

## Ildikó Szabó

Department of Mother Tongue and Art Education

Faculty of Pedagogy

John von Neumann University, Hungary

e-mail: szabo.ildiko@pk.uni-neumann.hu

# [ A Good Practice (based on ELINET criteria) of Non-formal Education Involving a Library to Improve Literacy Skills (on the example of Hungarian project)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/0860-7435.27.02>

**Abstract:** Started in February 2014, ELINET project run for 2 years including 28 European countries. It aimed to analyse and consult on literacy policies at a local, regional, national, and trans-national level, raising awareness of literacy issues and coordinating campaigns. Ultimately, the fruit of this network was to include a European framework of good practice in raising literacy levels and a sample of corresponding examples. The paper is to present the way good practices were collected and reviewed; and introduces a good practice (run by John von Neumann University Pedagogical Faculty, “Reading belongs to everyone, even to you!”) based on the ELINET good practice framework.

**Keywords:** literacy good practice, non-formal education, co-operation of librarians, pre- and in-service teachers

## **Introduction and aim of the paper**

Literacy is fundamental to human development. It enables people to live full and meaningful lives and to contribute towards the enrichment of the communities in which we all live. By literacy we mean the ability to read and write at a level where individuals can effectively understand and use written communication, be it in print or digital media.

The European Commission recognises that there has been little improvement in literacy in the last 15 years, since the shocking results of the first PISA study (OECD 2001). Yet, with the right support in place, children, young people and adults can develop the literacy skills that they need to function effectively and independently in society. Against this background the European Literacy Policy Network ELINET was established by the European Commission in February 2014 to complete an ambitious two-year work programme (ELINET 2018).

ELINET aimed to improve literacy policies in its members' countries in order to reduce the number of children, young people and adults with low literacy skills. The ambitious aim that inspired all ELINET work is for every European citizen to achieve functional literacy, defined as the ability to read and write at a level that enables personal development and functioning in society, the home, school and work. By building a powerful and sustainable network its aim was to develop common standards and frameworks in a bottom-up-process, develop evidence-based tools for all actors in the field of literacy and support existing and new activities locally, regionally, nationally and transnationally. ELINET had 78 members in 28 European countries representing a wide range of players in the field of literacy: literacy networks, education ministries, national agencies, transnational and international organisations, foundations, NGOs, universities, research centres, teacher training institutions, volunteer organisations and other stakeholder groups. ELINET brought together researchers, practitioners, professionals and volunteers who work across age-groups and sectors, covering family literacy, pre-primary and primary children, adolescents and adults; informal, non-formal and formal learning; digital literacy and reading for pleasure, and much more.

The ELINET Work Programme included the following areas:

1. One European Framework of Good Practice in Literacy Policies (EFGP) comprising all age groups.
2. Best Practice Examples based on the EFGP.
3. 30 Country Reports for all Network countries about Literacy Performance and Good Practice.

4. One common European Literacy Communication Platform.
5. Toolkit for Fundraising.
6. Toolkit of Awareness Raising Activities and Indicators for measuring effectiveness.

Ten tasks of the project were organized in 4 themes, in the Themes A, B, C, D, in the following way:

**Theme A:** Development of Country-specific Knowledge

Task A1: Analysing and reporting on Member States performance in literacy on all levels.

Task A2: Identifying and disseminating the sources of funding and other support.

**Theme B:** Facilitating the Exchange of Good Practice

Task B3: Identifying good policy practices in raising literacy levels.

Task B4: Providing a platform for exchanging these good practices. (It was decided to work across tasks A1 and B3 in 3 age-groups Teams: Team 2: Children / Team 3: Adolescents / Team 4: Adults).

**Theme C:** Awareness-raising Initiatives

Task C5: Identifying awareness-raising activities, campaigns and other events.

Task C6: Managing and further developing a Europe-wide campaign to promote literacy.

Task C7: Contributing to the literacy section of the Commission's education and training website.

Task C8: Defining indicators to measure the impact of awareness-raising and other literacy activities.

**Theme D:** Cooperation with other Institutions and Organizations to promote effective Literacy Policies

Task D9: Organizing network meetings and seminars.

Task D10: Organizing one European conference to share the results of the network with a wider audience.

This paper is to introduce how examples of good practice were identified and selected within this project. Another focus of this paper is to present a good practice that was facilitated by a library.

## Scientific background of the project

Literacy is an essential prerequisite for all forms of learning. In the knowledge-based societies of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, with the rapid spread of new technologies and a constantly changing work environment, literacy learning is no longer limited to childhood and adolescence but must be recognised as a lifelong need and requirement.

In Europe one in five 15-year-olds and nearly 55 million adults lack basic literacy skills. This increases their risk of poverty and social exclusion, limiting opportunities for employment, cultural and civil participation, lifelong learning and personal growth.

ELINET continued the work of the European Union High Level Group of Experts on Literacy (further in text: HLG) which was established by the European Commission in January 2011 and reported in September 2012. That group examined how to support literacy throughout lifelong learning, identified common success factors in literacy programmes and policy initiatives, and came up with proposals for improving literacy.

In ELINET, the research was built on the multi-layered definition of literacy, from baseline literacy to functional and multiple literacy, which the HLG report provided:

- **Baseline literacy** means having the knowledge of letters, words and text structures that is needed to read and write at a level that enables self-confidence and motivation for further development.
- **Functional literacy** stands for the ability to read and write at a level that enables someone to develop and function in society, at home, at school and at work.
- **Multiple literacy** corresponds to the ability to use reading and writing skills in order to produce, understand, interpret and critically evaluate written information. It is a basis for digital participation and making informed choices pertaining to finances, health, etc. (EU High Level Group... 2012, p. 103).

As ELINET focused on struggling readers and writers among children, adolescents and adults, it is important to understand that those persons identified as ‘low achievers’ by national and international assessments (such as PIRLS, PISA and PIAAC) are not analphabets (‘illiterates’), but persons who struggle with the increasing literacy requirements of contemporary societies:

Changes in the nature of work and the role of the media, as well as in the economy and society more generally, have made reading and writing much more important (EU High Level Group... 2012, p. 23).

## **Methods and objectives of Theme B: Facilitating the Exchange of Good Practice**

There were two general objectives for Theme B, Facilitating the Exchange of Good Practice:

1. to identify good policy practices in raising literacy levels of poor achievers in all age groups by developing a common European Framework of Good Practice in Raising Literacy Levels of Children, Adolescents and Adults (ELINET 2016) containing main features of good practice in all related policy areas that can be applied in all European countries,
2. to connect, align and unify organisations and players to strengthen cross-European collaboration on literacy by developing a Europe wide communication platform enabling all network partners to exchange the network's results (e.g. country-specific knowledge, analytical frameworks and examples of good practice) across Europe.

The four specific objectives for Theme B were:

1. to develop common criteria of good literacy policy practice based on international research results concerning the requirements of literacy development in the different age groups, the most urgent needs of support for low literacy achievers and the most successful measures to address these needs,
2. to gather, select, analyse and disseminate examples of 'good practice' in literacy policy from all involved European countries in applying the framework of the country reports and to develop criteria for good practice out of this analysis for the EFGP,
3. to establish a common online communication platform serving as information hub, for internal communication among all partners and as basis to reach out to all organizations, political decision makers, stakeholders, companies and civil society groups engaged in literacy in Europe,
4. to consult ministries in charge (of education, labour, social issues etc.), decision makers and stakeholders in the participating countries by providing them with the collected examples of good practice and the European Framework for doing consultation.

For evaluating literacy practices, the project differentiated between “good practice” and “promising practice”:

- **good practice** being based on research-based programme theory and evaluated in some form (e.g. quasi-experimental pre-post design),
- **promising practice** being based on research-based programme theory and proven practicability; but without evaluation. The practice may act as a source of inspiration for new projects.

An ELINET Call for Good Practice (plus a related Template for submitting good practice examples) was developed in order to gather good practice examples from all ELINET Member States. This Call was distributed among all network members in December 2014; many members translated the call into their national languages and distributed it in their country to all relevant institutions and stakeholders. The call was publicly displayed in February 2015 on the ELINET Website, accompanied by an electronic template for submitting good practice examples from a variety of different practice fields, covering 10 areas, the practice areas were grouped in the following way:

### **I. Creating a literate environment**

1. Reading animation programmes: Programmes addressing families, schools, libraries and other co-operations fostering reading for pleasure and motivation for reading.
2. Comprehensive literacy programmes where literacy growth of children, adolescents or adults is at the centre of the programme (‘comprehensive’ is understood to encompass both performance and motivation).
3. Programmes / projects fostering digital literacy and multi-literacy skills of children, adolescents or adults.

### **II. Improving the quality of teaching**

4. Literacy curricula, e.g. (national) core curricula based on clear educational standards and embedding literacy instruction and promotion systematically in all school subjects and all grades, in pre-school focusing on language and emergent literacy programmes.
5. Screening / assessment tools or programmes to systematically monitor children’s, adolescents’ or adults’ performance progress in literacy skills as a basis for individual support.
6. Reading / literacy instruction: Programmes targeted at improving literacy skills and strategies.

7. Initial teacher education programmes which systematically build literacy expertise for teachers of all school subjects and grades with the aim to identify and support poor readers and writers. For initial education of preschool teachers we focus on the development of emergent literacy skills.
8. Continuous professional development programmes for teachers which systematically build / expand literacy expertise for teachers of all school subjects and grades with a focus on identifying and supporting struggling readers and writers.

### **III. Increasing participation, inclusion and equity**

9. Programmes and initiatives to allow participation in literacy education and development opportunities:
  - prevention programmes aiming to decrease risk factors of early literacy in the pre-school age,
  - intervention programmes supporting families from disadvantaged backgrounds, e.g. family literacy programmes, book-gifting programmes, languages courses for parents who do not speak the language of instruction (may be linked under I as well).
10. Closing the gaps: programmes / projects addressing struggling literacy learners and literacy learners with special needs (e.g. second-language learners / migrants / students from disadvantaged families / boys).

The review process started with 8 general criteria which the project partners discussed and agreed upon and which fitted to all examples. Not all criteria had the same impact: No. 1 – No. 4 were regarded as essential (meaning: examples which do not meet these criteria should not be selected as good or promising practices) and No. 5 – No. 8 as additionally important, but no “knock-out” criteria:

1. A clear focus on struggling readers/writers. For pre-primary years, also universal programmes were to be taken into consideration as they often have preventive character.
2. A clear and sound conceptual basis (programme theory) which is well grounded in scientific research.
3. A clear definition of objectives.
4. Documentation concerning the implementation of the program (clear information about the activities to be carried out, about participants, stakeholders and target groups etc.).

5. In case of good-practice: Transparent documentation of the evaluation of the project and its effects on the target group.
6. Transferability: The practice or project has the potential of being applied to parallel or similar situations in the same or different regions.
7. The program outcomes (flyers, manuals, materials) should be available in print or – preferably – in the internet.
8. Sustainability of programmes or project outcomes.

In our application we promised to identify altogether 20–30 examples of good practice (across all age groups). 30 examples for 3 age-group teams meant 10 examples for each team, meaning 1 example for each of the 10 practice areas defined above. This limit required a very selective procedure. For pragmatic reasons we decided to select only one or two “best practice examples” per area and age-group for full presentation on project website and as reference examples for the European Framework of Good Practice in Raising Literacy Levels (ELINET 2016). All other examples which were evaluated as good or promising practice were presented on our website in a short form, e.g. containing the abstract and the link to the project’s website and eventually to the submission template.

A careful procedure for selecting the “best” among the “good” practice examples was used. Each example was reviewed by two reviewers. To reflect the lifelong and life wide perspective of ELINET, peer reviewers were appointed across age-groups according to their expertise. Naturally, they did not evaluate examples they were involved in themselves. As a result of the review, both reviewers gave an overall recommendation:

- approved as good or promising practice,
- request for more information for a second round of review,
- not approved.

Additionally, they were asked to rank the example according to a scale of 6 points (6 = very good; 5 = good; 4 = satisfying; 3 = acceptable; 2 = weak; 1 = very weak). Each policy area was coordinated by one area coordinator. This person / organization was responsible for distributing the examples to the reviewers and monitoring the review process. The coordinator read all reviews in his / her area and suggested the best practice example(s). The team leaders will in close communication with the area coordinator come to a final decision about the examples to be presented on the website and included into the European Framework of Good Practice in Raising Literacy Levels of Children, Adolescents and Adults (ELINET 2016).

The reviewers had to complete four main tasks:

1. Carry out the reviews of those examples which have already been submitted (according to the electronic template designed by the project). Each example was reviewed by two experts. If further information was needed, communication between the reviewers was welcome; the reviewers had to coordinate the communication process with the submitters.
2. Prepare the documentation of the GP examples on the ELINET website. The following categories were needed for the complete documentation on the website; the reviewers should give a short statement about the quality of the available information in the submission template:
  - Title
  - Picture / Logo / Photos
  - Teaser-Text
  - Abstract
  - Country
  - Policy area (literate environment, quality of teaching, participation...)
  - Objectives
  - Link to project website
3. Search pro-actively for more good practice examples especially in areas and countries which were so far underrepresented; for this purpose other ELINET partners were to be addressed to help with their national or field-specific expertise.
4. Contribute to develop area-specific indicators of good practice for the European Framework of Good Practice in Raising Literacy Levels to further specify our indicators for good practice:
  - top down-approach: drawing on international research we defined indicators for the different fields of practice,
  - bottom up-approach: secondly, we collected good practice examples which covered at least some of those indicators,
  - fusing both approaches: in analysing those examples we revised, refined, modified or completed the indicators in the framework [bringing together both approaches].

We carried out pilot-reviews of two examples with all appointed reviewers, in order to pilot our criteria and our review template and used the results of this piloting for improving the usability of the review template.

Based on those features about 150 good practice examples covering all areas and age-groups were collected and analyzed. In the second step,

the preliminary draft of the Good Practice Framework was revised and refined, based on the ‘bottom-up’ analysis of the features of good practice as identified in the multiple examples which had been reviewed so far. The 8 preliminary criteria of good practice mentioned above were agreed to work out more specific features of good practice for the different policy areas and practice fields covered by this framework. The result of the Cologne Workshop was the “Final Version” of the Good Practice Framework (January 2016), which was publicly presented at the Final ELINET Conference in Amsterdam. The Final Version was thus produced in March 2016, proofread and final edited and uploaded on the ELINET web-site.

The involved team-leaders and coordinators decided that all examples being approved by reviewers and team-leaders should be published on the ELINET website. At the end of the project, 145 examples had been submitted; out of those 36 examples had been rejected and 109 examples were published in the “Good Practice” section of our website (<http://www.elinet.eu/good-practice/>).

**[ “Reading belongs to everyone – even to you!” a Good Practice Example involving school-library-teacher training cooperation for better literacy**

The situation described above is present in Hungary. As the number of the low-achievers is high regarding text comprehension, John von Neumann University Pedagogical Faculty (previously Kecskemét College) decided to initiate a project in order to develop the text comprehension and literacy skills of the students in the university’s practice schools; the project involved in-service teachers of the school of teaching practice, the librarians of the university and pre-service teachers as volunteers (the name of the project was “Tudásdepó Expressz” a Kecskeméti Főiskolán “Értő olvasás – piacképes tudás” – szolgáltatásfejlesztés a szövegértés és a digitális korszerűsítés területén az élethosszig tartó tanulás érdekében a Kecskeméti Főiskolán TÁMOP 3.2.4.A-11/1) in order to improve the literacy skills of the young students in non-formal education settings (Szabó, 2012). The project run for two years (in 2012 and 2013) and was sustained for 5 additional years. The main aim of the project was to put the most effective literacy improvement techniques and strategies into practice in the everyday teaching.

A forerunner of ELINET project, the ADORE-Project was explicitly interested in this input; and asked: Which are the components of “good practice” in order to support adolescent low achievers in reading (Garbe, Holle,

Swantje, 2010, pp. 67–73)? The project focused especially on the instructional practice in public secondary schools (including vocational schools). The 12 national teams searched for examples of good practice concerning reading promotion in their own countries. ADORE project summarized 13 Key Elements of good practice. When designing this project, we aimed to include as many of these key elements as possible in this project. The following good practice elements were highlighted: choosing engaging reading materials, teaching cognitive and meta-cognitive reading strategies, creating an inspiring reading environment multi-professional support for teachers, community support and involvement for schools (Steklács, Szabó, Szinger, 2013).

To identify the target group we used documents on status of students with special needs provided by professional experts and advisors, plus developmental teachers and a speech therapist were also involved in selecting the target students from the school of teaching practice of our university. In the academic year 2012/2013 the total number of students in this school was 242, out of which 90 were underprivileged students (abbr. UPS). Many of the underprivileged students were children with special educational needs (SEN) having long-lasting and/or serious cognitive disorders; or they had behaviour, learning, and integration disturbances (BLID). During the selection procedure we focused on the population having low achievement in text comprehension and/or being underprivileged. Based on a questionnaire 60 students were involved in the project. One student could have several problems, so out of the total number of 60 students 10 were students with special needs, 17 had behaviour, learning, and integration disturbances and 54 were underprivileged students.

The literacy skills of the age group of 8–10 year-old students were assessed with a test based on a tale. The test had 11 tasks. The tasks having the lowest achievement score was drawing a conclusion from the text; 11,76% of the students could fulfil this task. The second problem area was the reproduction of the tale; speech problems, lack of vocabulary and difficulties with creating mental images were in the background. Based on these problem areas, we put these students into 3 groups: 1. Logopaedic skills, creating mental images, 2. Previewing; reading technique problems, 3. Activating previous knowledge, developing vocabulary.

The literacy skills of the age group of 10–12 year-old students were assessed with a test based on explanatory non-fiction text. The test had 12 tasks. The most difficult task for the students was to give reasons with information retrieval. The second problem area was reproducing the text, highlighting the problems of comprehension and attention retainment. Based on these problem areas, we put these students into 3 groups: 1. Identifying the most

important ideas; Keeping attention; 2. Problems with drawing conclusions and understanding cause-effect relations; 3. Monitoring understanding, memory defects.

The literacy skills of the age group of 13–15 year-old students were assessed with a test based on explanatory non-fiction texts. The test included 9 tasks, which focused on students' comprehensive, interpretive and critical reading skills. Students had the lowest achievement when they were asked about cause-effect relations; only 25% of them could give the right answer. Based on these problem areas, we put these students into 2 groups: 1. Fix-up strategies; problems with imagination and thinking skills, 2. Selective reading, developing critical reading competence.

The most important objective in our project was to put those most effective, research-based methods and techniques that promote reading comprehension into practice. "Reading belongs to everyone, even to you!" programme was initiated to make students got familiar with methods involving cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies that improve their literacy and learning skills. We adapted transactional strategy teaching method, PQRST or SQ3R (Robinson), Sensory Imaging Strategy, STPG method (set two literacy goals), IEPC (imagine, elaborate, predict, confirm) (Wood), reciprocal teaching (Palincsar), SIS-method (creating mental images), cooperative learning to the Hungarian educational settings.

Teachers, developmental teachers, librarians had a formal training about the strategies they were expected to work with in each group; the training was held by the author of this article. The training was based on BaCuLit project (Szabó, Szinger, Steklács, 2011); BaCuLit materials were used and adapted to the needs of this programme.

Developing literacy skills and text comprehension is a very complex task requiring not only the skills needed to become a good reader, but the whole personality as such should be developed. At the beginning of the project the librarians and the volunteers made a reading list including books taking gender difference (boys-girls) into consideration; all the books in the list were available at the faculty library. Each child chose a book from this list and made a "reader contract" with the librarians that they would read that particular book until the end of the project. These contracts were signed by both parties (students and librarians) and were put on display in the library. As research has shown, struggling readers often have a negative self-concept about themselves as students; it is due to their failures at school. Involving them in planning their learning proves makes them feel more responsible for their own reading, which has a positive impact on their reading motivation and achievement.

During the project year there were 15 sessions for each group; 7 out of these sessions were held in the library and 8 sessions were put in one block and organized in a camp. The camp was held on a farm, where students could really experience and enjoy the non-formal educational settings. The volunteers, the pre-service students took part in the work in all sessions. The text chosen to be used in the all areas with all the age groups in the project belonged to four text types: narrative, descriptive, functional and graphic (e.g. charts, Venn-diagrams, fishbones); their themes or topics were closely connected to activities in the project ending camps.

During the project three camps were organized: a Winter Camp at the end of the first term, a Spring Camp towards the end of the academic year, and an Autumn Camp at the beginning of the new academic year. The venue of the camp was a farm house named the Guardian, where the 2-day programme included being familiarised with animal keeping, farm life, the flora of the Great Plain (especially the local junipers), baking bread, horse riding, archery, star watching by night, folk dancing. Knowing that these programmes would be offered in the camp, the topics and themes of the texts were related to them, and were about national parks, folk music instruments, keeping horses, baking bread, herbs, Hungarian breeds (e.g. puli); some texts were about how to use a library.

Most of these students came from a low-income family without a literacy supportive background; these students lacked a family model where reading and writing would have been a part of everyday life; or where reading would have been seen as a value. The sociocultural background of the camp was to compensate for the lack of such a family background.

The free-time activities indirectly improved skills needed for improving literacy skills (fine motor skills, eye coordination, body image), while working in groups and pairs improved children's social competences.

Teachers made a lesson plan including the source of the texts about each session following BaCuLit lesson planning guidelines. All these lesson plans were published in the final project publication.

Teachers working in the project had to make a progress report about the groups they worked with based on the entry and exit tests. The following data are from these progress reports.

The group of "Previewing; reading technique problems" (7 persons) had two text types (a recipe and a fairy tale) in their entry tests. The maximum score of the entry test was 46,5 points. The best achievement was 70,9%, and only one student had this result. Two of the students reached 37,6%, one student reached 34,4%, another one 30,1%, another one 23,7%, and the lowest achievement was 17,2%. The highest score in the exit test (one student)

was 93%, while the lowest one was 56,5%. (Further results: one test with 89,1%, three with 82,6%, and one with 73,9% results.) Compared to the entry test a significant improvement can be seen, which shows that the sessions were successful.

The group of “Problems with drawing conclusions and understanding cause-effect relations” (7 persons) included students who had comprehension problems, especially reading between the lines, drawing conclusions, seeing cause-effect relations. The entry test showed that the putting events in chronological order was the most difficult task. The best achievement was 66% reached by one student, the rest of the group could not complete this task. Categorising, “understanding consequences” were also areas to be improved, because students had low scores in these tasks as well (2 students reached 66%, 1 did 16%, 4 students achieved 0%). In the exit test the group achieved 100% results answering 8 questions out of 14. The rate of good answers about cause-effect relations and drawing conclusions: 5 students reached 100%, 1 student reached 80%, 1 student had 60%.

The entry test of “Selective reading, developing critical reading competence” (7 persons) group included different tasks: instructions, data collection from a text, putting events in chronological order, true or false questions, making decisions, giving opinion. The average result of the group was: 57,84%. The results of the exit test show a significant improvement. One student made a minimal progress, two students achieved 5% progress, but the others made about 20–36% progress. The average score of the group exit test was 74,57%.

Following the ELINET Good Practice Review Template and its guidelines “Reading belongs to everyone, even to you!” project can be regarded as a good practice example. The target group is primary students and adolescents, as the age range of the targeted students was between 9 and 15. Regarding the stakeholders (providers and partners) a library, teachers, volunteers, a teacher training institution, an education institution leader (the principal of the teaching practice school actively took part in the project) and a business (the farm house is a family business, functions as a tourist place) were involved in the project. Defining the policy area of this example, it is a comprehensive literacy example as the literacy growth of children, adolescents was at the centre. It was “comprehensive” encompass both performance and motivation were encompassed: students’ performance was improved according to the test results; their motivation towards reading was targeted by entering into a reading contract with them. Focusing on increasing participation, inclusion and equity, the project supported both prevention and intervention. It also served closing the gaps, as struggling literacy learners and literacy learners with special needs were highly represented in the target group.

This programme focused on struggling readers and aimed to decrease risk factors of literacy in the school and adolescent age. There is a clear conceptual basis in the background which is represented in the forerunner projects of ELINET; in the ADORE and BaCuLit projects. The BaCuLit lesson planning guidelines and its conceptual background is deeply rooted and based in the research basis of these programmes. The objectives were clearly defined: to improve reading and learning skills of the target to make them able take part in life-long learning. The implementation of the project was clearly documented: teachers leading the groups made a progress report about their groups, the training materials of the teachers were distributed among them and there were regular training sessions for them. The final publication of the project included a short research background of the problem areas, all the lesson plans used during the project, photos taken during the sessions. The entry and exit tests, their evaluations were included in the project documentation; these documents were also presented at a final conference at the end of the project. Regarding the transferability criterion, the practice has the absolute potential of being applied to parallel or similar situations in the same or different regions. The programme outcome is a book containing all the lesson materials. Moreover, three of the volunteers, pre-service teacher trainees, wrote their theses about the project. The outcomes and effects of this project could outlast the funding period; the sustaining period lasted for 5 years. The methods, strategies teachers and librarians learnt and used during the project period were applied later on their everyday work; the volunteers who were pre-service teacher trainees got familiar with these methods, and they could integrate them in their future work. As this project did not have a one-shot approach, by training pre- and in-service teachers our aim was to change their perspective on their self-concept as teachers; we wanted to make them realise that teaching cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies to their students they can become more successful learners. Involving librarians in this work guaranteed the multi-professional support as a key element of good practices according to ADORE project. There is a transparent documentation of the evaluation of the project and its effect on the target group. As a conclusion “Reading belongs to everyone, even to you!” meets the requirements of good practice example of ELINET standards.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, when launching a call for examples of good practice in raising literacy levels of children, adolescents and adults in all 28 ELINET member countries, we expected to receive about 40–50 examples of GP,

describing the projects or programmes on a 10-pages template and adding additional material which in most cases needs translation into English. We were amazed by the overwhelming interest of about 150 ELINET partners and external organisations in presenting their projects and programmes as “Good Practice” on the ELINET platform. On the one hand this was an encouraging result; on the other hand it required us to set up a complex review process.

Teams 2, 3 and 4 produced two major frameworks and a great number of related reports and good practice examples: The Frame of Reference for the Country Reports and the European Framework of Good Practice in Raising Literacy Levels of Children, Adolescents and Adults. We expected that both frameworks would have a major impact in shaping European and national literacy policies in the future, as for the first time all European countries could refer to common frameworks to analyse literacy performance and policies in their countries and for designing programmes to improve literacy levels in their countries. Both frameworks would be especially powerful, as they were accompanied by a plethora of examples.

During the course of the ELINET project it could be observed that in several of the partner countries new initiatives in national literacy policies were fostered while working on the frameworks, the reports and the collection of good practice examples. In many countries, e.g. Cyprus or Hungary or Romania, national literacy organisations connected much more closely than before and started to discuss common literacy initiatives in their countries. The good example titled “Reading belongs to everyone, even to you!” had started before the ELINET project, however, ELINET proved that such initiatives are very necessary, they do exist; and collecting them on the one hand creates a network encouraging the all the participants to continue and keep up their good work; on the other hand ELINET created a reservoir of good practices that can be shared, applied in different settings. This way literacy level of different age-groups, in different countries could be improved.

### **Acknowledgment**

This publication is supported by EFOP-3.6.1-16-2016-00006 “The development and enhancement of the research potential at John von Neumann University” project. The Project is supported by the Hungarian Government and co-financed by the European Social Fund.

## References

- ELINET (2016). European Framework of Good Practice in Raising Literacy Levels of Children, Adolescents and Adults. Final Version, March 2016. Retrieved 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2018 from: [http://www.eli-net.eu/fileadmin/ELINET/Redaktion/user\\_upload/European\\_Framework\\_of\\_Good\\_Practice1.pdf](http://www.eli-net.eu/fileadmin/ELINET/Redaktion/user_upload/European_Framework_of_Good_Practice1.pdf)
- ELINET (2018). Home Page. Retrieved 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2018 from <http://www.eli-net.eu/>
- EU High Level Group of Experts on Literacy. Final Report (2012). Retrieved 4<sup>th</sup> February 2016 from: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/96d782cc-7cad-4389-869a-bbc8e15e5aeb/language-en>
- Garbe, Christine, Holle, Karl & Swantje, Weinhold (eds.) (2010). *ADORE – Teaching Struggling Adolescent Readers in European Countries*. Frankfurt am Main; New York: Peter Lang.
- OECD (2001). *Knowledge and Skills for Live. First results from the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2000*. Retrieved 15<sup>th</sup> November 2018 from: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/9789264195905-en.pdf?expires=1543253615&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=32C9D964D2669A0BF657AB0F1F60C03B>
- Steklács, János, Szabó, Ildikó & Szinger, Veronika (2013). Teaching Adolescent Struggling Readers: a Comparative Study of Good Practices in European Countries. In: *Texts and Contexts: Collisions and Collusions Selected Papers* (pp. 93–103). Vilnius: Vilnius University.
- Szabó, Ildikó, Szinger, Veronika & Steklács, János (2011). Basic Curriculum for Teachers' Professional Development in Content Area Literacy in Secondary School. In: Hegedűs Orsolya, Psenaková Ildikó (eds.), *Science for education – Education for Science* (pp. 217–222). Nitra: I. Constantine University.
- Szabó, Ildikó (2012). A gyermek- és ifjúsági korosztály olvasási képességének fejlesztése a nem formális képzés keretén belül a Kecskeméti Főiskolán. In: *Agtedu 2012. A Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe alkalmából rendezett tudományos konferencia kiadványa* (pp. 279–284). Kecskemét: Kecskeméti Főiskola.
- Szabó, Ildikó & Steklács, János (2013). The Evaluation of BaCuLit-project in Hungary. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 81 (28), 638–643
- “Tudásdepó-Expressz” a Kecskeméti Főiskolán. “Értő olvasás – piacképes tudás” – Szolgáltatásfejlesztés a szövegértés és a digitális korszerűsítés területén az élethosszig tartó tanulás érdekében a Kecskeméti Főiskolán. “Az olvasás mindenkié, a tiéd is!” (2013). Kecskemét: Kecskeméti Főiskola.

**Biographical note:** Ildikó Szabó has a PhD in Linguistics. She teaches Linguistics, Methodology, American Literature and Civilization. She is involved in pre-service and in-service teacher training. She also teaches English in a primary school. She takes part in international researches on language teaching (CulTiFoLa, pri-sec-co, MOLAN, INTACT, AduLeT) and reading literacy (ADORE, BaCuLit, ISIT, ELINET, BleTeach). Her research areas are: early language teaching, CLIL method, bilingual education, teacher training, literacy.

**Dobra praktyka (oparta na kryteriach ELINET) edukacji pozaformalnej angażującej bibliotekę w celu poprawy umiejętności czytania i pisania (na przykładzie projektu węgierskiego)**

**ABSTRAKT:** Rozpoczęty w lutym 2014 r. Projekt ELINET był realizowany przez 2 lata, przez 28 krajów europejskich. Jego celem była analiza i konsultacje w zakresie lokalnych, regionalnych, krajowych i ponadnarodowych polityk rozwoju umiejętności czytania i pisania, podnoszenie świadomości na temat alfabetyzacji oraz koordynowanie kampanii. Ostatecznie, efektem działania sieci było utworzenie *Europejskiej ramy dobrych praktyk w podnoszeniu poziomu umiejętności czytania i pisania* oraz przykładów jej zastosowania. Artykuł ma na celu przedstawienie sposobu, w jaki zebrano i zweryfikowano dobre praktyki, opisuje również dobrą praktykę (prowadzoną przez Wydział Pedagogiczny Uniwersytetu Johna von Neumanna w ramach programu „Czytanie należy do wszystkich, nawet do Ciebie!”), stworzoną w oparciu o dobre praktyki ELINET.

**SŁOWA KLUCZOWE:** alfabetyzacja; dobra praktyka; edukacja nieformalna; współpraca bibliotekarzy; nauczyciele i przyszli nauczyciele.