Pitt Open Library Publishing

This work is published by Pitt Open Library Publishing and is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Journal of Child and Youth Care Work

acycpjournal.pitt.edu | ISSN: 2641-3450 (online) and 0741-9481 (print) | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

Acquiring democratic competencies through projects in cooperation between youth welfare services and schools in Germany

Observations and findings of an underestimated field of cooperation

Dr. Oliver Bokelmann
Institute for Educational Science, Department of Social Pedagogy
University of Münster, Germany

Abstract

This article describes the way in which the theoretical and practical debate on civic education has taken place in Germany as well as the resulting difficulties for comprehensive democratic education. Additionally, this article presents the research results of a mixed-method study (including online surveys, participant observation, and interviews), which show how cooperation projects between youth welfare services and schools give young people the opportunity to acquire a variety of democratic competences. Such approaches can contribute to a promising expansion of efforts in the field of civic education (beyond the school subject of politics) since findings regarding the state of civic education, particularly in schools, can be regarded as disappointing; child and youth welfare services are broadly considered to have the potential for improvement, at least structurally. Up to now, these discourses have been wholly separate from one other.

Keywords: Civic Education, Citizenship Education, Cooperation Youth Welfare Services and Schools, Democratic Competence

acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

Introduction

In Germany, the Federal Ministry for Families, Seniors, Women and Youth commissions a report on children and youths in each legislative period. In 2020, the report was entitled *Promoting Democratic Education in Childhood and Adolescence* and identified deficits in schools in all areas of civic education (BMFSFJ, 2020, p. 16). Nevertheless, since the signing of the Potsdam Agreement in the summer of 1945, schools in Germany have been regarded as central institutions where all children and young people should be given the opportunity to grow into responsible citizens. It was the mutually agreed-upon goal of the Allies to organise the education system in Germany in such a way as to enable the successful development of democratic ideas (Potsdam Agreement, 1945). The Conference of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs formulates the democratic education mandate as one of the highest goals of school education (Kultusministerkonferenz, 2018, pp. 2-6); every federal state has also established this goal in the school laws and has developed control documents for civic education. However, the fields of child and youth welfare services, especially child and youth work, are attested a higher potential for the acquisition of democratic competences in the current Children and Youth Report (BMFSFJ, 2020, pp. 329-332). Regarding the academic discourse in Germany, however, it appears that civic education in child and youth welfare services is often reduced to the aspect of 'participation'; other democratic competences (e.g., communicative skills; the ability to engage in dialogue, debate, and cooperation; or the ability to deal with conflict as well as diversity) are neglected (Bokelmann, 2020).

This article examines the empirical data of projects in the field of civic education in cooperation between youth welfare services and schools. A recommendation for cooperation in this regard can be found in the 16th Children and Youth Report from 2020. The Commission recommends networking as a guiding principle for all actors. Networking is necessary at various levels: at the national level, for example, cooperation and coordination is necessary between schools and non-school providers of civic education (BMFSFJ, 2020, p. 76). The discussion regarding cooperation in the field of civic education can be a relevant contribution to the international discourse.

This article therefore focuses on the question of the acquisition of democratic competences by young people through projects in which schools and youth welfare organisations share responsibility. The aim is to explore the potential for democratic education of children and young people that results from cooperation. Cooperation in the field of civic education has not been the subject of common practice or professional debate compared to cooperation in the fields of school social work or all-day education.

First, the theoretical basis of this study is presented, followed by the state of research, from which the research question of the study was derived. Methodological explanations of the research design follow before the results of the research project are presented.

Theoretical basis - Acquiring democratic competences through democracy education

In academic and school practice contexts in Germany, three different terms for civic education (a) political education, b) democracy education and c) democracy pedagogy) are used for which there are no adequate translations in the English-speaking world. The discussion of these three terms is important to understanding the German discourse on civic education in schools and child and youth welfare organisations. In the context of teaching, for example, the usual term used is ‘political education’, while in the non-school context it is ‘democracy education’. In addition, the term ‘democracy pedagogy’ has been used in schools since the early 2000s (Wohnig, 2017, pp. 245-248). These three terms are associated with different approaches and understandings of civic education, which a) differ significantly regarding the extent to which knowledge is imparted and orientation towards experiential learning, b) decisively influence cooperation between formal and non-formal educational settings and c) show the resulting challenges facing civic education in Germany. Even if it is often argued that the differences in meaning are negligible, the discourse shows that three diverging perceptions can be found behind the three terms and that dealing with them is necessary to promote cooperation between youth welfare and schools.

Accordingly, the three terms and related ideas will be explained in more detail in the following. A historical-chronological analysis of the use of these terms and their associated connotations makes it possible to

Journal of Child and Youth Care Work | acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

define them; this can also elucidate the specifically German particulars and the difficulties of international compatibility.

After 1945, 'political education' was used in the school context with the aim of conveying content related to the political sphere via fixed school structures (BMFSFJ, 2020, p. 119). Through the expansion of political science as a reference discipline in the following decades, this content was taught in the school subject of politics. Politics was the core of political didactics; according to Massing and Weißeno (1995), historical or sociological points of reference were largely ignored (Landwehr & Weißeno, 2017, pp. 213-217). This development caused international scepticism since in other countries broader democracy-oriented educational concepts (e.g., 'civic education' or 'citizenship education') were used as a basis for education. In some cases, a 'politicisation' of schools and students (Himmelmann, 2006) was assumed to be the intent. In summary, it can be said that 'political education' is predominantly oriented towards imparting knowledge about political processes and that its content is shaped by the reference discipline of political science. The focus is on the political system and political interactions; social aspects or aspects oriented to the lifespace are largely ignored. For the organisations of child and youth welfare as non-formal education providers, this concept of civic education is incompatible, because the imparting of knowledge plays a subordinate role or no role at all, whereas social and life-world aspects are central.

In combination with the social conditions of the time in Germany, this development led to the emergence of 'democracy pedagogy' in schools in the 2000s. From 2002 to 2007, the Federal-State-Commission for Educational Planning and Research Promotion's model programme 'Learning and Living Democracy', based on a broader understanding of democracy as a triad of governance, society and life (Himmelmann, 2006), attempted to focus not only on the cognitive transmission of knowledge (Galston, 2001), but also on a more experience-based orientation towards contemporary democratic living conditions and the democratic shaping of society (Himmelmann, 2006; Sliwka, 2006). In this sense, Edelstein et al. (2009) have classified four different areas of 'democracy pedagogy' in schools: a) lessons as a place for negotiation and the practice of discussion and discourse as well as cooperation, b) projects (e.g., service learning, cooperation with child and youth welfare services), c) internal school policy with participation as a declared goal (e.g., negotiation rounds, class councils, student parliament, dilemma discussions, social learning, etc.) and d) opening up to the community (e.g., cooperation with parents or local political projects). Political scientists have clearly criticised democracy pedagogy efforts, judging them to be too apolitical and overly oriented towards social conditions (Himmelmann, 2006; Annette, 2006). In transferring social competences to political processes, civic education relies on Reinhardt's (2003) finding that it is necessary for political discourse, for example, to be able to adopt perspectives. In this context, Besand (2020) emphasises that the transfer of skills from the area of self and social competence to political processes must always be based on the conditions of these political processes and not the other way around. 'Democracy pedagogy' can accordingly be understood as a counter-design to 'political education' in schools and for the first time attempts to conceptually consider more clearly experience-based learning processes as well as social and life-world aspects. This means that it can be connected to child and youth welfare organisations, which not only have methodological experience in this area, but also seem predestined for cooperation due to their background in social work.

Although 'democracy pedagogy' employs a wider definition of democracy developed by Himmelmann (2006) as well as a less strongly cognitive-oriented focus (and would thus certainly be adaptable for the fields of action of child and youth welfare services; Bokelmann, 2020), in the non-school context the term used is usually 'democracy education' (Sturzenhecker, 2020). There is no explicit mention of 'political education' (Giesecke, 1966) or 'political youth education' (Hafeneger, 2020). In the fields of child and youth welfare services, democratic education takes place against a background of negotiation, co-determination and participation. There, the questions of how, for example, child day care facilities (Richter et al., 2017), child care services (Pluto, 2007) or especially child and youth work (Sturzenhecker, 2020) can contribute to democratic subject formation are explored.

To briefly summarize the distinctions between these three concepts, Table 1 provides concise definitions of political education, democracy pedagogy, and democracy education.

acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

Table 1: Summary and Definitions of Civic Education Concepts in Germany

Concept	Definition
Political education	Primarily focuses on conveying knowledge about the political system and political interactions; largely neglects social or lifespace-oriented aspects.
Democracy pedagogy	A counter-approach to political education within schools, explicitly considering experiential learning processes as well as social and lifespace-oriented aspects.
Democracy education	Predominantly used in non-school contexts, emphasizing processes of negotiation, co-determination, and participation.

Approaches to democracy pedagogy are often rejected in child and youth welfare services because they are perceived as overly structured and pedagogical, potentially undermining young people's self-education and subjectivity. However, this rejection prevents professionals from fully exploring educational opportunities that could enrich democracy education beyond just participation, while still supporting self-education (Bokelmann, 2020, p. 530).

The term 'political education', in view of its specific school setting, the empirical findings (see state of research), and its international non-connectivity, is in clear contrast to the broader concept of 'democracy pedagogy'. The efforts for a broad civic education of young people associated with the introduction of the term at the beginning of the 2000s can be seen as a reason for the use of democracy pedagogy in child and youth welfare. It also offers the possibility of meeting current challenges for democracy in Germany (Zick et al. 2019 regarding group-related misanthropy; Schneekloth and Albert, 2019 with regard to populism). The composite term 'democracy pedagogy' can be understood through its composition with 'pedagogy' as a collective term for pedagogical action, including the associated foundations, goals and techniques on one hand and the theory guiding this action on the other (Böhm & Seichter, 2007, p. 358). The aim is to enable democratic education as a process and result of human self-construction (Tenorth, 2007, p. 92).

The specific understanding of education of youth welfare or youth work, understood as self-education of young people and along different educational programmes, as well as the professional socio-pedagogical activities in this field of work differ significantly from school conditions, in which qualification and selection aspects in particular are in the foreground. This makes it clear that the framework in which civic education projects take place is different from that in schools. Furthermore, the principles of participation, openness and discursiveness, the low-power structures of youth welfare and the renunciation of performance assessment enable a genuinely democratic approach. Dealing with questions of social justice is of central importance for social work, which is why various bases for action and theoretical positions have been established with it. Orientation towards the lifespace of the addressees, subject orientation and social space orientation can be described as principles that promote democracy. Accordingly, the school-established concept of democracy pedagogy can contribute to an expansion of democratic education in the fields of action of child and youth welfare, which is why cooperation can be profitable for both institutions.

Overall, however, the conceptualisation of any efforts in the field of civic education appears to be insufficiently reflective of democratic theoretical reference points as their basis and source of legitimisation. It cannot be sufficient that democracy education in Germany is merely based on John Dewey's conception and human rights (Berkemeyer, 2020, p. 213). Different competence requirements for democratic and political coexistence can be derived from the democratic theories of political liberalism, communitarianism, deliberation, liberal republicanism, pragmatism and even Neo-Aristotelianism (see in detail Bokelmann, 2022). Interestingly, none of these political theories explicitly derives a requirement for the acquisition of knowledge, but they do derive a variety of competences with regard to a) the realisation of equitable decisions (e.g., communication, dialogue and discourse skills, the ability to adopt perspectives and empathy, conflict and compromise skills, trust in democratic principles, orientation towards ethical, moral and legal principles), b) living together in plural societies (e.g., self-efficacy, solidarity, respect, tolerance, openness and curiosity, diversity competence, diversity of opinion, openness to the world and civil courage) and c) creating a public sphere (e.g., the ability to articulate, initiative, self-confidence, self-awareness, assumption of responsibility).

Journal of Child and Youth Care Work | acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

Table 1.1: Model of democratic competences for the fields of child and youth welfare (based on Bokelmann, 2020, p. 525)

Model of democratic competences for the fields of child and youth welfare

Acquisition of democratic competences

COMPETENCES	Self-determination, -confidence & -respect Motivation & initiative Self-organisation skills & reliability Self-control & frustration tolerance Self-confidence Self-efficacy Reflection & critical faculties Articulation skills Critical thinking	Communication, dialogue, discourse & Ability to interact Perspective-taking ability, empathy, solidarity Ability to cooperate Conflict & compromise skills Respect, tolerance, openness & curiosity Diversity competence	Thinking and judgement skills Media skills Trust in democratic principles Diversity of opinion Openness to the world & civil courage Political knowledge and interest Orientation towards ethical, moral and legal principles, sense of justice Environmental awareness & behaviour Civic engagement, assumption of responsibility & participation Being able to create publicity
DIMENSION	I	WE	WORLD

These democratic competences of the 'I', 'WE' and 'WORLD' dimensions (Bokelmann, 2020, p. 525), which are based on democratic theory concepts, illustrate the adaptability of civic education in the fields of child and youth welfare services (see Table 1.1).

State of research and research question

In this study, the state of research will be discussed with a focus on Germany regarding three aspects: a) civic education in schools, b) civic education in the fields of child and youth welfare (with a focus on child and youth work) and c) with a view to the cooperation between youth welfare and schools. The specific German state of research shows similarities to the international discourse and differs only with regard to the specific German development towards an educationally oriented form of child and youth welfare (in comparison to the often described compensatory orientation of social work).

The international and comparative *International Civic and Citizenship Education Study* (ICCS) is a significant resource regarding civic education in schools. In 2016, the study showed that the political knowledge of German pupils is significantly below the average in Europe (Schulz et al., 2018). Political education is not very strongly established as a school subject in most federal states (Besand, 2019, Gökbudak & Hedtke, 2020) and is often taught by teachers not explicitly trained for this (Lange, 2018), although teachers hold a special relevance for political appropriation processes (Schneider & Gerold, 2018). Students often describe lessons as a teacher-directed process of knowledge transfer (Hekenborg et al., 2008), as abstract, descriptive (Schulz et al., 2018) and without opportunities for discussion (Weber et al., 2007). The content of the school subject associated with politics in Germany clearly focuses on economics; topics from the areas of local politics, migration or ecology are neglected (Hippe et al., 2020), although young people express an interest in politics as well as a desire for more opinion-forming, discussion competence, democratic practice and engagement with everyday democracy topics (Arnold et al., 2011). Projects in the field of civic education or democracy pedagogy that are offered in addition to the subject lessons are not very common in schools (Schneider and Gerold, 2018). Most of them are short-term events and are only used by a small number of schools (Lange, 2018). Democracy pedagogical instruments such as class councils are widespread (Schneider & Gerold, 2018), but they are often shaped by school-based procedural and evaluation logics (Budde & Weuster, 2018). Overall, the understanding of participation in the institution of school can be described as instrumental (Bohnsack, 2013). Service-learning projects can be considered the most extensively empirically studied, showing positive effects on responsibility, empathy, and self-efficacy (Astin et al., 2000; Billig et al., 2005; Furco, 2006; Conway et al., 2009; Yorio & Ye, 2012), although the studies do not examine long-term consequences in a longitudinal study at the individual level (Campbell, 2019).

acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

Regarding general correlations between school programmes to promote civic education, the study published by Holbein (2017) can also be mentioned. He shows that a connection can be established between school programmes for the development of psychosocial competences and civic engagement or election participation.

An examination of democracy education in child and youth welfare services shows a reduction in the number of youth education centres by more than half since 1990 (Waldmann, 2020). Young people value the atmosphere there as much as their relationship and social interaction with the pedagogues (Balzter et al., 2014). The self-image of the professionals shows a proximity to school educational contexts (Becker, 2020). The pupils' motivation to participate in such projects is based in a desire to take part in a group experience (Schröder et al., 2004) and a desire to deal with topics related to their lives (Salihi, 2020). When asked about the benefits of the projects, most of them say they have learned new things (Balzter et al., 2014). In addition, they mention an increase in everyday problem solving and the promotion of perception, communication, cooperation and conflict management skills (Schäfer & Schack, 2009). In youth organisations, a varying degree of opportunities for participation can be observed (Ahlrichs, 2019). Overall, however, there are only a few studies on participation. Civic education and institutionalised co-determination result particularly from the association structure and social interaction (Sturzenhecker, 2014).

Informal participation dominates in the facilities of open child and youth work in youth centres, and civic education is a high priority for the professionals working there; about half of the institutions explicitly implement offers related to citizenship (Möller & Honer, 2020). In this setting, the young people experience a less hierarchical relationship with the pedagogues and can participate in the design of the programme and the room; they experience a high level of self-determination and no pressure to perform (Kilb, 2018). The educational space can be seen as suitable for different educational processes (Müller et al., 2008). The young people involved speak of participation, of taking responsibility and of learning competences in the fields of diversity and conflict resolution (Delmas & Scherr, 2005).

There is more empirical evidence regarding civic education in the institution of school in Germany than in the fields of child and youth welfare services (in the latter, it is often only with regard to the forms of negotiation and participation). The approach of democracy pedagogy, which was developed as an extension of school-based political education, has so far not been relevant outside of schools; however, it seems suitable for transfer to child and youth welfare services. Furthermore, there are no comprehensive empirical findings for such civic education cooperation projects so far; as such, a research desideratum can be assumed. In particular, the perspectives of the participating children and young people remain neglected in many research projects. Against the background of the state of research presented above and the epistemic gap outlined here, the following research question can be derived: What are the possibilities of acquiring democratic competences for young people in the implementation of civic education projects in cooperation between youth welfare services and schools?

Research access - methodological approach

Due to the explorative nature of the research project, an attempt was first made to collect key data on the importance of civic education for schools via a quantitative online survey (What is the thematic orientation of civic education in the school? What is the scope? What forms of cooperation exist? To what extent do activities take place in addition to lessons?) In addition, the quantitative survey served to establish contact with the field for the subsequent qualitative research approach. This survey, which was conducted in November of 2019, allows assessments of the significance of civic education programmes in practice and provides a differentiated picture of the extent to which such programmes are implemented in cooperation with child and youth welfare organisations. The basic population of the online survey can be stated as N = 10,834 schools. The target sample size was n = 372. The size of the adjusted sample was n = 384 and thus slightly above the calculated target sample size. However, it should be noted that not all schools had the opportunity to participate in the survey as contact details were not available from all schools, resulting in a sample that was not fully randomised. The questionnaire was addressed to and usually answered by the school director.

The subsequent ethnographic procedure (in the research style of grounded theory [Strauss & Corbin, 1996]) consisted of systematic, semi-structured, non-covert, passive-participant observations in three projects conducted in cooperation, some of which lasted several days (Breidenstein et al., 2013). During the field stay, observation notes were made with the help of a semi-structured observation grid; directly after the respective

Journal of Child and Youth Care Work | acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

observation day, they were converted into an audio file by dictation and thereby supplemented and finally written down into observation protocols. The aim was to be able to describe the cooperation projects taking place between child and youth welfare organisations and schools more precisely. The focus was on a) the methodological-didactic orientation of the projects, b) the interaction between educational professionals and pupils and c) the possibilities for young people to acquire democratic competences.

Following the projects, three participating pupils, the responsible socio-pedagogical professionals and the school principal were interviewed using the problem-centred interview developed and tested by Witzel (2000). The aim was a) to condense the observations made and b) to be able to analyse non-observable issues. A total of 15 interviews and the observation protocols from six observation days in the field were included in the analysis.

The theoretical sampling was carried out, based on the expression of interest in the online survey, by selecting and describing a first case for the survey. To homogenise the sample (Strauss & Corbin, 1996), criteria were defined based on this first case that would apply to all further cases. Additional characteristics were determined after the survey, which should also apply to all other projects. It was determined in advance that all schools are public schools and all youth welfare organisations are legally recognised child and youth welfare organisations. Furthermore, in the interest of comparability, it was determined even before the first project implementation that all projects take place in lower secondary schools and are conceptually closely oriented to an understanding of democracy as a form of government and society to ensure connectivity with school-based civic education. Projects on social learning or gender education (i.e., democracy as a way of life) were excluded.

Since the research interest was related to child and youth welfare organisations from the local social area, a further characteristic was defined as their spatial proximity to the school, with a maximum distance of 25 km. The first cooperation project, investigated in October of 2020, was a class representative trip; this was the responsibility of an employed socio-pedagogical professional of an institution of open child and youth work from a youth centre nearby. The organisation was a cooperation partner known to the school, which had already realised projects with the school in the past. Both characterisations, that of the employed professional and that of project continuity, were taken into consideration for the further case selection. Accordingly, a future workshop for local political processes carried out in cooperation in northern Germany in November of 2020 and a Holocaust or memorial project in western Germany in December of the same year were examined. Both the first and the second case resulted from the information provided in the online survey; the Holocaust or memorial project was found through an internet search.

In the interest of maximum contrast (Strauss & Corbin, 1996), the following characteristics were defined in which the projects should differ: the type of school, the federal state, the organisational structure of the child and youth welfare organisation, the extent of cooperation at the school, the distance to the school, the project experience of the socio-pedagogical specialists, the topic, the grades and the involvement of the schools' own staff (school director and teachers). This procedure within the framework of theoretical sampling made it possible to ensure a high degree of variability despite the small number of researched cases.

During the entire collection and evaluation process, in the sense of Grounded Theory, permanent comparisons, minimum and maximum contrasts were made and memos were written. The evaluation was carried out in three stages. Open coding was carried out separately according to the type of material collected; axial coding was again carried out separately according to the type of material collected and, in the case of the interviews, according to perspective; the coding paradigm was also used in this step and diagrams were drawn up. The final step was selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1996).

This mixed-methods approach makes it possible to approach the research question in an explorative way and to gain insights into which possibilities of acquiring democratic competences for young people can result from projects between child and youth welfare organisations and schools

Findings on the genesis and constitution of a 'fluid in-between space' of youth welfare services and schools that emerges through cooperation

The online survey indicated that 70.6 % of the schools (the questionnaire was addressed to the school directors) surveyed offer programmes in the field of civic education in addition to political lessons. Social learning projects (82.3%) are especially common, followed by memorial and anti-violence projects (56.9% each) and service learning (40.8%). Of the schools that carry out such projects, 91.9% do so with external partners. The high willingness of the schools to open up to the community is also evident with regard to partners in child and youth

acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

welfare, as 43.4% of the cooperations can be located in this field. Most of these youth welfare organisations (86.9%) are located in the neighbourhood of the school and carry out social learning projects in almost half of the cases (48.7%).

The qualitative approach provided interesting findings and shows that cooperation in the project area creates a 'fluid space in between' that neither of the two institutions can claim exclusively for itself. This area of education involves different characteristics of both institutions, so that it is neither an offer of child and youth welfare services in everyday school life, nor a school event, carried out by professionals of child and youth welfare services. Regarding the content of the project and how the cooperation comes about, two forms could be differentiated: a) the child and youth welfare organisations develop a project independently and offer it to the school, or b) the school formulates a need and is involved in the content (albeit to varying degrees). Both forms have an impact on the constitution of the in-between space. The following can be described as cross-case conditions for success: 1) commitment of the school leaders, 2) financial support for the projects, and 3) personal relationality between the project leaders of both institutions. The time in the in-between space is partly in competition with school and free time; the pupils say in the interviews that they carefully weigh their participation in the projects before and during the projects.

With a focus on the constitution of the space in between, the pupils described the projects positively throughout, both regarding the atmosphere in the space and the relationship with the pedagogues. The child and youth welfare services benefited from the contrast to everyday school life, as the events all took place in compulsory education. During the implementation of the projects, the pupils had the impression of the activities being very flexible and open-minded because of the time available. They spoke of a ‘relaxed and free atmosphere’. This impression was reinforced by the contrasts between the professions represented: teachers on the one hand and child and youth welfare professionals on the other. The absence of any performance evaluations was also emphasised in the constitution of the in-between space. The projects give the impression of supporting free will to the young people. However, an examination of the planned and implemented programmes does not confirm this impression of complete flexibility and openness to results. Although some of the programme points were extended or shortened in time or varied in their sequence, the content covered remained planned in advance. It is worth noting that the pupils were not given any opportunities to participate planning the projects either before or during the projects, and despite the information provided about the projects, they had no precise (and, in some cases, only very vague) ideas about their content and goals.

The young people only had an idea of the setting of education, and they were looking forward to the variety the projects would bring to their everyday school lives. The dearth of participation opportunities in the programmes may be explained by the fact that the professionals of child and youth welfare services in the compulsory school sector, in view of the already existing contrasts to everyday school life, were of the opinion that participation was not needed.

In terms of methodology and didactics, the social form of the cooperation projects was dominated by the chair circle (the group discussion in the plenum), small group work, playful elements (for room transition, room change, introduction of a new thematic section, elaboration of contents and for loosening up) and the use of testimonials or biographies. The testimonials and biographical narratives of invited persons, including audio clips or videos of them, were highlighted by the young people as being particularly interesting. Disruptions that repeatedly occurred during the programme (especially when the programme took a long time or shortly before the end of the project day) were mostly ignored by the professionals, or their perpetrators were kindly asked to stop. This choice of reaction gave the impression that those responsible did not want to act in a regulatory or sanctioning manner under any circumstances. Teachers were involved to varying levels in the programmes, and the level of involvement had an impact on the constitution of the interim space. In some cases, teachers also experienced role conflicts through playful programme points. The participating pupils experienced the socio-pedagogical professionals as 'close adults' who built a relationship with them and allowed personal contact. It should be pointed out, however, that in none of the cases did a comprehensive or individual reflection or evaluation of the projects take place. This also impacts the acquisition of democratic competences, as the young people's opportunities for appropriation remain hidden from the socio-pedagogical professionals.

The fluidity of the in-between spaces created by cooperation can be clearly observed in two of the projects investigated: 1) The trip of the class representatives shows an in-between space in which a high level of activity by teachers can be seen as well as school-defined contents and goals. This is the result of the school principal's guidelines and her participation in the trip, as well as that of the counsellor, who was also responsible

Journal of Child and Youth Care Work | acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

for the content of the programme. The programme was predefined and not very flexible due to the two-day implementation. The socio-pedagogical professional was relationship-oriented. There were only limited opportunities for reflection in the programme. 2) The intermediate space in a five-day Holocaust memorial project can be described differently. The contents and goals of the project were determined autonomously by the child and youth welfare organisation; the school administration was not informed of them. An accompanying teacher was only present at the beginning and end of the project and had the opportunity to work in a separate room during the project. Because the project lasted several days, the order and duration of the agenda was varied; the programme was perceived as having greater flexibility in comparison to the first example. Similar to the class representatives' trip, there were only partial opportunities for participation and reflection.

In addition to these general spatial sociological observations on the cooperation of youth welfare services and schools in projects, the aim of the research project was to describe more precisely the possibilities for young people to acquire democratic competences. However, the genesis and constitution of the in-between space described above already show that this is an educational space that offers adequate conditions for appropriation processes through its atmosphere, the impression of flexibility and openness to results, the methodological-didactic arrangement, the relationship design between child and youth welfare professionals and young people, and the use of testimonials as well as biographical narratives. In the interviews, the pupils surveyed were able to describe appropriation processes in a very differentiated way across cases and at the first attempt, and they were able to point out the continuing benefits for their life. Closely connected to planned programme points (especially through the presentation of work results and feedback from classmates, as well as casually in small groups and during breaks) the young people reported new, unfamiliar and exciting situations in which they were challenged to act. This tension leads to an experience that is subsequently evaluated as positive; it differs from the experience of school situations because the renunciation of performance assessments, the positive atmosphere in the room and the support of the socio-pedagogical professionals are all constitutive elements.

The context differs from regular school situations as well as from child and youth work settings because of the lack of proximity to formal learning settings. The strengthening of self-determination, self-confidence, self-esteem and self-awareness can be mentioned as well as the promotion of presentation, articulation and moderation skills. In addition, the young people reported that they had practised their ability to reflect and criticise.

In addition to these descriptions of self-competence, social aspects can also be identified. Small group work promoted cooperation; conflicts that arose were solved independently and communicative discussion strategies oriented towards dialogue and discourse were tested. Because the young people were confronted with tasks they enjoyed in the in-between space, they actively participated. In the plenary session, discussions took place regularly; the professionals mainly held back or participated as equal conversation partners. In most cases, corrective instructions were not given to maintain the discussions. If the respective programmes also provided for the presentation and reflection of reports of shared experiences or the confrontation with prejudices, this led to the promotion of the adoption of perspectives, empathy and solidarity.

Interestingly, all the aforementioned aspects related to personal and social competences were named exclusively by the pupils – and this directly, extensively and in a differentiated manner. The adults responsible for the project, on the other hand, did not mention these competence acquisition processes. Since there was no comprehensive or individual evaluation in any of the projects, these acquisition moments remained hidden (at least to those responsible for the project). Regarding aspects of subject-matter competence that resulted directly from the respective programme concepts and were related to the thematic orientation of the project, it is noteworthy that these were mentioned significantly less, compared to the other two areas of competences, by the pupils.

Accordingly, the acquisition of political or social knowledge can be observed in the Holocaust memorial project and in the future workshop for local political processes, albeit with a different thematic orientation. In the case of the class representatives' trip, an examination of the assumption of responsibility and commitment can be observed; these were the only competences mentioned in the interviews by the adults responsible for the project.

Discussion

acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

It has been empirically shown that the cooperation between youth welfare organisations and schools in the project area creates a 'fluid in-between space', which has implications both in and out of school and which neither of the two institutions can claim exclusively for itself. Regardless of how strongly this space is shaped by the respective institution at work, it presents clear contrasts to everyday school life for the pupils. The level of school association of the in-between space predominantly affects the interaction between the professions involved. For the participating young people, these are projects during compulsory school hours; however, they are seen and experienced as a welcome change. The child and youth welfare organisations operate according to premises that are just as different from school conditions as the methodological-didactic approach of the socio-pedagogical professionals. The young people look forward to the projects and are actively involved. The social form 'circle of chairs' and the interaction form 'group discussion' are predominantly used, small group work often takes place and playful elements are used. The working atmosphere is perceived as ‘relaxed’ and there are informal breaks between the programme points. The pupils experience 'approachable adults' through the professionals of the child and youth welfare services who meet them at eye level, show interest, act with little regimentation and do not give marks. This makes them stand out in contrast to most adults the pupils otherwise experience in everyday school life.

Since many tasks are worked on in small groups and then discussed in the large group, the young people are given time for self-determined activities. They have much time at their disposal and the day is not strongly structured as is usually the case at school. The young people's descriptions of the project atmosphere suggest that the in-between space is suitable for appropriation processes, as there are few power asymmetries and a high level of self-determined action is possible in heterogeneous groups away from a judgemental classroom setting.

However, the reflection of the genesis and constitution of this 'fluid in-between space' – as well as the pedagogical action in it – must be given much more importance. Because the projects take place during compulsory school hours and the actions of the pedagogical professional’s contrast for the young people with contexts experienced as school-based, the professionals tend to neglect a participatory design of the programmes across all cases, in the pre-project phase and during the projects as well as their evaluation. The participating pupils are given the opportunity to acquire a wide range of democratic competencies, especially in the ‘I’ and ‘WE’ dimensions (see competence model) and are not only able to describe these in a direct and differentiated manner (unlike the adults), but also to specifically name the continued benefits for their life. Due to the lack of evaluation, however, there are no additional opportunities for reflection for the addressees, and there is no further development of the possibilities for appropriation.

The results show that the examination of the educational understanding of child and youth welfare services (especially that of child and youth work), understood as a subject-oriented appropriation process, must be given a much greater role in theory and practice. The development of competences presented here can not only contribute to the legitimisation of child and youth welfare services to the public, but also a) facilitate the cooperation between formal and non-formal places of education and b) contribute to defining the function of social work (as a welfare state institution that strengthens and maintains democracy).

With a view to the three terms presented at the beginning (a) political education, b) democracy education and c) democracy pedagogy) it becomes clear that cooperation makes it possible to create spaces that differ from school learning settings and thus from the predominant imparting of knowledge. Through cooperation with schools and through the approaches and experiences of experiential and life space-oriented ‘democracy pedagogy’, child and youth welfare services also can develop further and to sharpen their democracy-building profile. The research results show that the describable deficits of civic education in schools (see state of research) can be compensated for through cooperation with child and youth welfare organisations and that very effective places of civic education for young people can be create.

References

Ahlrichs, R. (2019). *Demokratiebildung im Jugendverband. Grundlagen – empirische Befunde – Entwicklungsperspektiven*. Beltz Juventa.

Journal of Child and Youth Care Work | acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

Annette, J. (2006). Community Involvement & Citizenship Education – Where is the 'Political' in Citizenship Education. In: Sliwka, A., Diedrich, M. and Hofer, M. (Eds.) *Citizenship Education. Theory – Research – Practice*. Waxmann, pp. 27-36.

Arnold N., Fackelmann B., Graffius M., Krüger F., Talaska S. & Weißenfels T. (2011). *Sprichst du Politik? Ergebnisse des Forschungsprojekts und Handlungsempfehlungen*. Available at: http://www.sprichst-du-politik.de/downloads/sprichst-dupolitik_Studie.pdf (accessed 01 June 2022).

Astin, A., Vogelsang, L.J., Ikeda, E.K. (2000). *How Service Learning Affects Students*. Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Balzter, N., Ristau, Y. & Schröder, A. (2014). *Wie politische Bildung wirkt. Wirkungsstudie zur biographischen Nachhaltigkeit politischer Jugendbildung*. Wochenschau Verlag.

Becker, H. (2017). Der einseitigen Ausdeutung entreißen. Zur fehlenden Kompetenzdebatte in der außerschulischen politischen Bildung. In: Achour, S & Gill, T (Eds.) *Was politische Bildung alles sein kann. Einführung in die politische Bildung*. Wochenschau Verlag, pp. 127-140.

Becker, H. (2020). *Studie zum Thema „Demokratiebildung und politische Bildung in den Handlungsfeldern der Kinder- und Jugendarbeit (SGB VIII § 11-13)". Recherche im Rahmen des 16. Kinder- und Jugendberichts der Bundesregierung*. Available at: https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/bibs2021/Becker_Exp16KJB_16032021_final.pdf?fbclid=IwAR22CUDCCy3vr04MUtmqkep-3s3f-WR9kFsKmdngq2-I78HXAMudonPJik0 (accessed 01 June 2022).

Berkemeyer, N. (2020). Demokratisierung der Schule durch eine deliberative Profession? Konzeption und Forschungsperspektive. In: Burth, H.-P. and Reinhardt, V (Eds.) *Wirkungsanalyse von Demokratie-Lernen. Empirische und theoretische Untersuchungen zur Demokratiedidaktik in Schule und Hochschule*. Barbara Budrich, pp. 207-244.

Besand, A. (2019). Was ist gute politische Bildung in der Schule? *Bildung und Erziehung* 72(3): 262–276.

Besand, A. (2020) Kollateral-Lernen in der politischen Bildung. In: Bade, G., Henkel, N. & Reef., B. (eds) *Politische Bildung: vielfältig – kontrovers – global. Festschrift für Bernd Overwien*. Wochenschau Verlag.

Billig, S.H., Root, S. & Jesse, D. (2005*). The impact of participation in service-learning on high school students' civic engagement*. Circle working paper 33. Denver, CO: RMC Research Corporation.

BMFSFJ. (2020). *16. Kinder- und Jugendbericht.* Self-published.

Böhm, W. & Seichter, S. (2017). *Wörterbuch der Pädagogik*. Schöningh.

Bohnsack, F. (2013). *Wie Schüler die Schule erleben. Zur Bedeutung der Anerkennung, der Bestätigung und der Akzeptanz von Schwäche*. Barbara Budrich.

Böhm-Kasper, O., Dizinger, V. & Gausling, P. (2016). Multiprofessional Collaboration Between Teachers and Other Educational Staff at German All-day Schools as a Characteristic of Today's Professionalism. *International Journal for Research on Extended Education* 4 (1): 29–51.

Bokelmann, O. (2020). Demokratiepädagogik in Kooperation von Jugendhilfe und Schule. Betrachtungen und Befunde eines wenig beachteten Kooperationsfeldes. *neue praxis* 50(6): 517-533.

Bokelmann, O. (2022). *Demokratiepädagogik in Kooperation von Jugendhilfe und Schule. Eine explorative Untersuchung der Aneignung demokratischer Kompetenzen*. Springer VS.

Breidenstein, G., Hirschauer, S., Kalthoff, H. & Nieswand, B. (2013). *Ethnography: The practice of field research*. UVK.

Budde, J. & Weuster, N. (2018). Subjektivierungen im Persönlichkeitsbildungsdispositiv. Das Beispiel Klassenrat. In: Budde, J. and Weuster, N. (Eds.) *Erziehung in Schule. Persönlichkeitsbildung als Dispositiv*. Springer VS, pp. 139-162.

Campbell, D. E. (2019). What Social Scientists Have Learned About Civic Education: A Review of the Literature. *Peabody Journal of Education* 94: 32-47.

Conway, J., Amel, E. & Gerwien, D. (2009). Teaching and learning in the social context. A meta-analysis of service learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology* 36: 233-245.

Deinet, U. & Sturzenhecker, B. (2014). Zur aktuellen Praxis der Kooperation von Offener Kinder- und Jugendarbeit mit Ganztagsschule. *Jugendhilfe* 52(6): 413-420.

Delmas, N. & Scherr, A. (2005). Bildungspotenziale der Jugendarbeit. Ergebnisse einer explorativen empirischen Studie. *deutsche jugend* 2005(3): 105-109.

acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

Edelstein, W., Frank, S. & Sliwka, A. (Eds.) (2009). *Praxisbuch Demokratiepädagogik. Sechs Bausteine für Unterrichtsgestaltung und Schulalltag*. Beltz.

Floerecke, P., Eibner, S. & Pawicki, M. (2011). Ganztagsschulen in der sozialraumorientierten Kooperation. In: Speck, K., Olk, T., Böhm-Kasper, O., Stolz, H.-J. and Wiezorek, C. (Eds.) *Ganztagsschulische Kooperation und Professionsentwicklung. Studien zu multiprofessionellen Teams und sozialräumlicher Vernetzung*. Beltz Juventa, pp. 182-196.

Furco, A. (2006). Is Service-Learning Really Better Than Community Service? A Study of High School Service Program Outcomes. In: Sliwka, A., Diedrich, M. and Hofer, M. (Eds) *Citizenship Education. Theory – Research – Practice*. Waxmann, pp. 155-182.

Galston, W.A. (2001.) Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4(1): 217–234.

Giesecke, H. (1966). *Politische Bildung in der Jugendarbeit*. Juventa.

Gökbudak, M. & Hedtke, R. (2020). *3. Ranking Politische Bildung. Politische Bildung an allgemeinbildenden Schulen der Sekundarstufe I im Bundesländervergleich 2019. Working Papers 11/2020*. Available at: https://pub.uni-bielefeld.de/download/2941780/2943402/Ranking_Politische_Bildung_2019_final_1.pdf (accessed 01 June 2022).

Hafeneger, B. (2020). Politische Bildung. In: Bollweg, P., Buchnam J., Coelen, T. and Otto, H.-U. (Eds) *Handbuch Ganztagsbildung*. Springer VS, pp. 669-680.

Himmelmann, G. (2006). Teaching, Learning and Living Democracy: An Advanced Concept for German "Political Education". In: Sliwka, A., Diedrich, M. and Hofer, M. (Eds.) *Citizenship Education. Theory – Research – Practice*. Waxmann, pp. 45-58.

Hippe, T., Hedtke, R. & Hellmich, N. (2020). *Politische Bildung und Demokratie-Lernen in der Sekundarstufe. Curriculumanalyse für den Bereich Demokratiebildung für Kinder und Jugendliche in den Fächern der sozialwissenschaftlichen Bildung*. Deutsches Jugendinstitut e. V.

Holbein, J. B. (2017). Childhood Skill Development and Adult Political Participation. *American Political Science Review* 111(3): 572-583.

Kilb, R. (2018). Wirkt Offene Kinder- und Jugendarbeit wirklich? *deutsche Jugend* 66(3): 122-129.

Kultusministerkonferenz (2018). *Democracy as objective, subject and practice of historical and political education in schools.* Available at: https://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/Dateien/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/2009/2009_03_06-Demokratiebildung-engl.pdf.pdf (accessed 01 June 2022).

Landwehr, B. & Weißeno, G. (2017). The significance of trust in the political system and motivation for pupils' learning progress in politics lessons. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education* 15(3): 212-226.

Lange, V. (2018). *Politische Bildung in der Schule – ein Statusbericht. Ergebnisse einer bundesweiten Befragung der Kultusministerien*. Available at: http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/studienfoerderung/14033.pdf (accessed 01 June 2022).

Massing, P. & Weißeno, G. (Eds) (1995). *Politik als Kern der politischen Bildung. Wege zur Überwindung der politischen Bildung*. Springer VS.

Möller, K. & Honer, O. (2020). Demokratische Bildung in der Offenen Kinder- und Jugendarbeit sowie der Aufsuchenden Jugend(sozial)arbeit – Befunde einer Umfrage unter Einrichtungen. *deutsche jugend* 68(7-8): 328-337.

Müller, B., Schmidt, S. & Schulz, M. (2008). *Wahrnehmen können. Jugendarbeit und informelle Bildung*. Lambertus.

Pluto, L. (2007). *Partizipation in den Hilfen zur Erziehung. Eine empirische Studie*. DJI. Available at: https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/bibs/Vergriffene_Buecher_Open_Access/Dritte_Lieferung_cd03_2/Pluto%20Partizipation%20in%20den%20Hilfen%20zur%20Erziehung.pdf (accessed 01 June 2022).

Potsdam Agreement (1945) *Protocol of the Proceedings of the Berlin Conference.* Available at: https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1945Berlinv02/d1383 (accessed 01 June 2022).

Richter, E., Lehmann, T. & Sturzenhecker, B. (2017). *So machen Kitas Demokratiebildung: Empirische Erkenntnisse zur Umsetzung des Konzepts „Die Kinderstube der Demokratie"*. Beltz Juventa.

Journal of Child and Youth Care Work | acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

Reinhardt, S. (2003). Irrige Alltagsvorstellungen im Politikunterricht. Fehlverstehen als Bedingung politischen Lernens? *Gesellschaft – Wirtschaft – Politik* 4: 499-505.

Salihi, N. (2020) *Sekundärauswertung von Jugendbeteiligungsprozessen für den 16. Kinder- und Jugendbericht der Bundesregierung. Perspektiven junger Menschen zum Thema „Demokratiebildung und politische Bildung". Expertise im Rahmen des 16. Kinder- und Jugendberichts der Bundesregierung*. Available at: https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/bibs2020/Salihi_Exp16KJB_03032021_final.pdf (accessed 01 June 2022).

Schäfer, E. & Schack, S. (2009). Wirkungen des Projektes „Schule und Ausbildung für Toleranz und Demokratie". In: Lindner, W. (Ed.): *Jugendarbeit wirkt*. Springer VS, pp. 81-197.

Schneekloth, U. & Albert, M. (2019). Jugend und Politik: Demokratieverständnis und politisches Interesse im Spannungsfeld von Vielfalt, Toleranz und Populismus. In: Shell Deutschland Holding (Ed.): *Jugend 2019. Eine Generation meldet sich zu Wort. 18. Shell Jugendstudie*. Beltz, pp. 47-101.

Schneider, H. & Gerold, M. (2018). *Demokratiebildung an Schulen – Analyse lehrerbezogener Einflussgrößen*. Gütersloh. Available at: https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/Projekte/Jungbewegt/Lehrerbefragung_Demokratiebildung_final.pdf (accessed 01 June 2022).

Schröder, A., Balzter, N. & Schroedter, T. (2004). *Politische Jugendbildung auf dem Prüfstand: Ergebnisse einer bundesweiten Evaluation*. Juventa.

Schulz, W., Ainley J., Fraillon J., et al. (2016). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016 Assessment Framework*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Seckinger, M., Pluto, L., Peucker, C. & van Santen, E. (2016). *Einrichtungen der offenen Kinder- und Jugendarbeit. Eine empirische Bestandsaufnahme*. Beltz Juventa.

Sliwka, A. (2006). Citizenship Education as the Responsibility of a Whole School: Structural and Cultural Implications. In: Sliwka, A., Diedrich, M. & Hofer, M. (Eds.) *Citizenship Education. Theory – Research – Practice*. Waxmann, pp. 7-18.

Speck, K., Olk, T. & Stimpel, T. (2011). Auf dem Weg zur multiprofessionellen Organisation? Die Kooperation von Sozialpädagogen und Lehrkräften im schulischen Ganztag. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*. Pädagogische Professionalität 57. Beiheft: 184–201.

StEG-Konsortium (Eds.) (2019). *Ganztagsschule 2017/2018. Deskriptive Befunde einer bundesweiten Befragung*. Available at: https://www.pedocs.de/volltexte/2019/17105/pdf/Ganztagsschule_2017_2018_StEG.pdf (accessed 01 June 2022).

Strauss, A. L. & Corbin, J. M. (1996). *Grounded theory. Grundlagen qualitativer Sozialforschung*. Beltz.

Sturzenhecker, B. (2014). Anspruch, Potential und Realität von Demokratiebildung in der Jugendverbandsarbeit. In: Oechler, M. and Schmidt, H. (Eds.) *Empirie der Kinder- und Jugendverbandsarbeit. Forschungsergebnisse und ihre Relevanz für die Entwicklung von Theorie, Praxis und Forschungsmethodik*. Springer VS, pp. 225-236.

Sturzenhecker, B. (2020). Demokratiebildung in der Kinder- und Jugendarbeit. In: Bollweg, P., Buchna, J., Coelen, T. & Otto, H.-U. (Eds.) *Handbuch Ganztagsbildung*. Springer VS, pp. 1261-1271.

Tenorth, H.-E. (2007). Bildung. In: Tenorth, H.-E. & Tippelt, R. (Eds.): *Lexikon Pädagogik*. Beltz, pp. 92-95.

Waldmann, K. (2020). *Die Entwicklung der Landschaft der außerschulischen politischen Jugendbildung in Deutschland seit 1990. Expertise für die Kommission zum 16. Kinder- und Jugendbericht der Bundesregierung*. Available at: https://www.dji.de/fileadmin/user_upload/bibs2020/Waldmann_Exp16KJB_03032021_final.pdf (accessed 01 June 2022).

Weber, C., Winklhofer, U. & Bacher, J. (2007). Partizipation von Kindern in der Grund- und Sekundarschule. In: Alt, C. (Ed.) *Kinderleben – Individuelle Entwicklungen in sozialen Kontexten*. Springer VS, pp. 317-343.

Witzel, A. (2000). The Problem-Centered Interview. *Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung* 1(1). Available at: https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1132/2521 (accessed 01 June 2022).

Wohnig, A. (2017). Political learning by social engagement? Chances and risks for citizenship education. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education* 15(3): 244-261.

acycpjournal.pitt.edu | DOI 10.5195/jcycw.2025.463 | Vol. 30,2025

Yorio, P. L. & Ye, F. (2012). A Meta-Analysis on the Effects of Service-Learning on the Social, Personal, and Cognitive Outcomes of Learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 11(19): 9-27.

Zick, A., Küpper, B. & Berghan, W. (2019). *Verlorene Mitte. Feindselige Zustände. Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2018/19*. Available at: https://www.fes.de/forum-berlin/gegen-rechtsextremismus/mitte-studie (accessed 01 June 2022).