

Michał Bron Jr

Södertörn University, Stockholm

**Non-formal workplace learning
– similar frameworks, divergent conditions
A study of two transnational environmental organizations
operating in four countries**

**Edukacja nieformalna w miejscu pracy
– podobne założenia, rozbieżne warunki
Badanie dwóch międzynarodowych
organizacji ekologicznych działających w czterech krajach**

STRESZCZENIE: Autor porusza zagadnienia związane z procesem uczenia się w dwóch ekologicznych organizacjach pozarządowych (ENGOS). Przykłady nieformalnej edukacji w miejscu pracy zaczerpnięto z dwóch ENGOS: Greenpeace i WWF. Badanie prowadzono w czterech krajach – Chorwacji, Polsce, Szwecji i we Włoszech. Miało ukazać sposób kształcenia w tych organizacjach; kto określa potrzeby, treści, priorytety i rozwiązania praktyczne; jak pracownicy tych organizacji uzyskiwali wiedzę i umiejętności; jakie były kompetencje zawodowe szkoleniowców; gdzie to kształcenie się odbywało – w ramach organizacji czy poza nią; czy można zauważyć jakieś znaczące różnice w sposobie organizowania nieformalnego kształcenia w tych organizacjach w badanych krajach. Aby znaleźć odpowiedź na te pytania przeprowadzono serię wywiadów z pracownikami obu ENGOS w wytypowanych krajach. Zebrany materiał empiryczny ujawnił, że Greenpeace i WWF „magazynują wiedzę” i potrafią zrobić z tego dobry użytek, jakkolwiek rzadko aktywnie wspierają uczenie się. Najbardziej udane i skuteczne sposoby nieformalnego uczenia się w miejscu pracy są wówczas, gdy zdobyte doświadczenia są przekazywane nowym współpracownikom. W ten sposób ENGOS dokonują konwersji wiedzy ukrytej w wiedzę jawną. Ustalenia doprowadziły autora również do obserwacji, że ludzie działają w różny sposób w różnych krajach, ale uczą się w sposób podobny.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Uczenie się dorosłych, edukacja nieformalna w miejscu pracy, ekologiczne organizacje pozarządowe.

ABSTRACT: The paper explores learning that occurs in two environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOS). Examples of non-formal workplace learning were studied in two transnational environmental organisations: Greenpeace and WWF. An investigation was carried out in four countries – Croatia, Italy, Poland and Sweden. I was interested to determine how learning in these two ENGOS was organized; who defined needs, content, priorities and solutions; how people engaged in these organizations gained knowledge and competences; where did training competences come from; where did it take place – within the organization (in-service training) or outside; were there any significant differences in how non-formal learning processes are run within two ENGOS active in four countries? To find answers to these questions I conducted a series of open-ended interviews. Interviewees were staff members of both ENGOS from all four countries. Collected interviews disclosed, that Greenpeace and WWF “store knowledge” and make good use of it, although they do not necessarily actively foster learning. Most successful, and efficient, ways of non-formal workplace learning tend to be when gained experiences are transferred to new co-workers. In this way ENGOS converted their tacit knowledge into explicit one. My findings lead me also to an observation that people act differently in different countries, while they learn in similar ways.

KEYWORDS: Adult learning, non-formal workplace learning, environmental non-governmental organization.

Introduction

Many environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOS) are engaged in broad spectrum of activities: from setting agendas for sustainable development and nature protection, initiating protest or awareness-raising campaigns, through popularizing scholarly research or conducting them, negotiating with decision-makers, to introducing new solutions, training volunteers and activists and conducting educational work in schools and local communities. To do all that, ENGOS “must have the resources to sustain their activities and sufficient knowledge and expertise to make meaningful contributions” (Carmin 2010, p. 198).

The focus of the present article is on educational needs as they were recognized by ENGOS themselves as well as on training/learning activities that have been organized by them. Key concept here is non-formal learning of adults, especially non-formal workplace learning by ENGOS staff.

In the first section of the article, I describe my research – its topic, design, questions posed as well as background information on two ENGOS under study, namely Greenpeace and WWF. In the second section I outline theoretical considerations around concepts of learning, non-formal learning, non-formal workplace learning. In the third section, I present findings on how necessary knowledge is being acquired in two ENGOS active in four countries. Discussing findings I focus on two aspects of non-formal learning that occurs in the studied ENGOS. One is on knowledge that the staff already possesses and the ways it is kept updated. Another aspect concerns the persons who are instrumental in assessing learning needs and organize necessary and rel-

evant training (volunteer coordinator, the so-called volcoor). Then, in section 4, I juxtapose my findings with results from other studies. In the final section I challenge my own hypothesis.

Research design

During their daily life people acquire knowledge and skills. They do this intentionally or incidentally - at work, while socializing, keeping household, following their interests, or taking active part in political, cultural or religious activities. Based on my earlier research on civic education through non-governmental organizations in several EU countries (*cf.* Bron 2008, Bron & Fennes 2008), I assumed that membership or volunteering in an NGO is also an educational endeavour. Or, as a leading adult educationist observed: “These movements, [...] need people who have the necessary knowledge and skill to operate [...] some of their tools must be educational in nature if they are to be successful” (Jarvis 2000, p. 69). The paper explores learning that occurs in two environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOS).

Literature on non-governmental organizations that explicitly considers them as sites of learning is quite limited. Most of relevant adult education literature is focused rather on social movement education. Studies by Finger (1989), Welton (1993), Dykstra & Law (1994), Foley (1999), Kilgore (1999) or Holst (2002) sought answers to following questions: is adult education capable to bring about social change, what is a relationship between the “old” and “new” social movements, what is a general purpose of adult education (*cf.* Holst 2002, p. 78). Some studies (*e.g.* Dykstra & Law 1994) discussed also learning processes that occurred within studied social movements.

Another strand of adult education literature is focused on workplace learning (Marsick 1987, 2009; Fenwick 2005). Although most research on this phenomenon has been carried rather by sociologists and economists (*cf.* Eraut 1994, 2000, 2004; Clarke 2005). Researchers who extensively studied workplace learning tried to categorize their modes and proposed typologies. Most research was carried out in rather structured and hierarchical institutions, like schools, offices, hospitals. Nevertheless some types of workplace learning, as identified in literature, fit also non-governmental organizations. For instance in Carr & Kemmis’ (1983) classification a *technical paradigm* of learning relates to “acquisition of specified bodies of knowledge or skills to meet identified task or job requirements” (cited in Marsick 1987, p. 171). Mezirow (1997), based on Habermas, has distinguished three categories, or domains, of learning. One of them – an instrumental learning – is usually task-oriented, and focuses on

how to do a job better. It occurs when a person gathers new information, or learns how to share own knowledge and experiences, or realizes a cause-effect relationships. Instrumental learning is often skills-based learning, and as such is a dominating form of workplace learning among studied ENGOs staff.

The article presents what was learned and how within two transnational environmental NGOs. It contributes to the body of knowledge about settings in which adults learn – in this case, in non-formal ones. It can also help ENGOs to further understand needs and possibilities to foster learning opportunities for their staff.

In order to get varied empirical material I followed Gerring's (2007) recommendation to use "diverse cases" in selecting countries to study. For the purpose of this article an investigation was carried out in four countries – Croatia, Italy, Poland and Sweden. Examples of non-formal workplace learning were studied in two transnational environmental organisations: Greenpeace and WWF. Political history of these countries differ – while after the World War II Italy and Sweden experienced democratic rules, Croatia and Poland were governed by authoritarian communists regimes. It undoubtedly had an impact on under what conditions civil societies in these countries could develop. Political culture, trust among adult population, voluntarism, citizens' attitudes towards authorities divide these countries along lines of political history. Croatia and Poland differ from Italy and Sweden in yet another aspect. The first two countries have a long tradition of university adult education and a rich record of adult education practice. Italy and Sweden, while also strong in providing educational opportunities for adults, are less so in developing adult education as an academic discipline.

I was interested to determine how learning in these two ENGOs was organized; who defined needs, content, priorities and solutions; how people engaged in these organizations gained knowledge and competences; where did training competences come from; where did it took place – within the organization (in-service training) or outside; were there any significant differences in how non-formal learning processes are run within two ENGOs active in four countries?

To find answers to these questions I conducted a series of open-ended interviews. Interviewees were staff members of WWF and Greenpeace from all four countries. Their formal positions varied – usually they were either project leaders or persons responsible for training volunteers (the so-called volcoor). Interviewees from the first category were chosen as they could give the most informed answers on the whole organisation. Volcoors in turn, were most competent to assess non-professional educational needs of the staff and supporters.

Most interviews were carried out face-to-face (usually audio-recorded), some were conducted through Skype or telephone. Irrespective of the form, all interviews were equally informative. When relevant, additional information or comments have been obtained afterwards through e-mails. Language of interviews was either English, Italian, Polish or Swedish.¹ Altogether twelve interviews constitute empirical material for this article. Mission statements and other accessible written information produced by studied ENGOs were consulted, as well as relevant scholarly publications.

Both studied organizations differ significantly from one another. Individual Greenpeace country chapters sign a contract with Greenpeace International that imposes some rules (e.g. participation in international campaigns, non-partisanship, nonviolence). Major actions have to be consulted first with the international main office. It must stay free from influences from governmental agencies and business. "Greenpeace's trademark is the staging of attention-grabbing actions to point up environmental abuses" (Markham 2008, p. 235). To do so Greenpeace organizes various demonstrations and protest actions. WWF country chapters are more independent, although they do work very closely with international office. Unlike Greenpeace, the WWF decided to be recognized in governmental hearings and who has right to file complaints. Their ways of working and acting differ, too. WWF main activity is lobbying and fundraising so it would be able to buy lands in ecologically sensitive areas, like coasts, wetlands. Country chapters run nature reserves and research stations.

Some activities are, though, similar for the organizations, for example both are often engaged in public awareness-raising activities, work with schools (teachers and pupils), initiate and sponsor research. And both are very keen in establishing and maintaining contacts with the media.

Both organizations chose not to have members to whom they would have to be accountable. Instead, they have devoted supporters who contribute money or participate in driving petitions. Greenpeace supporters "have no direct voice in decisions" (Markham 2008, p. 239); similarly WWF supporters "have no say in the WWF's policies or management" (Markham 2008, p. 227).

Croatian, Italian, Polish and Swedish WWF and Greenpeace are characterized by their multinational links and by dealing with topics that usually go beyond country borders. They share with their mother-organisations and be-

¹ Several interviews quoted in this article are translated into English, while the rest is reproduced without altering their grammar.

tween themselves missions, goals, projects and ways of working. Thus, similar organisational frameworks are present in all country chapters of these organisations.

My hypothesis was the following:

ENGOS staff, even if active in four different countries, works and learns in similar ways, because it tries to achieve the same or similar objectives, it works according to the same or similar job-descriptions, and it operates under similar legal conditions.

Non-formal workplace learning

Some researchers of social movements, including non-governmental organizations, focused their interests on cognitive aspects of their work and on knowledge generated by them (*cf.* Finger 1989; Foley 1999; Jamison 2001; *Lifelong learning* 2008). Even though much was written about cognitive praxis, communities of practice, and alike (*cf.* Eyerman & Jamison 1991; Holford 1995; Wenger 1998; Boström 2004), learning itself, however, was not investigated. Before I report my results I ponder first on terminology. In this section I am narrowing a concept of learning from a general notion, through non-formal to non-formal workplace learning which is a topic of this article.

Learning, from a psychological point of view, is defined as “any process that for living beings leads to a durable change of capacity and is not caused by oblivion, biological maturing or aging’. For humans this process is ongoing throughout life, whether it be intentional or incidental” (Illeris 2008, p. 401). Very often learning is envisaged only as knowledge and skills. However, according to Jarvis (1987), Merriam & Caffarella (1991/2006), Rogers (2003) it does also encompass attitudes, competencies, viewpoints, meaning, insights, values.

In the literature three notions are distinguished: formal, informal and non-formal learning (education). ‘Formal learning’ is commonly associated with ‘schooling’ – a chronologically graded system of teaching and learning, structured courses, assessments and certificates. Is typically provided by an education institution, is structured (has prescribed curriculum, explicit goals and assessment mechanisms) and is leading to certification. It “relies on certified teachers, and after competing successfully each level and grade, students are granted a diploma or certificate that allows them to be accepted into the next grade or level, or into the formal labor market” (Schugurensky 2007, p. 164). Formal learning is intentional from the learner’s perspective.

‘Informal learning’ is unorganized and often incidental. Informal learning results from daily life activities related to work, or family or leisure. It is not structured nor does lead to certificates. It “occurs outside the curricula of educational institutions, or courses or workshops offered by educational or social agencies” (Schugurensky 2007, p. 165). Informal learning may be intentional but in most cases it is non-intentional.

Non-formal learning (education) is a 50-years old concept (Tight 2002, p. 71), although „we have had non-formal education for a long time, but we have not had it so called” (Fordham 1979, p. 2; Coombs 1976). A division of education into formal, non-formal and informal has been discussed since late-1960s. It begun in 1968 when Philip Coombs published his seminal book *The World Educational Crisis. A system approach*. There he included a chapter entitled „Non-formal education: to catch up, keep up, and to get ahead” (Coombs 1968). Together with a book *Attacking Rural Poverty* (Coombs & Ahmed 1974) it initiated enormous interest in a kind of education that could surpass limits of formal education. An extensive, practically loose, definition enable growing believe in its applicability:

“It is not, as some people assume, a separate „system” of education in the same sense that formal education is a system, with its own distinct structure, interlocking parts, and internal coherence. On the contrary, nonformal education is simply a convenient label covering a bewildering assortment of organized educational activities outside the formal system that are intended to serve identifiable learning needs of particular subgroups in any given population...” (Coombs 1976, p. 282).

A comparison between formal and non-formal education showed (Simkins 1977) main characteristics of the later. Non-formal education is usually short-term, specific and non-credential; it is individualized, often practical and entry requirements are commonly decided by ‘clientele’; participants exert control over content and methods; it is flexibly structured and generally resource-saving. Typically it does not lead to certification. The presence of a teacher (trainer, coach, instructor) is not necessary (Schugurensky 2007, p. 164). That non-formal education is learner-centred means that emphasis is mostly on learning rather than on instruction (Etling 1975, 1993; Courtney 1989; Merriam & Caffarella 1991). Non-formal learning is „embedded in planned activities that are not explicitly designated as learning, but which contain an important learning element” (Colardyn & Bjørnåvold 2004, p. 71). Non-formal learning is intentional from the learner’s point of view.

Advantages of non-formal education were stressed by trans-national organization like OECD (1977), Council of Europe (Dumitrescu 1999) and Eu-

ropean Union (COM(2001) 678 final). High degree of flexibility and individual learner's intentionality were especially mentioned. While formal education is mostly associated with schools and educational institutions, non-formal education is coupled with organizations, enterprises and various community groups. As mentioned earlier, of the three main types of learning the present article focuses on its non-formal kind.

In ENGOs that rely their work mostly on own staff we have to do with a learning through the doing of work – a phenomenon called workplace learning. Naturally, most workplaces are not organised for educational purposes, nevertheless, some learning in and for the workplace do occur. Workplace learning has a number of characteristics which differentiate it from other types of learning. It is task oriented and collaborative in its nature. In the case of Greenpeace and WWF a non-formal working learning turned to be relevant.

With growing work specialization and more complicated organizational structures it became clear that learning was not anymore confined to schools and other educational institutions. Proliferation of information and communication technology, attention paid to human resources, and urgency of constant necessity for upgrading already possessed qualifications speeded up this process. Workplaces, of various types, became recognized as learning environments, too. However, there is no definite theory of workplace learning, though there is an agreement that this kind of learning relates to “human change in consciousness or behaviour occurring primarily in activities and contexts of work” (Fenwick 2005, p. 673). There is neither a single definition of what workplace learning is. The reason being the fact that this phenomenon is studied from so many various perspectives: organizational theory, industrial economics, management studies, and not the least – adult education.

Based on the works of Eraut (1994, 2000, 2004) I understand non-formal workplace learning as learning focused on both enhancing work performance (an employee benefit) as well as contributing to workplace functioning (an employer benefit) (see also Clarke 2005). I also draw on works by Marsick (1987, 2009), who pointed out that learning at work occurs all the time. It might be conscious or not. One learns skills how to use tools or how to perform certain operations, how to co-operate with colleagues, how a given workplace is structured and operates.

Michael Eraut conducted several studies on learning in workplace settings. According to him formal learning is confined by syllabus, teaching regulations, designated teachers, specified outcomes, credit or certificate, recognition of qualifications (cf. Eraut, 2000). Practically none of these features would

apply to how staff of two ENGOs learned. In the case of the studied organizations workplace learning was not stipulated by any state regulations (as internship, apprenticeship, compulsory in-service training). Their staff undertook learning, i.e. attended courses, workshops, seminars rather on voluntary or ad-hoc bases.

Findings

This section reflects the views of the interviewees. In section 4 I juxtapose them with other sources.

Staff competence and its maintaining

The necessary knowledge, often at a university level, is today secured through employment of staff with relevant degrees and specializations. For instance among employees of Swedish Greenpeace and WWF there are many people even with Ph.D. degrees. Thus, they are “well equipped to read and analyze scientific data and reports” (WWF Sweden, Näslund, Feb. 24, 2012). Personal commitment and a high level of education led many interviewees to praise their own organizations as competent and reliable: “[...] environmental organizations [...] are generally well equipped with good knowledge of both the issue and the process. They have all the expertise needed in order to be a trustworthy advisor and they are often giving well-grounded and rational suggestions” (Greenpeace Norden, Bengtsson, March 8, 2012); “Through in-house-expertise we can cope with overarching problems” (WWF Sweden, Meriman & Thoreson, Sept. 11, 2012).

The way to reach this status was long, though. An interesting description of professionalization processes has been given by educational officer of WWF Italy: “Initially we were only 10 staff now WWF has about 100 staff members and it works similar to other big organizations [...] there were not specific courses about this topic and so most skills and competences were acquired on the ground by running the activities... [Today] the Human Resource Department coordinates recruitment via an open-call, then having interviews and a selection process” (WWF Italy, Quadrelli, Sept. 25, 2012).

This development from committed enthusiasts to expert employees can be observed in other countries chapters. Not all of them have human resources units; some prefer to directly employ a university graduate with specific area competence.

Practically all the interviewees observed, that despite having university diplomas, many employees soon discover that their knowledge does not

suffice without further learning to meet requirements from their workplaces. This finding corresponds well with Eraut's (1994) observation, that non-formal workplace learning is more functional than formal training when one needs to grasp job-related skills and gain knowledge because one needs first to obtain insight to put theory into practice. This is quite evident in environmental NGOs whose day-to-day work, campaigns and lobbying is depended on updating of staff's competence and knowledge.

Analysing the topics of courses given or attended by studied ENGOs I could conclude, that their diversity was rather limited. Most important, and most valued, was learning the latest developments within the area of responsibility of an individual employee. Be it scientific, legislative or political. This could be sustainable consumption, transport policies, petroleum *pollutant spills*, eutrophication, blue-green algae. Topics depended on the organization's or an individual person's needs and interests. "Generally speaking there is a preference towards training about content, e.g. topics on which people work. There is less interest to get training on management aspects [...] when workshops are organized most often these are about a current environmental topic. Hence we search for experts who can deliver content that has to be covered" (WWF Italy, Quadrelli, Sept. 25, 2012).

Other interviewees, from both organizations, corroborate this description. What is also common, is a recognition of needs to broaden topics to cover other skills that are required to perform work well: "To be resourceful within the process you need expert knowledge both in the practical issues at hand, as well as in the process and management system in itself" (WWF Sweden, Merriman & Thoreson March 26, 2012); "...in large organizations with many employees there is many strong different opinions and it is certainly not given that everyone always agree on plans and strategies. Processes may be delayed due to internal positioning and negotiation. It can be frustrating having to waste time on internal debate[s]" (Greenpeace Sweden, Jacobsson, March 20, 2012).

Thus, there is an awareness of a need to enlarge content of workplace learning, however not much is done to meet that.

Non-formal, workplace oriented, learning could take place in a number of forms and venues. The three main learning forms that were mentioned by interviewees were courses, workshops and information meetings. Sometimes e-learning was chosen instead of a more traditional form. However the use of Internet differed much. Especially a possibility to create internal web-sites (password protected, i.e. available only for a given NGOs employees) designed for educational purposes was seldom used.

Interestingly enough face-to-face courses were more appreciated than those organized through the internet or at a distance. The most important rationale behind this was that personally attended courses enable participants to interact with others, they raised motivation and might facilitate identity creation (WWF Italy, Quadrelli, Sept. 25, 2012).

There were two main ways to up-date one's knowledge or to learn new one: to attend courses organized by others or to organize an in-service training. Greenpeace and WWF staff in the four studied countries participated in training organized and hosted by other NGOs, specialized firms or state authorities: "we learn while attending conferences and courses organised by others. Upon certain occasions, we work in a similar way, i.e. by holding an event for the needs of other organizations" (WWF Poland, Tymorek, May 17, 2012).

It seems that Italian WWF (through its Milano Office) developed comprehensive policy and practice how to deal with upcoming needs of learning or updating knowledge and skills. By establishing Human Resources Department it can assess and meet needs and co-ordinate efforts: "Training needs are identified at the level of individual office and suggestions prepared accordingly [...] But also individual staff members can identify needs for improving or acquiring a competence for him/herself, and search for training courses run by universities or other institute. In this case she/he has first to apply to the human resource department for permission to attend to this course. The human resource department assesses the economic side of this (there is an internal fund from where this can be paid) and the benefits this training will bring to the person and to the office" (WWF Italy, Quadrelli, Sept. 25, 2012)

To cope with changing needs and developments in the field, some country chapters instead of sending their employees to courses organized their own in-service training. Often they engaged external experts in the field: "Twice a year the whole team engaged in Baltic Ecoregion Programme attends workshops to which external coaches are invited" (WWF Sweden, Merriman & Thoreson, Sept. 11, 2012); "Regarding the sort of expertise that we simply do not possess, in case of need we try to find a suitable expert. As a rule, we turn to some sort of a scientific institution and commission an expert opinion about a given, concrete theme" (WWF Poland, Tymorek, May 17, 2012).

Greenpeace Sweden seems to be even more focused on benefits of in-service training: "Greenpeace have multiple channels and contact points to circulate information and knowledge within the organization... Regional and international networks are the basis of the organization's knowledge sharing... The links between members in different networks are strong and the communication often rapid... A good organization culture and a low level of bureau-

cracy is probably the reason for this efficient communication” (Greenpeace Sweden, Jacobson, March 20, 2012).

What is to be learned by people employed by environmental non-governmental organizations? A list of tasks is a lengthy one:

- expressing NGO’s interests – properly and intelligibly defining and indicating problems and issues; drafting alternative decisions and/or policies;
- learning decision-making processes at different authority levels – how to participate in them;
- controlling authorities’ work and revealing tools to keep them accountable;
- adjusting means and forms of action to needs and possibilities;
- studying legal frameworks for civil protest.

The scope of the courses outside the main domain of work span from working with media, creating web-pages, raising funds, or learning conflict management.

The least formalized workplace learning is when members of staff are challenged with unexpected situations. They tend to spontaneously discuss and seek solutions (*cf.* Eide 2000). This is how an interviewee (WWF-POL) described their way to cope with upcoming problems.

Despite differences Greenpeace and WWF share one feature that distinct them from many other ENGOs – they exist for many years now and they work in a number of countries and regions. Both are examples of a phenomenon called „collective knowledge”, through which they are well equipped to reach their goals. This feature helped to accrue knowledge and experiences, which also include a list of failures and less successful projects or actions. All that information is available for all the staff: “The fact that WWF has existed for long in so many countries provides an opportunity for an exchange of multiple experiences between various national organisations [...] Generally, we attempt to use what is already available within the network and has been accumulated for the past fifty years” (WWF Poland, Tymorek, May 17, 2012); “Regional and international networks are the basis of the organization’s knowledge sharing and are created in order to facilitate daily contact between the campaign managers [...] To work in international networks have predominantly benefits. We share information and experiences and can jointly build statements and actions” (Greenpeace Sweden, Jacobson, March 20, 2012).

Organizing discussions on „best practices” and debriefing colleagues that attended conferences or courses were usual ways to share acquired knowledge with other members of the staff. Another was to create and maintain a database on „lessons learned”.

All that contributes to building up a „collective knowledge” that makes individual country chapters not dependent on individual employees: “The history and reliability of the organization makes it possible for a new staff member to continue almost at the exact spot where her predecessor ended [...] With a close cooperation and by keeping each other “in the loop” through daily email and phone contact, as well as annual meetings, it is possible for members to act as stand in for each other. Since the organization is tight and ‘seamless’ all staff can fill in for each other and express the common voice of WWF” (WWF Sweden, Merriman & Thoreson, March 26, 2012).

An interesting case of transfer of such „collective knowledge” constituted Croatian WWF. Unlike WWF in other countries, the Croatian is not a country chapter but the so-called Programme Office. It deals with the whole Dinaric Region and works through assisting other NGOs: “We help them in building up their communication skills, that is how to approach government, how to work with media, how to make their voices heard, how to make good comments on EIS” [Environmental Impact Statement (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Environmental_impact_statement)]. Sometimes we use our staff, sometimes we use other people. We teach them how to be a more constructive partner for governments. We help them in their role as ‘watch-dogs’ ” (WWF Croatia, Stojanović & Štefan, July 4, 2012).

Environmental NGOs are allegedly knowledge-intensive organizations. However, in the case of studied country chapters of Greenpeace and WWF, it turned out that this observation applies mostly to environmental issues. Data collected revealed that in other spheres of their activity they work mainly intuitively. Crucial decisions are sometimes made without comprehensive knowledge. Methods that ENGOS often ‘apply’ in public-relation work, in contacts with authorities or media are based on common sense and trial-and-error, rather than on professional expertise.

Volunteer coordinators competence

There is a difference between Greenpeace and WWF in their attitude towards supporters. There is practically no Greenpeace country organization without supporters (Slovenia being an exception). Consequently, Greenpeace in all the studied countries have volunteer coordinators (or equivalent). WWF shows some variations; for instance Italian WWF does have supporters/volunteers, while Polish and Swedish made deliberate decisions not to.

Volcoors, volunteer coordinators, are persons who are responsible for recruiting, training and supervising supporters ‘working’ for a given organization. To prepare training material, design training sessions (content and meth-

ods) volcoors have to work closely with NGO's regular staff to identify needs and scope of volunteering. Volcoors are also responsible for evaluating work done by supporters and – if necessary – deciding whether a given person meets expected standards. As they also are often involved in in-service training for a given NGO staff, they constitute a relevant for my study personnel.

Mainly all of the regular staff, especially those recently recruited, are university graduates in disciplines relevant for ENGO's work, i.e. the very majority in environmental sciences, some in media or ITC. However, this does not apply to all the employees of Greenpeace and WWF in those four countries. An exception are those among the staff, who are responsible for training ENGOs employees and supporters – namely volunteer coordinators. These people are still recruited on other grounds than their university education. Practically in all the studied cases they learned their trade „by doing”; accumulating necessary knowledge through years of practical work interwoven with some courses. A case of an Italian WWF educational officer is a good example of this phenomenon: “By the time the need to set-up an office focused on education arose, I had acquired expertise, competences and know-how which WWF needed so they offered me to join to the then newly formed Education Office”² (WWF Italy, Quadrelli, Sept. 25, 2012).

A Greenpeace Poland volcoor, for instance, was 17 when she volunteered for Amnesty International in Gdansk: “I was responsible for education group [...] I was always interested in this field. When I worked for Amnesty I attended a course – 120 hours – about how to educate people, how to work with them, how to motivate. How to »sell« knowledge. Then I took a course at the Volunteering Centre in Gdansk. It was a four-day course for would-be volcoors. During my first years at the Greenpeace every year I took part in one course of another to improve my qualifications [...] It was – in my case – a mixture of »picking up« some knowledge on courses with practical work [...] I think I learn the best when learning by doing. I need first to have some experiences than I will know what I should improve or correct” (Greenpeace Poland, Zielinska, Sept. 4, 2012).

Parallel to her first project-based and now a full-time employment as Greenpeace Poland volunteers coordinator, she pursues her university study in a subject far away from her professional life, namely history of Polish liter-

² Quite recently this office, located in Milan, was renamed and now it is called: Transforming Culture Office. The rationale behind the change is to stress, that WWF educational activities are not limited only to school children; it is addressed to general public as well. Awareness-raising campaigns are directed to adult population, too.

ature. Similarly to Greenpeace volcoor in Poland, WWF Italy volcoor formal education has nothing to do with her full time employment.

Carmin (2010) distinguished two types of knowledge – an expert one, and an operational. The „expert knowledge” stems from attending conferences, membership in networks, professional publications, media and training programmes (though the author does not mention the obvious source, namely university education in a given field). The „operational knowledge” is acquired from similar sources, mainly networks and workshops; it enables and facilitates a given organization’s day-to-day work. The findings suggest that, oddly, the second type of knowledge is the only one that people responsible for workplace non-formal training of staff and volunteers actually acquired through their organizations. Professional academic degree in their case is neither required nor expected.

Discussion

In this section I juxtapose interviews with other sources. Several opinions expressed by interviewees in all four countries have been indeed corroborated by other research.

It seems relevant here to make five reflections that stem from my investigation. First I discuss an issue of what adults used to perceive as learning and how this relate to my study. Second, I turn to the phenomenon of workplace learning. Thereafter I reflect whether Greenpeace and WWF are, as it is claimed, learning organizations. Next I discuss a phenomenon called collective knowledge. And finally I consider what kind of immaterial benefits one can gain from working in a non-governmental organization.

What adult educationists have already established is that *adults learn* what they want to learn, and have very little inclination to acquire something they do not want, that is, something they do not perceive as meaningful for their own life goals (Illeris 2008, p. 406).

As it is evident from my interviews, especially with regular staff, what they felt they needed was not perceived as learning at all. Many interviewees mentioned their need for updating their skills and knowledge that would make their work at ENGOs better. It is a rather common phenomenon that adults confine „learning” to structured, formalised education and training (Coombs 1976, p. 284). Distinguishing between learning, training, education is a challenging endeavour. The British „Campaign for Learning” has carried a survey among adult population asking how those words are understood, what do respondents associate them with? „Learning”, according to respondents,

was mostly associated with discovering, finding out more or personal growth. „Training” was understood mostly as gaining new skills. And finally, „education”, was related to school, studying, qualifications or „being taught” (Campaign for Learning 1998 after Tight 2002, p. 23).

Evidence gained by Eraut (2000, 2004) showed that workplace learning was unintentional, and even unrecognized at the time. Tight (1998) calls it ‘untaught’ learning activities. Based on my own results, I have to concur with an observation that “learning is often not the primary motive for engaging in an activity; the motive is the activity itself” (McGivney 2006, p. 13).³

Eraut’s (2000, 2004) typology of non-formal learning seems to be the most relevant for my investigation. It comprises three types of learning: implicit, reactive and deliberative. Implicit learning occurs when there is no conscious attempt to learn nor awareness of learning at the time. A day-to-day work of an environmental NGO is full of situations when unconscious knowledge acquisition, information gathering or ‘picking-up’ of skills takes place. Reactive learning occurs usually in an un-planned way, even if it is explicit. This kind of learning is prompted by „recent, current or imminent situations without any time being specifically set aside for it” Eraut (2000, p. 115). Reflecting on past experiences (successful/failed fund-raising, petition signing, awareness-raising campaigns), reacting to them, will be the case of when this type of non-formal workplace learning occurs in studied organizations. The least frequent, as most time-consuming and qualified, is the third type of learning – a deliberative one. It would require from a given organization (as employer) a commitment, defining learning goal and assigning time (Eraut 2004, p. 250f).

In the case of studied ENGOS attempts at deliberative learning could be detected in interviews with volcoors, especially at the beginning of their employments there. Initially many volcoors did attend some courses to learn their new trade. However, when a workload of volcoors grew, intentional attempts to learn became fewer and fewer. As it came out of interviews, doing work became their first priority.

³ Two common-sense examples: „We do not always learn just for the sake of it but to achieve another purpose. People who spend a lot of time gardening may learn in the process where to place plants... It is probable that most would refer to the development of such knowledge and skills not as ‘learning’ but as ‘gardening’, even if it involves following instructions from a book or manual” (McGivney 2006). „Researchers may identify workers as learning the culture and habitus of the workplace, but for those concerned, they may be simply getting by” (Edwards, Gallacher & Whittaker 2007).

Nevertheless, workplace learning did occur in all studied organizations. It took place in environmental non-governmental organizations because they „must have adequate capacity to initiate and sustain their activities” (Carmin 2010, p. 186). Practically every country chapter of the studied ENGOs was a site of adult teaching and learning. In some cases the staff undertook intentional efforts, goal-oriented actions, e.g. organizing in-service training or attending a course or a workshop. In other cases, as some interviewees observed, the staff could learn intuitively by observing more experienced colleagues.

Environmental non-governmental organizations are often called *learning organizations*, and are, undoubtedly, knowledge-intensive organizations. To campaign for environment, to challenge decisions (be political or economic), and to propose own solutions involve learning about ecology, botany, biology, chemistry, etc., as well as on public relations, negotiation strategies and alike. A certain legal expertise is also often needed. To stay updated on recent developments in environmental hazards and methods to deal with them, staff of ENGOs read scholarly publications. This itself requires a high level of education. Major part of staff at the studied Greenpeace and WWF country chapters is already a qualified, well-educated personnel. These two ENGOs, like many other knowledge-intensive organizations, are „dependent on their ability to attract, mobilize, develop and transform the knowledge of these employees” to achieve their immediate goals and overall objectives (Løwendahl, Revang & Fosstenlokken (2001, p. 912). It seems that „lessons learned” (from successful and failed actions) and other forms of non-formal learning are the main ways to secure accomplish their missions.

To run awareness-raising actions, and negotiate solutions require an ongoing training. As Loeber, van Mierlo, Grin & Leeuwis (2007) correctly observed “sustainable development implies a need for learning [...] the learning processes [...] are more than mere ‘joint fact finding’ exercises” (Loeber et al. 2007, p. 84).

How staff competence is maintained as described by interviewees (see section 3.1) can be seen as an example of a phenomenon called *collective knowledge*. Lyles and Schwenck (1992) could conclude that an institution, enterprise, organisation can have knowledge that exceeds the knowing of their individual employees. von Krogh, Roos and Slocum (1994, p. 60) agreed that shared knowledge is not dependent on individual collaborators: „Individuals may leave the group [...] but the knowledge of the group does not [...] vanish”. Such collective knowledge, according to ENGOs representatives, is maintained through collecting and keeping experiences gained throughout the years. Thus, ongoing sharing and storing of experiences reduces vulnerabili-

ty of the whole organization. The two ENGOs that I discussed in this article “build their skills by engaging their peers through network interactions and membership in umbrella organizations, coalitions and international federations” (Carmin 2010, p. 188). Transnational nature of Greenpeace and WWF enable new local organizations to become knowledgeable and effective (*cf* Bell 2004). Interviewees from Croatian, Italian, Polish and Swedish ENGOs confirmed this observation.

However, there is a backside of this positive development. As the RETGACE research team warned, a too one-sided focus on capacity-building might lead to emergence of „professional activists” in NGOs and make these organisations more estranged from grass root society. The division between this „entrepreneurial” category as planners and decision-makers on one hand and volunteers as their assistants on the other hand may inhibit the development of the public space for dialogic participation (Chioncel & Jansen 2004, p. 11).

Another risk is that „the issues of importance to the international organisation may be very different from those the locals want to pursue” (Bell 2004, p. 198).

Being involved in NGO is often valuable and *beneficial* – for an individual as well as for society at large. One acquires knowledge, skills and sensitivity to work with others as well as for others. Branagan & Boughton (2003, p. 358) observed that adult learners usually assess educational outcomes very pragmatically – they should be directly relevant for day-to-day life. However, these results may as well have an impact on long-term personal development (*cf*. Kurantowicz 1995; Ciesiołkiewicz 2001; Bron 2008). Among social skills and dispositions that use to be learned through active participation in NGOs are public speaking, consistency, persistence. The findings presented by Polish researchers are similar to those from other countries: “Many recognized that they had gained new and potentially transferable skills [...] they also referred to the development or improvement of ‘softer’ skills such as communication skills, social skills and team-working” (McGivney 2006, p. 17).

Strikingly, unlike staff of other NGOs, interviewees from Greenpeace and WWF did not mention these benefits. Apparently working for environmental NGO is too focused on pragmatic issues, as content of non-formal workplace training clearly showed.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine how learning in two worldwide environmental non-governmental organizations was organized and where

training competences came from. Both have been in operation for more than forty (Greenpeace) or fifty (WWF) years. Acting for such a long time and being truly transnational both ENGOs accumulated knowledge and skills that are available for new country-chapters and new generations of employees and activists. As some interviewees mentioned, Polish and Croatian staff of Greenpeace and WWF acquire new or advance their knowledge and skills by relying on expertise amassed by their sister organizations. Manuals, kits, internet sites contain „pools of knowledge” that are non-dependent on currently employed staff.

I was interested to learn whether there were any significant differences in how non-formal workplace learning was organized within two ENGOs active in four countries? Collected interviews disclosed, that Greenpeace and WWF „store knowledge” and make good use of it, although they do not necessarily actively foster learning. Ways of acquiring knowledge and skills grew naturally within each organization as their staff conducted their work. Most successful, and efficient, ways of non-formal workplace learning tend to be when gained experiences are transferred (taught) to new co-workers. In this way ENGOs did convert their tacit knowledge into explicit one. This was the case with Italian WWF in Milano.

My study identified three features that are common to Greenpeace and WWF and observed in all four countries:

- almost all training, organized in-house or commissioned from outside, was focused on environmental issues (acquiring new knowledge or updating it);
- only a few in-service courses for regular staff were devoted to learn or improve skills in fund-raising or managing projects;
- no attempts have been made by volunteers, or others, to obtain relevant and needed expertise that could be provided by adult educationists, i.e. scholars specialising in how adults learn.⁴

My findings led me to an observation that people do act differently in different countries, while they learn in similar ways.

⁴ The following quote from Italy is valid for both Greenpeace and WWF in all four countries: collaboration with academics with training in adult education is not that common, as when workshops are organized most often these are about a current environmental topic. Hence we search for experts who can deliver content that has to be covered (WWF Italy, Quadrelli, Sept. 25, 2012).

Literature

- Boström M., (2004), *Cognitive practices and collective identities within a heterogeneous social movement. The Swedish environmental movement*, „Social Movement Studies”, 3, 1.
- Branagan M., Boughton B., (2003), *How do you learn how to change the world? Learning and teaching in Australian protest movements*, „Australian Journal of Adult Learning”, 43, 3.
- Bron M. Jr, (2004), *From ‘parallel society’ to civil society. Surfacing from authoritarianism*, „Japanese Adult and Continuing Education Journal”, 6, Special Issue: *Civil Society in Post-Communist Countries*.
- Carmin J., (2010), *NGO capacity and environmental governance in Central and Eastern Europe*, „Acta Politica” 45, 1–2.
- Carr W., Kemmis S., (1983), *Becoming critical. Knowing through action research*, Vic.: Deakin UP, Geelong.
- Ciesiołkiewicz A., (2001), *Organizacje społeczne jako środowisko edukacyjne* [Social organizations as an educational community], [in:] *Mała ojczyzna: kultura, edukacja, rozwój lokalny* [Little fatherland: culture, education, local development], Theiss W. (ed.), Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”, Warszawa.
- Colardyn D., Bjørnåvold J., (2004), *Validation of formal, non-formal and informal learning: policy and practices in EU Member States*, „European Journal of Education”, 39, 1.
- Coombs P.H., (1968), *The World Educational Crisis*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Coombs P.H., (1976), *Nonformal education. Myths, realities, and opportunities*, „Comparative Education Review”, 20(3).
- Coombs P.H., Ahmed M., (1974), *Attacking rural poverty. How nonformal education can help*, John Hopkins UP, Baltimore.
- Courtney S., (1989), *Defining adult and continuing education*, [in:] *Handbook of adult and continuing education*, Merriam S.B., Cunningham P.M. (eds.), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Dykstra C., Law M., (1994), *Popular social movements as educative forces: Towards a theoretical framework*, [in:] *Annual Adult Education Research Conference Proceedings (35th, Knoxville, Tennessee, May 20-22, 1994)*, Knoxville, TN: Ralph Brockett, University of Tennessee (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 381616).
- Edwards R., Gallacher J., Whittaker S. (eds.), (2007), *Introduction. Tangled up in learning*, [in:] *Learning outside the academy 2006. International research perspectives on lifelong learning*, Routledge, London.
- Eide D., (2000), *Learning across interactions*, Paper presented at the 16th EGOS Colloquium, July 2000, Helsinki (quoted after: Boreham, Nick, (2004), *A theory of collective competence. Challenging the neo-liberal individualisation of performance at work*, „British Journal of Educational Studies”, 55,1).
- Eraut M., (1994), *Developing professional knowledge and competence*, Farmer Press, London.
- Eraut M., (2000), *Non-formal learning and tacit knowledge in professional work*, „British Journal of Educational Psychology”, 70, 1.
- Eraut M., (2004), *Informal learning in the workplace*, „Studies in Continuing Education”, 26, 2.
- Etling A., (1993), *What is nonformal education?*, „Journal of Agricultural Education”, 34(4).
- Eyerman R., Jamison A., (1991), *Social movements. A cognitive approach*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Fenwick T., (2000), *Expanding Conceptions of Experiential Learning: A Review of the Five Contemporary Perspectives on Cognition*, „Adult Education Quarterly”, 50, 4.

- Finger M., 1989, *New social movements and their implications for adult education*, "Adult Education Quarterly", 40(1).
- Foley G., (1999), *Learning in social action. A contribution to understanding informal education*, Zed, London.
- Fordham P., 1979, The interaction of formal and non-formal education, "Studies in Adult Education", 11(1).
- Gerring J., (2007), *Case Study Research. Principles and practices*, Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Gumkowska M., Herbst J., Szolajska J., Wygnański J., (2006), *The Challenge of Solidarity. CIVICUS Civil Society Index Report for Poland*, Stowarzyszenie Klon/Jawor, Warszawa.
- Holford J., (1995), *Why social movements matter. Adult education theory, cognitive praxis, and the creation of knowledge*, "Adult Education Quarterly", 45, 2.
- Holst J.D., (2002), *Social movements, civil society, and radical adult education*, Bergin & Garvey, London.
- Illeris K., (2008), *Lifelong learning as a psychological process*, [in:] *Routledge International Handbook of Lifelong Learning*, Jarvis P. (ed.), Routledge, London.
- Jamison A., (2001), *The making of green knowledge. Environmental politics and cultural transformation*, Cambridge UP, Cambridge.
- Jarvis P., (2000), *The education of adults as a social movement. A question for late modern society*, [in:] *Adult education and social responsibility 2000. Reconciling the irreconcilable?*, Wildemeersch D., Finger M., Jansen T. (eds.), 2 rev. ed., Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Kilgore D.W., (1999), *Understanding learning in social movements: A theory of collective learning*, "International Journal of Lifelong Education", 18(3).
- Krogh G. von, Roos J., Slocum K., (1994), *An essay on corporate epistemology*, "Strategic Management Journal", Special issue, 15.
- Kurantowicz E., (1995), *The advocating groups as a forum of active democratic citizenship*, [in:] *Adult Education and Democratic Citizenship*, Bron M. Jr, Malewski M. (eds.), Wrocław University Press, Wrocław.
- Loeber A., van Mierlo B., Grin J., Leeuwis C., (2007), *The practical value of theory. Conceptualising learning in the pursuit of a sustainable development*, [in:] *Social learning 2007. Towards a sustainable world. Principles, perspectives, and praxis*, Arjen E., Wals J. (eds.), Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen.
- Lowendahl B.R., Revang Ø., Fosstenlokken S.M., (2001), *Knowledge and value creation in professional service firms: A framework for analysis*, "Human Relations", 54(7).
- Lyles M.A., Schwenk Ch.R., (1992), *Top management, strategy and organizational knowledge structures*, "Journal of Management Studies" 29, 2.
- Markham W.T., (2008), *Environmental organizations in modern Germany. Hardy survivors in the twentieth century and beyond*, Berghahn Books, New York.
- Marsick V. (ed.), (1987), *New paradigms for learning in the workplace. In Learning in the workplace*, Croom Helm, London.
- McGivney V., (2006), *Informal learning. The challenge for research*, [in:] *Learning outside the academy 2006. International research perspectives on lifelong learning*, Edwards R., Gallacher J., Whittaker S. (eds.), Routledge, London.
- Merriam S.B., Caffarella R.S., (1991), *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Mezirow J., (1997), *A critical theory of adult learning and education*, "Adult Education", 32, 1.
- OECD 1977, *Learning opportunities for adults*, Paris.

- Pye L.W., (1968), *Political Culture*, [in:] *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, Sills D.L. (ed.), Macmillan, New York.
- Rogers A., (2003), *What is the difference? A new critique of adult learning and teaching*, NIACE, Leicester.
- Schugurensky D., (2007), „*This is our school of citizenship*”. *Informal learning in local democracy*, [in:] *Learning in places. The informal education reader 2007*. Bekerman Z., Nichlas C.B., Silberman Keller D., Peter Lang, New York.
- Simkins T., (1977), *Non-formal Education and Development. Some Critical Issues*, Department of Adult and Higher Education, University of Manchester, Manchester.
- Sutherland P., Crowther J. (eds.), (2008), *Lifelong learning. Concepts and contexts*, Routledge, London.
- Tight M., (1998), *Bridging the “learning divide”. The nature and politics of participation*, “Studies in the Education of Adults”, 30(2).
- Welton M., (1993), *Social revolutionary learning. The new social movements as learning sites*, “Adult Education Quarterly” 43(3).
- Wenger E., (1998), *Communities of practice. Learning, meaning, and identity*, Cambridge UP, Cambridge.

Internet sources

- Bell R., Greenspan 2004. Further up the learning curve. NGOs from transition to Brussels, *Environmental Politics*, 13, 1, 194–215. Accessed Feb. 16, 2014. DOI: 10.1080/09644010410001685209
- Bron M. Jr, (2008), Research on education for democratic citizenship in Poland. http://www.dpu.dk/fileadmin/www.dpu.dk/lledcstudy/research/nationalreports/subsites_lllx2dedc_research_20080115110112_poland-reaearch-bron_wb1_final.pdf
- Bron M. Jr, & Fennes H., (2008), *Adult Education for Democratic Citizenship: Transnational Analysis of Practices*. Final Report. <http://www.dpu.dk/everest/Publications//subsites/lllx2dedc/practice/20080108131655/currentversion/transnational%20analysis%20of%20edc%20practices%20berlin%2020071216.pdf>
- Chioncel N., Jansen T., (2004), *Reviewing education and training for governance and active citizenship in Europe. A Central and Eastern European perspective*. RE_ETGACE Final Report. Available at: <http://repository.uibn.ru.nl/bitstream/2066/19560/1/19560%20%20reviedant.pdf>
- Clarke N., (2005), *Workplace learning environment and its relationship with learning outcomes in healthcare organizations*, “Human Resource Development International” 8, 2, <http://www.tandfonline.com.till.biblextern.sh.se/doi/full/10.1080/13678860500100228#.UqQa5-IuewA> (accessed: Dec. 7, 2013).
- COM (2001), *Commission of the European Communities 2001. Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality*, Luxembourg: Publications Office, 2001, (COM (2001) 678 final, 21.11.2001). Accessed March 18, 2012 at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2001:0678:FIN:EN:PDF>
- Dumitrescu C., (1999), *Non-formal education*. Parliamentary Assembly. Access Jan. 9, 2014 at <http://assembly.coe.int/ASP/Doc/XrefViewHTML.asp?FileID=8807&Language=en>
- Italian Civil Society 2010. *Facing new challenges*, Moro, Giovanni, Ranucci, Roberto, Ruffa, Monica (eds.), 2nd ed., Fondaca. Accessed March 18, 2012 at: http://www.fondaca.org/file/AttivismoCivico/Ricerca/RicercaConcluse/civicus_2_report_finale.pdf

- Marsick V.J., (2009), Toward a unifying framework to support informal learning theory, research and practice, „Journal of Workplace Learning”, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 265-275. DOI 10.1108/13665620910954184 (accessed Jan. 7, 2012).
- Reed M.S., Evely A.C., Cundill G., Fazey I., Glass J., Laing A., Newig J., Parrish B., Prell Ch., Raymond Ch., Stringer L.C., (2010), What is social learning?, “Ecology and Society” 15, 4, <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol15/iss4/resp1/> (accessed Aug. 8, 2012).
- WVS 2005. World Values Survey (2005), Official data file. Madrid (accessible at: www.worldvaluesurvey.org).

Interviews

- Greenpeace Norden, Frida Bengtsson, Nordic sea regional coordinator, March 8, 2012.
- Greenpeace Norden, Markus Power & Ivan Oljelund.
- Greenpeace Poland, Agata Zielińska, volunteer coordinator. Sept. 4, 2012.
- Greenpeace Poland, Robert Bednarski, May 14, 2012.
- Greenpeace Sweden, Therese Jacobson, Arctic campaign manager. March 20, 2012.
- ISP Warszawa (Instytut Spraw Publicznych – Institute of Public Affairs), Małgorzata Koziarek, May 16, 2012.
- PKE, Marek Władysław, May 25, 2012.
- WWF Italy, Milano Office. Maria Antonietta Quadrelli, Head of Transforming Culture Office. Sept. 12, 2012.
- WWF Italy, Veneto Office, Stefano Gazzola, July 13, 2012.
- WWF Poland, Karolina Tymorek, Head – Baltic Sea Protection Project. May 17, 2012.
- WWF Sweden, Inger Näslund, senior conservation officer marine and fishery. Feb. 24, 2012.
- WWF Sweden, Ottilia Thoreson, Manager – WWF Baltic Ecoregion Programme. Feb. 22, 2012 and Sept. 11, 2012.
- WWF Sweden, Pauli Merriman, Director – WWF Baltic Ecoregion Programme. Feb. 22, 2012 and Sept. 11, 2012.