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Abstract

“THE LIFECYCLE OF A NEIGHBORHOOD”: DEVELOPING A SELF-GUIDED TOUR OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT IN JUDICIARY SQUARE FOR THE NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM, WASHINGTON, DC

By Amy H. Griffin, M.A.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2014

Major Director: Margaret A. Lindauer, Associate Professor, Interim Department Chair, and Museum Studies Coordinator, Department of Art History

Self-guided tours for museums require authors to define a learning objective, research content, design graphics, and implement inclusive interpretive methods. However, museum education literature does not provide clear, comprehensive direction for these complex projects. By recounting the development of a self-guided tour of Judiciary Square for the National Building Museum in Washington, DC, this thesis assesses the value and limitations of theoretical literature in practice. It introduces additional research methods and approaches to address project components that museum education literature overlooks.
Introduction

In 2007, the education departments at the National Building Museum (NBM) and the Smithsonian American Art Museum (SAAM) collaborated to develop a school field trip that examined the built environment surrounding these two Washington, DC, institutions. Because both museums occupy buildings originally intended for government offices, change was a natural theme for the resulting program, “Lifecycles of a Building, a Street, and a City.” It consisted of a tour of SAAM’s historic Patent Office building, an “investigative walk” through the surrounding neighborhood guided by an NBM educator, and a craft project conducted at NBM for which students designed a city block as they envisioned it fifty years in the future.¹ The goal of this program was for “students [to] become more responsible citizens” by understanding human interaction with the environment and articulating the repercussions of these interactions on the quality of life.² Although well received by school groups visiting multiple locations, education staff withdrew the program due to the high frequency of scheduling conflicts and bad weather. In February 2013, Mary Hendrickse, School and Youth Groups Manager at NBM, expressed her desire for a self-guided version of the

---


² “Lifecycles of a Building, a Street, and a City,” 1.
“investigative walk” portion of the program, so that patrons might continue to study change in the surrounding built environment outside the context of a field trip.³

This thesis project recasts the “investigative walk” as a stand-alone tour for NBM visitors of all ages to undertake independently. The self-guided tour is issued as a letter-size document that can also be downloaded as a PDF file. It maintains the goals of the original program to foster an appreciation for the ways people shape their environments and the far-reaching implications of these actions. It also adopts the theme of change to underscore the role of evolving needs, technical abilities, cultural values, and tastes in guiding these decisions. That participants will emerge more engaged, responsible citizens as a result of this tour remains as an implicit, optimistic goal. To this is added the hope that they will bring heightened sensitivity to and curiosity about built environments elsewhere after the tour is over.

Significant alterations to the “investigative walk” include its restructuring into a self-guided format, its recalibration into a program suitable for adults as well as children, and a shift in focus from the neighborhood surrounding SAAM to Judiciary Square, where NBM is located.⁴ Creating this revised tour involved: determinations of how to present information thoroughly and accurately while remaining sensitive to the needs of a general audience; researching tour mechanics to devise a framework best suited to the objectives of this project; and surveying literature on

³ In an email communication of 11 February 2013, Hendrickse referred to the self-guided version of the walking tour as a “wish-list” departmental goal.

⁴ The revised tour contributes to the education department at NBM. As such, it does not assume the structure of the original tour developed in conjunction with SAAM.
interpretive methods to develop a system of approaches compatible with both the conditions and the desired learning outcomes unique to this particular tour.

The thesis consists of four parts. Chapter One outlines theories and methods currently espoused in the fields of museum and design education, which were consulted while creating the self-guided tour. A survey of the various, sometimes inconsistent pedagogies reveals that no single author recommends methods incorporating all factors involved in this project. Based on this review, it is clear that tour writers must select from multiple sources as well as devise their own strategies to meet requirements specific to their assignment. Although the literature presented in Chapter One is gathered and assessed for its pertinence to this museum education project, it contains guidelines applicable to many forms of instruction, such as recommendations for communicating with, orienting, and engaging audiences. Chapter Two presents an overview of the development of Judiciary Square in chronological sequence. This narrative essay serves to accentuate the differences between the scholarly presentation of historical facts and their depiction in a self-guided walking tour, providing both context and contrast for the methods enacted in the tour, “The Lifecycle of a Neighborhood: A Self-Guided Tour of Judiciary Square,” which comprises Chapter Three. An account of how these methods were researched, selected, and implemented follows in Chapter Four. This concluding section situates the chosen methods in the scholarship described in Chapter One and introduces some additional theories of built environment education that were found to be more pertinent to the objectives of this project and more useful during its formative stages than the museum education literature. The essay relates how, although
methods recommended in the museum education literature were not viable for the first planning stages of the tour, they proved valuable in making refinements. This literature asserts the importance of visitor perspectives in self-directed learning, and its effects are evident in the organization, modes of communication, and interpretive methods of the tour. Finally, although methods recommended in all fields consulted provided substantial guidance, Chapter Four stresses that only repeated, first-hand experiences with both the tour site and the guidebook format enabled clear recognition of which methods recommended in theory would serve this particular project in practice.

Ultimately, the thesis argues that no one theory or pedagogical platform can provide directives sufficient enough to counsel the development of a public tour because the parameters of such projects are both singular and fluid. This project has learning objectives that are rooted in built environment and design education, it contributes to educational programming at a museum, and yet it transpires entirely outside of the museum walls. With so many factors to consider, it was necessary to identify which resources offered support for specific components of the project. When little guidance was available for one aspect of the tour, it was productive to consult literature that addressed museum practices with similar characteristics. Turning to writings on exhibition texts, for example, informed the formatting and phrasing of text in the guidebook. Of paramount importance is becoming familiar with the limitations and potential of the format through which any given program is being delivered because this will determine which theories and methods will advance the learning objectives.
Chapter One

Museum Education Methods and the Structure of Self-Guided Tours

This chapter presents a summary of the theories and methods recommended for educational practice in museums. It first addresses visitor-driven principles, which pervades these suggestions. Next, it describes the mechanics of self-guided tours and the inherent challenges of communicating indirectly with participants. The final section presents an overview of methods proposed to facilitate interpretation for museum visitors. Literature on design education was also reviewed for this project; methods from this field appear when they correspond with and supplement the museum education strategies described. Through this survey, Chapter One demonstrates the impracticable volume of recommended methodology and begins to define its uses and limitations, which will be more fully addressed in the final chapter.

The Visitor-Driven Ethos of Museums and Its Implications for Public Tours

Outside of school-related visits, museum attendance is a leisure activity pursued in anticipation of “worthwhile and valuable” experience.⁵ Researchers

---

identify desires to socialize, learn, and venerate sites or collections as dominant motivations for visiting museums. Outcomes of museum visits and programs include: the acquisition of knowledge; fresh, often empathetic interpretations of culture and the world at large; and self-discovery through the realization of one’s own preferences and objectives. According to Gail Anderson, the perpetuation of these outcomes after the museum visit depends largely on their relevance to visitors’ lives and “the future health of their communities.” While wanting to be enlightened, visitors set their own agenda when attending museum exhibitions and programs, which may or may not align with those of the specialists who stage them. Museum educators cannot anticipate all the diverse, individual motivations of their audiences, but accepting this reality can help them articulate realistic goals.

Current literature on museum education and tour strategies embraces these conditions, prescribing methods that prioritize visitors over content and

---


complement the flexibility of visitors’ objectives.\textsuperscript{10} Marie-Andree Leith defines visitor-driven gestures in museums as including a warm welcome to the institution, ease of travel and way-finding, changing exhibitions, content that is important to the larger community, and fostering perceptions that the journey is the visitors’ own by creating a sense of ownership, dialogue, and participation.\textsuperscript{11} Barbara Abramoff Levy, who has published several texts on tours at historic sites, entreats museum staff not to view the limited time and attention of visitors as a problem, but rather “accept this reality and concentrate on presenting the most important information to the public.”\textsuperscript{12} Few, if any, writers contend that the objectives and communicative preferences of curators, programmers, docents, and other museum staff should take precedence over those of their audience. In fact, this attitude is cited as a cause of unclear and ineffectual communication.\textsuperscript{13}

A visitor-driven approach to museum education is grounded in the research of cognitive psychologists, which finds that people assimilate new information to their existing knowledge and belief structures, preferring to access that information

\textsuperscript{10} Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 4. While not commonly absorbed into the missions of museums until the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century, visitor-driven approaches have existed since the early 1900s, most notably in John Cotton Dana’s work at the Newark Museum from 1909-1929.

\textsuperscript{11} Marie-Andree Leith, (paper presented in the program session “Integrating Visitor Perspectives into Interpretive Planning” at the annual meeting of the American Alliance of Museums, Baltimore, MD, 21 May 2013).

\textsuperscript{12} Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber, xii. Emphasis in original.

through processes in which they already feel competent. Moreover, researchers find, visitors most effectively retain concepts introduced in the museum setting when they recur in their subsequent experiences outside of the staged learning environment. The basic pedagogy emerging from these theories entails selecting content with broad applications outside of the museum, presented in ways that accommodate different learning preferences and invite multiple interpretations. John Falk and Lynn Dierking summarize the overarching goal of these methods as contributing to “what someone knows and understands about a topic,” rather than simply teaching the visitor something new.

Thus, most recommendations for defining a tour’s objectives do not concern institutional priorities or informational content; they articulate what the outcomes

---


16 Falk and Dierking, Lessons, 42.
will be for audiences. Levy states: “the best guided tours ... cause us to reflect as we listen, and make us curious to learn more when we leave. They stimulate questions [and] stir conversation.”

17 Alison L. Grinder and E. Sue McCoy suggest that, to focus the attention of visitors, tours assume only one or two main goals, which can be vague if participants are adults, but should be more specific when directed at youths.

18 Ari Seligmann notes that tour authors must determine if they are addressing “novices, professionals, connoisseurs, tourists, or the general public” in order to present information effectively.

19 He adds that programmers grapple with selecting content that will appeal to a diverse public and finding ways to share facts “while fostering wonder and discovery” in participants.

20 Finally, Richard Banz hails programs that accommodate “independent thinking,” which “inevitably results in greater self-awareness and self-direction.”

21 Certainly general discussions of what self-directed education sets out to achieve cannot account for objectives unique to a particular museum or field of study, but it is nonetheless significant that effective communication with audiences is considered the primary measure of a tour’s success, not the information being communicated.

---

17 Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber, xi-xii.

18 Grinder and McCoy, 53-5.


20 Seligmann, 87.

21 Banz, 49-50.
Visitors and their presumed cognitive abilities are even more pivotal in determining methodology. In *Great Tours!,* Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber assign tour methods to the age-specific learning stages established by developmental psychologists Jean Piaget and Robert Selman. Grinder and McCoy base some recommendations on the three categories of learning—cognitive, affective, and psychomotor—proposed in Benjamin Bloom’s *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.* These categories, they argue, determine how audiences will respond to tour structures that are lecture-based, dialogic, or geared toward guided discovery. Systematic methods such as these help tour authors converge on a mode of delivery consonant with people’s learning capabilities and theoretically increase the likelihood that content will be retained. However, this appealingly conclusive rationale still tends to make foregone conclusions about participants, their abilities, and their objectives. A tour based solely on the research of Piaget and Selman, for example, could assume that all visitors ages sixteen and older share the same intellectual faculties and are responsive to the same kinds of information.

In addressing the risks of adhering to any one interpretive method, Lesley Cunliffe concedes that pedagogy inattentive to students’ perspectives risks “passive and unengaged responses,” but also asserts that approaches that are too student-
centered suffer because they can give rise to unsubstantiated opinions and interpretations. His remarks illuminate a dilemma in the visitor-driven museum field. By concentrating on the priorities and perceptions of visitors, programmers may sacrifice rigorous content knowledge and authoritative interpretations. Yet complicated and decisive exposition can alienate museum audiences. Richard Hickman calls for a “synthesis of pupil-centered and subject-centered approaches” to ensure that content is precise and explanatory, but presented in such a way that learners can form their own judgments and extract personally relevant meanings. Elliott Kai-Kee proposes that the educator in art museums develops a “pedagogy that genuinely respects everyone’s voices: the visitors’, her own, curators’ and art historians’, and the voices of tradition.” As these authors suggest, educators can provide rich learning experiences for visitors by avoiding a rigid pedagogical stance, especially one that assigns methodology to indefinite and protean situations.


The Mechanics of Self-Guided Tours

There are two basic tour formats. Docent-led tours are presented either in the third-person or in the first-person, the latter usually requiring the docent to act as a costumed interpreter. Self-guided tours are delivered as pamphlets, audio guides, or digital media incorporating some combination of video, interactive maps, text, and sound recording. Because of the constitution of this thesis project, this section concentrates on the properties of self-guided tours.

Eilean Hooper-Greenhill characterizes self-directed education, or “distance-learning,” as a form of mass-communication: “it is one-way (indirect), impossible to modify at the moment of communication (unresponsive) and takes place in the absence of one of the partners (unequal).”29 A known detriment of self-directed learning in museums is that messages get distorted and participants cannot seek explanations when messages are unclear.30 Visitors’ questions can go unanswered to the extent that learning ceases to happen, especially when they are alone.31 It is impossible to anticipate every question or concern that could arise when developing a self-guided program, but there are suggested methods for mitigating this problem.32 Grinder and McCoy recommend anticipating issues likely to require clarification, such as definitions of technical or specialist terms, explanations of stylistic classifications, and the reasons an object is relevant or meaningful enough

29 Hooper-Greenhill, Visitors, 142.


32 Falk and Dierking, Experience, 2-7.
for the visitor to attend to it. Foreseeable questions about the site can be addressed at the outset of a self-guided tour. For example, those offered at the Seattle Central Library are “front-loaded with factual information” or accompanied by a sheet of answers to frequently asked questions. These measures identify areas where, despite being absent, tour authors can forestall distracting and unnecessary feelings of doubt in their audience.

Self-guided tours are also similar to forms of mass-communication in that participants can choose to ignore messages or leave the situation altogether. This fact distinguishes self-guided tours from museum programs or docent-led tours, which participants may be disinclined to leave out of courtesy for the educator. Literature on self-directed learning calls for programmers to affirm rather than challenge participants’ tendency to deviate from a set agenda. Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi and Kim Hermanson argue that nurturing “personal autonomy and responsibility” is more effective than asserting control over participants because “people are more open to learning when they feel supported, when they are in a place where they can express themselves, explore their interests without fear of embarrassment,” and are not subject to pre-determined expectations.

33 Grinder and McCoy, 74-6.

34 Seligmann, 85-6.

35 Grinder and McCoy, 43-6.

Banz suggests that museums trust visitors not only to set their own goals, but also to “decide upon an effective skill or strategy to achieve that goal.” The role of the self-directed learning apparatus, he states, is to furnish “a purposeful, challenging framework” to facilitate this individualistic process. When participants are solely responsible for seeing a tour through, their sustained interest is contingent upon the compliance of the program with their own beliefs, objectives, and discretion.

Characteristics of tours that complement independent, self-selecting participants would include an initial “hook” to incite “curiosity and exploratory behavior” in visitors by convincing them that the program is or could be meaningful to them personally. Given that participants are predisposed to stray from set frameworks in self-guided learning contexts, Falk and Dierking recommend advising visitors immediately if the program must be followed sequentially to comprehend its message. Opportunities for “enactment, intervention, participation, involvement, and response” enable visitors to partake in the formation of cultural

---


37 Banz, 50-51; Barbara L. McCombs similarly notes that participants must “see themselves as responsible agents in the definition and accomplishment of personal goals” as a condition of constructive self-directed learning. See McCombs, 124.

38 Banz, 48.


meanings rather than act only as recipients of fixed interpretations.\textsuperscript{41} In his work at Plimoth Plantation, James Deetz put visitors in control of interpretation by providing a basic introduction to the content and then leaving them to puzzle out strategically chosen evidence.\textsuperscript{42} Still, Barbara McCombs argues, a system must be in place to assist participants in “effectively and efficiently encoding, processing, and recalling information,” in gauging their progress as they strive toward self-determined goals.\textsuperscript{43} Motivation to continue the learning process requires not only the setting of clear goals and tasks equal to the participants’ abilities, but also clear feedback about their performance of these tasks.\textsuperscript{44} One strategy for providing feedback in self-guided learning is to ask participants to make guesses and then reveal factual information against which they can gauge their responses.\textsuperscript{45} Some tour formats are also by nature more accommodating than others. Digital media can be highly responsive to participants’ incentives, potentially giving learners control over tour routes, the ability to adjust the volume of content and the mode in which it

\textsuperscript{41} Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 37. While serving to counteract older educational theories that characterized learners as empty vessels to be filled with the wisdom of an authority figure, advocates of more active participation in the learning process erroneously assume that students who are not speaking or otherwise physically engaged are necessarily “passive.” Margaret Lindauer, (class lecture, The Museum as Educational Institution, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, 20 February 2013).


\textsuperscript{43} McCombs, 124.

\textsuperscript{44} Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 104-6.

\textsuperscript{45} Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 74.
is delivered, and even to share their experiences and opinions publicly through social media platforms. Participants tend to find these interactive tours memorable and leave with a sense that they have been part of a dialogue, outcomes which authors of any kind of self-guided tour could take into consideration when developing their presentation.

In tours where participants are responsible for delivering themselves to each destination along the route, issues of orientation and navigation are crucial. Getting lost incites feelings of insecurity and anxiety, which detract from people’s ability to concentrate on and enjoy learning tasks. Hooper-Greenhill stresses the importance of providing a concise institutional overview, information about basic comfort facilities, and a “conceptual framework” for individual programs at the outset of the museum visit so that participants can establish their agendas and not be distracted by nagging concerns throughout the learning process. Regarding navigation, Falk and Dierking question the usefulness of two-dimensional floor plans and maps, which many people have trouble relating to three-dimensional space; they suggest rendering maps at an oblique aerial view that illustrates


47 Hale and Schnädelbach, 59.

48 Falk and Dierking, Experience, 88, 104-6; Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 67-8, 74; McCombs, 118-19, 124.

49 Hooper-Greenhill, Visitors, 84-95.
recognizable landmarks.\textsuperscript{50} Within the tour, it is considered important to keep distances short and consistent, take advantage of seating areas, and be clear about where to stop and what to look at.\textsuperscript{51} Rebecca Edwards and Susan Edwards of the J. Paul Getty Museum report their success in incorporating navigation into the narrative of their mobile app tours, making transitions between primary destinations a part of the experience to curtail disorientation.\textsuperscript{52} Katrine Prince of Britain’s Institute of Tourist Guiding recommends planning around scheduled neighborhood events, either to exploit or avoid them, and generally synthesizing contemporary issues with historical facts in walking tours to acclimate participants to unfamiliar places.\textsuperscript{53} Similar to the foreseeable visitor questions discussed above, orientation and navigation mechanisms enable tour designers to facilitate and clarify the experience for participants whose unique priorities, concerns, and dispositions are largely unknowable.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{50}] Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 58, 88.
\item[\textsuperscript{52}] Rebecca Edwards and Susan Edwards, (paper presented in the program session “Magnificent Masters of Museum Mysteries: Narrative Games in Museum Contexts” at the annual meeting of the American Alliance of Museums, Baltimore, MD, 21 May 2013).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Methods of Interpretation

Given the visitor-driven ethos of museum education theory, the fundamental purpose of most tours is not only to acquaint participants with objects and information, but also to facilitate long-term understanding through the construction of personally relevant meanings. The literature is brimming with recommended strategies for engaging visitors in the interpretive process. Methods can relate to the organization, presentation, and conduct of the tour. Following the survey of these methodological categories is a discussion of the calculated, limiting aspects of interpretation and how these can be mitigated through transparent and inclusive methodology.

In organizing a self-guided program, Hooper-Greenhill proposes principles similar to those of an essay with an introduction to the content, objective statement, evidence grouped into about seven categories to support that objective, and a conclusion.54 She warns against including information superfluous to this hierarchical foundation.55 By contrast, Falk and Dierking espouse a narrative structure as a memorable, emotionally engaging, and potentially dramatic interpretive device.56 Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber also recommend structuring tours around a narrative with a beginning, middle, and end, in which objects are the

54 Hooper-Greenhill, Visitors, 159.


illustrations that “visually reinforce the story’s plot.” Additionally, they advise selecting an overarching theme for tours because it reinforces the significance of content. Grinder and McCoy remark that a thematic structure can convey abstract concepts more effectively than one serving specific learning objectives. Unlike tours intending to elucidate a specialized branch of knowledge, thematic tours also have the potential to reach participants through universally familiar topics such as the human body, organic and constructed environments, nature, and major historical events. Clear organization helps participants ground information and their experience in a concrete framework.

As mentioned above, Grinder and McCoy recommend different presentations based on the cognitive and affective learning categories articulated in the two-volume *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Cognitive learning outcomes include the recall, translation, interpretation, application, analysis, and evaluation of information. Affective learning, by contrast, concerns the “interests, attitudes, 

---


61 Bloom, 2, 201-7.
appreciations, values, and emotional sets or biases” of the learner.62 Through affective learning objectives, the educator seeks to produce some change in the student’s worldview, value system, and character.63 Such changes might be evident in the student’s listening skills, a principled approach to different situations, and a willingness to accept alternative perspectives and modify judgments.64 In the Taxonomy, the fullest achievement of affective learning is the integration of an attitude or belief into the learner’s actions and value system.65 Although distinct, cognitive and affective learning are not mutually exclusive; cognitive responses often derive from an emotional or ethical position, while value systems frequently depend on the retention and synthesis of knowledge.66 Unlike cognitive learning outcomes, which are relatively concrete, affective learning can be difficult to assess. Educators generally do not regard the student’s attitudes or values to be a valid


63 Izabela Savickiene, “Conception of Learning Outcomes in the Bloom’s Taxonomy Affective Domain,” *Quality of Higher Education* 7 (January 2010), 37-8, 41-2.


65 Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 184-5.

66 Randee Lipson Lawrence, “Powerful Feelings: Exploring the Affective Domain of Informal and Arts-Based Learning,” *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 120 (2008), 70; Pierre and Oughton, 1-7.
consideration in evaluating academic performance.\textsuperscript{67} One’s beliefs are a personal, private matter, and their manipulation by educators may be perceived as indoctrination.\textsuperscript{68} Moreover, the outcomes of affective learning often become evident over longer periods of time than is measurable during a single course or school year.\textsuperscript{69} However, bearing in mind that many museum visitors seek not only to learn something new but also to enjoy a social, leisurely experience, a program that appeals to the values and perspectives of visitors is perhaps more compatible with their own objectives than one rooted in the fact-laden cognitive domain of learning.

The strategies Grinder and McCoy recommend for affective and cognitive learning outcomes in museums include dialogic tours and lecture-style tours, respectively. Tours that encourage dialogue among participants deal primarily with abstract concepts and provide the experience “most likely to change visitors’ attitudes (affective learning) because it builds upon their own interests, perceptions, responses, and questions.”\textsuperscript{70} Guides serve to gradually elevate participants' thinking throughout the course of the discussion. Lecture-style tours accommodate cognitive learning through the one-way presentation of information; participation is limited to questions asked at the end of the program.\textsuperscript{71} Grinder and McCoy assert that lectures are most effective when facts are linked in a continuous

\textsuperscript{67} Savickiene, 49-50
\textsuperscript{68} Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 15-18; Shephard, 89.
\textsuperscript{69} Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia, 15-18; Shephard, 89.
\textsuperscript{70} Grinder and McCoy, 60-62.
\textsuperscript{71} Grinder and McCoy, 56-60.
narrative, information relates only to objects that participants can see, and the tone of the presentation varies throughout the course of the tour.\textsuperscript{72} These writers suggest that these program structures are widely familiar to audiences and will attract people seeking a cognitive or affective learning outcome.

In selecting historical tour presentations based on Piaget and Selman’s cognitive development stages, Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber recommend that guides introduce simple vocabulary and object identification for participants ages three to six (Egocentric Perspective), use storytelling and questions to reinforce facts and explain people’s decisions for ages five to nine (Subjective Perspective), use storytelling and student responses to problems for ages seven to twelve (Self-Reflective Thinking Perspective), introduce themes to conceptualize facts and explain their importance for ages ten to fifteen (Mutual Perspective), and examine themes through historical context, analogies to contemporary issues, and conflicting interpretations for ages sixteen and older (In-depth and Societal Perspective).\textsuperscript{73} In this model, younger audiences are more responsible for explaining content than adults. These characterizations of learning abilities and outcomes intend to help museum staff ensure that their tours, independently or within a schedule of programs, accommodate audiences who are capable of and interested in different experiences.

A handful of guidelines exist for communicating effectively with tour participants. According to Grinder and McCoy, tedious tours tend to treat all objects

\textsuperscript{72} Grinder and McCoy, 56-60.

\textsuperscript{73} Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber, 112.
as having equal importance and do not connect facts.\textsuperscript{74} Monotony can be avoided by varying the amount of information and mediation as each destination within the tour warrants. They also recommend “talking ‘with’ visitors” rather than “‘at’ visitors” because people will stop paying attention if they are not personally invested in the messages being conveyed.\textsuperscript{75} Falk and Dierking dissuade tour authors from using dry, technical language and instead suggest descriptions and classifications compatible with the concrete knowledge of novices.\textsuperscript{76} In order to communicate effectively with audiences whose knowledge and experience varies, they recommend tailoring didactic methods to everyone from beginners to experts, either through “multiple entry and exit points” in a single program or the adoption of one approach for programs targeted at particular learners within this spectrum.\textsuperscript{77} Hooper-Greenhill identifies the intention to produce an effect on audiences as essential to communication; unless people already share the author’s point of view, a message lacking this intention “tends to be expressive rather than communicative.”\textsuperscript{78} Tour authors should seek “some activity or change as a result of the process” to ensure that participants have in fact received and assimilated

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{74} Grinder and McCoy, 51-3.
\textsuperscript{75} Grinder and McCoy, 63.
\textsuperscript{76} Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 138-41; Also see Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 162.
\textsuperscript{77} Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 136-8; Also see Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 44-5, 146.
\textsuperscript{78} Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 37-41.
messages. Lastly, the tour medium can affect the quality of communication. In their comparative research on various formats adopted for built environment tours, Jonathan Hale and Holger Schnädelbach found that many participants preferred audio guides to both printed brochures and digital media because they do not divide people’s attention between the curatorial voice and the objects being examined. While not all messages will be universally absorbed and adopted, the tone of communication can induce participants to receive and contemplate them.

In self-directed museum learning, there are exacting methods for relating text with reproduced images and the physical object being interpreted. Georgina Goodlander of SAAM insists that the primary objective of self-guided tours is to put collections in front of participants for their consideration. This is a commonly held belief; onsite tours do not exist so that participants can imagine they are somewhere else, interpreting objects they cannot see. Direct access to objects is what distinguishes museums as educational institutions, and first-hand contact with them can provide the sort of immersive, sensory experiences that create lasting impressions on visitors. Seema Rao of the Cleveland Museum of Art issues


80 Hale and Schnädelbach, 56-7.

81 Georgina Goodlander, (paper presented in the program session “Magnificent Masters of Museum Mysteries: Narrative Games in Museum Contexts” at the annual meeting of the American Alliance of Museums, Baltimore, MD, 21 May 2013).

82 Campbell, 12-13.

guidebooks that consist mainly of images, with the text serving only to direct close looking.\textsuperscript{84} In their analysis of participant responses to self-guided tours, Hale and Schnädelbach find that even an over-reliance on printed imagery is unsatisfying for people unless it serves as a point of comparison with an object that is physically present.\textsuperscript{85} In tours and exhibitions, texts should not consume, but rather direct the attention of participants. Ingrid Schaffner asserts that visitors in art museums turn to it because they “want not only to know more, but also to see more,” and therefore “labels should talk to the viewer and to the art \textit{simultaneously},” providing guidance for visitors making sense of and interpreting the object on display.\textsuperscript{86} Moreover, she favors a case-by-case approach to the task of label writing, as not all objects warrant or demand an equal degree of explanation.\textsuperscript{87}

“Language used in museums and galleries is as important as the objects. It structures the visitor’s experience, it welcomes or discourages, it informs or mystifies.”\textsuperscript{88} In the case of exhibition labels, visitors on average spend ten seconds programming, Zipporah W. Collins, ed., (Washington, DC: American Association of Museums, 1981), 8; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 36-7.

\textsuperscript{84} Seema Rao, (paper presented in the program session “Magnificent Masters of Museum Mysteries: Narrative Games in Museum Contexts” at the annual meeting of the American Alliance of Museums, Baltimore, MD, 21 May 2013).

\textsuperscript{85} Hale and Schnädelbach, 56.


\textsuperscript{87} Schaffner, 156-8.

\textsuperscript{88} Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 138-9.
attending to each and nobody reads them all.\footnote{89} Falk and Dierking suggest that, because visitors read “only those labels which hold the prospect of directly meeting [their] immediate informational needs,” concrete facts should precede discussion of more abstract concepts and all statements should be unambiguous.\footnote{90} Hooper-Greenhill proposes that most visitors are more absorbed in their social experience than in learning, “and read just enough to introduce the topic … into their conversations.”\footnote{91} Schaffner implores writers to bear in mind that readers are standing and to use “an active voice and short sentences [as] one way to avoid inducing mental collapse.”\footnote{92} For the same reason, Hooper-Greenhill recommends an informal, familiar tone, limiting sentences to a single idea and sharing only “a few key points.”\footnote{93} From a design perspective, texts can differentiate information through contrasting sizes and styles of type, and ease of reading is enhanced when line breaks correspond to the ends of natural phrases.\footnote{94} Issues of language and textual content are central to the distinction between written scholarship and instruction


\footnotetext[90]{Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 74-8; Also see Schaffner, 164.}

\footnotetext[91]{Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 136-7.}

\footnotetext[92]{Schaffner, 165-6.}

\footnotetext[93]{Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 125-131, 138-9.}

\footnotetext[94]{Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 125-6, 134.}
on self-guided tours, where text serves to help participants examine object-oriented concepts in physically demanding, distracting situations.

When presenting information and objects for visitors to interpret, many writers highlight the importance of context. For history tours, this could involve explaining how an object or site developed over time and relating events pertinent to the tour site with those happening simultaneously elsewhere in the world.\(^95\) In an object-focused tour, context can be essential because formal details typically hold little interest for participants with no knowledge of their significance.\(^96\) Roger A. Fortin notes that, even for scholars, “the deeper value lies not in the aesthetic appeal but rather in the manner in which people coexisted with their environment, their houses, their artifacts and each other.”\(^97\) Providing background information helps to demystify “opaque sign systems” for participants, but tour designers must also be aware that in determining what contexts to feature, they can manipulate the interpretive process by making some explanations seem more viable than others.\(^98\)

Among methods that seek visitors’ active participation in the interpretive process, questioning strategies are perhaps the most ubiquitously endorsed in museum education literature. Grinder and McCoy define four kinds: memory questions typically have one correct, concrete answer such as a fact, name, or

\(^95\) Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber, 2, 23-5, 52-3.

\(^96\) Grinder and McCoy, 48-50.

\(^97\) Fortin, 20.

definition; convergent questions ask participants to draw on available information to identify the best answer; divergent questions have many answers that can be reached through “imaginative thinking and exploration of all facets of an issue;” and judgmental questions solicit informed, personal evaluations or opinions.  

Hooper-Greenhill adds synthesis questions to this list, which “demand the recall of recent experiences, enable a review and evaluation of what has happened, and enable the contextualization and assimilation of new knowledge or material.” Grinder and McCoy maintain that questions help “change the pace of a tour,” “promote new dimensions of thinking,” and train participants to analyze objects and facts in order to support their answers. But they recommend that guides “provide facts and ... ask visitors to make comparisons, contrasts, and inferences” rather than having visitors try to guess correct answers.

Museum educators are beginning to invert questioning techniques and concentrate instead on the questions visitors ask, issues that pique their curiosity, with less emphasis on facts they have learnt. Rika Burnham and Elliott Kai-Kee contend: “in good gallery teaching, the art of asking questions disappears into the

---

99 Grinder and McCoy, 73-4.

100 Hooper-Greenhill, Visitors, 158.

101 Grinder and McCoy, 56-60.

102 Grinder and McCoy, 76-7.

art of dialogue.”104 They criticize interrogative approaches as achieving only the illusion of a democratic and exploratory methodology.105 Questioning techniques, they argue, often impede not only the participants’ curiosity but also the guide’s ability to clearly convey basic information because it becomes swallowed up in convoluted, unproductive guessing games. Burnham and Kai-Kee counterclaim that questions are best adopted to advance an already initiated dialogue or “to focus concerns that visitors themselves voice.”106 While their cooperative methods offer little to those designing a self-guided program, these authors make assertions about questioning strategies that are applicable to a wide variety of learning contexts. They recommend asking questions that “demonstrate a degree of genuine openness” which can be answered by looking at material evidence, avoiding those that allow people to turn so far inward that they lose sight of the subject under consideration, and implementing them only in the service of a clear purpose.107

In addition to questioning strategies, games, imaginative thinking, and comparisons are commonly implemented to involve tour participants in the interpretive process. Engaging visitors with collections and sites through games provides them with a clearly delineated agenda and offers clear feedback about their performance.108 Offering enjoyable, active tasks, they can inspire visitors’

105 Burnham and Kai-Kee, 95-6.
106 Burnham and Kai-Kee, 98.
108 Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 74.
interest and intrinsic motivation, precipitating their desire to remain present throughout the experience.\textsuperscript{109} By selecting a well-known game whose mechanics are largely familiar to people—choose your own adventure, bingo, spot-the-difference—planners can avoid the need to explain rules or weave a complex narrative.\textsuperscript{110} Moreover, games tend to reward unconventional thinking and alternative perspectives.\textsuperscript{111} Disadvantages of a game structure include their perceived lack of seriousness and the risk that participants will doubt the authority of any presented facts.\textsuperscript{112} Grinder and McCoy describe interpretations for which people use their imaginations as allowing them to be “venturesome in their thinking ... free to guess, probe, take risks, and challenge.”\textsuperscript{113} Comparative analysis can urge participants to look closely and critically at the subject matter; their observations of similitude and contrast between subjects heightens conceptual understanding.\textsuperscript{114} Furthermore, provocative comparisons can generate conversation among participants and leave lasting impressions.\textsuperscript{115} In soliciting comparisons, guides must state an objective and furnish participants with information sufficient enough to

\textsuperscript{109} Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 172-3; Grinder and McCoy, 22-4.

\textsuperscript{110} Edwards and Edwards, “Magnificent Masters.”

\textsuperscript{111} Goodlander, “Magnificent Masters.”

\textsuperscript{112} Rao, “Magnificent Masters.”

\textsuperscript{113} Grinder and McCoy, 48-50.

\textsuperscript{114} Grinder and McCoy, 48-50.

\textsuperscript{115} Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 143-5.
meet it. These interpretive activities provide a structure for participants to examine content, apply knowledge, and formulate conclusions independently.

No interpretive methods consider the experience of participants as directly as those that enhance people’s perception of how objects and environments affect them physically. As Hooper-Greenhill states, “museum-based learning is physical, bodily engaged: movement is inevitable, and the nature, pace and range of this bodily movement influences the style of learning.” The artist Kianga Ford developed a series of audio guides for walking tours that combined music, ambient sound, and narration to bring participants into dialogue with the urban environment, prompting consideration of how the experience of a place changes depending on a variety of external and internal conditions. For a self-guided tour in Nottingham, England, that examined universal qualities in the architecture of Tadao Ando, planners urged participants to take note of how their bodies reacted to topography, how travel engenders certain expectations—for instance, the anticipation of a reward after a long uphill climb. Participants also received a disposable anorak with their guidebooks, which allowed them to adopt a temporary,

116 Grinder and McCoy, 53-5.

117 Hale and Schnädelbach, 54-5.

118 Hooper-Greenhill, Museums and Education, 4-5.

119 Karleen Gardner, (paper presented in the program session “Contemporary Stories: A Path for Successful Sensemaking and Placemaking in Museums” at the annual meeting of the American Alliance of Museums, Baltimore, MD, 21 May 2013).

120 Hale and Schnädelbach, 55-6.
almost ritual identity as they took the tour.\textsuperscript{121} They carried this memory of physical immersion and heightened sensory awareness with them, and thus strongly recalled the associated themes of this walking tour in subsequent experiences of the built environment. Learning is physical as well as cognitive and affective. When concepts are examined through physical acts that engage all the senses, they have great potential to be retained because their relevance has been felt, not just postulated.

A major consideration in designing an interpretive program is the ideological authority it carries. Several authors comment on heritage sites where interpretation seems to have ossified into uncritical acts of commemoration. Hugh Campbell cautions that walking tours oversaturated with monuments can limit the “imaginative possibilities” in participants’ engagement with both the history and present state of these sites.\textsuperscript{122} Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber propose introducing “more complex, multi-dimensional stories” at heritage sites with controversial pasts because this affords “opportunities to expand knowledge and experience” rather than allowing interpretation to languish.\textsuperscript{123} Tours examining artistic subjects confront a similar problem of insipid meanings, contending with a tradition in which quality and significance are narrowly, often obscurely, defined.\textsuperscript{124} These conditions reveal that in selecting content and setting interpretive agendas, the “values, ambitions, motivations, expected and unexpected paradigms” inherent in acts of

\textsuperscript{121} Hale and Schnädelbach, 55-6.

\textsuperscript{122} Campbell, 16-17.

\textsuperscript{123} Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber, 6.

\textsuperscript{124} Addison, 184.
cultural mediation can define the very “knowledge and ideas” about a subject.\textsuperscript{125} Tour writers must recognize that they are contributing to people’s conceptions about culture and that the work of representing culture “cannot be perceived as neutral.”\textsuperscript{126} Indeed, as many heritage sites show, interpretations can have “the effect of neutralizing the power of objects to bear witness to the past.”\textsuperscript{127} When meanings are presented as fixed and non-negotiable, there is little incentive for audiences to glean original insights from historical evidence.

While tours writers cannot, and perhaps should not always try to combat inevitable partiality, there are methods for reducing the sense that the interpretations they elicit are final. For example, mediators of the arts might call attention to “qualities of significance” rather than “significant quality,” allowing participants to scrutinize how diverse cultural forms take shape and operate, as opposed to discriminating between them based on received criteria of artistic value.\textsuperscript{128} This approach does not only depart from the canon to include objects participants themselves find worthy of consideration, it can sharpen their ability to independently analyze and form judgments in future encounters with material culture. Historians can avoid describing “a past that seems harmonious, productive


\textsuperscript{126} Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 1-2; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 115.

\textsuperscript{127} Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 116. Emphasis in original.

\textsuperscript{128} Addison, 184.
and comfortable.” Such conclusions tend to favor and possibly misrepresent the experiences of only some individuals and can stifle the ability of visitors, for whom “conflicting voices” and uncertainty are a fact of life, to see themselves in the history presented. Additional methods include publicizing the reasons authors made certain choices, challenging myths, and sharing the stories of individuals or communities to represent multiple experiences of the period or event a program investigates. Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson assert: “Information that is presented as true without alternative perspectives discourages the motivation to learn and explore more.” Evading some measure of doubt and the possibility of alternative explanations could not only compromise the intellectual rigor of public tours, it might also diminish the audience’s incentive to partake in them.

This chapter reviewed recommended methods in museum education and self-guided learning contexts to convey the concerns that are generally shared by practitioners in this field, as well as the various resolutions proposed to address them. Recommendations pertain to matters of orientation, communication, active participation, and inclusivity. Nearly all of these relate fundamentally to visitors—their perceptions, learning abilities, preferences, comfort. These sources generally do not advise educators to approach and evaluate their work as content experts. It is the educator’s responsibility to acclimate visitors to an institution or program,


130 Fortin, 21.

131 Hooper-Greenhill, Visitors, 10-12.

132 Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 71-3.
convince them that content has personal significance, and prove that they are capable not only of learning in the museum, but also of contributing to a larger dialogue.

The following chapter presents a review of the historical research required to produce “The Lifecycle of a Neighborhood.” Although largely neglected in museum education literature, developing accurate content for programs is an enormous responsibility, especially in museums with no differentiation between curatorial and education staff. Like the literature discussed above, this historical narrative represents accumulated information with the potential to inform a tour, but whose application in a single project is not feasible. Furthermore, the essay contrasts with the tour itself to highlight the distinctions between scholarly reporting and the graphic, straightforward medium of a self-guided tour, which is presented in Chapter Three.
Chapter Two

The Development of the Built Environment in Judiciary Square, 1790-2014

Before Congress passed the Residence Act in 1790, ordering the development of a permanent federal capital, nature shaped the landscape above the Potomac River estuary. Judiciary Square—a district organized around numbered streets and radial avenues—was dense woodland rising steeply from the north bank of Tiber Creek, a tributary of the Potomac that still flows beneath Constitution Avenue.133 A stream traveled downhill near present-day Fifth Street to empty into the Creek and a deep ravine carved into land south of D Street about where Interstate-395 now cuts through the city.134 An anonymous observer of Washington’s infancy foresaw the imminent subjugation of nature by the built environment in prose titled “Prophecy”:

The time will come when this wide waste of morass and thicket, open plain and wooded dell will resound with the busy hum of industry and be redolent with the glow

---


of action and the thrill of life!—the swamps along the Tiber, teeming as they do now with all the varieties of animal and plant life, before the destructive march of man will gradually disappear, and Art will erect its palaces over the ruin of nature.\footnote{Anonymous author, written in a record book of the Commissioners of the City of Washington, dated 5 January 1795. Quoted in Hugh T. Taggart, “Old Georgetown,” Records of the Columbia Historical Society 11 (1908): 141.}

Natural resources guided the decisions of the city’s first planners. Situated on a river granting access to the Atlantic Ocean as well as an inland route to the Shenandoah Valley, the capital city could easily engage in foreign and domestic trade. In selecting a location sheltered by the Eastern Shore of the Chesapeake Bay, President Washington, Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War, anticipated the defensibility of the city against naval attack.\footnote{Elbert Peets, “Famous Town Planners,” in On the Art of Designing Cities: Selected Essays of Elbert Peets, Paul D. Speiregen, ed., (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1968), 3-6.} As loggers set out to clear roads and plots devised by surveying engineer Pierre Charles L’Enfant in the 1790s, laborers established residences around natural features. Waterways became the city’s canals and sewers; the ravine, its dumping ground.\footnote{Architecture: Market Square, 1-2; Weeks, 72; and Zevely, 32.} On a plateau north of Indiana Avenue, the high elevation and access to fresh water compelled Irish builders and brick-makers to erect timber-frame houses, a hospital, and a temporary jail on the site that would become Judiciary Square.\footnote{Pamela Scott and Antoinette J. Lee, Buildings of the District of Columbia, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 178; Elizabeth Barthold, “Judiciary Square: Photographs, Written Historical and Descriptive Data,” (Washington, DC: Historic American Buildings Survey, National Park Service, 1993), 2-3; “Known as
While nature surrendered to human culture, the cursory settlements of the late 1700s dissolved as federally authorized plans for the city crystallized. Judiciary Square was one of the seventeen tracts L’Enfant reserved for public buildings in his design for the capital (figure 1), completed at President Washington’s request in 1791. L’Enfant formed “a geographical relationship” between the three branches of government; he designated this site, equidistant from the President’s House and the Capitol, the seat of the federal judiciary. George Hadfield, a British architect, designed the first government buildings on the site. A brick jail was completed north of E Street in 1802, followed by the Greek Revival Washington City Hall (figure 2) on Indiana Avenue, begun in 1820. City Hall, which accommodated the Circuit Court for Washington County in addition to municipal offices, attracted professional classes to Judiciary Square. Their brick townhouses (figures 3 and 4) edged out the hastily built wooden dwellings of laborers from 1830-1860 and increased property values. Lawyers and statesmen desiring close proximity to work at a time when


139 Barthold, 1.
horses and walking were the primary modes of transportation propelled this second wave of residential development.\textsuperscript{143} Institutions supporting community life soon followed: numerous houses of worship, businesses, medical practices, and schools thrived here in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{144}

Lots on the northeast edge of the neighborhood remained undeveloped in the 1860s, probably because of their proximity to Washington Jail (figure 5).\textsuperscript{145} This building replaced Hadfield’s jail, which had grown overcrowded with the “debtors, criminals, runaway slaves, and ... mentally insane” it imprisoned.\textsuperscript{146} Although Washington Jail preserved the approximate location of its predecessor, which was convenient for transporting prisoners to trials, its architect Robert Mills integrated newly formed conceptions of penal institutions in his design. Whereas Hadfield’s jail was a brick structure with a hipped roof and gables—not especially characteristic of its function, Mills’ crenellated roofline implied defensibility.\textsuperscript{147} Inspired by Charles Bulfinch’s Massachusetts State Prison, it also embodied the innovatory criminal

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{143}] Goode, 146; Barthold, 3; “Chief Justice Taney-A Talk with His Biographer,” \textit{Public Ledger} (13 November 1868); Zevely, 32.
\item[\textsuperscript{144}] Zevely, 32; Bednar, 122-4; Scott and Lee, 179; Barthold, 3.
\item[\textsuperscript{145}] Barthold, 4.
\item[\textsuperscript{146}] Faculty of the Columbian College medical school converted the original jail into the Washington Infirmary Hospital in 1844. It burned down in 1861. Barthold, 3; Goode, 304.
\item[\textsuperscript{147}] Desire to associate the jail with security only intensified; in the 1860s, architect Thomas U. Walter recommended covering the stucco exterior with a blue wash to simulate granite, but mainly succeeded in inspiring the building’s nickname, “the Blue Jug.” See Goode, 304-5; Barthold, 4.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
theory that solitary confinement facilitated penitence.\textsuperscript{148} In his memoir, former prisoner Daniel Drayton describes his cloistered cell as poorly lit and ventilated, and guards denying him the benefit of exercise in the jail passages.\textsuperscript{149} While residential life flourished in the area southwest of Washington Jail, speculators resisted developing real estate in its immediate vicinity. In 1858, the city boarded up the windows, “excluding the prisoners from public view and preventing them from seeing the passerby on the streets, which used to excite them to use the profane and vulgar language that offended the moral sense of the whole neighborhood.”\textsuperscript{150} Critics described the building as “defective” in design and of “careless” workmanship before it was even finished.\textsuperscript{151} Thirty-six years after opening, Washington Jail was demolished and its prisoners were relocated to a larger facility at the edge of the city. The removal of Washington Jail coincided with a concerted effort by the DC Board of Public Works and the Army Corps of Engineers’ Office of Public Buildings and Grounds to make improvements to federal property beginning

\textsuperscript{148} Bryan, 33.

\textsuperscript{149} Daniel Drayton, \textit{Personal Memoir of Daniel Drayton, for Four Years and Four Months a Prisoner (for Charity’s Sake) in Washington Jail}, (Boston: Bela Marsh, 1855), 40-44. Drayton was imprisoned in Washington Jail from 1848-1853 for aiding in the escape of seventy-six enslaved persons from Virginia and Georgetown.

\textsuperscript{150} \textit{Report of the Commissioner of Public Buildings}, quoted in Barthold, 3.

\textsuperscript{151} Goode, 304-5. Politicized criticism of Washington Jail is given in “Reports of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Condition of the Public Buildings,” issued under Whig President Taylor in 1841 as a reaction against the federal building projects authorized by Democratic President Jackson and largely carried out by Robert Mills, whom Jackson named Architect of Public Buildings for the federal government during his term in office. See Bryan, 279-85.
in 1872. A public garden (figure 6) was cultivated in Judiciary Square with graded streets, improved drainage, gravelled walkways, new trees, and a fountain.¹⁵²

When Montgomery C. Meigs designed the airy interior of the Pension Building in the early 1880s, he partly sought to assuage critics who lamented losing the north end of Judiciary Square, so recently unencumbered with the demolition of Washington Jail, to a four-hundred by two-hundred-foot colossus of brick, terra cotta, and cast-iron (figure 7).¹⁵³ In soliciting designs for the building, the Senate Appropriations Committee issued two criteria: it was to be inexpensive and fire-resistant.¹⁵⁴ Meigs studied architecture and engineering at West Point before joining the Army Corps of Engineers, attaining expertise in practical design and efficient construction methods.¹⁵⁵ For the Patent Office, he drew from Classical design precedents, modeling the exterior after Antonio da Sangallo’s Palazzo Farnese (figure 8). Meigs also infused Classical architectural ornament with contemporary war motifs. Cannons and bombs replace conventional fleur-de-lys and acanthus leaves in the cornice. A decorative frieze, modeled after that of the Parthenon, depicts various regiments of the Union Army in a continuous procession. These

¹⁵² Barthold, 5.


¹⁵⁴ Scott and Lee, 184; Lyons, 15-6.

¹⁵⁵ As supervising engineer for the renovation of the U.S. Capitol, his design choices resulted in maximum usable space, improved ventilation, and climate control; from 1879-1881, Meigs served as consulting engineer for the fireproof National Museum (Smithsonian Arts & Industries Building)—the least costly government building ever constructed in the United States. See Lyons, 12-13.
embellishments, on a building where the pensions of United States Army veterans were processed, enacted an ancient architectural principle that buildings should express their function.\textsuperscript{156} But pioneering, cost-efficient techniques were used to create the academic details associated with labor-intensive, skilled craftsmanship.\textsuperscript{157} For example, the Boston Terra Cotta Company fabricated the frieze panels (figure 9) from twenty-eight designs, which are repeated and shuffled around the 1200-foot perimeter.\textsuperscript{158} They were manufactured and delivered to the site three years before the building was finished.\textsuperscript{159} The Pension Building has undergone many transformations in response to changing needs over the years, housing several government offices after the Pension Bureau vacated in 1926. Perceptions of its architectural merit have also changed over time. Contemporaries derided the structure as “Meigs’s Old Red Barn” and one critic stated that it was “too bad the damn thing is fireproof.”\textsuperscript{160} Today, the National Building Museum preserves


\textsuperscript{157} “In the late nineteenth century ornament was considered an indispensable element of architecture, whose omission except for the most compelling need to economize was equated with rudeness of manners. It was consistent with the laborious methods of skilled hand work and afforded ample evidence of the craftsman’s skill.” \textit{Architecture: Market Square}, 11-12.

\textsuperscript{158} Lyons, 19-21.

\textsuperscript{159} Lyons, 19-21.

\textsuperscript{160} This criticism is attributed to either General William T. Sherman or General Philip Sheridan. Reception did not improve in the early twentieth century;
the edifice as a monument of “architectural quality and distinction” and its atrium is an in-demand venue for large social and political functions.161

The Pension Building heralded the transformation of Judiciary Square from a mixed-use, residential neighborhood into a dedicated administrative district. In the early twentieth century, law enforcement buildings rapidly multiplied and City Hall became the District of Columbia courthouse.162 These buildings replaced the rowhouses that once flanked the park and filled in its side streets, such as Blagden Row (figure 4), the present site of the Metropolitan Police Department (figure 10).163 Number 513 Sixth Street is one of the only surviving components of the nineteenth-century residential streetscape (figure 11).

As Judiciary Square shifted into a bureaucratic center, older neighborhood features that once bound the residential community together became ancillaries to federal and municipal bureaus, particularly those institutions whose communities

John Clagett Proctor stated “the building has served a useful purpose as an example to our national legislators of what not to do, and fortunately it is located in a not very prominent place” in his 1930 book, Washington, Past & Present. The red brick Pension Building contrasts with Washington City Hall, whose neoclassical exterior is customarily sheathed in white limestone. See Lyons, 55.


162 The District of Columbia Court of Appeals was erected on the southwest corner in 1910, the Municipal Center on the southeast corner and the Juvenile Court on the east side in the 1930s. Berthold, 5-6; Bednar, 124-5.

163 Goode, 146-7; Bednar, 123.
had moved to developing neighborhoods in northern Washington and outlying suburbs.\textsuperscript{164} First Unitarian Church at Sixth and D Streets (figure 12), begun in 1822, served a congregation of abolitionists in the years leading up to the Civil War. In 1859, the city denied the church permission to ring its 1,000-pound bell after doing so in mourning for the execution of John Brown.\textsuperscript{165} The building lost its bell tower altogether in the 1880s when the church became a police court.\textsuperscript{166} Proving too small for its newfound function, First Unitarian Church was demolished in 1906, after the neoclassical building had accommodated changing demands for two decades. Most Gothic structures near Judiciary Square, such as Metropolitan Methodist Church (figure 13) and Trinity Episcopal Church (figure 14), were simply demolished as the neighborhood became a bureaucratic center.\textsuperscript{167} St. Mary Mother of God (figure 15), a Catholic church, survives on Fifth Street largely because its clergy found a constituency among the Chinese population that settled in the area northwest of Judiciary Square after the German community withdrew from the neighborhood in the 1920s.\textsuperscript{168}

\textsuperscript{164} Barthold, 7.

\textsuperscript{165} Goode, 196-7.

\textsuperscript{166} First Unitarian Church stood until 1906, when it was replaced by a larger court building, which was itself demolished to create the Office of the Recorder of Deeds in 1940. See Goode, 198.

\textsuperscript{167} Bednar, 122-4.

\textsuperscript{168} A Short History: Saint Mary Mother of God Church, Washington, DC, (1975), n.p.; Evening Star (26 July 1890); “New German Catholic Church,” The United States Catholic Magazine 5 (1846): 226.
There were many causes of the steady decline in residential life around Judiciary Square from the late 1800s through the mid-twentieth century. After the Civil War, neighborhoods like Dupont Circle and Columbia Heights emerged in the largely undeveloped northern reaches of Washington, DC, drawing residents out of the older sections of the city. With the advent of electric streetcars in 1888, which replaced horse-drawn trolleys by 1900, higher speeds and more comfortable travel allowed citizens to settle farther away from the urban centers where they conducted business (figure 16). They only “streetcar suburbs” like Takoma Park, Silver Spring, and Chevy Chase emerged on the Maryland border in the 1890s. In the twentieth century, “the beginnings of a new kind of metropolitan community [were] laid by the automobile.” Car registration in the District quadrupled between 1910 and 1930, precipitating the construction of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and Rock Creek Parkway, as well as further suburban development in Virginia and Maryland. During and after the Second World War, the expansion of the federal military bureaucracy created thousands of new jobs, attracting people from across the United States to settle in the growing Washington suburbs. In 1953, for the first

---


171 Schrag, 5.

172 Schrag, 17.
time, less than half of the residents in greater Washington lived in the District of Columbia; the 1960 census reported the District’s first population decrease, a trend that continued into the early 2000s.\textsuperscript{173} Limited parking, high property costs, and the restraints of urban density numbered among the grievances people developed against the inner city. Suburbs afforded the novelty, freshness, and exclusivity that downtown areas—increasingly associated with “smog, dirt, crime, disorder”—did not.\textsuperscript{174} Looting and riots following the 1968 assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. prompted remaining residents to move if they could afford to do so.\textsuperscript{175}

Increased automobile commuting from suburbs led to citywide traffic congestion and parking shortages. In 1958, the Zoning Office required detailed parking plans before approving new construction.\textsuperscript{176} By 1975, eighty percent of the 350,000 people entering the central business district during the morning weekday commute drove cars, which outnumbered available downtown parking spaces.\textsuperscript{177} City planning officials and public opinion came to champion paving over public gardens because motorists would already park in them and disfigure the sod: “the basic pattern which emerged in the 1930s was the destruction of grassy areas by motorists, followed by requests that these unsightly areas be paved to improve the

\textsuperscript{173} Schrag, 17; Moving People, 6-7.

\textsuperscript{174} Longstreth, 245-7; Schrag, 17.

\textsuperscript{175} Denise Kersten Wills, “‘People Were Out of Control’: Remembering the 1968 Riots,” The Washingtonian (1 April 2008); Scott and Lee, 179.

\textsuperscript{176} DC Municipal Regulations, Rule 11-2100, (14 March 2008).

\textsuperscript{177} Deiter, 11; Moving People, 6-7.
appearance of the park.” An appetite for more parking lots often superseded the desire to preserve historic buildings; the Judiciary Square rowhouses (figure 3) were among many pre-Civil War structures demolished in the 1960s for this purpose.

The federal government supported automobile use by keeping fuel taxes low and investing in the interstate highway system, which President Eisenhower launched in 1955. Interstate-395 (figure 17), bounding the eastern edge of Judiciary Square, was part of an ambitious project to build a ring of expressways around downtown Washington initiated in 1966. This limited access roadway, free of intersections and traffic lights, was designed to isolate cross-town commuters from surface roads; it was “the modern answer to the problem of moving traffic volumes rapidly and safely.” Because the project affected so many resources and neighborhoods in the city (Interstate-395 stretches from northwest to southwest Washington by tunneling underneath the National Mall and part of the Capitol grounds), it required the approval of various government agencies, including the National Gallery, Congress, and the National Park Service, as well as a formal

---


179 Goode, 147.

180 Schrag, 1 and 23-24.


public hearing prior to groundbreaking. The federal government reclaimed nineteen million dollars-worth of property—630 housing units, 105 businesses, 7 churches, and 1 school—in order to build the highway. The last unit of Douglas Row (figure 18), three pre-Civil War townhouses on Eye and Second Streets, numbered among the buildings demolished between Second and Third Streets, now the Interstate-395 corridor. The expressway opened to traffic in 1973 and, on average, 130,000 vehicles access the cross-town route daily.

Almost concurrent with the development of Washington’s freeways, city planners began formulating a solution to traffic congestion and parking shortages by linking the District of Columbia with surrounding suburbs through an underground rail system. People had advocated for a subway in the capital as early as 1909, but it was not seriously considered until 1959, in a Mass Transportation Survey that envisioned the highway and rail systems working cooperatively. Among East Coast cities, Washington’s Metro is unusual in that it was introduced after automobiles came into widespread use. Its “controlled, predictable path,”

---


184 Anderson, “Historic Overview.”


186 Anderson, “Historic Overview.”

187 Deiter, 24-33.

188 San Francisco and Atlanta were the only other American cities to inaugurate subway systems after the 1920s. Schrag, 1; Robert T. Dunphy and Robert E. Griffiths, The First Four Years of Metrorail: Travel Changes, (Washington, DC: Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, 1981), 1-7.
isolated from surface roads and highways, reduced traffic volumes more than earlier forms of mass transit such as streetcars and buses.\textsuperscript{189} Once Congress allocated the initial funds to begin construction, a groundbreaking ceremony took place at Judiciary Square, in front of photogenic old City Hall, on 9 December 1969. The next day, these holes were filled in and work began at the actual location of the Judiciary Square station on F Street (figure 19).\textsuperscript{190} The Metro opened to passengers in 1976 but work persists to this day. It succeeded in alleviating rush hour traffic: the number of vehicles entering the city daily, including buses, had decreased thirty percent by 1981.\textsuperscript{191} Although designed to transport commuters from outlying regions into the city center, an unforeseen result of the subway was a mid-day rush, as people began taking advantage of increased mobility within the city to dine and shop in neighborhoods distant from their workplace during lunch breaks; it came to “dominate travel entirely within the downtown area.”\textsuperscript{192} Much like the streetcars that stimulated suburban growth in the 1890s, the Metro also became a catalyst for residential and commercial development around greater Washington.\textsuperscript{193}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{189} Deiter, 20-21.
\textsuperscript{190} Deiter, 24-33.
\textsuperscript{191} Dunphy and Griffiths, iii-vii.
\textsuperscript{192} Deiter, 61-68.
\textsuperscript{193} Dunphy and Griffiths, iii-vii.
\end{flushright}
Suburbanization and postwar public works efforts “destroyed historic urban neighborhoods by cutting them up for major street and highway projects.”\textsuperscript{194} Construction of Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority headquarters (figure 20), the nerve center of the subway system, directly threatened the historic Adas Israel Synagogue on the west side of Judiciary Square. Abandoned by the congregation in 1907, the temple subsequently became a Greek Orthodox church, a take-out restaurant, and a barbershop (figure 21).\textsuperscript{195} Nevertheless, the structural fabric of the building continued to express the conservative religious principles of those who commissioned it in 1873: the only iconography is a sunburst above the front door.\textsuperscript{196} In 1969, the Jewish Historical Society of Greater Washington agreed to move the building to a new site on G and Third Streets (figure 22); it reopened as the Lillian and Albert Small Jewish Museum in 1975.\textsuperscript{197}

An ardent preservation movement had grown out of the widespread demolition related to highway construction nationwide. It culminated with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which led to tax incentives for adaptive reuse and subjected to formal review any federal construction on or around properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places.\textsuperscript{198} The Moran Building


\textsuperscript{195} \textit{Architecture: Market Square}, 87-93.

\textsuperscript{196} Scott and Lee, 186; Weeks, 75.

\textsuperscript{197} Weeks, 75.

\textsuperscript{198} Lea, 10-11.
on Fifth and F Streets, among Washington’s last surviving commercial buildings designed in the once-popular Second Empire style, enjoys the protection of the National Register. But, wedged against a new high-rise apartment building, it also illustrates the sometimes uncoordinated co-existence of new development and old architecture (figure 23).\textsuperscript{199}

Roughly half of nearby Chinatown falls within the Downtown Historic District created in 1984 to preserve the Western European architectural resources of the nineteenth century. Chinese architectural motifs on old buildings are mostly veneers because the buildings are protected from irreversible changes (figures 24 and 25), but also because the majority of Chinese-Americans in Washington were transplanted to this established, historically German neighborhood after their original settlement, begun in the 1860s near Pennsylvania Avenue, was demolished for the Municipal Center complex in 1927.\textsuperscript{200} Government expansion and public


works projects not only leveled old buildings, but also displaced communities. When the city proposed to build a convention center in the heart of Chinatown in the 1970s, threatening to displace the community yet again, architect Alfred Liu designed Wah Luck House (figure 26), an apartment building which provided elderly residents with subsidized housing.\textsuperscript{201} Preserving the distinction of the neighborhood became a municipal priority when policy-makers came to realize that Chinatown was the only remaining ethnic district in Washington. The most forceful expression of the city’s newfound interest was the 1986 installation of the Chinatown Gateway Arch (figure 27), which was funded in equal part by the Chinese government and the DC Office of Business and Economic Development.\textsuperscript{202} But as in Judiciary Square, and Washington at large, the population of Chinese home- and business-owners had vastly decreased as a result of post-war suburbanization and improved transportation. In 2010, about five hundred (less than one percent) of the 55,000 Chinese Americans in greater Washington lived in or around Chinatown.\textsuperscript{203}

And yet, with the rise of heritage tourism and the issuance of the \textit{Chinatown Design Guidelines Study}, the neighborhood has undergone a rebirth. Built from scratch, Wah Luck House incorporates Chinese design motifs such as latticed balconies and large, Chinese characters on the façade. The convention center was eventually finished in 1983 near Mount Vernon Square.


\textsuperscript{202} Controversy surrounded the acceptance of this “Friendship Arch” from Beijing. In the mid-1900s, most Chinese immigrants to Washington were political refugees. Some received extortion letters from the Communist government threatening to torture family members they left behind. People with these memories resented the government-sponsored Friendship Arch and even considered erecting a Taiwanese counterpart at H and Fifth Streets in protest. Leslie, “Poignant Tale”; Mintz, “Chinatown Fights”; Leeman and Modan, 174-7.

\textsuperscript{203} Leeman and Modan, 169-70.
Guidelines in 1988, which encourage real estate developers to incorporate Chinese motifs and signage, cultural differentiation in this neighborhood has never been more conspicuous.204

In the 1980s and early 1990s, Judiciary Square and surrounding districts had become “a run-down, forgotten part of the city's old downtown ... where drug traders went about their business and few outsiders ventured after dark.”205 The development of John Marshall Memorial Park in 1983 (figure 28) and the creation of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Judiciary Square Park between 1989 and 1991 (figure 29) indicate efforts on the part of city officials to endow public spaces with a sense of purpose and to exert greater control over its use.206 A wave of private urban revitalization enterprises followed the completion of the one-million-square-foot MCI/Verizon Center in 1997 (figure 30). Abe Pollin, owner of the Capitals hockey team and the Wizards basketball team, decided to move the

---

204 The municipal government issued the first design regulations through the Chinatown Program in 1976. The Mayor’s Downtown Committee reiterated these standards in 1982, as did the 1984 Comprehensive Plan for DC. A consortium of architects, residents, property-owners, and the Chinatown Steering Committee published the Chinatown Design Guidelines in 1988 to ensure that all real estate development in the neighborhood served “the creation of an enhanced Chinese character.” See Fred L. Greene, “Foreword,” Chinatown Design Guidelines, n.p.


206 For more on John Marshall Memorial Park, see Carol R. Johnson, Carol R. Johnson: A Life in the Landscape, (Allston: Daybreak Press, 2011), 106-11; Weeks, 80-1; and Bednar, 126. For the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, see Bednar, 126-8.
sports arena to Penn Quarter from the Maryland suburbs.\textsuperscript{207} With the creation of this sports arena, new investors flooded the neighborhood and an estimated 5,000 jobs became available.\textsuperscript{208} Although the sports complex remains largely unchanged in its appearance and function, its corporate affiliation and copious advertizing space instigated some of the most rapid changes in Washington's built environment (figure 31). One of the most pervasive changes the MCI/Verizon Center brought about was the establishment of a Business Improvement District, which oversees “the order, cleanliness, infrastructure, and marketing necessary for sustained growth.”\textsuperscript{209} Property owners in the Business Improvement District pay the salaries of cleaning crews, of Public Safety Workers who alert city police of criminal activity, and of a Physical Improvement Team that manages repairs to sidewalks, streets, parking facilities, and signage, and also purports to provide support for the homeless.\textsuperscript{210}

The Natural Resources Defense Council considers the MCI/Verizon Center a planning success story; Pollin's choice to revive a degraded urban neighborhood, rather than building on arable land in the automobile-dependent suburbs, led other

\textsuperscript{207} Pollin chose this location despite offers of large public subsidies from Virginia and Maryland governments. See \textit{Solving Sprawl}, 41-2.

\textsuperscript{208} \textit{Solving Sprawl}, 41-3.

\textsuperscript{209} The Business Improvement District stretches from Massachusetts Avenue to Constitution Avenue on the north and south, and from I-395 to Sixteenth Street on the east and west. The program is based on similar efforts in Philadelphia, New Orleans, and New York City. See \textit{Solving Sprawl}, 44-5; Stephen C. Fehr, “DC Hopes Arena Is Just a Warm-Up,” \textit{Washington Post} (13 October 1997); and \textit{MCI Center Dedication Book}, 51.

\textsuperscript{210} \textit{MCI Center Dedication Book}, 51.
developers to rehabilitate existing architectural resources and encouraged the use of mass transit.\textsuperscript{211} Residential presence in the Judiciary Square vicinity has also expanded as an indirect result. By 2005, the neighborhood offered at least 2,000 new housing units.\textsuperscript{212} Cranes puncture the skyline today, emanating from the construction sites of high-rise residential buildings. A vacant lot at 305 G Street (figure 32), in one of the Zoning Office’s “Housing Priority Areas,” awaits development into a twelve-story apartment complex that incorporates the adjacent Harrison Building into its design.\textsuperscript{213} Government bureaucracy came to dominate Judiciary Square, which was effectively deserted after dark, while its residents, community institutions, and private businesses relocated to burgeoning suburban areas. The tide has shifted once again. The District’s population grew by five percent between 2000 and 2010 after five decades of decline.\textsuperscript{214} In the neighborhoods surrounding Judiciary Square, the number of residents ages twenty-five to thirty-____________

\textsuperscript{211} About $3 billion dollars were spent in developing the surrounding area. The Verizon Center is built above the Gallery Place/Chinatown Metro station, one of the largest transportation hubs in Washington; about 55\% of people attending sporting events arrive by subway. See \textit{Solving Sprawl}, 42-3. For more on the NRDC’s criteria for “smart growth” that has low environmental impact, see \textit{Solving Sprawl}, 2-4.


four grew by two hundred thirty-five percent.\textsuperscript{215} Under the auspices of national chains, retail industries thrive once again in Penn Quarter and Chinatown, and are now joined by entertainment and nightlife venues. Nothing remains of its agrarian past, but historic buildings hint at the self-contained community that once prospered in Judiciary Square. Transportation networks now connect the area to outlying regions and an odd vacant lot embodies the future possibilities for this revitalized historic neighborhood.

Chapter Three

“The Lifecycle of a Neighborhood: A Self-Guided Tour of Judiciary Square”

This chapter consists of the guidebook presented to the education department of the National Building Museum.
A SELF-GUIDED TOUR OF JUDICIARY SQUARE

THE LIFECYCLE OF A NEIGHBORHOOD
Why do buildings, streets, and neighborhoods look the way they do?

In both forming and transforming it, in considering these factors, the tour begins to answer such questions: They reveal different ways a neighborhood changes by looking at the circumstances, people, and choices involved. They represent a range of property types like public parks, highways, government offices, and commercial buildings. The stops span nearly two centuries of history, but the tour is more thematic than chronological. The tour examines how and why buildings, streets, and districts common to most urban environments will gain not only knowledge of the decisions that shape cities over time, but also different perspectives on types of buildings, streets, and districts common to most urban environments.

This tour examines how and why buildings, streets, and districts common to most urban environments.

Judiciary Square is a small neighborhood in Washington, DC. At its center is a public plaza, also called Judiciary Square.
TOUR MAP & KEY

10. Parking Lot
9. Old Adams Partially
8. 199 E Street Overpass
7. Blaasden Row
6. John Marshall Park
5. First Unitarian Church
4. Vernon Center
3. Hogan Building
2. Washington Hall
1. St. National Building Museum

Follow this suggested order: the top directions appear in red italics and the bottom directions appear in black. As you read each direction, examine the map and a picture of the site on the next page. Each site is examined at the National Building Museum, where you will find information and a display. The tour ends in Judiciary Square Plaza. After an introduction, you acquire certificate stickers and round the Judiciary Square neighborhood. This tour takes about 45 minutes. The route...
exists in the neighborhood.

In the late 1990s, new commercial development sparked widespread revitalization of Judiciary Square and nearby districts. Stores, restaurants, and entertainment venues filled once-silhouetted commercial buildings.

With the introduction of electric streetcars in 1888, residents and commerce radiated moving from the city center into developing suburbs. Cars internalized this trend in the mid-20th century. At the same time, the streets were deserted and unused at night. Storerooms with more courts and offices, it became a weekday commuter destination. The streets were
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A SHORT HISTORY OF JUDICIARY SQUARE
building differently now? This dramatic shift of opinion may make you wonder what buildings that presently seem

Many people disliked the Pension Building at first, calling it "Wife's Old Barn." 100 years later, it became the

the materials influence your thoughts about these structures?

Compare the materials used on this building to those used for the stone buildings nearby. In what ways, if any, do

while stone often used for classical public buildings,

used brick and terracotta instead of expensive

similarities can you find? To save time and money, Wife's

Wife's admired Italian Renaissance buildings and modeled

a cultural preference for classical architecture.

The building's influences:

- Limited Federal funding
- Mediterranean Revival
- Architect Montgomery Wife's recognized with:

bear in mind that when he designed this building in 1882,

it became the National Building Museum in 1980.

This building originally housed the United States Pension Office, which processed retirement benefits for veterans.

GO TO: The south side of 4th Street, halfway between 5th and 6th Streets, look North, at the Museum.

CONSTRUCTION: 1882-1887; Architect: Montgomery Wife's

1. NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM (OLD PENSION BUILDING)
The jail was ultimately demolished in 1874. Prisoners were relocated to a new building on the outskirts of town. In accordance with developing theories that social isolation would help criminals repent.

Windows at people walking by
• Imprisonment of criminals
• Mobs of people came to witness the

They were held in cells on the 2nd and 3rd floors. They were held in cells on the 2nd and 3rd floors. Mental illness in addition to common criminals, dark without permission, debacles, and the.

Washington Jail was built here so prisoners could

Only 32 years. Designed by Robert Mills, architect of the Washington Monument, was neither durable nor admired. It stood for

2. Site of Washington Jail (demolished)
With new construction, go to the next site to see what that looks like. What, if any, value do you see in preserving the Moran Building? How might this block feel different if it was filled in?

The Moran Building has been stripped down to make room for the apartments. Notice how the roof of the old building is being preserved, which went up in 2005. Notice how the roof of the old high-density apartment complexes like the River Park, developers and zoning officials tend to favor pitched roofs, dormer windows, and tower buildings. Second Empire style—its double-historic preservation values the Moran Building.

Conflicting priorities are evident on this block today: the difference in its scale and prominence today. This photograph of the building dates to 1904. Notice that Moran Building was listed as a historic landmark in 1989. Also, as headquarters for the Communist Party, businesses still lease space here. The Moran Building was businesswoman L.E. Moran commissioned this office building in 1889. In 1925, it was housed a pawnshop. GO TO: The southeast corner of 6 St. Streets. LOCK: northwest of the building on the corner.

Construction Begins: 1889; Architect: George Boggs and Others

3. MORAAN BUILDING
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We then successfully sold the building and kept some of the existing buildings.

The architects of the Verizon Center wanted the new building to beBrunet and cutting-edge, a catalyst for renewal. The architects demolished to build this arena. and note that over a dozen structures were

For all that the Verizon Center is a testament to the commercial and residential properties nearby.

4.3 billion spent to develop

Creation of over 5,000 new jobs

Sustaining maintenance and public safety

Strong public and private partnerships in

Accessibility by car and mass transit

Features of the urban revitalization project:

Center area drew consumers and investors back.

Changes helped recover the former status of the district.

decline as residents and commerce moved to suburbs. Clane rose and property was abandoned. The Verizon

For 80 years, from 1870-1950, this was a bustling shopping district (Picture below). After 1950, it fell into economic

GO TO: The southeast corner of 6th & F Streets. LOOK: northwest, at the Verizon Center.

Constructed: 1995-1997; Architects: Ellerbe Becket Architects
As you move to the next stop, think about the presence (or absence) of nature in the city and how it functions.

Neighborhood Fresh Fish

deep running near D & E Streets was the present-day S Street was a public sewer. A pleasant stream that once flowed down 1800s, then it is today, but it was not always.

Nature was more visible here in the early

This drawing shows that

from the Roman ruins, would the men in the number, would you guess that you are not

smell, would you guess that you are not

today? Based on what you see, hear, and

feel, do you find here

what natural features do you find here

where the Recorder of Deeds Office is now.

First Unitarian Church is on the left in this

Deeds office in 1941.

Police court before replacing it with a larger courthouse in 1906. That too was demolished for the Recorder of

GO TO: The southwest corner of 6th & D Streets. Look: northeast.

Companied: 1822 Razed: 1906; Architect Charles Bullock

5. Site of First Unitarian Church (Demolished)
What if any, qualities do you expect in a memorial park?

How could these plans change the function of this green space?

Explaning his career along the edges.

Lawn will be reconfigured into an ellipse, with text panels.

Now plans are underway to feature Marshall more prominently.

Is it clear to whom this park is dedicated and why?

Do they inspire contemplation as Johnson intended?

If you like, go down and cross C Street to walk on the paths.

- Encouraging indirect, meditative movement
- Paths running parallel and perpendicular to the axis.
- Dated to the late 18th century
- Keeping the open north-south axis of 4th Street, which
  - A statue of John Marshall on the north edge

Memorial includes:

Aspects of Johnson's design that correspond to its function as a

Installation of the park involved removing 4th Street and several buildings, including the boarding house.

In 1983, the Federal Government hired Carol Johnson to design a memorial park in a neighborhood linked to the life of John Marshall, the first Supreme Court Justice. Marshall lived in a boarding house near the park.

Go to the top of the steps south of Indiana Avenue/D Street between 4th & 5th Streets. Look: South, beyond C Street.

Completed: 1983; Landscape Architect: Carol R. Johnson

6 JOHN MARSHALL PARK
Judiciary Square as you proceed to the next site—a highway.

The forms of transportation people now use to come work in
than when people walked or drove horse-drawn carriages. Consider
Short distances between home and work are less important now.

What features of a residential neighborhood are missing?
Urban design helps distinguish this area as a business district.

Notice the scale, material, and function of buildings here today.

- Residential areas were characterized as slums
- Wealthy residents began moving to stricter suburbs
- Space was needed for expanding government buildings
- Most townhouses were demolished in the mid-20th century because:
  - to lawyers and politicians dependent on horses for travel
  - its proximity to the courts and offices in City Hall
  - look across the street: Il, now serves as the Court of Appeals
  - the remains of architecture of Old City Hall, begun in 1820
  - its high, hood-resident elevation

Judiciary Square attracted residents in the 19th century for:

The Blagden Row townhouses were among many built around Judiciary Square Plaza in the 1800s. The Daily Building,

Go back to: Indiana Avenue; look: east of the Henry T. Daily Building (Metropolitan Police Department).

Constructed: 1852; razed: 1931; Architect: William Baldwin

7. Site of Blagden Row (demolished)
395 runs through the area in the foreground of the image shown above. To build this highway, the Government Realized as many cars entered DC in 2010 than in 1975. Subways, which opened in 1976, also helped. Half separate from the urban grid creating a cross-town route below and eliminating intersections.

Freeways resolved these problems by:
- Lack of dedicated cross-town routes
- Glut of (80,000 cars entered DC daily)

In the 1960s, Washington traffic suffered from:

- LOOK: North of I-395.
- Now: GO TO: The north side of E Street, just east of 39th Street.

Roads with the freeway.
This office building was designed to accommodate I-395. Note the ramps underneath the building that link surface streets with the freeway.


- LOOK: Southeast of the Department of Labor Building.
- First: GO TO: The northwest corner of 30th St.

8 Interstate 395, E Street Overpass
Old Adas Israel Synagogue and the Old Pension Building

What differences are there in the present significance of your opinions about that structure changed over time. As you head back to the building museum, remember

Adas Israel was a conservative congregation and reserved

Intended for Religious purposes,

Search the exterior for any signs that this building was

Washington raised money to move and restore the historic structure. It opened as a museum in 1975. demolition in 1966 to build the Metro Operations Control Center but the Jewish Historical Society of Greater

subsequently became a Greek Orthodox Church, a bank, and a bank. The building was restored. It was leased for

Modern Building. The congregation bought over time and later built a larger temple in 1907. This building

This building was originally a synagogue for the Adas Israel Congregation and it stood at 6th and 6th Streets, near the

GO TO: The northeast corner of 3rd & 6th Streets. LOOK: northeast, at the Jewish Historical Society

Constructed: 1873-1876; Architect: Unknown

9th Old Adas Israel Synagogue
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• the role of nature in urban environments
• the architectural distinction of the building
• the "architectural distinction" of the building
• some sites attract customers and investors
• growing residential presence in Judiciary Square
• modes of transportation used to move around the city

Your vision for the future of this site?
Which of the historic circumstances and concerns relevant to other sites on this tour, listed below, would influence
Imagining these parking spaces were moved underground, what would you put here?

You have studied how this neighborhood has changed in the past. Now consider how it could change in the future.

GO TO: The west side of 6th Street, halfway between F & G Streets. LOOK: West, at the parking lot.

20. BUILDING MUSEUM PARKING LOT
The Historic American Buildings Survey
The National Register of Historic Places
State Department of Historic Resources
State Department of Transportation
United States Census Report
State and Town Building Codes
Zoning Offices
State and Town Historical Societies

For more information about architectural history and urban planning in your area, consult:

This tour investigated change in the built environment through the social forces and design choices that have shaped it. Although concentrating on Judiciary Square, the types of places on the tour—public buildings, a park, a highway, a supermarket, housing, and historic landmarks—are not exclusive to this neighborhood.
Chapter Four

The Role of Recommended Methods in the Making of

“The Lifecycle of a Neighborhood: A Self-Guided Tour of Judiciary Square”

This chapter describes the methods used in “The Lifecycle of a Neighborhood” tour in relation to those outlined in Chapter One. Because many of the recommended museum education approaches were only useful in later iterations of the project, this chapter argues that these are more valuable in making revisions than as planning tools. Before any recommended methods could be implemented, it was necessary to thoroughly research Judiciary Square to ascertain the scope of possible content, which is presented in Chapter Two. In determining which sites to include, considerations of the NBM institutional commitment to built environment education were more constructive than methods suggested for self-guided learning in museums generally. Moreover, the parameters and educational possibilities of the published guidebook format became clear only through practical experimentation. Select methods from museum education literature provided the most support in the later drafts of the tour, when determining how to communicate with participants, organize and format the guidebook text, and involve participants directly in the interpretation of sites. In researching and designing this tour, literature detailing theories and methods did not lay the foundations for the final product; it emerged from continuous revisions based as much on historical
documentation, the educational objectives of NBM, the format of the tour, and the conditions of the site as on the practices recommended by authorities in a variety of fields. No one methodology was sufficient on its own.

It is clear from the cross-section of literature reviewed in Chapter One that this project drew from sources addressing not only tours and museum education, but also curatorial practice and design education. This diverse group of resources came together not only because there is a dearth of material on self-guided tours, and so it was necessary to investigate methods related to other forms of self-directed learning, but also because of the nature of this particular project. Design education forms the pedagogical foundation of educational programs at NBM and it seemed necessary at first to preserve that pedagogy in the project. The mission of NBM, “to advance the quality of the built environment by educating people about its impact on their lives,” informs the objectives of this tour.\footnote{National Building Museum, “About the National Building Museum,” accessed 20 March 2014, http://www.nbm.org/about-us/about-the-museum.} No single museum education resource provided direction that encompassed the learning objectives of this project, the parameters of a guidebook format, and visitor-driven interpretive methods. But comparing the recommendations of multiple authors helped define the educational potential of this self-guided tour. For example, Grinder and McCoy describe how participants opt into lectures and discussions because they seek mainly cognitive or affective learning outcomes. This assertion contrasts with directives that museums should accommodate the multifarious knowledge,
experience, objectives, and preferences of the learning public. While this tour conveys factual information about Judiciary Square and relates the many competing interests, constraints, and external forces that inform its transformation, this knowledge promotes an affective learning objective. The purpose of cognitive interpretations is to illuminate meaningful and influential characteristics in the built environment, which in turn may encourage participants to take an inquisitive and responsive attitude toward it. The tour would likely be highly unsatisfying for someone seeking cerebral investigation of the neighborhood’s architecture or social history. It was both liberating and energizing to deduce, late in the process, that this tour was intended as just one educational program among many offered by NBM—which include lectures, demonstrations, exhibits, and classroom activities. Though accessible to anyone, it did not need to gratify everybody, as some authors suggest. In fact, attempting to create an experience that was equally geared toward cognitive and affective learning would have achieved neither.

It became evident early on that adopting a pedagogical approach that made sense in theory unraveled once it was put into practice. A critical component of this project, and one that no source provided direction for managing, was creating a new tour out of a program that had already been developed. In gauging which objectives and methods from the original program to retain, discrepancies emerged between the pedagogy espoused by NBM in the “Lifecycles” program and the requirements of a visitor-driven self-guided tour. The “investigative walk” on which this tour was

²¹⁷ Falk and Dierking, Experience, 136-41; Also see Hooper-Greenhill, Visitors, 44-5, 146, 162.
based took students from the Smithsonian American Art Museum to NBM along an indirect route, making four stops. Following a segment in SAAM’s historic Patent Office Building investigating how the structure had changed in response to new technologies and needs, the walking tour enabled participants to apply this line of reasoning to the Penn Quarter neighborhood. The tour introduced not only additional buildings, but also issues related to transportation and zoning. Stops included: the National Archives, formerly the site of a large marketplace; the Hecht’s Department Store building, now a restaurant and apartment complex; the corner of Seventh and E Streets, once a major streetcar junction; and the Verizon Center, a vast sports arena that replaced more than a dozen late-nineteenth-century commercial buildings. Large format documentary photographs broadened students’ perceptions of how these sites had been transformed. Text directed students to deduce the previous and present functions of a site through visible evidence and then asked them to judge whether those uses of space were “good,” “bad,” or both. After the “investigative walk,” students completed the program with a classroom project at NBM, in which they decided which sites to retain and arranged new buildings among them on a zoned map of Seventh Street.

The original “Lifecycles” program was largely created to instruct students about and engage them in the design process. As it is practiced at NBM, design education consists of an instructor presenting the parameters of a problem in architecture or urban planning, and then students imagine, test, evaluate, and re-
test solutions through hands-on activities. Within the “Lifecycles of a Building, a Street, and a City” program, the classroom project implemented design education principles more methodically than the “investigative walk.” The tour sharpened the ability of students to ascertain how the built environment is shaped in response to people’s needs, key outcomes of design education, but this exercise mainly prepared them for the final activity simulating urban design. Attempting to retain the emphasis on design education theory and methods in the self-guided tour was a doomed enterprise. Buoyed by the positive experiences related by Dan Spock, who has successfully anchored narratives in the design processes for exhibitions at the Minnesota Historical Society, the first iteration of “Lifecycles of a Neighborhood” (the subheading of which was “A Self-Guided Design Tour”) explained changes at each site as the result of an ongoing process of trial and error among designers, urban planners, city officials, and inhabitants. While effectively describing the


\[\text{219} \text{ Similar classroom projects investigating the functions and zoning of neighborhood built environments are proposed in Paul Langdon, “Kevin Lynch and Others: Implications for Built Environment Education,” in Built Environment Education in Art Education, Joanne K. Guilfoil and Alan R. Sandler, eds., (Reston: National Art Education Association, 1999), 20-2; Anne Taylor, “User Group Participation in Design Education and the Built Environment,” in Built Environment Education in Art Education, 118, 123-4; and Masengarb and Rehbein, Architecture Handbook, 39, 66.}\]

\[\text{220} \text{ Dan Spock, “Design as a Narrative Form,” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Alliance of Museums, Baltimore, MD, 19 May 2013).}\]
design process, this approach required a great deal of background information that did not always relate directly to what was on view. The tour was too verbose and cerebral for the conditions of a self-guided walking tour. Moreover, an essential component of design education at NBM is that participants actually produce designs to resolve a hypothetical problem, a goal outside the purview of this project.

However, the final tour retains some aspects of the design process in the occasional description of designers’ objectives and identification of the conflicting interests underlying the transformation of built environments. The final stop, where participants are asked to imagine a future for the parking lot adjacent to NBM also enacts design education methodology by presenting a design problem with clear restrictions and possibilities, for which participants can then propose solutions based on their accumulated knowledge of the neighborhood. In later versions, the guidelines offered to participants in imagining a new use for the parking lot changed with the withdrawal of design as a central theme. The first drafts of the tour provided information about neighborhood demographics, building codes, and zoning restrictions so that participants could grapple with some actual limitations faced by planners and architects. In the final tour, whose primary focus is change in the built environment, the guidelines instead recapitulate different issues that resulted in changes at each of the preceding tour sites. Although lacking the practical applications of the original approach, this revision still allows participants to imagine design solutions with the added benefit of a clear, summative conclusion.

221 This exercise originally was to take place at a vacant lot at 305 G Street. The site was changed to avoid confusion if planned construction on this property begins in the near future.
The problems arising from the emphasis on design in the first draft of the tour related to overshooting the amount of information that could be manageably digested in the form of a printed guidebook, and, by extension, a lack of consideration for visitor perspectives. Still, this first draft was essential in gauging how to present facts through this medium and determining where methods relating to didactic texts and visitor participation could be effectively applied. Doing everything contrary to the directives in museum education literature—putting intricately explained content ahead of clear communication and engaging interpretive strategies—somehow diminished the jurisdiction of facts and enabled deliberation on how to present them in a less formal, more generous manner.

When the design process ceased to compete with the companion theme of change, subsequent drafts were organized around an increasingly clear central idea. Change is an important issue in built environment education. According to Eileen Adams and Colin Ward, a core objective of this field is to foster “an appreciation that the environment is constantly changing,” that it is not indelible and students are not powerless over it.\(^{222}\) The original “Lifecycles” program used examples of change to illustrate how built environments reflect evolving societal needs. In the self-guided tour, it is hoped that historical contrasts will encourage participants to see the built environment as a meaningful and persuasive presence in their lives. As built

environment educators suggest, awareness of the effects of built environments—on physical activity, community relations, the economy, emotional health, cultural traditions—may inspire students to take a vested interest in its maintenance and future development.\footnote{223} Therefore, while the self-guided tour could not maintain the design processes as a central theme, it still fulfills the driving institutional objective of NBM.

Certainly the realization of the tour objectives, hinging on the perceptions and attitudes of participants, required visitor-driven methods of organization, communication, and interpretation. Designed specifically for a youth audience, the original “investigative walk” was able to implement methods conversant with Piaget’s and Selman’s cognitive development stages, as articulated by Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber.\footnote{224} The new audience was not so clearly defined, and so this approach was somewhat immaterial.\footnote{225} The self-guided tour is written for a general audience, intended for adults while remaining appropriate for chaperoned children. Authors characterize adult learners as having a wealth of life experience and the desire to integrate this into their education, motivation to cultivate their self-identity, contentment with ambiguity and relativity, and a desire for autonomy in learning.


\footnote{224} Levy, Lloyd and Schreiber, 112.

\footnote{225} Grinder and McCoy, 56-70; Levy, Lloyd and Schreiber, 112. As a document with the potential to be downloaded online from the NBM website, it cannot even be assumed that audience will consist of museum visitors.
situations. Methods that would complement the presumed attributes of adult learners are not very distinguishable from those recommended in visitor-driven museum education generally—selecting content relevant to situations beyond the tour, inviting participants to formulate opinions and conclusions independently, presenting multiple perspectives on issues, and orienting participants so that they feel in control of the experience. Methods devised to achieve specific learning outcomes in particular audiences are perhaps more advantageous in developing programs for young students than in creating a self-guided tour for the general public.

Still, Falk, Dierking, and Hooper-Greenhill’s belief that museums should accommodate the varied learning preferences and abilities of general audiences was impractical for this self-guided tour. The format of a printed guidebook restricts the amount of information that can be coherently and concisely presented, and certainly precludes the simultaneous presentation of facts for both novices and experts. Nor could the tour enact all of the methods suggested to appeal to autonomous self-directed learners. The tour would appeal primarily to participants


Leith, “Integrating Visitor Perspectives”; Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and Education*, 4, 31-42, 170-8, 193; McCombs, 118-9, 124; Burnham and Kai-Kee, 94-5; Falk and Dierking, *Experience*, 106-9, 120-5; Falk and Dierking, *Lessons*, 16, 35-42; Banz, 43-4, 50-1; Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 67-73; Geahigan, 100-1; Cunliffe, 127; Hickman, 49-50; Kai-Kee, 48.

who prefer to read and study images, and favor interpretation through comparative analysis and reflection questions. There are no audio recordings, interactive maps, or options for adjusting content as offered in electronic media.\textsuperscript{229} The tour is not particularly amenable to alternative learning goals or skills.\textsuperscript{230} Participants are only likely to entertain this program and see it through if the stated objective of the tour aligns with their own, if the text and interpretive methods examining change inspire fresh perspectives on the built environment, as promised in the introduction to the tour.\textsuperscript{231}

Committing to a defined objective that accommodates mainly participants desiring an affective learning experience did not absolve the tour from accounting for the characteristics of self-directed learners and visitor behavior in free-choice educational environments described in the literature. The introduction apprises participants of the issues examined in the tour so that they can determine if the program will complement their interests or past experiences.\textsuperscript{232} The questions, “Why do buildings, streets, and neighborhoods look the way they do?” and, “Why do some historic features of the built environment remain while others have disappeared?” are meant to entice participants already curious about changes they have seen effected on the built environment. Within the tour, changes are not described as inevitable or uncontested; whenever possible, conflicts of interests are

\textsuperscript{229} Hale and Schnädelbach, 56-9; Seligmann, 87-8.

\textsuperscript{230} Banz, 48-51; McCombs, 124.

\textsuperscript{231} McCombs, 124; Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 104-6.

\textsuperscript{232} Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 69, 72; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 85-7.
highlighted so that participants can evaluate issues based on their own beliefs and perceptions. In this way, the tour engages participants in an ongoing dialogue rather than an authoritative tutorial.\textsuperscript{233} Because it is non-sequential, the possibility that some participants might deviate from the suggested route was not a major concern.\textsuperscript{234} This contingency was addressed further by avoiding the assumption that participants had come from the previous site upon their arrival at a destination and not including references to other sites that would be critical to understanding the topic under consideration. Still, it would be unsatisfying for those who are following the prescribed order to lose all sense of continuity, and so transitional statements appear at the bottom of pages to conceptually link sites when appropriate.\textsuperscript{235} The final, summative exercise at the NBM parking lot also serves to unify the tour’s distinct parts. While the tour dispenses facts and directs interpretation to serve a predetermined objective, these techniques enable self-directed learners to determine how the tour will advance their own beliefs about and subsequent interactions with the built environment.

The clear thematic focus aligns with organizational strategies advocated in the museum education literature, theoretically helping participants contextualize

\textsuperscript{233} Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 74; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 37; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 136-7; Hale and Schnädelbach, 59; Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 74-8; Schaffner, 164.

\textsuperscript{234} Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 67-9, 146-50. Non-compliance with the suggested order might also not be a deliberate choice. This urban neighborhood could present any number of unforeseen obstacles—a street closure, a threatening situation—that would prevent participants from carrying out the tour as advised.

\textsuperscript{235} Grinder and McCoy, 56-60.
and make meaning of facts and objects. This method also facilitated precise, calculated selection of information. It was challenging to abandon engrossing but superfluous facts, but doing so helped reinforce the theme at each site. Although Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber’s widely shared predilection for a narrative tour structure was an attractive prospect, it was not practical in this case. Judiciary Square undoubtedly has rich narrative potential not only in its chronological development, but also in the many ways people have inhabited it, the role of famous architects in establishing its district identity, and its connections to two centuries of social history. Given the tour’s objective to inspire insights into the meanings and influences of built environments, not just in Judiciary Square but in general, presenting a wide range of built environment features took precedence over selecting evidence in support of a highly site-specific narrative. Moreover, while the tour stops might have been ordered in a chronological progression, perhaps quite powerfully, this could not be done while also maintaining a straightforward route with consistent distances between sites; erratic directions could confuse and frustrate participants. The organization is ultimately more like the one proposed by Hooper-Greenhill; it introduces the theme and objective, provides ten different variations on the theme that support the objective, and ends with a concluding


238 Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber, 2, 23-5; Falk and Dierking, Lessons, 50; Guinan, 65.

239 Campbell, 10; Hale and Schnädelbach, 59.
statement and suggestions for further investigation of the theme, which also reinforces the objective.240

Similar to the process of narrowing in on a single theme, defining the tour route began with a broad, unmanageable set of possibilities that was pared down in the interest of conceptual clarity. As stated in the introduction, the tour does not follow the structure of the original “investigative walk” because that program was developed in cooperation with SAAM, whereas this project is intended for NBM alone. This distinction did not shape the initial research on the development of the built environment in the vicinity of NBM, which encompassed sites in Penn Quarter, the Federal Triangle on Pennsylvania Avenue, and Chinatown. Buildings in the latter three districts were omitted at various stages in the development of the tour. A walk-through of an early tour route revealed that taking participants to Pennsylvania Avenue would be too time-consuming. The decision to reduce the presence of Penn Quarter and Chinatown began while drafting the narrative essay describing the history of the tour area. Even a scholarly report, which can introduce complex issues and tangential reasoning, requires a concrete, unifying component, for which the somewhat nebulous theme of change did not suffice. That anchoring

framework became Judiciary Square, a single neighborhood, because among all of
the sites, the Pension Building, the historic home of NBM, was the only one that was
truly indispensible. The neighborhood focus in the tour provides participants with a
conceptual framework that is manageable both physically and intellectually.

Even though the process of selecting sites entailed narrowing the range of
the tour, the sites were chosen to increase the scope and texture of the larger theme
of change in the built environment. Many authorities in education on the built
environment insist that students scrutinize all its component parts to fully
appreciate its complexity, the multiple functions it serves, and the sometimes
contentious circumstances guiding its formation.²⁴¹ To this end, streets, vernacular
buildings, and green spaces demand consideration as much as high style, architect-
designed edifices because they exert comparable influence over people’s actions and
perceptions. These theories correspond with those put forth in museum education
literature, arguing that the realization and continuation of educational outcomes in
self-directed learning situations depends on the relevance of content to the

²⁴¹ See Laura H. Chapman, “Preface,” in Built Environment Education in Art
Education, Joanne K. Guilfoil and Alan R. Sandler, eds., (Reston: National Art
Education Association, 1999), vi-vi; Eileen Adams, “Art and the Built Environment:
A Framework for School Programs,” in Built Environment Education and Art
Education, 184; Barbara Ann Francis, “Going Home: Finding Our Roots in Late
Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century Architecture,” in Built Environment
Education and Art Education, 174-5; Kevin Lynch, The Image of the City, (Cambridge:
MIT Press, 1960), 47-8, 117-20; Matthias Albrecht Amann, “Caring for Dead
Architecture,” in Curating Architecture and the City, Sarah Chaplin and Alexandra
Stara, eds., (London: Routledge, 2009), 104; Taylor, “User Group Participation,” 125-
6; Morrish and Brown, 17-8, 23-9; Adams and Ward, 16-7, 27, 59; Langdon, 18.
student’s prior and subsequent experiences. The sites in this tour represent a cross-section of the built environment so that participants may sense that neighborhoods comprise a network of features that fulfill diverse needs. Examining different types of sites in Judiciary Square also may help participants recognize correlating elements in neighborhoods with which they are more familiar, which could perhaps inspire them to relate concepts examined on this tour to subsequent experiences in other places.

Sites are strategically chosen to introduce not only a range of building types and functions, but also the range of experiences these places inspire. Illustrating how sites have changed, too, prompts participants to consider how people in the past related with the same location. As stated in Chapter One, bodily immersion and engagement can produce powerful reactions in individuals and sustain memories of the concepts associated with them. Like the tours enacting immersive and multi-sensory methods described in that chapter, this project certainly could have examined change in the built environment chiefly through ephemeral atmospheric qualities and explicitly drawing attention to how participants themselves changed as they moved through space. However, those tours sought to engender an

\[ \text{Footnotes:} \]

\[ ^{242} \text{Anderson, 4-5; Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 67-73; Falk and Dierking, Lessons, 9-10, 16, 35-42; Falk and Dierking, Experience, 106-9, 120-5; Hooper-Greenhill, Museums and Education, 4-5, 25-42, 170-8, 193; Leith, “Integrating Visitor Perspectives”; McCombs, 118-9, 124; Burnham and Kai-Kee, 94-5; Banz, 43-4, 50-1; Geahigan, 100-1; Grinder and McCoy, 37-8, 56.} \]

\[ ^{243} \text{Hooper-Greenhill, Museums and Education, 4-5; Hale and Schnädelbach, 54-5.} \]

\[ ^{244} \text{Gardner, “Contemporary Stories”; Hale and Schnädelbach, 55-6.} \]
aesthetic experience, whereas this one preserves the intention of the original NBM program to feature historical context and pragmatic aspects of the built environment. Still, direct encounters with sites are no less significant on this tour, and could be the interpretive method most capable of achieving affective learning outcomes.\footnote{Goodlander, “Magnificent Masters”; Campbell, 12-13; Nye, 8; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 36-7; Hale and Schnädelbach, 56.} It is hoped that while standing over Interstate-395, participants will not only read about the demolition of the 743 buildings that stood in its path, but apprehend the division this created in the urban fabric, altering people’s access and connection to the land. Similarly, pausing at the site of First Unitarian Church permits participants to contemplate how the surrounding built environment structures their sense of place. Finally, if participants choose to test Carol Johnson’s meditative pathways at John Marshall Park, they have an opportunity to experience how design might effect changes in one’s frame of mind. At other stops, interpretations of change rely upon the physical presence of the site, using evidence—of scale, uniformity, field of vision, presence, and absence—best discerned through immediate contact. The sites and instructions on this tour were chosen to produce a range of visceral reactions to the built environment not only to reinforce concepts, but also to convince participants that urban design choices affect them personally and in many significant ways.

In adapting the “investigative walk” into a self-guided tour, it was useful to enact recommended museum education methods for orienting and directing participants. Hooper-Greenhill’s delineation of basic visitor concerns in \textit{Museums and Education}, 36-7; Hale and Schnädelbach, 56.
and Their Visitors aided considerably in the development of the introductory pages. In consulting early drafts of the tour, it became clear that none of the simple yet critical issues she raises—informing participants about where they are, what to expect, and how to find comfort facilities—had been addressed.246 It was surprisingly difficult to carry out Hooper-Greenhill’s suggestion that educators define program objectives for participants in the introduction. Stating outright that the tour sought to transform people’s attitudes about the built environment could perturb participants; though true, it is not as demanding or compulsory a goal in practice as such a statement would make it seem. The serious objective needed to be recast truthfully in informal, undemanding terms and this required multiple attempts. To orient participants throughout the body of the tour, small images appear beside the main headings to help visitors confirm that they are in the correct place and looking in the right direction, which responds to Hale and Schnädelbach’s remarks that confusion about positioning on self-guided tours can result in frustration and disengagement.247 Although noted, Falk and Dierking’s suggestions for a three-dimensional map could not be undertaken for lack of necessary creative resources; the issue also did not seem to be as crucial for a tour transpiring in an urban environment where there is copious signage, as it may be in museum galleries.248 Another tempting but foregone orienting device was incorporating

246 Hooper-Greenhill, Visitors, 84-95.

247 Hale and Schnädelbach, 59.

248 Falk and Dierking, Experience, 58, 88.
walking directions into the interpretation. In this case, there was insufficient space to artfully introduce and illustrate a topic unrelated to the main subject of the page. Together, the adopted methods intend to inspire the confidence of participants and help them feel supported throughout the tour.

Although transpiring in very different environments, self-guided walking tours have a great deal in common with museum exhibitions, insofar as participants attend to real objects and are not in the position to heed detailed texts. For this reason, the tour implemented some suggested methods for writing wall text and didactic labels. Sentences are brief, simply constructed, and informal in tone. Text is stylistically differentiated based on the kind of information it communicates, and similar facts are consistently arranged on the pages. Basic information—site name, dates, and designer—is conveniently located at the top, followed by a concise overview of how the site has changed over time. This concrete information is then fleshed out with either a more detailed account of what precipitated those changes or a brief discussion of how those changes relate to broader concepts. Within this discussion, bullet points separate the different factors that led to or resulted from changes at the sites under consideration. In addition to relieving participants of dense paragraphs, bullet points give prominence to the competing demands and interests underlying design changes. At nearly every site, participants are directed

---

249 Edwards and Edwards, "Magnificent Masters."


251 Hooper-Greenhill, *Visitors*, 125-6, 134.

252 Falk and Dierking, *Experience*, 74-8; Schaffner, 164.
to take account of their surroundings, notice details, and draw conclusions based on visible evidence.\textsuperscript{253} The volume and tone of text varies depending on the contextual information that seemed necessary to interpret changes at each site.\textsuperscript{254}

Unlike an art exhibition, this tour promises to explain how and why built environments change, and therefore directing the participant’s gaze is not the primary responsibility of the text. Background information about each site, though dividing participants’ attention between the site and the guidebook, is necessary to describe changes that are not always immediately evident.\textsuperscript{255} In comparative analysis, the primary method used to interpret change throughout this tour, written facts and instructions were also required to focus participants’ observations.\textsuperscript{256} Contrasting sites today with documentary images is both straightforward and well suited for the program’s objectives. Documentary photographs allow participants to find physical evidence of transformation in the environment in which they are standing.\textsuperscript{257} When dramatic, these comparisons have the potential to elicit strong emotional reactions and therefore a shift in their attitude about the site.\textsuperscript{258} Thus,

\textsuperscript{253} Goodlander and Rao, “Magnificent Masters”; Campbell, 12-13; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 36-7; Hale and Schnädelbach, 56; Schaffner, 156-8, 164.

\textsuperscript{254} Schaffner, 156-8; Grinder and McCoy, 56-60, 63.

\textsuperscript{255} Grinder and McCoy, 48-50; Fortin, 20; Addison, 178.

\textsuperscript{256} Grinder and McCoy, 53-5.

\textsuperscript{257} Grinder and McCoy, 48-50.

\textsuperscript{258} Falk and Dierking, \textit{Experience}, 143-5.
while not accommodating multiple learning preferences and abilities, these comparisons use cognition to advance affective modes of understanding.\textsuperscript{259}

In addition to comparative analysis, questions and prompts for reflection are a prominent interpretive method on the tour, often appearing as a means for participants to synthesize and reflect on information at the end of each site visit. As suggested in museum education literature, questions never ask participants to identify a single, correct answer.\textsuperscript{260} The tour questions are grounded in either physical evidence, the contextual information provided, or the participant’s own judgments.\textsuperscript{261} In order to maintain “genuine openness” in these questions, participants are encouraged to form their own opinions about the changes described and evaluate the wisdom of those decisions.\textsuperscript{262} Although some answers are anticipated, questions directing participants to compare the present condition of sites with an image could elicit multiple responses informed by the participant’s own observations. Moreover, adding phrases such as “what, if any” and “if you like” to questions releases participants from any obligation to believe selected features or issues merit their consideration at all. Beyond engendering a sense of dialogue and inclusivity, some latitude in the questions is necessary because, as multiple authors

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{259} Grinder and McCoy, 35-7, 56-70, 109-110.
  \item \textsuperscript{260} Burnham and Kai-Kee, 98-9; Grinder and McCoy, 56-60, 76-7.
  \item \textsuperscript{261} Questions generally fall into the categories of convergent, divergent, and judgmental questions outlined in Grinder and McCoy, 73-4.
  \item \textsuperscript{262} Burnham and Kai-Kee, 98-9.
\end{itemize}
argue, guided interpretation is by nature a constrictive process.\textsuperscript{263} These questions omit issues unrelated to the theme of change and concentrate only on one facet of this issue at each site. Questions risk alienating participants whose motives and interests lie elsewhere.\textsuperscript{264} Not asking them at all could send the message that participants’ own perspectives and background knowledge are irrelevant. The tour author mediates content to achieve a particular objective, but the phrasing of questions can reinforce and expand the participant’s own judgments about the meanings and importance of that content.\textsuperscript{265} Perhaps more truly open-ended are the prompts asking participants to simply consider an issue rather than respond to it in a specific way. The prompts offer conflicting perspectives on an issue against which participants can measure their own values or beliefs and engage with genuine interpretive quandaries.\textsuperscript{266} At Interstate-395 and Washington Jail, the facts seemed powerful enough to stand alone, requiring no further interpretive posturing. When considered altogether, these participative methods alternately encourage responses that build upon the participant’s own beliefs, acknowledge diverse perspectives, and support independent appraisals.

\textsuperscript{263} Campbell, 16-7; Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber, 6; Addison, 184; Ewing, 23-4; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 1-2; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 115-6;

\textsuperscript{264} Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 67-8; Falk and Dierking, \textit{Lessons}, 9-10; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Museums and Education}, 4-5, 25-7.

\textsuperscript{265} Addison, 178.

\textsuperscript{266} Levy, Lloyd, and Schreiber, 6; Hooper-Greenhill, \textit{Visitors}, 10-2, 116; Fortin, 21; Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 71-3.
Like the selection of sites for this tour, interpretive emphasis at each destination was established so that the featured issues were varied and potentially relevant to participants’ existing knowledge. It was challenging to refrain from interpretations that focused on the unique characteristics of a site and or required a great deal of contextual information. For example, the exterior ornament on the Pension Building is laden with meanings about its original function and the professional training of its architect. But preparing general audiences to engage in this analysis required lengthy explanations of Classical design principles, a daunting subject in the context of a self-guided walking tour. It was also fairly impersonal, offering little opportunity for participants to assess conflicting positions on an issue or make judgments about transformed sites.\textsuperscript{267} The method of featuring “qualities of significance” rather than “significant qualities,” recommended by design educator Nicholas Addison, proved useful in moving away from interpretation that emphasized objects more than participants’ encounters with them.\textsuperscript{268} In the end, the tour sites introduced multiple ways of interpreting change in the built environment by synthesizing participants’ perceptions and beliefs with historical facts, with the intention that the meanings uncovered will be broad enough for participants to apply to experiences beyond the tour context.

This final chapter examined the research, project development, and implementation of recommended methods involved in creating “The Lifecycle of a Neighborhood.” The scope not only of suggested methodology but also the history of

\textsuperscript{267} Falk and Dierking, \textit{Lessons}, 42; Banz, 49-50; Csikszentmihalyi and Hermanson, 74.

\textsuperscript{268} Addison, 184.
Judiciary Square is so great, and often so tangential to the purposes of this specific project, that not all of the facts and strategies could comfortably serve this one tour. A manageable framework for the tour emerged primarily through ongoing empirical investigation of the site and experimentation with the guidebook format. Select built environment education theories helped define the objective and determine the content that will support it. Methods espoused in larger communities of museum practice made the most appreciable difference when refining the tour. These strategies were especially useful in making allowances for the perceptions of participants, which resulted in a more visitor-driven program. This tour initially set out to examine the poignant theme of change in the built environment alongside a rigorous explanation of how designers produced the buildings, roads, and landscapes of Judiciary Square. None of the resources consulted seemed to doubt that it could be done—after all, manageable tours can have “one or two related objectives.”²⁶⁹ Only in testing multiple theories and methods within the unique constraints of this project was the potential of the tour to enact theories of participative and affective learning realized. A self-guided tour must provide a clear sense of purpose and direction; it cannot assimilate to the agendas, preferences, and unforeseeable concerns of different visitors. But it can serve interested self-directed learners by clearly stating goals, incorporating diverse content in support of that goal, relating concepts to experiences that are both shared and individual, and implementing subtle but imperative methods to make the guidebook an accessible, dependable resource for participants at all points along the journey.

²⁶⁹ Grinder and McCoy, 53.
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Washington City Hall/District Court of Columbia
Architect: George Hadfield
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Judiciary Square circa 1920
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United States Pension Building (National Building Museum)
Architect: Montgomery C. Meigs
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Begun: 1517
Figure 9
Boston Terra Cotta Company advertisement illustrating Patent Office frieze

Figure 10
Metropolitan Police Department
Constructed: 1941
Figure 11
513 Sixth Street NW
Constructed: circa 1840

Figure 12
Augustus Kollner, *First Unitarian Church*
Drawing, 1839
Architect: Charles Bulfinch
Completed 1822; Razed 1906
Figure 13
Metropolitan Methodist Church
Architect: Samuel F. G. Morsell
Constructed: 1854; Razed: 1935-1936

Figure 14
Trinity Episcopal Church
Architect: James Renwick, Jr.
Constructed: 1849; Razed: 1936
Figure 15
St. Mary Mother of God
Architect: E.F. Baldwin
Begun: 1890

Figure 16
Streetcars at the corner of Sixth and F Streets NW
Circa 1909-1920
Figure 17
I-395 E Street Overpass

Figure 18
Aerial View of Douglas Row and Stanton Hospital at I and Second Streets NW
Lithograph, circa 1864
Architect: William Baldwin
Constructed: 1857; Razed: 1934, 1950, and 1965
Figure 19
Judiciary Square Metro Station
Opened: 27 March 1976

Figure 20
Operations Control Center Building, WMATA
Architects: Keyes, Lethbridge, and Condon
Constructed: 1971-1974
Figure 21
Old Adas Israel Synagogue, circa 1930
Architect: Unknown
Constructed: 1873-1876

Figure 22
Moving of Old Adas Israel Synagogue to G and Third Street, 1969
Figure 23
Moran Building and Avalon at Gallery Place
Commissioned: J.E. Moran
Architect of Roof Addition: George Bogus
Constructed: 1889 and later

Figure 24
Left: 604 H Street (Surratt Boarding House) circa 1910-1926
Architect: Unknown
Constructed: 1843
Right: 604 H Street today
Figure 25
618 H Street

Figure 26
Wah Luck House
Architect: Alfred H. Liu
Constructed: 1982
Figure 27
Chinatown Gateway
Architects: Alfred H. Lieu and Beijing Ancient Architectural Construction Corp.
Constructed: 1986

Figure 28
John Marshall Memorial Park
Landscape Architect: Carol R. Johnson & Associates
Constructed: 1983
Figure 29
National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial
Architect: Davis Buckley

Figure 30
Verizon Center (formerly MCI Center)
Planning: Chinatown Steering Committee, Commission on Fine Arts, and DC Preservation League
Architect: Ellerbe Beckett Architects
Constructed: 1995-1997
Figure 31
Successive snapshots of television screen on southwest corner of the Verizon Center

Figure 32
Vacant Lot, 305 G Street NW
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