# SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF PUBLIC CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS: THE EXAMPLE OF MUSEOLOGY. OBSERVATIONS, REFLECTIONS AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS: SUMMARY OF THE FOCUS GROUP STAGE*

**Marianna Otmianowska**
Royal Łazienki Museum
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
ORCID 0000-0003-4253-5065

**Izabela Bukalska**
Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
ORCID 0000-0001-7930-1700

In 2020–2021, five focus group interviews (FGIs) and a guest lecture by Dr Bernadette Lynch held at the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw took place as part of the sociology-related Project: Social Responsibility of Public Cultural Institutions: the Example of Museology.[1] Two interviews participated by international experts and three conducted among Polish participants constituted one of the several stages of the research Project implemented at the Chair of Cultural Sociology at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University related to the investigation of the concept of social responsibility of museums. The paper attempts at summing up this stage of research. Its first part is dedicated to presenting the Project's assumptions, goals, and methodology, while part two deals with the properties of the category[2] 'social responsibility of museums' and the perspective on the role of museum education and its social responsibility.[3]

The Project was rooted in two key processes. One of them is the currently occurring global redefinition of the social role

of museums and their growing involvement in ethical issues and community values. The above-mentioned transformation takes into account the potential and impact of the educational function. The second relates to the practice of conducting quantitative and qualitative research in museums developing more and more dynamically amidst the Polish circles.[4]

The presently conducted considerations related to social responsibility of museums,[5] their inclusiveness, variety, democratization, accessibility, and relational[6] or participatory[7] activity, as well as the importance attributed to the educational function in each of those aspects, seem to be a natural stage in the debate carried out for many years now. It is participated by museums and e.g., local and beyond-local communities, while in the recent years also by virtual communities.

Departing from reflection on museums becoming more socially committed, in the discussed Project an attempt was made at discovering the means of the perception and implementation of the idea of museums' social responsibility,[8] but also at defining the position of and the role presently attributed to museum education. Bearing in mind the ISO 26000 standard, the Authors, however, did not treat it as the only benchmark. Their ambition was decisively more the verification of how the actors of the social world of museology perceive this idea and define it. The issue was analysed, among others, *versus* the social responsibility of museum education, commitment to it, the role it plays inside the institution and towards the public. Attention was also paid to the question of museums' democratization and inclusiveness. The issues related to social responsibility may also include the museums' mission and objectives, as well as strategies of the development of museology and of respective museums. Furthermore, in the course of the investigation Project an issue arose related to the changes occurring in museum education and relations with the public caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The research was conducted using the Symbolic Interactionism Paradigm. Furthermore, elements of the grounded theory methodology (GTM), developed in 1967 by Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, were applied, i.e., the concepts were not defined at the outset (in this case there were no 'ready' and defined categories); furthermore, the research used the constant comparative method, theoretical sampling, method triangulation, and coding.[9] Only selected GTM methods were used, omitting the final objective of formulating hypotheses and theoretical generalizations. The method triangulation consisted in combining Desk Research, DR,[10] Individual In-depth Interviews, IDIs,[11] and Focus Group Interviews, FGIs. In total, 59 IDIs[12] and 5 FGIs were conducted. The two first interviews involved Polish executives and educators, following which two interviews were carried out with international participants, and subsequently one was conducted with Polish educators. Furthermore, the Project included a guest lecture of Dr B. Lynch[13] titled *Challenging the Unhelpful Museum: radically changing museums to face up to our collective future* (Fig. 1).

Owing to the pandemic restrictions, FGIs were conducted online obeying the maximum possible number of methodological guidelines. Initially, the plan was made for four FGIs among experts (including the executive staff in Polish museums). The two first ones were to involve Polish participants, while the other two were planned to have an international

participation. Following a partial analysis, the decision was made to carry out an additional fifth interview participated by Polish educators (Tables 1-5). What mattered was for participants to represent different positions and competences, as well as different museum types which differed as for their experience in implementing social projects, size, organizer type, collection character, or location.

The interviews in Polish concerned the issues related to the involvement and development of museums, participation and local activity, and also to the opinion on the current situation, diagnosis of needs and development prospects, as well as opportunities and challenges. The international interviews allowed to compare experience and to obtain an overview of the above topics in a broader context. Also new motifs appeared, while the areas in which museums can act responsibly extended. In the previously unplanned fifth FGI the search was conducted for the data to complete the educators' diagnosis versus their awareness of agency, cooperation, and interaction with the remaining staff members, development options, and appreciation of their expertise and commitment by the management as well as the remaining museologists.[14]

The concept of 'social responsibility' is not as yet universally used among the social circles of museology, and was interpreted by the respondents in many ways. It was related to accessibility, disabilities, cooperation with the local community, ecology, upbringing, or museum volunteering. The respondents engaged in the talks, sharing their concepts, however, they did not always express them in the above categories. There were also individuals who did not undertake any further conversation in this aspect claiming that these concepts were not relevant for museums, applicable merely to the private sector, calling these concepts 'corporate newspeak' or even 'verbosity'. Interestingly, the understanding of the idea of the social responsibility of museums among international participants proved to be wider, and did not yield as extreme reflections as among the Polish respondents.

The range of responses to the question on the meaning of the 'social responsibility of museums' was broad: from the negation of the concept to a deepened analysis both as part of the development of museologists' community, as well as the relation with the public and the potential public. The properties of the categories defining the discussed issue can be located within the areas of the type: internal relations, organizational order, development strategy, external relations, social engagement, activity focused on social issues, monitoring of the needs of the recipients, and education. In the reflections a strong emphasis was placed on the role which the museum educational activity can and should play in this concept.

The materials collected in the course of the conducted FGIs allowed to observe that there is a continuous negotiation on the position assigned to education amidst the statutory museum functions carried out among museologists. Depending on the position, the museums' educational function is assigned a different role in the institution's mission, strategic and operational goals, and in the image creation. The diagnosed differences delineate the borders of a peculiar sub-world of museum education within the social world of museology, this referring to the concept of social worlds of Tamotsu Shibutani and Strauss.[15] Depending

Drawing 1. Graphic recording created during the guest online lecture of Dr Bernadette Lynch titled *Challenging the unhelful museum: radically changing museums to face up to our collective future*, Drawing GoTek Rysuje

**Table 1.** Designation of the on-line FGI No. 1 participants among museum executives. Research conducted among Polish participants

| POSITION AND FUNCTION | INSTITUTION | DESIGNATION |
|---|---|---|
| Member of the executive staff | POLIN Museum of the History of Polish Jews | Fok_PL_1_1 |
| Member of the executive staff | Józef Piłsudski Museum in Sulejówek, Maria Grzegorzewska University in Warsaw | Fok_PL_1_2 |
| Lecturer, professor | Institute of Polish Culture, University of Warsaw | Fok_PL_1_3 |
| Member of the executive staff | Lublin Village Open-Air Museum, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University | Fok_PL_1_4 |
| Member of the executive staff, exhibition curator | Bureau of Artistic Exhibitions (BWA) in Tarnów | Fok_PL_1_5 |
| Member of the executive staff | The Przypkowski Museum in Jędrzejów | Fok_PL_1_6 |
| Member of the executive staff | Stutthof Museum in Sztutowo | Fok_PL_1_7 |

**Table 2.** Designation of the on-line FGI No. 2 participants among museum executives connected with museum education. Research conducted among Polish participants

| POSITION AND FUNCTION | INSTITUTION | DESIGNATION |
|---|---|---|
| Member of the executive staff | Frederic Chopin National Institute | Fok_PL_2_1 |
| Exhibition curator, facilitator, social activist | Museums for Climate Initiative | Fok_PL_2_2 |
| Member of the executive staff | European Solidarity Centre | Fok_PL_2_3 |
| Lecturer, professor | Institute of Polish Culture, University of Warsaw | Fok_PL_2_4 |
| Member of the executive staff | Royal Łazienki Museum | Fok_PL_2_5 |
| Member of the executive staff related to the domain of education | Museum of King Jan III's Palace at Wilanów, Forum of Museum Educators | Fok_PL_2_6 |
| Member of the executive staff | National Museum in Warsaw | Fok_PL_2_7 |
| Volunteer | Warsaw Rising Museum | Fok_PL_2_8 |

**Table 3.** Designation of the on-line FGI No. 3 participants. Research conducted among international participants connected with museology

| POSITION AND FUNCTION | INSTITUTION | DESIGNATION |
|---|---|---|
| Deputy Director, Education and Visitors | National Museums Liverpool, England | Fok_INT_1_1 |
| Professor, President of the International Committee for Museology of ICOM (ICOFOM) | Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro (UNIRIO), Brasil | Fok_INT_1_2 |
| Profesor, President of ICOM Commitee | University of Belgrade, Serbia | Fok_INT_1_3 |
| Learning & Engagement Manager | Santa Cruz Museum of Art & History, USA | Fok_INT_1_4 |
| Chief curator of Modern and Contemporary Arts | Slovak National Gallery, Bratislava, Slovakia | Fok_INT_1_5 |

**Table 4.** Designation of the on-line FGI No. 4 participants. Research conducted among international participants connected with museology

| POSITION AND FUNCTION | INSTITUTION | DESIGNATION |
|---|---|---|
| Head of Learning and National Programs | The National Gallery in London | Fok_INT_2_1 |
| Head of Education | District Six Museum in Cape Town | Fok_INT_2_2 |
| Head of the Education Centre | Kumu Art Museum in Tallinn | Fok_INT_2_3 |
| Project Director Raranga Matihiko | Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa in Wellington | Fok_INT_2_4 |
| President of The Association of European Open-Air Museums | Bokrijk, Genk, Belgium | Fok_INT_2_5 |

**Table 5.** Designation of the on-line FGI No. 5 participants among museum educators. Research conducted among Polish participants

| MUSEUM TYPE | EDUCATOR: DESIGNATION |
| --- | --- |
| Museum dedicated to literature and history of the regions, with branches, local-government cultural institution. Located in a city with county rights. | Fok_Eduk_1 |
| Historical museum in a historic facility, with branches, of national and worldwide relevance; its organizer is the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage. Located in a voivodeship city. | Fok_Eduk_2 |
| National museum with branches, co-run by the voivodeship local government and the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage. Located in a voivodeship city with county rights. | Fok_Eduk_3 |
| Museum of contemporary art; local-government cultural institution. Located in a voivodeship city with county rights. | Fok_Eduk_4 |
| Historical and martyrology museum; its organizer is the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage. Located in a voivodeship city with county rights. | Fok_Eduk_5 |
| Historical museum; local-government cultural institution. Located in a city with county rights. | Fok_Eduk_6 |
| Scientific centre of a character similar to a museum, located in a voivodeship city. | Fok_Eduk_7 |

on the development strategy of a given institution, museum education can assume an ancillary, central, or autotelic role. What should be of importance is the attempt to grasp at each single instance the importance of the educational function and the tasks of the employees connected with it in two basic communication formats taking place in museums, inside and outside the organization, between the institution and the public. Expertise and experience of the staff dealing with museum education: coordinators, guides, educators, individuals responsible for bookings, and providing services to visitors, are a source of information both on the needs of the co-staff, as well as on the public, and the 'potential public.

Within each social world there operate peculiar arenas of debate.[16] Within the distinguished world of museology and the sub-world of museum education, in the course of research 15 arenas of negotiations around peculiar flashpoints, in literature also referred to as borderline objects, have been identified.[17] It would be worthwhile recalling particularly those which oscillate around the area of education-related issues in external relations: a) debate on the typology of recipients of the museum educational offer; b) debate on the analysis of the needs of the individuals visiting museums; c) debate on the dialogue of museum education with the public; d) debate on museum programmes dedicated to formal and informal education; e) debate on museum educational offer dedicated to informal education; f) debate on the concept of accessible museum.

Based on the talks it can be seen that in the course of the change of activity practice and technique during the COVID-19 pandemic in museums a slow, albeit visible attempt at changing the awareness towards the importance and potential of educational activity can be observed. At the same time, the impact of real-life cooperation, not virtual, particularly among family groups or among children and teenagers, was clearly emphasized. The digital version may constitute the departure point, however the real-life encounter in a museum, in cooperation, is of major importance. *Really interesting social situations occurred there. This enabled us to see museum education in an entirely new light* [Fok_PL_2_4].

According to the respondents, the expression 'social responsibility of museum education' forms a heterogenous semantic field. Already the very analysis of the names of museum sections or departments responsible for the educational activity: e.g., education, brokerage, commitment, mediation, contact with the public, emphasized this variety, showing a wide competence scale. When undertaking the attempt to define the social responsibility of museum education, we can set it in the following contexts (Table 6):

1. Upbringing. It has to be perceived broadly, within the concept of lifelong learning, both with respect to social or cultural competences, as well as to definite attitudes or skills. The respondents identified the need for e.g., aesthetical, patriotic, ecological, democratic upbringing based on vital social values.
2. Didactics. In their observations the respondents emphasized the necessity for museums to commit to three levels of education: formal, non-formal, and informal. A strong emphasis was put on experience, engagement of various senses, and use of activating methods: from debates to workshops, even theatrical or musical, regardless of the character of recipient groups.
3. Bonding. Educational activity of museums was pointed to as an area where relations can be established and strengthened, but also to museums as institutions responsible for their establishment in the local, supralocal, and virtual dimensions. It is particularly the application of activating methods that helps meet these challenges while forming conditions enabling overcoming obstacles, e.g., emotional, mental, and infrastructural.
4. Inclusiveness. The respondents pointed to participatory and relational activity, but also to that which minimized any barriers in the access to the museums' offer, particularly for the public with special needs. It was in the statement of the employer at the District Six Museum in South Africa that this potential for

| CONTEXTS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF MUSEUM EDUCATION | FRAGMENT | PARTICIPANT'S DESIGNATION |
|---|---|---|
| Upbringing | *We can emancipate this visitor, show him/her that they are powerful subjects who can speak up, and maybe they will take such an attitude elsewhere and be such self-confident individuals who will wish to speak up in other social situations, who will want to express their opinion, and will have their opinion.* | Fok_PL_2_3 |
| Didactics | *We try to use key words, to carefully follow the curriculum, in order to respond to teachers' needs and help them, yet on the other hand, we can move a little step forward. Meaning, we can develop this educational model apparently faster than schools can.* | Fok_PL_1_1 |
| Bonding | *Community meaning that I learn in a group. I know that the group is a kind of support to me, I know that I learn different things from the group. This is also a feeling of security. This is the base. I come to a place, for example a museum, where I feel at ease, where I feel invited, where I feel welcome.* | Fok_PL_2_4 |
| Inclusivenss | *I believe that we should treat those museum re-cipients with utmost sensitivity, meaning that if we want to consistently stick to the education defini-tion as a relation, we should all the time reflect not so much to what extent they are resistant, but what important things they have to tell us. What interesting concepts they have of education. And even if such concepts are too rigid versus what we offer, they are worthy of being heard and taken into consideration, if a museum activity is to be a participatory and relational activity.* | Fok_PL_1_2 |
| Organizational issues | *We work with extremely valuable collections, not merely in financial terms, but also cultural. In order to collectively take care of them, we have to cooperate. Because this affects what kind of educational activities we offer within the gallery space. This is an extremely interesting balance between the care of the collection, thinking about the future generations, and seeking the means to engage the public.* | Fok_INT_2_1 |
| Image-related issues | *Museums should also acknowledge that they are not the only depositary of knowledge of the given topic, somewhere providing an opportune moment when we can talk.* | Fok_PL_2_7 |

democratizing museums through listening to society was raised. He pointed to the community-based character of museums obtained through the empowerment and giving voice to the people marginalized for centuries and deprived of their own narrative.

5. Organizational issues. Another question voiced was the involvement of educational departments in internal interactions, and their potential in the organizational development of museums. The potential of museum education should be observed within the area of management, communication, cooperation, and development.

6. Image-related issues. Museums' educational activity and education-related museum staff can essentially contribute to shaping the character and image of their entire institutions. The respondents emphasized the relation of activating methods, democratization, and credibility of the message and of the soft skills of museum curators to the development of museums being venues for both dialogue and comfortable time spending.

When synthesizing the research results, we can propose three major directions in which thanks to their educational activities, when in contact with the public, museums have the possibility to shape, teach, and create conditions for development, while each of the directions has to be treated broadly. They consolidate the image of museums as institutions of public trust, in favour of development, socially activating, constituting the pillar of democratization, inclusiveness, and innovation. *The development of social skills, the fact that not only do children establish social relations, but also learn from one another, that a museum is such a place, a laboratory where different people can meet, exchange experience, be with one another in various ways, are exceptionally important* [Fok_PL_2_4].

The above overview of the main conclusions can be commented upon resorting to Lynch's reflections she shared during her guest lecture, illustrated also in the format of a mind map. (Fig. 1). Basing herself on international examples, she analysed how museums could act distanced from their experiences, prejudices, or exclusions, for the sake of constructing community, solidarity, and democracy. Furthermore, she analysed whether currently the term of a 'useful museum' was applicable. She proposed that when developing cooperation with the public in the areas of communication, education, and commitment, to create conditions for the development and building of the social capital, bonds, relations, and community foundations, so important particularly after the pandemic. She emphasized the importance of relations within museums, and claimed that involving all their skills, museums should revise their social usefulness in order to avoid a future situation in which the public would negate their potential.

*The public form part of the institution. A museum should have its public role and social responsibility towards its public set within the entire museum, and not merely within its fragments and respective departments. Museums which are most successful worldwide are those which understand this, and expect this from all the organization and the entire staff.*[18]

Social researchers thus have to fulfil quite a substantial role consisting not only in understanding the current vision of social responsibility by various actors co-creating the policy of museum development, but also in providing them with tools to carry out a mature reflection. It seems justifiable for museums to conduct research in the thematic areas defining the category of social responsibility, to subsequently implement its results in fulfilling their mission and vision. Supporting open and dialogical strategy in which one of the priorities is raising of the status of museum education in the first place requires a reliable diagnosis of the situation.

The present paper sums up the most important contexts diagnosed in the course of the Project implementation. The outlined motifs are worthy of being developed in subsequent research initiatives. Plans have been made for the Project to continue the research into museums' relations with local communities. To conclude, let us mention that all the FGI participants mentioned how valuable similar events were, since they enabled experience exchange, networking, and establishing relationships. The relevance of such remarks allows to reflect on the need to continue the research both within museology in the process of museums' increasing social engagement and the development of communication processes.

**Abstract:** The term 'social responsibility of museums' implies various associations, most frequently referring to the sphere of management and the activities of commercial entities in accordance with the ISO 26000 standard. In this article, we report on some of the tasks performed in connection with a project based on a sociological perspective and addressing the social responsibility of public cultural institutions such as museums. As this concept is relatively new, we decided to check how it is understood in the social world of Polish museum professionals. The research was therefore carried out using elements of the grounded theory methodology, i.e., the concepts (categories) were not defined at the outset, but defined and characterised in the course of the research according to the understanding of the respondents. Using a triangulation of methods, an analysis of found data, individual interviews in Polish museums (IDI) and focus group interviews (FGI) in Polish and international groups were conducted. A particularly interesting strand of the Project was museum education and its growing importance. This article focuses on the conducted focus group interviews (FGI). A specific commentary on the findings is provided by the reflections given during a guest lecture by Dr Bernadette Lynch organised as part of the Project.

**Keywords:** museums and social responsibility, museum education, museum learning, museums' inclusion, COVID-19 pandemic, qualitative research methods.

## Endnotes

\* The paper sums up the focus group stage research conducted as part of the grant programme of the Ministry of Education and Science implemented by the Chair of Cultural Sociology at the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw in 2020-2022, No. SONP/SP/463450/2020, the Project titled: *Social Responsibility of Public Cultural Institutions: Example of Museology*.

[1] We would like to express our gratitude to Rafał Wiśniewski PhD, Associate Professor, supporting the Project at its every stage.

[2] According to Barney Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss the category definition is composed of properties rooted directly in the data.

[3] Izabela Bukalska, the paper's co-author, coordinated and directed the described Project. Marianna Otmianowska, the second co-author, was the member of the organizational committee. Both were responsible for the Project and the implementation of its respective stages in the research, analytical, and logistical aspects. At the organizational stage of the international activities they invited Katarzyna Jagodzińska (Jagiellonian University, Toy Museum) to cooperate with them; the latter was also the co-moderator of the talks and of the guest lecture.

[4] *Edukacja muzealna w Polsce. Sytuacja, kontekst, perspektywy rozwoju. Raport o stanie edukacji muzealnej w Polsce*, ed. by M. Szeląg, Warszawa 2012; *Raport o stanie edukacji muzealnej w Polsce. Suplement. Część 1*, ed. by M. Szeląg, Warszawa-Kraków 2014; *Raport o stanie edukacji muzealnej w Polsce. Suplement. Część 2*, ed. by M. Szeląg, Warszawa-Kraków 2014; M. Szostakowska, I. Pogoda, *Ewaluacja projektu „W Muzeum wszystko wolno". Raport*, 2016, http://www.mnw.art.pl/gfx/muzeumnarodowe/userfiles/_public/ewaluacja_projektu_w_muzeum_wszystko_wolno_raport.pdf [Accessed: 10 May 2021]; E. Nieroba, *Pomiędzy dobrem wspólnym a elitarnością. Współczesny model muzeum*, Opole 2016; A. Szostak, 'Misja jako element zarządzania strategicznego muzeum', *Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne*, 107 (2017), pp. 289-306; P.T. Kwiatkowski, B. Nessel-Łukasik, *Publiczność muzeów w Polsce. Badania pilotażowe. Raport*, Warszawa 2017, https://nimoz.pl/files/articles/187/Raport%20Publiczno%C5%9B%C4%87%20muze%C3%B3w%20w%20Polsce%202017.pdf [Accessed: 5 April 2020]; idem, *ABC Badania publiczności w muzeum*, Warszawa 2018, https://nimoz.pl/files/publications/59/ABC_Badania_publicznosci.pdf [Accessed: 5 April 2020]; idem, *Muzeum w społeczności lokalnej. Raport*, Warszawa 2018, https://www.nimoz.pl/files/articles/212/Raport%20Publiczno%C5%9B%C4%87%20muze%C3%B3w%20w%20Polsce%202018.pdf [Accessed: 5 April 2020]; Ł. Gaweł, 'Zaginiony świat – edukacja muzealna a proces zarządzania dziedzictwem kulturowym', in: *Etnografie instytucji dziedzictwa kulturowego*, ed. by Ł. Gaweł, M. Kostera, Kraków 2018, pp. 17-32; Ł. Gaweł, 'Zarządzanie publicznymi instytucjami kultury w kontekście koncepcji Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Społeczna odpowiedzialność muzeum', *Studia Ekonomiczne*, 376 (2018), pp. 48-62; E. Grigar, 'Tworzenie nowego świata sztuki: o instytucjach sztuki i ich odbiorcach', *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej*, 17 (3, 2021), pp. 126-141; D. Porczyński, A. Rozalska, 'Uobecnianie przeszłości w muzeach lokalnych. Uwagi o wykorzystaniu sztuki w kreowaniu reprezentacji lokalności', *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej*, 17 (3, 2021), pp. 142-162; the *Statystyka muzeów* Project run by NIMOZ from 2014. All the reports available at the Project website: www.statystykamuzeow.pl under the Baza wiedzy tab [Accessed: 30 August 2022].

[5] In 2020-2021, a series of three on-line international conferences titled: *Museums and Social Responsibility* were held by the Network (NEMO): 1. *Values Revisited*, Germany, 17-18 September 2020, 2. *Participation, Networking and Partnerships*, Portugal, 23-24 March 2021, 3. *What's Next?*, Slovenia, 23-24 September 2021. More on the Conference at https://www.ne-mo.org/about-us/eu-presidency-museum-conference [Accessed: 20 August 2022].

[6] M. Krajewski, 'W kierunku relacyjnej koncepcji uczestnictwa w kulturze', *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, 57 (1, 2013), pp. 29-67; J. Byszewski, B. Nessel-Łukasik, *Muzeum relacyjne przed progiem/za progiem*, Sulejówek 2020.

[7] N. Simon, *The Participatory Musuem*, 2010, http://www.participatorymuseum.org/read/ [Accessed: 9 May 2021].

[8] The issue was also discussed from the point of view of the management sciences by Łukasz Gaweł in his paper 'Zarządzanie publicznymi instytucjami kultury w kontekście koncepcji Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Społeczna odpowiedzialność muzeum. Ł. Gaweł, *Zarządzanie publicznymi instytucjami kultury…*, pp. 48-62. Gaweł directly referred to the ISO 26000 Social Responsibility Guidance Standard.

[9] The Atlas program was applied for coding. B.G. Glaser, A.L. Strauss, *Odkrywanie teorii ugruntowanej. Strategie badanie jakościowego*, transl. by M. Gorzko, Kraków 2009.

[10] The data used came from museum statistics, results of the *Museum Statistics* Project, results of available ICOM reports, and the documents obtained from museums thanks to individual contacts (22 connected with the development strategy, 13 related to the survey of the public).

[11] The conclusions from DR and IDIs served to construct scenarios of the focus group research.

[12] The interviews were conducted at eight Polish museums of various type, while the respondents represented seven different positions and the public. The sample selection took into account e.g., museum's organizer type, town size, type of the amassed collection, regional spread.

[13] A lecturer, researcher into museum theory and praxis. Formerly Deputy Director at the Manchester Museum at the University of Manchester, she focuses on the social change through a critical cooperation with various communities and on conducting museum transformation and change. Her publications deals with participatory democracy in museums and the practice of 'useful museum'. She is an Honorary Research Associate at the University College London. For her works see http://ucl.academia.edu/BernadetteLynch. She co-authored *Museums and Social Change*. See *Museums and Social Change. Challenging the Unhelpful Museum*, ed. by A. Chynoweth, B. Lynch, K. Petersen, S. Smed, London-New York 2020.

[14] Owing to the pandemic the FGIs were conducted in a digital format by two moderators. For the interviews 1-4, the WebEx software was applied, and for FGI No. 5, the Zoom Platform was used. The interviews lasted 110-130 minutes. The talks were registered, following which they were transcribed and coded. On virtual conducting of FGI there was a paper delivered at the international conference of the European Sociological Association Qualitative Network [RN20] (Contemporary challenges for qualitative sociology: Digital developments, ethical requirements, quality standards) on 24-26 August 2022 in Copenhagen.

[15] An attempt can be made at describing museums and their educational functions within the concept of social worlds authored by Shibutani (see T. Shibutani, 'Reference Groups as Perspectives', *American Journal of Sociology*, 60 (6, 1955), 562-569) and Strauss (see A.L. Strauss, 'A Social Worlds Perspective', in: *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, ed. by N. Denzin, vol. 1, Greenwich 1978, pp. 119-128; A.L. Strauss, 'Social Worlds and Legitimation Process', in *Studies in Symbolic Interaction…*, vol. 4, Greenwich 1982, pp. 171-190; idem, 'Światy społeczne i społeczeństwo', in *Metoda biograficzna w socjologii. Antologia tekstów*, ed. by K. Kaźmierska, Kraków 2012, pp. 471-487), in Poland described and practiced by Anna Kacperczyk (see A. Kacperczyk, 'Zastosowanie koncepcji społecznych światów w badaniach empirycznych', in *Konstruowanie jaźni i społeczeństwa. Europejskie warianty interakcjonizmu symbolicznego*, ed. by E. Hałas, K.T. Konecki, Warszawa 2005, pp. 169-191; A. Kacperczyk, *Społeczne światy. Teoria – empiria – metody badań. Na przykładzie społecznego świata wspinaczki*, Łódź 2016).

[16] A.L. Strauss, *A Social Worlds Perspective…*, pp. 119-128.

[17] A. Kacperczyk, *Zastosowanie koncepcji społecznych światów…*, pp. 169-191.

[18] Fragment of the statement pronounced by Dr Bernadette Lynch during her guest lecture.

## Bibliography

Byszewski Janusz, Nessel-Łukasik Beata, *Muzeum relacyjne przed progiem/za progiem*, (Sulejówek: Muzeum Józefa Piłsudskiego w Sulejówku, Muzeum Pałacu Króla Jana III w Wilanowie, 2020).

*Edukacja muzealna w Polsce. Sytuacja, kontekst, perspektywy rozwoju. Raport o stanie edukacji muzealnej w Polsce*, ed. by Marcin Szeląg, (Warszawa: Narodowy Instytut Muzealnictwa i Ochrony Zbiorów, Muzeum Pałac w Wilanowie, 2012).

Gaweł Łukasz, 'Zaginiony świat – edukacja muzealna a proces zarządzania dziedzictwem kulturowym', in: *Etnografie instytucji dziedzictwa kulturowego*, ed. by Łukasz Gaweł, Monika Kostera, (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2018), pp. 17-32.

Gaweł Łukasz, 'Zarządzanie publicznymi instytucjami kultury w kontekście koncepcji Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). Społeczna odpowiedzialność muzeum, *Studia Ekonomiczne*, 376 (2018), pp. 48-62.

Glaser Barney G., Strauss Anselm L., *Odkrywanie teorii ugruntowanej. Strategie badanie jakościowego*, trans. by Marek Gorzko, (Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy „Nomos", 2009).

Grigar Ewa, 'Tworzenie nowego świata sztuki: o instytucjach sztuki i ich odbiorcach', *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej,* 17 (3, 2021), pp. 126-141.

Kacperczyk Anna, *Społeczne światy. Teoria – empiria – metody badań. Na przykładzie społecznego świata wspinaczki*, (Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 2016).

Kacperczyk Anna, 'Zastosowanie koncepcji społecznych światów w badaniach empirycznych', in *Konstruowanie jaźni i społeczeństwa. Europejskie warianty interakcjonizmu symbolicznego*, ed. by Elżbieta Hałas, Krzysztof T. Konecki, (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe „Scholar", 2005), pp. 169-191.

Krajewski Marek, 'W kierunku relacyjnej koncepcji uczestnictwa w kulturze', *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, 57 (1, 2013), pp. 29-67.

Krstović Nikola, 'Colonizing Knowledge: New Museology as Museology of News', *Prace Etnograficzne*, 48 (2, 2020), pp. 125-139.

Kwiatkowski Piotr T., Nessel-Łukasik Beata, *ABC Badania publiczności w muzeum*, (Warszawa: Narodowy Instytut Muzealnictwa i Ochrony Zbiorów, 2018a), https://nimoz.pl/files/publications/59/ABC_Badania_publicznosci.pdf [Accessed: 5 April 2020].

Kwiatkowski Piotr T., Nessel-Łukasik Beata, *Muzeum w społeczności lokalnej. Raport*, (Warszawa: Narodowy Instytut Muzealnictwa i Ochrony Zbiorów, 2018b), https://www.nimoz.pl/files/articles/212/Raport%20Publiczno%C5%9B%C4%87%20muze%C3%B3w%20w%20Polsce%202018.pdf [Accessed: 5 April 2020].

Kwiatkowski Piotr T., Nessel-Łukasik Beata, *Publiczność muzeów w Polsce. Badania pilotażowe. Raport*, (Warszawa: Narodowy Instytut Muzealnictwa i Ochrony Zbiorów, 2017), https://nimoz.pl/files/articles/187/Raport%20Publiczno%C5%9B%C4%87%20muze%C3%B3w%20w%20Polsce%202017.pdf [Accessed: 5 April 2020].

*Museums and Social Change. Challenging the Unhelpful Museum*, ed. by Adele Chynoweth, Bernadette Lynch, Klaus Petersen, Sarah Smed, (London-New York: Routledge, 2020).

Nieroba Elżbieta, *Pomiędzy dobrem wspólnym a elitarnością. Współczesny model muzeum*, (Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski, 2016).

Porczyński Dominik, Rozalska Agata, 'Uobecnianie przeszłości w muzeach lokalnych. Uwagi o wykorzystaniu sztuki w kreowaniu reprezentacji lokalności', *Przegląd Socjologii Jakościowej*, 17 (3, 2021), pp. 142-162.

Shibutani Tamotsu, '*Reference Groups as Perspectives*, *American Journal of Sociology*, 60 (6, 1855), pp. 562-569.

Simon Nina, *The Participatory Museum*, 2010, http://www.participatorymuseum.org/read/ [Accessed: 9 May 2021].

Strauss Anselm L., 'A Social Worlds Perspective', in: *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, ed. by Norman Denzin, vol. 1, (Greenwich: JAI Press, 1978), pp. 119-128.

Strauss Anselm L., 'Social Worlds and Legitimation Process', in: *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, ed. by Norman Denzin, vol. 4, (Greenwich: JAI Press, 1982), pp. 171-190.

Strauss Anselm L., '*Światy społeczne i społeczeństwo*', in: *Metoda biograficzna w socjologii. Antologia tekstów*, ed. by Kaja Kaźmierska, (Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy „Nomos", 2012), pp. 471-487.

*Raport o stanie edukacji muzealnej w Polsce. Suplement. Część 1*, ed. by Marcin Szeląg, (Warszawa-Kraków: Muzeum Pałacu Króla Jana III w Wilanowie, Universitas, 2014).

*Raport o stanie edukacji muzealnej w Polsce. Suplement. Część 2*, ed. by Marcin Szeląg, (Warszawa-Kraków: Muzeum Pałacu Króla Jana III w Wilanowie, Universitas, 2014).

Szostak Agnieszka, 'Misja jako element zarządzania strategicznego muzeum', *Archiwa, Biblioteki i Muzea Kościelne*, 107 (2017), pp. 289-306.

Szostakowska Magdalena, Pogoda Iwona, *Ewaluacja projektu „W Muzeum wszystko wolno". Raport*, 2016, http://www.mnw.art.pl/gfx/muzeumnarodowe/userfiles/_public/ewaluacja_projektu_w_muzeum_wszystko_wolno_raport.pdf [Accessed: 10 May 2021].

**Marianna Otmianowska**
A museum curator, art historian, manager, educator, design thinking moderator; a lecturer at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw and the University of Warsaw. An art dealer at galleries and an auction house (2007–2012), Head of the Education Department at the National Museum in Warsaw (2013–2016), Director of the National Digital Archives (2016–2018); since September 2018 Deputy Director at the Royal Łazienki Museum. Author of numerous papers, addresses, and workshops. Originator of many initiatives, also participatory, involved in scientific-research projects. Member of ICOM Poland and the Association of Art Historians (SHS); marianna.otmianowska@gmail.com.

**Izabela Bukalska PhD**
A cultural sociologist, social researcher resorting to qualitative methodology, lecturer at the Chair of Cultural Sociology at the Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences at the Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw; member of the Board of the Section of Qualitative Sociology and Symbolic Interactionism and of the Warsaw Branch of the Polish Sociological Association. In 2014, she defended her doctoral dissertation at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences; i.bukalska@uksw.edu.pl.

**Cite this article as:** Otmianowska M., Bukalska I.: SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF PUBLIC CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS: THE EXAMPLE OF MUSEOLOGY. OBSERVATIONS, REFLECTIONS AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS: SUMMARY OF THE FOCUS GROUP STAGE Muz., 2022(63): 210-220