Acting between professional rules and financial resources in the field of work-oriented basic education

Jana Arbeiter

Abstract This paper considers the powerful decision-making process in programme planning in work-oriented basic education by focusing the analysis on the disposition rights of the participating actors and their respective interests. The study is defined by a theoretical interconnecting of Educational Governance and assumptions of the structuration theory according to Giddens. Thus, disposition rights are allocative and authoritative resources as well as normative and cognitive rules which define the actions of the actors and, on the other hand, can be changed by their actions. A secondary analysis of 14 expert interviews was conducted in order to answer the research question how actors legitimise their actions and decisions in the context of developing work-oriented basic education programmes. The results reveal asymmetrical power constellations and at the same time show the dynamic of a programme planning process in terms of a duality of structures.

Keywords Work-oriented basic education · Program planning · Disposition rights · Duality of structure · Power constellations · Educational governance · Structuration theory

✉ Jana Arbeiter
Universität zu Köln, Cologne, Germany
E-Mail: jana.arbeiter@uni-koeln.de

Das Zusammenspiel professioneller Standards und finanzieller Mittel im Feld der arbeitsorientierten Grundbildung

Zusammenfassung Der Beitrag nimmt den machtvollen Entscheidungsprozess in der Programmplanung der arbeitsorientierten Grundbildung in den Blick und stellt die Verfügungsrechte der beteiligten Akteure und ihre jeweiligen Interessen in den Mittelpunkt der Analyse. Die Studie basiert auf einer theoretischen Verknüpfung der Educational Governance und Annahmen der Strukturationstheorie nach Giddens. Demnach sind Verfügungsrechte allokative und autoritative Ressourcen sowie normative und kognitive Regeln, die einerseits das Handeln der Akteure bestimmen und andererseits durch deren Handeln verändert werden können. Zur Beantwortung der Forschungsfrage, wie Akteure ihr Handeln und ihre Entscheidungen in der Planung von arbeitsorientierter Grundbildung legitimieren, wurde eine inhaltsanalytische Sekundäranalyse von 14 Experteninterviews durchgeführt. Die Ergebnisse zeigen asymmetrische Machtkonstellationen auf und verdeutlichen zugleich die Dynamik eines Programmplanungsprozesses vor dem Hintergrund der Dualität von Struktur.

Schlüsselwörter Arbeitsorientierte Grundbildung · Programmplanung · Verfügungsrechte · Dualität von Struktur · Machtkonstellationen · Educational Governance · Strukturationstheorie

1 Introduction

Whenever we talk about programme planning in adult education, it becomes clear that this is an activity characterised by the negotiation of interests and power relations (Cervero and Wilson 1994; Gieseke 2008). A programme evolves around interactive processes of coordination and negotiation with numerous internal and external actors pursuing different interests and considering diverse requirements. Programme planning is thus situated in a field of tension between heterogeneous expectations (von Hippel 2011, p. 45). In line with person-specific processes, within the planning process the actors involved are assigned different influencing capabilities (cf. von Hippel and Röbel 2016). At the same time, the autonomy of planning action can be limited by external factors, resulting in a smaller scope of action (cf. Alke and Graß 2019, p. 138). In addition, social interactions with different actors in the planning process evoke different possibilities for action by the individuals, each equipped with different power relations (cf. Cervero and Wilson 1998, p. 18).

The field of basic education and literacy also constitutes a field of tension between power and interests (cf. Euringer 2016a, p. 74 ff., 2016b, p. 243 ff.). Here, the orientation towards financial and funding policy frameworks stands in contrast to the simultaneous need for situational and short-term planning (cf. Mania and Thöne-Geyer 2019, p. 153 ff.). In the field of work-oriented basic education[1] the situation is

---

[1] Work-oriented basic education receives a lot of attention in the course of improving literacy and is represented in the educational policy development directions of the Alpha Decade (cf. AlphaDecade n.d.).

even more complex as, in addition to its fluid structure, a particularly large number of actors is involved in programme planning (cf. Koller et al. 2021). Work-oriented basic education is defined as a complex educational service in the sense of an outreach strategy that creates educational opportunities in everyday life (cf. Schwarz 2021, p. 21). It is legitimised by the high number of low-literate and in-work target groups (cf. Buddeberg et al. 2021, p. 202). To develop a programme, not only do planning and teaching professionals come together, but the personnel managers of the companies that represent the location of learning processes are also involved (cf. Arbeiter and Schemmann 2021, p. 49). A diverse reference group is required to ensure close alignment of the programmes with the needs of the companies and participants (cf. ibid.). Additionally, target-oriented educational management is essential throughout the process to coordinate and match the different interests (cf. Radtke and Koller 2020, p. 161).

These observations highlight the core aspects of Educational Governance, which stipulate that the provision of services of the education system depends on "a multitude of actors and constellations of actors" (Altrichter 2015, p. 28). The perspective of Educational Governance has already provided some insights into existing actor constellations and forms of coordinated action for the field of work-oriented basic education. Such insights demonstrate the multifaceted set of actors, the dependence on financial resources and the necessity of investing in networks and cooperation in order to maintain the range of learning opportunities (cf. Koller et al. 2021). Bickeböller (2022) conducts regional case studies on coordinated action forms in literacy and basic education and also highlights the relevance of network and cooperation relationships to ensure the actors' ability of public outreach, programme planning and participant recruitment.

Although the field of (work-oriented) basic education has already been considered from the perspective of Educational Governance, "questions of justification structures and the legitimacy of decisions remain open" (Arbeiter and Schemmann 2021, p. 50). This is where the article engages by focusing on the disposition rights of the actors that enable them to act and simultaneously influence the structures in turn. The research question is thus as follows: How do actors legitimise their actions and decisions in the context of developing work-oriented basic education programmes? The aim is to reveal existing power and interest constellations in the planning of a work-oriented basic education programmes. Therefore, it is appropriate to analyse the disposition rights of the actors, which can be classified into rules and resources.

Constellations of power and interests can be reconstructed by combining Educational Governance and structuration theory according to Giddens (1988) to exactly define disposition rights both as allocative and authoritative resources and as cognitive and normative rules (Giddens 1988; Niedlich 2019). They provide information about the respective decision-making and design power of the individual actors within the planning process of work-oriented basic education. From this perspective of correlations, cognitive rules are an expression of subjective interests and justify actions. Normative rules legitimise actions and reflect real interests. Allocative and authoritative resources are (im)material instruments of power.

To answer the research question the following steps are taken: The first is an overview of the existing structure of actors in the planning process of work-oriented

basic education. Second, I describe the understanding of power at the planning table according to Cervero and Wilson (1994), before Educational Governance is outlined in relation with the structuration theory as developed by Giddens (1988). The focus is on an explanation of the disposition rights. The results are based on a secondary analysis, which is explained in the methodological procedure below. Following on, I present the disposition rights that have been identified. In the discussion, conclusions are drawn about power and interest constellations in the field of work-oriented basic education. Finally, the results are considered within the overall context of educational leadership.

2 Structures and actors in work-oriented basic education

In order to be able to analyse the background of the actions and decisions taken by the actors in the field of work-oriented basic education, you have to know who is involved in the first place. The following description is based on the process character of work-oriented basic education and gives an overview of the existing configuration of actors in the planning process, highlighting some coordination of action in the planning process.

Work-oriented basic education exists "as a hybrid between public and private interests" (Koller et al. 2020, p. 16). The field should be regarded as a multi-level system, with the focus on the learning service and actors at different levels tasked with delivery. Koller et al. (2021) provide such an overview based on a document analysis. At organizational level, there are numerous further education institutions, adult education centres, associations and non-profit societies, who are themselves characteristic of the community itself (cf. Schrader 2011, p. 121) and feature as operative actors (ibid.). The organisational environment is characterised by umbrella organizations, coordinating centres and special basic education centres. With the purpose of realising work-oriented basic education, they coordinate programmes, providers and participants (Koller et al. 2021, p. 50 ff.). Work-oriented basic education is mainly established in the scope of cooperative communities (cf. ibid.) and supported by other actors such as universities, the employment agency and companies (cf. ibid.). In addition, it is funded by political actors such as the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research and other state ministries and municipalities. At a supranational level, the European Social Fund acts as relevant funding source. All in all, different structures of actors and financial sources depend on the geographical region and, at the same time, they affect coordination of actions at various levels (cf. Koller et al. 2021, p. 58).

Zooming into the planning process, the actors involved can be seen as functions that influence the process within their decisions (cf. Stanik 2019). Thus, they do not only consider macro-didactic decisions, which revolve around, among others, addressing target groups, public relations, personnel recruitment, and financing (cf. Reich-Claassen and v. Hippel 2018, p. 1004; Gieseke 2019). In addition, they get involved in meso-didactic (planning and supervision of courses and teachers, evaluation, conception of content (cf. von Hippel and Fuchs 2009, p. 81)) as well as micro-didactic decisions (detailed planning of content and methods (cf. Stanik 2016,

p. 319 f.)). These decision fields have to be considered rather independent of the actors, which characterises the various levels interconnected in the planning process (vgl. Gieseke 2012, p. 441). For the field of work-oriented basic education, the following functions in the planning process could be empirically identified as relevant (cf. Arbeiter and Schemmann 2021, p. 46): education management and further education organizations tasked with staff planning, as well as the companies, the teachers and participants with their specific functions as central influencing factors. These actors come together and negotiate their interests throughout a social process of decision-making (cf. ibid., p. 50). At this point, it remains unanswered how the decisions are justified and legitimised (cf. ibid.).

It has been shown so far that different actors from all levels of the education system, representing their different functions, come together and make decisions in the planning process of work-oriented basic education. These are based on different powers and interests, which will now be illustrated against the theoretical background as developed by Cervero and Wilson (1994). Furthermore, I am going to explain it is highly informative as regards power and interest constellations to analyse the disposition rights in theoretically interlinking Educational Governance and the structuration theory according to Giddens (1988).

3 Theoretical background (rules and resources as expressions of power and interest at the planning table)

The paper engages in the debate about power and interests within a programme planning process. Therefore, the focus is on the theoretical definition of power at the so-called planning table according to Cervero and Wilson (1994). In the following, the disposition rights (rules and resources) are defined on the basis of a theoretical interlinking of Educational Governance and the structuration theory according to Giddens (1988).

According to Cervero and Wilson (1994), programme planning takes place as a negotiation. The programme is the outcome and it confirms or changes power and interest constellations of the actors involved: "People's interests and power relations are not static, but are continually being acted upon by the negotiation practices themselves" (ibid., p. 256 f.). The social interactions among different actors in the planning process evoke different possibilities for action by individuals, all of which manifest as specific power relations in the planning process. Besides power, interests and ethical beliefs of the actors also play a central role and find expression in the negotiations at the planning table. Thus, the basis for all negotiations at the planning table is that the participating actors bring with them certain interests as well as ethical beliefs and try to enforce them during the negotiation using more or less power. Power therefore functions as an instrument to enforce certain interests and ethical beliefs in the course of the negotiations (ibid., p. 84 f.). Consequently, according to Cervero and Wilson (2006, p. 85), power is defined as the ability to act. Finally, power is also a dynamic construct. It is negotiable and can have its effect based on different power constellations. Accordingly, the theory of programme planning not only explains the action by various actors, but also shows how the action structures

the respective organizational context and is in turn structured by it: "With this notion, we now are able to understand the effect of human action—agency—on the context of practice—structure—as well as the reverse. In other words, planners neither act in totally unencumbered ways nor is their action completely determined by social structures; setting and action are truly interactive and mutually constitutive" (Cervero and Wilson 1994, p. 184).

The perspective of many actors being involved with quite different controlling and preventing powers reflects the core idea of Educational Governance (cf. Altrichter and Maag Merki 2016, p. 3). Actors have a controlling effect on the governance process through their actions and thereby influence the subsequent actions of others. The Governance perspective breaks away from "the difference between a 'steering subject' versus a 'steering object'" (Kussau and Brüsemeister 2007, p. 23). A programme for work-oriented basic education, for example, only results from the interaction of different actors. In this context, the constellation of actors is considered a social order and contains a structure that, on the one hand, influences the actions of the actors and, on the other hand, can also be changed by their actions (cf. Kussau and Brüsemeister 2007, p. 27). Thus, these structures are reproduced or changed again and again (cf. ibid.). An actor is capable of acting if he or she has access to disposition rights. These are considered structural elements on which action is based (cf. Altrichter 2015, p. 38) and provide information about the "different chances of participation and influence" (Kussau and Brüsemeister 2007, p. 33) of the actors within the overall constellation. Applying disposition rights, decisions can be made that maintain or expand one's own scope of action (cf. ibid., p. 33 f.).

Looking at the concept of disposition rights, Niedlich (2019) outlines that Educational Governance is based on Gidden's understanding of structure (cf. Niedlich 2019, p. 357; Altrichter and Heinrich 2007, p. 63 f.; Kussau and Brüsemeister 2007, p. 34). Giddens (1988) understands human action and structure as coherent (cf. p. 52). Actors reproduce "the conditions that make their actions possible" (ibid.) in and through their actions. This, then, illustrates his core idea of the duality of structure: structure is not only the medium but also the result of human actions (cf. Giddens 1982, p. 10, 1988, p. 77). Structure only exists when it is reproduced through social relations over space and time by reference to particular structural moments. In this context, Giddens (1988) characterises rules and resources (cf. p. 67 ff.) as structural moments which are referred to as disposition rights in Educational Governance.

While Educational Governance refers to material and immaterial resources in the sense of money, time, competence, meaning etc., Giddens (1997) makes a distinction between allocative and authoritative resources. He defines them as follows:

Allocative resources are material resources involved in the generation of power, including the natural environment and physical artifacts. Allocative resources derive from human domination over nature (Giddens 1997, p. 429). *Authoritative resources* are non-material resources involved in the generation of power that derive from the capacity to make available the activities of human beings; authoritative resources derive from the domination of actors over other actors (ibid.).

Niedlich (2019), for instance, recognizing the potential of linking Educational Governance with structuration theory, understands "the determination of work pro-

cedures, hours, and pay as an authoritative resource [...]" (cf. Niedlich 2019, p. 359). The ability to define responsibilities and instructions for action is also understood as such a resource. Last but not least, authoritative resource knowledge can be used to create scope for negotiation. Thus, actors can also gain capabilities for action by actively constructing meaning (cf. Niedlich 2019, p. 360).

Cognitive rules are an expression of subjective interests and reflect the respective individual preferences, logic, interpretations, and intentions revealed by the actors involved (cf. ibid., p. 96 f.). *Normative rules* legitimise action and reflect real interests, and are themselves governed by social goals as well as role expectations and laws.

An analysis of the disposition rights extended by assumptions of structuration theory allows us to gain knowledge about actors and their ability to act. Moreover, it is possible to highlight "how far and in which way actors rely on [...] structuration modalities in their actions" (cf. Niedlich 2019, p. 361). By referring to the various rules (means of power) and resources (interests), actors constantly reproduce or change the structure of signification, domination, and legitimation (cf. Niedlich 2019, p. 363). Giddens (1988) refers to these structures as structural dimensions that are (re)produced in the course of interaction via so-called structuration modalities (cf. p. 81). From a theoretical structuration perspective, an approach to understand actor constellations as a social order that "influences actors' expectations, capacities, and options for action" (Niedlich 2019, p. 362) can then be made by clarifying the structuration modalities (cf. ibid.). Structuring modalities mediate between the interaction level and the respective structural dimensions. Here, Giddens (1988) refers to the cognitive rules that enable actors to justify their actions (cf. ibid., p. 45). They refer to their knowledge base and their constitution of meaning (cf. ibid., p. 81 f., p. 84). Norms in the form of rights and obligations mediate in that they enable actors to orient themselves in their actions and legitimize their actions through them. These are underpinned by the normative rules (cf. ibid., p. 84); Giddens (1988) refers to the resources already mentioned and clarifies that "domination depends on the mobilization of two distinguishable types of resources" (ibid., p. 86)—allocative and authoritative resources.

In this way, the analysis of rules and resources enables differentiated insights into particular (non-)available means of power and interests of the individual actors. Last but not least, the findings about disposition rights allow conclusions to be drawn about the constellations of power and interests (cf. Niedlich 2019, p. 332).

To sum up, in this paper the object of programme planning is regarded as a social process of interaction within various power constellations. Accordingly, every decision in programme planning is based on different powers and interests which come together at the planning table (cf. Cervero and Wilson 1994). In line with the critique of Sork and Käpplinger (2014) on the approach of Cervero and Wilson (1994) that "(technical) skills are still important" (p. 191), it becomes crucial to consider the disposition rights (rules and resources) behind decisions, which has been defined as a fundamental concept by a theoretical interlinking of Educational Governance and structuration theory.

Thus, the decisions in the planning process are not only illuminated from the structural perspective but also from the point of view of justifying the actions of the

Table 1 Interview-Sample

Teachers	Program planners	Education managers
8	5	5

participants. How these become the object of analysis is explained in the methodological procedure below.

4 Methodological procedure

A secondary analysis of 14 expert interviews (cf. Meuser and Nagel 1991) was conducted[2] in order to analyse how actors legitimise their actions and decisions in the context of developing work-oriented basic education programmes. The data were collected as part of a research project (ABAG²)[3]. The selection of experts represents the planning process from multiple perspectives and makes it possible to look at the planning process at the micro, meso and macro levels respectively (cf. Table 1). At this point, a limitation of the study becomes apparent, as the perspective of politicians and companies could not be taken into account.

The following topics were surveyed using a semi-structured guide: structures of cooperation, conditions for success and the procedure for planning a work-oriented basic education programme. Not only the questions asked are particularly informative for the research question, but also the sampling. However, the core of the analysis focused on the individual actions of the actors. The interviews were analysed by means of structuring content analysis (cf. Mayring 2015) with a deductive and inductive category system and a reliability coefficient of 0.78 (cf. Krippendorff 2004). In the secondary analysis, the coding "rules" and "resources" were used which refer to justifications of actors' actions and their decisions. This enabled a differentiated analysis of *allocative and authoritative resources* as well as *cognitive and normative rules* based on a theory-guided operationalisation in accordance with Niedlich (2019) (cf. Table 2).

A structured presentation of these results follows below before the significance for dominant power and interest constellations are explored.

Table 2 Operationalization of resources and rules in accordance to Niedlich (2019)

Resources		Rules	
Authoritative	Allocative	Normative	Cognitive
Financial resources	Power of decision making	Social goals	Logics of action
Legal requirements	Access to knowledge	(Role) expectations	Individual opinion & interest
Availability of time and participants	Dissemination of knowledge	Professional standards	Individual understanding of problems

---

[2] Two of the 14 interviews were conducted through a group survey.

[3] Duration May 2016–August 2021 in cooperation of Universität zu Köln and Lernende Region—Netzwerk Köln e. V. (funding code: W142400B).

5 Results

Constellations of power and interests can be reconstructed by means of disposition rights. The categories of allocative and authoritative resources as well as normative and cognitive rules are derived from the interlinking view of theories and are systematically summarised below. This is succeeded by a reconstruction of the power and interest constellations within the group of actors involved in the planning process of work-oriented basic education. The original German quotes from the interviews, which should underline the results, were translated by the author for the purpose of this paper.

5.1 Allocative and authoritative resources

Allocative resources first enable the planning of work-oriented basic education. If no *financial resources* and *legal requirements* are secured, for example by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research, the planning process cannot even begin. However, actors at the levels of national and international education policy who provide funding thus define many rules of the game at the planning table, even if they are not involved in the actual planning process. It can be seen as a go-ahead lever that allows whether and in which form the actors come together at the planning table or not. It is the foundation for all further actions and decisions. Another unavoidable resource in the planning process is the *availability of time and participants* as an allocative resource. In this case, the companies are the actors who dispose of the resource required. Thus, their employees are the target group and their rooms are the places of learning. From the planners' perspective, acting in a demand-oriented way by addressing the companies is one of the key factors at the beginning of the planning process, because "you also have to know that the education of low-literate workers in the company is not now a priority, which means that you always have to have an eye on the available resources and prioritization of the partners" (I_PP, Z. 329–332). If the companies are convinced of the purpose of work-oriented basic education, they decide on the times when learning takes place: "If they have regular working hours, then we come after regular working hours, in case of shift work, we come after the early shift or before the late shift" (BM_2 para. 22). Additionally, they decide about the content. This *power of decision-making* can be seen as an authoritative resource of the companies. The companies hold power of decision-making, but the teachers also have some means to design the programmes. Thus, working hours and the daily work of the participants partly affect the design capabilities so that the teachers have to quickly adapt their strategies by shortening content or by adding new elements (cf. I_L3, Z. 15). Another important authoritative resource revealed in the interviews is *knowledge,* and not only the *access to knowledge* but also the *dissemination of knowledge.* In the planning process, education managers make the first contact with the companies so that they get area-specific information and gain access to internal company materials (cf. I_EM, lines 377–380). These are necessary for the further planning. The education managers then filter the information and decide which knowledge is relevant for the further planning process. They illustrate the importance of teachers also having access to this company-specific information

and getting to know the participants' workplace. Hence, the education management involves all actors in this social process: "You need these different experts, and you don't pick them up one after another, but try to get them to work together in this planning process" (I_EM, lines 265–268).

In summary, the authoritative resources include available resources (money, space, time) that influence the decisions of the actors. Structures of the field are thus fixed and influence the actors' scope of action, which is mainly determined by allocative resources—substantive knowledge of the field and the power of decision-making through the definition of responsibilities.

5.2 Normative and cognitive rules

Normative and cognitive rules guide the whole planning process of work-oriented basic education. First the normative rules are described. Above all, there is the *social goal* of promoting the participation of the low-literate people, which legitimises the field of work-oriented basic education. In fact, this is the main condition for the investment of financial resources.

Furthermore, special (*role) expectations* are visible as normative rules along the whole planning process, and they are partly contradictory. For example, companies expect learning opportunities to be aligned with the competence development of employees leading to economic growth. In this regard, the companies talk about increasing *digitization in the world of work as a social goal* that they would like to have represented in the learning services. In contrast, the teachers reflect that it is important for the participants above all to feel comfortable and valued. Relationship learning is in the foreground: "You have to create contact, create an atmosphere so that they open up and dare to participate actively" (I_8). On the one hand, it is a crucial challenge to meet the needs of the companies and make them recognize the benefit of the programmes and initiate future in-house programmes in order to secure funding in other ways (allocative resource). On the other hand, the participants must be motivated to invest their time resources (allocative resource). In this dichotomy, the planning professionals make appropriate decisions about the learning content influenced by different perspectives. How these are effectively implemented is up to the teacher who has the power of decision during the learning process itself. All in all, it is mainly the teachers who illustrate the important principle of participant orientation as a *professional standard*. In addition, they justify their rather situational planning activities on the basis of the requirement of differentiated learning. Therefore, they decide to act like "asking questions, listening and understanding in order to be able to draw planning conclusions from them and do so over and over again" (I_T_5). In conclusion, professional standards as internal structures inform decisions in the planning process of work-oriented basic education and also reflect expectations for action that characterise the field. These structures seem to be clearly manifested as they are not questioned.

The *cognitive rules* become visible in the form of the logic of meaning expressed by the respective actors. Individual *logic of action, individual opinions* and *individual understanding of problems* shape the planning process and justify the decisions and actions. These facts are mainly based on the skills and expert knowledge of the

actors. The start of the planning process reveals the different individual actors as representing quite contradictory logics of action, which result in the subsequent actions and decisions. Educational management relies on the central logic of "listening" action (I_EM, line 183) in the planning process in order to identify the problems and needs of the companies and the participants: "Listen to the participants, listen to the foremen, listen to the managing director and then try to see where the problems are, where the system can function better" (I_EM, lines 672–675). Programme planners always take the same action steps following the needs analysis by education management, and define the framework of the offer: "We [proceed] ultimately always in the same way; so we look at it and then we start, we call writing the script, where we then say, this is the topic, this is how we would like to present it, this is the formulation of the learning objective and these are the media or methods we use for this and this is how we then naturally prepare a topic" (I_PP, lines 233–238). All these decisions can only be made because the actors draw on their great wealth of experience and skills.

Thereupon, the teachers follow with their action steps and check how the basic conditions of an offer are designed and whether or how far they can implement the courses through their planning: "The first thing I say, 'I'll have to look at that, what's the curriculum like? What have you guys applied for? How many hours do you have? What should they be able to do in the end? Do we have a measuring stick attached to it, i.e. final exam? What does that look like? What are the entry requirements?'" (I_T2, lines 32–36). At this point, the teacher independently checks which fixed resources are available and where he or she has didactic and methodological freedom.

5.3 Asymmetric constellations of power and interests

As we can see, the planning process of work-oriented basic education is characterised by asymmetric power and interest constellations inherent of conflicts and contradictions. Above all, society's goal is to improve educational conditions for low-literate people and thus contribute to securing a skilled workforce. Despite this, the planning of a work-oriented basic education programme is largely shaped by the available resources (money, time, space) on two levels. First, they legitimise the process at the planning table, and second, they determine the rules of the game. A certain asymmetry arises since these resources are distributed mainly by two groups of actors (politicians and companies). It forces the players at the planning table to exercise their power of action and decision in different ways. In addition to allocative resources (money, time, space), authoritative resources are the foundation for exercising power and allow the actors to expand their range of influence and shape the planning process. Since educational managers, programme planners and teachers do not have access to allocative resources, they influence the planning process primarily through authoritative resources. This resource consists mainly in knowledge about the field and the target groups and in making this knowledge available for everyone at the planning table. As an example, the actors try to "become experts of the companies through the acquisition of material and site visits" (cf. BM2 lines 178–179). Thus, they have the power to convince the companies with

customised offers, and the asymmetrical power constellation is weakened by a large investment of time.

In part, normative rules are also a construct in which (role) expectations are inscribed and through which the actions of teachers are legitimized. Accordingly, programme planners recruit only teachers who are methodologically and didactically competent and highly trained. This in turn shows that teachers are not only dependent on educational management, but also on the recruitment and selection of programme planners. There is then an asymmetrical power imbalance here as well. It should be emphasized, however, that teachers in particular can draw on a large repertoire of authoritative resources (access to knowledge and skills) and are accordingly significantly involved in programme planning decisions and designs. Their access to the participants and their knowledge allows specific needs to emerge that cannot be grasped in advance by the companies, education managers and programme planners. In addition, teachers decide on the weighting of the content of the courses, which in some cases must also be adapted flexibly and at short notice. Finally, it must be emphasized that work-oriented basic education cannot be fully planned and, above all, implemented without teachers and their ability or authoritative resource to impart knowledge.

In conclusion, it can be said that actors who pursue basic education out of real interest, who legitimise their actions through normative rules, usually have allocative resources at their disposition, such as money, space and time. Hence, they have relatively substantial creative power, in the sense of 'making it possible'. Actors who are active planners in the planning process act within the scope of their possibilities and draw on authoritative resources that allow them to exert influence or power on other actors. These are often coupled with the subjective interest, i.e. the cognitive rules. These justify the actions of the respective actors. Creating access to specific knowledge appears as a key resource in the planning process that enables and extends programme planning action for educational managers, programme planners, and teachers. Due to normative rules related to the adult education profession, such as role expectations and professional standards, the respective actors are assigned specific responsibilities and have power of definition in their fields. Work-oriented basic education arises on the one hand from the available (allocative) resources of political actors and companies. On the other hand, the close cooperation between education managers, companies, programme planners, teachers and participants determines the planning of the offers. Through authoritative resources, actors who are in less powerful positions in asymmetrical power constellations can succeed in creating symmetry in the planning process. This becomes especially clear when looking at teachers, who, in comparison with educational managers and programme planners, are able to mobilise numerous authoritative resources and thus gain power of decision in the planning process.

In this context, "the constellation, not the actor acts" (Kussau and Brüsemeister 2007, p. 26). The actions of the individual actors and their power to shape and influence due to their allocative or authoritative resources condition and influence the subsequent actions and decisions of the other actors involved in the planning process.

6 Conclusion

Programme planning processes in adult and continuing education involves the negotiation of different constellations of interests and power (cf. Cervero and Wilson 1994). The field of work-oriented basic education seems to be particularly informative for this debate. The paper discusses this point and explores the question of how actors legitimise their actions and decisions in the context of developing work-oriented basic education programmes. In the paper assumptions of Educational Governance are interlinked with those of Giddens' (1988, 1997) structuration theory (cf. Niedlich 2019). The resulting concept of disposition rights reveals the rules and resources on which actors in the work-oriented basic education programme planning process legitimise their actions and decisions. The focus is on the analysis of disposition rights. To answer the research question, a secondary analysis was done on 14 interviews with various actors of work-oriented basic education, which had been conducted as part of a project funded by the BMBF (ABAG²). The results break down the planning process to understand the decisions made by the actors at every level of the system of work-oriented basic education (cf. Koller et al. 2021). While allocative and authoritative resources (cf. money, space and time) secure the main conditions and thus establish the design scope for planning, decisions are justified mainly with cognitive (cf. logic of action and understanding of problems) and normative rules (cf. professional standards and social goals). The actors refer above all to a large repertoire of knowledge (cognitive rules) so that they can face the dominant resources (money, time, space) in the planning process. They draw their knowledge particularly from a great amount of experience and technical skills. All in all, the duality of structure and power (cf. Giddens 1988) has been illustrated by showing that every decision in the planning process is taken from a certain external or internal structure, which in turn influences the actors. As shown before, asymmetric power constellations in particular bring a lot of movement and dynamic into the field. Furthermore, it becomes obvious that disposition rights cannot be viewed in isolation from the constellations of actors. Once again, it becomes apparent that (power) structures and actions are inherent. Thus, programme planning actions are strongly dependent on the available resources and can be legitimised or justified with reference to rules. In summary, by analysing rules and resources from the perspective of Educational Governance and structuration theory it is shown that programme planning processes can only be understood by considering the required knowledge enclaves (cf. Gieseke 2003) AND the planning cultures as structural conditions (cf. Dollhausen 2008) at the macro, meso and micro levels of planning. Programme planning processes are characterised by a great inherent dynamism at the planning table led by internal and external structures as well as available knowledge and professional standards. As a result, managing programme planning becomes a coordination process in a complex constellation of actors with different interests and resources they each contribute.

Looking forward, this piece of work could be scientifically continued by further research focusing on the forms of coordinated action. It would be interesting to find out how relations of adjustment are established within the constellations of power and interests and between the various actors. This could provide further insights into

the process of negotiation and coordination in programme planning. Another point of interest would be to clarify the way in which the planning and institutionalisation (cf. Schemmann 2020) of work-oriented basic education take place when companies initiate it on their own without political support in forms of funding.

Conflict of interest J. Arbeiter declares that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Alke, M., & Graß, D. (2019). Spannungsfeld Autonomie. Programmplanungshandeln zwischen interner und externer Steuerung. *Hessische Blätter für Volksbildung*, *2*, 133–142. https://doi.org/10.3278/HBV1902W133.

AlphaDekade. *Die Nationale Dekade für Alphabetisierung und Grundbildung: Ziele und Maßnahmen.* https://www.alphadekade.de/de/ziele-1698.html. Accessed: 22 Mar 2021.

Altrichter, H. (2015). Governance – Steuerung und Handlungskoordination bei der Transformation von Bildungssystemen. In J. Hermann, T. Brüsemeister & M. Schemmann (Eds.), *Governance im Bildungssystem. Analysen zur Mehrebenenperspektive, Steuerung und Koordination* (pp. 21–63). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Altrichter, H., & Heinrich, M. (2007). Kategorien der Governance-Analyse und Transformationen der Sytemsteuerung in Österreich. In H. Altrichter, T. Brüsemeister & J. Wissinger (Eds.), *Educational Governance. Handlungskoordination und Steuerung im Bildungssystem* (pp. 55–103). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Altrichter, H., & Maag Merki, K. (2016). Steuerung der Entwicklung des Schulwesens. In H. Altrichter & K. Maag Merki (Eds.), *Handbuch Neue Steuerung im Schulsystem*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Arbeiter, J., & Schemmann, M. (2021). Mikrodidaktische Planungsprozesse für weiterbildungsferne Gruppen am Beispiel der arbeitsorientierten Grundbildung. *Hessische Blätter für Volksbildung*, *71*(4), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.3278/HBV2104W005.

Bickeböller, J. (2022). „Wie sieht's aus? Macht ihr wieder mit?" – Handlungskoordination in regionalen Netzwerken der Grundbildung. Eine Fallstudie. *Zeitschrift für Weierbildungsforschung*, *45*(3), 547–564. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40955-022-00226-6.

Buddeberg, K., Stammer, C., & Grotlüschen, A. (2021). Geringe Literalität im Kontext der Erwerbstätigkeit. In Lernende Region – Netzwerk Köln e.V. (Ed.), *Grundbildung in der Arbeitswelt gestalten. Praxisbeispiele, Gelingensbedingungen und Perspektiven* (pp. 25–32). Bielefeld: wbv.

Cervero, R., & Wilson, A. (1994). The politics of responsibility: A theory of program planning practice for adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *45*, 249–268.

Cervero, R., & Wilson, A. (1998). Working the planning table: the political practice of adult education. *Studies in Continuing Education*, *20*, 5–21.

Cervero, R., & Wilson, A. (2006). *Working the planning table. Negotiating democratically for adult, continuing, and workplace education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dollhausen, K. (2008). *Planungskulturen in der Weiterbildung: Angebotsplanungen zwischen wirtschaftlichen Erfordernissen und pädagogischem Anspruch. (Theorie und Praxis der Erwachsenenbildung)*. Bielefeld: wbv. https://doi.org/10.3278/14/1102w.

Euringer, C. (2016a). *Das Grundbildungsverständnis der öffentlichen Bildungsverwaltung*. Bielefeld: wbv.

Euringer, C. (2016b). Grundbildung im Spannungsfeld bildungspolitischer Ein- und Abgrenzungsinteressen. *Zeitschrift für Weiterbildung*, *39*, 241–254.

Giddens, A. (1982). *Profiles and critiques in social theory*. London Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Giddens, A. (1988). *Die Konstitution der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt a.M., New York: Campus.

Giddens, A. (1997). *Konstitution der Gesellschaft: Grundzüge einer Theorie der Strukturierung*. Frankfurt a.M., New York: Campus.

Gieseke, W. (2003). Programmplanungshandeln als Angleichungshandeln. In W. Gieseke (Ed.), *Institutionelle Innensichten der Weiterbildung* (pp. 189–211). Bielefeld: wbv.

Gieseke, W. (2008). *Bedarfsorientierte Angebotsplanung in der Erwachsenenbildung. Studientexte für Erwachsenenbildung*. Vol. 6. Bielefeld: wbv.

Gieseke, W. (2012). Profession. In O. Dörner & B. Schäffer (Eds.), *Handbuch Qualitative Erwachsenen- und Weiterbildungsforschung* (pp. 434–447). Opladen: Budrich.

Gieseke, W. (2019). Programm und Angebot. In M. Fleige, W. Gieseke, A. v. Hippel, B. Käpplinger & S. Robak (Eds.), *Programm- und Angebotsentwicklung* (pp. 18–27). Bielefeld: wbv.

Hippel, A. von (2011). Programmplanungshandeln im Spannungsfeld heterogener Erwartungen: ein Ansatz zur Differenzierung von Widerspruchskonstellationen und professionellen Antinomien. *REPORT – Zeitschrift für Weiterbildungsforschung*, *1*, 45–57.

Hippel, A. von & Fuchs, S. (2009). Aufgaben- und Tätigkeitsprofile von Weiterbildner/innen. In A. v. Hippel & R. Tippelt (Eds.), *Fortbildung der Weiterbildner/innen. Eine Analyse der Interessen und Bedarfe aus verschiedenen Perspektiven*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.

Hippel, A. von & Röbel, T. (2016). Funktionen als akteursabhängige Zuschreibungen in der Programmplanung betrieblicher Weiterbildung. *Zeitschrift für Weiterbildungsforschung 39*, 61–81. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40955-016-0053-1.

Koller, J., Klinkhammer, D., & Schemmann, M. (2020). Arbeitsorientierte Alphabetisierung und Grundbildung. Eine Einführung. In J. Koller, D. Klinkhammer & M. Schemmann (Eds.), *Arbeitsorientierte Grundbildung und Alphabetisierung. Institutionalisierung, Professionalisierung und Effekte der Teilnahme* (pp. 5–18). Bielefeld: wbv.

Koller, J., Arbeiter, J., & Schemmann, M. (2021). „Da baut sich was auf, da ist jemand, der ist verlässlich da, der hat auch Geld" – Akteurskonstellationen, Handlungskoordination und Leistungen in fragilen organisationalen Strukturen am Beispiel der arbeitsorientierten Grundbildung. *Zeitschrift für Weiterbildungsforschung*, *44*(1), 43–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40955-021-00179-2.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). Reliability in content analysis: some common misconceptions and recommendations. *Human Communication Research*, *30*, 411–433.

Kussau, J., & Brüsemeister, T. (2007). Educational Governance: Zur Analyse der Handlungskoordination im Mehrebenensystem der Schule. In H. Altrichter, T. Brüsemeister & J. Wissinger (Eds.), *Educational Governance. Handlungskoordination und Steuerung im Bildungssystem*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Mania, E., & Thöne-Geyer, B. (2019). Die Auswahl von Lerninhalten in der Alphabetisierung und Grundbildung. *Hessische Blätter für Volksbildung*, *2*, 151–158.

Mayring, P. (2015). *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.

Meuser, M., & Nagel, U. (1991). ExpertInneninterviews – vielfach erprobt, wenig bedacht: ein Beitrag zur qualitativen Methodendiskussion. In D. Garz & K. Kraimer (Eds.), *Qualitativ-empirische Sozialforschung: Konzepte, Methoden, Analysen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Niedlich, N. (2019). Was kann die Strukturationstheorie zur Educational Governance-Forschung beisteuern? In R. Langer & T. Brüsemeister (Eds.), *Handbuch Educational Governance Theorien* (pp. 351–376). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Radtke, C., & Koller, J. (2020). Professionalisierung und Professionalitätsentwicklung von Lehrkräften in der arbeitsorientierten Grundbildung – eine Diskussion zum Spannungsfeld zwischen allgemeinen erwachsenenpädagogischen und (feld-)spezifischen pädagogischen Kompetenzanforderungen. In J. Koller, D. Klinkhammer & M. Schemmann (Eds.), *Arbeitsorientierte Grundbildung und Alphabetisierung. Institutionalisierung, Professionalisierung und Effekte der Teilnahme* (pp. 115–170). Bielefeld: wbv.

Reich-Claassen, J., & von Hippel, A. (2018). Angebotsplanung und -gestaltung. In R. Tippelt & A. von Hippel (Eds.), *Handbuch Erwachsenenbildung/Weiterbildung* (pp. 1003–1015). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Schemmann, M. (2020). Institutionalisierung arbeitsorientierter Grundbildung. Befunde zu Gelingensbedingungen. In J. Koller, D. Klinkhammer & M. Schemmann (Eds.), *Arbeitsorientierte Grundbildung und Alphabetisierung. Institutionalisierung, Professionalisierung und Effekte der Teilnahme* (pp. 103–114). Bielefeld: wbv.

Schrader, J. (2010). Reproduktionskontexte der Weiterbildung. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, *56*, 267–284.

Schrader, J. (2011). *Struktur und Wandel der Weiterbildung. Theorie und Praxis der Erwachsenenbildung*. Bielefeld: wbv.

Schwarz, S. (2021). Arbeitsorientierte Grundbildung: Definition, Überblick und Einordnung. In Lernende Region – Netzwerk Köln e. V. (Ed.), *Grundbildung in der Arbeitswelt gestalten. Praxisbeispiele, Gelingensbedingungen und Perspektiven* (pp. 17–24). Bielefeld: wbv.

Sork, T., & Käpplinger, B. (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.), *Professionalisation of adult educators. International and comparative perspectives* (pp. 183–200). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Stanik, T. (2016). Mikrodidaktische Planung von Lehrenden in der Erwachsenenbildung. Theoretische und empirische Annäherungen an ein Forschungsdesiderat. *Zeitschrift für Weiterbildung*, *39*, 317–330.

Stanik, T. (2019). Mikrodidaktische Planungen von Trainerinnen und Trainern in der betrieblichen Weiterbildung. In E. Wittmann, D. Frommberger & U. Weyland (Eds.), *Jahrbuch der berufs- und wirtschaftspädagogischen Forschung* (pp. 109–124). Opladen: Budrich.