ANALYZING PROGRAMS FOR ADULT LEARNING IN MUSEUMS

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE LANDSCAPE OF ARTS AND CULTURAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS AND THEIR ORGANIZATIONS
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GENERAL BACKGROUND

Arts and cultural education for adults in Germany

Distinguishing between organized adult education institutions with a stable program (Volkshochschulen, adult education center) and so-called “adjunctive” organizations of lifelong learning whose primary purpose is not adult education, but which still undertake educational tasks (e.g. museum, opera, theater) (Gieseke & Opelt, 2005)

Volkshochschule as largest adult education organization in Germany provides a wide range of arts education offers

GENERAL BACKGROUND

Arts and cultural education for adults: museums

“A museum is a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.” (Deutscher Museumsbund e. V. & ICOM, 2006)

Increasing interest of German adults in visiting a cultural institution like museum (Institute für Museumsforschung, 2014)

→ Despite of the relevance of museums in society and as place of adult learning, a systematic survey of educational offers for adults in museums is missing
RESEARCH QUESTION(S)

Questions

- Which educational (accompanied pedagogical/the exhibition) programs for adults do museums offer?
- What (event) formats, organizational (social) forms, topics, etc. could be found and differentiated in the sample?

⇒ Qualitative method: selective, exploratory program analysis (n. Käpplinger, 2008)

PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Coding system

- Deductive and inductive procedure
- Basis: theoretical and basic research and literature of continuing education + museum education and museum research [see below]
- Pilot testing with 37 national and international educational offers from different museums/adult education institutions

Continuing education
- Körber et al. (1995)
- Gieseke & Opelt (2003, 2005)
- Käpplinger (2007)
- Schnieder & Zentrer (2011)
- Huntemann & Reichert (2013)
- Robak & Petter (2014)

Museum theory and research
- Institut für Museumsforschung (1998, 2008)
- Sachatello-Sawayer et al. (2002)
- Keuchel & Weil (2010)
- Examples from a big art museum in Bonn
PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Coding system

Validation of 20 developed categorical categories
- 34 randomized educational offers from our sample
  (Research Randomizer Form v4.0)
- Two independent raters → agreement
- Percent agreement: 79.4%–100%
  Cohen’s Kappa: .617–1.00 (p < .000)
  (good – very good, Wirtz & Caspar, 2002)

⇒ Coding system with 40 main categories which include between 2 until 30 subcategories

PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Coding system (selected categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main category</th>
<th>Number of subcategories</th>
<th>Percent agreement</th>
<th>Cohen’s Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format of the offer/event</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>.869*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>.698*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising text</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>.687*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way of addressing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>.787*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indication of the target group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>.787*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification of the target group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>.725*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .000
A Existing of a second/third pendant if several nominations are made
B In combination with a open category for gathering detailed information
PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Coding system III

Open (non-categorical) categories:
- Title of offer
- Month (taking place/starts)
- Year
- Duration in hours
- Costs/Fees
- Minimum and maximum number of participants

PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Sample and challenge

Challenge: over 6000 different museums in Germany
(Institut für Museumsforschung, 2014)

→ With regard to resources (time, financial, feasibility)
  decision for programs of the five museum educational centers in Germany
  - Hamburg, Berlin, Cologne, Nuremberg, Munich
  - January – June 2014
  - N=739

† Limitations: not every educational offer is served from such a center, not every program is archived
## Program Analysis

### Findings

**Advertising text (N=739)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, offer is described/rewritten with several sentences</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, offer isn’t described/rewritten in excess of pure facts like what, when, where</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the topic/exhibition as synonym for the offer</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer is described/rewritten in a preamble which is applied to several similar educational offers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format of the offer/event</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic-specific guided tour (in German language)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(General/normal) Guided tour in German language</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/study group</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided tour with extra/special offer</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further education for multiplier</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar/Workshop</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive guided tour</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided tour in another language then German</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert, music event</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others like demonstration, projects, reading etc.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69.6% types of guided tours

28.09.2015

PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts education, History of art, Art theory [theoretic]</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, Cultural History [theoretic]</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town history, Regional history, city related</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Arts education (unspecific)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, Arts and Crafts, Fashion [in practice]</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural science/technique</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape gardening, Nature/Garden [theoretic]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film, TV, Video, PC [theoretic]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing, Painting, Typography [in practice]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Music/Concerts (0.8%), Theology/Church (0.8%), Industrial art (0.3%), Health (0.3%), Fiber craft (0.1%), …
PROGRAM ANALYSIS

Findings

Way of addressing (N=739)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No statement, because of no advertising text</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct nor indirect addressing</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect addressing of the target group</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct addressing as a member of a secondary group (“you”)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct addressing as a member of a primary group (“we”)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed form (1, 2 and/or 3)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indication of the target group (N=739)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No statement, because of no advertising text</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, despite advertising text</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specification of the target group:
- Adults
- Elderly (N=12), Blind persons (N=8), Multiplier (N=51), Deaf persons (N=4), Persons with special needs (N=6), Missing (N=156)
CONCLUSION / DISCUSSION

Conclusion and Discussion

• Programs contain advertising text, mostly neutral addressed
• 69.9% of offers comprise different types of guiding tours
  → Systematic-receptive offers – in comparison: Volkshochschulen
    (Adult education center in Germany) offer more than 50% self-
    acting-creative programs (s. Gieseke & Opelt, 2005)
• Additionally, museums offer a lot of different formats
  (films, concerts, discussion groups, trips…)

⇒ Results indicate that museums play an important role in the area of
  arts and cultural education for adults which should not longer be
  ignored/neglected
⇒ They enrich the field of arts education with their different programs

CONCLUSION / DISCUSSION

Conclusion and Discussion

• Developing a coding system taking both continuing education and
  museum theory/research in to account
  → Types of validation like percent agreement & Cohen's Kappa
    as well as trained rater could improve the exploratory power
    of a program analysis

• Limitations:
  – Sample (no museums by themselves; different responsibilities
    of the different museum educational centers: some cost-
    effective offers are done from the museums themselves)
  – Only for 2014 up to date
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