Networking European Citizenship Education (NECE)

Report 3

Expert Workshop: *Citizenship Education for Hard-to-reach-learners*

Copenhagen, October 28th –30th, 2005

Dr. Viola B. Georgi

for *Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung*

October 2005

Table of Contents

Abbreviations: Hard-to-reach-learners: HRLs
CHIs: Centers of high intesitiy

1. Conference Report

The phenomenon of the so-called hard-to-reach-learner (HRL) does not only challenge educational systems and areas of non-formal education in Europe, but also demands for an analysis, of how hard-to-reach learners are being "produced" by their educational socialisation and experiences they make in their social environment and in specific political and historical contexts.

Educational and political institutions in different European countries have made experiences with a variety of hard-to-reach-learners-groups. Specific approaches and innovative methodologies have been applied in order to meet the needs of these target groups. When considering the specific field of citizenship education, we however face some serious challenges to be dealt with, particularly regarding access to citizenship education and the motivation of HRLs to participate.

The workshop, firstly, aimed at exchanging of experiences and good practices in terms of attracting and accompanying the diverse groups of HRLs. Secondly, the workshop was supposed to provide a platform for identifying models and strategies that may be applicable in different learning contexts of HRLs. This brought about the necessity to discuss and clarify terms from the sociological, psychological and political discourse on the HRLs in the different countries. By doing so, the workshop was thought to prepare common ground for developing European approaches.

Discussants from different subject areas and professional backgrounds (research, cultural education, project co-ordinators etc.) from ten European countries (UK, Lithuania, Estonia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Sweden, Austria, Denmark, Hungary and Germany) participated in the discussion. The workshop, that took place in Copenhagen, was designed in co-operation of the German *Federal Agency for Civic Education* (bpb), the Danish NGO *Severin*, and the *Danish Workers Association* (AOF). The workshop was officially opened by Petra Grüne (bpb) and Jens William Grav from *Severin*.

The introductory panel *Hard-to-reach-learners – a European Definition?* consisted of Thomas Silkjaer (*AOF, Denmark*) and Orsolay Becze (*Ec-Pec Foundation*, Hungary). Both gave short presentations against the background of their national experiences. Silkjaer focused on skills and knowledge that HRLs need in order to (re)enter the job market. The most important field that AOF engaged in, Silkjaer stressed, was literacy. He stated, that 25% of the Danish population between 16 and 60 have very **low literacy skills** which disqualifies them to get a job in today's information

society. Literacy according to Silkjaer presented a great challenge to both the educational system and the HRLs that often suffer from "**Schoolphobia**". He underlined that deficits in literacy were mostly combined with a "negative education heritage" that was passed on to the next generation. To fight this development and increase literacy competences among HRLs, the learning environments and conditions should be examined. In order not to reproduce experiences of exclusion the following aspects should be considered: (a) respect for the learner, (b) providing a feeling of comfort and (c) supporting processes of (re)building self-confidence. Often **informal learning environments** seem more promising than traditional school settings, because HRLs do seldom enroll in literacy classes. Silkjaer in that context mentioned examples for literacy education offered in enterprises, personal tuition, study circles, evening classes in a café-like atmosphere, Danish-as-a-second-language classes or family learning on Saturdays. All these measures have in common that they take place in a non-formal educational setting and work with methods that take into account the specific difficulties and learning biographies of HRLs.

Orsolay Becze (*Ec-Pec Foundation*, Hungary[1]) introduced the **programme S*tep by Step*[2] for school education in Hungary** that aims at supporting children with learning difficulties, disabilities and minority background. In Hungary the biggest minority are the Roma[3], therefore most programmes of the *Ec-Pec Foundation* address this specific target group of HRLs. Becze stated, that the number of Roma children in school is very little, because educating children within this community was traditionally considered to happen in the families rather than in school. In fact – she argued, **school education from a Roma perspective** threatens the tradition as well as the control of the parents of knowledge and skills of their children. In short: Many Roma parents are reluctant when it comes to sending their children to school. In addition some families cannot afford the costs for schooling. Therefore, in particular the Roma girls, fall out of the educational system early. The reasons for the poor performance of Roma children in school, Becze attributed to their lack of speaking Hungarian. However, she admitted that there was also a certain amount of discrimination they had to face in school. The approach chosen by *Ec-Pec*

---

[1] See: www.issa.nl/network/hungary/hungary.html.

[2] The *International Step By Step Association* (ISSA) is a non-governmental membership organization established in the Netherlands in 1999, which unites individuals and organizations into a powerful network to foster democratic principles and promote parent and community involvement in early childhood education. For more information see: www.issa.nl.

[3] Information on the situation of the Roma in Hungary are available at: http://lists.errc.org/publications/factsheets/hungary.shtml.

Foundation to reach this particular group of HRLs, Becze characterized, as "child-centered."

The discussion brought up the following aspects: It was remarked that it is important to train teachers from the Roma community (Georgi) as a way to diminish school scepticism. A Roma project from Serbia was mentioned that succeeded in motivating school attendance through providing students with clothes, food etc. In addition assistant teachers from the Roma community were educated to support education in classes particular set up for Roma children (Miljevic). Milana responded that with respect to Roma education, the curriculum itself was less important than the relationship between the Roma community and the wider community. The integration of minorities such as the Roma should be seen as a learning process for the minority as well as for the majority.

Then the more general question of "Who do we identify as HRLs?" was taken up by the group. The following groups were identified: the socially and economic disadvantaged (unemployed etc.), Roma, immigrants, rural population, the elderly, women, the individualised and well-off individuals with no interest in social or political engagement whatsoever. The discussion concluded, that definitions of HRLs strongly depend on the social, political, cultural and historical context of a specific country or a specific region. However, the group succeeded in agreeing on the following **working definition of HRLs** proposed by Miljevic: "HRLs are those that are not actively engaged and /or have no capacity and knowledge to be actively engaged in changing their society for the benefit of both: themselves and society, but are respecting democratic values."

The discussion also took up the question of in how far **HRLs are the outcome of educational systems**. It was argued that not the HRLs should be examined but rather the systemic conditions that caused their exclusion (Wimmer). Moreover, Wimmer stressed that becoming and being a HRL is a learning process itself that derives from the experience of being insufficiently qualified in the light of (dominant) "cultures of education and learning". Dealing with HRLs therefore should always include reflecting power relations as well as changing the conditions and the places of learning (Slikjaer, Grav, Milana, Turner).

The second workshop day was opened by a presentation of Prof. Lena Larsen (*University of Roskilde, Denmark*), who took up the previous debate on defining HRLs. Larsen questioned the perspective chosen for the workshop. Instead of talking about HRLs from a system perspective – that defines the HRL in the light of a deficit on the learners side – she preferred to look at the problem from the learners perspective. Larsen asked what the

deficits on the systemic side are that cause the **exclusion of specific groups of learners** and thereby make them residual. She referred at **HRLs as "residual groups".**

She presented some figures on residual groups that she defined as those with very little educational attainments and no access to the job market. Larsen stated that since the 1970's the number of drop outs in Danish school steadily increased: 20 % of young people in Denmark today are without a qualifying education. The major challenge – she argued – is **keeping young people in education.** Larsen made the point that young people often "get lost in education." She asked, whether the answer to this should be more individual educational planning for more individualised learners. Larsen rejected such an individual approach underlining that she believed that young people who are exposed to the demands of individualisation every day rather need **collective experiences**, experiences of participation and community in their learning environment.

Larsen stressed how important **communication skills** were for residual groups: Being able to communicate is the precondition for participating. In particular young HRLs often suffered from a lack of communication in their families. This lack, Larsen explained, should be compensated for in educational programmes.

As an immediate **reaction to the talk** and the previous discussion some participants criticised that the debate had not succeeded in linking the issue of HRLs to citizenship (Erle, Wimmer, Fuchs). Erle remarked that the discussion tended to look at young people in school only. He stressed that a lot of learning processes today take place on an informal ground, in informal settings such as peer groups, interest groups, NGOs etc. Miljevic strongly agreed that citizenship education in particular with a focus on HRLs cannot sufficiently be analysed looking at the formal educational sector only. Wimmer taking up this point, stated, that we are presently facing a crisis of the formal educational sector. Schools – he argued – are losing authority, because they have to compete with other agencies of transferring knowledge and skills (e.g. the media, peer groups etc.). As a consequence the non-formal and informal educational sector gain more importance and influence (Wimmer).

Erle concluded that **learning to be a citizen takes place in the various communities we belong to**. Citizens – he emphasised – are always part of different communities: the local community, the national community, the European community and the global community. He therefore considered relating to different communities as the central aspect of being a responsible citizen.

The following presentation by Alina Fuchs (*Center for Applied Policy Research, Research Group Youth and Europe[4], Germany*) was titled "**Citizenship Education for Young People**". Fuchs defined young people as HRLs with respect to civic education, arguing that young people – as studies prove – are not very interested in political issues, because they seemed too far away from their every day life. She stated that there was a huge gap between the aspirations of civic education and the daily experience of young people that needed to be bridged by innovative educational programmes. **The lack of attraction of political issues**, in particular European affair**s, among young people** – Fuchs said – needed to be met by target group specific methods that aim at motivating and activating young people to get involved.

Fuchs presented two approaches developed by the *Research Group Youth and Europe*: The approaches are based on the assumption that the young learners need to develop a sense of citizenship and political literacy by exploring their very own social, political and cultural environment, trying to answer questions and find solutions for concrete problems.

The first approaches/methods Fuchs outlined were **simulation and role play**. Every simulation starts with a concrete scenario (local, national or European level), that describes a certain problem, conflict or task. The scenario always creates a pressure to act, therefore all participants are urged to negotiate – following democratic procedures and rules – in favour of a common solution to the given problem. The set of democratic rules to be followed is taken from real institutions such as the national and regional parliament, town meetings or the assembly of the United Nations.

The participants have to take over pre-designed roles and play societal and political actors that approach the problem from different angles.

The **simulation method**, Fuchs stressed, would be a helpful approach in citizenship education because it allowed young people to step into the active role of decision makers, to experience the process of balancing contrasting interests and to take over responsibility for the decisions taken. The learning process of a simulation includes two aspects:

(1) There is a lasting learning effect with regard to the content of the role play because it is a very intensive experience. (2) The simulation provides young people with a basic democratic experience and develops their democratic competences (interacting with others, tolerate different view points, co-operation, argumentation skills, conflict resolution and compromising). The *Research Groups Youth and Europe* developed simulations on topics such as: Security and defence policy on EU and

---

[4] See: www.fgje.de.

NATO level, asylum, the future of Europe (enlargement process etc.), the conflict around the building of a mosque in a small German town etc.

The second project/approach Fuchs presented **was the peer group approach** realised in the so called **Juniorteam Europe**[5]. The peer group approach assumes that young people learn more easily and effectively when facilitators of the same age group who share similar values and interests are responsible for creating the learning enviroment and structuring the learning process.

In order to reach young people with European issues, Fuchs stated, the peer group approach is very successful. The *Juniorteam Europe* established in 1997, today is a network of 400 young trainers that reaches over 3000 youngsters annually with their programmes. The trainers absolve a special training that providing them with the knowledge and skills needed to organise and perform activities of Europe-related civic education for peers.

Fuchs concluded that both methods, the simulation and the peer-group-approach, proved to be very successful strategies to involve young HRLs in citizenship education activities.

The **discussion** took up the question, whether young HRLs do have the communication skills needed for the rather complex simulations. Also the question was raised, whether young people appreciated "playing" participation, rather than really experiencing participation and decision taking in their social environment: families, school, the different communities they belong to.

In her presentation "**Citizenship Education for the Socially Disadvantaged,**" Cheryl Turner (*National Institute for Adult Continuing Education*[6], UK), focused on a specific group of HRLs, namely the socially disadvantaged groups, which she defined as groups of people who are excluded from learning and from political activities. Before looking at these groups, Turner gave some basic information on what is meant by citizenship learning in the British context. She stated that in the UK, the concept of citizenship learning is both old and new. On the one hand, citizenship learning from the perspective of adult education, she explained, is a traditional area of pedagogy that goes back to the 19th century, the early labour movement and the co-operative movement, that shared the belief that critical, politically literate, socially responsible adults are vital to a healthy democracy. On the other hand, she said, that compulsory citizenship

---

[5] See: www.fgje.de/was/juniorteam
[6] See: www.niace.org.uk

education in British schools[7] aiming at political literacy and the development of democratic skills and attitudes is quite a recent phenomenon.

The British government, Turner argued, follows a specific interest with regard to citizenship education. She said that under the labour government, citizens in the UK have become used to the idea an "active participating citizen," defined as a person who helps to shape public services, who is active in local decision making and whose community activism builds the trust and networks that make communities thrive (social capital). However, Turner stated, that government interest in active citizenship is also a response to processes of social fragmentation and violent disturbances.

Turner also mentioned the general necessity of a democratic renewal due to a lack of voting in the UK as well as in Europe that can be supported by citizenship education. At the same time, Turner explained, there is a surge of interest in popular social movements that are self-organized and make use of electronic media to pursue their political ambitions. She concludes that it seems important – dealing with HRLs – to let the learners take the lead, to recognise the power of local learning, of peer learning and of new technologies.

Turner gave an example from the UK: The *Bernie Grant Trust* – a small NGO – named after a well-known black Member of Parliament in the UK set up to support black communities in London. The aim was to support the establishing of **community leadership**. Turner described that young black activists were trained in advocacy, gathering evidence, putting forward a case, formal democratic processes, how power works, formally/ informally as well as conflict resolution. The programme, she concluded was of good quality and very successful but lacked sustained funding. Turner complained that getting mainstream funding for this work was a big problem in the UK.

Turner then gave a definition of what she meant by 'hard to reach': namely groups or communities who for reasons of age, gender, race, class, sexuality, faith, disability or poverty find learning inaccessible. In many cases they will have had poor previous educational experiences and left school earlier with little qualifications. In the UK, she said, these groups are long-term unemployed, people with basic skills needs, travellers, some ethnic groups, prisoners and ex offenders, people recovering from mental illness, and so on. However, Turner stressed that definitions strongly depend on the local contexts: in one area it will be Somali refugees, in

---

[7] In 2002, citizenship education became a part of the compulsory curriculum in secondary schools in the UK. Policy and curriculum documents on citizenship education in the UK can be found at www.dfes.gov.uk/citizeship, www.nc.uk.net/index.html and www.qca.org.uk/6123.html.

another, white working class young men. There are many groups, Turner added, that experience layers of disadvantage for instance, the elderly.

Turner then clustered four barriers to learning:

- **Practical barriers:** lack of time; bad timing; not enough money; no childcare; can't get to where learning is happening
- **Psychological barriers**: "schoolphobia" is commonly given as a reason for not engaging in organised learning; and scepticism about its value; feeling too 'old', too 'stupid', loss of face, fear of failure
- **Cultural barriers**: for some groups, involvement in organised learning is just outside their lifestyle, seen as elitist; wasteful, for women it can cause tension with their roles as mothers, partners; for some men, learning is not manly
- **Institutional barriers**: Institutions do not accept they have organize learning differently to fit learners patterns and priorities

Turner added two examples of **good practice from the U.K.**: The first is a project funded through government money especially for active citizenship learning. Community-based organisations built on already existing work with Asian women focusing on diabetes in their families. The community group developed a programme for these women that is supporting their **involvement in local public life.** The programme involves building confidence and self worth; building knowledge of local, national and European political processes; building the skills of organising, and encouraging women to know themselves, their community and the world. The project, as Turner outlined, builds on learner support, childcare, culturally sensitive materials, a residential element and a visit to Brussels in order to present one's cause. She stressed that this example illustrates how learning starts with the personal and grows to the political.

The second project Turner presented was a sculpture project in a small rural community that used to be a mining and farming village. The village got a small amount of money to build a **community sculpture.** The citizens designed it themselves to reflect their industrial and agricultural past. Everyone contributed according to his capacities and skills and through a mixture of creativity, energy, collective action, generosity and sheer stubbornness, as Turner outlined, they created a beautiful sculpture in the middle of their community. They had to evaluate the work to meet the funding requirements to manage the bureaucracy in an appropriate way without destroying the project. The product, apart from the sculpture, Turner said, was a **community book,** in which people told their story of the sculpture and what it meant to them using written stories, paintings, poems, photographs, cartoons.

Turner finally summed up some principles of good practice that underpin the concept of learning she described:

- Informal as well as formal (involve 'non-educational' as well as 'educational contexts')
- Careful process of consulting with and listening to local people – using trusted intermediaries
- Reflexive learning that values and builds on people's issues (knowledge, needs, desires)
- Developing projects with and in the communities
- Building political literacy and critical consciousness
- Empowering those involved
- Leading to democratic social change and greater social justice

Tim Verbist (*Evans Foundation[8], Belgium*) presented the **European Youth Empowerment Project[9]** (**YEPP**). YEPP is an international community-based programme that aims to empower communities and young people to improve their lives by increasing choice. A consortium of European and American foundations and the OECD work in partnership designing, implementing and evaluating YEPP. It works on the basis of partnerships between public, private and independent sectors. It concentrates on empowerment for example through local projects that engage disadvantaged youth as active players in educational, cultural and civic activities or workshops that bring disadvantaged young people from different countries together.

YEPP is designed as a **transnational project** that works with the same methods and approaches in different counties from Bosnia to Finnland. Each participating country has a local co-ordinator, researchers and a support group. YEPP works with young people in **centres of high intensity (CHIs)** such as CHIs in Antwerp (Belgium), Tuzla (Bosnia), Kristinastadt (Finnland), Dublin (Ireland), Mannheim (Germany) and Torino (Italy).

After the introduction of the YEPP-approach, Verbits introduced the **YEPP projects** developed **in Antwerp** to give an example for the locally initiated activities. Verbist described a CHI in Antwerp that has 40.000 Inhabitants from 127 nationalities, speaking 53 different languages, many illegal immigrants, very high unemployment rates, youth criminality, co-habitation problems, bad housing and drug abuse. YEPP initiated a variety of youth empowerment projects in this CHI, such as *the Renovation Project*,

---

[8] See: www.evensfoundation.be.
[9] See: www.yepp-community.org.

the *Matching Project*, *Solicity Training*, *Peer Education*, *Classroom of Difference* and *Community Television*.

The **Renovation Project,** for example, gives youngsters the opportunity to do vocational training and work in mixed teams (with professionals) to renovate dilapidated houses pointed out by the local authorities. They are coached on an individual basis and receive regular payment, an experience that helps and motivates them to find another job after the project. The socalled **Matching Projects** shall motivate youngsters to offer specific services to the elderly in the community (e.g. delivering meals, hair-cutting). The objectives are to reduce the gap between young and old, reduce mutual prejudices, gain work experience and stimulate voluntarism. The **Solicity Training** offers 'mock interviews' for less articulate youngsters in order to develop their communication skills and improve their self-esteem. The **Peer Education** trains younsters to become a 'peer' to other fellow students. Community Television is a joint YEPP project, which means that all CHI's in the different countries produce documentaries with the youngsters as scriptwriters, directors and producers. The goal is that youngsters "translate" their perception of the world into their own visual images.

The **Community Empowerment Projects** encourage and (financially) support all kinds of initiatives that are set up by inhabitants to improve their living environment. The objectives are to (1) encourage inhabitants into taking their own action and responsibility, (2) to improve the relationship between inhabitants and city services and (3) to foster voluntarism and active citizenship. One example for such a community empowerment project is the *Language Cafe* that offers and informal way to teach Dutch as a second language to newcomers.

The discussion on Verbists' presentation centred around the question of how to measure the impact of projects such as those Verbist had outlined. Verbist explained that society was not a laboratory, which made it impossible to control and measure all factors of change. It was remarked that the impact of such projects can only be qualitatively described but not measured. Wimmer argued that processes of change need to be documented with new, more adequate methods.

The next best practice example was introduced by Dieter Galinski (*Citizen Foundation, Hamburg,* Germany), who is the co-ordinator of the project **Streetsoccer League Hamburg**[10]**.** The streetsoccer project was founded in 2001. Since then it has reached more than 2.600 children and young people in the city of Hamburg. The idea of streetsoccer was born in Colombia's second largest town Medellin approximately eight years ago.

---

[10] See: www.streetsoccer-Hamburg.de.

The approach of "**Futbol por la paz" – soccer for peace –** had travelled from Latin America to Germany.

The streetsoccer project in Hamburg was set up in a CHI characterised by drug and prostitution problems, crime, large anonymous housing estates, many immigrants, high rates of unemployment and xenophobia. The target group of the streetsoccer project in Hamburg are young people aged 12 to 16 years. 90 per cent of them come from the centers of high intensity; 30 per cent are ready to use physical violence solving conflicts. Most participants of the project are boys from econimically, socially and educationally deprived families. About 80 % of the participants have a migration background.

Streetsoccer differs from soccer: Team and pitch are smaller. The team consists of four players. They play on a field of 10 by 15 metres without a goalkeeper**.** A match takes only ten minutes. There is no referee that is why street soccer puts emphasis on technical competence, proficiency and interaction skills. Winning the game – apart from kicking the ball – depends on the capacity to negotiate the violation of rules and comply with the rules of your fellow players. Players who slam or foul disqualify. Playing fair and taking responsibility for ones own game is important. However, the streetsoccer project also trains young people to act as mediators in offering conflict resolution in conflict situations. The educational objectives with respect to citizenship education can be summed up as follows:

- **Commitment and reliability** are learnt as important skills that are the preconditions for engagement in the community or in civil society
- **Taking responsibility** for organising and realising the leagues provides the youngsters with a sense of responsibility
- **Tolerance and non-violent conflict management** are practised during the games (fair play)

Galinski also stressed another function of streetsoccer for young males: decreasing aggressions, while at the same time learning to act fair, accept rules and solve conflicts in a non-violent way. Therefore, Galinski argued, it can be considered a violence-preventive approach. He also emphasised that streetsoccer provides young players with an experience of **companionship and a sense of community** beyond ethnic lines.

Apart from the educational objectives the Streetsoccer League has build up a remarkable **network** between the *Citizen Foundation Hamburg,* the youth welfare office, the public authority for sport and education with the departments of violence prevention and sport, a sports club and the police.

Social youth work benefits from this unusual co-operation that links school, juvenile welfare service, sports and police.

The presentation was commented on very enthusiastically by many participants of the group that welcomed the innovative and cross-cultural approach to citizenship education with a residual group.

The first presentation on the panel "**Cultural Education – a Way to Reach HRLs"** by Michael Wimmer (*edukult*[11], Austria) focused on **examples of good practice** with cultural education in Europe. Wimmer presented an example from Denmark, telling the story of a small town that created an own opera by mobilising many citizens to participate and contribute. In another example, Wimmer described the establishing of the new subject "culture and arts" in Dutch schools that succeeded in motivating students to attend and report on cultural events. Some schools in Austria, Wimmer outlined, allow students to do internships at cultural institutions which he considered a great opportunity for young people to get in touch with culture.

Wimmer argued that cultural education is an indispensable part of citizenship education. After all citizenship, according to Wimmer, had also to deal with various forms of culture (national, diverse, European). He defined cultural education as education that includes artistic forms of expression.

The second presentation on cultural education was given by Kaili Lehtemaa (Estonia). She presented the project **Kinobuss**[12]. The Kinobuss was founded in 2001 by six young filmmakers in Estonia. The bus is equipped with screening equipment, tents, and film-computers. It travels around the country with a team of volunteers, mostly film students, to screen films in particular in the rural areas that have no access to cinemas. The volunteers do not only show the films – they also produce films (short films and animations) with children and youngsters and by doing so help them to develop media literacy. The project is so successful that the Kinobuss-team gives media classes in kindergardens as well as in public schools, delivers teacher training (on media) and travels to Sweden, Finland and Latvia for screenings. Lehtemaa showed film works from children and young people that had participated in her classes and workshops.

The third presentation by Hans Skolund (*Kulturskolan[13]*, Sweden) dealt with the **Stockholm School of Arts**. The origin of the school goes back to the socalled *Var Teater* – a theatre created by children, with children and performed for children – brought to live by Elasa Olenius in

---

[11] See: www.**educult**.at.

[12] See: akamai.tehnokratt.net/gems/**kinobus**s/Teataja2005.pdf.

[13] See: www.kulturskolan.se.

the 1940ies. Taking up this approach to work with children in the arena of arts and culture, Kulturskolan Stockholm started project work in 1996. The school, financed by the city of Stockholm, has a staff of 370 persons, reaches about 14.000 pupils and counts 28.000 participants annually, which makes it the biggest school of Arts in Europe. Kulturskolan includes a variety of arts such as dance, theatre, baroque ballet, world music, classical music, singing, hip hop. The main educational goal according to Skolund is making children happy. Skolund presented a number of projects run by Kulturskolan often in close co-operation with schools: Digital story telling (a modern version of the ancient art of story-telling); PLEJ (learning an instrument and practising with the help of a computer programme); Theatre (games, theatrical improvisation, movement, own plays or dramatisation of a book or tale); *What tolerance?* (Short film on the issue of (in) tolerance by students); *Fast Bucket* (cultural scholarship for pupils); Hip Hop Centre (Courses on Hip Hop, Rap, Street Dance, Graffitti).

The **discussion** following the presentations on cultural education asked about the **relationship between cultural activities and citizenship** (Erle). It was argued that the definition of citizenship was too broad with respect to cultural education. If cultural education was to be considered a form of citizenship education the term would loose contours (Fuchs).
It was argued that artistic methods are good methods to enhance citizenship (Skolund). Cultural and artistic techniques were considered to be an innovative contribution to the approaches of citizenship education (Grüne).
Miljevic stressed that culture and sports are powerful tools to reach HRLs and "get them on board." She supported more holistic approaches to citizenship that would integrate cultural education. Verbist added that learning to express one-self in many different ways is a precondition for becoming a participating citizen. Turner made the point that arts and cultural work have to do with finding a voice – an individual and a collective voice. Therefore she considered cultural education relevant to citizenship education.

2. Results of Working Groups and Questionnaires

The working groups were composed of participants from different countries and dealt with the following questions:

1. What are the aims of citizenship education for HRLs?
2. What are the challenges that have become evident during the discussion?
3. What further activities/projects are required on a European level?

4. What could your institution contribute in terms of building up and fostering a European exchange/development strategy of successfully integrating HRLs into citizenship education?

(1) With respect to the first question: **"What are the aims of citizenship education for hard to reach learners?,"** participants compiled the following list:

- Self-confidence
- Increasing participation in learning (a pre-condition) and increasing participation in society/politics (outcome)
- Basic skills (language/literacy/numeracy) as a pre-condition rather than an aim
- Communication, social interaction, present an argument or a case, readiness to assume responsibility
- Community empowerment
- Tolerance and open mindedness
- Knowledge of political processes and structures (there may be different aims relevant at different times)
- Awareness of rights and responsibilities, opportunities to enjoy these rights and actively participate
- Integration – Identification: HRLs realise themselves as part of a community
- Goals depend on specific target groups: (a) Motivating, raising interest, involvement (children); (b) Acceptance, respect, mutual understanding (adults)

(2) With regard to the second question **" What are the challenges that have become evident during the discussion?"** participants brought up the following issues:

- Participants asked: How to get to a common definition and understanding of citizenship education in Europe?
- Many participants stressed that the question of "Who are the HRLs?" has to be answered within specific contexts, not in general terms.
- Apart from that it was emphasized to consider the role of the (educational) system in creating HRLs.
- Others questioned the setting of curricula by teachers and institutions, arguing that a need-oriented approach was essential for reaching HRLs.
- It was noted that the workshop presented many good examples of ways of reaching certain HRLs. However, the challenge remains how

to keep them in the system: Funding is needed, progression and support when HRLs leave educational projects.

(3) The third question "**What further activities/projects are required on a European level?**" brought about the following list of suggestions:

- Lobbying for common projects
- Exploring strategies of keeping learners involved
- Setting up cross-border projects with HRLs
- Pooling European institutions working in this field
- Creating a "European observatory" – a source of information about partners (Partner European Agency for Civic Education (PEACE): PEACE would provide an overview of national and transnational projects (best practices); it would help to create a network; it would provide brief summaries of projects and contact details for circulation as well as a chat room for experiences (in order to avoid "reinventing the wheel").
- Workshops for and with groups of HRLs
- Creating a toolbox
- Database with "best practices"
- More specialisation (target groups, methodologies, testing, evaluation, modifying)
- Exploring and developing methodologies of open dialogue
- Workshop on participation in the civil domain

The last question: **What could your institution contribute in terms of building up and fostering a European exchange/development strategy of successfully integrating HRLs into citizenship education?,** produced the following list of commitments and offers:

- Training the *Junior Team Europe* to be facilitators for citizenship education (Fuchs)
- Research in citizenship learning and work with "hard to reach learners"; good practice examples from projects (Turner)
- Exchanging experiences on Roma development projects/ Roma education (Becze)
- Initiating a *Baltic Sea Cup of Street Soccer* taking a first step towards citizenship education through non-verbal communication (Galinski)
- Fundraising
- Developing programmes

- Networking: Partnerships and sharing of networks, experience and expertise

3. Feedback of Participants and Conference Communication

The overall response to the workshop by the participants was positive. Participants appreciated the opportunity to discuss the challenges of HRLs in such a European forum, learning about different approaches and best practice examples from other countries.

Many participants, however criticized, that the workshop was structured very strictly in terms of time management because it consisted of twelve presentations. Due to the dense programme the working days were long and did not leave much time for in depth discussions and reflection. There was not much time for informal exchange (breaks). For future workshops it was strongly suggested to work in smaller groups.

Some participants criticized that not all the projects presented did address the workshop theme, which was perceived as confusing. To some participants the discussion on defining HRLs seemed too long and theoretical.

Others felt that there was too much jumping from one projects to the other. One participant missed a link between the debate on HRLs in general and the challenges for citizenship education targeting this group in particular. Another participant criticised that the workshop did not succeed in clarifying the relationship between citizenship education and cultural education. Some discussants felt that the gap between theory and practice could not be bridged in the workshop.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation for Future Activities

Most of the weak points of the workshop (see point three of this report) were mentioned by the participants themselves as for example the overloaded programme. However, I think that the many inputs would not have been a problem, if those presenting projects or papers, had had a clear understanding of what the specific function of their presentation was supposed to be. There was no differentiation in design and timeframe between a project presentation, a theoretical input, the introduction of an institution or a statement. From my perspective this caused a rather confusing mix of very specific inputs that were difficult to be related to each other.

From a contend perspective, I think that participants had difficulties managing the two issues combined in the workshop programme (HRLs and citizenship education) at the same time: On the one hand there was an ongoing but unsolved clarification process on the question of citizenship education and what was meant by it. On the other hand, there was a debate on how to define HRLs. Even though the group could agree on a common definition, the term itself was considered inadequate, because it represented a system perspective on the learner. Many participants preferred to talk about "residual groups" (Larsen) rather then HRLs. The term HRLs, it was criticized, did not reflect the fact that residual groups are being produced by the educational system and its institutions. The group stressed that the term HRL did not take into account that these learners are those excluded by the system for a variety of reasons. It was emphasized that the causes for individual failure and institutional exclusion need to be analysed carefully in order to develop strategies, approaches and materials for this specific group of learners.

With regard to future activities, I think it is very important to distinguish whom to work with: residual groups themselves , institutions or NGOs. If there was a follow up workshop, it should concentrate on one specific group as for instance the Roma, women or immigrants. The best practice projects chosen for an exchange should follow a certain set of quality criteria (see Turner, page 10). Such a criteria-oriented approach might not only help to identify and link European projects that work on a comparative level, but also provide common ground for joint projects. Finally, the idea of pooling European institutions working in this field could be addressed in this way.