into the shop and seeing me do it.”

This conveys the value Freya places on tangible experiences as a tool for visitor engagement in creating memorable experiences for them.

Callum uses objects in his barn for a similar purpose. He says “let’s say the leg on my chair broke. Well, this is the bench I’d use to make a new one, a new leg, and I’d put a piece of wood in it and take my shave and start to shave it. Show them how it would be done.” Callum engages with the objects around him because he feels it is important to show what would go on in the building as opposed to just telling the visitor and pointing to it. Both Callum and Freya recognize the use of objects in creating a more interesting and realistic experience for the visitors. Jenny Kidd reached a similar conclusion that when the visitor was “holding, using, critiquing or even making objects”, the experience became more meaningful for them (Kidd, 2011, p.29).

Hot authenticity

Jenny Kidd coined the term “hot authenticity” to capture how visitors create an emotional connection towards historical narratives presented to them at heritage sites (Kidd, 2011, p.30). I found that interpreters also intersect their emotions with history for themselves to engage with

their roles. One way they do this is through their characters' names. Georgia altered her name to be an older version of what her real name is. By doing this, she created a separation from her own self and a connection to the character she interprets. Callum also changed his name because he feels that his own name is too modern and not reflective enough of the time period he represents. He wanted his name to have a richer, more connected sound to the culture he is representing. The importance of names to Callum and Georgia portrays their desire to be close to the history as a whole, in order to feel connected to it and in turn share what they believe to be a truthful representation of it. It also conveys the desire and emphasis placed on character portrayal for an authentic presentation of history.

Similarly, Jacqueline takes this connection a step further by saying, "if I'm going to interpret you, I have to know more about you than what your name is and where you live. I have to know how you feel, I have to know what you're thinking about, I have to know what your world is like". She went on to tell me that this is very important for visitors to engage with the history because there needs to be a deeper sense of connection to the person they are engaging with. The visitor will see past you if there is nothing deeper to you character. Therefore, having a developed and deeper character is necessary for the interpreter's representation of history.

Interpreters also seek to create authentic experiences for visitors by seeing the value in gaining emotional responses from them. For example, Callum mentioned to me that a visitor sent him a postcard at Christmas half a year after their visit and explained that "they were just so overwhelmed by the whole story" and wanted to thank him for their great experience. By receiving this positive feedback, Callum recognizes that personal and emotional connections to the site are important to the visitor and something they will remember.

These interpreters have shown me that a believable performance is formed through dynamic reading of emotions and active engagement with objects around them in order to affect the visitor's sensory perceptions. Moreover, they are frequently aware of these aspects and are always on their toes to anticipate a visitor's reaction to increase their engagement. By modifying their appearances, using the space around them and harnessing emotions, it is seen that interpreters clearly recognize the impact they have on creating a realistic experience for a visitor.

Representing the “past and present”

Looking at motivations to work with authentic performance can aid in understanding the implications of recreating history. Three subthemes appeared upon analysis. The first stems from discussion with interpreters about their views on the term “cultural intermediary”. The second theme is interpreters' perspectives on the benefits and limitations of interpretation and the third is how they feel about representing history wider than their site.

Cultural intermediary

According to Pierre Bourdieu, a cultural intermediary is a person who manipulates an individual's “taste” in culture (Maguire & Matthews, 2014, p.16). Therefore, by being in this position the cultural intermediary influences social reproduction of goods and services (Maguire & Matthews, 2014, p.19). When describing this concept to interpreters, I phrased it as being a middleman between history and the visitor. The interpreters related strongly to this definition and many felt that it was exactly how they would describe themselves.

Everyone agreed with the term when I brought it up to them and used different phrasings to convey a similar understanding of the term. Callum mentioned he believes interpreters are “middle range interpreters for past and present” and similarly, Harriet said, “it's like you're the connecting link between the past and the present because you as an interpreter can relate to the

past, but you can also relate to the tourist as well. And the tourist can relate to you”. Both Callum and Harriet used the phrase “past and present” to convey that they believe they are mediating between two separate standpoints. It further conveys they recognize a distinction between their present selves, and the past. Harriet takes this a step further by explaining that there is a circular connection between the visitor, the interpreter, and the history and that as an interpreter she is aware of the influence she holds over the visitor’s experience.

Another way to look at this is as a form of gate keeping. The concept of gatekeepers was formed by Kurt Lewin through his research on the process of societal change. He studied familial eating habits to see if they influence larger cultural shifts in food consumption. He found that people in “key positions” work as “channels” which funnel and influence change (DeJuliis, 2015, p.7). This promoted his creation of term “gatekeepers” as being an individual who has the power to selectively choose what to pass on to others. (DeJuliis, 2015, p.5) Interpreters similarly have the power to selectively choose what they include and exclude in their presentation of the past to visitors. Gatekeepers “determine[s] specifically what things are to be included in the representation of any given life space at any particular time” (DeJuliis,2015, p. 5). The interpreters I interviewed see themselves as mediators between the past and present, which can be seen as similar to being gatekeepers to the historical knowledge of their heritage sites.

Benefits and limitations of interpretation

As mentioned previously, interpreters can perform from a first-person perspective or a third-person perspective, offering two different approaches to representing history. For example, as a first-person interpreter, Abigail plays the role of lady of the house at her heritage site and presents herself fully immersed as a character to visitors. A third-person interpreter, like Harriet, wears a military uniform and carries out tasks as her role would have done in the time period, but

does not take on the nature of a character. Two of the interpreters I spoke to solely perform in third person while the other seven are first-person interpreters. Interestingly, four interpreters who use first person-interpretation mentioned that they find themselves switching between the two forms of interpretation.

A few of the interpreters mentioned only good things about first-person interpretation. Both Callum and Declan feel that first-person is the most engaging way to learn history and it helps them learn and they expect this to be a similar feeling for visitors. Similarly, Georgia told me first-person is “hands on at the highest level”. These three interpreters value engagement and hands on learning for visitors and believe this is best achieved through first-person interpretation. Discussing the benefits of first-person interpretation, Stacy Roth (1998) writes that some people view first-person interpretation to be limiting because it is too theatrical, and this promotes inaccuracy (p.23). Based on the motivations that bring performers into their roles, I found that instead of interpretation being seen as over the top and unrealistic, it should be viewed as making the past accessible. The intentions of the interpreters I spoke to are to make history and heritage accessible through engagement.

As much as the first-person interpreters value their method of performance, they also notice limitations for sharing history. One limitation is that visitors become too invested in the interpretation and take the performance too literally. For example, Freya told me, “I’ve had people out waiting for the stagecoach that I told them that would be coming at 2:00pm in the afternoon, which was not coming along haha, but would’ve been if I was in my time period, you know? I have to be careful.” She feels that this is a limitation, especially with kids because she does not want to lie to them.

To prevent this situation from occurring, a couple of interpreters have developed their own methods to mitigate these problems. Quite a few interpreters told me how important it is to read the visitor to know whether they want to engage in first-person interpretation or not. Freya told me she thinks it is important to be able to switch between the two forms of interpretations. Evelyn says that to mediate this challenge she has found her own special ways to communicate the truth with the visitor. For example, if a visitor asks “‘do you live here in this village?’ And I go ‘yes’ but I’m shaking my head ‘no’, especially to the little visitors! Because they’ll say, ‘really do you live here?’ haha.” She does this to make sure she does not wrap people in too much and feels this is not a drawback to first person interpretation “‘because usually they very much understand”, as they are briefed at the visitor’s centre before entering the heritage site.

These interpreters do not feel these problems prevent them from interacting with visitors and only minorly diminish the effectiveness of their interpretation. The examples show that they are dynamic and are ready to engage with and read visitors’ emotions. Moreover, as Evelyn said, the visitors are aware that they are in a reproduced site, so this is to be expected.

The two third-person interpreters I spoke to had negative views of first-person interpretation. As a third-person interpreter, Harriet told me that she thinks that first-person roles limit what information can be conveyed to visitors. She told me that when she interprets, she relates objects of the past to something in the present. For example, when talking about the “magic lantern” which was used in school rooms at her site, she says “often I explain it by comparing it to a slideshow or a PowerPoint presentation. If you’re in first-person interpretation, as an example, it would be harder to explain how it works. Because as a first-person interpreter you’re not supposed to know what PowerPoint is.” Declan agreed with Harriet, saying that first-person is limiting for conveying historical facts. He told me it is harder as you would break your

character. Talking to the first-person interpreters and hearing their perspectives on breaking character and switching to third person is very different to how Declan and Harriet view this. The first-person interpreters do not feel that breaking their character is necessarily a bad thing. They support this argument by saying it is more about reading the visitor and delivering what they want so if you need to break character, that is ok. Conversely, the third person interpreters see this as a drawback as it is not staying true to the positions.

When discussing issues with historicism and its drawbacks for framing history in a modern way, Stephan Palmié and Charles Stewart (2016) mention that there is an age-old tension with performance history as it tries to “establish the internal life world of the past” while trying to balance facts, dates, events and people (p.228). They do not expand greatly on this topic, but they write that historians have a passion for understanding and contextualizing the past “to go along with their dispassionate scholarship” (Palmié & Stewart, 2016, p.228). First and third person interpretation tend to be questioned because of a lack of attention to detail and the worry that arises around miscommunication and inaccurate reproduction of history. However, Palmié and Stewart write that traditional historians have always formulated their own visions of the past and that interpretation is an extension of this. From my findings I have found that interpreters also wish to communicate this same vision and use objects and stories collected from around them to do so. With their passion, they can be seen in a similar light to historians just through different methods.

Wider history

The main role of an interpreter is to represent the history of their heritage site, but I was also curious to find out whether they thought this is enough or whether they should be more aware and reflective of wider Nova Scotian history.

A couple of interpreters said they do incorporate a wider history at their sites. This was seen mostly in relation to giving Indigenous histories and narratives a platform. Callum mentioned that it is important to learn from Indigenous people and know their stories in case visitors ask questions. Freya similarly believes it is important to incorporate Indigenous narratives into her interpretation, but also believes it is important to balance this with giving Indigenous persons their own voice through Indigenous centres at the heritage sites.

Contrarily, some of the interpreters recognized the importance of representing wider histories but did not necessarily think of it being connected to their roles. When asked, Abigail told me she feels that interpreters at her site try their best to incorporate more history, but she moved on from the topic quickly, showing that it is not of great importance to her. Harriet talked about incorporating African Canadian history but also feels that as important as that is, “[the site] itself didn’t really have anything to do with [that history].” Declan told me that his site represents a specific time period and group of people, so it does not need incorporate more history as it is not the purpose of the site. These interpreters show that they do not believe this to be important to their position and do not feel it is their job to change this.

Conversing with these interpreters about their views on representing history has shown that they recognize themselves as being a separate entity from history, but also the importance of their role in being the linking factor for engagement. Moreover, there proved to be an interesting divide between historical accuracy and performance where they do not feel that performance draws away from this. Speaking with interpreters on this topic shows that there needs to be a balance between wanting to encompass more narratives and stories but not having the scope to do so as well as being respectful and aware but within the confines of what they are doing.

CONCLUSION

My brief experience of being a heritage performer at a pioneer village has shown me that the visitor is inherently an anthropologist; conducting participant observation of the everyday life of the past, performed by the interpreter. My research reveals interesting insights into how heritage performers understand and recognize the work that they do. The themes of motivations and authenticity in living history were used to engage with the overarching question of, *how do heritage performers understand their role(s) as representing history?*

To begin to deconstruct my primary question I also asked, *what motivates an individual to take on the role of a heritage performer?* This allowed me to gain insight into their intentions. I found that interpreters are motivated by the desire to share their passions with others through open, engaging, and personal interpretation. Through these motivations, I was able to understand that heritage performers were not monetarily motivated to participate; rather, they go into it because they enjoy the work. Moreover, participants felt content at their heritage sites knowing they could immerse themselves in their roles.

Building from my second question, *how do heritage performers engage with authenticity in their work?* I listened to stories interpreters shared about their experiences in the workplace and analyzed how they engage with different types of authenticity. When in their positions they engage with techniques to make an experience realistic for themselves as well as for the visitors. They were able to complete this task by understanding the need to produce an authentic environment through visual and emotional experiences.

Exploring these sub-questions sheds light on the overarching question; *how do heritage performers understand their role(s) as representing history?* The interpreters I spoke with see themselves in roles which represent history in a way that reflects what the visitor wants to

engage with. They felt their own personal research and family histories (when applicable) are enough for working with the visitors, making the history accessible to them. Moreover, their ability to increase accessibility of history by bringing it to life for the visitor shows how they value the role cultural intermediaries play over the necessity of complete historical accuracy.

With more time, it would be interesting to take the current findings and compare the responses from interpreters who work at the same sites to consider similarities in their approaches and motivations. This could be linked to conducting interviews with directors of the respective sites to understand the aims of the managerial staff. It would further provide useful feedback and changes for recruiting staff at the sites.

My study works to complement the discipline of anthropological and heritage studies. Through their narratives, I found that my participants greatly influence the production and consumption of knowledge at heritage sites. My participants emphasized the importance of creating a positive experience for the visitor through their ability to create a tangible experience of living history, while at times valuing this over an authentic representation of history. Through examining the lived experiences and motivations of heritage performers in Nova Scotia, we observe that study of living history requires expansion to accurately reflect both interpreters' and visitors' and experiences. By strengthening this link, we are able to better understand the past in the present.

REFERENCES

- Bunten, A. (2008). Sharing culture or selling out? Developing the commodified persona in the heritage industry. *American Ethnologist*, 35(3), 380-395.
- DeJuliis, David. (2015). Gatekeeping theory from social fields to social networks. *Communication Research Trends*, 34(1), 4-7.
- Handler, R., & Saxton, W. (1988). Dyssimulation: Reflexivity, Narrative, and the Quest for Authenticity in "Living History". *Cultural Anthropology*, 3(3), 242-260.
- Jackson, A., & Leahy, H. (2005). "Seeing It For Real?"--Authenticity, Theatre and Learning in Museums. *Research in Drama Education*, 10(3), 303-325.
- Keith Negus (2002) The work of Cultural intermediaries and the enduring distance between production and consumption. *Cultural Studies*, 16:4, 501
515, DOI: [10.1080/09502380210139089](https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380210139089)
- Kidd, Jenny. (2011). Performing the knowing archive: heritage performance and authenticity. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 17:1, 22-35, DOI: [10.1080/13527258.2011.524003](https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2011.524003)
- Kvale, Steinar (1996). Chapter 7: The Interview Situation. In *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing* (pp. 124-135). London: SAGE.
- Luker, K. (2008). *Salsa dancing into the Social Sciences : Research in an age of info-glut*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Morgan, C. (2016). *Commemorating Canada : History, heritage, and memory, 1850s-1990s* (Themes in Canadian history). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Palmer, G., & Jankowiak, W. (1996). Performance and Imagination: Toward an Anthropology of the Spectacular and the Mundane. *Cultural Anthropology*, 11(2), 225-258.
- Palmié, S., & Stewart, C. (2016). Introduction: For an anthropology of history. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 6(1), 207-236.
- Roth, S. (1998). *Past into present : Effective techniques for first-person historical interpretation*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Tivers, J. (2002). Performing heritage: The use of live 'actors' in heritage presentations. *Leisure Studies*, 21(3-4), 187-200.
- Waitt, G. (2000). Consuming heritage: Perceived historical authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(4), 835-862.
- Wynn, J. (2012). Guides through Cultural Work: A Methodological Framework for the Study of Cultural Intermediaries. *Cultural Sociology*, 6(3), 336-350

APPENDIX A: Email inquiry for recruitment sent to Nova Scotian Heritage Sites

Hello,

My name is Lizzie James, and I am in my final year of my Bachelor of Arts degree studying Social Anthropology at Dalhousie University.

I am reaching out to you as I am conducting my honours research project on performative heritage. I am interested in conducting interviews with individuals who have worked as heritage performers at Nova Scotian Heritage Sites, such as yours, in order to gain insight into their motivations and experiences in the role. I was wondering if it would be possible for you to pass this message along to current or past part-time, full-time and seasonal heritage performers, tour guides and interpreters?

I really appreciate your help and look forward to keeping in contact with you and gaining some responses,

All the best,

Lizzie James

lizziejames@dal.ca

Email to forward to employees:

Hello!

My name is Lizzie James, I am in my final year of my Bachelor of Arts degree studying Social Anthropology at Dalhousie University. This email has been forwarded to you as you have previously or recently worked as a heritage performer in Nova Scotia.

For my final fourth year honours project I am interested in conducting interviews with individuals who have worked as heritage performers to gain insight into their motivations and experiences in the role.

I am looking to speak with individuals who fit the guidelines of being seasonal, part-time or full-time heritage performers. I would like to speak with anyone who currently holds one of these positions or has done in the past 3 years. Heritage performance roles encompass a variety of shapes and forms including first-person narrative (for instance, taking on a specific role, speaking in character), third person narrative (for instance, describing, demonstrating methods of

the past to visitors, ex. “I am cleaning my rifle as soldiers did in 1815”), tour guides in character and so on.

If you fit these criteria, I would love to interview you and hear about your experiences in the profession! The interview would take around an hour and would be scheduled at a time and place that works well for you. I am happy to meet in person at a COVID-safe distance if you are in Halifax, or over skype/zoom/teams/phone call. Your identity will be kept confidential throughout the research.

If you are interested or have any questions please feel free to reach out to me or my research supervisor, Martha Radice (martha.radice@dal.ca).

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you!

Lizzie James

lizziejames@dal.ca

APPENDIX B: Participant consent form



CONSENT FORM

Heritage Performance: Authenticity, Motivations and the Representation of History

You are invited to take part in research being conducted by me, Lizzie James, an undergraduate student in Social Anthropology, as part of my honours degree at Dalhousie University. The purpose of this research is to interview heritage performers to understand what motivates them in taking on their roles and how, if at all, this in turn implicitly impacts the representation of history. I am specifically interested in what motivates people to take up these roles and how they engage with authenticity as they do so. I will write up the results of this research in a paper for my class, called the honours thesis.

As a participant in the research you will be asked to answer a set of interview questions concerning your role at your heritage site. The interview will take about an hour and can be conducted either in person, at a safe COVID distance, or online. With your permission, the interview will be audio-recorded, either through my phone if we meet in person or through

Zencast, Cleanfeed, or Audiohijac if we meet over video chat (if you have a preferred method for a recording please let me know). I will also take hand-written notes as you speak. If I quote or discuss anything specific you say, I will give you a pseudonym and remove any identifying information from it. Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. You do not have to answer questions that you do not want to answer, and you are welcome to stop the interview at any time if you no longer want to participate. If you decide to stop participating after the interview is over, you can do so until March 1 2021. I will not be able to remove the information you provided after that date, because I will have completed my analysis, but the information will not be used in any other research.

Information that you provide to me will be kept private and will be anonymized, which means any identifying details such as your name will be removed from it. Only the honours class supervisor and I will have access to the unprocessed information you offer. I will describe and share general findings in a presentation to the Sociology and Social Anthropology Department and in my honours thesis. Nothing that could identify you will be included in the presentation or the thesis. I will keep anonymized information so that I can learn more from it as I continue with my studies.

The risks associated with this study are no greater than those you encounter in your everyday life in relation to discussing this topic. If we are to conduct our meeting via videochat, there is a risk of loss of personal privacy from the use of internet-based communications. The risk is no greater or lesser than when using applications such as Skype and Zoom for other purposes.

There will be no direct benefit to you in participating in this research and you will not receive compensation. The research, however, will contribute to new knowledge on heritage sites and performers, and their role in the representation of history. If you would like to see how your information is used, please feel free to contact me and I will send you a copy of my honours thesis after April 30.

If you have questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact me or the honours class supervisor. My contact information is lizziejames@dal.ca. You can contact the honours class supervisor, Dr Martha Radice, at the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Dalhousie University on (902) 494-6747, or email martha.radice@dal.ca.

If you have any ethical concerns about your participation in this research, you may contact Catherine Connors, Director, Research Ethics, Dalhousie University at (902) 494-1462, or email ethics@dal.ca.

Participant's consent:

I have read the above information and I agree to participate in this study. My participation is voluntary, and I am aware that if I wish to withdraw my interview from the study I must do so before March 1, 2021. I understand that my interview will be audio-recorded, and that my words may be quoted directly, without identifying me.

Name:

Signature:

Date:

Researcher's signature:

Date:

APPENDIX C: Interview Guide

Interview guide

Opening remarks:

Before we get started, I would like to remind you what my project is about and explain why you are here. I am interested in understanding why heritage performers, like yourself, decide to take on the role that you do and how you feel about it.

I would also like to go over a few key points from the information and consent form I sent you. Is that ok?

If you feel uncomfortable at any point you are more than welcome to take a break or skip a question.

- Do you have any questions before we begin?
- What are your preferred pronouns?

Intro questions/motivations

1. You mentioned in your email that you work at _____, I don't know a lot about the site could you give me a brief introduction please?
 - a. To start off, could you please tell me if you are currently working as a heritage performer? And for how long you've been working there?
 - b. How did you find out about the position? What inspired you to apply for and take up the position?
 - c. Did you ever visit heritage sites as a child?
 - d. Have you always wanted to work in the heritage sector?
 - e. Do you think it is important to have a passion for history being an interpreter?

- f. Have you ever worked with individuals that you don't think have done a good job? Or went in with the wrong intentions
 - i. Could you provide me with an example?
 - g. Could you please list 3 traits that you believe make a good interpreter?
2. Could you please take me through a typical day at your workplace in your role?

Authenticity, cultural intermediary

- 3. Do you do first or third person interpretation?
- 4. Do you have a specific role that you play when you work?
 - a. Could you describe this character? (costumes, props, accents etc.)
 - b. And how much of the creation of the role was up to you? Are you given a script or any guidelines?
 - c. Do you think these aspects of your character help visitors engage with the history?
 - d. How do you feel being in a role representing an individual from a different century? Can you describe what that is like?
- 5. Is "authenticity" a word that resonates with you?
- 6. How do you try to make your performance as realistic as possible?
- 7. What effect do you want to have on the visitors in the moment?
- 8. There is a term which I have been researching for my paper titled, "cultural intermediaries". This basically means, that individuals in certain roles attempt to share things they know and are passionate about in order to make the topic engaging for another person and engage them in something new.
 - a. Do you see yourself as a middle-man between history and the visitor?
 - b. On this note, can you describe to me what you hope a visitor takes away at the end of the day when they leave?
- 9. Do you think interpretation and performance is the best way to convey history?
- 10. Do you feel that your heritage site accurately represents a wider Nova Scotian history (minority groups, voices less spoken)?
 - a. Are you aware of any initiatives to combat these issues?
 - b. Do you feel that parts of history are being left out? that it is biased from a white settler perspective for example?
- 11. Do you think you should include a wider historical narrative? Or stick to your personality?

Closing remarks

- 12. Is there anything else you would like to add or share with me about your experience as a heritage performer?
- 13. Do you have any final questions about the rest of the process?

Thank you so much for your time, I really appreciate it, I will be in touch soon with a follow-up email

APPENDIX D: Follow-up email sent to participant after interview

Hi _____,

I just wanted to send you a quick follow up email to you and say thank you again for taking the time to meet and chat with me, I really appreciate it! Please feel free to contact myself or my research supervisor (Martha Radice, martha.radice@dal.ca) if you have any further questions or concerns for the rest of the project.

I aim to have my final thesis finished by the end of April and if you would be interested in reading it, please let me know and I will forward you a copy or link to find it online!

Thank you again and all the best,

Lizzie James

APPENDIX E: REB Final Report



ANNUAL/FINAL REPORT

Annual report to the Research Ethics Board for the continuing ethical review of research involving humans / Final report to conclude REB oversight

A. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

This report is (<i>select one</i>):			
<input type="checkbox"/> An annual report		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A final report	
REB file number:	2020-5395		
Study title:	Heritage Performance: Authenticity, Motivations and the Re-Presentation of History		
Lead researcher	Name	Elizabeth James	
	Email	lizziejames@dal.ca	Phone 647-201-2523

(named on REB submission)				
Current status of lead researcher (at Dalhousie University):				
<input type="checkbox"/> Employee/Academic Appointment <input type="checkbox"/> Former student				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Current student <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please explain):				
Supervisor	Name	Martha Radice		
<i>(if lead researcher is/was a student/resident/postdoc)</i>	Email	martha.radice@dal.ca		
Contact person for this report (if not lead researcher)	Name			
	Email		Phone	

B. RECRUITMENT & DATA COLLECTION STATUS

Instructions: Complete **ALL** sections relevant to this study

Study involves/involved recruiting participants: Yes No
If yes, complete section B1.

Study involves/involved secondary use of data: Yes No
If yes, complete section B2.

Study involves/involved use of human biological materials: Yes No
If yes, complete section B2.

B1. Recruitment of participants	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
B1.1 How many participants did the researcher intend to recruit? <i>(provide number approved in the most recent REB application/amendment)</i>	8-10

<p>B1.2 How many participants have been recruited? <i>(if applicable, identify by participant group/method e.g. interviews: 10, focus groups: 25)</i></p> <p>a) In total, since the beginning of the study: interviews, 9</p> <p>b) Since the last annual report: n/a</p>
<p>B1.3 Recruitment for this study is:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> complete; or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> on-going</p>
<p>B1.4 Data collection from participants for this study is:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> complete; or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> on-going</p>

<p>B2. Use of secondary data and/or biological materials <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable</p>	
<p>B2.1 How many individual records/biological materials did the researcher intend to access? <i>(provide number approved in the most recent REB application/amendment)</i></p>	
<p>B2.2 How many individual participant records/biological materials have been accessed?</p> <p>a) In total, since the beginning of the study:</p> <p>b) Since the last annual report:</p>	

C. PROJECT HISTORY

<p><i>Since your last annual report (or since initial submission if this is your first annual report):</i></p>
<p>C1. Have there been any variations to the original research project that have NOT been approved with an amendment request? This includes changes to the research methods, recruitment material, consent documents, study instruments or research team.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>

If yes, list the variation here:

(You will be notified if a formal amendment is required)

C2. Have you experienced any challenges or delays recruiting or retaining participants or accessing records or biological materials?

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

C3. Have you experienced any problems in carrying out this project?

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

C4. Have any participants experienced any harm as a result of their participation in this study?

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

C5. Has any study participant expressed complaints, or experienced any difficulties in relation to their participation in the study?

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

C6. Since the original approval, have there been any new reports in the literature that would suggest a change in the nature or likelihood of risks or benefits resulting from participation in this study?

Yes No

If yes, please explain:

D. APPLYING FOR STUDY CLOSURE

Complete this section only if this is a FINAL report as indicated in section A

D1. For studies involving recruitment of participants, a closure may be submitted when:

all research-related interventions or interactions with participants have been completed

N/A (this study did not involve recruitment of participants)

D2. For studies involving secondary use of data and/or human biological materials, a closure may be submitted when:

all data acquisition is complete, there will be no further access to participant records or collection of biological materials

N/A (this study did not involve secondary use of data and/or human biological materials)

D3. Closure Request

I am applying for study closure

E. ATTESTATION (both boxes *must* be checked for the report to be accepted by the REB)

I agree that the information provided in this report accurately portrays the status of this project and describes to the Research Ethics Board any new developments related to the study since initial approval or the latest report.

I attest this project was, or will continue to be, completed in accordance with the approved REB application (or most recent approved amendment) and in compliance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS 2).

SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

1. Submit this completed form to Research Ethics, Dalhousie University, by email at ethics@dal.ca at least 21 days prior to the expiry date of your current Research Ethics Board approval.
2. Enter subject line: REB# (8-digit number), last name, annual (or final) report.
3. Student researchers (including postdoctoral fellows and medical residents) must copy their supervisor(s) in the cc. line of the annual/final report email.

RESPONSE FROM THE REB

Your report will be reviewed, and any follow-up inquiries will be directed to you. You must respond to inquiries as part of the continuing review process.

Annual reports will be reviewed and may be approved for up to an additional 12 months; you will receive an annual renewal letter of approval from the Board that will include your new expiry date.

Final reports will be reviewed and study closure acknowledged in writing.

CONTACT RESEARCH ETHICS

- Phone: 902-494-3423
- Email: ethics@dal.ca
- In person: Henry Hicks Academic Administration Building, 6299 South Street, Suite 231
- By mail: PO Box 15000, Halifax, NS B3H 4R2