

## An analysis of educational programmes for adults accompanying museum exhibitions: the typology of portals

*Inga Specht*

German Institute for Adult Education (DIE), Germany (specht@die-bonn.de)

*Franziska Stodolka (née Semrau)*

Germany (f.stodolka@mailbox.org)

### Abstract

*This paper discusses the many educational programmes offered to adults in parallel with museum exhibitions. These were systematically examined using programme analysis, a research method developed in adult education research in Germany, with the goal of determining and differentiating between learning/participation pathways to cultural education—the so-called portals to arts education. An analytical approach to cultural adult education developed in 2005 was used for the first time to identify these various portals in museum offerings. This approach defines portals as specific pathways to arts education. The process described in this paper resulted in a refined and relatively stable set of categories that differentiates between educational programmes accompanying museum exhibits; it also resulted in a better understanding of the range of cultural education offerings for adults in Germany today. Within this framework, the method of programme analysis, research results, limitations, implications, and possible implementation are discussed.*

**Keywords:** adult education; educational programmes for adults in museums; portals to arts education; programme research

### Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Nowadays, museums not only view themselves as cultural institutions or exhibition spaces, but are also very aware of their mandate as learning places. In this sense, they



play an important role in lifelong learning (German Museums Association & ICOM Germany, 2006; Taylor, McKinley Parrish, & Banz, 2010). To better understand their contribution to lifelong learning and their role as sites for education and learning from the standpoint of adult education studies, it is of interest to examine how these services are structured—that is, what educational programmes are offered specifically to adults at museums, what these programmes encompass, and what sorts of learning approaches/pathways and cultural content they provide. These questions, which have not yet received much attention in adult education research, were the subject of a programme analysis conducted for different museums at the German Institute for Adult Education – Leibniz Centre for Lifelong Learning in Bonn (Specht & Fleige, 2016; Specht & Semrau, 2016).

Program analysis is not a particularly well-known method internationally. It was developed within the German adult and further education research community and refers (partly) to discourse analysis (van Dijk, 2011) and content analysis (Mayring, 2010). It ‘is a non-reactive method, which means that the material is analysed by a coding scientist or a coding team of scientists ... based on a code plan which was deductively and inductively developed’ (Käpplinger, 2015, p. 143). The material are *programmes*, which are defined as ‘texts presented in the form of brochures, leaflets, or announcement texts [of educational offerings] printed or retrievable from the internet’ (Nolda, 2003, p. 212 [trans.]<sup>2</sup>) from adult education institutions. Programmes provide information about the content and conditions (e.g., time, place, topic, and fee) of educational offerings and the educational provider itself. Thus, they constitute ‘the materialized contemporary expression of ... the social interpretation of education, influenced by the framework conditions of educational policy and by the participants and their demands, and filtered through professional agents’ (Gieseke, 2017, p. 31).

In the present study, we examined and categorised adult educational programmes<sup>3</sup> accompanying exhibitions in Germany with the aim of taking inventory and describing the diversity in the types of programme formats. In addition, the analysis identified learning pathways to arts education by applying the typology of *portals to arts education* developed by Gieseke and Opelt (2005), in this case provided by museums.

This study therefore contributes to theory and to the practice of educational offerings for adults in the field of arts and culture (not only in museums). The study also has implications for adult education research (e.g., comparative research) and for (programme planning) practice. Even although programme planning—the underlying process of creating and establishing a programme (Robak & Fleige, 2017)—is internationally seen as a core activity of professional practice in adult education (Käpplinger, Robak, Fleige, von Hippel, & Gieseke, 2017; Lattke & Jütte, 2014), programme analysis as a research method is less known in non-German speaking countries. Thus, this method could provide some new opportunities for (international) research and develop the field of adult education research, as called for by Rubenson and Elfert (2014).

As basis for the analysis, we will first present the theoretical background for learning pathways, the *portals to arts education* within the framework of adult educational programmes accompanying museum exhibitions. Then, we will describe the methodological approach used to identify the portals to arts education in museums via programme analysis and the results of this study. Subsequently, we will describe portals and their theoretical underpinnings in more detail. Finally, we will discuss the results and implications of the study in broader terms.

## Portals to art education

One theoretical starting point of the present analysis and categorisation of museum offerings was the original empirical work of Gieseke and Opelt (2005). In the course of a comprehensive programme analysis of advertising texts of cultural adult education offered in 1996 and 2001 by organised public and adjunctive<sup>4</sup> institutions in Berlin and Brandenburg in Germany as well as in neighbouring regions in Poland (17,277 offerings), Gieseke and Opelt inductively reconstructed three nonhierarchical, mutually exclusive (*participation*) *portals* implemented by institutions of adult (arts) education for the first time. They defined a *portal* as a learning/participation pathway to cultural/arts adult education. A portal is understood as a specific theoretical criterion by which educational programmes in arts and culture can be described through their approaches to and didactically prepared ways of appropriation and reception of art and culture (Gieseke, 2014). The three genuine portals are 1) *systematic-receptive*, 2) *autonomous-creative*, and 3) *empathetic-communicative (intercultural)*. They were originally defined<sup>5</sup> as follows:

- Portal 1 – ‘Programmes of the systematic-receptive type deal with the history of culture, art, and literature’ (Gieseke & Opelt, 2005, p. 53 [trans.]). These include lectures, readings, talks, seminars, and the like, which are offered in 12 different categories or fields such as literature, visual art, and music/singing.<sup>6</sup> The participant typically has a receptive role in arts education.
- Portal 2 – ‘Characteristic for programmes of the autonomous-creative type is the participant’s own activity in producing art. The participant creates a product, learns a technique, or expresses him- or herself in some fashion’ (ibid., p. 53 [trans.]). Examples are a painting course, an arts and crafts course, or some other type of autonomous-creative activity or practical work in one of 12 different categories (e.g., drawing/painting, sculptural design, creative computer work, photography, or writing). All offerings in which the participants are actively and autonomously practising or producing something tangible or material (e.g., picture or clay sculpture) or visible/audible (e.g., dance movement or song) are therefore categorised under this portal.
- Portal 3 – The empathetic-communicative portal in the intercultural sense focuses on ‘intercultural exchange, encounters, and identity-forming activities’ (ibid., p. 53 [trans.]). Only programmes with a markedly intercultural approach, such as intercultural communication or training, are assigned to this category. This portal is therefore also referred to as *intercultural-communicative*. The participants may be either receptive or active. ‘Exchange’, ‘discussion’, and ‘communication’ imply both receptive intake (of other opinions and interpretations) as well as ‘active’ debate (e.g., comparison with one’s own interpretations). Examples are ‘programmes to promote intercultural dialogue or intercultural competence as well as intercultural sensitivity’ (Robak & Petter, 2014, p. 12 [trans.]).

Developed in the context of programme analysis portals are categories through which researchers can distinguish between the different offerings available based on substantiated interpretation, classification, and categorisation of written text (texts advertising educational programmes) and not based on educational practice during an offering.

Each type of initial portal demarcates a specific approach to learning, a kind of entryway that only participants themselves can proceed through as avenues to specific learning paths to participate in culture/art education. However, the assignment of a

category to a written text does not necessarily mean that the participants in the actual offering can obtain cultural/art knowledge in the specified manner only, or that individual participants are limited to this approach. Instead, visitors can gain individual experiences from cultural/art offerings or use individual learning approaches (Falk & Dierking, 2000; Heine, 1998; Kade, 2010).

Ten years later, the third portal (*intercultural/empathetic-communicative*) was examined in detail with a programme analysis by Robak and Petter (2014), using the example of intercultural education in Lower Saxony (1,574 offerings). They demonstrated a thematic differentiation within the intercultural-communicative portal. Building on the three initial portals to cultural education from 2005, they supplemented the intercultural/empathetic-communicative portal with five additional alternative portals (ibid., p. 12f.): empathetic-communicative in a transcultural context (Portal 4), discursive-reflexive (Portal 5), programmes especially for migrants (Portal 6), interreligious dialogue (Portal 7), and qualification of staff in intercultural capacities (Portal 8).

In addition to the aforementioned initial portals, an exploratory review of current (German) research literature as well as various handbooks and dictionaries was done in the present study, revealing theoretical discussions about differentiating educational offerings in cultural institutions, particularly in museums. The *Beltz Lexikon Pädagogik*, for example, defined cultural adult education as an element of general continuing education that includes ‘offerings for the theoretical reflection on art and culture as well as the artistic creative process itself’ (Tenorth & Tippelt, 2007, p. 433 [trans.]). Stang (2010) also mentioned contemplative and artistic/aesthetic engagement in the *Wörterbuch Erwachsenenbildung* (see also Stang, 2001). In addition, the most recent infrastructure survey of educational programmes in German cultural institutions differentiated between offerings ‘that teach [a specific target group] about art and culture through artistic-creative and/or receptive-analytical methods’ (Keuchel & Weil, 2010, p. 12 [trans.]). The former includes theatre workshops and creative courses such as arts and crafts or drawing, and the latter refers to readings, lectures, or guided tours. Keuchel and Weil (2010) also stated that before the 1980s, most arts education programmes offered in museums were of the receptive variety. Gradually, more and more artistic-creative formats/offering types were added. Keuchel and Weil (2010, p. 65) also showed that the educational offerings at museums increasingly use not just one of the two teaching methods but instead often combine receptive (analytical) programmes with artistic-creative methods. They concluded that there are arts educational offerings for adults in museums that are both receptive (analytical) and artistic-creative (e.g., a guided tour followed by a creative hands-on activity). Such mixed offerings have also been developed in the course of professional trainings for artists, according to a recent empirical study by Robak and colleagues. Here, systematic-receptive offerings embed the practice of creative aspects (see Robak, Fleige, Sterzik, Seifert, Teichmann, & Krueger, 2015).

To sum up, a differentiation between offerings taking a more systematic-receptive (receptive-analytical, theoretical-reflexive) approach and those that are more practical and autonomous-creative (artistic-creative, artistic-aesthetic) is made in the fields of both adult education and cultural studies. A similar differentiation between the first two initial portals (systematic-receptive vs. autonomous-creative) was also found in the works of Keuchel and Weil (2010), Stang (2001), as well as Tenorth and Tippelt (2007). However, in keeping with the findings of Keuchel and Weil (2010), no such exclusivity is assumed in the present analysis, partly due to a recent adult education survey of nonformal arts education (see Robak et al., 2015; Robak & Fleige, 2017), which also identified the hybrid form (*systematic-*)receptive AND artistic (*autonomous-*)creative.

Building on these theoretical considerations, the goal of the present analysis was to identify for the first time different *portals* leading to arts education *in the context of museums* based on texts advertising adult education programmes accompanying exhibitions. The specific approach taken in this analysis is outlined in the following section.

## Methodology

The present analysis is part of a more extensive study of texts advertising adult educational programmes accompanying museum exhibitions.<sup>7</sup> This analysis examines 709 programme offerings from the first half of 2014 by museum education centres/services in five different cities and (non-)affiliated individual museums in Germany (see Specht & Fleige, 2016; Specht & Semrau, 2015, 2017). Table 1 provides an overview of the total sample and allocates the offerings to nine possible museum types (Institut für Museumsforschung [IfM], 2014).

*Table 1.* Overview of the total sample ( $N = 709$ ) of analysed offerings categorised according to nine possible museum types

<b>Museum type</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>
Art museums	272	38.4
Historical and/or archaeological museums	193	27.2
Museums focusing on folklore or national or regional history	113	15.9
Specialised museums of cultural history	52	7.3
Science and/or technology museums	44	6.2
Natural history museums	17	2.4
Palace and castle museums	7	1.0
General museums with complex holdings	-	-
Museum complexes	-	-
Missing	11	1.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: Analysed programmes are from Hamburg, Berlin, Cologne, Nuremberg, and Munich (involved museum education centres/services: Museumsdienst Köln, Museumsdienst Hamburg, Kunst- und Kulturpädagogisches Zentrum der Museen in Nürnberg, Kulturprojekt Berlin GmbH, and Museumspädagogisches Zentrum München).

With regard to the root category *portals*, this analysis incorporates the three initial portals previously illustrated theoretically, along with the category ‘undecided’, and introduces into the code system an additional category in accordance with Keuchel and Weil (2010) and Fleige, Gieseke and Robak (2015): the ‘(systematic-) receptive AND artistic-(autonomous) creative’ portal.<sup>8</sup>

Keeping in mind the complexity and variety of the available programmes for adults in museums (Sachatello-Sawyer et al., 2002) as well as the fact that ‘experiences and research traditions from general educational institutions [are not necessarily] transferable to museums’ (Wadhwa, 1996, p. 214 [trans.], as cited in Lewalter & Noschka-Roos, 2010, p. 530), this analysis aims to apply the typology of portals as reflectively as possible to validate the concepts of portals to arts education in a new context, namely museums.

Thus, the code system accounts for every possible hybrid portal form, and multiple encodings can be made. But it still realises the objective of adhering as closely as possible to the given material when identifying portals to arts education in museums, without allowing the theoretical background to cause an excessive focus from the outset on selected categories. Furthermore, for the purposes of this analysis, not only the title of each offering but also all available descriptive information in both the advertising text and the foreword to the programme brochure were brought to bear on the classification.

The findings of this exploratory coding of portals then served as a starting point for an in-depth analysis of advertising texts. Moreover, it served as a classification (coding) of these texts using the typology of portals, investigating the specific sample for possibilities of differentiating between arts education portals. However, discursive exchanges and close textual analyses, particularly the offerings by museum education services that were categorised as ‘undecided’ ( $n = 217$ , 30.6% of 709), brought to light certain weak points of the basic coding system for the museum sample. For example, the exploratory coding showed that the ‘empathetic-communicative’ category with its more content-driven, intercultural purpose proved to be highly problematic for this sample; therefore, it has to be conceived in a more differentiated way. It also became evident that much more could be said about the learning pathways than the four existing categories (systematic-receptive, autonomous-creative, empathetic-communicative/intercultural, and systematic-receptive AND autonomous-creative portals) allowed for.

For these reasons, and as a result of the first exploratory coding and considering the selectivity desired for the potential portals, the continuation of our specific analysis necessitated a more precise and slightly different interpretation of the concept of ‘portal’ for the underlying museum sample. This had a particular effect on the third portal. In terms of the empathetic-communicative portal, the programme content or theme is by no means the decisive criterion for its classification. In cases such as these, the new (second) analysis of the museum programmes places less importance on the intercultural nature of the topics or themes treated—the content of the museum offering is thus no longer emphasised—and instead focuses primarily on the ways in which the (intercultural) topic is taught. Consequently, in the following decision for a specific portal, the specific characteristics of the adult educational offering accompanying museum exhibitions (e.g., specified teaching methods, social form, learning objectives [content], form of event, didactical intention, and the forms of knowledge acquisition they open up for participants) received more emphasis. These characteristics were manifested in the texts advertising educational offerings and enabled different (learning) pathways to arts education or, more specifically, participation in arts education. In this way, we tried to make the portals as categories more selective in an empirical-methodical sense for the specific sample.

Additionally, we developed some subcategories (facets) for the first portal, the systematic-receptive portal, to exploit all the information on an offering that was not previously shown in the initial portals but could contribute to a more selective differentiation. These facets identified in the inductive extension or further elaboration (see Mayring, 2010, p. 83ff.) of the main categories of (participation) portals were tested by two independent, trained reviewers using two randomised samples ( $n = 34$ ) drawn with the aid of *Research Randomizer Form v4.0* from the underlying sample. Only offerings

featuring advertising texts (containing information beyond simple facts stating what, where, and when) were included in the samples. The Cohen's kappa coefficient for these two tests ( $k_A = .859$ ;  $k_B = .786$ ) as well as the percentage consistency among reviewers (A: 94.1%; B: 85.3%) can be considered good or excellent (see Wirtz & Caspar, 2002).

### Final results: portals to arts education provided by museums

As a result of this step in our specific analysis—in addition to a slightly different interpretation of the typology of portals—we now have an inductively adjusted system of four main categories and one residual for the educational offerings of museums. We have also expanded five subcategories (facets) within the systematic-receptive (participation) portals. The following portals and facets can be distinguished:

- *Systematic-receptive (receptive-analytical)*: The systematic receptive portal is characterised by the systematic presentation and mediation of knowledge (see above). Participants receive information without contributing anything, while an expert may act as a mediator between them and the exhibits or content. Examples of this portal are lectures, film screenings, and traditional guided tours within or outside museums (city walks). The educational programme may offer a *purely* systematic-receptive approach, or it may augment the systematic-receptive aspects with the following possible facets (subcategories) of this portal:
  - *Discursive-reflexive*: Programmes of this type provide the participants with the opportunity to actively expand their own perspectives or models of interpretation either in their own thoughts or through communicating with others. This inspires reflection on one's own values and standards, leads to developing or changing one's point of view, or involves an active appraisal of and reflection on artistic/cultural content/objects, while allowing this information to be related to a socio-critical context. An announcement from the sample can be cited as an example: 'Guided tour on the subject ... We will critically assess our own views on ... based on cultural representations by others.'
  - *Dialogical-interactive*: These programmes offer an opportunity for participants to actively contribute content and ideas. The participants are thus no longer a purely receptive audience but take an active part in learning. Examples are museum talks, moderated events, or guided tours where dialogue is encouraged.
  - *Autonomous-interactive*: Systematic-receptive programmes with this facet offer opportunities for inquisitive discovery without the direct guidance of educational staff. In this approach, participants bring their physical presence as well as their personal traits and skills into play, as opposed to the purely verbal participation in the dialogical-interactive model. Examples of this type of programme include museum rallies, work/activity sheets, as well as activities such as a goal-shooting contest following an otherwise systemic-receptive tour of a soccer ball museum.
  - *Imaginative-conceptual, interpretational*: In this approach, participants use costumes and performances to mentally travel to other worlds, immerse themselves in the topic, or stage something. The visitors participate actively in the events, but not in an outwardly productive sense,

in contrast to the autonomous-creative portal. Examples include a programme offering a guided hike along an archaeological footpath during which the participants may wear clothing and jewellery and carry weaponry from the period in question, and programmes in which visitors are actively involved in a fantastic voyage or role play.

- *With a sensory-haptic component*: These programmes involve learning opportunities that are not purely cognitive but occur through sensory-haptic perception (touching and feeling). Generally, this approach affords access for specific target groups (e.g., people with cognitive disabilities, those with hearing or visual impairments, or sufferers of dementia). Examples of such programmes include touch tours, taste and smell tests, as well as suitcases provided by the museum containing materials appealing to all the senses.
- *Systematic-receptive AND autonomous-creative*: In these cases, systematic-receptive and autonomous-creative/artistic-productive phases can be clearly distinguished within a programme (see Fleige et al., 2015; Keuchel & Weil, 2010). Both learning pathways shape the overall character of this type of programme. In addition to a purely systematic presentation of knowledge during which the participants receptively take in information, they may also be active in a practical sense, applying or enhancing their own artistic abilities and talents. In this portal, the systematic-receptive aspects may include all the previously mentioned facets, from ‘pure’ approaches to those ‘with a sensory-haptic component’. As an example, an activity in a museum workshop or creative workshop may be offered following a guided tour.
- *Autonomous-creative (artistic-creative) (through outward action)*: This portal is characterised by active participation in artistic-productive activities, according to the initial description. Visitors can actively contribute by practising a skill as well as by applying or enhancing their artistic abilities and talents. Examples of this type of programme include drawing or dance classes as well as learning to play an instrument.
- *Empathetic-communicative (in an intercultural sense)*: The empathetic-communicative portal is characterised by *intercultural* exchanges, encounters, and identity formation processes based on communicative engagement with different cultures and cultural practices (see above).
- *Undecided*: These are programmes that cannot be clearly assigned to any of the portals (and facets) outlined.

The inductively differentiated facets (subcategories) of the systematic-receptive portal may be understood as possible, but not necessarily compulsory, particular aspects. A pathway to arts education that is opened up by a specific offering may be purely along systematic-receptive lines. However, receptive-analytical offerings may also provide participants with the opportunity to take part in some way. This analysis provides points of reference for this purpose. Furthermore, the portal in which systematic-receptive and autonomous-creative approaches are combined may contain any of the subcategories (facets) delineated in the systematic-receptive type of programme; these differentiations were deliberately omitted in the coding. The empathetic-communicative portal as

described by Gieseke and Opelt (2005) as well as Robak and Petter (2014; see also Robak et al., 2015) could not be conclusively identified in the evaluation process of the current sample. While ‘discursive-reflexive’ and ‘dialogical-interactive’ facets might have certain similarities to individual aspects of the ‘empathetic-communicative’ portal, the thematic exclusivity of content is not a decisive criterion in these facets.

To test and quantify the newly delineated facets (subcategories) for the overall sample, all offerings ( $N = 709$ ) were recoded based on their learning pathways. The results are shown in Table 2.

*Table 2.* Frequency and percentage of the portals and their newly defined facets in the sample ( $N = 709$ )

<b>Portal(s) and facets</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Systematic-receptive (receptive-analytical)</b>		
~ pure	462	65.2
~ dialogical-interactive	108	15.2
~ with a sensory-haptic component	15	2.1
~ autonomous-interactive	14	2.0
~ discursive-reflexive	7	1.0
~ imaginative-conceptual, interpretational	4	0.6
<b>(Systematic-)receptive* AND artistic-(self-acting-)creative</b>	26	3.7
<b>Autonomous-creative (artistic-creative)</b>	28	3.9
<b>Empathetic-communicative (in an intercultural sense)</b>	-	-
<b>Undecided</b>	45	6.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: All aforementioned facets from ‘pure’ to ‘with a sensory-haptic component’ can be included in the systematic-receptive portion of this portal. For reasons of clarity, subcategories were deliberately omitted in coding this hybrid form. A breakdown can be provided (retrospectively) depending on the question at hand.

Examples of the advertising texts are given for each facet below (each translated by the authors):

- ‘Within a museum talk, a museum theme or collection area are presented in detail. The event has a dialogical character; it is time to respond to the questions and requests of visitors.’ (dialogic-interactive)
- ‘Speaking hands— – the sculptures of Käthe Kollwitz. Sculptures are the focus of a tactical guided tour. ... Until the smallest angle, the affecting figures can be explored in order to detect the emotional design language of the artist.’ (sensory-haptic component)
- ‘Stadium tour [in a football stadium with a museum] and goal-shooting contest where visitors could prove their skills.’ (autonomous-interactive)

- ‘Guided tour on the history of Black Africa. ... Knowing the history helps us to better understand the present political, economic, social, and cultural realities of Africa as well as to question the stereotypes and prejudices about Africa.’ (discursive-reflexive)
- ‘Immerse yourself in colours [guided tour of the water lilies of Monet] ... we explain the museum as our fantasy space in which we let water flow, dip dryly into waves, or swim standing thereof.’ (imaginative-conceptual)

Table 3 provides an overview of the portals and their newly defined facets with regard to the main event<sup>9</sup> formats found in the sample.

*Table 3.* Frequency of the portals and their newly defined facets with regard to (some) formats of event in the sample ( $N = 709$ ) (percentage in brackets)

Portal(s) and facets	Guided tour	Discussion/ study group	Seminar / workshop	Advanced training	Excursion, study trip	Film	Other
<b>Systematic-receptive (receptive-analytical)</b>							
~ pure	436 (87.2)	4 (4.9)	-	1 (2.6)	-	5 (100.0)	16 (53.3)
~ dialogical-interactive	37 (7.4)	52 (64.2)	4 (8.9)	-	8 (88.9)	-	7 (23.3)
~ with a sensory-haptic component	14 (2.8)	-	1 (2.2)	-	-	-	-
~ autonomous-interactive	6 (1.2)	5 (6.2)	1 (2.2)	-	-	-	2 (6.7)
~ discursive-reflexive	1 (0.2)	4 (4.9)	1 (2.2)	-	-	-	1 (3.3)
~ imaginative-conceptual, interpretational	3 (0.6)	-	-	-	1 (11.1)	-	-
<b>(Systematic-)receptive* AND artistic-(self-acting-)creative</b>	3 (0.6)	14 (17.3)	8 (17.8)	-	-	-	1 (3.3)
<b>Autonomous-creative (artistic-creative)</b>	-	-	28 (62.2)	-	-	-	-
<b>Empathetic-communicative (in an intercultural sense)</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Undecided</b>	-	2 (2.5)	2 (4.4)	38 (97.4)	-	-	3 (10.0)
<b>Total</b>	500 (100.0)	81 (100.0)	45 (100.0)	39 (100.0)	9 (100.0)	5 (100.0)	30 (100.0)

Note: All aforementioned facets from ‘pure’ to ‘with a sensory-haptic component’ can be included in the systematic-receptive portions of this portal. For reasons of clarity, subcategories were deliberately omitted in coding this hybrid form. A breakdown can be provided (retrospectively) depending on the question at hand.

In the course of recoding the programmes, the autonomous-creative portal encompassed 28 (3.9%) of the offerings (see Table 2), mainly composed of seminars/workshops (see Table 3). Twenty-six offerings (3.7%) were assigned to the systematic-receptive AND artistic-creative hybrid category. Offerings like discussion/study groups and seminars/workshops were mainly categorised under this mixed portal (see Table 3). The empathetic-communicative portal was not identified due to the previously described different interpretation and the specific sample. By contrast, a particularly high proportion (86%) of the offerings was associated with the systematic-receptive portal. Educational offerings under this type of approach are usually guided tours (see also Keuchel & Weil, 2010). This is also shown in Table 3. Guided tours are generally the dominant educational

format for adults in museums (IfM, 1998, 2008; Sachatello-Sawyer et al., 2002). This originally purely monologue-based format has changed in recent years to include more dialogue, with the museum's educational staff acting as moderators (Best, 2012; Czech, 2014; Schrübbers, 2013), since museum education work is often organised to facilitate 'dialogue between the visitors and the objects and content at the museum' (German Museums Association & Federal Association for Museum Education, 2008, p. 8). This is also reflected in the data at hand: In general, 15.2% of the offerings could be allocated to the systematic-receptive portal and subcategorised under the dialogical-interactive facet (see Table 2). Of these 108 offerings, 34.2% are related to guided tours (see Table 3). These offerings accompanying exhibitions, although receptively organised to present knowledge to visitors in a systematic fashion, go beyond the intake of information to give visitors an opportunity to communicate their own thoughts and ideas. The specific offerings classified in this category are described in advertising texts as 'conversations' and 'psychological image appraisal'. Furthermore, for some of these guided tours, the programme brochure explicitly states that there will be an opportunity to participate in a dialogue with the docent (e.g., 'Our experts look forward to engaging in a dialogue with you'; 'where they can converse with our docent team in a casual atmosphere'). These offerings still present knowledge systematically, making the portal systematic-receptive; however, it is different from the *purely* systematic-receptive portal of the kind made available, for example, in the typical guided tour monologue.

In the offerings cited, visitors are already encouraged in the advertising text to actively contribute to the discussion, so allocating these offerings to a *purely* receptive portal would not do justice to the scope of what is being offered. Nevertheless, following the receptive-practical/active differentiation made in the initial description of portals, this form of participation is not an artistic-creative activity either, as with a drawing or dance course, making the assignment to an autonomous-creative portal just as inaccurate for the same reasons. These examples of arts education offerings in museums therefore demonstrate that the variety of educational offerings accompanying museum exhibitions cannot be sufficiently captured by the originally suggested typology.

The facet 'with a sensory-haptic component' encompassed 15 (2.1%) of the offerings. Forty-five offerings (6.3%) of the analysed programmes from the sample were placed in the category 'undecided'. This category contains offerings—particularly advanced training courses (see Table 3)—that deal with the logic of the museums themselves, the creation of exhibitions, or possible educational approaches.

A few of the facets were found in the sample only on a very small scale; this might be due to the specific orientation of educational programmes accompanying exhibitions. It seems that the centres are generally not responsible for all the offerings of a museum (cost-effective offerings are often run by the museums themselves) and/or are not responsible for all museums in their area (e.g., Munich), so some educational offerings might be underrepresented. Another possible explanation could be the analysed advertising texts themselves. Several guided tours were announced only through simple facts (e.g., format, title of the tour, possible group size, where, and when) and were missing a 'real text'. For assigning facets, a more detailed advertising text would be necessary.

The different portals inherent in the texts advertising arts education programmes may also contain an 'experience dimension'. This experience dimension, however, is not considered a portal per se and therefore will not be distinguished in this inductive extension of the portals. In general, any offering or visit taking place in the specific situational context of a museum can be said to provide different 'experiences' (Pekarik, Doering, & Karns, 1999).

## Discussion

Our study began by analysing the advertising texts for educational programmes accompanying museum exhibitions, using the method of programme analysis. In the course of this process, *portals to cultural adult education in museums* were identified and differentiated for the first time. The research on (participation) portals by Gieseke and Opelt (2005), who examined arts education in general in Berlin/Brandenburg and Poland, formed the theoretical basis for this analysis. The present analysis focused on a more specific sample, namely educational programmes offered for adults by museum education centres/services, as well as by the affiliated museums, to accompany specific exhibitions. Unlike the original work from 2005, the decision to allocate an offering to a particular portal was determined mainly by the format of the event, the teaching methods used, and the means of knowledge acquisition. For the third portal, the decision was not determined primarily by the content of the offering. This was done so that the allocation would be verifiable and highly selective for the specific sample.

Despite the differences within the sample and in the procedure, it was possible to confirm the differentiation between the systematic-receptive (receptive-analytical) and autonomous-creative (artistic-creative) portals in the context of arts education in museums. The initial descriptions of the portals also indicate that the first two portals can be clearly and sharply distinguished from one another with respect to their focus and teaching methods as well as the way in which knowledge is acquired. For these two portals, as well as for a (systematic-) receptive AND autonomous-creative portal, parallels were found in the theoretical models (Stang, 2010; Tenorth & Tippelt, 2007), in a more recent infrastructure survey (Keuchel & Weil, 2010), and in a current census of nonformal arts education programmes (Robak et al., 2015).

The empathetic-communicative portal could not be identified in the underlying specific sample. Thus, in the context of museum educational offerings, these categories do not meet the criterion of mutual exclusivity in a qualitative research sense (belongs/does not belong; see, for example, Frieberthäuser & Prengel, 2003; Mayring, 2010). A selective allocation to one of the three initial portals from 2005 becomes more difficult.<sup>10</sup> This selectivity problem can also be found in the intercultural portals identified by Robak and Petter (2014): Portals 6 and 8 focus on target groups (programmes for migrants and advanced training for multipliers), and Portals 3, 4, and 7 focus on content/content areas (intercultural, transcultural, and interreligious) as the designation criterion. This highlights how crucial it is to have descriptions of (participation) portals that are as concrete as possible if they are to be used as highly selective and disjunctive categories and if they are to differentiate clearly and meaningfully between museum educational offerings.

In addition, the systematic-receptive portal can be differentiated on the basis of additional facets—in terms of particular and possible aspects of a specific portal (subcategories): pure; discursive-reflexive; dialogical-interactive; autonomous-interactive; imaginative-conceptual, interpretational; and with a sensory-haptic component. Contrary to the findings of Gieseke and Opelt (2005), in the systematic-receptive portal, ‘active’ elements were identified that did not imply a classification as autonomous-creative in every case. These ‘active’ elements do not always consist of outward autonomous activity in an artistic-creative sense. Rather, imaginative, dialogical, reflexive, or sensory activity that can be part of a receptive framework was demonstrated. Overall, the offerings for arts education in museums therefore provide more than just a choice between either a purely more passive<sup>11</sup>, receptive intake of information or the acquisition of knowledge through the visitor’s autonomous artistic activity. Within an

educational offering with a receptive character, such as a guided tour, diverse opportunities present themselves for the participants to become active communicatively or physically.

So what could be derived from the present study and the applied research method for the field of adult (art) education research and practice? First, beyond the format of an event, the typology of (participation) portals to arts education—the developed category system—provides a theoretical and empirical framework for future research, programme planning, and training. With regard to further research, the typology could be used as a theoretical approach to analyse the advertising text of educational offerings in museums/arts education and thereby systematically differentiate, characterise, and illustrate the wide range of learning pathways that are conceptualised in educational programmes. In this context, a comparison with other samples of texts advertising adult education programmes in museums or arts education programmes for adults in other institutions/organisations and in different countries could verify the theoretical model of portals and the developed set of categories, especially since the present study has shown that the initial typology of portals could not be applied one-to-one to other educational settings. Thus, further differentiations for different adult educational settings are needed. Moreover, using the typology of portals in a cross-sectional study, the educational offerings of different institutions could be compared, and areas of focus in cultural/arts education offerings could be discovered. By applying a longitudinal study, historical developments of educational offerings could be further explored.

Second, with regard to planning educational offerings (for museums), the developed category system enables programme planners and docents to reflect on and clarify the role of and the interaction between educators/museum staff and participants. This, in turn, allows them to develop more finely differentiated adult programmes in arts/cultural education, as well as to write the corresponding advertising texts.

However, it should be noted that portals are an inductively developed typology that call for a substantiated interpretive decision by the researcher when categorising written text advertising educational offerings. This means that the learners' knowledge acquisition during the course of these offerings is not necessarily only possible in the specified manner. It is also possible that in designing the offering, other teaching methods and/or means of knowledge acquisition were planned that would not be obvious to the researcher based on the advertising text only. An additional field study could clarify this. Future studies could also try to find out if visitors/participants would interpret the advertising text in the same way and decide to participate in an event particularly because it offers them a specific portal ('entryway') and the associated 'role'. Dealing with this question might consequently contribute to the overarching research question of why people decide to participate in an educational offering.

As programme analysis is almost exclusively used in adult education research in Germany, an internationally (comparable) developed category system for programme analysis is still pending. Using the research method of analysing programmes with an international comparative perspective could provide new opportunities for adult education research. This is applicable to, for instance, questions about planning and creating programmes/courses for adult learners, professionalisation of adult education, and participation or the larger context of educational practice. The strength of programme analysis is that by working closely with the programmes, it explores and obtains precise insights into the educational services and profiles of institutions and the goals, content, and structures of adult education (Robak & Fleige, 2017; Schrader & Ioannidou, 2009), as well as into the theory and practice of the programme planning process (Käpplinger & Sork, 2014).

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Some main parts of this article were published in German as an online document in November 2015 (see Specht & Semrau, 2015, 2017) and revised here. Many thanks to Prof. Dr. W. Jütte for the valuable advice, the museum education centres/services for their programmes, and our colleagues Dr. Alexandra Ioannidou and Prof. Tom Sork for their very helpful feedback.

<sup>2</sup> All quotations in this paper were translated from German by the authors and marked by '[trans.]'.

<sup>3</sup> Educational programmes accompanying exhibitions and guided by museum education staff encompass all forms of social guidance in museums involving either museum staff or media, such as guided tours or organised courses. By contrast, elements integrated into the exhibition, the objects on exhibition themselves, and explanatory media such as texts and pictures are not the subject of the present study (Lewalter & Noschka-Roos, 2010).

<sup>4</sup> These refer to institutions whose main task is not education, such as cultural institutions (e.g., theatres, operas, and museums) as well as initiatives, cultural centres, and associations (see Gieseke, 2005, p. 26).

<sup>5</sup> Gieseke and her colleagues further developed and partly revised the concept of portals with some colleagues after the present analysis was done (for more information, see Fleige et al., 2015).

<sup>6</sup> The original understanding of 'portal' also contains in a second step the assignment of the offering to its content or to a cultural/art section such as literature, music, theatre, or handicrafts. This will be waived in the present study to concentrate on the learning pathways opened up for the participants.

<sup>7</sup> A more methodologically detailed research approach to the analysis of these programmes is elucidated more thoroughly by Specht and Fleige (2016).

<sup>8</sup> An initial pilot test and validation of the portal with these five subcategories ( $n = 34$ ) by two independent reviewers resulted in a percentage reviewer consistency of 88.2%, with a Cohen's kappa coefficient of .656 ( $p < .000$ ). All the available descriptive information from the brochures on the various offerings was incorporated into the coding, which was done using SPSS. Nevertheless, it was not always possible in this pilot test to clearly allocate an offering to one of the inductively derived (participation) portals (categories). To keep the system open for the discovery of other categories, as well as to identify new hybrid forms and borderline cases, both multiple coding (e.g., Portals 1 and 3) and an open root category ('Portal open') were allowed.

<sup>9</sup> In Table E1, the frequencies and percentages of the categorised event formats found in the sample are provided.

*Table E1.* Frequency and percentage of the formats of event of the sample ( $N = 709$ )

<b>Format of event</b>	<b><i>n</i></b>	<b>%</b>
Guided tour [German-speaking topic-specific guided tour ( $n=236$ ), German-speaking museum tour ( $n=176$ ), guided tour with an additional offer ( $n=54$ ), inclusion-oriented guided tour ( $n=27$ ), foreign-language guided tour ( $n=7$ )]	500	70.5
Discussion/study group	81	11.4
Seminar/workshop	45	6.3
Advanced training for multiplier	39	5.5
Excursion, study trip	9	1.3
Film (screening)	5	0.7
Concert, music event	4	0.6

Lecture	3	0.4
Others like demonstration, project, reading, theatre performance, etc.	20	2.8
Undecided	3	0.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>100.0</b>

<sup>10</sup> In the original work from 2005, only the titles of two offerings are presented as an example of the assignment to one of the initial portals (p. 54). Further information about these offerings would have been helpful for the assignment and for the reconstruction of the decision. Unfortunately, such information was not available to us.

<sup>11</sup> From a constructivist point of view, ‘passive’ does not mean ‘inactive’, as receiving and processing information is always an active process based on the learners’ prior knowledge, previous experiences, and perspectives (Heine, 1998).

## References

- Best, K. (2012). Making museum tours better: understanding what a guided tour really is and what a tour guide really does. *Curator - The Museum Journal*, 27(1), 35–52.
- Czech, A. (2014). Führung – Führungsgespräch – Dialog. In A. Czech, J. Kirmeier, & B. Sgoff (Eds.), *Museumspädagogik. Ein Handbuch* (pp. 225–231). Schwalbach/Ts: Wochenschau.
- Deutscher Museumsbund e.V., & Bundesverband Museumspädagogik e.V. [German Museums Association and Federal Association for Museum Education] (2008). *Qualitätskriterien für Museen: Bildungs- und Vermittlungsarbeit*. Retrieved May 3, 2018, from <https://www.museumsbund.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/qualitaetskriterien-museen-2008.pdf>
- Deutscher Museumsbund e.V., & ICOM-Deutschland. (2006). *Standards für Museen*. Retrieved May 3, 2018, from <https://www.museumsbund.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/standards-fuer-museen-2006-1.pdf>
- Falk, J., & Dierking, L. (2000). *Learning from Museum. Visitor Experiences and Making of Meaning*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
- Fleige, M., Gieseke, W., & Robak, S. (2015). *Kulturelle Erwachsenenbildung. Strukturen – Partizipationsformen – Domänen*. Bielefeld: wbv.
- Frieberthäuser, B., & Prengel, A. (2003). *Handbuch Qualitative Forschungsmethoden in der Erziehungswissenschaft*. Weinheim, München: Juventa.
- Gieseke, W. (2017). Programs, Program Research, Program-planning Activities – Rhizome-like Developments. In B. Käßlinger, S. Robak, M. Fleige, A. von Hippel, & W. Gieseke (Eds.), *Cultures of Program Planning in Adult Education. Concepts, Research Results and Archives* (pp. 23–42). Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Gieseke, W., & Opelt, K. (2005). Programmanalyse zur kulturellen Bildung in Berlin-Brandenburg. In W. Gieseke, K. Opelt, H. Stock, & I. Börjesson (Eds.), *Kulturelle Erwachsenenbildung in Deutschland. Exemplarische Analyse Berlin/Brandenburg* (Europäisierung durch kulturelle Bildung: Bildung – Praxis – Event 1) (pp. 43–130). Münster u.a.: Waxmann.
- Heine, G. (1998). *Learning in the museum*. London: Routledge.
- Hippel, A. von, & W. Gieseke (Eds.), *Cultures of Program Planning in Adult Education. Concepts, Research Results and Archives* (pp. 43–64). Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Institut für Museumsforschung. (1998). *Statistische Gesamterhebung an den Museen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland für das Jahr 1997*. Berlin: IfM.
- Institut für Museumsforschung. (2008). *Statistische Gesamterhebung an den Museen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland für das Jahr 2007*. Retrieved May 3, 2018, from [https://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut\\_fuer\\_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Materialien/mat62.pdf](https://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut_fuer_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Materialien/mat62.pdf)
- Institut für Museumsforschung. (2014). *Statistische Gesamterhebung an den Museen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland für das Jahr 2013*. Retrieved May 3, 2018, from

- [https://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut\\_fuer\\_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Materialien/Mat68.pdf](https://www.smb.museum/fileadmin/website/Institute/Institut_fuer_Museumsforschung/Publikationen/Materialien/Mat68.pdf)
- Kade, J. (2010). Aneignung – Vermittlung. In R. Arnold, S., Nolda, & E. Nuisl (Eds.), *Wörterbuch Erwachsenenbildung* (2nd ed.) (pp. 18–19). Stuttgart: UTB.
- Käpplinger, B. (2015). Adult education research between field and rhizome – a bibliometric analysis of conference programs of ESREA. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 6(2), 139–157.
- Käpplinger, B., & Sork, T.J. (2014). Making program planning more visible: what to do when they don't know what they don't know. In S. Lattke, & W. Jütte (Eds.), *Professionalization of adult educators: international and comparative perspectives* (pp. 183–200). Frankfurt/Main: Lang.
- Käpplinger, B., Robak, S., Fleige, M., von Hippel, A., & Gieseke, W. (Eds.) (2017). *Cultures of Program Planning in Adult Education. Concepts, Research Results and Archives*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Keuchel, S., & Weil, B. (2010). *Lernorte oder Kulturtempel. Infrastrukturerhebung: Bildungsangebote in klassischen Kultureinrichtungen*. Köln: ARcult Media Verlag.
- Lattke, S., & Jütte, W. (Eds.) (2014), *Professionalization of adult educators: international and comparative perspectives*. Frankfurt/Main: Lang.
- Lewalter, D., & Noschka-Roos, A. (2010). Museum und Erwachsenenbildung. In R. Tippelt, & A. von Hippel (Eds.), *Handbuch Erwachsenenbildung/Weiterbildung* (4nd ed.) (pp. 293–308). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Mayring, P. (2010). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken* (11th ed.). Weinheim: Beltz.
- Nolda, S. (2003). Paradoxa von Programmanalysen. In W. Gieseke (Ed.), *Institutionelle Innensichten der Weiterbildung* (pp. 212–227). Bielefeld: Bertelsmann.
- Pekarik, A.J., Doering, Z.D., & Karns, D.A. (1999). Exploring Satisfying Experiences in Museum. *Curator*, 42(2), 152–173.
- Research Randomizer Form v4.0*. Retrieved November 24, 2015, from <http://www.randomizer.org/form.html>
- Robak, S., & Fleige, M. (2017). Programs, Organizations and Providers in Adult Education – Insights from Program Analyses in Adult Education Organizations in Germany. In B. Käpplinger, S. Robak, M. Fleige,
- Robak, S., Fleige, M., Sterzik, L., Seifert, J., Teichmann, A.-K., & Krueger, A. (2015). *Die Konstitution Kultureller Bildungsräume. Fünf überregionale Institutionen der non-formalen Kulturellen (Erwachsenen-) Bildung: Bildungsangebotsentwicklungen, innovative Impulse, Planungsspielräume (Empirische Studie im Auftrag des Rates für Kulturelle Bildung e.V.)*. Retrieved May 3, 2018, from [http://www.rat-kulturelle-bildung.de/fileadmin/user\\_upload/pdf/RFKB\\_RechercheRobakFleige\\_ES.pdf](http://www.rat-kulturelle-bildung.de/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/RFKB_RechercheRobakFleige_ES.pdf)
- Robak, S., & Petter, I. (2014). *Programmanalyse der interkulturellen Bildung in Niedersachsen*. Bielefeld: wbv.
- Rubenson, K., & Elfert, M. (2014). Changing Configurations of Adult Education Research: Exploring a Fragmented Map. In B. Käpplinger, & S. Robak (Eds.), *Changing configurations of adult education in transitional times* (pp. 25–38). Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Sachatello-Sawyer, B., Fellenz, R.A., Burton, H., Gittings-Carlson, L., Lewis-Mahony, J., & Woolbaugh, W. (2002). *Adult museum programs: designing meaningful experiences*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Schrader, J., & Ioannidou, A. (2009). Kapitel 5: Ziele, Inhalte und Strukturen der Erwachsenenbildung im Spiegel von Programmanalysen. In T. Fuhr, P. Gonon & C. Hof (Eds.), *Erwachsenenbildung - Weiterbildung. Handbuch der Erziehungswissenschaft 4* (pp. 259–269). Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh.
- Schrübers, C. (Ed.) (2013). *Moderieren im Museum. Theorie und Praxis der dialogischen Besucherführung*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Specht, I., & Fleige, M. (2016). Programmanalytisch ermittelte ausstellungsbegleitende Vermittlungsangebote für Erwachsene in Museen – Eine Programmanalyse am Beispiel des Museumsdienst Kölns. *Zeitschrift für Bildungsforschung*, 6(2), 187–201.
- Specht, I., & Semrau, F. (2015, 2017). *Portale zu kultureller Erwachsenenbildung in Museen. Eine Analyse ausstellungsbegleitender Vermittlungsangebote für Erwachsene*. Retrieved May, 03, 2018, from <https://www.die-bonn.de/doks/2017-kulturelle-bildung-01.pdf>
- Specht, I., & Semrau, F. (2016, September). *Educational programmes for adults accompanying museum exhibitions: programmes providing access to arts education beyond traditional guided tours*. Paper presented at the 8<sup>th</sup> Triennial European Research Conference of the European Society for Research on the Education of Adults (ESREA) (Maynooth University, Ireland, 8.-11.09.2016).

- Stang, R. (2001). Kulturelle Bildung. In R. Arnold, S. Nolda, & E. Nuissl (Eds.), *Wörterbuch Erwachsenenpädagogik* (pp. 180–181). Bad Heilbrunn/OBB: Verlag Julius Klinkhardt.
- Stang, R. (2010). Kulturelle Bildung. In R. Arnold, S. Nolda, & E. Nuissl (Eds.), *Wörterbuch Erwachsenenbildung* (2nd ed.) (pp. 176–177). Stuttgart: UTB.
- Taylor, E.W., McKinley Parrish, M., & Banz, R. (2010). Adult education in Cultural Institutions, Libraries, Museums, Parks, and Zoos. In C.E. Kasworm, A.D. Rose, & J.M. Ross-Gordon (Eds.), *Handbook of Adult and Continuing Education* (pp. 327–336). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Tenorth, H.-E., & Tippelt, R. (2007). Kulturelle Erwachsenenbildung. In H.-E. Tenorth, & R. Tippelt (Eds.), *BELTZ Lexikon Pädagogik* (p. 433). Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.
- van Dijk, T.A. (Ed.) (2011). *Discourse Studies* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Wirtz, M., & Caspar, F. (2002). *Beurteilerübereinstimmung und Beurteilerreliabilität*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.