Emerging Technologies for Holistic Literacy in Adult Education

D5.1 ETHLAE Report testing and piloting the Toolbox

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION

Abbreviation	Description
Due date of deliverable	31.10.2026
Submission date	
File name	D5.1 ETHLAE Report testing and piloting the Toolbox
Linked Task	T5.3 National pilots
Author(s)	Alexandru-Octavian Ursulescu
Deliverable responsible	CPIP
Reviewer(s)	All partners
Revision number	01
Status	Draft
Dissemination level	PU — Public
Key words	

REVISION HISTORY

Version	Date	Reviewer (s)	Comment(s)
1.0		All partners	Additional information and revisions

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION *2*
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS *6*
LIST OF PARTNERS *6*
1. Introduction *7*
2. Piloting Methodology *8*
2.1 Co-design and preparation of the pilots 8
2.2 National piloting approach 8
2.3 Flexible and context-sensitive implementation 9
2.4 Participants and target groups 9
2.5 Implementation documentation and common reporting framework 10
3. Overall Overview of the Piloting Activities *10*
4. National Piloting Experiences *11*
4.1 Romania 12
4.2 Finland 13
4.3 Austria 14
4.4 Croatia 15
5. Cross-Country Analysis of the Piloting Results *16*
5.1 Participant Profiles and Learning Needs 16
5.2 Implementation and Adaptation of the Learning Scenarios 17
5.3 Learner Engagement and Participation 17
5.4 Digital and Emerging Technology Use 18
5.5 Role of the Educator 18
5.6 Main Results Observed Across Countries 19
5.7 Common Challenges 19
5.8 Transferability Across ALE Contexts 19
5.9 Cross-Country Conclusions 20
6. Feedback on the ETHLAE Toolbox and Learning Scenarios *20*
6.1 Relevance and Practical Usefulness 21
6.2 Flexibility and Adaptability of the Learning Scenarios 21
6.3 Feedback from Learners 22
6.4 Areas Identified for Improvement 22
6.5 Recommendations Emerging from the Feedback 23

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

6.6 Overall Feedback 23
7. Challenges Encountered During Piloting 23
7.1 Organisational Challenges 23
7.2 Pedagogical Challenges 24
7.3 Learner-Related Challenges 24
7.4 Technical Challenges 25
7.5 Challenges Related to Digital Inclusion 25
7.6 How Challenges Were Addressed 25
7.7 Overall Reflection on Challenges 26
8. Lessons Learned 26
9. Transferability, Replication and Sustainability 29
9.1 Transferability to Other ALE Contexts 29
9.2 Conditions for Successful Replication 29
9.3 Replication Through Existing Learning Programmes 30
9.4 Sustainability at Organisational Level 30
9.5 Recommendations for Scaling Up 31
9.6 Overall Perspective on Sustainability 31
Overall Conclusions 31

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
ALE	Adult Learning and Education
AI	Artificial Intelligence
IoT	Internet of Things
AR/VR	Augmented and Virtual Reality
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
WP	Work Package

LIST OF PARTNERS

No	Partner	Country	Acronym
P1	EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF ADULTS	Belgium	EAEA
P2	SVEUCILISTE ALGEBRA	Croatia	AU
P3	ALL DIGITAL AISBL	Belgium	AD
P4	KANSANVALISTUSSEURA	Finland	KVS
P5	CENTRUL PENTRU PROMOVAREA INVATARII PERMANENTE TIMISOARA ASOCIATIA	Romania	CPIP
P6	VERBAND OSTERREICHISCHER VOLKSHOCHSCHULEN	Austria	VOV
P7	NATIONAL LEARNING AND WORK INSTITUTE	United Kingdom	L&W

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

1. Introduction

The ETHLAE – Emerging Technologies for Holistic Literacy in Adult Education project addresses the need for more meaningful, inclusive and pedagogically grounded approaches to the use of emerging technologies in Adult Learning and Education (ALE). While technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), Internet of Things (IoT), Augmented and Virtual Reality (AR/VR), robotics and other digital tools are increasingly present in education and society, their potential use in holistic literacy and life skills programmes for adults, particularly adults in vulnerable situations, remains insufficiently explored from a pedagogical perspective. The project therefore seeks to bridge the gap between technological innovation and inclusive adult education by supporting educators in integrating emerging technologies into learning activities in a way that is relevant, accessible and responsive to learners' needs.

The overall approach of ETHLAE is centred on adapting existing educational practices and learning designs to the specific characteristics of adult learning and education. Particular attention is given to the social, contextual, economic and personal circumstances of both educators and learners, as well as to the opportunities, challenges and ethical considerations related to the use of emerging technologies. In this sense, the project does not approach technology as an objective in itself, but rather to support more inclusive, engaging and effective holistic literacy provision.

The project follows a progressive development process across its core work packages. The methodological analysis carried out under WP2 provided the evidence base by mapping and analysing existing practices, methods and tools related to emerging technologies and holistic literacy. Building on these findings, WP3 focused on the development of the ETHLAE Toolbox, combining resources for educators with pedagogical learning scenarios designed to embed emerging technologies into holistic literacy programmes. WP4 subsequently supported ALE organisations, educators and learners through Capacity Building Labs, participatory learning activities and peer mentoring, preparing participants to apply the project approaches in practice. WP5 – Testing and Piloting represents the practical implementation and validation phase of this process.

WP5 was designed to test the ETHLAE Toolbox with ALE educators, including educators beyond the core consortium, and to implement the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios in national and local adult education contexts. The work package pursues three main objectives: to define contextual guidelines for the implementation of the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios; to test the Toolbox through a low-fidelity prototyping approach involving wider communities of educators; and to implement national pilots involving both ALE educators and adult learners.

The testing and piloting process was conceived at two complementary levels. The first level focused on testing the ETHLAE Toolbox with educators, including engagement with broader European communities through surveys, user-experience activities and evaluation. The second level focused on the practical implementation of the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios in national and local ALE settings. The application foresaw at least four national/local pilots, with each pilot involving a minimum of 5 educators and 15 adult learners.

More specifically, Task 5.3 foresaw the piloting of at least one holistic literacy programme based on the ETHLAE scenarios in at least four ALE organisations or local contexts. The national pilots were intended not only to assess whether the scenarios could be implemented as designed, but also to explore how they could be adapted to different learner profiles, institutional settings and national circumstances. The

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

participating partners responsible for national piloting were CPIP in Romania, KVS in Finland, VÖV in Austria and Algebra Bernays University in Croatia.

The piloting phase has a dual function within ETHLAE. On the one hand, it provides evidence on the practical applicability, relevance and adaptability of the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios and Toolbox across different adult education contexts. On the other hand, it allows the consortium to collect direct feedback from educators and adult learners, identify strengths and areas requiring further improvement, and assess the potential for transferability and wider exploitation of the developed resources. This is consistent with the project's broader participatory and user-centred methodology, which foresees feedback loops, testing and the involvement of learners and practitioners throughout the development process.

This report, D5.1 – ETHLAE Report Testing and Piloting the Toolbox, consolidates the results and experiences generated through the testing and national piloting activities. The report presents an overview of the piloting approach, the participants and contexts involved, the implementation of the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios, the adaptations introduced at national level, and the main results and feedback reported by educators and learners. It also provides a cross-country analysis aimed at identifying common patterns, differences between implementation contexts, lessons learned and recommendations for the future use, adaptation and replication of the ETHLAE approach.

2. Piloting Methodology

The ETHLAE piloting methodology was designed as a practical and context-sensitive process aimed at assessing how the project's learning scenarios and related pedagogical approaches could be implemented in real Adult Learning and Education (ALE) settings. In line with the overall methodology of the project, the piloting phase combined a common implementation framework with sufficient flexibility for each partner to adapt the activities to the characteristics of its national context, organisation, educators and adult learners.

2.1 Co-design and preparation of the pilots

Before the national pilots were implemented, WP5 included a dedicated testing and pilot design phase. EAEA organised an online co-design workshops involving project partners, associated partners and external organisations with 25 participants. Two external organisations presented their findings from other initiatives to support the partnership to plan the piloting phase.

In addition, three further testing activities were organised: a survey, two user experience moments and an evaluation activity. The survey was carried out by EAEA and All Digital and asked potential of technologies, relevance of each 5 thematic area, what matters when choosing a tool and what would help most for the implementation of emerging technologies. Collaborative & social learning platforms were seen as the tools with most potential, and AR & AR (immersive environments) the least. Literacy and numeracy and sustainability were choosen as the most relevant today, followed by democracy. When asked what matters more when choosing a tool, respondents focused on easy to set up and use and accessibility to learners with low digital skills. What would help educators most when integrating emerging technologies into ALE was the last question. Training was the most chosen option, followed by materials, tutorials and peer exchange with other educators. One respondent added that training should focus on adult-education practice, not only the technology, and on tools that educators and learners can use easily.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

Of the two user experience moments, the first was organised by EAEA at its annual conference with ALE members, while the second was led by AD to gather more detailed feedback. Informal conversations with EAEA members showed that practitioners value emerging technologies for reaching remote learners, preparing adults for digital life and making learning more engaging. The main barriers they named were poor infrastructure, insufficient educator training, ethical and legal uncertainty, and the risk of widening inequalities. Members responded positively to ETHLAE, especially its learning scenarios, MOOC, competence areas, inclusive focus and emphasis on pedagogy over technology. They suggested providing editable Word or PDF versions alongside the Genially presentations and offering shorter scenario versions. They also stressed practical constraints such as limited time, part-time or volunteer staff, unreliable Wi-Fi and learner anxiety about technology. AD discussed the ETHLAE toolkit, and all respondents agreed this kind of resource is needed in adult education. Gamification was seen as the most accessible technology. AI tools were seen as having the greatest long-term potential, though they depend on easy interfaces. Collaborative platforms suit peer learning, while VR/AR is the least accessible. The five thematic areas were well received, with suggested additions of wellbeing, financial literacy (separate from numeracy) or science literacy. Respondents valued the toolkit's focus on real-life relevance over technology for its own sake but saw educators' digital readiness as the biggest risk. Finally, in September, EAEA held an evaluation activity with all partners to analyse the results of all the piloting experiences and agree on the changes needed for the WP3 Toolkit based on the results.

This phase reflected one of the key methodological principles of ETHLAE: a balance between common project objectives and flexibility at local level. The pilots were therefore not conceived as identical interventions replicated mechanically across countries. Instead, partners worked from the common ETHLAE scenarios and methodology while retaining the possibility to adjust the implementation according to the profile of participants, literacy levels, language, organisational setting, available time and local educational needs.

2.2 National piloting approach

The national piloting activities were implemented under Task 5.3. The project foresaw the piloting of at least one holistic literacy programme based on the ETHLAE scenarios in at least four national or local ALE organisations or contexts. Each pilot was expected to involve at least 5 educators and 15 adult learners, with educators and learners participating directly in the implementation and reflection process.

The national pilots were implemented by CPIP, KVS, VÖV and Algebra University, representing different ALE contexts in Romania, Finland, Austria and Croatia. This diversity was an important methodological element, as it allowed the consortium to examine the applicability of the ETHLAE approach across different institutional, cultural and pedagogical environments rather than evaluating it within a single type of adult education setting. Unfortunately, it was not possible to test with educators in the United Kingdom. L&W reached out to several potential participants and invited them to engage with the pilot session but received very limited expressions of interest. This way, the UK piloting activity did not generate any user engagement despite the outreach efforts.

The implementation process focused on the practical use of the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios. Partners were asked to select and approach the scenario most appropriate to their context and to organise the pilot in a way that responded to the needs of their learners.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

2.3 Flexible and context-sensitive implementation

A central element of the piloting methodology was the possibility to adapt the scenarios to the realities of each national and local context. Rather than assessing fidelity to a rigid implementation model, the piloting sought to understand how the ETHLAE approach could function under different conditions.

Partners were therefore encouraged to make relevant adjustments where necessary, including:

- cultural and contextual adaptations;
- language adaptations;
- adjustments according to learners' literacy levels;
- modifications to the timing or structure of the activities;
- adaptations to the original scenario;
- practical responses to unexpected organisational, pedagogical, learner-related or technical challenges.

These elements were incorporated directly into the final reporting framework so that the consortium could analyse not only whether the scenarios were implemented, but also how and why they were adapted in practice.

This aspect is particularly important for ETHLAE because the project explicitly targets adult learners with diverse backgrounds and needs, including adults in vulnerable situations. The project methodology recognises that a single standardised solution is unlikely to be equally effective across all ALE contexts. For this reason, flexibility, accessibility and responsiveness to learners' circumstances were treated as integral components of the implementation process rather than as deviations from the original scenario.

2.4 Participants and target groups

The piloting methodology involved two main categories of direct participants: ALE educators and adult learners.

Educators played a dual role. They acted as implementers of the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios while also providing professional feedback on their relevance, usability and adaptability. Their professional background, experience in ALE, previous work with literacy programmes and experience with digital tools were therefore documented as part of the national reporting process.

Adult learners were the direct beneficiaries of the pilot activities. Partners reported their general educational background, literacy level, relevant socio-economic circumstances where appropriate, and motivation for participation.

Collecting this information was important for the analysis of the pilot results, as the effectiveness and appropriateness of each implementation needed to be interpreted in relation to the characteristics of the participants and the context in which the pilot took place.

2.5 Implementation documentation and common reporting framework

To ensure comparability across countries, CPIP developed a common Piloting Report to be completed by each piloting partner after the implementation phase.

The reporting template collected information in five main areas:

1. the general context and organisation of the pilot;
2. the profile of educators and adult learners involved;
3. the design, implementation and adaptations made during the pilot;

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

4. challenges and lessons learned;
5. transferability and sustainability of the piloted programme.

Supporting evidence such as attendance lists, photographs or screenshots where consent was available, and agendas was also requested as annex material.

Using a shared reporting framework allowed the consortium to preserve the richness of the national experiences while ensuring that the same core dimensions were documented across all pilots. This common structure also provides the basis for the cross-country comparison presented later in this report.

3. Overall Overview of the Piloting Activities

The ETHLAE national piloting activities were implemented across Romania, Finland, Austria and Croatia, reflecting a broad variety of Adult Learning and Education contexts, learner profiles and delivery conditions. Although all partners worked within the common ETHLAE methodological framework, the national pilots differed substantially in their organisation, duration, target groups, learning scenarios selected and level of access to digital technologies. This diversity was particularly valuable for testing the flexibility of the ETHLAE approach and understanding how the learning scenarios could be translated into different real-life ALE environments.

Across the four countries, piloting took place in adult education centres, NGO settings, a correctional institution and online learning environments. The activities ranged from short, focused workshops of approximately 90 minutes to multi-session programmes extending over several days. The formats were predominantly face-to-face, although the Croatian learner pilot was delivered entirely online. In Romania, implementation took place in a highly restricted prison environment without access to the internet or digital devices, while Finland and several Austrian pilots combined literacy learning with direct use of computers, smartphones, AI and other digital tools.

This variation meant that the pilots tested more than whether the scenarios could simply be delivered as originally designed. They also provided evidence on how ETHLAE resources can be adapted, shortened, expanded, translated, digitised or converted into offline formats depending on the learners, institutional restrictions and available resources.

Overview by Country

Country	Org	Scenario(s) piloted	Main setting / format	Reported duration	Participants reported
Romania	CPIP	*Energy aware at home*; *Sustainability on a plate*	Prison education setting; face-to-face;	2-hour educator session + 4-hour learner session	5 educators; 15 learners
Finland	KVS	*Navigating everyday texts*	NGO and adult education	10 hours across two	5 educators; 18 learners

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

			centre; face-to-face	pilot formats	
Austria	VOV	*Digital spaces, human connections*; *My object, my story*; *Navigating everyday texts*; *Sustainability on a plate*	Adult basic education courses; face-to-face	4 face-to-face piloting workshops	20 learners per workshop; 3 educators
Croatia	AU	*Digital spaces, human connections*	Online adult education / informal learning environment	90-minute learner workshop, supported by separate educator testing and reflection activities	17 learners; 2 facilitators in the learner workshop and other 3 educators involved in the wider testing process

Overall, the national pilots provided a broad testing environment for the ETHLAE scenarios and generated the evidence used in the following sections to analyse the national experiences, participant profiles, implementation approaches, results, challenges and transferability in greater detail.

4. National Piloting Experiences

The national piloting activities were implemented in four countries and reflected different Adult Learning and Education contexts, participant profiles, organisational conditions and levels of access to digital technologies. Although each partner worked with ETHLAE learning scenarios, the implementation approaches differed considerably, allowing the scenarios to be tested in prison education, adult basic education, NGO-supported learning and online adult education environments.

The following sections present the main characteristics of each national piloting experience, including the scenarios selected, participants involved, implementation approach, adaptations introduced and the main observations reported by the partners.

4.1 Romania

The Romanian piloting was implemented by Centrul Pentru Promovarea Învățării Permanente Timișoara - CPIP at Timișoara Penitentiary between 17 and 23 April 2026. Two ETHLAE learning scenarios were used: *Energy aware at home* and *Sustainability on a plate*. The piloting was conducted entirely face-to-face in educational spaces within the prison and was organised in two stages: a two-hour session with educators and a four-hour session, including breaks, with people in detention.

The educator group consisted of five social reintegration professionals, including psychologists and educational officers. Most had substantial experience of working with

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.
Co-funded by the European Union

vulnerable adults and people deprived of liberty, while their experience with emerging technologies in education was limited. Their digital skills were described as medium to good, although technology was generally used more instrumentally than pedagogically. The educator session served both to introduce the project approach and to discuss how the learning scenarios could be adapted to the highly restrictive prison environment.

The learner group consisted of 15 people in detention with mainly low to intermediate educational backgrounds and basic or functional literacy levels. Their socio-economic backgrounds were described as vulnerable, with previous educational experiences often marked by failure or early school leaving. Initial motivation was moderate, and several participants showed reluctance towards formal learning and low confidence in their own ability to learn. However, engagement increased progressively as the activities became more practical and directly connected to everyday situations.

The two scenarios were selected because of their relevance to everyday life. Energy consumption was linked to understanding costs and household choices, while the food-related scenario addressed daily decisions, budgeting and environmental impact. The activities followed a simple and predictable structure, with familiar examples, practical exercises and a final reflection or personal application.

A major characteristic of the Romanian pilot was the extensive adaptation required by the penitentiary context. Participants did not have access to the internet, computers or AI tools. As a result, the technological elements of the scenarios were translated into analogue activities. The educator acted as an information mediator, explaining concepts that would normally have been explored through technology, while printed worksheets and guided exercises provided the main structure for learner participation.

The main challenges related to environment-specific restrictions, limited resources, the absence of technology, fluctuating motivation, anxiety about learning and difficulties with numerical concepts and concentration. These challenges were addressed through simplified explanations, concrete examples, repetition, adapted pacing and continuous encouragement.

The report notes a gradual shift from passive participation towards more active engagement. Learners became more willing to contribute to discussions and complete tasks, and they demonstrated greater awareness of energy consumption and the environmental impact of food choices. The intervention also appeared to reduce learning anxiety and increase willingness to participate.

From a transferability perspective, CPIP considered the approach suitable for replication in other penitentiary, community centres and NGOs working with vulnerable adults. The report particularly recommends the development of fully offline versions of the scenarios and their possible integration into reintegration programmes.

4.2 Finland

The Finnish piloting was implemented by the the Finnish Lifelong Learning Foundation (Kansanvalistusseura) in Helsinki and Kauniainen. The scenario selected was *Navigating everyday texts*. Two different piloting formats were implemented: the first between 24 February and 5 March 2026 and the second on 15 April 2026. The first piloting consisted of four two-hour sessions, while the second was a single two-hour session, resulting in a total of 10 hours of piloting. Both activities were delivered face-to-face, one in an NGO setting and the other in an adult education centre.

The Finnish piloting involved five educators with backgrounds in adult education, Finnish language teaching, literacy education and project work. Their experience ranged from a few years to approximately eight years in adult learning, with one participant bringing

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

around 20 years of broader specialist experience. All educators had experience with digital tools, but none had previously used AI specifically for literacy teaching.

The two piloting activities involved 18 learners in total: six in the first piloting and twelve in the second. Participants generally had prior education, including secondary and higher education, often completed outside Finland. Their literacy in their first language was good, while their Finnish-language literacy was approximately intermediate level. Nearly all participants were women. Their primary motivation was to improve their ability to understand and produce Finnish texts, while the first group also showed a particular interest in using AI for literacy learning.

The first piloting followed a multi-session structure. Learners were encouraged to first produce texts independently, with AI introduced later as a support tool for checking, editing and improving texts rather than as a replacement for the learners' own writing. Safety and responsibility in AI use were also addressed. The scenario was used as a practical framework, but educators remained flexible and adapted activities according to the needs observed during implementation.

The second piloting was considerably shorter and therefore focused on selected activities that had proved most useful during the first implementation. It concentrated especially on AI-supported literacy learning and was integrated into an existing basic skills course.

Learner engagement was supported through interactive discussions, pair work and the use of tools such as Flinga, Padlet and Miro. In the first piloting, the small group allowed educators to respond directly to learner needs and even adjust subsequent sessions according to participant requests, such as practising job applications. Discussions about critical and pedagogical use of AI tools were important part of the sessions, and face-to-face environment supported them particularly well

Adaptation to literacy level was an important feature. Learners could work with texts of different levels of difficulty, and AI prompts were adapted accordingly. More advanced participants focused on tone and refinement, while learners with lower literacy levels used AI to simplify texts or identify key terms.

The report identifies organisational difficulties in recruiting enough participants for the first piloting, as well as technical issues with email inboxes, Gemini and Flinga. It also emphasises the need for educators to prepare backup options, test links and tools in advance and remain flexible because digital tools can change or fail unexpectedly.

Among the main lessons learned, KVS highlighted the value of embedding shorter piloting activities in existing basic skills courses, the usefulness of having two educators present, and the importance of personalised support. The report also suggests that individual exercises may be easier for ALE educators to use than long, fixed scenarios, especially when they need to select activities according to learners' needs and interests.

The programme was considered replicable, although access to computers and Wi-Fi was identified as important when AI-supported writing activities are included.

4.3 Austria

The Austrian piloting activities were implemented by Verband Osterreichischer Volkshochschulen - VOV and consisted of four separate face-to-face workshops in Vienna, covering four ETHLAE learning scenarios: *Digital spaces, human connections*, *My object, my story*, *Sustainability on a plate* and *Navigating everyday texts*.

Two workshops were organised on 17 and 18 June 2026 using *Digital spaces, human connections* and *My object, my story*. Each workshop lasted approximately three hours

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

and was implemented within an ongoing basic education course for young adults at VHS Floridsdorf. The learners were teenagers and young adults with migration backgrounds who had not completed school in their countries of origin and were working towards school-leaving qualifications.

The educator selected the scenarios after reviewing several options and considering both the characteristics of the learner group and her own teaching profile. *Digital spaces, human connections* was adapted to reflect the fact that participants were already frequent users of social media but had little experience with online learning environments. Activities included Zoom, Mentimeter, Google Forms, Google Slides and exploration of AI tools such as Gemini and Claude.

My object, my story focused on personal expression and digital creativity. Learners brought personal objects, presented their significance and then used tools such as Canva and Suno to create digital presentations and AI-generated music. The educator noted that registration processes and access to online tools represented a practical barrier even for relatively digitally confident learners.

A third workshop, *Sustainability on a plate*, was implemented on 23 June 2026 with five learners and one educator. It was embedded in a basic education course preparing young people for entry into a compulsory school-leaving certificate programme. The scenario was adapted considerably due to limited time and language needs. English-language materials were replaced with more accessible alternatives, while activities focused on climate change, food miles, ecological and water footprints, carbon footprints and sustainable food choices. Learners also used laptops and AI-supported activities.

The fourth workshop, *Navigating everyday texts*, was implemented on 7 July 2026 in a four-hour face-to-face session with nine learners and one educator. The learner group included adults with basic literacy skills, many of whom had limited experience with reading and writing in German and no experience using email. The selected focus was highly practical: understanding official and employment-related documents encountered in everyday life.

Because the original scenario was more complex and designed for longer implementation, only selected elements were used. The scenario was adapted to learners with low reading and writing skills, and the learning activities focused on selective reading strategies and identifying key information in written documents. Digital elements such as Mentimeter and QR codes were also introduced, and learners responded positively despite having very limited prior digital experience.

Across the Austrian pilots, time constraints were one of the most consistent challenges. Several scenarios could not be implemented in full within a single workshop. Technical infrastructure also created difficulties, including old laptops, battery limitations and registration requirements for digital tools. At the same time, the reports consistently note strong learner engagement when topics were linked to everyday needs or when participants were given opportunities to explore digital tools directly.

The Austrian experience indicates that the scenarios can be used with very different learner profiles, but generally require adaptation in terms of duration, language, literacy level and digital complexity. The reports also highlight their potential for replication, particularly when educators are free to select and adapt individual elements according to their learners' needs.

4.4 Croatia

The Croatian piloting was implemented by Sveuciliste Algebra – AU in Zagreb, with the main learner piloting taking place online through Microsoft Teams on 16 April 2026. The

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

selected scenario was *Digital spaces, human connections*. The learner workshop lasted 90 minutes and was designed as an interactive online session focusing on digital participation, confidence-building and inclusion.

The learner piloting involved 17 adult learners with diverse educational backgrounds and different levels of digital confidence. Some participants had limited experience with digital tools, while others had basic or intermediate skills. Several participants reported fear of making mistakes, uncertainty when navigating online platforms and concerns about being judged. Their motivations included improving digital skills, increasing confidence in online participation, understanding AI tools and exploring new digital practices.

Two educators facilitated the learner workshop. Their profiles combined experience in non-formal education, work with vulnerable groups, digital education, facilitation and adult learning. Both were familiar with interactive tools and learner-centred approaches.

The scenario was selected because of its relevance to digital confidence and inclusive participation. Before implementation, participant needs were explored through an initial questionnaire, and the workshop design was adapted accordingly. Particular attention was given to psychological safety, gradual engagement and offering multiple ways to participate, including speaking, writing in chat or observing.

The workshop progressed from anonymous reflection and individual sharing to case-based discussion and group work. Participants used Mentimeter, Padlet and generative AI tools, and worked in breakout rooms to design ideas for inclusive online spaces. One important adaptation was the introduction of AI-supported presentation creation using tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude and Perplexity. This was added to help participants transform their ideas into structured outputs and experience practical uses of AI.

The implementation revealed differences in digital confidence and participation preferences. Some participants required more support, while others found parts of the session too basic. Time also proved insufficient for deeper reflection and presentation, suggesting that a longer or multi-session format could be more appropriate in future.

In addition to the learner workshop, the Croatian testing process involved five educators in a broader review and reflection process. Educators were first introduced to the ETHLAE project, MOOC and learning scenarios, then one educator implemented the scenario, after which a second educator session was organised to discuss implementation, usefulness and possible adaptations.

Feedback from educators was generally positive. They considered the materials relevant because they combine digital and emerging technology themes with inclusion, ethics, accessibility and learner confidence. At the same time, they emphasised that successful implementation depends strongly on the target group and that some learners may require simpler language, more introductory explanation and additional time.

The post-workshop learner evaluation also showed strong satisfaction and perceived usefulness. Participants particularly appreciated the introduction to new digital and AI tools, the collaborative activities and the supportive learning environment. A significant number reported increased confidence in using digital tools, while suggestions for improvement mainly concerned longer duration, more hands-on practice and clearer advanced information about the tools to be used.

AU considered the scenario highly transferable because of its flexible structure and relatively modest technical requirements. The organisation also reported plans to

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

continue using the scenario in future adult education and training activities, particularly in relation to digital literacy, inclusion and transversal skills.

5. Cross-Country Analysis of the Piloting Results

The national pilots implemented in Romania, Finland, Austria and Croatia provide a diverse evidence base for assessing the applicability of the ETHLAE learning scenarios across different Adult Learning and Education contexts. The piloting activities differed significantly in terms of learner profiles, delivery formats, duration, institutional settings and access to technology. At the same time, several common patterns emerged across countries regarding learner engagement, the role of educators, the need for adaptation and the practical value of connecting literacy learning with real-life situations.

Rather than indicating one preferred model of implementation, the piloting experiences show that the ETHLAE scenarios can function as flexible pedagogical frameworks that require contextualisation according to the learners, available resources and educational setting.

5.1 Participant Profiles and Learning Needs

One of the clearest cross-country findings concerns the diversity of the participants involved. The piloting activities reached learners with very different educational histories, literacy levels and degrees of digital confidence.

In Romania, the participants were people in detention with mainly low to intermediate educational levels and basic or functional literacy skills. Their previous educational experiences were often characterised by disengagement or early school leaving, and low confidence towards formal learning was evident at the beginning of the activities.

In Austria, participant profiles varied considerably between workshops. Some groups consisted of young people with migration backgrounds preparing for school-leaving qualifications, while another group included adults with basic reading and writing skills and very limited familiarity with email, computers and other digital tools.

The Finnish participants generally had stronger educational backgrounds and good literacy in their first languages, but an intermediate level of Finnish literacy. Their learning needs were therefore more strongly related to improving written communication in Finnish and exploring how AI could support reading and writing.

In Croatia, the main differences were related to digital confidence rather than traditional literacy. Participants ranged from people with limited experience of digital tools to more confident users, with several expressing insecurity, fear of making mistakes or hesitation when participating online.

Across countries, the reports therefore show that vulnerability and learning need cannot be defined through a single criterion. Some learners needed support with basic reading and writing, others with second-language literacy, others with digital confidence, and some with access to or understanding of emerging technologies.

5.2 Implementation and Adaptation of the Learning Scenarios

A common finding across all four countries was that the learning scenarios required some degree of adaptation before or during implementation.

In Romania, adaptation was extensive because digital devices and internet access were not available in the penitentiary environment. Digital elements were therefore transformed into analogue exercises, while the educator assumed a central role in explaining technological concepts through examples and printed materials.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

In Austria, adaptations mainly concerned duration, language, literacy level and digital complexity. Several scenarios originally designed for longer implementation had to be reduced to single workshops, while materials in English or activities that were too demanding were replaced with more accessible alternatives.

Finland demonstrated a different type of adaptation. The first implementation followed a longer multi-session structure, while the second pilot selected only the most relevant exercises and condensed them into a two-hour lesson. Activities were also differentiated according to participants' literacy levels, including different uses of AI for simplifying, revising or improving texts.

Croatia adapted the scenario based on information collected before the workshop regarding participants' confidence and previous digital experience. The facilitation approach was deliberately slow, supportive, and flexible, while AI-supported presentation creation was added as a new element to the original scenario.

Overall, the comparison indicates that adaptability is one of the strongest characteristics of the ETHLAE scenarios. The scenarios were rarely implemented exactly as originally written; instead, educators selected, simplified, extended or reorganised elements according to the needs of their learners and the practical conditions of delivery.

5.3 Learner Engagement and Participation

Across the piloting activities, learner engagement was generally stronger when activities were practical, relevant and clearly connected to everyday situations.

In Romania, initial reluctance gradually decreased as participants worked with concrete examples related to household energy use and food choices. By the end of the activities, most participants were contributing more actively to discussions and completing the proposed tasks.

In Austria, activities linked to immediate everyday needs were particularly well received. The *Navigating everyday texts* workshop, for example, addressed official documents and employment-related texts that participants regularly encountered, while digital activities involving QR codes and Mentimeter generated noticeable interest even among learners with very limited prior digital experience.

Finland reported strong engagement when learners could work on texts that were personally useful, such as job applications. Participants responded positively to using AI to receive feedback on their own writing and identify ways to improve it.

Similarly, Croatia found that anonymous participation tools, collaborative activities and a supportive environment helped learners overcome initial hesitation. Group work was particularly successful, with participants supporting one another and sharing their own knowledge and experiences.

These experiences suggest that engagement was strongest when learners could clearly understand why the activity was useful to them, when participation did not involve fear of failure and when educators allowed multiple ways of contributing.

5.4 Digital and Emerging Technology Use

The piloting activities also revealed considerable variation in how emerging technologies could be integrated into adult learning.

At one end of the spectrum, Romania demonstrated that the pedagogical aims of the scenarios could still be addressed in a context where direct access to technology was impossible. Emerging technologies were mediated through educators rather than used directly by learners.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

At the other end, Finland and Croatia integrated AI tools directly into learning activities. In Finland, AI was primarily used to support text comprehension, feedback and revision, while learners were still encouraged to produce their own initial texts independently.

In Croatia, generative AI was integrated into collaborative work and presentation creation, alongside Mentimeter and Padlet. The activity demonstrated that AI could be introduced in a structured and scaffolded way even to participants with mixed levels of digital confidence.

Austria presented both situations. Some learners were already active users of social media and adapted easily to tools such as Zoom, Google Forms, Canva or Suno, while other groups had very limited experience with computers or QR codes and required more introductory support.

A key cross-country conclusion is therefore that everyday technology use should not be equated with educational digital competence. Familiarity with smartphones or social media does not automatically mean that learners feel confident using online learning platforms, AI tools or productivity applications.

5.5 Role of the Educator

Another strong common finding concerns the central role of educators in successful implementation. Across all pilots, educators did considerably more than simply deliver predetermined activities. They acted as facilitators, mediators, adapters and sources of reassurance.

In Romania, the educator effectively replaced inaccessible digital tools by translating technological concepts into understandable explanations and practical activities.

In Finland, educators adapted exercises between sessions, differentiated materials and provided personalised support. Having two educators present was explicitly identified as beneficial because it made it easier to respond to individual learner needs.

In Croatia, facilitators continuously adjusted pacing and participation formats according to the confidence of the group and used both anonymous and direct forms of participation to create a safe learning environment.

The Austrian reports similarly show that educators needed to make real-time decisions regarding language, timing, tools and the complexity of activities.

This indicates that the effectiveness of the scenarios depends substantially on educators' ability to interpret the materials and adapt them rather than on strict adherence to a fixed sequence.

5.6 Main Results Observed Across Countries

Although the national reports used mainly qualitative evidence, several recurring outcomes can be identified.

First, the pilots generally supported increased learner engagement and confidence. Romania observed reduced learning anxiety and greater willingness to participate, while Croatia reported that a significant number of respondents felt more confident using digital tools after the workshop.

Second, learners developed or practised functional literacy skills connected to real-life tasks. Examples included understanding official documents in Austria, improving Finnish texts and job applications in Finland, and interpreting energy or food-related information in Romania.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

Third, several piloting activities contributed to greater digital or AI awareness. Participants learned new tools, explored different applications of AI and reflected on how digital technologies could support communication, learning and everyday participation. Croatia's evaluation highlighted the introduction to new tools as one of the most appreciated elements, while Finland reported that learners discovered new ways of using AI beyond their previous everyday practices.

The reports therefore suggest that the strongest outcomes were not limited to technical competence. They also included confidence, awareness, participation, functional literacy and the ability to connect learning with everyday decisions.

5.7 Common Challenges

Several challenges were shared across more than one country.

Time constraints were among the most frequent. Austria and Croatia both reported that some scenarios or activities required more time than was available, while Finland's experience showed clear differences between what could be achieved in a multi-session programme and a short, embedded workshop.

Different learner competence levels were another recurring challenge. Educators frequently had to balance the needs of learners requiring substantial support with those who were already more confident or advanced. This was particularly visible in Finland and Croatia.

Technical issues were also common where digital tools were used. Finland reported problems with email capacity, Gemini and Flinga, Croatia experienced temporary issues with Mentimeter, and Austria encountered limitations related to old laptops, battery life and registration processes. The Romanian context presented a different challenge: technology was not unreliable but entirely unavailable, requiring the scenario to be redesigned for offline delivery.

Across all contexts, the reports indicate that successful implementation requires flexibility, preparation and alternative solutions rather than dependence on a single tool or rigid activity sequence.

5.8 Transferability Across ALE Contexts

All four national experiences provide indications that the ETHLAE learning scenarios can be transferred to other adult education contexts, although adaptation remains essential.

Romania identified potential application in other penitentiary, NGOs and community centres and highlighted the usefulness of creating fully offline versions of relevant scenarios.

Austria considered several scenarios highly replicable, particularly because they can be adjusted for different ages, literacy levels and degrees of digitalisation. Some activities could be delivered entirely digitally, entirely analogue or through a combination of both.

Finland suggested that individual exercises may sometimes be more transferable than complete long scenarios because educators can integrate them more easily into existing basic skills courses.

Croatia similarly emphasised flexibility in format, duration and tools and concluded that the scenario could be delivered online, face-to-face or in blended form with relatively basic technical resources.

Taken together, these findings indicate that transferability depends less on reproducing the exact original format and more on preserving the core pedagogical purpose of each scenario while allowing educators to adapt content, timing, tools and level of complexity.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

5.9 Cross-Country Conclusions

The cross-country comparison highlights several consistent messages emerging from the piloting phase.

The ETHLAE scenarios were applicable across substantially different adult learning environments, but their successful implementation depended on contextual adaptation. Learners responded particularly well to activities that were practical, relevant to everyday life, and delivered in a supportive environment. Digital and emerging technologies provided meaningful opportunities for literacy learning when introduced gradually and with sufficient guidance, but direct access to technology was not a prerequisite for maintaining the broader pedagogical value of the scenarios.

The piloting activities also reinforce the importance of the educator as the key link between the learning scenario, the technology, and the learner. Across all countries, educators were required to assess needs, adjust the level and pace of activities, manage technical or organisational constraints, and create conditions in which learners felt confident enough to participate.

Overall, the piloting results support the use of the ETHLAE scenarios as flexible, adaptable resources rather than fixed teaching packages. Their value lies in providing educators with a pedagogical framework that can be reshaped according to learner needs, institutional conditions and available technology while retaining a focus on holistic literacy, meaningful participation and inclusive use of emerging technologies.

6. Feedback on the ETHLAE Toolbox and Learning Scenarios

The feedback collected through the national piloting activities was positive overall and confirmed that the ETHLAE materials were considered relevant, adaptable, and useful across different Adult Learning and Education contexts. At the same time, the reports also show that the usefulness of the materials depends strongly on how well they are adapted to the characteristics of the learner group, the available time, the institutional setting and the level of access to digital technologies.

Across the countries, partners generally treated the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios as flexible pedagogical frameworks rather than fixed lesson plans. This was repeatedly identified as a strength, as it allowed educators to select, shorten, simplify or expand activities according to local needs.

6.1 Relevance and Practical Usefulness

One of the most consistent elements of feedback was the perceived relevance of the scenarios to real-life adult learning needs.

In Romania, the scenarios were considered particularly useful because they could be linked to concrete everyday topics such as energy consumption, food choices and budgeting. The practical nature of the activities contributed to increasing learner engagement and confidence, even in a highly restrictive prison context.

In Finland, the *Navigating everyday texts* scenario was positively received because it addressed authentic literacy tasks such as understanding emails, writing job applications and improving written communication in Finnish. Learners particularly appreciated exercises where AI could be used to review and give suggestions for improving texts they had first produced themselves.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

The Austrian reports also emphasised the value of scenarios that could be connected directly to learners' everyday situations. *Navigating everyday texts* was especially relevant for participants who regularly encountered official documents they could not easily understand, while *Sustainability on a plate* worked well because food is a familiar topic that all learners can relate to.

In Croatia, the selected scenario was considered highly relevant to learners who lacked confidence in digital environments. Participants valued the practical introduction to digital and AI tools as well as the supportive and interactive format of the workshop.

Overall, the feedback suggests that the scenarios are most effective when educators can clearly connect them to learners' immediate needs, routines and challenges.

6.2 Flexibility and Adaptability of the Learning Scenarios

A second major strength identified in the piloting reports was the adaptability of the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios.

The Austrian experience showed this particularly clearly. *My object, my story* was considered highly transferable because it can be implemented with different age groups and skill levels and can be delivered entirely digitally, entirely analogue or through a combination of both.

In Finland, educators suggested that the scenarios might become even more usable if some activities were presented as separate exercises rather than only as complete multi-session programmes. This would allow adult educators to select individual components and integrate them more easily into existing basic skills courses.

Croatia also highlighted the flexibility of the scenario structure. The *Digital spaces, human connections* scenario was considered adaptable to online, blended and face-to-face formats, with the possibility of changing the duration, tools and level of complexity according to the target group.

Romania demonstrated the most extensive form of adaptation. Although the scenarios included digital and emerging technology elements, they were successfully transformed into fully offline activities because internet access and digital devices were not available in the penitentiary setting.

These experiences suggest that flexibility is not simply an optional feature of the ETHLAE scenarios but an essential condition for their successful implementation across different ALE settings.

6.3 Feedback from Learners

Learner feedback also points to generally positive experiences. In Croatia, the majority rated the session as very satisfactory and very useful, and all respondents indicated that they would recommend the workshop to others. Participants particularly appreciated the introduction to new digital and AI tools, the collaborative activities and the supportive atmosphere.

A significant number of Croatian participants also reported feeling more confident in using digital tools after the session. At the same time, some suggested that the workshop should be longer, include more practical exercises and provide clearer information in advance about the tools that would be used.

In Romania, learners gradually became more engaged and demonstrated increased awareness of energy use and sustainable food choices. Their comments also indicated that concrete examples and simplified explanations helped them understand the topics more easily.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

In Austria, the reports describe strong learner enthusiasm, particularly when activities involved digital tools or directly addressed everyday challenges. The *Navigating everyday texts* pilot reported that learners responded very positively to QR-code based activities and online forms despite having little previous experience with such tools.

In Finland, learners responded especially positively to practical exercises involving job applications and AI-supported text revision. The reports indicate that participants discovered new ways of using AI beyond their previous everyday practices.

6.4 Areas Identified for Improvement

Although feedback was generally positive, some improvements were suggested across the national reports.

One recurring issue was the length and structure of the scenarios. Austria and Croatia both noted that some activities could not be fully completed within the available workshop time, while Finland suggested that shorter, modular activities could sometimes be easier for educators to integrate into existing courses.

A second area concerned language and accessibility. In Austria, some materials had to be replaced or simplified because English-language resources were not appropriate for the target group.

A third issue was the reliability and accessibility of digital tools. Finland reported technical problems with Gemini and Flinga, Austria highlighted registration barriers and outdated laptops, and Croatia recommended conducting technical checks and preparing alternative tools in advance.

Romania identified a different need: the development of official fully offline versions of selected scenarios for environments where digital access is impossible or heavily restricted due to the target-group chosen.

Finally, several reports point to the need for clearer differentiation according to the learner level. Learners with different literacy or digital skill levels may require different versions of the same activity, additional scaffolding, or a slower pace.

6.5 Recommendations Emerging from the Feedback

Based on the national feedback, several practical recommendations can be identified for the continued development and use of the ETHLAE Toolbox and Learning Scenarios:

- maintain the scenarios as flexible and adaptable resources rather than fixed lesson plans;
- allow educators to select individual activities from longer scenarios where appropriate;
- provide simplified or alternative versions for learners with lower literacy or digital competence;
- consider fully offline versions for restricted environments;
- provide clear information on the digital tools required and possible alternatives;
- allow sufficient time for reflection, practice and collaborative work;
- encourage educators to prepare backup options in case digital tools fail.

These recommendations are directly reflected in the experiences reported across Romania, Finland, Austria and Croatia.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

6.6 Overall Feedback

Taken together, the feedback collected through the national piloting activities supports the overall relevance and usability of the ETHLAE Toolbox and Learning Scenarios in diverse adult education settings. The materials were generally perceived as practical, adaptable and capable of supporting both literacy learning and engagement with emerging technologies.

At the same time, the piloting clearly demonstrates that the materials are most effective when educators are given sufficient freedom to adapt them. The strongest feedback across countries therefore does not point towards greater standardisation, but rather towards maintaining a modular, flexible and context-sensitive approach.

The national experiences also confirm that the pedagogical value of ETHLAE lies not only in introducing digital or emerging technologies, but in combining them with broader holistic literacy dimensions such as confidence, participation, critical thinking, accessibility, inclusion and relevance to everyday life.

7. Challenges Encountered During Piloting

The national piloting highlighted a range of organisational, pedagogical, learner-related and technical challenges. While the specific difficulties varied according to the national context, several recurring issues emerged across countries, particularly in relation to time constraints, differences in learner competence, access to technology and the need for continuous adaptation during implementation.

Overall, the reports show that most challenges did not prevent implementation, but required educators to remain flexible and responsive throughout the piloting process.

7.1 Organisational Challenges

Time was one of the most frequently reported organisational constraints.

In Austria, several scenarios had originally been designed for longer implementation, but the piloting had to be compressed into single workshops. In the *Navigating everyday texts* piloting, for example, a scenario originally designed for four sessions of 120 minutes had to be reduced to four 50-minute teaching periods. Similarly, the *Sustainability on a plate* piloting was limited to three teaching units, which meant that only selected activities could be implemented.

Croatia also reported time constraints, particularly because the integration of AI-supported activities required more time than initially expected. Some group presentations therefore had to be shortened, and the report suggests that a longer session or an additional follow-up workshop would have allowed deeper learning and reflection.

In Finland, one of the main organisational difficulties concerned participant recruitment for the first piloting. KVS reported that relying on one partner organisation to recruit participants was insufficient, and concluded that future activities should be promoted through a broader range of channels.

Austria also noted that identifying suitable existing courses willing to host the piloting activities required time and coordination.

Romania faced a different organisational challenge linked to the prison environment, where institutional restrictions and limited access to resources influenced both the design and delivery of the activities.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

7.2 Pedagogical Challenges

A common pedagogical challenge across the piloting was the need to adapt the learning scenarios to different literacy, digital competence and confidence levels.

In Finland, learners had varying levels of Finnish-language proficiency, which required educators to continuously adjust texts, exercises and AI-related tasks. The small size of the first group made this easier, as educators could adapt each session after observing what had worked well in the previous one.

Croatia also reported difficulties in finding the right pace for a mixed group. Some participants considered certain activities too basic, while others still needed additional explanation and support. This required continuous adjustment throughout the session.

In Austria, language and literacy level frequently required modifications. Some original resources were not appropriate because they were in English or assumed a higher literacy level than the learners had. As a result, educators had to simplify language, replace resources and focus on selected learning objectives. …

Romania faced the pedagogical challenge of maintaining the relevance of scenarios originally containing digital components in a setting where technology could not be used. Educators therefore had to translate digital concepts into analogue activities and rely on explanation, printed materials and practical examples.

7.3 Learner-Related Challenges

Differences in confidence, motivation and previous learning experiences also influenced the implementation process.

In Romania, several learners initially showed low confidence, reluctance towards formal learning and anxiety about their ability to complete the activities. Difficulty understanding numerical concepts and maintaining concentration over longer periods was also reported. These issues were addressed through simplified tasks, repetition, concrete examples, encouragement and a slower pace.

In Croatia, some participants were initially reluctant to speak, activate their cameras or participate actively in the online session. Flexible participation options, including chat-based contributions and anonymous activities, helped reduce pressure and increase engagement.

In Finland, learner-related difficulties were less explicitly reported, although differences in literacy levels and computer skills required personalised support. Pair work was useful in the second pilot, as learners could support one another.

The Austrian reports similarly show that learners differed greatly in digital experience. Some young participants were highly familiar with social media, while others had never used email, online learning platforms or QR codes.

7.4 Technical Challenges

Technical difficulties were a recurring issue in contexts where digital tools were used.

In Finland, educators experienced problems with full email inboxes, Google Gemini not functioning as expected and Flinga becoming unavailable during one session. These experiences reinforced the need to test tools and links in advance and to prepare alternatives.

Croatia reported a temporary technical problem with Mentimeter shortly before the workshop. Because the facilitators had carried out a pre-session check, they were able to prepare Microsoft Forms as a backup solution.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

Austria encountered several practical issues related to digital infrastructure. Some laptops were old and could not remain charged for the duration of the workshop, while the registration process for digital platforms also proved time-consuming.

Romania represented the most restrictive technical context, as learners had no access to computers, internet or AI tools. The challenge was therefore not tool failure but complete lack of access, requiring a fully offline implementation.

7.5 Challenges Related to Digital Inclusion

The pilots also showed that digital inclusion is not only a question of access to devices.

In Austria, some learners regularly used smartphones and social media but had little or no experience with online learning environments, email or productivity tools.

In Croatia, learners' hesitation was often linked to fear of making mistakes or uncertainty about how to participate online rather than lack of access itself.

In Finland, learners were generally familiar with digital tools, but educators still needed to introduce responsible and purposeful use of AI for literacy learning.

These experiences indicate that digital participation requires not only infrastructure, but also confidence, guidance and opportunities to practise in a safe environment.

7.6 How Challenges Were Addressed

Across countries, similar strategies were used to respond to implementation difficulties.

Educators simplified instructions, adapted pacing, selected only the most relevant activities, provided additional explanations and used practical examples. Peer support and pair work were also effective, particularly when participants had different levels of confidence or experience.

Where technology was used, partners prepared alternative tools and conducted technical checks in advance. Where technology was unavailable, as in Romania, activities were redesigned for offline implementation.

The reports therefore show that successful piloting depended strongly on the capacity of educators to make real-time decisions and adapt both content and delivery methods.

7.7 Overall Reflection on Challenges

The challenges encountered during the pilots underline the importance of flexibility in adult education. Differences in learner profile, available time, institutional restrictions and technological conditions meant that no single implementation model could be applied equally in all contexts.

Rather than being viewed solely as barriers, many of these challenges generated useful learning for the consortium. They demonstrated where scenarios require simplification, where more time is needed, where alternative formats should be available and where educators require additional support.

Overall, the piloting suggests that future implementation of the ETHLAE scenarios should allow sufficient room for adaptation, provide alternative digital and non-digital options where possible, and encourage educators to prepare backup solutions and adjust activities according to the specific needs of their learners.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

8. Lessons Learned

The national piloting activities generated several practical lessons regarding the implementation of the ETHLAE learning scenarios in different Adult Learning and Education settings. Although the piloting was carried out in very different contexts, several recurring lessons emerged around adaptation, learner engagement, the role of educators, the use of technology, and the organisation of learning activities.

1. Flexibility is essential

One of the clearest lessons across all national piloting is that the learning scenarios need to be treated as adaptable frameworks rather than fixed lesson plans.

In Austria, scenarios had to be shortened, simplified or adjusted to different literacy levels and available time. In Finland, the second piloting deliberately selected only the most relevant exercises from the longer scenario. Croatia adapted the scenario according to participants' digital confidence, while Romania converted digital components into fully offline activities because of the prison environment.

This shows that successful implementation depends on the educator's ability to preserve the core learning objectives while adapting the format, tools, examples and level of complexity to the local context.

2. Practical relevance increases learner engagement

A second important lesson is that learners respond particularly well when activities are directly connected to everyday life.

This was visible in Romania, where energy consumption and food choices supported gradual increases in participation. In Austria, official letters, job-related texts and food sustainability were effective because learners could clearly relate them to their daily experiences. In Finland, job applications and everyday written communication were among the most useful activities.

The piloting therefore indicates that literacy activities are more engaging when learners understand immediately how the knowledge or skill can be applied outside the learning setting.

3. Digital confidence should not be assumed

Another recurring lesson is that regular use of smartphones, social media or digital services does not necessarily translate into confidence in educational digital environments.

In Austria, some young learners were active on social media but had never participated in online courses or used some productivity tools. In Croatia, several learners were hesitant because they feared making mistakes or being judged. Finland also showed that even participants familiar with AI could benefit from structured guidance on how to use it purposefully for literacy learning.

This suggests that digital learning should include not only technical instruction, but also confidence-building, safe experimentation and opportunities for supported practice.

4. The educator plays a central mediating role

The piloting consistently highlighted the importance of the educator as more than a facilitator of pre-designed content.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

Educators needed to simplify instructions, adapt pacing, select appropriate tools, respond to learner anxiety and provide continuous support. In Romania, the educator effectively became a mediator for digital concepts that could not be accessed directly. In Finland, personalised support and the presence of two educators were particularly valuable. Croatia showed the importance of flexible participation pathways and active facilitation of psychological safety.

This confirms that the quality of implementation depends strongly on educators' pedagogical judgement and capacity to adapt the materials in real time.

5. Small-scale and modular implementation can work well

Several reports suggest that shorter and more modular formats can be particularly effective in adult education.

Finland explicitly recommended presenting individual exercises separately so that educators can integrate them into existing basic skills courses. Austria and Croatia also found that single-session workshops were feasible, provided that activities were prioritised and adapted to the available time. …

This indicates that scenarios do not always need to be implemented in full to be useful. Selected activities can still achieve meaningful learning outcomes when they are well matched to the group.

6. More time often leads to deeper learning

At the same time, the reports also show that limited time can reduce the depth of implementation.

Croatia noted that some collaborative and AI-supported activities would have benefited from a longer session. Austria repeatedly reported that not all scenario activities could be completed in one workshop. Finland's longer pilot allowed more time for practice, homework and adaptation between sessions.

A key lesson is therefore that educators should carefully match the scope of the selected activities to the time available.

7. Technical preparation and backup options are necessary

Where digital tools are used, technical preparation is essential.

Finland experienced difficulties with email access, Gemini and Flinga. Croatia encountered a temporary issue with Mentimeter but was able to prepare Microsoft Forms as a backup because technical checks had been carried out in advance. Austria reported hardware and registration difficulties.

The common lesson is that educators should test tools beforehand, prepare alternatives and avoid making the success of an activity dependent on a single platform.

8. Offline alternatives increase accessibility

The Romanian pilot demonstrated that the pedagogical aims of the scenarios can still be maintained without direct access to technology.

By replacing digital tools with printed materials, discussion and educator-led explanations, the pilot preserved the core learning goals while adapting to a highly restricted environment.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

This suggests that developing official offline or low-tech versions of selected activities could improve the accessibility of ETHLAE resources for prisons, community settings, and other contexts with limited infrastructure.

9. Peer support and collaborative learning are valuable

Peer interaction also emerged as an important element across the pilots.

In Finland, pair work helped learners support one another. In Croatia, group work encouraged participants to share experiences and assist less confident peers. Austria similarly used group discussions and collaborative tasks to sustain engagement.

These experiences suggest that collaborative learning can reduce pressure, build confidence, and make digital or literacy activities more approachable.

10. Educator reflection strengthens implementation

The Croatian and Finnish reports also show the value of creating space for educators to reflect on implementation.

In Croatia, educators met before and after the pilot to discuss the materials, implementation experience and possible adaptations. In Finland, educators used ongoing planning and peer-learning discussions to adjust the scenario according to what they observed in practice.

This suggests that the ETHLAE materials are particularly useful when accompanied by opportunities for peer exchange and professional reflection.

11. Overall Lessons Learned

Taken together, the national pilots indicate that the effectiveness of the ETHLAE learning scenarios depends less on strict adherence to a predefined format and more on contextual relevance, educator flexibility and learner-centred adaptation.

The most successful activities were those that connected learning to real-life needs, offered safe and supportive participation, allowed sufficient time for practice, and provided alternatives where digital access or confidence was limited.

The pilots also reinforce that emerging technologies should be introduced as tools that support broader learning goals rather than ends in themselves. Across the four countries, the strongest outcomes were associated with increased confidence, practical literacy, participation, and relevance to everyday life.

These lessons provide a useful basis for future adaptation, replication, and scaling of the ETHLAE learning scenarios in other ALE settings.

9. Transferability, Replication and Sustainability

The national piloting reports indicate that the ETHLAE learning scenarios have strong potential for transferring to other Adult Learning and Education contexts, if implementation remains flexible and responsive to local conditions. Across the four countries, partners consistently reported that the scenarios could be reused beyond the original pilot settings, although the required format, duration, resources and level of digitalisation may differ substantially from one context to another.

A common conclusion is that transferability should not be understood by reproducing the scenarios exactly as they were originally designed. Instead, the pilots show that the scenarios are most transferable when educators are able to preserve the main learning

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

objectives while adapting the content, tools, timing, and level of complexity to the characteristics of their learners.

9.1 Transferability to other ALE contexts

The Romanian pilot demonstrated that the ETHLAE approach can be transferred even to highly restrictive environments. CPIP reported that the programme could be replicated in other prisons, community centres and NGOs working with vulnerable adults. The experience showed that the absence of digital infrastructure does not necessarily prevent implementation, as the scenarios can be adapted into offline formats using printed materials, educator-led explanations, and practical exercises.

Austria also reported a high degree of transferability. In particular, *My object, my story* was considered suitable for different age groups and skill levels because it can be implemented fully digitally, fully analogue or through a combination of both. Other Austrian pilots also showed that scenarios such as *Navigating everyday texts* and *Sustainability on a plate* can be adjusted to learners with very different literacy levels and learning needs.

Finland similarly considered the piloted programme replicable in other contexts. The report suggests that individual exercises may sometimes be more easily transferred than complete long scenarios, as educators can integrate selected activities into existing basic skills courses and adapt them to learner needs.

Croatia reported that *Digital spaces, human connections* could be transferred across a variety of adult education contexts because of its flexible and modular structure. The scenario was considered adaptable to online, blended, and face-to-face formats and suitable for participants with different levels of digital confidence.

Overall, the pilot reports suggest that the ETHLAE scenarios can be transferred across different institutional settings, age groups, and learner profiles, but that successful transfer depends on contextual adaptation rather than standardised replication.

9.2 Conditions for successful replication

The reports also identify several practical conditions that support successful replication.

One of the most important is the presence of a trained and flexible educator. Across the pilots, educators were required to interpret the scenarios, adapt activities, respond to learner needs and adjust the pace and level of difficulty. This suggests that replication depends not only on access to the materials but also on the educator's ability to contextualise them appropriately.

Adequate time allocation is another important condition. Several national reports noted that the full scope of a scenario could not always be implemented within one short workshop. Austria and Croatia both identified the need for either longer sessions or a multi-session format when deeper reflection, collaborative work or use of digital tools is expected.

The required technical resources depend strongly on the scenario and setting. Finland identified access to computers and Wi-Fi as necessary for AI-supported writing activities, while Croatia listed stable internet access, a digital platform, interactive tools and AI applications as sufficient resources for implementation.

At the same time, Romania showed that replication is still possible with minimal technological infrastructure if suitable offline alternatives are available. In that context, the essential resources were a trained educator, printed materials, an educational space and sufficient preparation time.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

These findings suggest that replication does not require a single standard package of resources. Instead, the scenarios can be implemented through different combinations of human, pedagogical and technological resources.

9.3 Replication through existing learning programmes

Several pilots suggest that integration into **existing education programmes** may be more sustainable than organising isolated activities.

Finland found that the second pilot, which was embedded into an existing basic skills course, was easier to organise and attracted a larger number of participants than the first stand-alone pilot. The report therefore recommends integrating selected activities into longer learning programmes where possible.

In Austria, several scenarios were also implemented as part of ongoing basic education courses, which allowed the activities to build on learners' existing needs and interests. The *Navigating everyday texts* pilot, for example, was directly connected to challenges learners already encountered in their daily lives.

Romania similarly identified the possibility of integrating the approach into reintegration programmes for prisoners.

These experiences indicate that embedding the ETHLAE scenarios into existing programmes can support both participant recruitment and long-term use.

9.4 Sustainability at organisational level

The reports provide different levels of commitment regarding continued implementation.

Algebra Bernays University explicitly stated that it plans to continue using the piloted scenario in future educational and training activities, particularly in relation to digital literacy, inclusion and transversal skills. The organisation also identified the possibility of expanding the scenario into a multi-session format.

In Austria, sustainability was visible mainly through the interest of educators and course teachers in continuing to work with the topics. Following the *Navigating everyday texts* pilot, other teachers expressed interest in using the materials, and the course teacher planned to continue working on the topic. Similarly, the educator involved in *Sustainability on a plate* intended to further explore the topic and the integration of AI tools.

In Romania, CPIP reported that the organisation has the potential to continue implementation, particularly if an offline version of the scenarios is further developed and connected to reintegration activities.

In Finland, the report does not confirm a concrete organisational commitment to continue implementation, but it identifies clear potential for future use, particularly through integration of AI and literacy-related activities into adult basic skills education.

9.5 Recommendations for scaling up

The national reports point to several recommendations for scaling the ETHLAE approach.

Austria recommended peer collaboration between educators, including educator tandems, particularly to support teachers who may feel less confident using digital tools in basic education.

Finland recommended making scenarios more modular and emphasised the importance of including AI literacy, ethical considerations and responsible use of emerging technologies in adult literacy programmes.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

Croatia recommended maintaining flexibility, training facilitators in inclusive teaching approaches, clearly communicating expectations to participants and allocating sufficient time for collaboration and reflection.

Romania recommended developing standard offline versions of relevant scenarios and integrating them into programmes serving vulnerable adults.

Taken together, these recommendations suggest that scaling up should focus on adaptability, educator support, modularity and multiple implementation formats rather than on reproducing one standard delivery model.

9.6 Overall perspective on sustainability

The piloting experiences suggest that the sustainability of ETHLAE lies mainly in the practical usability and adaptability of its learning scenarios.

The scenarios can be reused in different formats, integrated into existing courses, shortened or expanded, and adapted to digital or offline settings. This gives organisations the possibility to continue using the materials without requiring identical conditions to those of the original pilots.

At the same time, long-term sustainability depends on educators being able to confidently adapt the materials and on organisations embedding the approach into their existing learning activities. The national reports therefore suggest that continued use is most likely where the scenarios are perceived not as stand-alone project outputs, but as resources that can be incorporated into regular adult education practice.

Overall, the piloting results indicate strong potential for the continued use, replication and scaling of the ETHLAE learning scenarios across different ALE environments, particularly when flexibility, accessibility and learner-centred adaptation remain central to implementation.

Overall Conclusions

The ETHLAE piloting phase demonstrated that the project's learning scenarios can be implemented across a wide range of Adult Learning and Education contexts, including adult basic education, NGO-supported learning, online training environments and prison education. The national pilots in Romania, Finland, Austria and Croatia involved different learner profiles, delivery formats, levels of digital competence and institutional conditions, providing a diverse basis for assessing the practical applicability of the ETHLAE approach.

A central conclusion emerging from the pilots is that the ETHLAE Learning Scenarios are most effective when used as flexible and adaptable pedagogical resources rather than as fixed teaching plans. In all countries, educators modified the scenarios to some extent, adjusting the duration, language, level of difficulty, tools, examples, or sequence of activities. These adaptations were an integral part of successful implementation.

The piloting also confirmed the importance of connecting learning activities to practical and meaningful everyday situations. Across the countries, learner engagement was stronger when activities addressed issues such as understanding official documents, preparing job applications, making decisions about food and energy consumption or participating more confidently in digital environments. The reports consistently indicate that practical relevance helped reduce hesitation and supported more active participation.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union

Another important finding relates to the integration of digital and emerging technologies. The pilots showed that the level of digital access and confidence varied considerably between contexts. In Finland and Croatia, AI and other digital tools could be incorporated directly into the learning process, while in Austria the extent of digital use differed between learner groups. In Romania, direct use of technology was not possible because of the restrictions of the prison environment, requiring the digital components to be translated into analogue activities.

These experiences demonstrate that the pedagogical value of the ETHLAE scenarios does not depend exclusively on direct access to advanced technology. Rather, emerging technologies can be introduced in different ways depending on the context, ranging from direct hands-on use to educator-mediated explanation. This increases the potential applicability of resources in settings with very different technological capacities.

The pilots also highlighted the central role of educators. Successful implementation depends on educators being able to assess learner needs, adjust the pace and complexity of the activities, provide reassurance, respond to technical or organisational challenges, and create inclusive learning environments. In several cases, educators also acted as mediators between technology and learners, particularly when participants had low digital confidence or limited access to digital tools.

The national experiences also indicate positive outcomes in relation to learner confidence, participation, and practical literacy. Romania reported a gradual shift from passive to more active involvement and reduced anxiety towards learning. Croatia's participant evaluation showed high satisfaction and increased confidence in using digital tools. Finland reported enthusiastic responses to practical AI-supported literacy activities, while Austria observed strong engagement when learners were introduced to relevant digital activities and everyday literacy tasks.

At the same time, the pilots identified several conditions that should be considered in future implementation. Time constraints affected the depth of some activities, especially in short workshop formats. Different literacy and digital competence levels required differentiated support, while technical problems reinforced the importance of advance preparation and backup options. In highly restricted environments, dedicated offline versions may be needed.

Regarding transferability, the national reports generally indicate strong potential for reuse of the scenarios in other ALE settings. The resources were considered suitable for adaptation to different learner groups, institutional contexts, and delivery formats. Finland and Austria highlighted the value of modular implementation, Croatia identified potential for online, blended and face-to-face delivery, and Romania demonstrated that the approach can also be implemented in fully offline conditions.

Overall, the piloting phase supports the relevance of the ETHLAE approach for diverse adult learning contexts. The strongest value of the learning scenarios lies in their capacity to combine holistic literacy with meaningful engagement with digital and emerging technologies while remaining adaptable to different learner needs and implementation conditions.

The evidence collected through the national pilots also suggests that future use of the ETHLAE materials should continue to prioritise flexibility, accessibility, practical relevance, and educator support. Maintaining these principles can facilitate wider replication and integration of the scenarios into existing adult education programmes and support their continued use beyond the project's lifetime.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Co-funded by the European Union