

Adult Education for Democratic Citizenship Transnational Analysis of Practices (Draft)

Michal Bron Jr and Helmut Fennes

Introduction

Active citizens do not ... simply happen; they have to be made. Even if the role of adult education is inevitably a limited one, we can still ask what types of social arrangement appear to foster active and participatory citizenship most effectively? (Field, 1995: 193)

This study on interesting and relevant initiatives in the field of adult education for democratic citizenship in nine European countries tries to respond to this question by describing and analysing some examples of “social arrangements” which foster active and democratic citizenship.

In 2002, the Council of Europe in its *Recommendation on Education for Democratic Citizenship*¹ (EDC) proposed a broad understanding of the respective concept. According to this recommendation, EDC is

- promoting a free, tolerant and just society;
- defending the values and principles of freedom, pluralism, human rights and the rule of law;
- embracing formal, non-formal and informal education;
- placing EDC at the heart of educational reform and implementation of educational policies;
- recognising EDC as a factor for social cohesion, mutual understanding, intercultural and inter-religious dialogue, and solidarity, as well as promoting equality between men and women, peace and a democratic society (see Fennes, 2007).

While policy documents and recommendations formulated by the Council of Europe, the International Bureau of Education and other international bodies are primarily (but not only) addressed to formal education settings for children and young people, the LLL-EDC project is focused on adult citizens and on non-formal educational provisions. While informal learning usually is an individual learning activity², non-formal learning³ is a structured, often collective process, normally with a specific purpose. Learning in and as a group can provide a good ground for building self-confidence, trust and solidarity as well as critical awareness.

The educational benefits of being an active member of an NGO (which often provides opportunities for learning in a social movement as can be seen in many of the initiatives

¹ Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (2002) Recommendation Rec (2002)12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on education for democratic citizenship. Strasbourg (<https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=313139&BackColorInternet=9999CC&BackColorIntranet=FFBB55&BackColorLogged=FFAC75>, accessed 12.10.2007)

² Informal learning: learning resulting from daily life activities related to work, family or leisure. It is not structured (in terms of learning objectives, learning time or learning support) and typically does not lead to certification. Informal learning may be intentional but in most cases it is non-intentional (or “incidental”/random). Source: European Commission (2001) Communication on Lifelong Learning (pp. 32-33)

³ Non-formal learning: learning that is not provided by an education or training institution and typically does not lead to certification. It is, however, structured (in terms of learning objectives, learning time or learning support). Non-formal learning is intentional from the learner’s perspective. Source: European Commission (2001) Communication on Lifelong Learning (pp. 32-33)

included in this study) lies in the fact that the participation in it is voluntary: this allows choices, is attractive, flexible and adequate to the needs and expectations of the individuals concerned.

When studying Adult Education for Democratic Citizenship (AEDC) or discussing the relationship between adult education and civil society, one can attribute an NGO, or the “Interesting and Relevant Initiatives” (IRIs) gathered for this project, three roles:

- as a supplier of services to civil society;
- as an organisation (or a group of organisations) which is part of civil society;
- as an exemplary power which itself visibly adopts and fosters the mind set needed for civil society to flourish (*cf.* Field, 1995: 193).

According to Thoresen (2002) citizenship education addresses the following issues:

- democracy and autocracy;
- fairness, justice and the rule of law;
- minorities and their rights;
- social marginalisation and exclusion;
- gendered societies;
- co-operation and conflict;
- rights and responsibilities.

It could be observed in this study that the submitted examples of AEDC do cover these issues.

Background to this study

Design of the practices analysis

The specific research questions related to the practice analysis were:

- What are the main elements in the internal practice related to the development of democratic citizenship in selected associations or institutions?
- How will this project define effective practice in the development of democratic citizenship in Europe?
- Which practice was effective in selected non-formal and informal settings⁴ 2000-2005?

The data collection for the description and analysis of interesting and relevant initiatives (IRIs) within education for democratic citizenship in the field of adult education has been based on the following⁵:

- written material produced and submitted by representatives of studied IRIs;
- mission statements, objectives, reports and other information publicly accessed through internet;
- interviews and informal talks;
- observations;
- follow-up letters/e-mail exchange.

⁴ Non-formal education/learning is considered to take place in a continuum between formal and informal education/learning. Non-formal education/learning can also have formal elements but can as well have minimal structure, thus being close to informal education/learning.

⁵ See also appendix B

Each partner has been encouraged to submit also his/her own comments.

Practices analysed

Altogether 24 Interesting and Relevant Initiatives (IRIs) were analysed in the nine countries involved: Austria (AT/2 IRIs), Germany (DE/2), Denmark (DK/3), Spain (ES/3), Hungary (HU/2), Poland (PL/5), Romania (RO/2), Slovenia (SL/2), United Kingdom (UK/2). The following list provides an overview over these IRIs, including the main stakeholders and abbreviations used in this document:

AT	ICC	Interkulturelles Zentrum/Intercultural Centre – Lehrgang interkulturelle Kompetenz/Intercultural competence course
AT	NonViolence	Internationaler Versöhnungsbund (IVB) – Non-violence training course
DE	NSHistory	Bildungswerk der Humanistischen Union – Geschichtsarbeit und historisch-politisches Lernen zum Nationalsozialismus / History Reflexion and Historical and Political Learning concerning National Socialism
DE	ZMD	Arbeitskreis deutscher Bildungsstätten Zusammenleben mit Muslimen in Deutschland/Living together with Muslims in Germany
DK	TEACH	Västra Nylands Folk High School (Finland) Teaching European Active Citizenship
DK	Udspil	Association of Danish Day High Schools (ADDHS) – Udspil
DK	World	Krogerup Folk High School – The World is Burning
ES	Agenda	ACSUR-Las Segovías – Agenda Común/Common Agenda
ES	YouthPart	Dirección de Juventud y Acción Comunitaria del Departamento de Cultura/Directorate of Youth People and Communitarian Action at the Culture Department – Juventud Vasca Cooperante / Youth participation through international non-formal education for democratic citizenship
ES	TechLit	Regional Government of Extremadura and AUPEX – Extremadura Technological Literacy Plan
HU	CompDev	Balatszepezd Folk High School and Central European Learning Centre and The Human Resources Development Operative Programme – Development of key competences
HU	TrainTrainers	Balatszepezd Folk High School and Central European Learning Centre and MATRA KAP program [the Netherlands] – Training multipliers for non-formal citizenship education
PL	FSEG	Feministyczna Grupa Samokształceniowa/Feminist Self-Education Group – Interdisciplinary Gender Studies Group
PL	Karta 99	Dolnośląskie Stowarzyszenie Pomocy Ofiarom Przestępstw – Karta 99 / Lower-Silesian Association for the Aid of Victims of Criminal Offence – Charter 99 Centre for Legal Education
PL	Lambda	Stowarzyszenie LAMBDA Warszawa LAMBDA WARSAW Association
PL	NGOLeaders	Stowarzyszenie Szkoła Liderów School of NGOs Leaders Association
PL	CyberHand	Towarzystwo Edukacji Otwartej/Open Education Society – Leader's Cyber-Hand

RO	DC	Center Education 2000 + Bucharest – Democratic Citizenship
RO	I&DCE	Intercultural Institute of Timișoara – Intercultural and democratic citizenship education
RO	DC-NFE	Intercultural Institute of Timișoara – Towards Democratic Citizenship through Non-Formal Education
SL	HRE	Mirovni Institut – Institut za sodobne družbene in politične studije/Peace Institute – Institute for Contemporary Social and Political Studies – Development and Implementation of a Non-Discrimination Pre- Service and In-Service Training Programme for Judges and Prosecutors on the Basis of Human Rights Education
SL	RomaSchool	Zavod za izobraževanje in kulturo Črnomelj – Primary school for Roma people
UK	ComLead	Birkbeck College – Community Leadership
UK	ESOL-CIT	Hackney Community College – English for Speakers of Other Languages

Stakeholders

Almost all stakeholders described are organisations or institutions, only one is an informal group. Almost all main stakeholders (main organisers and co-ordinators)⁶ are non-governmental and non-profit organisations or institutions. Only in two cases, the main stakeholder is a regional government (YouthPart/ES, TechLit/ES). Only in one case (DC/RO) the main stakeholder is profit oriented. Five practices analyses explicitly mention governmental organisations/institutions as stakeholders which are funding the respective IRIs, but also most other IRIs (all except two) report funding from public sources from regional or national governmental structures or from the European Commission.

The majority of main stakeholders (58%) are registered or organised at national level, 38% at local and 38% at regional level. Four main stakeholders (17%) are either also registered or organised at European level or are part of a European network⁷.

50% of the main stakeholders are reported to be active at local level, 50% at regional, 50% at national and 50% at European level (75% of the main stakeholders are active at more than one level).

The majority of main stakeholders is not part of the formal education system. Only two Colleges (ComLead/UK, ESOL-CIT/UK) are main stakeholders and organisers of an IRI.

75% of the main stakeholders implement the respective IRIs in co-operation with other organisations and institutions as partners (in some cases these are primarily funding partners). 5 IRIs involve partners in other countries.

In 75% of the IRIs the initiator of the activity was also a main stakeholder – in most cases the organiser or co-ordinator. In 2 cases (8%) the activity was initiated by a partner in another country as part of a European project. In 2 cases the activity was initiated by a non-governmental partner organisation/institution but for practical reasons it did not become the main organiser/coordinator. In one case the activity was initiated by a national authority and in one case by an expatriate. This indicates that most IRIs were initiated by non-governmental organisations and institutions on their own.

⁶ Two organisations are the main stakeholder for two IRIs each (Intercultural Institute Timișoara, Balatonszepezd Folk High School and Central European Learning Centre). Both are counted twice in these statistics.

⁷ Two main stakeholders have been reported to be registered at local, regional, national and European level.

Practices – Interesting and Relevant Initiatives (IRIs)

EDC context of practices

The 24 examples of interesting and relevant initiatives (IRIs) in the field of adult education for democratic citizenship (AEDC) that have been analysed in nine EU member-states have been, for the purpose of this report, divided into three groups:

- IRIs that explicitly refer to *citizenship learning* or *citizenship education* in their rationale or mission statements;
- IRIs for which practice analyses (written by researchers of this LLL-EDC project) explicitly mention that they are aimed at or devoted to *citizenship learning*, *citizenship education* and/or *education for active/democratic citizenship*.
- IRIs that only implicitly are related to these issues, but which, nevertheless, have been selected, described and analysed for being interesting and relevant EDC initiatives.

The **first cluster** of ten IRIs consists of the following cases:

- Interkulturelles Zentrum/Intercultural competence course (ICC/AT)
- Arbeitskreis deutscher Bildungsstätten/Living together with Muslims in Germany (ZMD/DE)
- Västra Nylands Folk High School/Teaching European Active Citizenship (TEACH/DK)
- Balatonszepezd Folk High School & Central European Learning/Development of key competences (CompDev/HU)
- Stowarzyszenie Szkoła Liderów/School of NGOs Leaders Association (NGOLeaders/PL)
- Intercultural Institute of Timișoara/Towards Democratic Citizenship through Non-Formal Education (DC-NFE/RO)
- Intercultural Institute of Timișoara/Intercultural and democratic citizenship education (I&DCE/RO)
- Mirovni Institut – Institut za sodobne družbene in politične studije/Development and Implementation of a Non-Discrimination Pre-Service and In-Service Training Programme for Judges and Prosecutors on the Basis of Human Rights Education (HRE/SL)
- Birkbeck College/Community Leadership (ComLead/UK)
- Hackney Community College/English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL-CIT/UK)

The **second cluster**, four IRIs, consists of the following cases:

- Krogerup Folk High School/The World is Burning (World/DK)
- ACSUR-Las Segovías/Common Agenda (Agenda/ES)
- Feministyczna Grupa Samokształceniowa/Interdisciplinary Gender Studies Group (FSEG/PL)
- Dolnośląskie Stowarzyszenie Pomocy Ofiarom Przestępstw – Karta 99/Charter 99 – Centre for Legal Education (Karta 99/PL)

The **third cluster**, ten IRIs, consists of the following cases:

- Internationaler Versöhnungsbund/Non-violence training course (NonViolence/AT)
- Bildungswerk der Humanistischen Union/History Reflexion and Historical and Political Learning concerning National Socialism (NSHistory/DE)
- Association of Danish Day High Schools/Udspil – Making one's proposal (Udspil/DK)
- Dirección de Juventud y Acción Comunitaria del Departamento de Cultura/Juventud Vasca Cooperante (YouthPart/ES)
- Regional Government of Extremadura and AUPEX/Extremadura Technological Literacy Plan (TechLit/ES)

- Balatonszepezd Folk High School and Central European Learning Centre/Training multipliers for non-formal citizenship education (TrainTrainers/HU)
- Stowarzyszenie LAMBDA Warszawa/LAMBDA Warsaw Association (Lambda/PL)
- Towarzystwo Edukacji Otwartej/Leader's Cyber-Hand (CyberHand/PL)
- Center Education 2000 + Bucharest/Democratic Citizenship (DC/RO)
- Zavod za izobraževanje in kulturo Črnomelj/Primary school for Roma people (RomaSchool/SL)

When analysing these three clusters of IRIs, the authors refer to criteria for EDC formulated in the Council of Europe's Recommendation on Education for Democratic Citizenship (2002) which have been summarised by Fennes (2007) in the following six categories (for details see appendix D):

- Context, concept and aims of EDC
- Principles of EDC policies
- Objectives and content of EDC
- Competences to be acquired through EDC
- Methodology and methods for EDC
- Training for teachers and trainers

Using the criteria under these six categories, one particular IRI is worth being presented here as a special case-study, since among the 24 IRIs it meets the biggest number of criteria for EDC: the IRI on competence development (CompDev/HU) organised by Balatonszepezd Folk High School and Central European Learning Centre and funded through the Human Resources Development Operative Programme (HEFOP). Aims and objectives of this IRI are⁸:

With the Balatonszepezd Folk High School as the centre for learning consultation and e-learning, and extending the scope to the Tapolca and Balatonfüred small regions, the general aim was raising the basic skills levels of the population in the two regions with the use of the EU key competences development programme as a basis in order to come closer to the indicators set by the EU for 2010. The integration of the learning partnerships in the target regions aimed at the practical implementation of lifelong learning with the help of needs analysis, programme and curriculum development, training for adult education professionals, building networks and introducing e-learning methods.

Objectives:

- *Screening non-formal education in two small regions*
- *Consultations and forums for non-formal education, adult education, public education, vocational education and labour market training institutions in the network related to the region*
- *Exploratory survey of the levels of key competences of the adult population, mapping learning needs as a basis for development*
- *Development and testing non-formal pilot learning programs, materials and working tools for the key competences identified as preferences in the regions targeted at*

⁸ Quotes from the case studies included in the national reports are in *italic* and have not been edited by the authors of the transnational analysis.

- *Training a total of 40 specialists from 20 settlements in the 2 small regions*
- *Implementation of training courses for active citizenship and key competences*

The project made it possible for more than 500 persons, mainly with elementary school or secondary vocational education, to develop their key competences, which at the same time changed their attitude towards learning and gave strengthening to them as individuals. Many of the participants who completed the course organised themselves into groups with the definite intention to continue learning on their own resources.

Main contents addressed in this IRI were:

	Task, exercise, theoretic unit	Implementation
1.	Self-definition in communities	training
2.	Fundamental questions about the quality of democratic (active) citizenship	theory
3.	Different aspects of education for citizenship. What does citizenship mean in practice?	theory and controlled discussion on the theme
4.	General legal knowledge: the rule of the law	theory
5.	General legal knowledge: citizens' rights	theory
6.	Values and decisions	group exercises
7.	General legal knowledge: the structure of the state	theory
8.	Local community and activity	role play

Naturally, many other IRIs also meet a number of the Council of Europe's criteria for EDC. In particular, the analysis of mission statements and rationales of IRIs of the first cluster revealed interesting similarities between the studied cases.

EDC contexts of IRIs in the first cluster

As far as *context, concept and aims of EDC* is concerned, two out of five criteria have not been mentioned in any IRI at all, namely:

- *Defending the values and principles of freedom, pluralism, human rights and the rule of law;*
- *Placing EDC at the heart of educational reform and implementation of educational policies.*

While the latter is obvious since this refers to the policy level, it is quite surprising that the former is not reflected explicitly in the IRIs studied.

Two others, *Promoting a free, tolerant and just society* and *Embracing formal, non-formal and informal education* have been mentioned only in one IRI, namely the Romanian DC-NFE. Only in this case promoting *tolerance and using diversity among Romania's youth* along with *democratic citizenship beyond the existing curricular and extra-curricular activities* was clearly stated.

First and foremost it was the criterion *Recognising EDC as a factor for social cohesion, mutual understanding, intercultural and inter-religious dialogue, and solidarity* that most of the IRIs grouped in the first cluster subscribed to.

One of the most comprehensive rationales that referred to combating xenophobia, exclusion and inequality was formulated in the Austrian ICC. It applies well to some other IRIs that address similar issues:

The coexistence between migrants (also second and third generation migrants) and the native/autochthonous population is characterised by distance, tension, emotionality, insecurity, intolerance, exclusion, xenophobia and racism. There is a tendency to tolerate migrants as long as they do not disturb everyday life of the autochthonous majority, thus resulting in a pressure for assimilation and/or segregation of the different ethnic groups. While there are efforts to promote intercultural education in schools, the approaches and resources are insufficient. One of the main shortcomings is the lack of intercultural competences of teachers, educators, multipliers and professionals in other areas such as health, social services, social work, youth work, institutions representing the interests of different groups of society etc.

The German ZMD, the Romanian DC-NFE and the two IRIs in the UK (ComLead and ESOL-CIT) in one way or another stressed their commitment to intercultural education.

Some of IRIs had the character of an educational intervention to current problems faced and/or debated by society at large. An example of such an IRI is the German case ZMD:

The IRI was strongly linked to political discussions and social requirements on integration, diversity and especially migrant population from Muslim countries ... It responded to the fact that there is little activity in terms of further adult education in this field as well as little knowledge of teachers and teamers about the religious and cultural background of the target groups ... It responded also to the fact that the majority society in general has only poor knowledge about Muslim religion and culture.

Among the five **proposed principles of EDC policies** only one was referred to by the IRIs studies: *to involve all kinds of actors*, which seems to be very important for successful non-formal education offers addressed to adult citizens. Especially the Austrian ICC, the Polish NGO Leaders and the Romanian DC paid attention to incorporate partners from schools, local communities, the private sector and local administrations into their activities.

Objectives and content of EDC described in the selected IRIs were coherent with the respective **concepts and aims** (see above). For instance, for the Austrian ICC both main objective and main content were *to develop the competences to act effectively in a multicultural/intercultural environment, including conflicts*.

Specific objectives of the Austrian ICC were the following:

- *To develop sensibility and empathic interaction with persons from other cultural backgrounds;*

- *To develop personal, social and professional competences, in particular for being able to act effectively in multicultural settings and or dealing constructively with intercultural conflicts;*
- *To acquire the necessary knowledge related to intercultural and multicultural issues;*
- *To develop clarity and security in one professional self-conception;*
- *To reflect and exchange experiences in this field;*
- *To develop and implement respective practice projects.*

For the German ZMD special topics were the following:

Tolerance is not enough; Together against violence and right wing extremism: faith and rationality; Inter-religious dialogue: religion, democracy, human rights, boys and girls / men and women; Respect and tolerance – interaction with Islam – a task for schools? The influence of Islam on mediaeval and modern Europe; What is religion? Intercultural and inter-religious interaction with Muslim children and young people; Young Muslims and their working life in Germany; Respect and tolerance – the debate; Gender mainstreaming and intercultural youth work.

Also to implement educational approaches and teaching methods which aim at learning to live together in a democratic society, and at combating aggressive nationalism, racism and intolerance and eliminate violence and extremist thinking and behaviour was an important objective for some IRIs. Among them, the Polish NGO Leaders organised seminars and workshops for NGOs volunteers and for youth from Belarus, Russia (Kaliningrad District), Ukraine), while the Romanian DC focused on strengthening *the schools and local community's capacity to cope with intolerance and xenophobia.*

Interestingly, none of the IRIs from the first cluster – thus, those explicitly addressing the issue of citizenship education/learning or EDC – has explicitly addressed the issue of citizenship **competences to be acquired through EDC** – neither in their own presentations (mission statements) nor have they been addressed in the respective national reports. However, the intention of citizenship competences to be acquired through participation in the can be found implicitly in the descriptions on how a given IRI is organised, in its content and specific objectives.

Methodology and methods for EDC applied in the IRIs analysed are referred to in more detail in the next section.

Not all of the Council of Europe's criteria are relevant at the project level, i.e. those related to policy development, curriculum development, training for teachers and trainers or to the development of educational material. In view of this, it is also evident that the criteria in the category **training for teachers and trainers** have not been referred to in the practice analyses: these are meant to be applied at a meta-level for the implementation of an EDC policy while the IRIs are taking place at an EDC practice level. It should be mentioned, though, that the target groups of a number of IRIs include teachers and trainers.

Similarly, it could be expected that some IRIs refer to policies, contexts, concepts, principles, aims, objectives, principles etc. that were not included in the Council of Europe's criteria.

EDC contexts of IRIs in the second cluster

This cluster contains four IRIs which do not make explicit reference to EDC in their mission statements but for which practice analyses mention that they are aimed at or devoted to citizenship learning/education and/or EDC. For instance, one of them aims to *foster people's self-reliance and empowerment* (Karta 99/PL). In order to achieve this goal, the initiative organises courses which put a special focus on developing the ability to *overcome social helplessness*. Another Polish IRI sees its role as an *educational impulse towards social change* (Gender Study Group, FSEG/PL). Raising the political awareness of adolescents is one objective of the Danish IRI “The World is Burning”/DK. This IRI also aims at *teaching young people to perceive themselves as subjects of societal processes*, as one of the organisers and teachers formulated it. While this Danish IRI focused on adolescents, the Spanish IRIE “Common Agenda” was working on *strengthening the citizenship rights of migrant women in Spain*.

These examples demonstrate that there are probably many activities which (also) promote learning and education for (active/democratic) citizenship but are not declared or perceived as such by those organising them. Only an outside perspective seems to be able to place them in an EDC context.

EDC contexts of IRIs in the third cluster

Interestingly, more than 40% of the IRIs analysed can be categorised as only being implicitly related to education for democratic citizenship. Nevertheless, the partners of the LLL-EDC project found them relevant enough to study them for the purpose of this project. They represent eight out of nine countries involved in the project. This demonstrates that activities relevant for EDC often are not in line with notions that an internationally composed research team would expect when exploring this field. This can be seen through the following analysis of ten respective cases.

The IRIs in question are first and foremost examples of how adult education can play – and actually does play – a societal role. By addressing various contents and using different methods and designs, adult education initiatives offer a variety of opportunities where participants can develop their citizenship competences. A good example is Udspil/DK. When launched it addressed quite an extensive number of issues:

- 1) *Democracy*; 2) *Freedom of speech*; 3) *Gender equality*; 4) *Tolerance*;
- 5) *Freedom of faith/belief*; 6) *Receiving and giving*; 7) *Equality*;
- 8) *Brotherhood/solidarity*; 9) *Law and order – crime and punishment*;
- 10) *Globalization*; 11) *Danes*; 12) *Strangers*; 13) *Immigration*; 14) *Integration*;
- 15) *Labour*.

However, when the actual educational work started, these issues were reduced and condensed to the following five 'key topics': 1) *Freedom, equality and brotherhood*; 2) *Dane and stranger*; 3) *Democracy*; 4) *Integration*; 5) *Equality*.

Also other IRIs had as their main objectives and goals to play an important societal role. For instance the IRIs TrainTrainers/HU, Democratic Citizenship/RO and TechLit/ES focused much attention to the development of local communities through:

- defining and analysing citizens' roles in a local community and identifying and solving problems;
- establishing and invigorating relationships between citizens and local politicians;
- promoting *democratic access of all citizens to information and communications technologies, so that they can actively participate in the changes that are taking place in the information and knowledge society* (TechLit/ES).

Several IRIs in different countries had a role as intermediary agents (NGOs) in facilitating the development or maintenance of civil society. This teaching-learning mission was part of a work carried out by the IRI CyperHand/PL: *The major overall objective of the project is to influence quality of services provided by non-governmental organisations by making their work more efficient ... to raise effectiveness of NGOs' actions and the quality of their services*. Even more clearly such a goal was formulated for Democratic Citizenship/RO:

The main aim of the project was to promote the civic participation of citizens and to encourage them in joining the NGOs in their efforts in order to improve the quality of life and for consolidating the democracy in Romania.

More pragmatic, but still oriented towards making NGOs work more effective was Lambda/PL. Its work was also focused on training competent activists who would work on awareness raising for HIV/AIDS and LGBT issues among the general public as well as among local authorities.

The scope of missions related to EDC among the different IRIs varied from individual citizens to global issues. E.g., YouthPart/ES committed itself to *international understanding and cooperation*. NonViolence/AT was a site of attitudes formation:

The initiative's central aim is to develop a main attitude, based on non-violence, through mediating special and specific values, skills and knowledge. The main idea behind this concept is to experience a new way of solving conflicts and try to support the participants in understanding and developing those specific competences, which enable them to make use of this non-violent concept in every day life.

For yet another IRI adult education was a means to empower people through supporting them in understanding the value of education: *Motivating Roma people to actively integrate into education and vocational training presented the largest professional challenge for Institution for Culture and Education in Črnomelj* (RomaSchool/SL).

A source of learning democracy and being democratic citizen could also be the recent past. One IRI, NSHistory/DE, focused on discussing the issues of nazism, the Holocaust and dictatorship: *The basic presumption is that people should learn from history and that they should be aware of the necessity to maintain democracy by active citizenship*.

Another IRI, HRE/SL, is an example how adult education can be used to reach a specific, highly educated and professional audience. This IRI was addressed to judges, lawyers and other officers of the court and judicial system of the country. The content seems to be relevant for EDC, as it was focusing on awareness raising on societal issues such as various forms of discrimination.

Concepts of practices

Each selected IRI has been described and analysed according to a given set of aspects. The following list of them constitutes a core of a presented here cross-national synthesis:

- rationale, context, aims and objectives of a given IRI; its main contents;
- target groups; access and selection procedures;
- pedagogical approach and methods used, programme/curriculum offered, evaluation carried through;
- educational staff involved.

Target groups and access

The IRIs analysed were addressed to a number of more or less specified target groups:

<i>young adults</i>	<i>Roma youth</i>	<i>young people</i>	<i>teachers</i>
<i>NGOs representatives</i>	<i>school teachers</i>	<i>adult educators</i>	
<i>elected politicians</i>	<i>civil servants</i>	<i>volunteers</i>	<i>women</i>
<i>community workers</i>	<i>ethnic minorities</i>	<i>new immigrants</i>	<i>lawyers</i>
<i>gay community</i>	<i>victims of crime</i>	<i>NGOs leaders</i>	<i>multipliers</i>
<i>club personnel</i>	<i>business people</i>	<i>'invisible' citizens</i>	<i>marginalized</i>
<i>everyone</i>	<i>concerned</i>	<i>'dealing with...'</i>	<i>'interested in ...'</i>
<i>feminist activists</i>	<i>professionals</i>	<i>students</i>	<i>members</i>

The overall impression is that studied IRIs attracted a broad spectrum and a great variety of participants. However, at least three categories of target groups can be distinguished among them, namely:

- direct EDC beneficiaries;
- facilitators/multipliers (including teachers), civil servants, promoters of democratic citizenship as well as people that could be named *good-doers* or “benevolent persons”;
- professionals, businesspeople, rather pragmatic than idealist, though with high social awareness; for them EDC is rather of a secondary importance, it is more a means to improve working conditions.

The participants in IRIs were unevenly distributed between those three categories, though. Most of the IRIs addressed primarily direct beneficiaries and facilitators/multipliers or, as in several cases, both. Only a few focused on the third category.

An apparent ambivalent attitude towards the issue of access and selection could be noticed. On a one hand an open access and a lack of selection is stated, in some cases very explicitly:

There is no formal selection. Anyone who meets the quite open participant profile can participate (ICC/AT)

The activity is accessible for everyone – there are no special selection criteria and target groups (NonViolence/AT)

On the other hand, the issue is often simply avoided to be clearly mentioned. In yet other IRIs, e.g. ESOL-CIT in the UK or the Spanish TechLit, enrolment is based on a “first come – first served” principle. In such cases interviewed IRIs representatives asserted that “access is open” and “any person can take part”. As it is formulated in a German IRI:

There is no selection of participants. Participants are accepted in the order of their notification (NSHistory/DE)

However, tailoring educational offers and defining specific target groups leads, naturally, to more selective admission criteria. Several IRIs have been designed to attract certain groups of people. For instance, ComLead in the UK was addressed specifically to persons – professionals or volunteers – who had at least one year experience in community work. In several cases, the aim of a given IRI was to reach a defined group of people, e.g. Roma population (DC/RO and RomaSchool/SL), migrant women (Agenda/ES), or victims of crimes (Karta 99/PL). In such cases, it was obvious that some procedures for selection had to be implemented.

Thus, enrolment procedures vary from open admission and no selection whatsoever, through addressing a group of people, to really restricted access. It is, though, important to notice, that imposed restrictions are legitimate, reasonable and usually well argued for:

... the course being taught in Danish, participants should be either Danish-speaking-as-first-language or possess high literacy skills in Danish-as-a-foreign-or second-language (World/DK)

... should be competent in spoken and written English (ComLead/UK)

The only limit established is that the users are over 16 years old (or accompanied minors). The reason for this restriction is that for those below this age there are already specific education policies in schools and institutes (TechLit/ES)

While analysing the descriptions of IRIs from nine countries, the following criteria for participation/registration could be found:

- demographic – i.e. age, sex, ethnicity etc.; for instance, in the case of ESOL-CIT in the UK participants were selected “according to their age groups”, while in the case of Hungarian CompDev focus was on *the involvement of members of ethnic minorities living in the settlements*;
- gender & LGBT – there were IRIs addressed to women (e.g. the Polish Karta 99 and the Spanish Agenda) or persons of certain sexual orientation (e.g. the Polish Lambda);
- practical competences – language, ICT, foreign languages (e.g. the Polish CyberHand, the Danish World and ComLead in the UK). Interestingly, no restrictions were formulated as to how these competences were acquired;
- professional/occupational context – several IRIs were specifically addressing, e.g., multi-cultural settings, or women associations, or teachers, or NGO leaders:

The only requirement is that those associations should be involved in the development of citizenship in a broader sense and they are involved in some projects (Agenda/ES)

They are asked for specific profiles (nurses, educator, engineers) (YouthPart/ES)

The target group were members of the pedagogical staff, multipliers in youth work and education for democratic citizenship (ZMD/DE)

The main target group is lawyers, attorneys and judges, legal experts who work on different levels of the judicial system (HRE/SL)

Three persons per region (7), a total of 21, took part in the scheme, all of which are organizers or heads of local training programs (TrainTrainers/HU)

- experience & life course were also put as a criterion for admission; especially prior involvement in civil society organisations was often required (e.g. for the German ZMD, ComLead/UK, TrainTrainers/HU, NGOLeaders/PL and World/DK);
- motivational – in some IRIs a certain degree of clearly expressed interest was expected from the participants; for instance, a German IRI was addressed to *adult people who are historically and politically interested and engaged* (NSHistory/DE).

The final comment regarding access and selection to IRIs concerns the problem of yet another obstacle for participation. In some cases, participation in the respective IRIs could be constrained by limited financial means or human resources of the organiser. These constraints have been clearly mentioned by several IRIs:

... did not currently have sufficient tutors and resources to deliver that many occurrences of the course (ComLead/UK)

... participation is limited to a maximum of 20 applicants per course (TEACH/DK)

... the criteria for funding of schools and individual participants vary between municipalities. This means that there may be different restrictions on who can actually participate in courses run by DHSs (Udspil/DK)

Members of the IVB have to pay a course fee of € 550.-, non- members € 600.- for the whole activity which lasts for a year (NonViolence/AT)

Pedagogic aspects

Which goals have been established for analysed IRIs? What did their organisers intend to achieve? And in what way – addressing which contents, using which methods and how structuring the teaching-learning situation? Have the initiatives been monitored and/or assessed? Have they been one-time offers or were they organised on a recurrent basis? What problems have been encountered? These are the questions that directed our work while describing and analysing interesting and relevant EDC initiatives in nine partner countries. Due to various obstacles encountered during the fieldwork not all questions could, naturally, be answered. And due to the diversity of IRIs not all of these questions turned out to be relevant for all of them.

In most cases, whether the goals have been explicitly formulated or implicitly assumed, the focus of individual IRIs was on providing a space and setting for learning, experiencing and practicing as well as an opportunity to obtain practical skills combined with awareness raising. The aims and objectives of IRIs varied, but an overall objective of empowering their participants predominated:

To offer tools for analysis and demand citizenship rights (Agenda/ES)

To sensitising public opinion about citizenship rights (Agenda/ES)

The primary objective of The World is Burning is educating young people to acknowledge themselves as actors in societal processes (World/DK)

Parallel to these goals many IRIs formulated also more pragmatic objectives. Naturally, they varied depending on what category of participants they were addressing:

... to fight and correct both prejudices and ignorance of the pedagogical staff (ZMD/DE)

The objective does not consist of organising courses to teach people to use technology and surf the Internet ... so they will learn and go away, but so they will learn and stay (TechLit/ES)

Meeting this goal, it is not merely a matter of providing knowledge about democracy; but rather that of providing a space where young people can experience that they are fully competent in taking action as subjects in society (World/DK)

Whether the particular IRI was organised in a non-formal way or in a more formal setting, we were interested in the contents of the studied initiatives. In order to avoid misunderstandings, the term “curriculum” was set under quotation marks in the practice analysis guidelines (see appendix B) ...

... to indicate the broad scope within which the term [curriculum] is used, going beyond the notion it has in formal education. In this sense, a curriculum is considered to be a structured programme organising educational processes. Such a programme includes aims, principles, methodology etc. While for many non-formal education activities there might not be an explicit, complete and coherent curriculum/programme, there still could be an implicit, fragmented and/or very basic curriculum/programme which is not labelled or recognised as such.⁹

Not surprisingly those IRIs that offered a non-formal learning setting were also less inclined to have a “ready-made” programme. Many of them were keen to be as flexible as possible in adjusting the educational offer to the needs of people who accepted this offer, e.g.:

The topics, the methods and the focus of discussion and findings depended on the previous knowledge of the participants, their professional deficiencies and demands and were related to their every-day experiences (ZMD/DE)

Equally natural was that IRIs which were organised in a more formal context were more explicit in their curriculum design. The most overt were those IRIs which provided formally recognised diplomas or certificates, e.g.:

The college had been explicit about it because of the requirement to have a citizenship component (ESOL-CIT/UK)

It is an explicit curriculum of [the] Ministry of education, adjusted by ZIK (RomaSchool/SL)

⁹ Guidelines for the practice analysis of this LLL-EDC project (see appendix B)

The explicit curriculum was set forth by the organisers when they chose the topics and the lecturers. The topics that were addressed are the following ... (HRE/SL)

The curriculum will be realised over a three-weekend long boarding training (TrainTrainers/HU)

But also some IRIs where certificates are not formally recognised and which in principle follow a non-formal education approach can follow a quite structured curriculum:

The activity has an explicit course concept and curriculum developed by permanent staff of Interkulturelles Zentrum. This curriculum has evolved over the more than 10 years during which the course was organised on an annual basis. The curriculum includes the course context, learning objectives, methodology and methods, educational principles etc. (ICC/AT)

While not so much was written about content, methods attracted a good deal of attention in different practice analyses. Interestingly, the dominant method used by many IRIs was workshops. Usually workshops were combined with other methods, such as group discussion, but also reading seminars, role playing and study visits (*i.e.* ZMD/DE, YouthPart/ES, Karta 99/PL, CompDev/HU, ComLead/UK, World/DK). For instance, a three-day workshop could be organised to prepare for participation in the forthcoming project. Its purpose was to enable people to get to know each other (CyberHand/PL). However, even ‘Chalk and talk’ was used when there was a need to explain things (ESOL-CIT/UK).

Some IRIs could rely on well-established methods and techniques, like was the case with one Slovenian IRI:

The method of instruction is well known in the domain of human rights education and focuses on Knowledge, Attitudes and Skills. The courses were mostly held in the form of seminars, with a lecturer presenting the topic, followed by discussion and questions (HRE/SL).

or a Danish one:

... the course’s pedagogical approach is based on the three principles of: 1) experiential-learning; 2) self-directed learning; and 3) reflective learning (TEACH/DK)

An overwhelming majority of methods was designed to raise participants’ activeness and to enable them to make/get a field experience. In the case of German IRI NSHistory it was inviting contemporary witnesses to meet participants and share with them their own life experiences. The Danish IRI World and the Spanish Agenda organised their work in a project-type with meetings, brain storming, discussions, presentations and follow-up training. The most comprehensive set of methods seems to be used by an Austrian IRI:

... a mixed-methods approach [that] includes:

- *Development of self-awareness through personal experience and reflection of it;*
- *Exchange of experiences;*

- *Acquisition of knowledge through lectures and input by experts;*
- *Discussions;*
- *Interactive exercises, role-plays, simulation exercises;*
- *Forum Theatre (Augusto Boal) – e.g., staging conflict situations participants have experienced personally and trying to develop approaches for solving them;*
- *Intercultural dialogue with persons from other cultural backgrounds than one's own;*
- *Intercultural project work (ICC/AT).*

The Danish IRI The World is Burning followed a quite elaborated and structured approach with a mix of methods covering a broad spectrum of the learning continuum.

The methodological approach comprises three core elements.

1. Theoretical learning, primarily taking place in class-based activities organized in Phase 1. The focus is on the students' acquisition of basic concepts and knowledge about politics, society and youth in a global perspective.

The pedagogical approach is problem-oriented, aiming at widening the students' views and making them reflect on their perceptions of society.

2. Experience-based learning, taking place during Phase 2, while travelling. The journey is in fact regarded as a unique learning setting, providing the students with the opportunity of combining the acquisition of specific knowledge and confronting a reality that challenge their established perceptions.

3. Practical learning, resulting from the students' direct engagement in developing communication projects based on the experience gain during the journey. The projects development involves the practical use of a variety of basic and technical skills the students acquire through the course – e.g. using different communication tools such as camera, video, photography, etc. -, for structuring and presenting information and knowledge gained during the trip to a wider audience. (World/DK)

The dominating focus on methods activating learning processes demonstrates the competence and commitment of the IRIs' staff. This focus is important because citizenship competences can and should first of all be *learned* and not *taught*. The choice of methods depended, according to reports on various IRIs, on the type of participants and on general issues they worked with, e.g.

The objective is: to facilitate the discussion about different topics and to explore the roles that young people have to play as future volunteers. (YouthPart/ES)

Only a very few country reports contained an assessment based on observation of on-going activities:

... teachers were usually very good at involving learners - getting the students into groups, in pairs, working together, and talking to each other. There was also lots of variety of activities – paired work, group work, whole class [work], going

out and researching, lots of different types of things ... the students motivated to learn, and interested in what they were learning (ESOL-CIT/UK)

The different seminars are designed in a coherent way and are building on each other (ICC/AT).

Only in a few IRIs participants were required to do a kind of “homework” or individual assignments outside structured meetings. Naturally, it depended mostly on the particular IRI’s goals and the applied methods to achieve them. Assignments varied in form and time/effort needed to do them. Some IRIs asked their participants to write an essay based on studying relevant literature:

There is assessment. All students take the Cambridge ESOL Skills for Life exams in listening, speaking, reading and writing (ESOL-CIT/UK)

In addition, there are two written assignments. The lecturer also mentioned that, for the Community Action module which was about action learning, students had to write a research piece about something in which they were involved ... (ComLead/UK)

Young people have to submit a report about their experiences during the three phases (before going abroad, abroad, and after coming) (YouthPart/ES)

The report consisted of the legal part and sociological part (HRE/SL).

A Slovenian IRI required from their participants even to carry out a field study, while Danish and Austrian IRIs asked their participants to do practical project work:

In addition 50 short interviews were carried out to obtain more information for the assessment of discrimination in Slovenia (HRE/SL)

... while extra activities for the production of the DVD involved only those students who volunteered to take part in the project (Udspil/DK)

The course also includes practice projects organised by individuals or groups of participants (ICC/AT)

In a few IRIs participants were obliged to undergo a kind of apprenticeship, as it was the case with a Polish IRI:

... each participant should choose one of the Lower Silesian organisations, where he or she wants to start an internship and a job, or to decide to establish his/her own NGO. Co-ordinators provide thematic and organisational support in this regard ... The internship lasts 2 months – September and October. Each participant joins a NGO, where they will want to start working in November (CyperHand/PL)

Unexpectedly, there were many inputs on evaluation. This somehow seems to contradict the research project’s intention to deal with non-formal and informal educational settings. It is possible to distinguish several types of evaluation that were in use in the analysed IRIs. They extended from quite informal, usually self-evaluative ones, e.g. *within the context of discussions on objectives and expectations (FSEG/PL)* or *after the ending of each training the*

educating team gathers and with the coordinator of the project makes a self-evaluation (NGOLeaders/PL).

Much attention was given to evaluation by a Danish IRI:

At the end of each edition of The World is Burning, the teachers carry out an internal evaluation based on students' opinions on their own learning process as well as on the course's contents and organisation. The evaluation is intended to be biographical, reflecting and verbalising the experienced outcome from each student; thus it is based on the following evaluation procedure: Class discussion (evaluating the entire course), students' written evaluations (evaluating each phases of the course). The internal evaluation's results are discussed among the teachers in order to revise the course's content and form, when required (World/DK)

The prevailing form of evaluation was a somehow formalised and recurrent assessment done by the providers themselves. It is done in a form of a *one-page evaluation questionnaire* (6 questions, some open-ended) (Karta 99/DK), an *evaluation questionnaire that included questions not only about the training but also about the entire project* (CompDev/HU) or as *reports based on quantitative criteria (number of participants, amount of association, number of workshops) and qualitative ones (satisfaction, information)* (Agenda/ES). Recurrence of evaluation was important for several IRIs, e.g.

The Plan is evaluated twice a year (once per semester) and again once annually, which includes the two previous ones (TechLit/ES)

The project as a whole and in particular the single events were evaluated by its organisers by means of discussion (both with participants and in the steering group) and questionnaires (ZMD/DE)

At the end of each module/seminar there is a reflection of the learning process and outcomes. Sometimes there are also reflections after specific seminar units, in particular those run by external experts. The interim evaluation methods include written questionnaires, reflections in small groups or in plenary (ICC/AT)

Often, the IRI provider was interested in all the elements and stages of their education offer, they wanted to receive opinions on information provided, selection processes, teachers'/trainers' performance, tutorials and other materials (when relevant). In order to carry out a sensible and meaningful assessment an active involvement of the participants/learners was necessary. Thus, several providers did address their evaluation queries to people attending their activities:

At the end of the course there is an internal evaluation by the participants, including a written evaluation of the achievement of the course objectives as well as of the course in general (ICC/AT)

At the end of the project, the teachers from SDHS-ARH and PDHS-CPH, carried out an internal oral evaluation with the students (Udspil/DK)]

In November, the evaluation of the activity takes place. All the participants reflect their experiences and have the chance to express their opinion and give some advice concerning the organisation of the next year's initiative as well. All the comments and different opinions are used for the redevelopment of the curriculum

... This evaluation, made by the participants, is the only internal evaluation, external evaluations have not taken place yet (NonViolence/AT)

In addition, the seminars are regularly evaluated by the participants by means of questionnaires. However, these (standardised) questionnaires are interpreted regularly resp. systematically not to evaluate single activities but the entire programme of the Bildungswerk (NSHistory/DE)

The best evaluation, however, consists of the testimonies of the users, many of whom explain in different forums how their life has been transformed through their participation in this experience (TechLit/ESP)

A special case was the Slovenian IRI HRE, where a partner from another country, the Irish Centre for Human Rights, played a significant role in the planning of the project and had to evaluate the training conducted by the partner organisations. According to the report, classes were always attended by one of the evaluators (HRE/SL). Also the providers of the German IRI ZMD were keen to have their educational offer assessed, in this case by an external evaluator:

The action programme ENTIMON was evaluated by a group of researchers of the Deutsches Jugendinstitut (DJI, German Institute for Youth Research). Both the results and a data base of projects are published on the homepage.

The evaluation for the grant giving institution is based on standardised questionnaires for the ENTIMON programme (ZMD/DE).

Providers of both Hungarian IRIs, CompDev and TrainTrainers, were interested not only how the courses were given but also wanted to learn the “level of satisfaction” on the part of participants:

After the preparatory period, every stage of the mainly practice oriented phase was monitored in order to follow up and measure the level of satisfaction (CompDev/HU)

Evaluation of the training was carried out by the coordinator and the teachers together using internal evaluation methods (such as questionnaires on learner satisfaction, personal feedback from teachers and learners as well as a closing interactive evaluation training) (TrainTrainers/HU)

Several practice analyses provide evidence that evaluation, be it internal or external, was not just a pretence, but was used as a point of departure for making their offer better, more relevant and coherent.

Results of this feedback are used to learn about the interests and needs of the participants and to take them into consideration for the following seminars and other activities (NSHistory/DE)

At the end of the training the participants were given a questionnaire, asking them about the impressions they gathered about the programme. The questions encompassed general questions, organisational questions, questions on the topic and methods used during the training, effects and impact it produced (HRE/SL)

Mentors were asked to write a final evaluation according to a set of aspects in order to evaluate the entire project, and to reflect on their personal development and their perspectives for the future (CompDev/HU)

Educational staff

None of the analysed IRIs has only one single type of educational staff to work face-to-face with the addressees of the EDC-related offer. In all the studied cases courses, lectures, seminars and alike have been given by a variety of qualified people. In this respect IRIs addressed to EDC did not differ from other educational offers provided by the same organisations and institutions. The necessary competences combined with commitment were the most required virtues.

The staff involved in EDC had various employment statuses, e.g. part-time or full-time employees of a given IRI; experts on temporary contract or external consultants as well as a significant number of volunteers. However, access to full-time or even part-time employed staff was unevenly distributed among studied IRIs. Even if the majority of IRIs had own personnel, some of them had to rely almost only on volunteers (as was the case of Austrian IRI NonViolence).

Whatever the formal employment status of educational staff was, the majority of organisations and institutions required educational and professional expertise relevant for the particular IRI's content. In the case of formalised courses run by established institutions, for example the British IRI ComLead "the qualifications, recruitment and evaluation for the staff would be the same as for any university". All IRIs sought trainers, teachers and leaders also among specialists outside their own staff:

Teachers are recruited so that they represent diverse education backgrounds and qualifications (World/DK)

Different professional are invited to take part in the programme (YouthPart/ES)

28 teachers are involved in the project. They are specialists in the fields of psychology, computer science, job counselling. 21 of them are trainers and consultants, 4 are psychologists and 3 are team-building (motivation/integration) instructors (CyberHand/PL)

The common range of competencies for the whole team includes: Cooperation in the project group. Communication in the team, Planning the social projects, Public performances (NGOLeaders/PL)

... is informed about the reality in different countries and knowledge of the main topics: citizenship, asylum and migration laws (Agenda/ES)

Even if the educational offer provided by most of the IRIs was of non-formal character, the dominant feature among them was trust and belief in scholarly or occupational expertise:

Teachers and trainers were carefully chosen on the basis of their expertise and experience (HRE/SL)

The trainers need different qualifications and competences, which depend on the topic of the module – they have to be experts (NonViolence/AT)

For each seminar, additional experts are invited for lectures and discussions on the respective priority themes. Most of these experts also have practical experience in the field (ICC/AT)

This dominant attitude to hire external experts did not, however, prevent EDC providers from caring for their own educational staff. When necessary they were provided with in-service training to raise their competences and awareness.

As soon as they join the plan, the educators receive a workshop of internal training especially focussed on contents related to free software (Linux), work methodology, the personal abilities of the educator, knowledge of the territory, aspects related to the unification of discourse and the use of a single language (TechLit/ES)

Many IRIs prepared their own teaching/training materials. In doing so, they always relied on experiences accumulated throughout years. The same experiences led EDC providers to encourage their staff to work in goal-oriented teams.

Analysis

Structural aspects and level of implementation

One third of the IRIs was implemented at national level and two thirds at regional or local level, with more focus on the regional level (only two IRIs were implemented on a purely local level). This suggests a more regional focus of the IRIs which attracted the researchers, but it could be assumed that more local adult EDC activities are happening without being very visible and/or interesting for researchers. At the same time, it is interesting that regional and regional/local initiatives received more interest than national initiatives: this could imply that this in fact representative or that more effectiveness is hoped from or seen in regional/local initiatives.

Four IRIs (17%) were organised as part of a multilateral European project which demonstrates an interest for linking local, regional and national activities with those in other countries and for learning from and with each other across national borders. Nevertheless, one could also ask why this percentage is not higher. Reasons could be: lack of resources – in particular the available human resources are fully invested at local/regional/national level – and already at these levels human and financial resources are insufficient; lack of competence (linguistic, project development and project management) to develop and implement or participate in European level projects; lack of transnational contacts and networks.

Aims and contents

The general aim of IRIs shows a strong emphasis on participation (79% of IRIs) and empowerment (67%) while community development is only an aim for 54% of IRIs analysed.

The most frequently applied types of education¹⁰ in the practices analysed were human rights education (67% of the IRIs), community education (63%) and intercultural education (63% of the IRIs). Rather prominently represented was also education against racism (46%).

Approximately one third of the IRIs applied peace education, conflict resolution education and global education. Education for sustainable development (13%), environmental education (8%) feminism education (4%) and legal knowledge empowerment (4%) are reflected rather marginally in the IRIs analysed.

While the selected IRIs are not representative for adult EDC, this still could be interpreted as a focus on issues related to the multicultural dimension of European societies and of their implications. At the same time, it is surprising how little attention was given to environmental education and education for sustainable development – when climate change is ranking high on the political agenda. One reason could be that there are really few initiatives on environmental education. Another reason could be that environmental education is not considered by the researchers to be citizenship education at an equal level as, e.g., human rights education, thus influencing the choice of IRIs by filtering out environmental education projects. “Feminism education” and “legal knowledge empowerment” were not an option in the guidelines for the practices analysis and were introduced for two IRIs under “other types of education”, but is still remarkable how little gender issues and equal opportunities for women and men were addressed in the IRIs analysed. Similarly, the rate of 38% of the IRIs’ following the principle of gender mainstreaming is surprisingly small.

Methods used

As for the methods used, cognitive methods with information transfer as well as discussions and debates (applied in 96% respectively 92% of IRIs) are most prominent. This suggests a still rather formal approach taken in these mostly non-formal education activities. Application to real issues (71%) reflecting a practice oriented approach is also rather high ranking. Use of new media (50%), games/exercises (50%) and facilitation/mediation (46%) reflect a balance between “new” and “traditional” methods. While self-directed learning (38%) is on the lower end of the scale it is still remarkable since it represents a more recent shift from a directive to an autonomous approach. The relatively low rate of simulations (33%) could be explained by their (perceived) complexity and that they can be time-consuming, thus requiring a specific setting, timing and structure. The low rate for interactive learning (25%) is difficult to explain since interactive learning could be seen as an indicator for non-formal learning.

Further methods mention under “other methods” were project work (17%), forum theatre, role plays, excursions, field trips, study visits, literature studies and development of self awareness partly overlap with categories already mentioned and demonstrate the broad scope and diversity of methods which were applied – an indication for a non-formal education approach.

Interesting is the fact that only 63% of the IRIs were reported to be run in a democratic way: this demonstrates how difficult it is to “walk as you talk” – EDC not implemented in a democratic way is contradicting itself. But traditions of a top-down approach in education are obviously very strong and difficult to overcome – also in non-formal education. One can argue that non-formal education approaches imply democratic values – such as a participatory approach, learner-centeredness, symmetric teacher-learner relations, transparency etc. – thus suggesting an interrelation between non-formal education and democratic education. In view of this, the relatively low rate for IRIs run in a democratic way could be explained with a lack

¹⁰ It is assumed that all IRIs applied some aspect of general citizenship education. The specifications below refer to specific focuses beyond this.

of non-formal education competence of educators in adult education as well as a lack of acceptance and recognition of non-formal education approaches in adult education in general. In particular, it could also be that adult learners expect and more easily accept formal education approaches which they are accustomed with from their formal/school education experience.

Success factors

Promising are the results on what was considered to be success factors: highest ranking are target group (79%) and participant motivation (75%) which are closely linked and reflect a learner-centred approach – together with the learning context (63%), “needs addressed” (63%) and participants’ proximity with issues (58%). As relevant success factors were mentioned: type of activity, main theme (both 54%) and involvement of different actors (50%) which indicate a successful choice of content, form and structures. Surprising is the relatively low rating of methods/methodologies (46%), challenges encountered (38%) and community involvement (42%): this supports the critical view at methods used in a still partly traditional way and not fully coherent with the principles of non-formal education and EDC (see above). A fairly low rating of objectives as success factors (46%) is encouraging since it points towards the effectiveness of a learner-centred approach and of self-directed learning: the objectives laid out by the education providers are becoming less important (see also “needs addressed” and “participants’ proximity with issues”). In line with the relatively low rating of IRIs which were run in a democratic way is the success factor “democratic involvement of participants” (46%). Revealing is that for 38% of the IRIs “funding” was seen as a success factor: Firstly, it could indicate how unexpected adequate funding already is so it is considered to be a “success factor”. Then it could indicate the importance of adequate funding for successful educational activities. And finally, it could indicate that funding is maybe not necessary for success in non-formal education. Difficult to interpret is the rating for “level of participation” (25%): this seems to contradict the high rating given to “participant motivation” – but at a closer look it could be an indication for the weakness of the methods and methodologies applied: the motivation of participants could not be transformed into participation. Another interpretation is that the researchers and interviewees interpreted this as a question of participation in the IRIs in quantitative terms, meaning the educational activities/initiatives did not attract enough participants from the beginning: this would indicate the difficulties encountered with promoting EDC in general.

Financing of the activities

While it was relatively easy to retrieve information on the sources for financing the IRIs, it was not possible to retrieve accurate information on costs and how these costs were covered, in particular which amounts by which source. This is in line with the general difficulty to retrieve reliable data in the fields of adult education or non-formal education.

The majority of IRIs (83%) was financed from more than one source. The major funding sources for the 24 IRIs analysed were public sources at national level (54% of IRIs) and at European level (33% of IRIs, primarily from the European Commission). It seems, though, that those IRIs receiving financial support from the European Commission covered around two thirds or more of their costs through this contribution. Foundations contributed to 29% of the IRIs – in particular in the new EU member states – which indicates a special engagement of foundations in this area. Only 25% of IRIs mention participation fees as a source of income (only 8% depend primarily on participation fees), and also just 25% of IRIs mention local and regional public sources as sponsors. This is interesting since a large portion of IRIs is

organised at local or regional level – a symptom for the lack of financial resources at local/regional level for non-formal education purposes. Some IRIs report on volunteer work (13%) and using own financial resources (8%) as a means for supporting the respective activities. Only one IRI reports corporate funding (in a new member state) – which is probably not surprising and confirm assumptions.

Altogether, this emphasises that the major financial contribution to adult EDC comes from national and European sources – where also the main policies are established – but no conclusions can be drawn if these contributions are sufficient to meet the needs.

Conclusions

Based on their empirical research findings, Gibson and Duch came to the following conclusion:

Perhaps what we are observing here reflects an interactive effect of education. That is, education increases support for democratic values not directly but by imparting skills that allow one to consume information and understand the world, especially during periods of rapid political change (Gibson and Duch, 1993: 312).

References

- Council of Europe (2002) *Recommendation Rec (2002)12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on education for democratic citizenship*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=313139&BackColorInternet=9999CC&BackColorIntranet=FFBB55&BackColorLogged=FFAC75> (accessed 05.11.2007)
- Gibson, James L. & Duch, Raymond M. (1993). Political intolerance in the USSR. The distribution and etiology of mass opinion, *Comparative Political Studies*, 263(3), 286–330.
- Fennes, Helmut (2007) *Council of Europe policies on Education for Democratic Citizenship*. http://www.dpu.dk/everest/Publications//subsites/lllx2dedc/policy%20reports/20071029142622/currentversion/counci_%20of_europe_policies_on_edc_20071020_final.pdf (accessed 05.11.2007)
- Field, John (1995). Active citizenship, adult education: reflections from Poland. In Bron Jr, Michal & Malewski, Mieczyslaw (Eds.). *Adult education and democratic citizenship* (pp. 187-196). Wroclaw: Wroclaw Univ. Press.
- Thoresen, Victoria W. (Ed.) (2002). Developing consumer citizenship. Conference report. Hamar. http://fulltekst.bibsys.no/hihm/oppdragsrapport/2002/04/oppdrapp04_2002.pdf (accessed 10.08.2007)

Appendix A

Work package 3: Practices Guidelines for the selection of practices

To all the Partners,

You are asked to propose 3 to 5 interesting and relevant initiatives (IRI) which are worth and feasible to be studied as part of our project. While selecting IRIs in your country to be proposed for further studying we would like you to focus on the following:

- The organiser of an IRI might be an organisation/association or an individual institution (independent or a member of a broader/umbrella organisation). E.g., a nation-wide Association of Centres for Further/Adult Education might have no references to EDC in its policy statement/statutes or alike. Thus it is not an IRI organiser for our project. However, if a specific Centre which is a member/part of such an association does organise activities qualified (by us) as EDC, then it might be worth selecting.
- IRIs recommended by you should be typical but significant examples of EDC practices in your country; however we should bear in mind that we do not seek a representative sample.
- Please see that there will not be two IRIs representing the same or a similar type of activity: we are keen to have an as wide as possible range of practices; they should vary by:
 - Types of education: human rights education, education against racism, peace education, conflict resolution, global education, environment education, education for sustainable development, community education, intercultural education
 - Aims of education: empowerment, participation, community development
 - Processes: gender mainstreaming
 - Provider and scope – nation-wide organisations and/or local institutions, long and/or short term provisions/activities.
- Each selected IRI should be policy related and educational by its nature.
- If possible, your proposal should also include IRIs which are (part of) Grundtvig funded project.

We believe that while searching for EU-wide commonalities we must not leave aside *specifica loci* of respective partner-countries. Thus, you should not disregard IRIs which do not occur in other partner-countries, but which you see as important and relevant in your own.

In order to make a reasonable and coherent final selection from 27 to 45 IRIs from nine countries we would appreciate receiving from you the following info/data for each IRI you propose:

- The IRI's name in original and in English
- Its web-site and e-mail addresses (if applicable and relevant)
- Which category of EDC practices it belongs to

- A short description of the activity (education content/area, scope, target group, duration, basic elements and structure, type of organiser – 10 to 15 lines should be enough for each IRI)
- A short rationale for your choice.

Appendix B

Work package 3: Practices Guidelines for the practices analysis

Introduction

These guidelines are intended to provide a common framework for the practice analysis performed by the nine project partners in order to receive comparable data for the comparative study and synthesis report for all partners and countries involved. Some questions are kept quite open to be suited for the variety of IRIs to be analysed. Some questions asked and the data retrieved at national level might go beyond what will actually be used at the end, but this should help us to avoid as far as possible that at a later stage the need for additional information comes up.

Beyond what these guidelines explicitly ask for, it will be necessary to be alert for any observations and findings – expected or unexpected – which occur during the process of exploring the IRIs and to document them for the analysis.

Objectives

The practice analysis should be done in view of the respective research questions of the project:

General research question

How can adults develop competencies relevant for democratic citizenship in Europe?¹¹

Specific research questions related to the practice analysis:

- 1) What are the main elements in the internal practice related to the development of democratic citizenship in selected associations or institutions?
- 2) How will this project define effective practice in the development of democratic citizenship in Europe?
- 3) Which practice was effective in selected non-formal and informal settings¹² 2000-2005?

The challenge is to translate these research questions into the practice analysis. For example, we do not know yet the nature and types of “main elements” we are looking for (question 1) – we only have some assumptions about this. Such an element could be a specific pedagogical approach, methodology, method, teaching/learning setting and environment, structural/organisational aspect etc., but it could as well be something we only find during the practice analysis.

In view of this, the practice analysis should search for those features and elements which contribute to and support an effective development of the relevant competencies. Vice-versa,

¹¹ A more precise description of such competencies should result from the research review. For the time being, one has to improvise and could use classifications as summarised in the appendix.

¹² Non-formal education/learning is considered to take place in a continuum between formal and informal education/learning. Non-formal education/learning can also have formal elements but can as well have minimal structure, thus being close to informal education/learning.

it would be useful to point out those features and elements which have turned out to be useless or even negative or counterproductive – at least for a specific target group and/or given structural/organisational conditions.

Furthermore – although not specifically included in the research questions – the relation between research, policy and practice should be explored, in particular in which way practice is based on research and policy.”

Methods and minimum standards

The practice analysis should be based on the following sources:

- Texts/documents provided by the organiser (printed or on websites), such as promotional material of the IRI, “curricula”¹³/programmes, activity schedules, handouts for participants, reports/documentations, internal and external evaluations. Obviously, the type, quality and volume of texts/documents will be diverse for the different IRIs, depending on their resources and how established they are.
- Interviews with key actors and stakeholders – at least with a representative of the organiser(s), a representative of the institution contracting the organiser (if applicable) and a “teacher”/“trainer”¹⁴. Interviews with participants would be very valuable but are probably too time-consuming and, therefore, optional.

The purpose of the interviews is:

- To retrieve information additional and complementary to the written documents;
- To clarify written information;
- To explore what is not provided in the written information;
- To explore how the IRI actually works in all its aspects, in particular concerning “soft” aspects such as relationships between the different actors, group dynamics etc.;
- To explore possible inconsistencies between the written information and the actual implementation of the activity.

¹³ „Curricula“ is set under quotation marks to indicate the broad scope within which the term is used, going beyond the notion it has in formal education. In this sense, a curriculum is considered to be a structured programme organising educational processes. Such a programme includes aims, principles, methodology etc. While for many non-formal education activities there might not be an explicit, complete and coherent curriculum/programme, there still could be an implicit, fragmented and/or very basic curriculum/programme which is not labelled or recognised as such.

¹⁴ If applicable: An IRI could also be a self-organised initiative without a teacher/trainer or a person taking the respective role. „Teacher“ and „trainer“ are also set under quotation marks because the person(s) taking the role of a teacher/trainer might not be perceived or labelled as such and could well take more the role of a facilitator or of a plain organiser of the learning environment.

Practice Analysis

1. Stakeholders/structural framework

1.1 Who are the major stakeholders¹⁵ of the activity/IRI?

- Who is/was the initiator of the activity/IRI?
- Who is the direct organiser of the activity/IRI?
- Are the organisers running the activity on their own initiative or as part of a larger initiative or are they contracted by another organisation/institution? If the latter, by whom?
- How is the activity financed? Who is financing the activity (including percentages of sources)?

1.2 Each major stakeholder(s) should be described with respect to the following aspects:

The stakeholder is

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> an individual | <input type="checkbox"/> an informal group | <input type="checkbox"/> an organisation/institution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> governmental | <input type="checkbox"/> non-governmental | <input type="checkbox"/> other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> non-profit | <input type="checkbox"/> profit oriented | <input type="checkbox"/> other: _____ |

The stakeholder is organised/registered at

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> local | <input type="checkbox"/> regional | <input type="checkbox"/> national | <input type="checkbox"/> European level |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|

The organisation is active at

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> local | <input type="checkbox"/> regional | <input type="checkbox"/> national | <input type="checkbox"/> European level |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|

If applicable, the following should be explored and documented (primarily based on written information if available, otherwise through interviews):

- mission, aims, values
- programme and activities
- members, partners, memberships in other organisations
- basic structure – governing structure, secretariat

¹⁵ A stakeholder is a person, organisation or institution that has a legitimate interest (or “stake”) in a project or entity. In the case of IRIs, major stakeholders could be the initiators, the organisers, a contractor, the sponsors, the government, a municipality, an informal group that runs the initiative etc. According to the very broad definition, teachers/trainers and learners are also stakeholders but should not be described under this point, but under point 2.1

2. The Activity/IRI

The description of the activity/IRI should differentiate under each heading between

- Information/data based on written material
- Information/data based on interviews
- Observations and comments
- Conclusions of the authors

The list below provides a number of aspects, which can be used to describe a more structured educational activity for democratic citizenship, such as a training course etc. It is well possible that some aspects are not applicable for a specific IRI or cannot be fully addressed for other reasons. In this case, the practice analysis should focus on those aspects which are relevant for the IRI and for which sufficient information and data can be retrieved.

2.1 The activity/IRI should be described with respect to the following aspects:

- Rationale and context: What is the rationale for the activity? Why is the activity run/initiated by this organisation? What is the political, social, cultural, educational context?
- Aims and objectives of the activity, including learning objectives
- Target group(s)/learners/participants: age group(s), backgrounds, geographic spread etc.; number of learners/participants per activity
- Promotion/information: how is the activity promoted, towards which groups and through which channels?
- Access: is the access to the activity open or limited? If limited, by which criteria?
- Selection: Are participants selected? If yes, what are the selection criteria? How many participants per activity?
- Curriculum/programme: is there an explicit or implicit curriculum? If yes, how was it developed and by whom? Curriculum and sample activity programme to be attached)
- Main contents addressed in the activity (*probably a list to tick will be established following the selection of IRIs, with an option to add other contents*)
- Pedagogical approach, methodology, methods, didactic material (if applicable)
- Products (if applicable): e.g. publications, handbooks, manuals etc.
- Evaluation: internal and/or external? Regular/standard or occasional? Evaluation methods?
- Reporting and documentation (if applicable): Reporting format? Regular/standard or occasional?
- Duration and timing (if applicable)
- Learning environment and setting: (physical) learning/meeting space, equipment available, residential/non-residential activities etc.
- Teachers/trainers (if applicable): How many per activity? What is the teacher/trainer – learner/participant ratio in an activity? How do they prepare for the activity? How do they evaluate and document their work?

2.2 Furthermore, the following aspects should be explored and documented:

- In case there is an activity cycle (e.g., a course for a certain period): Number of cycles/activities of the same type run by the organisation per year:
- Number of participants per year:
- Costs per participant
- Participation fee per person
- “Teachers”/”trainers”: how many per activity? What are their qualifications and required competences? How are they selected/recruited? How is their performance evaluated?
- Type of contract with “teachers”/”trainers”: employed, free-lance
- Payment of teachers/trainers: fee per day (gross); food and accommodation covered by organisers if applicable?
- Is the same or a similar activity run by other organisations? If yes, approximate number of organisations, activities and participants within the country?

3. Analysis

The following aspects should be analysed at national level:

- Is the activity based on a policy or policies at local, regional, national or European level? If yes, which?
- The curriculum: Is it implicit or explicit? Is it coherent, complete or fragmented? What are the underlying values? What are the pedagogical approach, methodology and methods? Are they coherent with the content? What are the roles of the learners and teachers? What kind of relationship between learners and teachers does it imply?
- How is the activity (implicitly or explicitly) related to the concept and/or strategy for Lifelong Learning?
- Which concept(s) of democratic citizenship is/are (implicitly or explicitly) underlying/used in the activity?
- The implementation: Is the participants profile meeting the profile of the anticipated target group? To which degree are the aims and (learning) objectives achieved? Is the implementation coherent with the curriculum? What is the actual relation between learners and teachers? What is the relationship among the teachers and among the participants?
- What is the output/result? Do the participants actually acquire competences for democratic citizenship?¹⁶ Which specific competences are acquired? How are they demonstrated?¹⁷

¹⁶ See footnote 11

¹⁷ These questions might be difficult to answer. They would require a proper assessment of the learning outcomes of the IRI/activity, which most likely was not done. And it would be too time-consuming to be done within our project. We probably have to limit our analysis to intended outputs, to subjective impressions of the teachers/trainers or – if it has been done – to a self-assessment of participants/learners.

- How is the activity embedded in the socio-political environment? Does it relate to other relevant activities in the field? Does it make use of potential synergies?
- How is the activity/IRI funded? Are there special funding sources for this type of activity?
- Any other observations/comments (e.g., personal impressions from interviews, observations which stress the respective IRI's uniqueness and/or typicality, etc.)

Appendix

Competencies relevant for democratic citizenship

Until the research review has provided more precise descriptions of such competencies, the following classifications of competencies in connection with EDC, which have been developed by Veldhuis (1997) and Audigier (2000), could be used:

- Political: knowledge of the political system, democratic attitude, participatory skills
- Social: knowledge of social relations in society and social skills
- Cultural: knowledge of the cultural heritage, of history, basic skills (language competence, reading and writing)
- Economical: vocational training, economic skills (for job-related and other economic activities)

Source: Veldhuis, R. (1997) *Education for Democratic Citizenship: dimensions of citizenship, core competences, variables and international activities*. Strasbourg, Council of Europe

- Cognitive competences: competences of a legal and political nature, knowledge of the present world, competences of a procedural nature, knowledge of the principles and values of human rights and democratic citizenship
- Ethical competences and value choices
- Capacities for action
- Capacity to live with others
- Capacity to resolve conflicts in accordance with the principles of democratic law
- Capacity to take part in public debate

Source: Audigier, F. (2000) *Basic Concepts and core competencies for education for democratic citizenship*. Strasbourg, Council of Europe. DGIV/EDU/CIT (2000) 23

Further information can be found in the "Draft common guidelines for Education for Democratic Citizenship" in the appendix of the "Resolution on Results and conclusions of the completed projects in the 1997-2000 medium-term programme" on the Project "Education for Democratic Citizenship" of the Council of Europe, adopted at the 20th Session of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education of the Council of Europe, Cracow, Poland, 15-17 October 2000, DGIV/EDU/CIT (2000) 40

(http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/Source/Pdf/Documents/2000_40_CracowResolution_En.pdf; accessed 14 July 2006)

Appendix C

Summaries of adult EDC practices analysed

[To be inserted]

Appendix D

The Council of Europe key policy related to EDC¹⁸

The key policy related to EDC of the Council of Europe is reflected in the *Recommendation Rec (2002)12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on education for democratic citizenship*, adopted in 2002.

This recommendation provides an extensive and broad conceptual framework for formal and non-formal EDC in a lifelong and life-wide learning context, including guidelines for EDC policies and reforms, educational objectives and contents for democratic citizenship, methods of EDC, initial and further training for teachers and trainers, and the role of media and the information technologies. Details of recommendation 2002(12) are:

...

Context, concept and aims of EDC

The recommendation defines EDC as a rich and broad concept:

- promoting a free, tolerant and just society
- defending the values and principles of freedom, pluralism, human rights and the rule of law;
- embracing formal, non-formal and informal education;
- placing EDC at the heart of educational reform and implementation of educational policies;
- recognising EDC as a factor for social cohesion, mutual understanding, intercultural and inter-religious dialogue, and solidarity, as well as promoting equality between men and women, peace and a democratic society.

Proposed principles of EDC policies

EDC policies of Council of Europe member states should

- be considered from the angle of lifelong education;
- take into account all components and levels of educational systems as well as all instruments, institutions and organisations of non-formal education;
- take into account opportunities for informal contribution to EDC from other institutions, structures, groups etc.;
- involve all kinds of actors;
- ensure that research and evaluation facilities are available

Objectives and content of EDC

Educational objectives and contents should:

- cover specific disciplines and varied cross-curricular fields of learning and might involve civic, political and human rights education;
- combine the acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes, giving priority to those reflecting the fundamental values of the Council of Europe, notably human rights and the rule of law;

¹⁸ Excerpt from Fennes, H. (2007) *Council of Europe Policies on Education for Democratic Citizenship*

- pay particular attention to the acquisition of the attitudes necessary for life in multicultural societies;
- implement educational approaches and teaching methods which aim at learning to live together in a democratic society, and at combating aggressive nationalism, racism and intolerance and eliminate violence and extremist thinking and behaviour.

Competences to be acquired through EDC

Key competences to be acquired include the ability to:

- settle conflicts in a non-violent manner;
- argue in defence of one's viewpoint;
- listen to, understand and interpret other people's arguments;
- recognise and accept differences;
- make choices, consider alternatives and subject them to ethical analysis;
- shoulder shared responsibilities;
- establish constructive, non-aggressive relations with others;
- develop a critical approach to information, thought patterns and philosophical, religious, social, political and cultural concepts, at the same time remaining committed to fundamental values and principles of the Council of Europe.

Methodology and methods for EDC

With respect to methods of EDC, the acquisition of these competences should be encouraged through:

- active participation of all actors in a democratic management of the learning place;
- democratic ethos in educational methods and relationships;
- learner-centred methods, including project pedagogy;
- the promotion of research, personal study and initiative;
- an educational approach combining theory and practice;
- involving learners in the individual and collective assessment of their learning;
- bringing formal, non-formal and informal education closer together;
- encouraging exchanges, meetings and partnerships between pupils, students and teachers from different schools.

Training for teachers and trainers

Initial and further training for teachers and trainers should be developed in order to acquire the following:

- an understanding of the political, legal, social and cultural dimensions of citizenship;
- the above-mentioned key competencies;
- the ability to work in an interdisciplinary environment and on educational teams;
- a command of project and intercultural pedagogy and of evaluation methods specifically related to education for democratic citizenship;
- the ability to establish the necessary relations with the educational institute's social environment;
- an awareness of the need for in-service training.