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ABSTRACT/ABSTRAKT:
The aim of this paper is to explore how the concept of inclusion is tackled in the field of museum education. Forty-one empirical articles written in four languages are examined, and the conceptual bases of different types of inclusive museum programs in those articles are identified and analysed. Results show that available research about inclusion in museum education can be classified in four categories: learning, community engagement, training/internship, and health/therapy. The category of learning refers to museum programs in which visitors learn different skills. Community engagement includes programs in which the objective is to invite and engage diverse specific groups of visitors in museum spaces and activities. Training/internship focuses on university training, internships, and museum personnel training. Health/therapy includes articles analysing programs directed to people with dementia or Alzheimer’s disease.
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1. Introduction: museum audiences, inclusion and museum education

In the last decades, museums have attempted to reach a broader and more diverse audience. Thus, the concept of inclusion has become relevant for those institutions, in line with the objective of reaching a wider public. However, inviting and targeting a diverse public has not always been in the centre of attention of museums. Modern museum (or modernist museum) is the term to refer to the post-colonial concept of these institutions. From the very beginning of its existence, by the late eighteenth century, to educate the public was a central goal of the modern museum – along with collecting and preserving valuable works. For example, it was believed in governmental circles during Victorian England that easy access to the so-called “high culture” would “civilize” the population in a mental, moral and behavioural sense. Even though museums were addressed to their public, they remained elitist institutions until the end of the 19th century, and even nowadays art museums still struggle with this stigma.

1 Acknowledgement: This article is supported by the Agencia Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo de Chile Doctorado Nacional 2020-533228.
The modernist museum aimed to enlighten and teach its visitors passively, i.e., in such a way that the public absorbs the knowledge and information available in the museum, without any further interaction. In this atmosphere, the museum curator was conceived almost as a scholar: an expert on the collection who decided which objects should be exhibited, and who wrote the texts about the displayed objects.7

In the 1970s a new outlook, audience research, appeared in the field of museum studies, and it shifted the focus of attention to visitors, to their background and their interests.8 Besides audience research, museum education and education departments also started developing and spreading in the 1960–70s.9 Following this trend, museums in general began offering open-ended and more individually directed learning strategies.10 These strategies aimed at responding to the needs of the visitors, and their design and implementation considered the motivation and background of the visitors, and also how, what and how much the audiences can learn at the museum.11

Although museums nowadays adopt a more individually oriented approach and they are supposed to focus on a broader public,
organizational structure of museums, while the English system intends to solve the societal problems towards the outside.

The problem of social inclusion and the museum has not only been addressed by these two countries. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Council of Museums (ICOM) pay attention to this issue too. These international organizations show that the problem of inclusion is a general widespread issue in the majority of countries, and they propose to address it with measures that include museum policies.

According to these new trends, museums can contribute positively on individual, community, and societal levels. The positive impact of museums on individuals can have effects on personal, psychological, and emotional dimensions, and it also has a pragmatic dimension in the acquisition of different skills. Community members can benefit from museum experience by gaining new skills and gain confidence that they can put those skills to good use by playing an active role in their lives and communities. Even though it is difficult to establish a direct relation between museums and the societies they are embedded into, with suitable policies, programs and activities, these institutions can contribute to promote inclusion, diversity, multiculturalism and social equity.24

In line with the above-mentioned concepts, a reasonably new museum movement has arisen in the 1990s called Social Museology.25 This movement prioritizes and proposes active social engagement, and it is committed to develop democracy, inclusion, cultural empowerment, contemporary debates, interculturality and reducing social inequalities. Social Museology also encourages that museums stand up against racism, prejudices, authoritarianism, homophobia, and xenophobia.26 One of the main features of this approach, and which is also connected to museum education, is the notion of cultural mediation: the role of mediating between culture and population, promoting active participation of the communities.27

On the other hand, museum education has received increasing attention in the last 50 years, and it is a dimension of museum ideology and practice that closely connects to issues about audiences and inclusion. The importance of the educational role of the museum is revealed by university programs and courses offering specializations for museum educational studies to prepare the students for the diversity of the job.28 The objectives of museum educators are usually multi-layered. Educators are responsible for designing and implementing guided tours, informal museum learning programs, programs and activities for schools, communities, families and adults, workshops and other public activities, online educational programs, and forming partnerships with other organizations.29

According to the new museum definition of ICOM, the purposes of museums are researching, collecting, conserving, interpreting, and exhibiting. They should offer experiences for visitors that aim at education, enjoyment, reflection, and knowledge sharing.30 In order to reach these goals in the context of social diversity, accessibility and inclusion are issues that must be essentially considered. One of the major importance of this new definition of museums is to recognize and call up for the centrality of these concepts. Thus, the definition establishes the operation of museums with the participation of communities.

In the realization of these goals, museum education is essential. In order to reach a diverse public, museums need to offer a variety of learning programs and activities.31 The quality and multiplicity of learning experiences contribute to attract the public and to redefine the relevance of museums for society. The development of museums as learning environments highlights two central tasks: incorporating different points of view within the museum space through conversations between visitors and reflecting multiple perspectives of the communities in a society.32 Museum learning

---

27 Social museology is theoretically connected to the approach Liberation Pedagogy, developed by the Brazilian pedagogue-philosopher Paulo Freire. See FERNÁNDEZ DOS REIS DÍEZ, Ana Mercedes. La creación de valor en el museo y la sociomuseología. Complutum, 2015, vol. 26, no. 2, p. 204.
helps the public to develop new experiences, interests, attitudes, beliefs, and insights in an informal setting.

This literature review focuses on how inclusion problems are tackled in museum-education studies. Its objective is to research, analyse and collect the empirical studies related to inclusion and museum education. Considering that museum education is a relatively new and developing field, this review aims to identify the niche where further research and publications are needed. It also serves a more pragmatic purpose, as it could be used by museum personnel in order to look for further ideas to implement social and inclusive programs in their institutions. Accordingly, the following question led to the research of the literature review: What type of inclusive museum educational programs are reported in academic publications?

2. Methodology

A systematic literature review aims to reveal known and unknown aspects of a research topic through analysing the existing bibliography. The literature review is carried out through clear procedure, defining a research question and purpose, inclusion and exclusion criteria, analysis, and discussion of the results.

The search was conducted first in two scientific databases, Web of Science and Scopus, focusing on empirical articles in four languages, English, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian. The terms used for the search were:

**Search**

Databases: Scopus, WOS, Dialnet, SCIELO, Science Direct

Search terms: “museum education” AND inclusion

**Found articles = 154**

**Inclusion of articles**

- Empirical articles
- Articles related to museum education or exhibitions describing specific programs
- Articles in English, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian
- Articles published until May 2021

**Exclusion of articles**

- Theoretical articles
- Conference papers
- Doctoral theses
- Articles in languages other than English, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian
- Articles published after May 2021
- Articles reported on visitors’ perceptions without describing any specific museum educational programs
- Articles not available online

**Articles after search = 41**

Fig. 1: Process of article selection


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Type of museum(s)</th>
<th>Target groups(s)</th>
<th>Program(s)</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addario &amp; Langer</td>
<td>Cultural centre, science, art, observatory, natural history</td>
<td>Non-white, lower socioeconomic status Media Arts &amp; Technology students</td>
<td>Project-driven internship</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alves et. al. (2020)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Deaf Children, young people with hearing deficiency</td>
<td>Guided tour</td>
<td>Constructivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anila (2017)</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
<td>Participatory, co-creative community engaged interpretive practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bajac (2017)</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Art education</td>
<td>Interactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazan et al. (2021)</td>
<td>Natural history, history, ethnography</td>
<td>Adults, professionals, families, classrooms, internal museum departments</td>
<td>Repatriation-centered programming</td>
<td>Decolonialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belver &amp; Ullán (2019)</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>People with cognitive problems or dementia</td>
<td>Museum visit and art creation</td>
<td>Small group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belver et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Persons with dementia</td>
<td>Guided tours and art-making workshops</td>
<td>Art therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford et al.</td>
<td>Art, science, history, maritime</td>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td>Conversations about artworks, accessible programs, learning labs, exhibition</td>
<td>Interactive, exploratory method, constructivism, participatory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunch III (2017)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>People of all races &amp; nationalities</td>
<td>One-to-one mentoring sessions</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Ríos et al.</td>
<td>Archeology, monumental, art, history, anthropology, science, natural history, technology</td>
<td>13-16 years old students, second year psychology students</td>
<td>Exhibitions</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cava Mori &amp; Kasseboehmer (2019)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Chemistry teachers</td>
<td>Chemistry teachers training</td>
<td>Informal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarke &amp; Lewis (2016)</td>
<td>History, art, science</td>
<td>Black &amp; Asian, minority ethnic &amp; refugee, &amp; economically excluded women</td>
<td>Community-led heritage project</td>
<td>Holistic model of adult education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuesta Davignon (2020)</td>
<td>Decorative art</td>
<td>14-18 years old students, adults</td>
<td>Guided tour</td>
<td>Gender perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falchetti (2020)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>14-25 years old convicts</td>
<td>Science and art workshops in and outside of the prison</td>
<td>Participatory approach, multiple intelligences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez-Garcia (2017)</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Persons with dementia</td>
<td>Guided tours &amp; art workshop</td>
<td>Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grek (2009)</td>
<td>Art, science, history</td>
<td>Adults with difficult social situation</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
<td>ICT technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grincheva (2015)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>University students, museum professionals &amp; broader communities</td>
<td>Mount a website and exhibitions, exchange travel</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper &amp; Hendrick</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
<td>Collaboration with other museums</td>
<td>Sharing points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidrich et al. (2020)</td>
<td>Fashion and design history</td>
<td>Visually impaired children</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>Multisensorial, inclusive design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>Type of museum(s)</td>
<td>Target groups(s)</td>
<td>Program(s)</td>
<td>Method(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismaeel &amp; Al-Abdullatif (2016)</td>
<td>Virtual museum about cultural heritage</td>
<td>6th grade elementary school students</td>
<td>Virtual museum</td>
<td>Interactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kreuzer &amp; Dreesmann (2017)</td>
<td>Natural history</td>
<td>Student teachers</td>
<td>Student teacher training course</td>
<td>PCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton &amp; Greene (2018)</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Transgender visitors and museum staff</td>
<td>Photography exhibition</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mithlo &amp; Sherman (2020)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>Photography exhibition</td>
<td>Perspective taking, VTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monzo et al. (2019)</td>
<td>Ethnography</td>
<td>Persons with dementia</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Recreational-cultural, person-centered care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muzi (2019)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>Student training, cataloguing a portion of the museum’s collection, guided tour, cultural animation</td>
<td>School work alternating training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omarov et al. (2016)</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Theory and practice</td>
<td>Interactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pablos González &amp; Fontal Merillas (2020)</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
<td>People with Autistic Spectrum Syndrome</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santacana Mestre et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Art, history, science, ethnography, archaeology</td>
<td>14-16 years old students</td>
<td>Analysis of the educational and didactic aspects of museums</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayers (2014)</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Young persons</td>
<td>Peer-led workshop</td>
<td>Learner-led learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shein et al. (2019)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor (2017)</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Museum staff</td>
<td>Organization development</td>
<td>Adult Learning Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theriault &amp; Redmond-Jones (2018)</td>
<td>Natural history</td>
<td>Young adults with autism</td>
<td>Social Stories Project</td>
<td>Constructivism, scaffolding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thogersen et al. (2018)</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Learning &amp; teaching community</td>
<td>Mapping collection objects</td>
<td>Object-based learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidal et al. (2019)</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Immigrant persons</td>
<td>Language learning</td>
<td>VTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright (2020)</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Young children and families from marginalized communities</td>
<td>Gallery visits and workshops with artists</td>
<td>Participatory approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2: The selected 41 studies reporting on inclusive museum education

the search were first ‘museum education’ and ‘social inclusion’. With these keywords 36 articles were found in total, 3 publications in Scopus and 33 in Web of Science. Screening the abstracts, out of the 36 articles, 3 were conference papers, 2 were book chapters, 7 did not relate to museum education, 7 were theoretical articles, and 2 articles were not available online, therefore, these publications were not considered as part of the review.

In order to find more articles, search terms were changed to ‘museum education’ and ‘inclusion’. With these, 18 documents were found in Scopus and 83 in Web of Science. Furthermore, three additional databases were included in the search: Dialnet, SCIELO and Science Direct. In Dialnet 7 articles, in SCIELO 1, and in Science Direct 45 publications appeared. In total, from the 154 articles, only 41 were included in the literature review (see inclusion and exclusion criteria in Figure 1). Considering the limited numbers of articles, the time period was defined until May 2021, without any beginning
date. Only empirical articles were selected for the review to answer the research question. The final chosen publications were first revised through their abstract and then through their reading.

Considering the broad and disparate meanings of inclusion, it was decided not to incorporate any other concepts related to inclusion to avoid the personal interpretation of the concept.

3. Results

In order to respond to the first research question, the categories which led to the analysis are the following: type of museum(s), target group(s), museum program(s) and teaching method(s). The categories were chosen to show the relevant information about the inclusive museum educational programs reported in the articles. Figure 2. presents the findings about the selected articles and categories. The publications are systematized in four comprehensive themes: (1) Learning, (2) Community engagement, (3) Training/Internship, and (4) Health/Therapy. The second category, Community engagement, contains two subcategories: people with disabilities and immigrant visitors.

3.1 Learning

People go to museums mainly, although not exclusively, for educational purposes. According to museum educators, the museum experience should be enjoyable, active and stimulating, with defined learning outcomes, and should consider the diverse goals of the public. Learning in the museum should embrace different and multiple viewpoints and opinions and include dialoguing in the programs as an essential part of gaining knowledge. Various studies demonstrated visitors’ improvements in critical thinking.

in creativity, scientific, linguistic, civic, and artistic literacy, and successful school curriculum implementation.  

Wright found that children's imagination and interest were triggered by playful interactions, using sounds, movements, storytelling, viewfinders, and art-making activities. Children's imagination for possible artwork interpretations and for exploration were supported by the artist-educators. During gallery workshop visits, children were accompanied by nursery practitioners, who learned about the Reggio Emilia philosophy and how the environment interacts in teaching. During gallery workshop participation the children felt relaxed and comfortable showing it through their body language.

Even though museums try to reach as wide an audience as possible and try to be accessible for all individuals, still, visitors are not differentiated in terms of their cultural and social capitals, as if all the persons had equal opportunities to enter the museums. Visitors with disabilities have similar difficulties considering that museum professionals tend to think of them as a homogenous group. People with similar disabilities are also diverse regarding their familiarity with themes in the museums. The difference of their knowledge should be considered when museum professionals design and implement programs for them.

A museum educator with similar disability in the museum staff attracts more visitors and this specific public feels better received and shows more commitment to the museum experience. Furthermore, Martins concludes that museum educators with disability facilitate other museum workers to understand their condition and work with them.

Various publications report on programs and exhibitions which targeted immigrant students and families. Programs and bilingual exhibitions involving these target groups help in their integration and relate to their identities, letting them feel more welcomed, competent and confident, while also increasing their social and/or cultural capital. Visitors showed positive emotions and openness after their participation. Falchetti described the museum programs' constructive effects on young, convicted subjects. Apart from the development of cognitive skills, the convicted youngsters demonstrated improvements in adaptability, positive social relationships, acquisition of values, sense of citizenship, and higher levels of self-esteem in scientific workshops realized both in the museum and in prison.

Learning in the museum involves a diverse public. The results of the majority of articles found positive effects and development in the learning of museum audiences especially in critical thinking. Furthermore, the visits can strengthen and relate to people's identity, increase their social and cultural capital, and help them in integration.

### 3.2 Community Engagement

The category of community engagement includes diverse groups of the public in museum space, and how these groups can be invited and involved in participation of
exhibitions, museum programs and education.

Decolonization and acceptance of different races are considered and discussed in many studies.


According to Anila, museums and exhibitions tend to display a ‘commonly’ recognized perspective which principally reflects on the curator’s viewpoint. Nevertheless, ‘official’ standpoints do not always consider or ignore other interpretations. Museums need to adopt polyvocality in their functioning, since visitors do not belong to a homogenous audience. An exhibited object which is accepted by the main ‘dominant’ culture and by visitors who would appreciate it from the same culture, sharing similar ideas, can be disturbing or even traumatic for visitors who do not share the same values or whose history and identity are painfully related to those same objects. In exhibitions, expressing distinct viewpoints show that objects are interpreted differently depending on the visitor’s cultural, social and educational background.

In order to convey multiple perspectives, participative and co-creative community-engaged interpretive practices can be effective tools towards inclusion. While preparing an exhibition, the museum can consult with an external advisory board that includes members of different communities that can be affected, or even form partnerships with those communities. In the context of exhibitions, programming and artifacts, the repatriation of objects is also part of the dialogues of inclusion. Pro-repatriation stance and agreements arise between museums and indigenous or nation-communities for which exhibited objects are important and meaningful.

The museum can also decide to consider organizing Indigenous-centric interpretations. Mithlo and Sherman noted that American Indian-centric interpretations are under-recognized. Their studies revealed that the lack of American Indian perspectives in museum exhibitions and the ignorance by visitors and museum workers, especially in museums displaying American Indian history, artifacts, and objects, may offend American Indian peoples. Through their conducted research with three visitor groups the above-mentioned authors also found that the perspective-taking approach led to a more positive impact of interpreting the American Indian peoples’ lives.

Finally, socioeconomically marginalized people and
families can also be reached with appropriate programs. Wright described vulnerable families and their children during museum visits and workshops in a three-year-long ethnographic research. While the children behaved relaxed even during the first visits, the parents needed more time to feel comfortable and accepted in the museum environment, considering they did not have previous experience visiting a gallery. With time both children and parents enjoyed the activities.

People with disabilities

Considering that museums constitute an important factor of cultural dissemination in relation both to individual and social development, the cultural values that museums offer should be also provided for people with different cognitive and sensory conditions. Instead of thinking of people with special needs who should be cured for their disability, the disability of these individuals should be embraced as a natural part of the human condition and society. Museums can be experienced by the senses of touching, hearing and smelling. The use of multisensory resources can facilitate the accessibility of museums and participation in activities for all visitors. In order to engage visitors with disabilities, museum educators and other museum workers should know and understand how their communities work, and how people with disabilities identify themselves. Museum workers tend to manage and identify people with the same disability as a unitary group, but these people are also a heterogeneous group from all social classes with various cultural, racial, religious and educational backgrounds.

Museums are ideal spaces for multiculturalism where the acceptance of personal identity and differences could lead to social inclusion. People from different backgrounds and cultures can interact and mutually learn from each other. Furthermore, by promoting activities for the communities, museums can enhance the sense of belonging among visitors who are part of the same group. Also museum staff can benefit from collaborations of people with disabilities to better understand these visitors and be able to respond to their requests.

Immigrant visitors

Museums can reach immigrant visitors to feel more accepted in their new environment through different programs, like bilingual exhibitions. English language courses in an art museum.

70 THERIAULT, Sam and Beth REDMOND JONES. Constructing Knowledge Together: Collaborating with and Understanding Young Adults with Autism. Journal of Museum Education, 2018, vol. 43, no. 4, p. 370.
and immigrant visitors. To involve communities, museum exhibitions should contain different narratives and express distinct viewpoints to engage the opinions of different groups. For the involvement of different communities, museum educators and museum staff need to understand the necessities and identities of these groups.

### 3.3 Training and Internship

Articles in this section include university training, internship, secondary school student training, and museum personnel training.

Museums can offer problem-oriented and inquiry-based teaching for students through their collections. According to Kreuzer and Dreesmann, although natural history museums have the possibility to provide knowledge for students, information about the importance and tasks of these museums are very low among school students. The authors suggest that it is viable to learn about natural history museums by developing museum activities into school curricula and improving student teachers’ professional knowledge through a university course.

The results of publications showed that interaction between museums and universities strengthens the teachers’ openness to museum visits, introduce them to new teaching methodologies, and allows them to experience out-of-school learning settings which they can utilize in their teaching.

Internships are another example of collaboration between museums and universities. Through paid internships museums become more inclusive environments and support university students from non-White and/or lower socioeconomic background to gain valuable working experiences. Paid internships also increase the employability of graduates.

Muzi describes in her publication a new teaching methodology she dubs school-work alternating training. This methodology addresses upper secondary school students and allows them work-training periods both in the classroom and at companies. As part of the educational process, students can also participate in museums or other places dedicated to heritage and cultural activities. During the museum training, the students learn about the history of the museum and its heritage, they observe the experts’ work and participate in cataloguing, laboratory observation activities, engaging with visitors, conducting interviews with museum professionals, and creating contents for social media platforms.

Museum professionals are receptive to reform their museum to be a more inclusive institution. To implement changes, they need to focus not only on diverse audiences, physically and cognitively inclusive programs but also on organization development in their museum. Inclusion should be considered on individual, group, organization and marketplace levels. The staff’s learning about inclusion is essential in the museum’s development. The organizational transformations can result in a more equitable hiring process, more varied outlook in program planning, activities for marginalized communities and increasing the participation of these groups.

The section focused principally on collaboration between museums and university programs and on organizational training related to achieving higher inclusion. The majority of the articles revised described positive results about teacher’s gains in museum related
knowledge, and about improved organizational inclusion.

### 3.4 Health and Therapy

An increasing number of museums offer specific programs directed to people with dementia or Alzheimer’s disease. In treating the mentioned illnesses, art-related activities can support to maintain and improve the cognitive and mental state of these persons. All the articles belonging to this category analyse the outcomes of special museum programs directed to visitors who are affected by dementia or Alzheimer’s disease.

The activities describe exhibition visits and workshops based on artistic creation. During the exhibition visit, five or six art works are shown to the visitors. The participants must visit the museum for the guided tours. During the tours, first an interactive discussion is generated among the participants and the museum educator, then only among the participants. The discussion is organized in small groups coordinated by the museum educator. On the other hand, the workshops take place either in the museum or in day centres for people with dementia. In the workshops, each participant receives a high-quality reproduction of an artwork. The participants are encouraged to recognize the work, share their memories related to the object, and create a dialogue with the other participants based on their observations. One of the objectives of the programs is to recall the participants’ memories. As a specificity of these diseases is that the persons progressively lose their memories. Communication, interaction and emotional expression are relevant parts of the activities which can stimulate social relations, inclusion and feelings of capability.

As a result of workshops and guided tours, people’s social relations with dementia or Alzheimer’s disease increased and the participants’ cognitive stimulation, social connections, self-esteem and sense of identity developed. Furthermore, the workshops and guided tours provided positive emotions and relaxation for the participants.

The publications in the Health/Therapy section reported on people with dementia or Alzheimer’s disease. The guided tours and workshops in the museums were specifically designed for people who suffer from these diseases. The results of the articles revealed that artistic activities have several positive effects on these people’s development in particular on cognitive abilities and social relations.

### 4. Discussion

Current publications about inclusion in museum education are related to four main areas: learning, community engagement, training/internship, and health/therapy. Some studies belonged to more than one category, showing that inclusion in museum education is a complex and interrelated issue involving different aspects of the museum work at the same time. Furthermore, one category, community engagement can be connected to all publications, considering that visitors belong to the museum’s own community.
with greater or lesser extent as permanent or occasional visitors. 95

Numerous publications discuss active and participatory visitor engagement. 96 According to Simon, in the participatory museum, visitors share their skills and ideas with museum workers, contribute and collaborate in activities and exhibitions. Participatory museums work democratically with active involvement of museum communities. Museums can hold creative and respectful dialogues in their community, as well as maintain and strengthen interpersonal interactions and relationships among a diverse audience. Participatory practices and activities can provide a meaningful learning experience. The museum can connect visitors with their heritage and art, with new ideas, and develop critical thinking and creativity. 97 Articles in the literature review prove the development and improvement of these skills. 98

4.1 Inclusion within museum work and personnel

Various articles conclude that internal museum inclusion and collaboration with vulnerable communities and groups can increase inclusion in museums within both museum staff and visitors. 99 In their publication, Ng, Ware and Greenberg defined a blueprint for museum educators to generate inclusion and diversity. According to the authors, museums can reach inclusion and diversity through working withallyships. In their conceptualization, an allyship means a collaboration with various identities in the creation for work environments, programming, and exhibitions considering everyone without exception, especially marginalized and racialized peoples. The definition includes both audience-centred museum work such as programming, education, and curation as well as internal museum work, working conditions and hiring. 100 To improve and implement inclusion among museum personnel, further research is suggested especially focusing on the field of museum education.

4.2 Museum programs for highly disadvantaged groups

Even though the publications report inclusion and museum education on vulnerable social groups, only a few are related directly to socioeconomic inclusion 101 or highly disadvantaged groups. 102 Publications between museums and people with disabilities and with difficult socioeconomic background and/or from minority culture and/or from LGBTIQ+ communities should be further researched, how museum education can contribute, improve, or change the situation of these people.

4.3 The use of research methods

Case studies are very popular research methods within museums, as it was shown in the results section. They demonstrate in-depth analysis of a situation or problem occurring in museums. 103 Even if case studies present effectively diverse challenges in museum education and inclusion, different research methods could help understanding different aspects and angles of a problem or perspective 104.
or even actively include visitor-participants in the research.\textsuperscript{106}

5. Conclusion

Four main and two subcategories are identified in the analysis of the 41 articles. The Learning category discusses different skills which visitors gain during participation and also includes school curriculum implementations in museums. The second category, Community engagement contains two subcategories, People with disabilities and Immigrant visitors. The section demonstrates the relevance of knowing and understanding the identities and necessities of different target groups to involve them better in museum participation. Training/Internship describes students’ involvement and gained skills during museum training. Furthermore, the category reflects on internal museum organizational inclusion. The final category, Health/Therapy incorporates articles analysing the effectiveness of programs for people with dementia or Alzheimer’s disease.

This paper gave an overview about empirical articles discussing museum education and inclusion. Nevertheless, this literature review has its limitations which are related to the scope of the analysis according to the selected criteria: databases, type of references, languages, and online availability.

Considering the classification of results and found categories, future lines of research could focus on: (1) inclusion within museum work and personnel; (2) museum programs for highly disadvantaged groups; (3) exploring different documents or (4) including additional databases and languages.
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