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Executive summary

This deliverable presents the main findings from the teachers’ training needs analysis survey and insights gathered from NEMESIS partners. These findings will inform the design and development of the teacher training to take place in June 2018.

First, we provide an overview of the deliverable. This includes the timeline of the survey and report, the objectives of the report that were defined in the bid and the research approach.

Then, we give information about each pilot school and cluster in the 5 countries involved in the NEMESIS project and hence the survey.

We present how we designed and developed the content and format of the needs analysis survey and give information on ethics and confidentiality, technological considerations and, due to the survey taking place in 5 European countries, translation issues.

Then we discuss the data collection approach and process in the pilot, the implications this had for the full survey and the decision to conduct further sampling. We explain the survey rollout and then provide quantitative analysis of the demographic information of survey participants and the findings from the qualitative analysis of all the data.

We end with conclusions taken from the analysis of all information gathered which will inform the design and development of the teachers’ training on delivering Social Innovation Education (SIE) in the pilot schools.

Some key highlights from the findings were that teachers, despite being unfamiliar with the concept of SIE, could engage with the idea of a social approach to education which would involve collaboration and co-creation to make the world a better place. A focus for teachers is how SIE might enhance education and help inspire young people to get involved in the world and change it for the good of everyone. These values are reflected in teachers’ ideas and suggestions for the content and format of the training. Teachers are also keen to understand the work of a Social Innovator and see social innovation in action so that they can recreate such experiences for students. Teachers see value in experimenting with current and new teaching methods and want to share with and learn from colleagues through the NEMESIS project. On the flip side teachers have many, and significant, concerns regarding potential barriers to implementing SIE. Time, infrastructure constraints, alternative priorities and (in France, Spain, Greece and Portugal) a lack of autonomy due to education being controlled by the central government, are important issues which limit school and teacher interventions. An important element of the teacher training in Greece will be to help teachers consider how they can approach such obstacles in their own context and settings.

1. Deliverable 2.1 overview

This cross-cultural needs report (deliverable 2.1) presents the training needs of primary and secondary teachers from the five participating countries regarding Social Innovation Education (hereon SIE). We collected and analysed data to identify their training needs (task 2.1) which will inform the content and delivery of the training we are providing for teachers from the 5
participating countries in Thessaloniki, Greece in June 2018 (milestone 2.1). This training is a starting point from which we will devise and provide remote and face to face ongoing support for teachers wishing to implement the NEMESIS educational model.

1.1. Timeline

Task 2.1: identification of teachers’ training needs - Month(M) 5
Deliverable 2.1: cross cultural needs report - M7
Milestone 2.1: teacher training - M9

1.2. Objectives

The cross-cultural needs report will summarise, compare, analyse and conclude the main findings identified from the answers provided in the training needs analysis survey. This will include overall main challenges, needs, knowledge gaps with regards to teachers’ familiarity to Social Innovation (hereon SI) issues, co-creation activities, project-based learning, digital storytelling and other teaching approaches across the different countries participating in the consortium. This report will highlight:

- How teachers conceptualise SIE and SI skills.
- What current approaches teachers use to embed SI into the classroom and school curricula.
- The use of digital storytelling and innovative learning tools in general in education.
- Approaches on how to involve students in innovative learning tools dealing with SI.
- The main areas where teachers require training on SI issues.
- The main barriers faced in involving students in innovative SI learning tools and training teachers in SIE.
- The main means teachers wish to have when receiving training on SI issues.

We will take into consideration any differences in countries and teachers’ needs regarding implementing SIE in their educational settings as identified in the report, as this also will assist us in understanding if national differences in levels of knowledge are so differentiated that they require a different pedagogical and methodological approach.²

1.3. Research approach

Considering the co-production ethos of this project, and the collaborative methods we seek to develop, the methodology for the training needs analysis survey draws on a compatible research philosophy. We used mixed methods that focus on gathering responses to open questions,

² NEMESIS Project Plan, page 19 - 20 / electronic page 74-75.
collective production of ideas and collaborative analysis of our findings. In short, we adopt a reflexive empirical approach and accept that all data are the results of interpretation and research products are a process of construction. We are not aiming to establish ‘facts’ but to gather insights, interpretations and the production of a narrative that is seen as legitimate by the parties to this project. Therefore, we unapologetically use the ‘we’ form and quote individuals verbatim to reflect the collaborative and human element of the project.

2. Participants

2.1. The pilot schools

The four schools in the consortium are from the UK, Greece, Portugal, Spain. There is also a school from France, which is not part of the consortium, which is taking part in the pilot. The schools cover a range of ages from primary to secondary education and come from a variety of backgrounds. Here is an overview of each partner school / school cluster as provided by the schools:

2.1.1. The UK

Herringthorpe Junior School (HJS), Rotherham, South Yorkshire.

HJS is part of the Willow Tree Academy and is a primary school for children aged 7-11 years. It has 13 teachers and 360 students. Two-thirds of students are of White British heritage, with Pakistani students forming the next largest group. Many do not speak English as their first language. HJS is in a disadvantaged area. The school has won the platinum award for enterprise from Warwick University’s Centre of Education and Industry and is part of a Champion Schools for Enterprise programme in its borough, providing support and training to schools seeking to develop enterprise learning. It develops social enterprise through ‘Real Projects’ (see section 5.3.3).

2.1.2. Greece

6th Intercultural and All-day Primary School of Eleftherio-Kordelio, Thessaloniki

This is a primary school for children aged 6 - 12 years. It has 29 teachers and 290 students (233 students from Greece and 57 from other countries such as Albania, Russia and the Ukraine). Many students come from under-privileged social groups such as refugees, immigrants and Roma. The school has a lot of experience in innovative projects but not in SIE.

The 67th Elementary School, Thessaloniki

This is a primary school for children aged 6 - 12 years. It has 30 teachers and 230 students. This school mainly has Greek children with 35 Syrian refugees also. The school is the only school with a specific program for refugee children (an afternoon welcome class and language teachers to teach...}

---

them Greek) in the municipality of Thessaloniki. Social needs and the fight for survival of the local, community, with its poor economy, leads to the neglect of the children. The school has experience of European projects but not in SIE.

**1st Experimental Primary School of Thessaloniki**

The school is a primary school for children aged 6-11 years. It has 25 teachers and 277 students. Most students are Greek with some from Albania. The school is in a middle to high class area. It is one of the few Model Experimental Schools in Greece. The school has a lot of experience in innovative projects / educational scenarios but not in SIE.

**The 14th Lyceum School, Thessaloniki**

This school provides secondary education to students aged 15 - 18 years. There are 27 teachers and approximately 278 students. The students are Greek. It is in a deprived area. The school has a lot of experience in innovative projects / educational scenarios but not in SIE.

### 2.1.3. Portugal

Agrupamento de Escolas de Maia, Maia, Porto

The Maia Cluster of Schools is composed of 4 schools: Secondary School of Maia (host school), E.B. 2/3 of Gueifães; E.B1.n.º 1 of Gueifães and E.B.1.n.º 2 of Gueifães. The cluster teaches children aged 3 - 18. In the cluster there are a total of 260 teachers, 760 children in the primary schools and 1240 in the secondary school. There are several students of Chinese, Romanian and Ukrainian descent, who do not always speak Portuguese. The cluster is in a middle / lower middle-class area. They have some enterprise education provision such as the Junior Achievement Association that works on entrepreneurship with young people, but they do not teach Social Innovation.

### 2.1.4. Spain

CEIP Los Albares, Zaragoza, Aragón

Los Albares is a public, primary bilingual school. Students are from 3 to 12 years old. There are 34 teachers and 488 students. Although most students are Spanish, some are of Romanian, Moroccan and Portuguese origin. The school is in a middle-class area. It is an innovative centre with a desire to evolve towards socially entrepreneurial education.

### 2.1.5. France

Ruffi School, Marseille

Students are aged 3 - 10 years. Ruffi has 17 teachers and 350 children. More than 90% of the students have foreign parents / are of foreign origin so French is their second language. It is in a very disadvantaged neighbourhood. 75% of the parents are unemployed. It opened in 2004 in uncomfortable, temporary prefabricated buildings. Most teachers are beginners except for management. Pupils regularly have violent behavior; the school is classified as a “Priority Education Zone”.
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3. Designing the teachers’ needs analysis survey

This section explains the rationale behind the questions chosen for the survey.

3.1. Creating the survey content

The goal of achieving a minimum of 100 survey participants across 5 countries suggests that this survey is not about creating generalizable results through a large sample\(^4\), but rather aims to explore the qualitative experiences of teachers in different countries and contexts with regards to SIE. In this case, quality should be prioritised over quantity, and the goal is to try to elaborate sufficient depth in the responses to get closer to understanding the variety of contexts and training needs.

As described in the report objectives the broad research topic is teachers’ training needs with regards to SIE. The subtopics that we drew from this are described in section 1.2 and formed the basis for the survey schedule.

Open ended questions with no minimum or maximum word count have been used so as not to limit or cap what teachers might write. An aim of the open-ended question is to (within the limitations of an online survey) elicit richer, more detailed qualitative data (than would short and/or closed questions) and provide a space for teachers to share their existing knowledge, experiences, thoughts and insights.

Whilst the questionnaire aims to identify knowledge gaps, the approach utilised to do this is to draw on, and value, the professional opinions of teachers. Question words such as ‘describe’ and ‘reflect’, ask participants to draw upon their own experience and give their opinions to avoid ‘talking down or otherwise insulting the intelligence’ of respondents\(^5\).

Linguistic clarity is important because ‘as question worders we need to develop a critical attitude toward our own questions’\(^6\). This is especially pertinent because the questionnaire will be completed in a variety of schools that not only have different backgrounds but are in different countries and may therefore have very different educational systems and social contexts. If surveys are translated into other languages, they must try and retain the same meaning.

Semantic clarity is also important because ‘we questioners assume that people know what we are talking about...we assume that they understand our questions. We assume that their answers are in the frame of reference we intend’\(^7\). If participants have to interpret the meaning of questions it may produce responses that provide extraneous and/or misleading information.

---

\(^4\) Dillman et al. (1998).
\(^6\) Le Baron Payne, (1951), p.16.
\(^7\) Le Baron Payne, (1951), p.16.
3.2. **Selecting an online survey provider**

We outlined a list of our requirements in an online survey and investigated 12 online survey collection formats using criteria such as data collection, storage, analysis and cost. We decided to use the standard paid package of Survey Monkey (hereon SM).

3.3. **Ethics and confidentiality considerations**

Consortium schools and Ruffi School, France gave written permission and are aware that they may withdraw and terminate their voluntary participation at any time. The pilot schools’ NEMESIS teams, Les Têtes de l’Art, Valnalon and KMAKEDPDE were highly supportive in facilitating understanding of the survey content, resolving translation issues and engaging survey participants. Some participants were from pilot schools / clusters, some were from schools not directly involved in the project. All were aware that they were not obligated to complete the survey:

Greece – Nikos Amantadis (from KMAKEDPDE) picked the participating teachers based on their interest in the following:

- innovative pedagogies and teaching modes
- engaging in new areas of teaching and learning (that could involve social innovation, inclusive teaching, multicultural ways of teaching and learning)
- adopting instructive methods to boost participation and knowledge outcomes

UK - Social Enterprise International used existing contacts to engage secondary school teachers. Jane Fearnley (CEO of Willowtree Academy) and Louise Greenwood (HJS school leader) asked staff across the school cluster:

- to apply to be part of the NEMESIS project
- to outline the work they had already done in social enterprise
- to detail why they wanted to support the academy in moving social enterprise forward

Spain - The majority of the teachers who completed the survey are those who have voluntarily committed to work as part of the centre’s NEMESIS team and a few teachers who at the moment prefer to collaborate in the project in a timely manner.

Portugal - The cluster’s NEMESIS project coordinator emailed all teachers from the cluster and the teachers from the school’s NEMESIS Team recruited existing contacts within their schools.

All individual participants will be referred to anonymously. All consortium schools and partners can contact Social Enterprise International via email as and when they feel necessary.

At the second consortium meeting in Seville (January 2018) we met with the consortium schools and partners to discuss and explain how the surveys would be conducted. Participants survey responses are stored securely in two cloud-based storage systems - Survey Monkey (SM) and on

---

8 Annex 1 - a table showing how the criteria used to select an online survey provider.
the NEMESIS server. Only Social Enterprise International and, as necessary, partners involved in the survey process can access this information.

Social Enterprise International will use the information collected to plan the teacher training (milestone 2.1, M7). We will archive the data for potential secondary use linked to the production of the handbook (deliverable 6.6, M38) and to inform dissemination and scaling of the NEMESIS educational model. We have made participants aware of the potential for any secondary use but will make contact again to give them the opportunity to consent or withdraw their data prior to any secondary use.

3.4.   Technological considerations

SM can be accessed from computers, laptops, tablets and mobile devices thereby making it easy to respond to the survey. We considered that there may be technical issues and so additional to the SM link we sent all participants a Word document so that if they had a problem with SM they could send in their results by email. We encouraged participants to only send us results by email as a last resort to reduce the workload of manually entering answers into SM.

3.5.   Translation

We launched the survey in the five pilot countries: England, Greece, France, Spain and Portugal. We wanted to ensure that everyone could comfortably understand and respond to the survey, so we consulted the pilot schools and consortium partners in the corresponding countries regarding their translation needs:

- The teachers in Greece said that they could answer in English.
- The teachers in France completed individual surveys in English on the same day together with the support of Les Têtes de l’Art for language and clarification of Social Innovation Education.
- Ten of the Spanish teachers completed the survey as a group with the support of Valnalon. This response was submitted as a Word document in a combination of Spanish and English. We translated it and manually entered it into SM to collate it with the 10 surveys completed online. Some of the online surveys were completed in Spanish and some were completed in a combination of the two languages. We translated these.
- We had the questions translated into Portuguese for the Maia school cluster. Most teachers replied in Portuguese, so we had these translated into English.9

9 We looked at five translation companies based on cost, turnaround and customer service. We chose one company to translate the questions and responses based on their insightful questions regarding our unique subject matter.
4. Collecting the data

At the second consortium meeting we ran two OPERA sessions and a World Café (both methods are described in this section) to give all partners the time and space to think collaboratively and creatively about what they want from and how they envisage the training. We used this data with the survey responses to inform our planning.

4.1. Piloting the survey

We devised the first draft of the training needs analysis survey to elicit:

- Demographic and contextual information
- Knowledge of and thoughts on SIE
- Information to inform the content and format of the training
- Reactions to the first draft of a summary of the SIE values and skills framework

The survey was comprised of 30 questions and was piloted at Willow Tree Academy in England, a multi-academy trust with three schools in its partnership.

Jane Fearnley, CEO of Willow Tree Academy, considered who to select to participate in the pilot survey (such as new/old teachers, familiar with social innovation/less familiar with social innovation...) and sent us a list of names from across the three schools in the pilot school cluster. Jane ringfenced time at school for staff to complete the survey within the negotiated window of January 5 - 7th 2018.

4.2. Problems discovered by piloting the survey

1. We sent the survey link to Jane to forward on to colleagues but once she had answered the survey the link expired.
2. We had intended for the survey to take a maximum of 45 minutes to complete however the average time participants spent on the pilot survey was 136 minutes.
3. Participants could not see what they were writing as the text continued in a ‘single line text box’. This was frustrating because it made editing responses difficult.
4. Participants discovered that if they left the internet browser tab they were completing the survey in when they went back to it they were in a different place.
5. Sometimes the email with the survey link went into recipients’ spam folder.

4.3. Implications for the real survey

1. We requested the email address of all participants so that each respondent would receive a unique link to the survey.
2. We redrafted and refined the survey by rewording and merging questions.

---

10 See annex 2 - the training needs analysis survey - draft (v1)

11 See annex 3 - the training needs analysis survey - final version (v3)
3. We created new surveys with a ‘comment box’ which made responses easy to read and edit.
4. We advised participants not to leave the tab they were completing the survey in.
5. We made the pilot schools aware that the survey link may go into recipients’ spam folders.

4.4. Survey rollout

In the second consortium meeting we consulted all pilot schools regarding the survey. We gave out relevant information regarding:

- Design and development of the survey
- Online survey provider chosen
- Survey length
- Translation considerations
- Survey launch date (February 5th 2018) and completion date (February 14th 2018)

Schools were able to ask questions and voice concerns or ideas. One concern was that it may not be possible to begin the survey and return to it later, so we agreed to send all participants a Word document of the questions enabling them to cut and paste their responses into SM at their leisure.

Throughout the 9 day survey completion window we sent timely emails to all participants thanking them for taking part and politely reminding them of the date that the survey would close. We also had contact with the pilot schools and some individual recipients regarding technological issues, which were all resolved.

The survey closed at 9am GMT on Thursday February 15th. We sent emails thanking participants and especially the NEMESIS partners for their dedication to engaging, supporting and participating in the survey.

4.5. Demographic information of survey participants

Each country provided us with a different number of voluntary participants. Our target was 100 responses. We sent the survey to 131 recipients and received 83 responses - a response rate of 63% and an 83% response rate with regards to our target.
Objective one of the NEMESIS project states that children of primary and secondary age are the target recipients of the NEMESIS educational model so both primary and secondary schools were involved in the survey. At this point it is pertinent to highlight that whilst in the UK primary schools teach students from 4 - 11 and secondary schools teach students from 11 - 18 this is not the same across Europe. The total age range taught by the participants is from 4 - 20 years old. We have based the terms ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ on UK standards however there is an overlap between primary and secondary in European schools as they both contain 12 year olds.

---

12 Section 1 - 3, page 4 / electronic page 59.
Both male and female participants were involved in the survey. There are clearly more responses from women and this could be because there are, in general, more female than male teachers, especially in primary education.

4.6. Additional data collection

As we developed and refined the survey we theorised that further sampling would be useful so we widened our methods to include collaborative data collection with NEMESIS partners at consortium meeting two held in Seville in January 2018. The face to face interaction allowed for rich discussions regarding the NEMESIS project and teacher training. This extension of data collection methods reflected the social philosophy of the project. Two collaborative activities were conducted - an OPERA session and a World Café activity - to gather data and harness the expert and unique opinions and insights of NEMESIS partners.

4.6.1. OPERA (Participatory decision-making)

OPERA has been pioneered by Innotiimi, and stands for own ideas, pairing, explaining, ranking and arranging. At the second consortium meeting (in Seville, January 2018) Cliff Southcombe and Rory Ridley-Duff (both from Social Enterprise International) split attendees into two groups and each facilitated an OPERA session. The question for people to consider was - ‘what impact do you envisage NEMESIS having on your stakeholders after the project ends?’ Everyone had 10 minutes to reflect and make notes however they wished before next sharing and discussing their ideas in a pair. Then each pair chose 3 ideas that they liked the best to put on the OPERA board and explained their rationale to the group. Each pair then had time to read all the ideas on the board and could vote 3 times for the ideas they preferred. Any ideas without votes were removed and the remaining ideas were discussed and organised into themes by the group.

4.6.2. World Café

This is a carousel activity. At the second consortium meeting we created 4 groups of people and four sets of tables. Each group comprised a mix of schools, Social Innovation Practitioners (SIPs) and partners. One member of Social Enterprise International was at each table each with a different topic regarding the teacher training to take place in June 2018. Each group spent 10 minutes at each table discussing and suggesting ideas whilst the Social Enterprise International team members recorded the responses in a thread on Loomio or in Word. All partners were invited to join Loomio so that they could read and add to the 4 threads.

5. Findings

In this section the findings from all three methods of data collection (World Café, OPERA and the online survey) are presented and analysed alongside the survey findings in section 5.3.

---


15 See Innotiimi’s ‘best practice’ page for suggested readings on OPERA.

16 Loomio is online decision-making software designed to assist groups with the collaborative decision-making process.
5.1. World Café

The findings from the World Café in consortium meeting two are presented in the four Loomio thread titles from the activity: logistics and agenda, activities and icebreakers, examples of existing SIE practice and how should SIPs be involved in the workshops in Greece?

5.1.1. Logistics and agenda

Relationships were highlighted as important; partners want to try to understand each other’s environment and way of working in each country so training and support will be more successful. Practically, this was reflected in very specific suggestions about name badges, introductions, speed dating and time to talk/share practice.

Participants wanted to know what to do, but have an experiential focus, for example, making prototypes, leaving the classroom, a simulation of a Co-Creation Lab, with a mix of formal and informal experiences.

Teachers are concerned about how colleagues who are not at the training will be involved, how they will be supported after the training and how they might interact with each others’ schools. ‘How to’ was a common theme: ‘how to start’, ‘how to connect’, ‘how to get it going in the classroom’, ‘how to move from individual learning to social learning’. Teachers wanted practical examples of social innovation rather than SIE language to see how a real initiative fits in with the NEMESIS model, and time to work and plan together on something they could use in school. Finally, delegates reasoned that a summary and materials to take away so teachers feel confident on how to implement SIE, run a Co-Creation Lab and potentially a launch project would be helpful.

5.1.2. Activities and icebreakers

- Introduce each other in groups.
- A picture of the NEMESIS team with names on.
- A ball game to introduce yourself.
- ‘Social Innovation Café’ - informal chat with SIPs. Open all the time for people to come and go freely.
- ‘Walking Dev’ - a field trip for inspiration so ideas are remembered by being associated with a certain place.
- Online video communities.
- A celebration at the end of the training.

5.1.3. Examples of existing SIE practice (detail on each practice given, as available)

- School co-operatives
- Library project - CEIP Los Albares is a model in Aragón with regards the work of the school library. The whole community takes part in it: teachers, parents, students and the town
hall. The students are in charge of managing the break time timetable, the parents organise animated films and reading with the teacher coordinator throughout the school year. The town hall collaborates with the cataloguing of material and economic resources.

- Talks from writers and illustrators
- Family involvement in school projects
- Artistic project through electronic music
- Create a digital movement such as not using plastic straws
- Peer to peer conflict resolution
- Mock public trial on a researched social issue
- Co-creation of curricula and ‘real’ projects with staff and students - see section 6.2.3 for more information.
- Philosophy for Children - see section 6.2.3 for more information.
- Digital storytelling - this has been implemented throughout Herringthorpe Junior School, UK across a selection of subjects. For example, they have used story mapping in Talk for Writing, comic life on the iPads and presenting newspaper reports using Google Drive.
- YouTube - CEIP Los Albares is a Google School so pupils use the YouTube school channel and access to Google Classroom to communicate with students in and out of school. Students work in teams, record their work and upload it to the YouTube channel, for example in Science, Spanish, literacy...
- eTwinning
- EdModo - closed community for teachers
- Padlet - makes 360° virtual reality tours for free
- Tipping Point - website providing 100 mentors for students
- Zoom
- Class Dojo - behaviour for learning tool that links with parents
- Changemakers website - a UK platform for children with digital badges, a reward scheme and games.

5.1.4. How should SIPs be involved in the workshops in Greece?

SIPs thought that considering how you could replicate elements of their experience in teachers’ professional development and student learning would be a useful method for understanding the work of a Social Innovator. For example, teachers could become a volunteer or work on a social issue together and then consult SIPs on how they might approach it (for example, through a co-creation simulation). Afterwards teachers could compare the stages of their work to the 6 phases
of Nesta’s Spiral of Social Innovation\textsuperscript{17}. Some delegates thought that story telling by SIPs during the training would be inspiring and give a shared vision of potential final outcomes of SIE. It was suggested that a broader range of types of Social Innovator are invited to share their ideas, such as someone from a collective.

Figure 5-1 – Nesta’s Spiral of Social Innovation

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{nesta_spiral_of_social_innovation}
\end{figure}

5.2. Co-produced insights

As part of our co-produced analysis, the Social Enterprise International team met and used the OPERA learning and development technique to surface and discuss a number of cross cutting themes\textsuperscript{18}. Every OPERA needs a theme for participants to respond to, and ours was to think about ‘what struck us’ about the data set gathered to analyse teachers training needs.

5.2.1. Tensions

The highest ranked category which emerged from this process was that of ‘tensions’. Tensions exist in terms of teachers’ interest and experience in social innovation, approaches to practice, the scope of ambitions and views about the roles of different stakeholders. Some common tensions which struck us are distilled below.

\textsuperscript{17} Murray, R., Caulier-Grice, J., Mulgan, G. (2010).

\textsuperscript{18} Annex 5 - a photo showing the results of the OPERA used to co-produce insights of the survey data.
## Tensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envisage transformation of learning</th>
<th>Envisage minor adjustments to curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need more face-to-face and relationships</td>
<td>Need more technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for interdisciplinarity</td>
<td>Prioritise subject teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make my own changes</td>
<td>Tell me what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want expansive, open learning</td>
<td>Have to follow the national programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst the tensions are presented in a binary way in the table above, participants have views that span a continuum and reach the extremes.

Overall though, we discerned a difference in an approach to change - best illustrated by the picture below. Is the project about changing a small part of the existing structure, or about changing the structure itself?

**Figure 5-2 – Social Enterprise International's co-produced insights regarding the of impact NEMESIS**

5.2.2. **Barriers - ‘the impossible’**

Another issue that struck the team was that existing barriers were such that change might seem almost impossible. Whilst the barriers have been summarised and analysed in section 5.3.7, what struck us was the multitude and magnitude of these barriers. We talked about the extent to which the combination and concentration of such barriers might make any action on anything seem unachievable. From our interpretation, teaching can be as much a matter of survival as it can transformation. Contemplating the extent of teachers' anxieties is sobering - morale is frequently
described as low: for individuals, for organisations, for communities or for some combination of all three.

5.2.3. Perspectives

Another aspect which emerged for us was that the teacher group was not, by any means, homogenous. The teachers involved are from different countries, different types of socio-economic areas, different types and levels of schooling, serve different pupils and have different national pressures. They are at different stages of their careers and describe different roles in schools. The experiences and working realities of the group are diverse. Even how the survey was completed varied substantially, from some incredibly detailed and referenced responses, to others where ‘respondent skipped question’ - so the levels of existing knowledge and interest will also vary from perspective to perspective. When teachers attend the training in Greece, they will be coming with these different experiences, and will have these very different realities as their personal, professional and social context. The phrase one size won’t fit emerged during our discussions, and that a process, which can in some way bring to light and value these different perspectives, may help accommodate and celebrate such diversity as strength.

5.2.4. Philosophy

One strand of our discussion focussed on the link between educational philosophy and teaching practice and whether this was something that was clearly articulated. Three questions tried to surface connections teachers might make between their current view of a SIE philosophy and what that would mean for their practice in the classroom. Teachers were asked about what i) what educational philosophy they imagined underpinned the approach ii) what values and skills might be involved and iii) what kind of teaching approaches would be used. The middle question about values and skills appeared relatively easy to articulate, with sample words describing values and skills within easy reach. But the prospect of articulating an educational philosophy appeared more daunting, with frequent short responses and some ‘not sure’ answers. Then there was the extent to which a link was made between the underpinning educational philosophy and the teaching approaches enacted in the classroom. For example, if one believed the underpinning educational philosophy was to create curiosity and promote learning with the community, but the teaching approaches were cited as ‘technology’ and ‘group work’, the link between imagined philosophy and possible practice is vague, and possibly tenuous. It is important to recognise that personal and educational philosophies are deeply embedded and influence daily actions and choices. Whatever country and school policies are, teachers are the people who talk to students, teach subjects and create the classroom climate. These actions will be influenced by the personal philosophies and ideas a teacher holds about life and education. Having a strong sense of SIE, which is critically analysed or compared with existing personal philosophies and alternative educational philosophies may help increase understanding about what is distinct about the NEMESIS model and how it would be enacted.
5.3. Survey findings and analysis of all data gathered

5.3.1. How do teachers conceptualise SIE?

WHAT THE TEACHERS SAY...

“The search for new solutions to respond to the evolution of society by involving all stakeholders in a collaborative way.”

Primary school leader, France

“Education that combines a different philosophy to that which has traditionally underpinned our education, based on values and skills that can make our youngsters social innovators, so they can create new responses to pressing problems in the areas of society, health, education, justice, etc.”

Secondary school teacher, Portugal

“The orientation of the education towards innovation to the benefit of the whole society.”

Secondary school teacher, Greece

“Education as a collective, phased process where the solutions are (co-) created by the beneficiaries themselves. Create learning with the students.”

Secondary school teacher, Portugal

“There can be no real progress or innovation in a society when significant population groups are marginalized or treated unequally. A prosperous society demands individuals that reach their true potential and that each one supports the other. Marginalization can only lead to fragmentation of a community and there can be no progress, technological, economic or any other.”

Primary school teacher, Greece

“Helping to change pedagogical practices to improve society by helping children to become enlightened citizens and involved in the life of the city.”

Primary school teacher, France
The conceptualisation of SIE and the philosophy behind it appear inclined towards learning theories related to collaborative learning and experiential learning and a social reconstructionist view of the world. Social reconstructionism is a philosophy that emphasizes addressing social issues through education to create a better society and worldwide democracy. Reconstructionist educators focus on a curriculum that highlights social reform as the aim of education. Teachers say that SIE involves preparing children for the world around them to make the world a better place for themselves and others through collaborative education that helps co-create innovative and creative solutions to existing problems. Many also believe that SIE would involve a break with more traditional education.

We asked teachers which values and skills they believed would be needed to effect this change. They are presented in the word clouds below. The larger the font, the more the word was mentioned. We created a word cloud for each country to compare countries and then created a word cloud for all 5 pilot countries. There were many similarities between the countries as teachers thought that values and skills such as empathy, collaboration, communication and respect were important to instil in young people when teaching SIE. In addition to these parallels, in the UK resilience and teamwork were highly valued, in Spain ecology and teamwork were viewed as significant, in Portugal social responsibility was seen as vital along with autonomy, creativity, innovation, critical thinking and solidarity a close second and in France, mutual aid, autonomy, solidarity, understanding, creativity, sharing, cooperation and problem solving were viewed as crucial. Across pilot countries, teachers have varying ideas about which values and skills could be important in SIE. This could be based on numerous cultural elements from their personal experience, the area their school is in to existing educational and life philosophies in their schools and in their countries. However, some overarching themes that can be identified are that teachers believe that SIE constitutes people working together effectively for mutual benefit through a critical, creative and innovative approach to problem solving.

---

19 Dillenbourg (1999).
21 Annex 4 - the original list of values and skills mentioned by teachers in its entirety.
Figure 5-3 – The values and skills articulated by teachers in the UK in the survey

Figure 5-4 – The values and skills articulated by teachers in Spain in the survey
Figure 5-5 – The values and skills articulated by teachers in Portugal in the survey

Figure 5-6 – The values and skills articulated by teachers in Greece in the survey
Figure 5-7 – The values and skills articulated by teachers in France in the survey

Figure 5-8 – The values and skills articulated by teachers in all 5 pilot countries in the survey
5.3.2. **Are there already approaches on how to embed SIE into the classroom?**

Many current teaching approaches are perceived as a useful method for teaching SIE (these will be discussed in the next section) though there were not many reflections on how to embed it in the curriculum. In secondary schools there were suggestions that SIE could be embedded through the ‘character curriculum’ such as in Personal, Social, Health Education or learning skills lessons. Another idea was that building it into current Enterprise Education (EE) provision could work. Naturally both these ideas rely on current provision of the ‘character curriculum’ and EE being in place. Teachers would like guidance on how to embed SIE in their educational settings.

5.3.3. **Current use of digital storytelling and innovative learning tools.**

Teachers stated a wide range of learning approaches and tools. Many of these were forms of technology such as:

- **Software:** Kahoot, Socrative, Padlet, I can animate, Book Creator, Google Drive, Google Hangouts, gaming / gaming apps.
- **Hardware:** computers, tablets, mobiles.
- **Internet:** internet research, social media, blogs, websites.
- **Digital tools:** video presentations, digital storytelling, digital simulation, film, video, recorded diaries, video conferencing.

Teachers gave rich information on current innovative practice that, with their current knowledge of SIE, they believe involves the social philosophy of SIE:

- Enterprise projects such as students financing an aquarium for their classroom (Ruffi school, France).
- Correspondence exchange on traditional festivals.
- Student councils.
- Peer and self-evaluation.
- Volunteering projects like giving food to the local church.
- E twinning projects with several different countries.
- Running a recycling project.
- Orçamento participativo das escolas - schools are given money for students to decide on how to improve their school.
- REAL projects (HJS, UK - see quote).
- Philosophy for Children (HJS, UK): The teacher is concerned with getting children to welcome the diversity of each other’s initial views and to use those as the start of a process of that involves the children questioning assumptions, developing opinions with
supporting reasons, analysing significant concepts and generally applying the best reasoning and judgement they are capable of to the question they have chosen.  

5.3.4. **Approaches on how to involve students in innovative learning tools in SIE.**

Teachers gave an extensive variety of approaches that could be used to involve students in SIE which were all underpinned by creating value through living and actively participating in our surroundings:

- **Experiential learning** - investigation, open ended question led enquiry, experimentation...

- **Collaborative / cooperative learning** - group work, projects, peer learning, community, cross curricular, interdisciplinary, getting involved in government etc initiatives and programmes...

- **Innovative methods** - informal, flipped classroom (students watch the concept explanation on a video before class and use lesson time to ask questions and master the concept), CLIL - Content and Language Integrated Learning (teaching subjects such as science, history and geography to students through a foreign language) ...

- **ICT**: internet research, video presentations, gamification / gaming, apps, digital storytelling, digital simulation, mobiles, film, video conference, recorded diaries, social media, blogs, websites, Google Drive, Google Hangouts, tablets...

- **Expert input** - visits, visitors, lessons given by business people...

5.3.5. **Main areas where teachers require training.**

It appears crucial that teachers understand what SIE is, with material to support this, so it needs to be clearly defined. Teachers want to know how it differs to approaches such as Enterprise Education or Philosophy for Children and why SIE is beneficial to children. They would like some background information and research to contextualise the values and skills chosen for the SIE framework and to participate in collaborative work on developing the framework. Teachers would like to understand how a social innovator thinks and puts their thinking into action, and to have knowledge of sustainable development and practice.

Teachers feel that understanding the pedagogical approaches to be used in SIE and how to apply its philosophy in the classroom needs exploring and explaining. They say that it is important to make teachers aware of the impact it would have on future generations and how to make students think about the world around them and how to intervene to make it a better place to live in.

The areas teachers think training would be useful are in technology and ideas on how to involve parents and community members. They would like to explore how to embed SIE into lessons / curriculum / extra-curricular activities and how current practice such as literacy, numeracy, behaviour for learning, safeguarding, inclusion etc. can be linked to it so that current and new

---

22 Excerpt taken from the Herringthorpe Junior School website: https://herringthorpejuniors.com/category/p4c/
practice has a shared ethos and vision. Finally, teachers would like ideas on how to raise the profile of SIE in school.

5.3.6. **Main means teachers wish to receive training and ongoing support.**

Teachers’ responses suggest that whilst a mix of theoretical and practical training would be necessary, primarily a **collaborative** and **hands on** approach would be best. This could include:

- Observing and interacting with other teachers
- Teachers thinking creatively about how SIE can be delivered
- Team teaching
- Sharing practice
- Being given the time to test and try out SIE
- Informal discussions and comparisons
- Sharing successful examples of how to embed SIE in lessons / curricula / extracurricular activities
- New experiences from other colleagues
- Delivery by peers
- Talks given by innovative teachers and educators already involved in the project

Secondary teachers would also like examples of how to teach SIE in their subject area as some that believe the best approach for teaching it is to integrate it into mainstream curricula.

Teachers would benefit from **ongoing support** over time to inform and help develop their practice. The material should contain information to help teachers understand the fundamentals of SIE as well as new information so that teachers can keep their knowledge up to date. This could be presented through an online sharing platform...

**Information to help understand SIE** - documentation, bibliography, online materials, examples of SIE in action via video...

**Online support network** - advisory service, coaching, online training (such as a Moodle course), videos, forums...

...combined with tailored face to face support:

**Support from experts** - SIP support, SIPs as role models, expert speakers, frequent visits from NEMESIS trainers, direct contact with a NEMESIS expert to resolve any problems, observations by NEMESIS trainers...

**Support from colleagues** - share practice / experience with other European schools via video, Think Tank, regular contact & meetings with other schools in the project, observations by SIE champion for that school, support network...

Timely feedback from any ongoing training would be useful.
5.3.7. Main barriers faced in implementing SIE in schools.

According to teachers a main barrier is their lack of time whether it is because of their workload, timetable restrictions, being overburdened by curriculum content or limited time for students to engage.

They give a wide range of alternative priorities within their educational settings that they think would reduce their ability to implement SIE such as constant changes to curricula which continually become heavier in content and subsequently increase workload. The pressure on teachers to ensure students achieve their exam targets is a priority because it impacts students’ choices for further education and result publication determines school rankings. Existing school programmes and shifting programmes were also noted as potential barriers. Teachers are under huge pressure to meet targets which involves observations and can leave staff feeling exhausted and isolated with little time for reflection.

The attitudes of all stakeholders could be a barrier. Students need convincing that SIE is useful, staff needs to be prepared to apply a new and different approach, parents need to be happy to collaborate. Some believe that implementation needs to be top down to work and that incentives and rewards needs to be apparent.

The coordination of implementing SIE needs to be good so that teachers have the necessary training and knowledge and so can apply this to stakeholders and in educational settings that have varying needs.

Physical resources such as lack of finance, lack of or obsolete educational equipment and small classrooms that do not allow for certain educational activities may be a barrier.

In Greece, France, Spain and Portugal schools have limited autonomy because teachers are assigned to schools by the government so there is continual yearly turnover and teaching teams are unstable. The curricula are also fixed & highly centralised which offers little flexibility for change.

Some teachers mentioned that the average age and lack of staff could present a barrier to implementing SIE. Some teachers mentioned that student immaturity was a concern. In the French school cluster communication with children is an issue because many do not have French as their first language.

6. Conclusions

The information gathered gave us rich information with which to approach the design of professional development that teachers and partners will find valuable when delivering SIE. It became apparent that teachers’ responses mainly fell into two groups - the content and format of the training.

6.1. Training content

It seems that teachers from the 5 pilot countries (France, Greece, Portugal, Spain and the UK) generally agree that SIE is about making the world a better place for everyone through
collaborative education and co-creating innovative solutions to existing problems. Some of the main values and skills that teachers perceive to be related to SIE are empathy, collaboration, communication and respect. In addition to these cross-country similarities, in the UK resilience and teamwork were highly valued, in Spain ecology and teamwork were viewed as significant, in Portugal social responsibility was seen as vital with autonomy, creativity, innovation, critical thinking and solidarity a close second and in France, mutual aid, autonomy, solidarity, understanding, creativity, sharing, cooperation and problem solving were viewed as crucial. Hence, teachers believe that a clear philosophy and definition of SIE is needed as well as a thorough understanding of SI and the work and approach of a Social Innovator. Teachers would also like to engage in collaborative work on the SIE framework. It is imperative to understand how to run a Co-Creation Lab and teachers are keen to learn from colleagues and share good practice that they believe could be used in teaching SIE. This encompasses a wide range of methods that teachers are already using from experiential, collaborative and innovative approaches to technological tools. Seeing existing initiatives is perceived as useful to help inspire how to tailor and implement SIE in their own schools. A launch project was suggested to see how it might work in different countries and schools. Guidance would be welcome on how to inspire and make SIE experiential for students so that they not only think about the world around them but actively participate in it to improve it. They need to be able to show students how SIE is beneficial now and for the future. Some collaborative consideration on how to assess SIE, how to embed it into the curriculum and how to link your school with the community would be constructive.

Teachers would like to hear Social Innovation Practitioners’ (SIPs) stories about their work and experience as it would be inspirational and help teachers understand how a SIP works and what Social Innovation involves. SIPs are keen to be involved in the teachers’ professional development through adapting their own practice into approaches that could be used in teaching. Teachers would like to know exactly how SIPs will be involved with their school and think expert input would be valuable when delivering SIE.

Materials on the training, information to help understand SIE, ongoing support from NEMESIS experts and colleagues and a NEMESIS ambassador in schools would help teachers feel more confident in implementing SIE. An online sharing platform is perceived as a good way to provide ongoing support considering the international nature of the project.

6.2. Training format

Teachers value the opportunity to share this time with colleagues from their own schools as well as the 5 pilot countries. They want time to get to know each other and understand each other’s backgrounds, potentially through an informal space such as a ‘Social Innovation Café’ containing displays and information on schools, Social innovation Practitioners and partners that can be visited at any time. It seems that teachers would most like collaborative experiential training through a mix of formal and informal activities, with some evidence to explain how SIE can help young people. Sharing good practice and teaching methods that are already being used or could be used in SIE is viewed as invaluable. Time built into the training for planning, trying and testing out SIE, for example through the simulation of a Co-Creation Lab, is requested due to barriers such as lack of time, alternative priorities, lack of autonomy and infrastructure constraints when back in school.
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8. **ANNEX 1: A TABLE SHOWING THE CRITERIA USED TO SELECT AN ONLINE SURVEY PROVIDER**

**Online surveys**

**Considerations**

We only need the survey tool for 3 months

We may need it to be in English, Greek, French, Spanish and Portuguese

**Wishlist**

Translation - but from what I've seen from websites' examples we'd be better off getting real translators to do it then typing the correctly translated questions in ourselves.

Data analysis tools.

Ability to export and download so we don’t lose data after our subscription ends (if we don’t use a free one).

**Deadlines**

We need to agree an online format ASAP.

The survey pilot starts 8/1/18 at HJS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
<td>£35 a month</td>
<td>Can export data to Office. Can personalise survey. Text analysis - all we need</td>
<td>No translation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://www.surveymonkey.com/pricing">https://www.surveymonkey.com/pricing</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Forms</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Can export to Google sheets</td>
<td>Not much info on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views Capture</td>
<td>No website so emailed Sten for info - 4/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only yearly &amp; VERY expensive!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Service</td>
<td>Monthly/Yearly Price</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Translation Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoho</td>
<td>29€ a month</td>
<td>Has everything, inc translation…</td>
<td>Google translate!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Survey</td>
<td>£50 a month</td>
<td>Can upload a document</td>
<td>Pay more for translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoGo Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only yearly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Nuts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardly any info on website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Legend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Can’t export data. No translation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t remember but not interested because you can’ export data.</td>
<td>Free. Can translate.</td>
<td>Can’t export data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Gizmo</td>
<td>Very basic package</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Not much info on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typeform</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>No translation, data analysis or ability to export data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **ANNEX 2: THE TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS SURVEY - DRAFT (V1)**

**Question Schedule for Needs Analysis Questionnaire**

**Context**

1. Name.
2. Country.
4. Briefly describe your school (eg. Age, subjects, number of students and staff, type of community...)
5. Reflect on the culture (values, behaviours and meanings) of your school.
6. Describe your role/s (past and present) within school.
7. What are the key priorities that drive your school?

**Social Innovation Education (SIE)**

'Social Innovation Education is a combination of philosophy (how you think about the world and life), values (such as empathy, social responsibility...) and skills (such as collaboration, innovation...) that we think young people need to know to become the social innovators of the future.'

**SIE Content**

8. Tell us what you know about SIE.
9. What do you imagine are the philosophy & values related to SIE? Why?
10. What skills do you imagine are related to SIE? Why?

**Approach to teaching SEI**

11. If students were approaching SIE what learning approaches and methods do you think would be involved?
12. Describe any experience you have of developing or observing SIE learning approaches and methods.
13. Describe any examples of co-creation in your educational setting.
14. Describe how technology is used in your educational setting.
15. Describe how project based learning is used in your educational setting.
16. Describe how digital story telling is used in your educational setting.
17. Describe any other innovative learning tools that are used in your educational setting.
18. FAU/ASOCCE learning approaches to be added?

**Barriers**
19. With regards to developing SIE what are the main barriers to its development in education / your educational setting?

CPD

20. What training do you think teachers would need / appreciate to deliver SIE in education?
21. Describe how teachers would best receive this training - reflect on good experiences.
22. What kind of support do you think teachers would appreciate to help them deliver SIE after the training?

Draft SI Learning Innovation framework (this would show us who needs what type of support).

23. Are any of the values taught in your educational setting?
24. If so, how are they delivered / what approaches are used?
25. Are any of the skills taught in your educational setting?
26. If so, how are they delivered / what approaches are used?
27. Rank the values & skills?? Rank the values & skills in order of importance, in your opinion, into a 'diamond 9.'**
28. Please give us your honest reactions and critique of this framework.
10. ANNEX 3: THE TRAINING NEEDS ANALYSIS SURVEY - FINAL VERSION (V3)

Teachers’ Training Needs Analysis - final version

YOUR BACKGROUND

1. What’s your name?
2. What country are you in?

YOUR SCHOOL’S BACKGROUND

3. What’s your school name?
4. What ages do you teach?
5. What’s your school’s socio-economic background?

Social Innovation Education

’Social Innovation Education is a combination of philosophy (how you think about the world and life), values (such as empathy, social responsibility...) and skills (such as collaboration, innovation...) that we think young people need to know to become the social innovators of the future.’

SOCIAL INNOVATION EDUCATION

6. Tell us what you know about Social Innovation Education.
7. What do you imagine the educational philosophy* underpinning Social Innovation Education is? Why?
8. What values and skills do you imagine are related to Social Innovation Education? Why?

TEACHING APPROACHES

9. What kind of teaching approaches do you think might be used in Social Innovation Education?
10. Describe any experience you have of developing or observing Social Innovation Education teaching approaches, such as co-creation*, technology*, projects, digital story telling*...
12. What training do you think teachers would require to deliver Social Innovation Education?
13. Describe how teachers would best receive this training - reflect on good experiences.
14. What kind of support do you think teachers would need to help them deliver Social Innovation Education after the training?

Glossary

Educational philosophy - an individual teacher’s guiding principles about what education is.

Co-creation - activities that produce resources, ideas or approaches that are created not only by educators but by groups of people working together such as students, parents, social entrepreneurs and/or other community members.

Technology - any approach that uses an electronic device, such as a computer, tablet or mobile.

Digital story telling - using technology to give an account of a process or event.
11. **ANNEX 4: THE ORIGINAL LIST OF VALUES AND SKILLS MENTIONED BY TEACHERS IN ITS ENTIRETY**

**UK**

resilience, reflection, challenge, communication, collaboration, communication, socialinteraction, collaboration, reflection, corevalues, passion, socialinteractionskills, collaboration, globalcitizenship, empathy, respect, values, collaboration, innovation, socialinteraction, understanding, awareness, sensitivity, empathy, understanding, moral, ethical, justice, fairness, generosity, empathy, resilience, patience, courage, reflection, creativeproblemsolving, planning, collaboration, resilient, confidence, communication, conflictresolution, empathy, respect, resilience, communication, collaboration, problemsolving, outwardlookingperspective, values, sharedvalues, sharedpurpose, selfbelief, selfworth, collaboration, teamwork, resilience, respect, empathy, enterpriseskills, economy, politics, creativethinking, teamwork, management, leadership, followdirection, socialawareness, kindness, communication, empathy, humanity, teamwork, risk, negotiating, influencing, effectivecommunication, creativity, innovation, positiveattitude, initiative, organising, planning, problemsolving, leadership, ethicaldecisions, financialliteracy, product&andservicedesign, socialresponsibility, sustainability, tolerance, empathy, relationshipbuilding, cooperation, teamwork, understandingtheworld, empathy, teamwork, shareideas, active

**Spain**

empathy, effort, initiative, respect, empathy, involvement, teamwork, equality, ecology, empathy, involvement, respect, empathy, education, goodlistener, trust, cooperation, empathy, criticalthinking,
autonomy, socialskills, empathy, collaboration, teamwork, ecology, compromise, creativity, responsibility, evaluation, teammanagement, flexibility, abilitytolisten, integration, critical thinking, resilience

**Portugal**

socialresponsibility, creativity, innovation, cooperation, collaboration, courtesy, respect, citizenship, knowledge, innovation, creativity, entrepreneurialism, solidarity, responsibility, integrity, citizenship, participation, freedom, reasoning, problemsolving, criticalthinking, creativethinking, interpersonalrelationships, autonomy, personaldevelopment, wellbeing, health, empathy, socialresponsibility, collaboration, innovation, respect, responsibility, endeavour, enrich, criticalthinking, sharing, interaction, socialresponsibility, collaboration, technologicalskills, socialresponsibility, perseverance, solidarity, respect autonomy, teamwork, presentationskills, developingideas, communication, reasoneddecisionmaking, ethics, empathy, friendship, love, creativity, enthusiasm, union, justice, responsibility, autonomy, critical thinking, developingopinions, solidarity, empathy, socialresponsibility, opennesstochange, collaboration,
multitasking, managementskills, entrepreneurialism, criticalthinking, creativity, collaboration, socialresponsibility, personalresponsibility, autonomy, perseverance, effort, empathy, equalopportunities, respect, sensitivity, fairness, identifiesocialproblems, believetheycandomakeadifference, activeparticipant, identifyproblems, thinksofthewelfareofall, knowledge, questioning, reflection, analyticalskills, understandingdemocracy, criticalthinking, problemsolving, communication, collaboration, technologicalskills, flexibility, adaptability, initiative, self-direction, social, crossculturalskills, productivity, accountability, leadership, responsibility, originality, inventiveness, developingideas, implementingideas, communication, openmindedness

Greece

personality, accountability, solidarity, collaboration, mutualrespect, trust, freedomofexpression, communication, teamspirit, interdependence, empathy, respectofsoociety&nature, understanding, sympathy, empathy, collaboration, inclusion, openmindedness, artisticskills, socialresponsibility, activecitizenship, collaboration, values, criticalthinking

France

understanding, linking, communication, creativity, problemsolving, researchvalues, mutualaid, cooperation, tolerance, empathy, autonomy, reflection, solidarity, acceptance, enrichmentbydifferences, autonomy, mutualaid, solidarity, cooperation, experimentation, respect, openmindedness, diversity, collectivedevelopment, respectfortheenvironment, abilitytodebate, collectivedecisions, individual&collectiveparticipation, problemsolving, equality, adaptation,
creativity, fightagainspoverty&exclusion, horizontalrelations, engagement, citizenship, sharing, goodwill, responsibility, empathy, communication, debate, understanding, empathy, sharing

The 5 pilot countries

resilience, reflection, challenge, communication, collaboration, communication, socialinteraction, collaboration, reflection, corevalues, passion, socialinteractionsskills, collaboration, globalcitizenship, empathy, respect, values, collaboration, innovation, socialinteraction, understanding, awareness, sensitivity, empathy, understanding, moral, ethical, justice, fairness, generosity, empathy, resilience, patience, courage, reflection, creativeproblemsolving, planning, collaboration, resilient, confidence, communication, conflictresolution, empathy, respect, resilience, communication, collaboration, problemsolving, outwardlookingperspective, values, sharedvalues, sharedpurpose, self-belief, self-worth, collaboration, teamwork, resilience, respect, empathy, enterskis, economy, politics, creativethinking, teamwork, management, leadership, followdirection, socialawareness, kindness, communication, empathy, humanity, teamwork, risk, negotiating, influencing, effectivecommunication, creativity, innovation, positiveattitude, initiative,
organising, planning, problemsolving, leadership, ethicaldecisions, financialliteracy, productandservicedesign, socialresponsibility, sustainability, tolerance, empathy, relationshipbuilding, cooperation, teamwork, understandingtheworld, empathy, teamwork, shareideas, active

empathy, effort, initiative, respect, empathy, involvement, teamwork, equality, ecology, empathy, involvement, respect, empathy, education, goodlistener, trust, cooperation, empathy, criticalthinking, autonomy, socialskills, empathy, collaboration, teamwork, ecology, compromise, creativity, responsibility, evaluation, teammanagement, flexibility, abilitytolisten, integration, critical thinking, resilience

socialresponsibility, creativity, innovation, cooperation, collaboration, courtesy, respect, citizenship, knowledge, innovation, creativity, entrepreneurialism, solidarity, responsibility, integrity, citizenship, participation, freedom, reasoning, problemsolving, criticalthinking, creativethinking, interpersonalrelationships, autonomy, personaldevelopment, wellbeing, health, empathy, socialresponsibility, collaboration, innovation, respect, responsibility, endeavour, enrich, criticalthinking, sharing, interaction, socialresponsibility, collaboration, technologicalskills, socialresponsibility, perseverance, solidarity, respect autonomy, teamwork, presentationsskills, developingideas, communication, reasoneddecisionmaking, ethics, empathy, friendship, love, creativity, enthusiasm, union, justice, responsibility, autonomy, critical thinking, developingopinions, solidarity, empathy, socialresponsibility, opennessstochange, collaboration, multitasking, managementskills, entrepreneurialism, criticalthinking, creativity, collaboration, socialresponsibility, personalresponsibility, autonomy, perseverance, effort, empathy, equalopportunities, respect, sensitivity, fairness, identifiesocialproblems, believetheycanmakeadifference, activeparticipant, identifyproblems, thinkofthewelfareofall, knowledge, questioning, reflection, analyticalskills, understandingdemocracy, criticalthinking, problemsolving, communication, collaboration, technologicalskills, flexibility, adaptability, initiative, self-direction, social, crossculturalskills, productivity, accountability, leadership, responsibility, originality, inventiveness, developingideas, implementingideas, communication, openmindedness

personality, accountability, solidarity, collaboration, mutualrespect, trust, freedomofexpression, communication, teamspirit, interdependence, empathy, respectofsociety&nature, understanding, sympathy, empathy, collaboration, inclusion, openmindedness, artisticskills, socialresponsibility, activecitizenship, collaboration, values, criticalthinking

understanding, linking, communication, creativity, problemsolving, researchvalues, mutualaid, cooperation, tolerance, empathy, autonomy, reflection, solidarity, acceptance, enrichmentbydifferences, autonomy, mutualaid, solidarity, cooperation, experimentation, respect,
openmindedness, diversity, collective development, respect for the environment, ability to debate, collective decisions, individual & collective participation, problem solving, equality, adaptation, creativity, fight against poverty & exclusion, horizontal relations, engagement, citizenship, sharing, goodwill, responsibility, empathy, communication, debate, understanding, empathy, sharing
12. ANNEX 5: A PHOTO SHOWING THE RESULTS OF THE OPERA\(^{23}\) USED TO CO-PRODUCE INSIGHTS OF THE DATA

\(^{23}\) Explained in section 5.6.1.