

SHOULD INFORMAL/NON-FORMAL LEARNING BE CONSIDERED IN TEACHER EDUCATION AND TEACHING? – REFLECTIONS BASED ON THE ANHOLT PROJECT

Karen Bjerg Petersen
Aarhus University, Denmark

Abstract: *In the past decades, the importance of developing and validating informal and non-formal learning processes has been launched by several international organizations including UNESCO and the OECD, originally mostly focusing on adult learning experiences. Meanwhile, in recent years an increased focus has been evidenced on introducing informal and non-formal learning environments for learners at primary and secondary school levels as means of re-engaging in particular school-leavers, drop-outs, and disadvantaged learners in the formal educational system. Educational policy, empirical studies, projects, and various pedagogical interventions carried out in Europe, the United States, and other countries evidence this development. Based on empirical data and research from an European project “Anholt 2013” aimed at empowering disadvantaged and disengaged young European school-leavers, and motivating them to take responsibility for their own need for education, this article sets out to reflect whether informal and non-formal learning environments should be considered in teacher education and teaching.*

Keywords: informal learning, non-formal learning, disadvantaged learners, disengaged students, teacher education

Introduction

In the past decades, the interest in how informal and non-formal learning could support formal learning has increased (Carlinger, 2013; Conlon, 2004; Livingstone, 2001, 2006). Concerns about increasing drop-out rates among students in primary and secondary school have worried educators and politicians; Denmark being no exception (Danish Government, 2011; Sørensen, Hutter, Katznelson, & Juul, 2013). As a result, during the past decade a heightened focus in research aimed at identifying drop-out factors, engaging students in schooling, and preventing young people from leaving school before finishing final exams can be evidenced (Doll, Eslami & Walters, 2013; Wang & Degol, 2014). Many educators, being involved in social work and alternative schooling systems for school-leavers as means of re-engaging these young people in the formal educational system, have suggested innovative and alternative intervention forms, which in many cases

include informal and/or non-formal learning settings.

Since 2008, in a series of pilot projects and seminars, a group of European educators have focused on re-engaging young school-leavers, aged between 13 and 19 years old in alternative educational activities based on experience- and interest-driven approaches in informal and non-formal settings (Höllmüller, 2011; Lind & Schroeder, 2012; Petersen, 2014a, 2014b). Based on investigations from the project entitled “Anholt 2013”, including findings from the project *Anholt 2011* (Höllmüller, 2011), the aim of this article is to discuss whether informal and non-formal learning and alternative educational approaches must be more consciously considered in teacher education and teaching in order to maintain student engagement especially among vulnerable and disadvantaged students.

In section one in this article I will address historical contexts of the notion of informal

and non-formal learning and the recently heightened focus among educational politicians and educators to these notions due to increasing drop-out rates. In section two I will introduce the educational ideas and summarize research findings from the Anholt projects. Finally, in section three, I will reflect upon whether informal and non-formal learning should be considered in teacher education and teaching.

Informal, Non-formal, and Formal Learning – History and Contexts

The notion of informal learning has been addressed in research since the 1950s, particularly in adult education. Knowles's (1950) book, *Informal Adult Education*, is considered the first contribution, which is partly based on John Dewey's ideas that "learning takes place through an individual's experiences, lifelong learning and, the role of reflective thought in education" (as cited in Conlon, 2004, p. 286). Meanwhile, it was not before the 1970s and 1980s that informal learning in connection with the concept of lifelong learning was acknowledged worldwide (Carlinger, 2013).

In a 1973 UNESCO report, entitled *The Faure Report*, on future worldwide educational planning, Platt (1973) raised discussions and notions about informal learning. A variety of "educational vectors" aiming at developing a future "learning society" were outlined in the report (Platt, p. 8). First of all "diversification of learning opportunities" including a set-up of "plural offerings in school and *out of school*" were outlined as being of immense importance for a future knowledge society. The requirement to "design linkages from nonformal [sic] to formal education" was similarly emphasized in the report (p. 9). The demand for equality and equity of educational opportunities was highlighted, and the organization of "'second change' arrangements to serve drop-outs and push-outs" was suggested (p. 10). Several ways

of obtaining equality were outlined in the report, for example organizing "work study programmes," "school connected apprenticeship," "creative arts," use of "local environment," and harnessing "informal educational potentials" (p. 10-11).

While the Faure report was the first to highlight the importance of informal learning in global educational policy, in 1996 the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) "agreed to develop strategies for 'lifelong learning for all'" (OECD, n.d.). Like the Faure report, the OECD's concept of lifelong learning "includes formal, non-formal, and informal learning" and the understanding of learning "from-cradle-to-grave." Since, the political awareness of the importance of informal/non-formal learning has increased. In 2004, the European Commission began to systematically develop "Common European Principles for the identification and validation of non-formal and informal learning," and "European Guidelines for validation of non-formal and informal learning" (European Commission, 2013, p. 1).

While the concept of informal learning in earlier years can be traced back to primarily adult education, in recent years it is also linked to engaging vulnerable and disadvantaged young people, who have left primary and secondary education without final exams. Politically, the increased drop-out rates among youngsters in Europe has led to a EU agenda in which efforts of validating young people's non-formal and informal learning have been launched. The European Commission highlights its aims

...to expand career and life-enhancing learning opportunities for young people with fewer opportunities and/or at risk of social exclusion. In particular, these young people should benefit from the expansion of opportunities for non-formal and

informal learning and from strengthened provisions for the recognition and validation of such learning within national qualifications frameworks. This can help to open the doors to further learning on their part. (Salto Youth, 2012, p. 4)

Increasing Drop-out Rates

While political efforts in Europe are underway to recognize and validate informal learning, various explanations to the increased amount of school-leavers without final exams have been forwarded. Some researchers have focused on individual reasons and students' own explanations for dropping out by investigating school-leavers personal motives and referring to theoretical models indicating push, pull, and/or falling-out factors (Bradley & Renzulli, 2011; Doll et al., 2013; Stearns & Glennie, 2006). According to Doll et al. (2013)

A student is *pushed out* when adverse situations within the school environment lead to consequences, ultimately resulting in dropout.... Students can be *pulled out* when factors inside the student divert them from completing school.... *Falling out* of school...occurs when a student does not show significant academic progress in schoolwork and becomes apathetic or even disillusioned with school completion. (p. 293, emphasis added)

While Stearns and Glennie (2006) and Bradley and Renzulli (2011) point to significant variations in dropout rates and reasons by grade level and age indicating that multiple dropout processes may influence teenagers to leave school, Doll et al. (2013) indicate that students' main reasons for leaving school, pushed-out factors constitute 48.7%, pulled-out factors 36.9%, and falling-out factors 14.3%. Meanwhile, these conclusions are based on meta-investigation of various studies, and

the authors emphasize that "caution should be taken in making comparisons across years and studies" (p. 293).

In contrast, other educational researchers have pointed to structural, societal, and educational policy reasons for increased drop-out rates. Critical European and American researchers and educators have for example highlighted unintended negative implications of neo-conservative education policy (Ball, 2006, 2009; Berliner, 2014; Berliner & Nichols, 2005; Biesta, 2007, 2010; Shohamy, 2001; Winter, 2011). One negative aspect is that the intense focus on testing in formal education leads to both inequality and inequity, higher drop-out rates, and a narrowing of curriculum content with teachers and educators focusing on merely teaching-to-the-test activities and excluding disadvantaged students (Berliner, 2014; Berliner & Nichols, 2005). Fear and inequality created by increased testing is another critique raised by the Israeli test researcher, Shohamy (2001, 2006). The "democratic deficit" in neo-conservative educational policy and thinking desiring "to have total control over the educational process" is a further critique outlined by the prominent European educational researcher, Biesta (2011, p. 539). The tendency to reproduce inequality in the formal educational system was highlighted by Bernstein (1971) and is repeated by Biesta, Berliner, and others in the 2010s.

Notions and Definitions of Informal/ Non-formal and Formal Learning

The increasing drop-out rates of particularly vulnerable and disadvantaged students have led politicians, researchers, and educators to suggest alternative educational approaches including informal/non-formal learning as means of re-engaging school-leavers without final exams in the formal educational system. In the past decade, researchers and politicians

have sought to define the notions of informal/non-formal and formal learning. Livingstone (2001) defined informal learning as “any activity involving the pursuit of understanding knowledge or skill which occurs without the presence of externally imposed curricular criteria...in any context outside the pre-established curricula of educative institutions” (p. 4). Livingstone outlined that “when teachers or mentors take responsibility for instructing others without sustained reference to an intentionally-organized body of knowledge in more incidental and spontaneous learning situations, such as guiding them in acquiring job skills or in community development activities” (p. 2), this might be called informal learning.

In contrast, non-formal learning is considered the type of learning in which “learners opt to acquire further knowledge or skill by studying voluntarily with a teacher who assists their self-determined interests by using an organized curriculum, as is the case in many adult education courses and workshops” (Livingston, 2001, p. 2). While Livingstone focused on the non-curricular environment of informal learning, Ainsworth and Eaton (2010) emphasized the educational outcome of informal learning in the following way: “...when learners can see the real-world application of their skills they are more likely to understand why it is important to continue to build their skill and competence level” (p. 36). Carlinger (2012) recently broadened the concept of informal learning to include “situations where the learner determines some or all combinations of the process, location, purpose, and content, and may or may not even be aware that instruction has occurred” (p. 5).

The distinctions between formal, informal, and non-formal learning have also been launched by organizations like UNESCO, OECD and the EU.

Although discussions and ambiguities in both the literature and the practical

understanding of the distinctions between informal and non-formal learning persist, it is emphasized by many that those involved in informal learning are often not aware of that they are learning. The European educators in the Anholt projects, setting out to develop new alternative educational approaches for disadvantaged young people (Lind 2014), defined their understanding of informal learning in continuation of Livingstone (2001), Robinson (2010), and the above outlined definitions. Lind and Schroeder (2012) stated

The term ‘informal learning’ includes anything we do outside of organized courses to gain significant knowledge, skill, or understanding. It occurs either individually or with other people. An interesting aspect of informal learning is that although it may be intentional, in most cases it is unintentional, incidental, random, or ad hoc. (p. 6)

The Anholt Project

The educational approaches (Lind, 2014; Pozo, 2014) in the *Anholt Project* (hereafter used as a generic term for the educational approaches) were implemented and investigated in two projects on the Danish island Anholt in 2011 (Hölmüller, 2011) and 2013 (Petersen, 2014a).

In the Anholt project, the European educators 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. (Petersen, 2014a, p. 10).

Anholt 2013 took place as a fourteen-day project for twenty-four young people from six youth organizations in six European countries: Germany, Austria, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and Denmark. The gender

distribution was eleven girls and thirteen boys. The participants were aged thirteen to nineteen years. The group of young people consisted of school-leavers, students facing academic or other problems, and some were considered vulnerable or disadvantaged due to various individual reasons. The participation in the project was voluntary (Petersen, 2014a).

The educational approaches in the Anholt project were conceived of and implemented as an opportunity for young people to *voluntarily* and *electively* engage in various experience- and community based and interest-driven informal learning processes. The Anholt project hence created both opportunities and structure for the young people in terms of providing the opportunity to freely and optionally participate in various *leisure volunteer activities* and *work experience/internships*.

The assumptions behind the pedagogical considerations were 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 and to choose activities and training, based on their own, and not someone else's choices” (Petersen, 2014a, p. 10). Furthermore, the European educators 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” (p. 10).

Research Findings: The Anholt Project

In the research of Anholt 2011, Höllmüller (2011) investigated whether (a) it is possible to make informal learning processes visible and (b) how informal learning can be supported by a non-formal setting (p. 2). Based on 225 observation charts (p. 5), 89 reflection charts (p. 10), and short daily interviews with the participants (p. 14-17), Höllmüller came to

the conclusion that “on the whole” the Anholt project “showed how informal learning processes within a nonformal frame can be observed and thus made visible” (p. 27). Regarding the second research question, Höllmüller stated “that informal learning often happens in less structured, self-organization-enabling programs with little distraction” in which in particular the relationship between adults and the young people are of importance (p. 27).

The purpose of linking a further researcher to Anholt 2013 was to bring the European educators “closer to valid documentation of the values and importance of the learning methods” they were exploring (Petersen, 2014a, p. 6). Two research questions were investigated in Anholt 2013. In continuation of Anholt 2011, the first research question was whether (a) informal learning occurred at Anholt 2013 and in what ways, and (b) whether intercultural learning occurred at Anholt 2013 and which kinds (p. 12-13).

Compared to the research in 2011, the research in 2013 was focused towards investigating the participants' outcome of the educational approaches. Based on theories about mixed-method research and triangulation (Frederiksen 2014), the data collection methods in 2013 were extended. As a result, comprehensive data were collected: 711 observation charts; 312 short daily interviews with the 24 participants; three in-depth individual interviews with the participants before, during, and after Anholt 2013 (in total 72 interviews); 180 observations from ethnographic fieldwork (see Blommaert & Jie, 2010); and finally, interviews with Anholt 2011 participants and European educators (Petersen, 2014a, p. 12-13).

After collecting, the data were processed, analyzed, coded, and recoded in quantitative and qualitative data based on EU Youthpass key competences (EU Youthpass Guide, 2011, p. 20). The skills

investigated in Anholt 2013 were (a) communication in foreign languages, (b) self-knowledge, (c) basic skills, (d) other skills, (e) social and civic skills, (f) entrepreneurship and sense of initiative, and (g) intercultural skills (Petersen, 2014a, p. 48). The quantitative data consist of three SPSS-processed data sets: (a) observation charts, (b) daily interviews, and (c) in-depth individual interviews. The qualitative data consist of field notes, responses, and extracts and statements from the various interviews (Petersen, 2014, p. 14-19).

In a research report on the outcomes of Anholt 2013 and the answers to the two research questions are stated as follows:

both informal and intercultural learning have been identified and analyzed 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 the young people stayed on the island of Anholt during this project. (see Petersen, 2014a, p. 48; for in-depth findings see p. 19-41)

The participants' overall impressions of the project can be evidenced in the third in-depth individual interviews, carried out after they returned to their home countries. A young Austrian school-leaver at-risk summarized his impressions: "It was great because we could take responsibility for ourselves and make own decisions without being criticized by adults" (Petersen, 2014a, p. 48).

Follow-up investigations on two particular Danish participants, who both were school-leavers, indicate "that informal learning in the Anholt project has influenced [the participant's] motivation for education" (Christiansen & Hansen, 2013). In 2014, in connection with the release of a film documentary about the Anholt project, the

two Danish participants were interviewed again and responded that they had returned to the formal Danish education system (Tv2oj Tema, 2014). In October 2015 a Spanish participant responded to the question of impact that "Anholt 2013 has changed my life." Another young Spanish participant from 2013 replied, "I learned that I am responsible for my own actions, that nobody was telling me what to do, and that I had to learn it myself. For me it was a 'key to life'" (Petersen, 2015).

A film documentary following three of the participants before, during, and after Anholt 2013 evidenced how the informal concept of giving young people possibilities, the freedom to choose, and be responsible of their own life without interference apparently had a significant impact on their personal development and life (anholt-project.eu., n.d.; Tv2oj Tema, 2014). The film documentary summarized the "adventure" of the three young people on Anholt 2013 as "...a journey inwards, to take control of one's-self, take risks, expand horizons, love, loose and perhaps realize that their past need not determine what they can do next in the future" (anholt-project.eu, n.d.).

Despite the fact that longitudinal impact studies are required to fully evidencing the applicability towards disadvantaged students and school-leavers of the educational approaches in the Anholt project, in continuation of Ainsworth & Eaton (2010), the research findings and outcomes from 2011 and 2013 may indicate, that "the real-world application" of the young peoples' skills in the Anholt project made the participants "more likely to understand why it is important to continue to build their skill and competence level" (Ainsworth & Eaton, 2010, p. 36).

Reflections about the Relevance of Informal Learning for Teacher Education and Teaching Based on the Anholt Project

The research findings, data, and case studies from the Anholt project introduced alternative pedagogical intervention forms, and interest-, community-, and experience-driven educational approaches aimed at developing independent, responsible young people. The findings indicate that the European educators have succeeded in their striving to re-engage school-leavers and at risk young people to return to the formal educational system.

These findings, on the other hand, may raise reflections about formal education, and in particular teacher education and teaching. Apart from an overall consideration whether informal and non-formal are at all relevant to formal education, and in particular to teachers and teacher education, another reflection could be raised whether alternative educational approaches, like the ones introduced in the Anholt project, are worth considering and introducing in schools and teaching. A further consideration to be raised is whether teachers and teacher educators ought to be more aware of various kinds of learning possibilities in informal learning settings.

Such reflections may foster a variety of responses, ranging from more general reflections about informal/ formal education and the overall purpose of education to discussions about specific proposals for extracurricular informal activities, which could be introduced in elementary and secondary school.

General Reflections about Informal and Formal Education: The Heritage of John Dewey

In the endeavor to discuss whether informal and non-formal educational approaches as implemented in the Anholt project should

be considered in formal education, teacher education, and teaching, it might be relevant to return to one of the most influential educational philosophers, John Dewey's general reflections about the aim of education. It is well known that one overall theme in Dewey's work was his belief in democracy – in politics, education, and communication. Dewey's statement from 1888 that “democracy and the one, ultimate, ethical ideal of humanity are to my mind synonymous” is essential (as cited in Boydston, 1969, p. 138). Linking education to democracy, equality, and humanity is at the core of Dewey's ideas about the aim of education. Biesta's (2007) critique mentioned in the beginning of this article about the ‘democratic deficit’ in contemporary education may remind us about some of the core values of education forwarded by Dewey more than 100 years ago.

In 1897 in his *Pedagogic Creed*, Dewey forwarded many of his beliefs and ideas that might remind today's teachers and teacher educators about general aims of education, schools, teaching, and teachers' roles. Dewey emphasized the importance of seeing schools as supporting both the individual psychology of a single child *and* the child's social life. In fact, Dewey put the importance of social life and social activities in the foreground of education. The aim of education according to one of Dewey's creeds is to support children's development in their own social activities. Dewey wrote, “To prepare [a child] for the future life means to give him command of himself; it means so to train him that he will have the full and ready use of all his capacities” (Dewey, 1897/1959, p. 19-20). Dewey continued “I believe therefore, that the true center of correlation on the school subjects is not science, nor literature, nor history, nor geography, but the child's own social activities” (p. 25). Dewey's critique of his own era's understanding of the teaching profession resonate with today's educational researchers' criticism of the

distinctive focus on accountability, narrowed curriculum focus, and high-stakes testing as mentioned earlier in this article. Dewey stated, “I believe, that under existing conditions far too much of the stimulus and control proceeds from the teacher, because of the neglect of the idea of the school as a form of social life” (p. 24). Dewey continued, “I believe finally, that education must be conceived as a continuing reconstruction of experience; that the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing” (p. 27).

Dewey’s idea of education as “a continuing reconstruction of experience” that gives students “command” of themselves so that they “will have the full and ready use of all [their] capacities” mirror the educational ideas and outcomes in the Anholt project, in which informal learning settings have enabled many of the young participants to take command of themselves. The critique of the European educators’ being in charge of disadvantaged students, and European and American researchers outlining negative implications of current global education policy for formal education echoes Dewey’s considerations and reflections about the purpose of education more than 100 years ago. In continuation of the many celebrations on John Dewey’s’ relevance for the past, present and future educational considerations, dedicated researchers’ and educators’ voices concerning recent decades development within formal education throughout the world, indicate that alternative and other informal educational approaches such as implemented in the Anholt project might be relevant to consider, reflect, and include in both teacher education, formal education, and teaching (Ball, 2006, 2009; Berliner, 2014; Biesta, 2007, 2010; dewey2016.co.uk; Winter, 2011).

Reflections about the Implementation of Informal Learning Processes in Formal Education

The educational approaches forwarded by the European educators in the Anholt project are not new. Experience-, community- and interest-driven educational approaches, implemented in formal education have been evidenced and developed since the 1990s (Boud & Miller, 1996; Experience Based Learning Systems [EBLS], n.d.; Kolb & Yeganeh, 2012; LIFE, n.d.).

The emphasis in the Anholt project that such approaches might be of particular benefit for disadvantaged students and school-leavers may nevertheless cause interest in a formal educational system striving to prevent young people from leaving school too early. The educational approaches invented in the Anholt project, enabled teachers to be ‘at eye level’ with at-risk, disadvantaged, and vulnerable young students by first giving the students opportunities to take responsibility for themselves, and second, establishing trustful relations with adults, could be important to consider in formal education and teaching throughout the world as a way of addressing increasing drop-out rates.

When it comes to ‘hands-on’ considerations about whether educational approached like those introduced in the Anholt project could possibly be introduced as specific extracurricular proposals for re-engaging vulnerable and at-risk students in the formal educational system, it should be reminded that this specific educational approach needs profound preparation, reflections, and collaboration among teachers and educators. The European educators have themselves forwarded a number of “Practical Advices” (Pozo, 2014) and outlined an “Educational Framework” (Lind, 2014) in order for others to follow and understand these educational ideas. No doubt, the

educational approaches could be adapted in various extracurricular activities, aiming at putting students' own activity and understanding in center of learning. Many other educators have forwarded similar or other proposals for arranging extracurricular activities, and evidence has been forwarded for the efficacy of such approaches. Nevertheless the introduction of experiences must be done in the specific context of specific schools taking many factors into account.

In sum, when it comes to considerations about whether teacher education and formal education should consider introducing informal learning processes as a possibility in line with the ordinary curriculum, here similarly, it seems necessary to both reflect and eventually adapt some of the educational ideas to specific facts. It has been seen in Piagetian approaches, for example, that it is possible to adapt and introduce profound experience and learner centered approaches in teacher education. One example is the Canadian-American teacher educator Eleanor Duckworth's

longstanding work at the Harvard School of Education to introduce profound Piagetian approaches into in teacher education (Duckworth, 1997, 2006). As it is known from meta studies carried out by another influential educational researcher the Australian/New Zealand John Hattie (2009), Piagetian programmes are mentioned as the second most efficient study programme (1,48) out of 138 ranged indicators, in which for example feedback is mentioned as number ten (see visible-learning.org, 2015). Alternative approaches like those introduced in the Anholt project, hence, seem to be worth listening to in both teacher education and schools. As is the case with the introduction of alternative educational approaches and extracurricular activities in specific teaching settings, however in teacher education, reflections about introducing informal learning processes, enabling students to take responsibility for their own learning processes on one hand seem worth taking into consideration, and on the other hand, also undoubtedly require further and specific development.

References

- Ainsworth, H. L., & Eaton S. E. (2010). *Formal, non-formal, and informal learning in the sciences*. Retrieved from http://w.eatonintl.com/www.eatonintl.com/Research_files/Formal,%20non-formal%20and%20informal%20learning%20in%20the%20sciences.pdf
- anholt-project.eu (n.d.). *The Anholt project*. Retrieved from <http://anholt-project.eu/about-the-documentary/>
- Ball, S. J. (2006). *Education policy and social class: The selected works of Stephen J. Ball*. London: Routledge.
- Ball, S. J. (2009). Privatising education, privatising education policy, privatising educational research: Network governance and the 'competition state.' *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(1), 83–99. doi: 10.1080/02680930802419474
- Berliner, D. C. (2014, April). How poverty and culture affect achievement scores around the world. Keynote presented at ISfTE Annual Seminar, Antalya, Turkey. Abstract retrieved from <http://www.isfte2014.org/AbstractBook.pdf>

- Berliner, D. C., & Nichols, S. L. (2005). *Test results untrustworthy: Point of view essay*. Arizona State University, USA: Education Policy Studies Laboratory. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED508512.pdf>
- Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education* (pp. 47–69). London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Biesta, G. (2007). Why “what works” won’t work: Evidence-based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research. *Educational Theory*, 27(1), 1–22. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-5446.2006.00241.x
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Boulder, CO, USA: Paradigm.
- Blommaert, J., & Jie, D. (2010). *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner’s guide*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Boud, D., & Miller, N. (Eds.) (1996). *Working with experience: Animating learning*. London & New York: Kogan Page.
- Boydston, J. A. (Ed.). (1969). *The early works of John Dewey, Vol. 1, 1882-98: Early essays and Leibniz’s new essays, 1882-88*. Carbondale, IL, USA: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Bradley, C. L., & Renzulli, L. A. (2011). The complexity of non-completion: Being pushed or pulled to drop out of high school. *Social Forces*, 90, 521–545.
- Carlinger, S. (2013). How have concepts of informal learning developed over time? *Performance Improvement*, 52(3), 5–11. doi: 10.1002/pfi21330
- Christiansen, T. D., & Hansen, S. S. (2013). *A case study from Anholt 2013*. (Unpublished master’s thesis). Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark.
- Conlon, T. J. (2004). A review of informal learning literature, theory and implications for practice in developing global professional competence. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 28 (2/3/4), 283–295. doi: 10.1108/03090590410527663
- Danish Government. (2011). *Regeringsgrundlag. Et Danmark, der står sammen*. <http://uvm.dk/I-fokus/95-procent-maalsaetning>.
- Dewey, J. ([1897]/1959). *My pedagogic creed*. In M. S. Dworkin (Ed.), *Dewey on education: Selections with an introduction and notes* (pp. 19–31). New York: Teachers College Press.
- dewey2016.co.uk (n.d.). *John Dewey’s ‘Democracy and Education’: 100 years on: Past, present, and future relevance*. Conference at Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, UK.

- Doll, J. J., Eslami, Z., & Walters, L. (2013). Understanding why students drop out of high school, according to their own reports: Are they pushed or pulled, or do they fall out? A comparative analysis of seven nationally representative studies. Retrieved from Sage Open, <http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/3/4/2158244013503834>. doi: 10.1177/2158244013503834
- Duckworth, E. R. (1997). *Teacher to teacher: Learning from each other*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Duckworth, E. R. (2006). *The having of wonderful ideas: And other essays on teaching and learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- European Commission. [2013]. *Recognition of prior non-formal and informal learning in higher education*. Retrieved from <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/focus-on/152.pdf>
- EU Youthpass guide (2008). *Youthpass – Making the most of your learning: Youthpass guide*. Retrieved from <https://www.youthpass.eu/downloads/13-62-64/Youthpass%20Guide%2018-10-2011.pdf>
- Experience Based Learning Systems, Inc. (n.d.). Retrieved from learningfromexperience.com
- Frederiksen, M. (2014). Mixed-methods forskning – fra praksis til teori. In M. Frederiksen, P. Gundelach, & S. R. Nielsen, (Eds.). *Mixed-methods-forskning. Principper og praksis*, pp. 9–34. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Höllmüller, H. (2011). *Anholt report research on non-formal learning processes*. (Unpublished). Retrieved from https://informalisnormal.files.wordpress.com/2012/08/anholt_research.pdf
- Kolb, D.A. & Yeganeh, B. (2012). Deliberate experiential learning: Mastering the art of learning from experience. In K. Elsbach, C. D. Kayes & A. Kayes (Eds.), *Contemporary Organizational Behavior in Action* (1st ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education. Retrieved from <http://learningfromexperience.com/media/2012/02/deliberate-experiential-learning.pdf>
- Knowles, M. S. (1950). *Informal adult education*. New York: Association Press.
- LIFE. (n.d.) *Learning independently from experience*. Retrieved from <http://lifeschoolwebsite.wix.com/life>
- Lind, A. S. (2014). The educational framework. In K. B. Petersen (Ed.), *The Anholt project 2013* (pp. 13-22). Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University.
- Lind, A. S., & Schroeder, K. (Eds.). (2012). *The Anholt project: The informal island adventure that makes young people grow*. Retrieved from <https://informalisnormal.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/anholt-book1.pdf>

- Livingstone, D. W. (2001). *Adults' informal learning: Definitions, finds, gaps, and future research: New approaches for lifelong learning (NALL)*. Working paper 21, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Canada. Retrieved from https://www.lindenwood.edu/education/andragogy/andragogy/2011/Livingstone_2001.pdf
- Livingstone, D. W. (2006). Informal learning: Conceptual distinctions and preliminary findings. In Z. Bekerman, N.C. Burbules, & D. Silberman-Keller (Eds.), *Learning in places: The informal education reader* (pp. 203–229). New York: Peter Lang.
- Ministry of Education, Denmark (2013). *Undervisningsministeriet - Definitioner på formel, ikke-formel og uformel læring*. Retrieved from <http://www.uvm.dk/service/Publikationer/Publikationer/Tvaergaende/2009/Uddannelse%20for%20baredygtig%20udvikling/Indledning.aspx>
- OECD. (n.d.). Recognition of non-formal and informal learning. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/edu/skills-beyond-school/recognitionofnon-formalandinformallearning-home.htm>
- Petersen, K. B. (2014a). Informal and intercultural learning among young Europeans: The Anholt Project 2013. Research report. Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark. Retrieved from <https://informalisnormal.files.wordpress.com/2014/03/research-report-final-informal-and-intercultural-learning-among-young-europeans-karen-bjerg-petersen-2014.pdf>
- Petersen, K. B. (Ed.). (2014b). *The Anholt project: Part II- 2013*. Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark. Retrieved from <https://informalisnormal.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/k-anholt-ii-bog.pdf>
- Petersen, K.B. (2015). Anholt II – 2013. Youth exchange. Informal and Intercultural learning. Research. Presentation at the University of the Balearic Islands, October 23rd. *Step in: Informal is normal. Seminar. October 20th-25th, 2015*, Mallorca. (Unpublished). Retrieved from Cooperacio.uib.cat/Transparencia/Arxiu-noticies/Seminari-Step-in-Informal-is-Normal-Els.cid412092
- Platt, W. J. (1973). The Faure report: A turning point in educational planning. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED101482.pdf>
- Pozo, T. (2014). Practical advices. In K. B. Petersen (Ed.), *The Anholt project: Part II-2013*. (pp. 97-122) Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark. Retrieved from <https://informalisnormal.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/k-anholt-ii-bog.pdf>
- Robinson, K. (2010). Changing education paradigms [TED Talks]. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_changing_education_paradigms
- Salto Youth. (2012). Recognition of youth work and non-formal and informal learning within the field of youth: Current European developments. Retrieved from <https://www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17->

2722/3%20Overview%20of%20recognition%20policy%20developments%20Dec%202012.pdf

- Shohamy, E. G. (2001). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. London: Pearson Education.
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Sørensen, N. U., Hutter, C., Katznelson, N., & Juul, T. M. (Eds.). (2013). *Unges motivation og læring*. Copenhagen: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Stearns, E., & Glennie, E.J. (2006). When and why dropouts leave high school. *Youth & Society*, 38(1), 29–57. doi: 10.1177/0044118X05282764
- Stier, J. (2014). *The Anholt project: Documentary*. Retrieved from <http://jamesstier.co.uk/portfolio/anholt-project/>
- Tv2oj Tema (2014). *Eksperimentet på Anholt*. Retrieved from http://www.tv2oj.dk/arkiv/2014/11/16?video_id=52717&autoplay=1
- Vifin. (2013). Methodology notes for the Anholt 2013 project [in Danish]. Unpublished.
- Visible-learning.org. (2015). Hattie ranking: Influences and effect sizes related to student achievement. Retrieved from <http://visible-learning.org/hattie-ranking-influences-effect-sizes-learning-achievement/>
- Wang, M. T., & Degol, J. (2014). Staying engaged: Knowledge and research needs in student engagement. *Child Development Perspectives*, 8(3), 137–143. doi: 10.1111/cdep.12073
- Winter, P. (2011). Coming into the world, uniqueness, and the beautiful risk of education: An interview with Gert Biesta. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30, 537–542.

Author

Karen Berg Petersen, Ph.D., is an associate professor at Aarhus University in Denmark. She has been a long-time member of ISfTE and is currently the journal editor. Her research interests include informal/intercultural learning; second language teaching and learning; curriculum studies; culture education and theory; and testing and benchmarking within educational policy.