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Foreword

By Anders Stenumgaard Lind, project manager, Denmark

We have chosen to give the educational approach that we use, and describe in this book a name: We call it PERIOD. PERIOD stands for Process-orientated, Educational, Relation-based, Individual-Oriented Development.

There has always been, and probably always will be, an ongoing debate among educators, teachers, and politicians, regarding the possibilities to motivate disadvantaged youngsters to take charge of their lives and educational situations.

The Anholt Project Part II.
There are many talented young people in Europe aged 15 to 18 who ‘don’t fit in’, or who do not know what they want to do with their lives. They are stuck. Stuck between life and education, and fearful for their futures. Many are simply tired of going to school; tired of being measured against standards they cannot meet, for various personal, social or cultural reasons. These youngsters are often marginalized, as they are removed from the ’standard’ educational system, and ‘put on hold’ in various programmes that are meant to
motivate them to return to the formal educational system. Some return, but many do not. They give up.

In Denmark alone there are 80,000 youngsters who have not completed a basic education (12 years of school). Many of these 80,000 Danish youngsters will probably never finish their educations. But does this mean that these youngsters do not possess skills and qualities beneficial to our society? The answer to this question is of course that they do.

In many European countries, there is a strong awareness of this situation, and many steps have been already taken to address it. Many projects or alternative schools and educational offers are designed to meet this target group. But how effective are they? Do these alternative forms of schools remember to address the individual situation in which the individual youngster is caught? Can they? This also raises the question, ‘Is it possible, in a formal system of education, over a rather short period of time, to work individually with young people, to enable the young people themselves to regain their inner motivation and self-esteem, to take back control of their life situations?’

The team behind the Anholt Project believes that this is possible. And, it does not have to cost much. With the right setting/environment, and the appropriate educational approach, we believe that it is possible to help young people to motivate themselves to make changes in their lives and begin to take control. We also believe that it is possible to make a significant change within 14 days.
With the right environment, and the appropriate educational approach, we believe that it is possible to help young people to motivate themselves to make changes in their lives and begin to take control. We also believe that it is possible to make a significant change within 14 days.
In this book, we describe the informal project called ‘The Anholt Project Part II’, and attempt to prove that formal, informal, and intercultural learning may support and benefit one another in a very powerful way, to improve learning environments, especially those focused on disadvantaged youngsters, who have had a difficult time at school. It is well known that you cannot learn at school, or anywhere else, if you are not motivated to learn.

The key question, and our motivation for this project is, ‘Can we create a pedagogical approach and framework that, over a short and concentrated time frame can motivate disadvantaged youngsters to acquire motivation and take responsibility for their own learning?’

In order to develop a valid approach to the project, we set out to document and validate the individual, informal, and intercultural learning that took place during the Anholt Project Part II.

We collaborated with Aarhus University (Denmark) and Käntern Fach-Hochschule (Austria), who created the research design for this project. This collaboration yielded a scientific report on informal and intercultural learning, the book you are reading, and a documentary movie. You may download the English language research report on the project at [www.learning-competence.eu](http://www.learning-competence.eu) or at [www.ungsyddjurs.dk/udvekslinger](http://www.ungsyddjurs.dk/udvekslinger)

I wish you could have seen the change in the faces of the youngsters who participated in the Anholt Project, as, over the course of the project, they started to open up, and slowly began to believe that
they were actually doing well. You may actually see them all in the documentary movie that was made during the project. It is called ANHOLT – the movie, and will be available on YouTube in September 2014.
Finally, I want to thank all the lovely people who participated in this project. You all put so much heart, passion, and time into making this project happen, because you believed that it is possible to make a change. You were all a part of giving these youngsters a lifetime adventure that they will never forget.

Thanks to the people who were in this from the beginning, developing the idea from scratch at the almost-famous lunch break in La Palma: Ansgar, Toni, Arthur and Altino;
To Malene, Lauritz, Helene, and all the people on Anholt who took us in, helped out, and believed in the project; we could not have done this without you;
To Karen and Hubert for keeping track of the research design and handling all the data, and for believing in the project;
To James, Mark, Alex, and Josh for saying Yes to the huge task of making ANHOLT - the movie;
To Jette and Melissa at our national office for Youth in Action, thanks for your support and expertise 24/7;
Finally, thanks to Mads and Natasja from Syddjurs Ungdomsskole, for all your help before, during and after the project.
To those of you who are not mentioned by name, also a big thank you.

I hope you enjoy the content
The Educational Framework - PERIOD

By Anders Stenumgaard Lind, Denmark, project manager

In an endeavour such as The Anholt Project, to be described further in this book, it is crucial that the teachers, mentors, or educators who are responsible for guidance and direction share an understanding of what is going to happen, and how, in all aspects of the project. This sounds very fundamental – but it is actually not that straightforward.

One of the most important conditions of the Anholt project was the finding that it is very difficult to keep a managing team of twelve together, on track, for 14 days, sticking to the original project plan the entire time. It was actually a greater challenge for the managing team than for the participants in the project.

Here are some guidelines for the suitable conditions for a project such as this:

- The **location of the project is very important**. It must take place in an isolated and safe place. It could be done in a small community, a village, on an island, or even at a community school. Wherever you choose to do the project, the local community must be ready to let the youngsters into their everyday lives. Try to arrive at the project setting/new environment in an unconventional way, for example, by boat, canoe, horses, hiking, or bicycle, to mark the change in environment. Give the youngsters the sense of stepping into adventures.
PERIOD Guidelines for youngsters:

- Location of project important
- No communication with outside world
- Brief introduction about educational approach
- Youngsters must solve own problems
- Provide activity-related equipment
- Offer optional activities and work-shops
- Daily individual mentoring of youngsters
During the project, the youngsters must agree to have **no communication with the outside world**, their parents, friends, and so on, for the duration of the project, unless they can find and use a traditional telephone booth. This is done by signing a contract before leaving for the project, and is a very important part of signing up for the project. In order to fulfil this contract, the youngsters agree to not to bring or use mobile phones, the internet, TV, or use any other media for the whole project period. Some will state that it is impossible to get youngsters to do this. However, this was relatively easy, and not being distracted all the time by mobile phones, Facebook, the internet and so on, was one of the things that they enjoyed the most during the project.

On arrival at the project site, **the youngsters get a brief introduction to everyday life in their new setting/environment**. They are provided with accommodation (for this project, 6 tents for 24 persons; could also be cabins, rooms, etc.), they are provided with money for food for the entire project period, a specific amount per person per day, and information about where they may buy it. They are not told to form groups; that is a part of the process. Utensils for cooking are provided. They are also informed that from that point on, they must cook, clean, and organize the camp themselves. NO structure is given to the everyday life they organize during the whole project period. The youngsters need to organize their everyday lives with no assistance from the counsellors, including arranging the camp site, determining sleeping arrangements, doing their own cooking and shopping, doing all the
cleaning (campsite, bathrooms, kitchen and toilets), being totally free to choose their own level of activities.

- **Some activity-related equipment is provided** and presented to the group on arrival, according to the chosen setting. This could be wetsuits, fishing rods, various board games, balls, and so on. Everybody in this project was also given a bicycle as mean of transportation on the island.

- **Exploration of the local area is left to the youngsters** themselves, for example to go on adventure to see, explore, and find nice things, scenery in the new environment on their own initiative.

- **The group of youngsters would have to solve any problems** that might occur within the group, (violence or abusive language would not be tolerated, and counsellors are allowed to step in if such occur). But counsellors would not interfere in everyday problems unless it was strictly necessary.

- During the project, **optional activities and workshops are offered** to the group, such as day to day training by local businesses and institutions, and tourist attractions are offered to the youngsters. However, the youngsters are NOT obliged to make use of these offers. They go ONLY if they want to, and are MOTIVATED to, on their own initiative.

- **Daily and individual mentoring of the youngsters** is crucial. Every morning and evening, personal reflections are heard, and interviews are held with the youngsters, in order to capture the ‘feel’ of the
day, and whether any learning situations have taken place during the day. The interviews and the daily reflections are also vital for coaching the youngster to describe his/her progress in the project, and reflect on his or her actions during the day, both positive and the negative, in order to build on the small successes and challenges of the day. The counsellors must have comprehensive personal/individual knowledge of/relationships with the youngsters that they are bringing to the project. THIS is crucial.
Preparation of the managing and counselling team

If you are going to set out to do a project like this, it’s crucial for the managing and counselling team to spend a lot of time preparing the pedagogical framework for the project, BUT it’s very important that the preparation of the managing and counselling team also include discussions, and in particular, agreement with the following.

- **Agreement on risk assessment** – what can happen – for example, creation of worst case scenarios, and what to do if worst case scenarios happen? How do we make sure that we all stick to the rules we agreed to, if a worst case scenario actually happens? No two groups of youngsters will interact in the same way. Therefore, it is really important to spend a lot of time talking about what can happen, and how to deal with various situations, that may arise when you give the floor to a group of youngsters aged 15 to 18 for 2 weeks. I am not saying that something will actually happen, but it’s a good idea to discuss and agree upon various issues, for example, common agreement on camp rules (regarding drugs, alcohol, sex, sleeping quarters, etc.)

- **Pedagogical rules – agreement to not interfere**, or help the youngsters, because we are always used to doing so, when they ask.

- Common agreement on **active participation from the counselling and managing team** during the entire project. The choice of partners for the project is crucial. The educational framework requires an extremely high level of shared responsibility on the part of the managing and counselling team, in terms of sticking to the
guidelines for preparation, choosing the target group, involvement throughout the entire project period. You need the ability to create an open-minded and honest platform for constant reflection among the managing and counselling team.

As mentioned in the foreword we have chosen to give the educational approach that we use in this project the name PERIOD - Process-orientated, Educational, Relation-based, Individual-Oriented Development. It describes the keywords and components that we believe are the main pillars of the Anholt project, and that sum up terms such as ‘empowerment’ and ‘self-motivation’.
PERIOD Guidelines
for
managing and counselling team:

- Agreement on risk assessment
- Educational approach: agreement to NOT interfere
- Active participation from the entire team
As a member of the original group behind the ‘informal is normal’ idea, I wish to make some comments regarding project development since 2008. After the Anholt exchange of 2011, I attended several seminars and meetings, where I presented the essentials of our project. The reactions often varied. For example, some reacted with: ‘Ok this is nice, but without the formal learning system we would be nowhere’. Others tried to laugh about it: ‘Yes I know this, in the past we called it: Collective hanging about!’ Most educators often responded with: ‘Respect! I would never keep myself so much in the background. Somehow, your concept is a general criticism of our non-formal education system...You need a lot of trust in your participants and partners’.

All these examples suggested that our idea of changing the world of learning by giving the power back to the learner is still very fragile. Although self-determination and self-motivation are seen as the basis of a sustainable education, more and more kids become bored with school. For us, informal knowledge is street knowledge. If you acquire it in its pure sense, everyone can participate, and in an atmosphere free of stress, we can be teachers and learners at the same time. So, how can it be that 70% of what we learn is learned informally, and still, nobody is paying attention to this?
The main work of our project involves building a non-formal framework in which informal learning may occur. This is the key point of our educational approach. Not everybody needs to learn the same things in a group of people of the same age, and within a fixed time frame. As a 14-year-old Anholt 2011 participant said: ‘I would give the pupils a lot more freedom, in hopes of their learning more, feeling more comfortable, possibly getting some other result than I did, because I didn’t have any freedom at school. I just want to give the kids the freedom they need to do good work!’
Introduction to ‘Anholt 2013 – Part II’

by Karen Bjerg Petersen, Denmark

The project titled ‘Anholt 2013 – Part II’ was implemented on the Danish island of Anholt in the summer of 2013. The project was a European exchange project for young people, which was sponsored by the EU programme, ‘Youth in Action’.

Behind the implementation of ‘Anholt 2013’ are youth organizations from six European countries, with South Djurs Youth School, Denmark as the leading organization. Also participating were youth organizations from Italy (Vicolocorto in the town of Pesaro), Spain (Centre d'Estudis de l'Esplai in Palma de Mallorca), Portugal (City Council - Youth House, located in Grande Porto), Austria (Verein Sozialmanagement Steiermark), and Germany (Naturfreundejugend Erfurt, Verein zur Förderung der Natur Freund Jugend Erfurt eV).

The primary intention of the project was to create conditions for informal learning processes in specific natural settings, such as the island of Anholt offers. A second intention was to ‘document and evaluate the influence of informal learning - looking (...) across cultural and social backgrounds’ (Project description 2012).

The project aim is formulated as follows in the project description:

**General aim of the project:**
To create an informal process through the participants’ creation of and participation in a micro-society in an adventurous and protected natural environment, to attempt to document and evaluate the impact of informal learning processes across various cultures and individual social backgrounds.
‘Anholt 2013’

‘Anholt 2013’ took place on the Danish island of Anholt, as a fourteen-day project for adolescents. This period consisted of the arrival at South Djurs Youth school on the 26th of July, the departure to Anholt on the 27th of July, the stay on Anholt from the 28th of July to the 8th of August (12 days), the departure from Anholt on the 9th of August, and the return to home countries after a trip to Tivoli and the arrival in Aarhus same day.

A total of twenty-four young people participated in the project. Four of the young people came from Germany (two girls and two boys), three from Italy (two boys and one girl), four from Spain (two boys and two girls), four from Austria (two boys and two girls), four from Portugal (two boys and two girls), and five from Denmark (three boys and two girls). Thus, the gender distribution among the young people was eleven girls and thirteen boys. The participants were aged thirteen to nineteen years. Some of the young people faced academic problems or other problems, such as substance abuse, or were 2G young people, ethnic youth, foster children, or school-leavers.

Two educators/leaders from each of the six European countries participated. From Denmark furthermore, the head of the youth school participated.

One resident from Anholt was also permanently attached to the project; throughout the project, she was responsible for organizing activities and contacts, on Anholt. She was also the contact person with respect to arranging the free of choice internship opportunities.
arranged for the young people in shops, inns, cafes and other places on Anholt during the project.

A British film crew (four men) was also present, making a documentary about the project as part of the project documentation.

Finally, three students and a researcher from the Department of Education, Aarhus University, Denmark participated in the Anholt project.

A total of twenty-one adults were permanently attached in various ways to the process and project, and the researchers and other adults participated for various periods throughout the process.
The practical implementation and activities of ‘Anholt 2013’

Similar to the preceding project, ‘Anholt 2013’ created both opportunities and structure for the 24 young people, in terms of providing the opportunity to voluntarily and electively participate in various more or less ‘adventurous’ leisure volunteer activities, as mentioned in the project description. The recreational activities in which the young people could participate during ‘Anholt 2013’ are listed in the figure below.

Activities if the young people wanted

- Guided historical city tour
- 20 km hike to the lighthouse
- Gospel workshop and concert
- Creative workshops 24/7
- Driving hay for the peasant
- Jam workshop
- Spear fishing
- Dinghy sailing
- BBQ evening for local
The young people also had the opportunity to work and acquire **work experience/internships** in various positions on the island of Anholt. The internship opportunities were made available to young people, as set out below:

Following the educational thinking driving the project, it was up to the young people themselves whether they participated in extracurricular activities and internships. However, they were required to cook and take care of their basic daily living tasks.
History and intentions of ‘Anholt 2013’

The basic idea behind ‘Anholt 2013 - Part II’ was originally articulated in 2008, and has since been developed and tested by some of the partners over a longer period. A pilot project was conducted in Germany in autumn 2010, in which the educational ideas were tested on one day during a week-long course.

In the summer of 2011, the educational ideas were tested in a project which was also carried out on Anholt, but this time over a nine-day period. This first Anholt project (henceforth, ‘Anholt 2011’) has been described in a book, a research report and, on a website (see Schroeder/Stenumgaard Lind et al. 2012; Höllmüller et al. 2011, and the website, Anholt 2011 www.learning-competence.eu/).

The description of ‘Anholt 2013’ addresses this as follows:

What if we could do a follow-up project to the Anholt project of 2011, based on the results from the 2011 Anholt Project, and still with the aim of improving the existing research in the field of informal and non-formal learning methods and tools, pedagogy, and anthropological and social pedagogy fieldwork? What if our follow-up project could bring us closer to valid documentation of the values and importance of the learning methods we explore in the project? (Project description 2012).
The purpose of repeating the project in roughly the same form as in 2011 was to further document and identify possible informal and intercultural learning among the young people involved, given the project's specific educational and methodological framework and approaches.

The EU ‘Youth in Action’ projects bring together young people from various European countries in exchange projects; therefore the research questions of ‘Anholt 2013’ were extended, since 2011. In addition to asking whether informal learning took place in the project, and in what ways, it was asked whether intercultural learning also occurred, and what kinds.

Research results and further documentation of informal and intercultural learning in the project ‘Anholt 2013 – Part II’ are described in a English and Danish research report (Petersen 2014, 2014a).

‘Anholt 2013’ is a direct sequel to the previous projects implemented under the same EU programme.
Preceding project: ‘Anholt 2011’

The book, *The Anholt Project - The informal island adventure that makes young people grow*, describes the background and educational considerations behind ‘Anholt 2011’, on which ‘Anholt 2013’ is also built. The history of the project is also disclosed. The project's thinking about 'informal learning' is emphasized as fundamental (See Schroeder/Stenumgaard Lind 2011).

As a result of ‘Anholt 2011’, the following was outlined: ‘the combined collected results of the observation charts, reflection charts, and daily questionnaires show that the Anholt project succeeded in making a considerable number of informal learning processes more visible’, so that ‘in quantitative terms, it may be said that a large number of specific informal learning moments were identified over the nine-day period on the island’ (Schroeder/Stenumgaard 2011: 44).

A conclusion of the 2011 project was that the pedagogical approach to self-determination and responsibility seem to have helped support informal learning processes: ‘the open setting and the self-determination approach of the Anholt project were important supports to the informal learning process’ (ibid). Finally, the ‘Anholt 2011’ study emphasizes that, the young people seemed to have been able to adapt to the open educational framework that was implemented, while the group of leaders had numerous discussions about how to implement the project idea (ibid p 51).
Educational approach in ‘Anholt 2013’

What if we could document the reason this method that we want to explore could be useful in the field of working with an informal/non-formal approach applying youth work towards motivating young people to take responsibility for their own need for education, and clarify the direction they would prefer when getting back into the more formal educational system? (Project description 2012)
The educational considerations

The educational considerations driving the project were developed over the years by five educational leaders, and – apart from discussions about informal learning – are based on the awareness that many young people in today's Europe leave the formal educational system. According to the developers of the educational ideas under discussion, the formal educational system is often not prepared for, or geared to at-risk young people. The experience of youth organizations is that the recently increased focus in primary and secondary schools, technical schools and other schools, on professional skills, tests, and exams, along with increasing student ratios per teacher, does not improve the situation of the group of young people who, in various ways, are disadvantaged, and therefore less likely to be able to keep up with the schools’ increasing demands for exam-sitting (See Schroeder/Stenumgaard Lind 2011: 6-7).

Based on thinking grounded in experience-based pedagogy, on situated and independent learning theories, ideas regarding young persons’ responsibility for their own learning, and the European approach to informal learning, in the past years the pedagogical leaders of this project set out to develop a specific educational concept that could accommodate and develop young people at risk, who have either left the formal education system or who, in various ways, have difficulties coping with and functioning in it.
The educational ideas are based on the concept that young people, especially vulnerable young people, instead of being faced partly with daily academic requirements, authorities, in a formal school context, and partly with constant media and information processing via social media, the Internet, mobile phones, need to be put in a particular context that is secluded, protected, and different from their everyday contexts. Moreover, the context must also establish a structural framework that requires them to organize their lives and activities, from cooking, to organizing their accommodation and housework, and to considering opportunities for participating in various recreational and work activities offered.

The educational hypothesis is that young people, if left to care for themselves and to organize their lives, are first confronted with a variety of novel situations, and second, must take responsibility for their own lives and actions.
The project constructed an informal and non-formal space around the young people for a period of about 2 weeks, where, in relatively safe but isolated settings, they managed all aspects of their lives without any adult assistance interfering in the young people’s ways of life and choices (despite an extensive presence of adults). The idea was conceived of and implemented as an opportunity for young people to engage in various informal learning processes.

A further assumption behind the pedagogical considerations was that, left to individually choose and self-organize, young people are capable of much more formal organization than adults expect of them. They are able to take responsibility for their own lives.
Did you change some of your thinking about others after “Anholt 2013”? What in particular - and why? Explain please..

I used to be much more confined around new people, but after Anholt, I have been much more open and talked to many different people.

I have never felt comfortable in a class room with many people. But I do now and I just started a new education. I then just decided to change education and work with people instead...

Response from one of the youngsters after ‘Anholt 2013’

Finally, the project organizers believed that some of the skills the young people acquired in the course of the project may to some degree be transferred to formal educational settings (e.g. Project description 2012 and documentation from ‘Anholt 2011’)

Quotation from interview with young boy after ‘Anholt 2013’
On informal and non-formal learning

The intent to create conditions for informal learning to take place among the young people through leisure activities and internship opportunities is crucial to the project. The project description for ‘Anholt 2013’ refers to the European Commission's official definition of ‘informal learning’.

The reference to UNESCO’s (1973) publication, referred to as ‘The Faure Commission Report’ is important (Simmons, 1973). Here, it is noted that about 70% of all learning processes are informal, and that informal learning has a great influence on formal learning processes (Project description 2012).

An interesting aspect of informal learning is that although it may be intentional, in most cases it is unintentional, incidental, random, or ad hoc’. Robinson’s (2010) ideas about ‘changing education paradigms’ were also significant to the project partners.

The concepts of formal, informal, and non-formal learning are described and defined in many different contexts. For example, the OECD defines ‘formal learning’ as organized, structured, and intentional learning, whereas ‘informal learning’ is seen as a contrast; as ‘never organized’ and ‘never intentional from the learner’s standpoint. Often, it is referred to as learning by experience or just as experience’. The concept of non-formal learning is often considered a mid-point between the two preceding
concepts. ‘Non-formal learning is rather organized, and may have a learning objective’ (see tdm.au.dk: 2013).

It is characteristic of informal learning that those involved often do not even realize that they are learning: ‘Formal learning refers to learning in educational institutions, which leads to a formal recognition of the training. Non-formal learning refers to learning that takes place outside the established educational institutions, and typically does not lead to an exam. Examples of these are learning in workplaces, communities, within organizations and groups.

Informal learning is about the learning that takes place in everyday life, which is not necessarily deliberately arranged for learning, and may not be perceived by participants as something that develops their knowledge and skills’ (Ministry of Education, 2013).
On informal intercultural learning

A key part of the EU programme, ‘Youth in Action’, addresses how young Europeans learn to know adolescents from other EU countries, through exchange programmes. This aspect of ‘Anholt 2013’ is addressed in the following way in the project description:

The youth exchange is designed to give participants the opportunity to live and to reflect upon their own experience of being an actor/observer in informal/non-formal learning among young people. The youth exchange is designed as a mutual learning situation, where participants can learn from one another and from their experiences during the youth exchange. Informal and non-formal learning methods will be the main feature of the youth exchange, with the respect to developing the intercultural competence of each participant. (Project description, 2012)

The British scientist Michael Byram’s work on intercultural competence and intercultural issues has been a source of inspiration for the research (Byram 1985, 1989, 2000).

What is intercultural competence?
‘Someone with some degree of intercultural competence is someone who is able to see relationships between different cultures – both internal and external to a society – and is able to mediate, that is interpret each in terms of the other, either for themselves or for other people’. (Byram 2000)
Research and data collection on ’Anholt 2013’

In extension of the first project of 2011, in the 2013 project, the partners wanted to avail themselves of the same data collection methods as in 2011 (see Höllmüller 2011). In the 2011 report, the focus was on quantitative studies of observed informal learning. In ‘Anholt 2013’ the aim was to extend the studies of informal learning, and to add investigations of intercultural learning among young people to the research design of the project. Therefore, in 2013 the research was supplemented by a research design, and qualitative research approaches such as fieldwork, in-depth personal interviews before, during, and after the project, and oral interviews on Anholt (see Petersen 2014, 2014a).

Comprehensive data was collected during ‘Anholt 2013’. The following five kinds of data collection were used:

1) Observation and reflection charts
2) Daily individual interviews with the young people
3) Three in-depth individual interviews with the young people, before, during, and after the project
4) Field notes and related reflections on fieldwork during the two weeks of the project, written up by three students from the University of Aarhus
5) Oral interviews with selected young people and leaders during the first and second weeks of the project

Ad 1) Observation and reflection charts
In total, 711 observation charts were completed by fifteen different people. The observation charts were completed partly by the educational leaders from each of the six participating countries, and partly by the three students. In total, 36 reflection charts were completed.

**Ad 2) Daily interviews with the young people**
The partners adopted the approach of conducting short daily interviews with the young people from the preceding ‘Anholt 2011’ project. Every evening, the educational leaders conducted interviews with the 24 young people in their native languages. In total, 312 daily interviews were conducted.

**Ad 3) Three in-depth individual interviews: before, during, and after ‘Anholt 2013’**
In the two weeks before, during the stay, and two to four weeks after the stay on Anholt, the educational leaders conducted three in-depth, personal interviews with the young participants (in their native languages). The 2nd personal interview was conducted during the period between days 5 and 9 on Anholt. In total, 72 personal interviews were conducted.

**Ad 4) Field notes and related reflections on fieldwork during the 2 weeks of the project**
As mentioned, anthropological fieldwork was carried out. This was conducted as daily field observations - including notes recording
reflections - by the 3 students from the Department of Education, who, throughout the process, followed the project, and wrote down their observations, reflections, and considerations. The reason for using qualitative observations was to observe and investigate lived experiences and situations in the field, in order to expand the information that could be observed via other data collection methods (Brinkmann & Tanggaard 2010).

**Ad 5) Oral interviews conducted by the researcher (author) with selected young people and group leaders.** The interviews were carried out in native languages (Danish, German) and in English. The interviews, conducted by the researcher, were recorded on a mobile phone, and subsequently written down.

After collecting the data, the data was processed, analyzed, coded and recoded in quantitative and qualitative data.

The quantitative data consists of three SPSS-processed data sets: 1) observation charts, 2) daily interviews, 3) personal interviews.

The qualitative data consists of the students’ field notes and reflection, responses, extracts and statements from the individual daily interviews, the three in-depth personal interviews, and the oral interviews.
Investigations in ‘Anholt 2013’ based on the key EU Youth Pass competences framework

In the data processing, in the encoding and categorization of the data, the 8 EU Youthpass Key Competences were taken into account (i.e. Communication in the mother tongue, Communication in foreign languages, Mathematical competence, and basic competence in science and technology, Digital competence, Learning to learn, Social and civic competences, Sense of initiative and entrepreneurship and, Cultural awareness and expression, see Youthpass Guide 2011 p 20).
However, an adjustment was made to the data collected for the specific purposes of this project. The use of Internet, mobile phones, and other electronic devices was not allowed during ‘Anholt 2013’. The study of the EU Youthpass categories, ‘Digital competence’ and ‘Mathematical competence, and basic competence in science and technology and basic competence in science and technology’ were hence omitted. In the research report ‘Anholt 2013’ (see Petersen 2014), in the statistical processing and analysis of data, the following seven variables have been investigated:

1. Communication in foreign languages: Respondent indicates having learned something new related to language, or in terms of improving language skills.
2. **Self knowledge**: Respondent indicates having undergone personal development, or having learned something new about him- or herself.

3. **Basic skills**: Respondent indicates having learned something with respect to everyday skills and the ability to fend for him- or herself, for example, cooking (also preparing dishes from other countries, and related activities), cleaning, housework.

4. **Other skills**: Respondent indicates having learned new skills (in addition to everyday skills), for example, surfing, sailing, photography, and a variety of job-related skills.

5. **Social and Civic competences**: Respondent indicates having developed with respect to social skills and behavior.

6. **Entrepreneurship and sense of initiative**: Respondent indicates being better to take initiative.

7. **Intercultural competences**: Respondent explicitly indicates having learned something about other cultures, and being able to navigate among different cultures (In the data, this category is separate from the Social and Civic competences, although the intercultural aspect was originally included in that category).
Summary of results from the investigations in the project ‘Anholt 2013’

Has something changed after Anholt 2013?

Yes, my way of thinking, my knowledge about other countries and cultures, I made new friends, and now I look to these youth exchanges programs in a completely different way, because I know how much they can change and affect a person’s life.
The studies carried out during ‘Anholt 2013’ and reported in the research report, based on five data collection methodologies, and quantitative and qualitative analyses of the data, indicate that both informal and intercultural learning occurred during the ‘Anholt 2013 – Part II’ project (see Petersen 2014, 2014a).

Both informal and intercultural learning have been identified and analysed occurring in the interaction among the young people in very different situations, especially in connection with the activities and internship opportunities made available to the young people, but also in everyday situations, and other situations in which young people stayed on the island of Anholt during this project.
Learning Category 1: Communication in foreign languages

In general, quantitative data analyses of observation charts and interviews, and the qualitative data, such as field notes and responses from the youngsters during the personal interviews, indicate that there was significant learning in the category of ‘communication in foreign languages’ in ‘Anholt 2013’.

From research report, 2014: Quantitative data analysis of learning category 1 (see Petersen 2014, p. 20)
Examining the qualitative data, including the students' field notes and the youngsters’ statements in the daily, personal, and oral interviews, the qualitative data confirm that, in fact, ‘communication in foreign languages’ took place on ‘Anholt 2013’.

**Portuguese girl in 3\textsuperscript{rd} personal interview:**
- I learned a new expression in Spanish that is: “si no te callas te voy a dar una ostia”.
- I learned basic phrases in Italian like: “Me chemo Ana e vivo in Portugalo”
- I learned some words in Danish but I can’t spell them.

**Language negotiation and collaboration:**
M. (Spain): “I don’t know what this is in English (Shows a tissue) but in Spanish it is ...”  
(Pronouncing in Spanish)  
A. (Portugal): “Arh, I think it is a kind of tissue”  
M. (Denmark): “Yeah, it is a wet tissue”  
M: “Arh”
Learning Category 2: Self knowledge

Both quantitative analyses and qualitative data, especially the personal interviews with the young people, reveal that many young people gained new knowledge about themselves, and also about themselves in various interpersonal relationships.

Both during and after ‘Anholt 2013’, a third of the young people stated that they had learned something new about themselves, and had undergone personal development.

Austrian boy:
It was new for me that the other young people from other countries were nice to me.

Spanish girl:
Before the program I thought I was going to be a quiet and shy girl. I stopped being shy and started to talk with most of them. That never happened to me, I never felt confident enough to talk with someone that I recently met, and talked about me or my favorite things and tastes.

Portuguese boy:
I also learned how to live in community, because it was a totally new experience to spend two weeks just with young people, making our own rules, and I learned a lot with that.

German girl:
the language, taking care of myself for two weeks

Italian boy:
I’ve learned a lot of things and for me [it] was [a] new life ...
Learning Category 3: Basic skills

While the young people stayed on the island of Anholt, approximately a quarter explicitly mentioned having learned basic skills such as cooking, cleaning, and other things.
Learning Category 4: Other skills

The young people indicated they had learnt new skills and explored new roles. Overall, the observation charts, field notes, and responses of the youths in the daily interviews indicated that there was significant learning within the category of ‘other skills’ in ‘Anholt 2013’.

What was the most exciting in ‘Anholt 2013’? Why?
Responses from 3rd Personal interview

Portuguese boy:
Building the pizza oven (...) because for me it was a really complicated thing, but, we did it, just with our own hands and work...

Danish boy:
To be with L. (local carpenter) and put roof paper on. I was surprised at the confidence I got. I was accepted, although I do not know him and even though I did not know what I was doing.

Austrian boy:
To work in the “Inn” Restaurant, to fish in the ocean for this poisons fish, wind surfing. Because I had contact to Danish strange people, because I learned windsurfing and because I could catch fish alone and crabs and mussels.

Portuguese girl:
Diving; sailing; riding bike

German girl:
the hiking trip through the desert - how we talked to each other, sometimes it wasnt nice

Italian girl:
Experiencing something new everyday in a friendly and cheerful context and being in the middle of a bright and quite nature. My daily life, on the contrary, sees days passying by one like the other and boring.

Spanish girl:
Being with people from other countries, visiting a different country and having to cook for 10 people. It was exciting because it was something new, and what is new is exciting.
Learning Category 5: Social and Civic skills

Overall, the quantitative analysis of observation charts and personal interviews, combined with the qualitative data, such as responses from the young people and field notes, indicate that there was significant learning in the ‘Social and civic competencies’ category of ‘Anholt 2013’.
Learning Category 6: Entrepreneurship and sense of initiative

Only the observers found that the youngsters showed a sense of initiative.

Learning Category 7: Intercultural skills

Overall, the quantitative and qualitative data, the observation charts, field notes, and responses from the young people in the interviews indicate that significant learning occurred in the learning category of ‘intercultural competence’ of ‘Anholt 2013’.
What is remarkable in a comparison of all the quantitative analyses of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} personal interviews, is that the category of ‘intercultural competence’ is the only one of the 7 learning categories examined, in which the 3\textsuperscript{rd} personal interview show an increase in the percentage of young people who indicated ‘yes’ to this question.

Much indicates that the learning category of ‘intercultural competence’, and the fact that the young people participating in ‘Anholt 2013’ learned about other cultures and were able to interact with others, left an especially lasting impression on the young participants.
Comments from partners
In the EU discourses on learning (in the German-speaking regions, a term with a wider meaning is frequently used instead: Bildung, ‘formation’), three forms of learning are clearly defined: formal, non-formal, and informal learning.

Universities, and also their ‘younger sisters’, Fachhochschulen, ‘Universities of applied sciences’, are related strictly to formal learning. ‘Formal’ means that the learning processes are institutional, set into forms that make them comparable and measureable. But once the form is set, it may be processed
independently from the content, and even without it. Therefore, the function of formal education is to produce graduates, not to develop learning processes (Luhmann). And, the didactical mainstream may be illustrated by the sentence, ‘Knowledge speaks for itself’. Teaching is then merely transferring knowledge, and it is up to the students to learn. Thus, the ‘form’ to make teaching formal are lectures and seminars. Learning does occur in the formal sector, but these processes are not linked by cause to the production of graduates. The more universities and Fachhochschulen see themselves as institutions, the more important are the institutional processes; learning however, cannot be institutional. So, we simply assume that learning happens, and we have the very strange idea that we may observe this learning by examination and testing. Heinz von Foerster turned the perspective around by saying: ‘Tests are testing tests’.

Knowledge speaks for itself....
What is also defined quite well in the EU discourses on learning is the term ‘competence’ as the main outcome of learning processes. ‘Competence’ in some definitions is considered the combination of knowledge, skills and attitudes. So, if universities want to teach skills, knowledge is only one third of it.

In a simplified way, the didactical mainstream of universities is transferring knowledge—we all know how sustainable that is. Other educational approaches exist: project-work, problem-based teaching, and so on. But until, now there has been no ‘turn’ towards any new mainstream educational approaches. From the point of view of the formal system, there is no need for a turn, as long as it provides graduates for society.

Internationalization in its simple form means that students and lecturers meet and learn from each other—by meeting. So, the physical presence and experience is the main learning context rather than a seminar in its traditional form, in which knowledge is transferred. Therefore, the main point is intercultural competence, which is the main feature of any internationalization; because only through intercultural competence can we understand the issues and problems of the countries with which we are dealing. So, understanding any conflict or issue differs from merely knowledge transferring.

The above mentioned definition of competence says: knowledge, skills, and attitude. We understand the concept of knowledge, but what do skills mean, in this context? We must learn how the people involved live, by taking part in their lives. So, we have to meet them,
and to share a little of their everyday lives, to get to know them. And what about attitude? We must have the inner readiness to understand the issues and problems of the people involved. We must be able to leave behind our prejudices, to be ready to learn something new.

Attitude is a private and personal dimension, but when it comes to professionalism, it becomes a public one, too.

Of course, meeting people from other countries has always some effect. But the point is to not only bring people – in the case of universities, students and lecturers – together. We must offer another framework, connected to the ideas of non-formal and informal learning.
The framework has a lot to do with the ideas of non-formal and informal learning. Of course it is also a matter of quality, as the aim is to develop competences.
About informal learning: Why stop thinking about the learning in informal contexts

By Laura Pierfelici, Italy

We all know of people who can barely read, but can fix a lawnmower with their eyes closed.

Have you ever considered why this could be possible?

There is an interesting theory, formulated in 1983 by H. Gardner, an American psychologist, which presumes the existence of a range of human intelligence, relative, independent human potential, possessed by every human. One form of intelligence is the capacity to solve problems, to create objects that are appreciated in one or more cultural contexts, and each form of intelligence may be shaped and combined by individuals in a variety of adaptable ways.

Everyone is intelligent in some way!

This belief is a sea change from the most influential approaches to the scientific study of intelligence, which asserts that everyone is born with a certain level of intelligence, often named Intelligence Quotient (IQ).
This way of thinking is very common, and is so much a part of us, that we typically classify people as ‘more brilliant than someone else’, ‘more intelligent than’, and so on.

IQ tests have been strongly criticized, particularly for their support of prejudices, especially against particular groups in the society: it is evident that different individuals (and different cultures) aim for different objectives in the development of their skills, and value different sorts of intelligence.

The individual differences make learning complex: they represent a challenge for each educational system, because there is no one best way to teach and to learn things, owing to the fact that there are multiple learning styles to consider.

De facto, the way our educational system is structured mainly applies what Gardner identified as Linguistic instruction and evaluation methodology, and a bit of the Logical-Mathematical approach.

The consequence is that our educational system considers many students failures, in terms of the Linguistic learning style.

Learning is becoming complex! What is the best way to structure it, to reach everyone?

Bruner, an American psychologist, strongly believes in his provocative affirmation that ‘it is possible to teach everything to everyone if we find an honest way to do it’.
This vision means that different students may be reached in different ways, and the expert is the one who can show his/her mastery in the field in multiple and adaptive ways. That reinforces the general objectives of education, which may now be focused on different methodologies, oriented to different learning styles.

More than 80 years ago, educational reformer John Dewey proclaimed the need for a radical change in the educational field, based on the need to reduce the distance between the school and the out-of-school school contexts.

He affirmed that the social environment is an educational setting according to the participation of the individual to social activities. Through the sharing in common activities, the individual get confident with the aim, the content and the methods and he get the necessary skills.

Today, attention is shifting from the classical educational approach, towards people gaining inspiration from radical critical discourse on education (I suggest you to read I. Illich’s ‘Deschooling the society’, 1973).
Learning is not only closely linked to school or university, but it is now recognized that people learn in everyday life, and in all the contexts, and may learn more and more often in alternative situations.

Let’s learn outside of school!

The redefinition of places and the timeframe for learning, which are not connected to a specific period of life, become the tools of the individual, who has the opportunity to plan and organize personalized and flexible learning paths that guarantee learning throughout life.

The characteristic of multiple, individual potential represents the great value of the individual, but at the same time, there is the risk of it remaining hidden, if it is not clearly recognized or valued, particularly because it is often acquired in different moments and
situations throughout life, which make it even harder to immediately recognize them.

The current focus of the European debate concerns the way in which learning is moving from educational systems towards the individual, being perceived as a recognized resource, and useful at social and institutional levels.

At the European level, the need to recognize and validate non-formal and informal learning has been taken into account by the European Strategy since 2000, through the ‘Lisbon European Strategy’, and it is reinforced today with new, political-institutional aims through ‘Europe 2020’, which clearly promotes the recognition of non-formal and informal learning.
The European policy supports the idea that the recognition of skills acquired through non-formal and informal learning may have a significant impact on active participation in society, because people may feel more engaged and competent, and therefore more inclined to serve society in a constructive way, but it might also increase motivation to pursue lifelong learning. Particularly, the results in the development of transversal skills (working in team, social skills, learning to live in a different country, etc.) could be transferred to work, supporting entry into the job market.

All the foregoing goals are crucial, especially for the socially or economically disadvantaged, the less-qualified, drop-outs, or people already out of the educational cycle.

The aim is to enable many more people, especially youngsters facing their first job placement or need (not learning or not working), and to reinforce the human resources (so-called ‘human capital’) represented by the skills not properly recognized until now, acquired in all the contexts of the life: work, daily life, free time, etc.

These results should clarify the importance and complementary character of informal learning and formal education, and the necessity of more recognition of non-formal learning.
Impressions from the fieldwork

By student fieldworkers:
Maria Bang, Tanja Damgaard Christiansen,
Stine Skovbjerg Hansen,
Department of Education, Arhus University, Denmark.

In psychology there have long been discussions about how we may theoretically connect the understanding of the individual to his or her social contexts. That people learn and develop through participation and social context seems to be a common starting point for many, but how can psychological methods generate knowledge about human life, taking into account this social nesting? (Our translation of Højholt and Kousholt, 2012: 77)

As mentioned in the foregoing quotation, there are many different methods and points of view in psychology. In this research project, mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative methods) were used. In our work as observers, we used the qualitative method of fieldwork. According to the Danish anthropologist Kirsten Hastrup (Hastrup 2010, p. 57), fieldwork is a research strategy in which you observe people in their settings. Often, the pivotal point is the understanding of social processes among people, but also between people and their environment. Furthermore, an important aspect is that the observer must be aware of his/her influence on the field, and the observations gathered. In other words, the goal is to try to understand human interactions
and experiences in social settings, rather than through statistical averages (Ibid.).

As observers, our work consisted of collecting information for the research on the project. Our observation focus was intercultural and informal learning. Inspired by professor Michael Byram’s (2000) theory of intercultural competences, our observations included detailed qualitative observations.

**Our job: to be a fly on the wall?**

Is it possible to be a fly on the wall? In other words, is it possible for the observer to be transparent, and not influence his or her own observations? To illustrate this issue, we present an example:

An observer opens the door to the gym, which makes a lot of noise. In response to the noise of the door, the youngsters turn, and look at the observer. The observer walks to a corner, and tries to observe the youngsters.

As seen in the example above, it may be difficult, if not impossible, to observe without interfering. The observer’s presence may influence the topics, the flow of conversations and, the youngsters’ behaviour. From our theoretically qualitative point of view and choice of fieldwork methods, continuous reflections about the observers’ role in fieldwork are necessary. Because of this, we generally tried to be aware of how much we interacted and talked with the youngsters. To secure a higher level of validity in our research, we
used the scientific approaches of investigator and methodological triangulation (Kruuse 2011). This means that we were multiple observers, and that we used more than one method in the fieldwork. An example of this is our daily reflection meetings, where we compared and discussed observations, or the situations where there was more than one observer present.

Throughout the project period, we noticed that different settings offered various opportunities for observations. Therefore we tried different techniques, for example, collecting information with or without a notebook, with a computer or iPad, at different times of the day, at night, and in different physical positions in the settings.

Considerations, reflections, and various attempts to observe are a natural part of fieldwork (Hastrup 2010).

**Ethical quandaries**

Reflections and attention to quandaries are important parts of any research project – often, these will be based on ethics. As a reflection tool, to start this process, it may be useful to utilize the Danish researcher of psychology and qualitative methods Brinkmann’s (2010) four guidelines: (1) informed consent, (2) confidentiality, (3) consistency, and (4) the role of the investigator.
Our focus has been on the micro ethics of the role of the investigator (guideline 4). Below, we exemplify some of the quandaries we met in the field.

Where is the point of balance between being among the youngsters as much as possible, and being able to observe without interacting or attracting any attention, for example, when the youngsters ask for help, and we are not supposed to give them an answer? And, where is the line between observation and supervision – when is the private sphere breached?

If the goal is to be as objective as possible, how does our existing knowledge affect our scientific work? How does our conception of vulnerable youngsters influence our observations? And, which role does our understanding of learning play? Information about the youngsters acquired during group meetings and from counsellors is another type of influence we experienced in the field. If the topic of a meeting is a sad youngster, how could this information affect our further observations of this particular youngster?

If the project, for ethical reasons, involves a midpoint evaluation of the observers’ influence on the youngsters’ daily lives, how could this be done? One way would be to ask the youngsters directly, during the daily interviews; another way might be to ask indirectly. By asking more directly, there is a risk of the youngster becoming unnecessarily aware of the observers and their work.
To sum up, the qualitative fieldwork had many facets and, this is just a small sample of possible aspects, reflections, and the quandaries of our part of the research project at Anholt.
‘It has become clear that an intervention like the ‘Anholt project 2013 - Part II’, giving young people responsibility and focusing on informal learning had a short-term positive effect, at least in the case of NN and XX.

NN is in a process in which he is about to do away with old habits and become more conscious of what other people think of him and how he appears. Although the intervention had a positive effect on him, from the analysis we could not conclude whether NN had a desire to be motivated to take responsibility for his own learning, which was the purpose of the intervention.

In relation to XX, after the project she has evolved in two ways. Firstly, she has become more open to trying new things, and secondly, she is generally more outgoing. The analysis showed, that informal learning in the ‘Anholt project 2013- Part II’ have influenced her motivation for education. Although XX before the project had an intention to start in a high school, the experiences of the intervention on Anholt gave her the courage and strength to change education and work with people.

In other words, a positive change in both NN’s and XX’s lives occurred.
Interview with the filmmaker

Whereas quantitative and qualitative research, data collection, and research reports are one way of presenting the ‘Anholt 2013’ project, another way of documenting the project was a film documentary, made by a British film crew. During ‘Anholt 2013’, the head of the film crew was interviewed about his impressions, and considerations when making a documentary. Some of his reflections are presented as follows.

**What do you think about ‘Anholt 2013’?**

‘It’s a lot to take in for sure. It’s been for me, five weeks on the road in some very different, fantastic, and amazing places. Meeting the young people, who we’ve been following for the film, and also their families. It’s been a very humbling experience, it’s been exciting, it has been challenging in many ways from a professional production position, but also from a logistical and organizational perspective....’

**What has been the most remarkable for you overall in the project?**

‘It’s been remarkable to me to see how six individual organizations or bodies of people have come together with only one real meeting, face-to-face – that was the advanced planning meeting in Denmark. In my mind this whole thing shouldn’t really work. It shouldn’t be an environment where amazing and interesting things can happen, because - maybe I am brought up in a culture, where everything is
ordered and has a certain way of doing things, - and if you give people too much freedom, then you have chaos. Well, I’ve never really agreed with that, and it’s been fantastic seeing these groups of people from different countries with different backgrounds and cultures come together and find some sort of consensus....

But if you look at the impact, that it’s made on the majority of these young people... I see smiles, I’ve heard amazing comments from all of the people I’ve interviewed, I’ve seen with my own eyes young people, who had some very challenging issues have developed in two weeks – it’s a short time - it might not change their lives, but it plants a seed and give them something to think about.

If one of those seeds start to grow later in their life – then this project has been very much a success... To get all that to work and to bring it all here and to do this for two weeks, it’s pretty remarkable.

**What about your own impact on the young people, while filming? How is your approach in filming?**

Well it is definitely a very important question... It’s something, I always consider, and something I considered from the start. My background is also stills photography, and one of my favorite photographers is James Nachtwey, he’s an American photographer. He has a very quiet and slow methodological way about approaching the subject. He embeds himself and lives and becomes a part of the environment, and then is able to start telling stories and capturing images with complete respect for his subjects, and
with a mutual respect about back to him and his work. And I always liked that approach.

Still photography is my background in some respects, but my approach to this project was more like a still photographer, rather than a TV news crew for example.

But there is a danger with that of being sucked in too much, but it’s finding that balance, that’s something that over the course of this project I think the crew has been able to do too...

... We start slowly introducing the camera... We then slowly work up to capturing/filming what would be called ‘uncontrolled action’. We didn’t shoot too much film the first two days when we first met of three protagonists, we kept our filming quite local...
So that was a challenge to come to Anholt, where we had to start filming right away – we tried our best, not to single out the three young people we are following, trying to introduce the camera gently to some of the others... they weren’t used to us.

Over the course of the project we approached, spoke to and interviewed lots of different young people, and they’ve been very accommodating...

**You are a kind of a film anthropologist/ethnographer then?**

Anthropology is a part of my work; it’s an important part of documentary making. I think most directors have a keen interest in people themselves, I love getting to know people and finding out about them, letting them surprise me. And the subsequent human interactions that follow with others in and outside a particular group. But I wouldn’t consider myself an expert by any means. So to be called an anthropologist is flattering but maybe not accurate, aspiring anthropologist maybe, and an aspiring adventurer.

We are shooting a film more visual and photographic that walks a line between capturing live events and situations that are setup especially for us to film.
Some of the young people trying out the cameras of the film crew
Tell me something, and I forget it. Show it to me, and I may remember it. Let me do it by myself and I will understand it!

(Chinese proverb)

Below, I will present three cases, and my reflections on some of the young people’s development during and after ‘Anholt 2013’.
CASE ONE - A., 16

**Background:** A is a 16-year-old boy who recently finished school, and is now trying to find a profession that offers an apprenticeship. He is his mother’s 3rd child. He lives in a house on the outskirts of a small town, with his mother, his stepfather, two stepsisters, one older brother, five dogs, eight cats, one parrot, a terrarium and an aquarium. His father works in a factory, and his mother delivers newspapers at night. A finished school with decent marks. He was chosen to apply for the Anholt project, to enable him to make decisions on his own, without being overruled by adults, and also experience acting in an intercultural group of people in his age. It was A’s second experience of an intercultural project.

**Development on the island:** Initially, A was rather shy. He speaks a minimal level of basic English, so he did not understand much, which made him feel insecure at the beginning. He first mixed only with the German-speaking participants, but soon started to interact with the Danes and the Italians, as well. He used body language and a few English words, and the other youngsters were very patient, and tried to understand and make them selves understood. By the third day, A was so confident that he took on every available work experience on the island. On one day, he worked two jobs, first in the afternoon at the coffee shop by the harbour, and in the evening at the INN restaurant kitchen and waiting tables. When he was at the camp, he helped with the cooking and cleaning, and also assisted others when they let him. Some impressions from his daily interviews:
'I started to learn to make myself better understood. I can use more English words now.'

'I went to the coffee shop by the harbour to visit B. There were also some counsellors visiting B. After 14:00, I went back to the camp to return the cans and bottles that we found to the supermarket, to collect the deposit on them. At about 16:30 we went together to the INN to work. I like it when the people at the restaurant speak German to me, and when tip'

'At 11:00 I went to the coffee shop to work, but today there was not much to do, so I went home at about 14.00. B and I cooked sausages, we grilled them and ate them with bread, onions, and ketchup. Then D came to join the lunch, and B and D left, and I took a nap until they came back. At about 16.00 we had a music workshop, and B and I took part in that. It was fun to play the instruments, and we composed a song.'

**Reflections:** A benefitted significantly from this experience on Anholt. Day by day, he developed from a shy person to an outgoing, self-confident person, simply because he was accepted into the group, and there were no restrictions on his decisions within the given framework. He could invent himself anew, and everybody accepted him as he was. That gave him self-confidence, and made him braver every day. He grew thanks to the respect of the others, which he had evidently not experienced before. To the question of what he liked most about the project he replied: 'I enjoyed that everyone was so nice to, and understanding of me, and they listened to me, and even tried to speak German for me. The work in
the restaurant kitchen was the best; I want work like that in future’. A’s development throughout the project was visible and documented. Three month later, A started an apprenticeship as a cook, and attended a boarding school. More than six months later, A still wants to participate in another project, and he is doing well in his apprenticeship. In 2015, he will finish his studies, and be a professional cook.
CASE TWO - L., 17

Background: L., a girl of 17, is in a secondary school for social work, and wants to work in the social environment of youth welfare programmes. She lives in a town in lower Austria with about 150,000 inhabitants, and shares flat with her mother, her brother, and a cat. L. enjoys a middle-class standard of living, and looked forward to this intercultural project.

Development on the Island: L. appeared very excited about the project, and was enthusiastic and active. After 3 days, her euphoria changed to frustration, and sometimes sadness. She needs a lot of attention from others, and is unhappy taking responsibility for herself, with regard to preparing food, and cleaning her tent and personal space. When asked about her expectations before the project, she answered:

‘I want to meet nice youths from other countries. I feel excited and a little bit afraid, to be left alone and never go home again. I am also afraid of mosquitoes, but I hope to meet new, fun guys.’

L. did not accept the separation from the counselling team, and often tried to mingle with the managing and counselling team, although it was clearly asserted that this would be allowed only in case of emergency. After four days, she had a serious personal crisis, and had to be comforted by her counsellor. She then explained all her problems and sorrows, which she could not speak of previously, because she always had to present a perfect facade of her family. She faced many unsolved social problems, and being alone and by herself on the Island for four days made it all come to
the surface. After a while, she felt much better, because she had freed herself from this pressure, and we could leave her with the others again. The day after this, she started to take advantage of the offers made by the counselling team and she joined the art group. She communicated more with the others at the camp, and the atmosphere grew calmer. She spent most of her time with one other girl, taking pictures at the beach, and sharing experiences and memories. L. often mentioned that she missed her mobile phone, because of the loss of contact through Facebook, and contact with her friends and family.

Reflections: L. had a lot of time to reflect on her life and the unsolved problems in her family. She sometimes cried, but this seemed to strengthen her, and help her to find solutions on her own. At a daily interview towards the end of the project, she stated:

‘It was so good to have time to myself, and to do things I wanted to do without regulations and consequences.’

L. is now back at school, and according to an interview with her mother, she improved in daily life, taking responsibility for herself.
CASE THREE - T., 14

Background: T. lives with his mother and a dog in a small town. His social situation may be described as ‘very problematic’. He is mostly home alone, or out on the street with friends, and he has already had problems with the law. He has a stressful relationship with his mother, and he left school a few months ago, so he has no positive school final (Schulabschluss). T. is intelligent and is interested in many sports, but has no money to participate in them. Even so, he is trying to make the best of his situation, and is always optimistic.

Development on the Island: The first few days T. was very quiet, and socialized only with people from his country. Then he moved to another tent, and stayed with people from other countries. It was surprising, because of his minimal level of English, but it worked out well. After a while, he was the most sought-after person at the camp, because he could do so many things, he helped with the cooking, washing up, repairing cooking utensils, cleaning the tent, and so on. That made him feel very good, because in his last years at school and at home, he never received positive feedback, and here he received it every day. During the daily interview on day six, he answered the question: ‘What were the normal things you did today that you would like to mention?’

‘We cooked together at the camp. I made pasta with meat and tomato sugo. We all ate it together. Tomorrow, I’ll have to do the washing up. We always take turns with the girls doing the cleaning,'
and we decided that everybody should be responsible for his own dirt and his own things.’

After almost one week of not taking part in any activities, T. started to take on the responsibility of working at the Inn as a waiter, and the next day, at the supermarket. He now preferred to work, because he said it made him feel good that people appreciated him, and also, the time went faster. One day, we offered to go to the lighthouse, walking about 20 km. That evening, he responded to the question of what he had learned that day:

‘I learned that seals are big nice animals and they look cool. I never thought that they were so big. I learned how a desert looks, and that there, the birds make their nests in the sand. I also learned about a new fruit in the desert, it grows like blueberries on the ground, it tastes bitter and is for thirst. I ate it, and just took the liquid out, and then spit it out again’.

The following day, he went diving and spear-fishing. He seemed to become more self-confident, day by day. At the end of the project, he answered a question about the three most exciting things he experienced on Anholt, and what made them so:

‘1. Working at the “Inn” Restaurant, 2. Fishing in the ocean for a poisonous fish, 3. Wind surfing.’

‘Because I had contact with Danish peculiar people, because I learned windsurfing, and because I could catch fish, crabs, and mussels on my own. It was great because we could take
responsibility for ourselves, and make our own decisions without being criticized by adults.’

Reflections: T. lost his fear of other youngsters day by day, and developed a positive attitude towards them. He came to the island with many prejudices, and left it with a different mindset, only two weeks later. He has learned to communicate and work in an intercultural environment. In his case, the most important thing is that he learned that he is worth something, and he can do things correctly. He received positive feedback and appreciation for what he did. That increased his self-confidence, and made him feel valued.

T. came back in August 2013, and started school again in September. He will finish school in July 2014, and start an apprenticeship as metal worker.
REFLECTIONS ABOUT THE PROJECT:

Most answers to the daily questionnaires related to practicing English language skills, and the fascination of working together as a team of open-minded people from different countries.

Also mentioned were trust and respect for others, and new friendships.

The daily interviews showed the emotional feelings of the moment; when summarizing the two weeks of togetherness amongst the young people not knowing each other from the beginning, however becoming friends and a team for a while, we could see the development of each and every one of the participants negotiating their feelings, fighting their prejudices, and finding new solutions to their problems. All in all, the project showed wonderful development in a short time, with sustainable effects for the future.

Looking over the participants’ expectations from the beginning of the project, I come to the conclusion that most, if not all expectations were fulfilled.
Impressions from Anholt 2013
From interviews with youngster

Youngsters from Austria:
“Like a roller coaster, but I love it”

“Very nice and beautiful”

“It was interesting, curious, funny (spannend). I expected it to be very boring but it was really exiting”.

Youngsters from Spain:

“Anholt 2013 was a fucking awesome project. I think it was the best experience I’ve ever lived; I want to live it another time”.

“Funny, interesting, entertaining, friendly…”

“I think that Anholt 2013 was amazing, It’s an amazing experience and I would like to do it again. I think that is something unique and you have to take the chance!”
Young people from Germany:

"I found Anholt cool. Because the island was great. Anholt was something new"

“The island was great. The project was ok. I liked the offers, that we could work somewhere.
And I liked the landscape.”
Young people from Portugal:
“ It was really awesome, a completely different and new experience, I got to know lots of people, that I really enjoyed to meet, and that I would like to see again, and I really miss them now that I am at home. I got to live with young people for two weeks, where we really had to do pretty much everything by ourselves, and we just helped each other, so there was no problem at all, it was, if not the best, one of the best experiences of my life”

“Anholt was a really good thing for me. I met new people and I’ve learned a lot of things to do in group”.

“The most amazing experience I have ever had, that’s all I can say.”

Youngsters from Italy:
”Fantastic, I will never forget it”
“Anholt 2013 was an amazing experience, one of the best experiences that I ever did”

“An incredible experience, I learnt a lot and I felt alive”
Youngsters from Denmark:

“Anholt was new, inspiring, a huge experience, funny, new and serious. It was exciting to be able to live that way and it was unforgettable and very useful.”

“It was entirely well. Normally I can have bad days, but on Anholt, I only had bad moments. It was fun and educational. I learned so much about myself and about others.”

“It was a good learning experience, an experience of a lifetime and if others got the opportunity they have to take it. It boosts your confidence. You get something socially together and learn about other cultures just by talking to each other.”

“It was different, interesting and, a very positive experience”.

“Luxury-it was great. Unforgettable ... It's not something you experience every day. Anholt has made me more social and I have found out I can fill my life with other things.”
PRACTICAL ADVICES

by Toni Pozo, Spain

The practical advices are addressed to those willing to apply the educational approach (PERIOD) to their project. And, if you consider them, they are not only useful for these kinds of projects, but are also practical for any intercultural/multicultural project involving human relations in an unfamiliar environment. After the introduction, the following will be addressed:

1. Managing and counselling team (preparation, APV, communication, task assignment, responsibilities)
2. Participants (selection, preparation, supervision, follow-up)
3. Establishing the learning frameworks - Risk assessment & solving conflicts.
4. Mentoring
5. Educational values
6. Local involvement
Introduction to practical advices

Taking part in projects such as ‘Anholt part I and II’ requires a range of special characteristics, not only those related to skills acquired in formal education, but mainly those related to non-formal education, and the educational frameworks around such models.

What we were doing on Anholt was obviously an activity open to everybody, but not everybody was ready to understand how it worked. Even the youngsters did not initially understand why we were doing certain things, but by the end, they started to get the key point. As a friend of ours says: ‘It’s part of the game’.

What we did with Anholt I and II was to define a method, and to apply it in a non-formal educational framework. To do this, we needed more preparation than a ‘normal’ youth exchange or an educational camp seems to need.

We debated a lot, argued with our partners, exchanged ideas and concepts, and prepared our groups, but in the end, the practical experience guides and teaches you how to improve, how to get the most from an experience such as this. For this reason, we consider the tips that we are providing in this book to be very important.

The first practical experience on Anholt 2011 was very useful for improving our method, and the second experience on Anholt 2013 after a good job assessing the outcomes from the first experience helped us to create an improved vision of the entire range of possibilities of the educational approach.
But for this, we needed continuity, and we needed people ready to work hard with the concepts of learning, recognition, empowerment, values, opportunities, and establishing new educational frameworks.

This was a project involving people from different sectors: formal education, non-formal education, vocational education. This combination needed to be coordinated, to ensure that each team member knew what we were doing, why, and how. Knowledge about the educational approach varied among the team members. This situation is not uncommon or negative, but may sometimes lead to some very useful and practical information being transmitting incorrectly, or being incompletely understood by other team members. This is caused by lack of information within the team, and a lack of understanding of the overall project. The result of such misinformation may produce various reactions, of which we detected two:

1. Team members, mainly newcomers to the project, have a simple perception of the project and its roles, and their involvement is partial, because they don’t know how to handle particular situations, or the different steps and sequences.

**Consequences**
Some team leaders, counsellors or team members may act independently, without knowledge of the context of the activities or of the educational approach; they may interact with a youngster, or engage in the process in an unsuitable way, such as offering help to the participants, advising them about how to do something,
1. MANAGING AND COUNSELLING TEAM

You - the managing and counselling team - are the soul of the project, your attitude and involvement are crucial to keeping alive the objectives and the expectations, you are the other eyes of the participants; don’t forget this: Learning is an amazing experience if you implement the educational approach. Join it!

1.1 Preparation

In a project such as Anholt II, it is very important to prepare the managing and counselling team before preparing the participants. Sometimes, new partners decide to take part, but only a few of them know how to execute the educational approach, or what they want to obtain from the programme. When there are several partners involved in the project, but not in the defining phase, we may find many misunderstandings and ongoing mistakes in the intervention of some of the counsellors during the programme. To avoid this, it is important that each member of the managing and counselling team participating in the programme has information about the educational approach, the characteristics of the group and about the role of the managing and counselling team in every step of the project.

An introductory meeting is recommended, where all members of the managing and counselling team have access to the intended educational approach, to an understanding of what informal and non-formal learning are, and to accurate knowledge about the importance of informal learning in a project like Anholt II. This
meeting must be a discussion meeting, where all the participants can debate and understand why they wish to apply the particular educational approach, what this approach means, how to execute it, and what each member of the managing and counselling team must do during the programme.

If the programme includes new members from fields other than that of non-formal education, it is important to know the role of each, and to not interfere in their tasks, to try to collaborate, and to talk about the different perceptions without transmitting disagreements to the participants or to the others members of the managing and counselling team.

The managing and counselling team must be aware, and able to identify the skills that the participants may acquire during the project, in order to facilitate the reflection and mentoring phase of the project.

If the managing and counselling team are used to working with young people with few opportunities, they will have to be flexible in their attitude towards the participants, because over-protection may minimize the effect of the educational approach on the young participants.

1.2 APV or preparatory meeting
This phase of the project is crucial, not only because of the information that we can exchange as the managing and counselling team, and for the information that we will provide to our youngsters.
Attention to getting the maximum benefit from this preparatory meeting is important. If it is possible to arrange the APV or preparatory meeting six months in advance, it would be great to arrange all the steps in the group preparation, and in the exchange of information connected with the educational approach and the development of the programme.

It is highly recommended to attend the preparatory meeting with the group of young people already selected. In this way, we can exchange information with our partners and the entire managing and counselling team, regarding the group and their special needs. This advance information can guide us in defining the project, and in managing the educational approach.

Another tip is to invest a minimum of two full days in the APV, possibly visiting the location where the programme will be held, the environment, the local population involved in the project, and the various possibilities of working with the educational approach.

The main structure of an APV should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time table</th>
<th>1st day</th>
<th>2nd day</th>
<th>3rd day</th>
<th>4th day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.30 – 09.30</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>The role of the managing and counselling team, Risk assessment</td>
<td>Visiting the project location Simulating an activity</td>
<td>Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 – 14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 18.00</td>
<td>Welcome managing and counselling team &amp; programme introduction, Understanding the educational approach PERIOD</td>
<td>Participant preparation Defining learning frameworks Outcomes &amp; follow-up</td>
<td>Simulating an activity &amp; interacting with the local population, Evaluation &amp; conclusions</td>
<td>Departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00 -</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. PARTICIPANTS

In other chapters of this book we have discussed the participants, but I’d like to offer some practical advice based on our experience in previous projects. Depending their backgrounds or origins, they may be more or less curious or interested in the activities realized during the project. Many question are not resolved prior the trip, but as our friend Ansgar says, ‘It’s part of the game’.

We have been managing target groups of youngsters between 14 and 17 years old. For them, the project is an adventure, something attractive but not forced, something different, new, unexpected, and risky in all senses. It’s provocative, because everything that is new and unknown stimulates their hunger for discovery.

2.1. Selection of participants

Selection was one of the main criteria, when we organized a project. We might have planned to work with various behaviours and attitudes of the participants, but it is very important to the whole picture that we inform our partners of the different profiles of our youngsters; in this way, we can work more effectively on the preparation, and on the prevention plan (problem solving, risk assessment).

- We consider participant commitment to the project very useful to make them feel that they are part of the project.
- The project addresses young people willing to take part in a project voluntarily.
- The project addresses young people that accept the project rules.
The project addresses young people with parental or mentor permission.

The project addresses young people from any background, with a special emphasis on those with fewer opportunities: lacking motivation at school or in their studies, introverted, poorly socialized and others.

During the preparatory phase, it is very useful to try building a balanced group, so we can create a framework of equal opportunities for all the participants from each country’s group.

On the next pages you’ll find some examples of documents (Participation Application and Contract for Participation) that we gave participants when they were selected:
YOUTH IN ACTION PROGRAMME – YOUTH EXCHANGE

Participant Application

THE ANHOLT PROJECT PART II – Denmark July 26th– August 10th 2013

Surname: [ ]
First name: [ ]
Date of birth: [ ]
Place of birth: [ ]
Nationality: [ ]
Address: (Street, Floor, City, Country)
Telephone: [ ]
E-mail: [ ]
Fax: [ ]

Education and/or vocational training: International experience as participant in any project:

Driving licence / [ ]
Do you know how to ride a bicycle? [ ]
Do you know how to swim? [ ]

Language ability

Language: fluent good basic

Other activities/skills (Hobbies, sports, music)

Please describe in detail your motivation for participating in this international project of the Youth in Action

Project Organisation

Address: [ ]
Contact person: [ ]
Tel. and fax: [ ]
e-mail: [ ]

Do you require a special diet? [ ]
If yes, please give details:

Do you suffer from any allergies? [ ]
If yes, please give details:

Are there other things we should know about you? [ ]

Contact address in the event of emergency: [ ]
Name: [ ]
Connection to participant: [ ]
Address (Street, house nr; post code, city, country)

Telephone: [ ]
At home: [ ]
Mobile phone: [ ]

I have completed this form personally.

Date and place: [ ]
Signature: [ ]
CONTRACT FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE ANHOLT PROJECT PART II

I, __________________________________________________________

with I.D. number ____________________, as a participant in the youth exchange that will be held on Anholt (Denmark) from July 26th to August 10th 2013, called ‘The Anholt project part II’ agree to:

participate and collaborate actively in the development of all the activities scheduled during the youth exchange.
 contribute to the overall organization of the exchange before, during, and after.
 respect the different beliefs, ideologies, and personal differences of those involved in the project.
 remain for the entire duration of the exchange period.
 respect the internal rules and cohabitation during the entire youth exchange.
 respect the schedules.
 accept the conditions of those responsible for the activities and those responsible for my group.
 not consume any illegal substance for the duration of the exchange.

Failure to comply with this contract will mean immediate expulsion of the participant, on his/her own costs.

I know and accept all the terms described in this contract as conditions for my participation in the youth exchange.

(Place and date)

Signature:
2.2 Preparation of participants

We realized that, during the selection process, some participants were anxious to know every detail of the project. We had to be very patient, and make them understand the positive aspects and the importance of the preparation preceding the programme.

Once we selected our group, it was important to make them feel that they were part of it; providing them with tools with which to interact was most important. We were not interested in preparing a group of participants that would not socialize with one another, we needed to create an approach, in which the participants took responsibility and would like to discover things on their own. It is important to inform participants about the project, but not about the educational approach, or what the managing and counselling team expects from this project.

You can see that the preparation is not going to be easy, but it is the basic starting point, in order to prevent frustration among the participants, or a lack of adaptation during the project.

Some topics related to the pre-departure preparation are:

- Intercultural issues
- Problem solving, risk assessment
- Introductions
- Youth in Action Programme – Youth exchanges
- Strengths and weeknesses? How can I deal with others?
- Funding my participation; ideas for earning money and co-financing; what can we organize or do?
- Developing activities with other young people
- Rules of the project, debating them
- Creating our meeting schedules, and what to do
- English conversation workshop; playing with English
- Country discovery (knowing about the place we’re visiting)
- Other (adapted to the circumstances of the project)

**When should we start the preparation?**

It is strongly recommended that the selection of participants be made more than six months in advance, and to involve them in regular meetings, since they are part of the project. Obviously, most of them are students, and they have to attend the classes, so we need to plan the schedule with them, in order to do so in a way that allows them all to participate. We must do this systematical, increasing the number of meetings as the project approaches. It may mean starting with one meeting every two weeks at the beginning, and ending the last month with at least two meeting per week, and the actualization of the activities and co-financing that they have decided to organize (e.g. party, concert, cleaning cars, t-shirt design and production, selling handcrafted products, lottery).

We have included English workshops, because in our case it was the working language of the project. In the case of countries where the
young people are not really familiar with the working language, we advise holding English workshops, in a fun way, not like lessons, but playing with the language, trying to speak English during the meeting, as though we were already in the programme. The managing and counselling team has a very important role in this meeting, encouraging the participants to use the English, but not forcing them to do so.

We have found that following the projects, most of the participants were aware of the importance of speaking other languages, and had extra motivation to learn them.

It is very important that we tackle other topics with a self-teaching methodology. If we are talking about problem solving, the participants have to manage the workshop, in order to find solutions. We have to start to manage self-reflection from the beginning, without explaining why we use this method.

When we talk about rules with the group, we have to mention that the use of electronic devices is not allowed during the programme, but not belabour this rule, merely clarify that it is mandatory for everybody.

During the preparatory phase, there is no contact/interaction among the participants. They only know that they are from different countries, but do not get to meet them until the programme begins. In this way, we avoid the creation of Facebook or Twitter groups that may be incompatible with the educational approach.
We must always help participants in the group initiatives, if possible. For example, if they are organizing a concert or a party where they will sell food or handcrafted items, and they need our support to reserve the venue, we try to help them during the preparatory phase (advising them how to approach this, or, being present if the venue requires a responsible adult to represent the group of youngsters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>How often</th>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st month</td>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>Meeting each other English conversation. What about the project? Rules and commitment. Creating our pre-departure preparation schedule.</td>
<td>Team leader Entire group Team leader and group.</td>
<td>To create confidence among the participants. Understanding the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd month</td>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>Problem solving &amp; risk assessment Youth in Action &amp; Erasmus+ Designing activities English conversation</td>
<td>Group with the facilitation of the team leader. Group + TL Entire group</td>
<td>Becoming familiar with the programme, and some of the important issues/values. Awareness of responsibilities during the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd month</td>
<td>Twice a month</td>
<td>What am I good at? What can I share with the others? English conversation Proposing activities to co-finance participation in the project. How to travel. Looking for options to reach the project destination.</td>
<td>Group with facilitation of the TL Entire group Group</td>
<td>Developing self-confidence. Looking for options, learning to evaluate the possibilities of the group. Make the group participative in selecting means of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Supervision

The team leaders have a special role during the development of the activities; it is obvious that, together with the rest of the team, we take care to create the learning frameworks, prepare the workshop options, and realize a follow-up to the learning observations. But the team is also responsible for supervising the programme. What do we mean by ‘supervision’?
Supervision includes our daily tasks related to interaction in the programme, questioning the young people (How are you? What are you going to do? I’m going to fish, do want to join? etc.), and joining them in some activities (football, swimming, some excursions).

‘Supervision’ also implies that we have everything under control, without interfering in the participants’ decisions and activities.

**Follow-up**

Why say ‘good bye’ when the programme has ended? It is our moral obligation to maintain contact with the participants, continue mentoring and involving them in new activities, where they can transmit what they have learned to other youngsters.

It is very important to carry out an evaluation one month after the programme, to meet all the participants in the own countries, and discuss what they experienced, and how we can support the participants for their future, including preparing of opportunities for new mobility, intercultural and learning activities.
3. ESTABLISHING LEARNING FRAMEWORKS

When establishing learning frameworks, we must review the chapter related to methodology. What we have experienced in the preceding experiences is that sometimes, the members of the managing and counselling team have different perceptions of the educational approach and our responses to some situations.

It is obvious that a youth educator, a youth worker considers him-or herself well-prepared to do his or her job, with the experience to teach and train young people. The educational approach however defines a new role for the youth worker and educator; a role, in which they should mainly focus on observations through a mentoring approach based on reflections on the youngsters’ activities and learning experiences.

Any kind of interference in participants’ day-to-day lives during the programme is very far from the central idea of the project, which is to provide the young people with the opportunity to manage their lives without interference from youth educators or youth workers forming the managing and counselling team.

**Risk assessment & conflict resolution**

The intervention of the managing and counselling team is acceptable only when is there is a clear possibility of risk or danger to any participant. If this is not the case we observe whether the participants look for a solution by themselves, as a part of their learning process.
It is important for the managing and counselling team to share the results of the mentoring sessions, in order to exchange information, and as a general approach to the participants’ learning. It is preferable to separate this information from the daily team meeting, in order to have two different perspectives on the programme: learning process, and a general working attitude.
4. MENTORING

By mentoring we understand a monitoring action by the participants’ team leader. The managing and counselling team do not provide solutions to the participants’ questions during the mentoring sessions, they coach and assess, but do not advise or instruct.

We comment on this, because some of the participants’ observations or reflections made us realize that sometimes, the team leaders were advising or offering tips to the participants.

Our main task during our mentoring sessions is to help them to reflect and identify possible learning that we may have noticed, but they have not, and make them aware of their process (see the related chapter with the reflection templates and charts).

5. EDUCATIONAL VALUES

As we explained in point 4 under ‘mentoring’, our main task in the pre-departure preparation, during the programme, and in the follow-up upon return, is more to accompany participants in their learning, than to train them, or facilitate the various aspects or experiences of the project.

It is obvious in the Youth in Action Programme, and the youth framework of the new Erasmus+ that the participants try to ensure the development of positive values. Those values are not imposed...
or mandatory, they need to be experienced and learned by the participants.

It is our task to create the frameworks in which the values have enough impact in the participants’ daily activities, and to make them aware of them.

6. LOCAL INVOLVEMENT
Interaction with the local people is one of the elements that ensures the success of our projects. We are in charge of maintaining contacts with the local community, to involve them in the project and make them feel they contribute to the youngsters’ learning.

It is important that they know us, that we offer our help and recognize their support. We may interact with them in front of the participants, asking questions about the place, their work, different aspects related to day-to-day life in the place: history, celebrations, places to visit, food.

It is important to exchange information and learn from them, regarding the evolution and learning of the youngsters that they have observed, by staying with them and helping with tasks.
Part of the recognition involves inviting the locals to a final party/celebration with the youngsters, and in this case, if is not an idea from the youngsters, we sell it as their idea. Why not to invite or organize a big celebration with the locals?

This is a real approach to the community, and mutual exchange.
The Anholt Project
2013
Concluding remarks

The comments and contributions in this book, the investigations carried out during ‘Anholt 2013’ indicate that both informal and intercultural learning occurred during the ‘Anholt 2013 – Part II’ project.

Informal and intercultural learning have been identified and analysed occurring in the interaction among the young people in very different situations, especially in connection with the activities and internship opportunities made available to the young people, but also in everyday situations, and other situations in which young people stayed on the island of Anholt during this project.

We encourage others to take advantage of the educational approach PERIOD.
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Annex 1 – The Anholt 2013 Project Partner Organisations

If you would like more information about the Anholt Island Project 2013, feel free to contact the participating partner organisations at the addresses listed below:

**Centre d’Estudis de l’Esplai (Spain)**
The Centre d’Estudis de l’Esplai is a non-profit organisation based in Mallorca. Their main activity is the training of future youth workers, educators and animators in the non-formal field, facilitating activities that promote the integration of young people in society.

*C/ Manuel Sanchís Guarner, 9*
*07004 Palma de Mallorca*
*Telephone/fax: + 34 971 728903*
*centreestudis@centreestudis.org*
*www.centreestudis.org*
*Contact: Toni Pozo*

**City Council – YouthHouse (Portugal)**
The Youth House (YH) offers daily activities and different spaces for their users. The YH gives special attention to youth groups whether formal or informal helping to develop and support their projects. The YH offers its facilities to youth associations, supports the creation of new youth organizations liaising with the Portuguese Youth and Sport National Institute.

*Rua D. Maria I, 56, 4490-538 Póvoa De Varzim, Portugal*
*Telephone: +351 252 619230*
*Email: luisaferreira@cm-pvarzim.pt*
*Contact: Maria Luísa Ferreira*
Syddjurs Ungdomsskole (Denmark)

Syddjurs Ungdomsskole is a non-formal municipal educational offer. Funded by the local community, Syddjurs Ungdomsskole is made up of five separate branches; the youth School, youth clubs, junior clubs, thor corps of crime/drug/alcohol prevention street workers and full-time educational programme.

Rosenholmvej1, 8543 Hornslet, Denmark
Telephone: +45 8753 6031
Email: asl@syddjurs.dk
Contact: Anders Stenumgaard Lind

Verein Sozialmanagement Steiermark (Austria)

The NGO Sozialmanagement Steiermark was founded 2003 to organize and act out projects under the governmental Youth Welfare Program. Since November 2007 the organization is a recognized partner of the governmental Youth Welfare Programme. The main target group are young people aged between 13 and 18 years old with social or upgrowing problems.

Mariahilferstraße 1, 8020 Graz, AT221 – Graz, Austria
Telephone: +43 316 827399
Email: info@sozialmanagement-stmk.at
Contact: Arthur Longin
Kinder und Jugendwerk der Naturfreundejugend Erfurt, Verein zur Förderung der Naturfreundejugend Erfurt e.V. (Germany)

Naturfreundejugend Erfurt is a youth organization with its main focus on value oriented groupwork, environment protection and participation of young people. The key activities are non-formal education on many different topics, and training courses for young group leaders, summer camps with outdoor educational aspects (for example climbing or canoeing) for children and young people.

Windhorststraße 43a, 99096 Erfurt, Germany  
Telephone: +49 361 7894386  
Email: info@naturfreundejugend-erfurt.de  
Contact: David Rolfs

Vicolocorto (Italy)

Vicolocorto is a non-political, non-profitable youth cultural association, based in Pesaro, Italy. It is specialized in youth work and it operates in fields of non-formal and extra-school education; intercultural learning; promotion of youth mobility and youth participation; study and research of youth policies and activities. Vicolocorto encourages cooperation with institutions, NGOs, public and local authorities, art groups and others.

Via Mazzolari, 8, 61122 Pesaro, Italy  
Telephone: +39 0721.581471  
Website: www.vicolocorto.org  
Email: info@vicolocorto.org  
Contact: Laura Pierfelici
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