Innovative Methods and Models of Collaboration in the Field of Pedagogical Prevention of Xenophobia, Anti-Semitism and Right-wing Extremism: Chances and Perspectives for a Better Cooperation between Formal and Non-formal Education in Germany[1]

Susanne JOHANSSON

German Youth Institute (Deutsches Jugendinstitut e.V.),
Franckeplatz 1, Hs. 12-12, D-06110 Halle, Germany.
Tel.: +49-345-6817828. E-Mail: johansson@dji.de

Xenophobic, anti-Semitic and right-wing extremist attitudes continue to pose a serious problem and an ongoing challenge among German youth. Since problematic attitudes and risk groups change with time and according to political circumstances and social change, there is a constant need for the development of new practices and the innovative adaption of existing strategies of pedagogical prevention. Evaluations of German government model programs aimed at the pedagogical prevention of xenophobia, anti-Semitism and right-wing extremism show that sustainable prevention effects can be reached on the basis of productive cooperation between formal and non-formal educators. In order to improve their efforts toward prevention and cooperation, both partners have to refine their collaborative models and their methodology as well as to react better to changes in the composition of groups of participants and students in a society characterized by immigration and globalization.

Key words: *right-wing extremism, xenophobia, evaluation, prevention, non-formal education.*

Xenophobic, anti-Semitic and right-wing extremist attitudes[2] continue to be a serious problem and an ongoing challenge among German youth. In 2006, German researchers found that among young people between the age of 14 and 30, 7.1% displayed anti-Semitic

---

[2] Right-wing extremism is considered to be a syndrome constituted by the components of "anti-semitism", "Xenophobia", "Social Darwinism", "Approval of totalitarianism", "Belittlement of national socialism" and "Chauvinism" (Decker et al. 2010: 23). Every element of the syndrome also exists independently, which means that a person can show xenophobic attitudes without being a right-wing extremist. In this article, not only preventative approaches to right-wing extremism, but also pedagogical strategies against xenophobia and anti-Semitism are tackled since the latter are widespread (this is especially the case for xenophobia) and/or can be characterized as central elements of the "right-wing extremism" syndrome.

sentiments and 22.6% xenophobic attitudes (Decker et al. 2010: 25). The researchers also found a rigid right-wing extremist view of the world in 8.2% of all respondents (Ibid: p.96).[3] Reasons for the development of right-wing extremist attitudes among young people are complex and multilayered. Risk factors have been identified on the macro-level of society (socioeconomic crisis and economic deprivation, hostile political and medial discourses, i.e. on immigration; structural racism) as well as on the micro-level (problematic socialization processes in the family, including parental violence; individual feelings or fears of disintegration and non-acceptance; dynamics in peer groups, leading to violence, especially after the consumption of alcohol and right-wing extremist music) (Heitmeyer 2002; Hüpping, Reinecke 2007: 77–101, Hopf et al. 1995; Jäger et al. 1998, 2003; Rieker 2009: 32–34, Wahl 2004: 15, Hafeneger, Jansen 2001).

Due to the historical impact of the Holocaust and World War II, German society is highly sensitive to right-wing extremist developments (Rieker et al. 2006: 9). Germany has a long tradition of political education and pedagogical prevention work whose roots have strongly been marked by the re-education and "de-nazification" efforts by the allies (Giesecke 2000: 15, 28). Since the 1990s, when the reunification processes in Germany were accompanied or followed by violent right-wing extremist crimes[4] in the Eastern and Western parts of Germany and also since the recent shock about the right-wing terrorist murders by the "National Socialist Underground" (NSU)[5], many governmental model programs aiming at a better prevention of right-wing extremism and the further development of adequate pedagogical prevention methods have been implemented[6]. The evaluation of the governmental programs showed that a variety of preventative pedagogical measures have been implemented, tested and adapted (Bischoff et al. 2010; Lynen von Berg et al. 2007; Klingelhöfer et al. 2007). Nevertheless (and due also to non-pedagogical but rather socio-economic and individual-biographical reasons which might limit the effectiveness of pedagogical programs), right-wing extremist subcultures continue to exist and

---

[3] Looking beyond national borders, one can state that right-wing extremism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism also constitute a problem in other European countries. The results of a comparative quantitative study on xenophobic, anti-Semitic and anti-Islamic **attitudes** conducted in eight European countries (France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, and Portugal) showed that approximately 50% of all European interviewees approved of the statement "There are too many immigrants in my home country" (Zick, Küpper, Hövermann 2011: 14). Right-wing extremist or right-wing populist **political parties** found noteworthy support in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Norway in the last years (Glaser 2006: 5). Furthermore, a significant increase of **violent acts** with a xenophobic background has been observed in several countries in Western and Central Europe (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung: 2005). In the young democracies of Central Europe, right-wing extremist, nationalist, and populist ideologies meet weak traditions of civil society and "are also experiencing a renaissance since the collapse of the socialist system" (Glaser 2006:5, also see Ligeti, Nyeste 2006: 96, Minkenberg 2005).

[4] In September 1991, right-wing extremists attacked homes for asylum-seekers and migrants as well as Vietnamese business people in Hoyerswerda. In August 1992, violent right-wing extremist and xenophobic attacks targeting a home for asylum-seekers took place in Rostock-Lichtenhagen. Violent right-wing extremist crimes also occurred in Western Germany (Solingen, Düsseldorf) (Rieker 2009: 15, 2006: 68).

[5] The right-wing terrorist "National Socialist Underground" is presumed responsible for a series of ten murders in the years 2000 to 2006 in Germany (Bundesministerium des Innern 2012: 55, 60).

[6] „Aktionsprogramm gegen Aggression und Gewalt" ("Action Program against Aggression and Violence") 1992–1996, "entimon- gemeinsam gegen Gewalt und Rechtsextremismus" ("entimon- Together against Violence and Right-Wing Extremism"), 2002–2006, "Vielfalt tut gut" and "kompetent. für Demokratie" ("Diversity Does Good" and "Competent for Democracy"), 2006–2010, "Toleranz fördern – Kompetenz stärken ("Enhancing Tolerance – Strengthening Competences"), 2010–1013.

develop further (also in reaction to prevention programs), and right-wing as well as xenophobic and anti-Semitic attitudes change according to political events and discussions both in Germany and abroad. They also reveal themselves to be a problematic phenomenon in hitherto unexpected groups, i.e. among immigrants themselves (anti-Semitic attitudes among Muslim communities, ultranationalist Turkish parties in Germany) (Kiefer 2002, Bundesministerium des Innern 2012: 271; Dantschke 2012: 86; Greuel 2012: 54). Therefore, there is a constant need for the development of new practices and the adoption of existing strategies of pedagogical prevention.

The present article focuses on pedagogical counter-strategies to right-wing extremist, xenophobic, and anti-Semitic attitudes among groups of young people characterized by a high level of heterogeneity concerning their national and religious background. It thereby concentrates on the question which models of collaboration between formal and non-formal educators[7] prove themselves to be helpful and which innovative pedagogical methods are qualified to meet some of the recent educational challenges in a society characterized by immigration and globalization.

In the following, I will at first concentrate on a short synopsis of both the strengths and weaknesses of formal and non-formal (political) education in the field of pedagogical prevention of right-wing extremism, xenophobia, and anti-Semitism in Germany (1). Afterward, concrete research questions and research methods will be described (2). The third part of the article addresses the research findings on innovative models of collaboration between formal and non-formal educators and on innovative and fitting methods (3). The fourth part offers a conclusion.

Potential and challenges of formal and non-formal education in the field of pedagogical prevention of right-wing extremism, xenophobia, and anti-Semitism

In the field of **pedagogical prevention**, both formal and non-formal education shows a specific potential in the prevention of xenophobic, anti-Semitic and right-wing extremist attitudes among youth.

Due to its compulsory nature, **formal (political and civic) education offered in schools** is able to reach the majority of young people, including students with a different social status as well as different national and ethnic, religious and language backgrounds. In general, it is possible to work with heterogeneously composed groups of students; this theoretically allows for the integration of different perspectives and experiences of students in teaching and discussion as well as for pedagogically dealing with the existing, i.e. "real", conflicts in classes and schools. These exist, and include xenophobic mobbing or discrimination, the distribution of right-wing extremist CDs on schoolyards (Luzar, Sischka 2007: 29) as well as discussions triggered by the conflict in the Middle East.

By integrating these topics in teaching and learning, competences regarding interaction and communication as well as opinion-making may be strengthened among students, and an understanding of the diversity of perspectives and/or the necessity of political engagement and action may be developed (Reinhard 2012: 162, Lange 2009: 46).

---

[7] The field of pedagogical prevention of right-wing extremism is broader than the one of formal and non-formal education and, for example, also includes counseling, e.g., of parents of right-wing extremist youth or pedagogical help to exit right-wing extremist groupings. Due to the thematic focus of the international scientific-practical conference "DO I KNOW YOUNG PEOPLE" where the author gave a speech (see footnote 1), this article focuses on formal and non-formal education.

Formal education is furthermore capable of conveying necessary and at the same time very contextually complex information to students, for instance, on the holocaust, on human rights or on immigration, since it can provide a long-term working basis with the students Glaser, Johansson 2012: 93). On the other hand, it is generally hierarchically structured and chronologically graded and has to fulfil the requirements of framework plans (Smith 2012), which might lead to a more extrinsic motivation of students.

Even though formal political and civic education has developed further in the last years and includes in many cases the application of participatory and creative teaching and learning methods, a cognitive transfer of knowledge and a focus on political institutions and processes still dominate (Reinhardt 2012: 163). This leads Nonnenmacher and Reinhard to the conclusions that political education in German schools enjoys a "worse reputation" (Nonnenmacher 1996: 182) and that (due to its complexity and due to the fact that political institutions are normally conceived by young people as not having much to do with their normal life) it normally "doesn't interest youth" (Reinhardt 2012: 163, also see Kohl, Calmbach 2012: 21). Furthermore, some students experience feelings of being saturated regarding the complex information about the holocaust.

Non-formal education as an organized activity outside the established formal educational system offered by non-formal educators (not teachers) is ideally qualified to relate to the situation and environment of young people and to be learner-centered, since it doesn't have to stick to a fixed framework which has been detailed by education authorities and which is the case for formal education in schools. It is generally offered on a voluntary basis and is non-credential based (Smith 2012; Glaser, Johansson 2012: 89). In its purest form, it is democratically structured and encourages participatory approaches (Smith 2012). In many cases in Germany, non-formal educators have more heterogeneous backgrounds than school teachers and therefore might act as authentic role models when working in multicultural and multi-religious teams. By allowing young people to use forms of expression besides the verbal (i.e. by painting, dancing), non-formal approaches can be suitable for the pedagogical work with young people whose academic achievement is low (and who, according to studies, are often more susceptible to developing xenophobic or right-wing extremist attitudes) or whose knowledge of German or the respective primary national language is not yet perfect. Creative methods like theatre are also qualified to "open up" and to arouse interest in young people to in specific topics. They may also allow a first distant and not overwhelming encounter with very emotional topics, i.e. xenophobic conflicts, in the group (Glaser, Johansson 2012: 90). On the other hand, the methodical strengths with regard to pedagogical work with underprivileged young people or those with a migrant background that are inherent to non-formal education are thwarted by the contradictory fact that the voluntary nature of non-formal education very often doesn't reach these target groups: Himmelmann describes this fact as "the big impact deficit" of non-formal (political) education (Ibid. 2012: 112). Very often, non-formal education only reaches exactly those target groups that already show an interest in political questions (Ibid.: 115, see also Bremer 2012: 27). Recent studies expand upon the problem of the social selectivity of political education itself as well as its entanglement with the reproduction of social inequality (Bremer 2012: 37).

In order to harness the strengths as well as to balance the weaknesses of both formal and non-formal (political) education, cooperation between formal and non-formal educators is necessary. Cooperation can lead to a better achievement among target groups and offers the possibility to combine cognitive, emotional, and conative learning processes (Glaser, Johansson 2012: 94).

Which types of collaborative models reveal themselves to be potentially effective and which pedagogical methods are qualified to deal with some of the recent pedagogical challenges in a society characterized by immigration and globalization?

Research question and research methods

The evaluated governmental programs can be characterized by the fact that they are model programs: their aim is to react to challenges and deficits in the youth welfare service and to develop innovative methods and strategies in order to develop it further and to react to recent problems, i.e. missing counter-strategies against youth violence or right-wing attitudes among hitherto unexpected groups (BMFSFJ 2012: 2 (1)). In line with this goal, the programs focus on a broad spectrum of target groups, especially on young people up to 27 years of age[8]. Over the last couple of years, the programs have also begun preventive activities for children under 14 years of age ("early prevention") (BMFSFJ 2007: 3, 6).

Research questions

The evaluation of three German governmental model programs against xenophobia, anti-Semitism and right-wing extremism[9] carried out by the German Youth Institute[10] in the years 2001 to 2012 tackled the following research questions:

1. How could innovative models of collaboration between formal and non-formal educators look like? Which additional partners are required?
2. Which innovative strategies and methods in the field of pedagogical prevention of xenophobia, anti-Semitism and right-wing-extremism have a high impact on youth?
3. Which topics are important for young people themselves? What do young people think about the prevention programs in which they participate?

We undertook a closer analysis of 15 projects in the field of political education and democracy learning (three projects), legal and moral education (one project), social training (three projects), intercultural and inter-religious learning (four projects) as well as the prevention of anti-Semitism (four projects[11]).

---

[8] In Germany, youth welfare services are available for children and young people up to 27 years of age.
[9] The evaluated programs are: "entimon-gemeinsam gegen Gewalt und Rechtsextremismus" ("entimon- Together against Violence and Right-wing Extremism"), 2002–2006, "Vielfalt tut gut" and "kompetent. für Demokratie" ("Diversity Does Good" and "Competent for Democracy"), 2006–2010, "Toleranz fördern – Kompetenz stärken ("Enhancing Tolerance – Strenghtening Competences"), 2010–1013.
[10] The different evaluations were carried out by Ulrich Brüggemann, Mareike Schmidt and Silke Schuster ("entimon-gemeinsam gegen Gewalt und Rechtsextremismus"), by Ursula Bischoff, Frank Greuel, Frank König, Peter Rieker, Mareike Schmidt, Anna Schnitzer and anne (Commentary Susanne: Please keep „Anne" with a capital "A") Schüttpelz ("Vielfalt tut gut" and "kompetent. für Demokratie") as well as by Ursula Bischoff, Frank Greuel, Frank König, Diana Zierold and Eva Zimmermann ("Toleranz fördern – Kompetenz stärken"). The author was involved in all three evaluations.
[11] Two of the non-formal projects against Anti-Semitism are sponsored in a governmental program for the prevention of Islamic, as opposed to right-wing, extremism). Since these projects focus on the prevention of anti-Semitism and since they closely cooperate with schools, they were integrated in the present sample.

Due to the character of the governmental programs which show a high heterogeneity in regard to the target groups, topics and pedagogical methods, the sample included projects which addressed young people between 14 and 27 years of age (12 projects) as well as projects for children in elementary and primary schools (three projects). All pedagogical projects were offered by non-formal educators intensively cooperating with schools, thereby applying different models of collaboration and choosing heterogeneous settings: five projects working with school classes took place exclusively outside of school (i.e. in youth museums or memorials), two projects combined both work in and outside school and eight non-formal activities took place in the school setting (i.e. in the respective classroom or the school-owned sports hall). In four cases, teachers were present during the non-formal activities.

Due to prevailing legal norms and the federal structure of Germany, schools themselves are not allowed to apply program funding; therefore, no exclusively formal activities could be included in the sample. This leads to the conclusion that, during the evaluation, the perspective of non-formal educators could be surveyed more intensively than the perspective of teachers[12]. This fact limits the scope of the evaluation data on the effectiveness of models of collaboration.

Research methods

Our research approach was multi-perspective. We analyzed the project outcomes (Beywl, Niestroj (n.d.): 77) by means of:

a) qualitative face-to-face interviews with project leaders (all cases)

as well as in cases in which the project setting allowed this approach;

b) interviews and group discussions with young participants (four cases);

additionally,

c) participatory observation (Diekmann 1995: 469) of seminars and other activities (six cases) and

d) an analysis of project concepts and project documents (i.e. films, pedagogical material, handbooks) (all cases).

The interviews and group discussions were taped and transliterated. Furthermore, protocols of the participatory observation have been written directly after the observation.

All data and material were imported into the program MAXqda before undertaking a triangulational and qualitative content analysis according to Mayring (2010).

In a methodological sense, the group discussions and interviews with young participants revealed themselves to be a necessary means of evaluation, since they gave a valuable insight into the perspectives of young people, which sometimes strongly differed from the perspectives of the adult project leaders. Multi-perspective evaluations which triangulate perceptions and realities of project leaders and young participants are desirable, but have been hitherto seldom undertaken (Glaser 2007: 75). In the present examples, no systematic carrying out of group discussions and interviews with young participants in all projects was possible due to the sensitivity of some topics and/or project settings or due to time resource problems.

---

[12] In one case, a teacher taking part in the project could be interviewed by the evaluators.

Research findings[13]

In the following, I would like to present the findings of our main research questions.

Innovative models of collaboration between formal and non-formal education and required additional partners

The research findings show that, especially in cases in which non-formal project topics deal with sensitive topics such as anti-Semitic hostility towards Israel or the conflict in the Middle East or refer to existing conflicts, for example, in school classes, it is helpful to concentrate non-formal project activities and collaboration on a *few selected schools* that show a manifest interest in more intense collaboration and/or in the topic. This approach sometimes contradicts an unexpressed logic of program-funding, which focusses on quantitative outputs ("as many activities as possible"), but this approach helps to avoid a surfeit of non-formal partners and to establish confiding and long-term projects in which a concentration on the individual situation of pupils or school classes is possible:

> *"It really is the case that one needs a head of school that says: "That's a fantastic project and we want you to do this project. [...] cases in which schools are willing to excuse pupils for a whole day from school when we do excursions. [...] Not every school does that [...] and the concrete youth welfare service offering the non-formal activity is important. It must have special resources and networks. [...] Like us who have an easy access to schools due to our long work with these schools" (Interview with non-formal educators, Project Beta 2012: 289; 99–114).*

Long-term collaboration very often also constitutes the *basis for a fitting and professional preparation and carrying out of non-formal activities* carried out in cooperation with schools. A lack of preparation of non-formal educators by teachers might lead to counterproductive effects, i.e. inadequate pedagogical intervention or demotivation of participants:

> *"The teacher hadn't told me before that one of the girls has a biography characterized by sexual abuse. I didn't know that. If I had known that, I would have never done these training exercises (of moral courage, note of the author) with her. How can I tell her "You can defend yourself and others like that" if she has been a victim of sexual abuse where she definitely couldn't defend herself? This can lead to unwanted self-reproach. I feel very bad about that. Teachers must tell me things like that before and not afterwards" (interview with a leader of social training, Project Alpha 2003, protocol 2).*

> *"When they (the teachers, note of the author) presented the topic and the week we could spend out of school with the trainers, I immediately thought that I would like to participate. But then our teacher said: It'll be like class. Don't think that this is going to be a fun week" [...] "When out teacher said that it would be from 9 am to 6 pm, I thought: "This is even more than in school". And I didn't want to participate. And they really presented it like that: "Don't expect too much, don't expect too much in terms of food, don't expect that the rooms will be nice". But when we came there, everything was beautiful." (Interview with 17- to 18-year old participants of a non-formal activity, Project Zeta 2012: 28).*

---

[13] The interpretation of the data has been carried out together with Michaela Glaser from the German Youth Institute. The quoted interviews have been conducted by Ursula Bischoff, Ulrich Brüggemann, Mareike Schmidt, Silke Schuster, Eva Zimmermann and the author.

But it is also non-formal education which has to open up to a specific situation in schools and to better adjust to heterogeneous groups. Normally, working with well-educated, politically interested young people, non-formal educators sometimes are not aware of the fact that they are going to work with very heterogeneous school groups characterized by virulent conflicts or members with strong anti-Semitic, xenophobic or right-wing extremist attitudes as well as provocative behavior:

> „[…] there shouldn't be any taboo topics in our work. […] [But] there are specific topics where I said "Oh no, please don't start with Hitler again". That's a problem if you do that. Because the pupils realize immediately where your neuralgic points are. Especially the older and the Arabic pupils love to praise Hitler (in order to provoke; note of the author). This gets on your nerves eventually. And they realize that. And your only chance is to put it on the table and to discuss it. Because they are trying (to provoke; note of the author), but they also miss knowledge on this topic. But by doing so, I also realize my lack of knowledge. Sometimes I could not react quickly, either" (Interview with non-formal educators, Project Lambda 2004: 259–266).

Long-term collaboration can also facilitate the *sustainable anchoring of non-formal activities* in schools. In four projects, non-formal activities could be offered on a weekly basis during a whole school year because of the trust formed from a long-term collaboration with a selected school.

However, a special challenge of these projects is to keep their character as non-formal educators when constantly working in a school setting and integrating topics in daily school teaching. The potential of non-formal education might only be maintained when non-formal educators stick to the basic characteristics of non-formal learning (no grading, open learning atmosphere) and if teachers don't try to hand over specific responsibilities to non-formal educators.

> "Last school year we had the chance to work too hours a week for six months with the students. That's perfect! But in the end, I also had to design a test for the school class we had worked with – and I also had to mark the results. The teacher didn't have the time to do this"(Interview with non-formal educator, Project Rho 2012: Protocol p. 1).

> "When we (the non-formal educators; the author) come, they (the young people, note of the author) first get out their mobile phones and text something. Then we have to say three or four times: "Now we start". These are things they are not allowed to do in school and they don't do it there. But we are not teachers, we are different, and of course they test what they can do in this new constellation. […] We can't say "Give me your mobile, you'll get it back in two weeks" like in school. For us, it's important to find a balance between the non-formal open learning atmosphere and our intention to also impart knowledge" (Interview with non-formal educators, Project Beta 2012: 289; 120–138).

Non-productive results might also be due to *individual-oriented work in problematic school structures and a lack of structured prevention work in school*.

Some non-formal projects cooperating with schools also encounter the problem that they work with individual pupils or classes identified as being "difficult" or violent by the school, but that the main problems also lie in the schools' atmosphere:

> "There were [other] pupils who were running over the school yard armed with baseball bats. Then I shook my head in disbelief and ask myself: "What should I do here"? I can't work with three or four pupils on how to deal with insults when the whole school freaks out, when teachers don't sanction this behavior and turn away and trivialize things […]. And then [my three or four pupils] are in the schoolyard and are only able to assert themselves by showing their old behavior. If they acted otherwise,

the others would say: "What kind of coward have you become?"" (Interview with an anti-violence trainer, Project Theta 2005: 315).

Innovative cooperation models between non-formal and formal educators are therefore often those models that involve the whole school and **combine individual-oriented work with work on the school structures and school atmosphere** on a long-term basis. These models include school democratization programs or programs like "Schools without racism – Schools with courage" (www.schule-ohne-rassismus.org) which are promoted and offered by non-formal education services. In the abovementioned program, the whole school (including the head of school and school staff like the janitors) has to commit itself to create a climate of acceptance and to overcome xenophobia and racism in their school as well as to develop and offer regular anti-racist and intercultural activities and projects in order to receive the status of a "school without racism".

Innovative approaches to cooperation very often also include an **opening up to the surrounding community** and to other, sometimes non-pedagogic, partners like initiatives against right-wing extremism, synagogues, mosques, refugees or the police:

> *"As a rule, schools constitute a closed system that normally is not interested in the surrounding community and its activities and problems. That is also a task for people like us (the non-formal educators; note of the author) to open up this system." (Interview with non-formal educators, Project Beta 2012: 290, 37–40).*

These approaches increase access to other perspectives of people or groups of persons whom pupils do not meet in their normal lives and enable personal contact with groups that are sometimes discriminated. It thereby allows young people to develop and train their personal and social competence and to reduce prejudices and/or to stimulate personal commitment in the community. The evaluation showed that sometimes non-pedagogical personnel or other peers living in the community often had a high impact on pupils by making a long-term impression as authentic partners for discussion:

> *"We had trained interview techniques (with our participants who were asked to explore their neighborhoods by doing interviews with different community initiatives; note of the author). […] One can hear in the interviews in the shops and on the markets how motivated they were. And they did a nice interview. For this interview, young migrants had gone into the editorial office of one journal of homosexuals.[…] And for the homosexuals that is an important topic: migrants attacking or insulting homosexuals (due to prejudices against homosexuals). And it is a difficult topic, one can hear that in the interview. But they (young people; the author) do it well and in an open manner. And at the end, one of the migrants asks one of the homosexuals if they had tried it with a woman. This was funny. And the homosexual said: "No, then I would have lived my life incorrectly". So our young participants did not only adhere to their interview guidelines (Interview with non-formal educators, Project Lambda 2004: 276–281).*

The evaluation showed that non-formal education cooperating with schools might acquire a **new role as a facilitator for the process of schools opening towards the community,** especially in the newly implemented full-time school system in Germany (Glaser, Johansson 2012: 102).

Innovative strategies and methods with a high impact on youth and the perspectives as well as the themes of young participants

The evaluation showed that only those the pedagogic strategies and methods that allow topics to be addressed in a participatory manner (Klingelhöfer et al. 2010: 251–272), that allow for discussion of contemporary topics i.e. on immigration which are of importance for young people, that focus more on approachable individual biographies (i.e. of victims of the Holocaust or refugees in our time) than on abstract information and that work on existing conflicts in the immediate social context, of the classroom, the school or the neighborhood might have an impact on youth. These existing conflicts might be transferred in other settings or frames such as a story or a theatre play by the non-formal or formal educators in order to allow the pupils to keep a certain distance to protect victims of mobbing, for example.

In most of the cases, the immediate social context is of a much higher importance for young people than political institutions:

> „Ilhame thinks that one could send away the Jews (out of Israel, note of the author). The world is big. [...] But one can't send both of them (Jews and Palestinians, the author) away, like Aycan said, because it's the home country of both. My cousin comes from Palestine, and I feel very sad because I know that she has never been there. [...] Many Palestinians are in Germany because of the war, and that's a little bit sad. Due to this project we talked about our origins [...] and that we are here because of the war and that we have the same destiny and before we didn't know that even though we lived here together for four or five years" (Ibid.: 18).

The topics the young people are interested in should be explored by formal and non-formal educators before starting a project and should, if possible, be integrated in the project.

> "And I liked that we didn't only talk about the Holocaust and Hitler because that is what everybody is doing and we already did this a thousand times. The crisis in the Middle East was something new to me, and I really liked to talk about it" (Interview with 17- to 18-year-old participants of a non-formal activity, Project Zeta 2012: 26).

> "I found it to be a pity [...] that we left out the recent situation. We focused on the history of anti-Semitism, but the present day was ignored" (Ibid.: 12).

In many cases, young participants favored **creative learning methods** (i.e. excursions, role-playing exercises, theater, music, film making, explorations of the neighborhood) that are able to tackle not only the cognitive but also the emotional aspects and levels of learning. They also preferred **attractive learning settings** such as excursions to politicians, synagogues or mosques, and **learning groups**, for instance, homogeneous groups in terms of gender, which allow for reflection on gender roles, or religiously heterogeneous groups which allow participants to get to know or befriend young people with different backgrounds. Very often, the general atmosphere in the learning group was of high importance for the young participants and a main precondition for the effectiveness of the project, as well as the main goal of the project in the eyes of the youngsters:

> "I am a Palestinian, but I knew absolutely nothing about the history [of the conflict in the Middle East; note of author]. I sometimes watch [...] my father watching this news, but they are 100% partial. They only show what Israel is doing to the Palestinians, and that's why I'm not watching this. But I not only learned that, but also our class got much closer. I really got to know and befriended people I think I wouldn't have anything to do with it had I not participated in this project. Honestly, we had been to

Prague with our class at the beginning of this year, but everybody went out in his or her small group. But in this project, we have been assigned to groups we had to work with, and I really liked this" (Ibid.: 24f).

The evaluation has shown that the conflict in the Middle East and the islamophobic sentiments are topics that presently are of high importance for many young people who have participated in the above-mentioned projects.

Conclusions

In order to achieve the goal of sustainable prevention effects on the basis of a productive collaboration between formal and non-formal educators, both partners have to refine their collaborative models and methodology.

Our research results on the **structure of collaboration** show that, especially in the sensitive field of prevention of right-wing extremism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, it might be very helpful for both non-formal actors and schools to concentrate on the selection of a few qualitatively high-level cooperative models on a long-term basis and to combine structure-oriented and individual-oriented work, i.e. training of individuals or chosen classes, in order to achieve more sustainable preventative effects. It is also important for schools to open up to non-formal actors and other community-based partners and to overcome the fear of admitting that schools are touched by problematic phenomena such as the right-wing extremist attitudes of students.

Non-formal actors and schools will have to tackle the question how non-formal methods might be better integrated and reinforced without losing the characteristics and potential of non-formal education. A very important theme is the improvement of young people's participation in selecting concrete topics of non-formal learning. In order to be able to tackle the relevant questions and conflicts, participating students should be sounded out before and during extra-curricular activities.

The evaluation also showed the new challenges and needs of adaption on the level of **topics and pedagogical methods**. Non-formal education has to better adjust to heterogeneous learning groups. Normally working with well-educated, politically interested young people, non-formal educators sometimes aren't aware of the fact that they are going to work with very heterogeneous school groups characterized by virulent conflicts or members with strong anti-Semitic, xenophobic or right-wing extremist attitudes.

In the last years, it also became apparent that the conflict in the Middle East has had strong repercussions the attitudes of young migrants and non-migrants: modern forms of anti-Semitism are widespread. The same holds true for anti-Islamic sentiments and attitudes which at the same time constitute new elements of the modern right-wing extremism. Non-formal as well as formal education has to better adjust to these topics as well as to participants with different immigration backgrounds and different perspectives, i.e. to the conflict in the Middle East, immigration, or the holocaust. It will be necessary to develop the methods and pedagogical material that can be characterized as multi-perspective.

Beywl, W., Niestroj, M. Das A-B-C der wirkungsorientierten Evaluation. Glossar – Deutsch/Englisch – der wirkungsorientierten Evaluation. 2. vollständig bearbeitete und ergänzte Auflage. Köln.

Bischoff et al. (2010). Abschlussbericht der Programmevaluation der Bundesprogramme „VIELFALT TUT GUT. Jugend für Vielfalt, Toleranz und Demokratie" und „kompetent. für Demokratie – Beratungsnetzwerke gegen Rechtsextremismus". Berichtszeitraum 01.07.2007 bis 31.12.2010. Halle: DJI.

BMI – Bundesministerium des Innern (2012). Verfassungsschutzbericht 2011. Vorabfassung. Berlin: Bundesministerium des Innern.

BMFSFJ – Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend) (2012). Richtlinien des Kinder- und Jugendplans des Bundes. www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Abteilung5/Pdf-Anlagen/richtlinien-kjp-stand-april-2012,property=pdf,bereich=bmfsfj,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf (Accessed February 4, 2013).

BMFSFJ – Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (2007): Bundesprogramm „Jugend für Vielfalt, Toleranz und Demokratie – gegen Rechtsextremismus, Fremdenfeindlichkeit und Antisemitismus". Leitlinien zum Programmbereich „Modellprojekte: Jugend, Bildung und Prävention". www.vielfalt-tut-gut.de/content/e4458/e7152/Leitlinien_Modellprojekte.pdf (Accessed February 8. 2013).

Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung (2005) (Hrsg.). MuB Newsletter (Migration und Bevölkerung), Ausgabe 4.

Bremer, H. „Bildungsferne" und politische Bildung. Zur Reproduktion sozialer Ungleichheit durch das politische Feld. In: Widlmaier, Benedikt/Nonnenmacher, Frank (2012) (Hrsg.). Unter erschwerten Bedingungen. Politische Bildung mit bildungsfernen Zielgruppen. Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag: 27–41.

Dantschke, C. „Graue Wölfe" in Deutschland. Türkischer Ultranationalismus und Rechtsextremismus. In: Greuel, F., Glaser, M. (2012). Ethnozentrismus und Antisemitismus bei Jugendlichen mit Migrationshintergrund. Erscheinungsformen und pädagogische Praxis in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft. Halle: DJI: 66–89.

Decker et al. (2010). Die Mitte in der Krise. Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2010. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Diekmann, A. (1995). Empirische Sozialforschung. Grundlagen, Methoden, Anwendungen. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Giesecke, H. (2000). Politische Bildung. Didaktik und Methodik für Schule und Jugendarbeit. Weinheim und München: Juventa.

Glaser, M. (2007). Offenheit und Multiperspektivität – Erfahrungen aus der wissenschaftlichen Begleitung von Projekten interkulturellen Lernens. In: Glaser, M., Schuster, S. (eds.). Evaluation präventiver Praxis gegen Rechtsextremismus. Positionen, Konzepte und Erfahrungen. Halle: DJI: 69–85.

Glaser, M. Right-Wing Extremism, Xenophobia and Social Counter-Strategies in Present-Day Europe. In: Rieker et al. (2012) (eds). Prevention of Right-Wing Extremism, Xenophobia and Racism in European Perspective. Halle: DJI: 5–11.

Glaser, M., Johansson, S. Außerschulische und schulische Bildung zu Rechtsextremismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit. Potenziale und Perspektiven der Kooperation. In: Boos, B., Engelmann, R. (2012) (Hrsg.). Gewalt von Rechts! Analysen, Hintergründe, Handlungsmöglichkeiten. Karlsruhe: von Loeper Literaturverlag: 88–107.

Greuel, F. Ethnozentrismus bei Aussiedlerjugendlichen. In: Greuel, F., Glaser, M. (2012): Ethnozentrismus und Antisemitismus bei Jugendlichen mit Migrationshintergrund. Erscheinungsformen und pädagogische Praxis in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft. Halle: DJI: 54–65.

Grubben, G. Right-Wing Extremist Sympathies among Adolescents in the Netherlands. In: Rieker et al. (eds.). Prevention of Right-Wing Extremism, Xenophobia and Racism in European Perspective. Halle: DJI: 48–66.

Hafeneger, B., Jansen, M. (2001), Rechte Cliquen. Alltag einer neuen Jugendkultur. Weinheim und München: Juventa.

Heitmeyer, W. (2002) (ed.). Deutsche Zustände: Folge 1. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Hüpping, S., Reinecke, J. Abwärtsdriftende Regionen. Die Bedeutung sozioökonomischer Entwicklungen für Orientierungslosigkeit und Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit. In: Heitmeyer, W. (2007) (Hrsg.). Deutsche Zustände: Folge 5. Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag: 77–101.

Himmelmann, G. Perspektiven des Zusammenwirkens von Politischer Bildung und Demokratiepädagogik. In: Beutel, W., Fauser, P., Rademacher, H. (2012) (Hrsg.). Jahrbuch Demokratiepädagogik. Aufgabe für Schule und Jugendbildung. Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag: 112–124.

Hopf, Ch. et al. (1995). Familie und Rechtsextremismus. Weinheim und München. Juventa.

Jäger, S. et al. (1998). Der Spuk ist nicht vorbei. Völkisch-nationalistische Ideologeme im öffentlichen Diskurs der Gegenwart. Duisburg: DISS.

Jäger, S. et al. (2003). Medienbild Israel. Zwischen Solidarität und Antisemitismus, Münster: LIT.

Kiefer, M. (2002). Antisemitismus in den islamischen Gesellschaften. Der Palästina-Konflikt und der Transfer eines Feindbilds. Düsseldorf: Druck im Fgk.

Klingelhöfer, S. et al. (2007). Abschlussbericht der wissenschaftlichen Begleitung des Programms ‚entimon' – gemeinsam gegen Gewalt und Rechtsextremismus. Halle: DJI.

Klingelhöfer, Susanne et al. (2010). Möglichkeiten und Grenzen partizipationsorientierter Jugend(bildungs-)arbeit in der Rechtsextremismusprävention. Erkenntnisse aus dem Programm „Entimon – gemeinsam gegen Gewalt und Rechtsextremismus". In: Betz, Tanja et al. (2010) (eds.). Partizipation von Kindern und Jugendlichen. Forschungsergebnisse, Bewertungen, Handlungsmöglichkeiten. Schwalbach/Ts.

Kohl, Wiebke/Calmbach, Marc: Unsichtbares Politikprogramm? Lebenswelten und politisches Interesse von „bildungsfernen" Jugendlichen. In: Widlmaier, B., Nonnenmacher, F. (2012) (Hrsg.). Unter erschwerten Bedingungen. Politische Bildung mit bildungsfernen Zielgruppen. Schwalbach/Ts. Wochenschau Verlag: 17–26.

Lange, D. Demokratiepädagogik und Politische Bildung. Zwischen Fachlichkeit und Schulprinzip. In: Beutel, W., Fauser, P. (2009) (Hrsg.). Demokratie, Lernqualität und Schulentwicklung. Schwalbach/Ts. Wochenschau Verlag: 43–45.

Ligeti, Györgi/Nyeste, Tamás: Right-Wing Extremism in Hungary. In: In: Rieker et al. (eds): Prevention of Right-Wing Extremism, Xenophobia and Racism in European Perspective. Halle: DJI: 96–112.

Luzar, C., Sischka, K. (2007). Rechtsextremismus im Generationenverhältnis – Wahrnehmungen und Handlungsstrategien im Weitlingstraßenkiez. Schriftenreihe Zentrum Demokratische Kultur. Berlin. www.zentrum-demokratische-kultur.de/app/so.asp?o=/_obj/71E7CCE8-2B47-4B5D-9016-D43823550A00/inline/Studie-Weitlingkiez_ZDK-April-2007.pdf (Accessed March 16. 2013).

Lynen von Berg, H. et al. (2007). Interventionsfeld Gemeinwesen: Evaluation zivilgesellschaftlicher Strategien gegen Rechtsextremismus. Weinheim: Juventa.

Mayring, Ph. (2010). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken. Weinheim und Basel: Beltz.

Minkenberg, M. (2005). Nationalistische Rhetorik ist kein Randphänomen. Rechtsextremismus in den jungen Demokratien Osteuropas. In: Das Parlament 55, Nr. 45: 8.

Mischok, A. (2010) (ed.). „Schwierige Jugendliche gibt es nicht…! Historisch-politische Bildung für ALLE". Projekte zur Auseinandersetzung mit dem Nationalsozialismus für besondere Zielgruppen. Braunschweig: Bildungsvereinigung Arbeit und Leben Niedersachsen Ost.

Nonnenmacher, F. Sozialkunde – vom Schulfach zum Lernbereich. In: Ebd. (1996). Das Ganze sehen. Schule als Ort politischen und sozialen Lernens. Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag: 182–197.

Reinhard, V. Demokratie-Lernen und Politik-Lernen. Politikvernetzte Projektarbeit aus Sicht von Lehrerinnen und Lehrern. In: Beutel, W., Fauser, P., Rademacher, H. (2012). (Hrsg.): Jahrbuch Demokratiepädagogik. Aufgabe für Schule und Jugendbildung. Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag: 161–173.

Rieker, P. (2006). Juvenile Right-Wing Extremism and Xenophobia in Germany: Research and Prevention. In: Rieker et al. (eds.): Prevention of Right-Wing Extremism, Xenophobia and Racism in European Perspective. Halle: DJI: 67–78.

Rieker, P. (2009). Prävention und Intervention: Ein Überblick über Ansätze, Befunde und Entwicklungsbedarf. Weinheim: Beltz Juventa.

Wahl, K. (2004). Gibt es mögliche Vorläufer für Rechtsextremismus/Fremdenfeindlichkeit, die sich bereits im Kindergarten- und Grundschulalter zeigen? In: Rieker, P. (ed.). Der frühe Vogel fängt den Wurm!? Soziales Lernen und Prävention von Rechtsext.remismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit in Kindergarten und Grundschule. Halle: DJI: 9–19

Schuster, M. Praktische Ansätze zur Erreichung von politikfernen Jugendlichen durch politische Bildung. In: Widlmaier, B., Nonnenmacher, F. (2012) (Hrsg.), Unter erschwerten Bedingungen. Politische Bildung mit bildungsfernen Zielgruppen. Schwalbach/Ts.: Wochenschau Verlag: 117–129.

Smith, M. K. (2012). Non-formal education. www.infed.org/biblio/b-nonfor.htm (Accessed March 25, 2013).

Zick, A., Küpper, B., Hövermann, A. (2011). Die Abwertung der Anderen. Eine europäische Zustandsbeschreibung zu Intoleranz, Vorurteilen und Diskriminierung. library.fes.de/pdf-files/do/07905-20110311.pdf (Accessed March 25, 2013).

NOVATORIŠKI BENDRADARBIAVIMO METODAI IR MODELIAI KSENOFOBIJOS, ANTISEMITIZMO IR DEŠINIOJO EKSTREMIZMO PEDAGOGINĖJE PREVENCIJOJE: GERESNIO BENDRADARBIAVIMO TARP FORMALAUS IR NEFORMALAUS UGDYMO GALIMYBĖS IR PERSPEKTYVOS VOKIETIJOJE[14]

Susanne Johansson

Santrauka

Ksenofobija, antisemitizmas, dešinysis ekstremizmas yra rimtos Vokietijos jaunimo problemos. Socialiniai ir politiniai pokyčiai sukuria naujų ideologijų ir socialinių grupių. Siekiant spręsti atsirandančias problemas, pedagoginės prevencijos praktikos turi būti atnaujinamos, vystomos. Vokietijos valstybinių ksenofobijos, antisemitizmo ir dešiniojo ekstremizmo pedagoginės prevencijos programų įvertinimas rodo, kad tvarią prevenciją galima pasiekti produktyviai bendradarbiaujant formaliems ir neformaliems ugdytojams. Norėdami pagerinti bendradarbiavimą, formalūs ir neformalūs ugdytojai turi pakeisti savo bendradarbiavimo ir darbo metodų modelius.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: dešinysis ekstremizmas, ksenofobija, įvertinimas, prevencija, neformalus ugdymas.