



Report of the study session held by  
**Rural Youth Europe and European Council of Young Farmers**

in co-operation with the  
European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe

European Youth Centre Budapest

This report gives an account of various aspects of the study session. It has been produced by and is the responsibility of the educational team of the study session. It does not represent the official point of view of the Council of Europe.

## Democritical

### Team:

Eelin Hoffström-Cagiran	RYEurope	Course director
Anja Mager	RYEurope	Facilitator
Alessia Musumarra	CEJA	Facilitator
Fiona Lally	CEJA	Facilitator
Armine Movsesyan	RYEurope	Facilitator
Jesse van de Woestijne		
Natalia Chardymova	ECYB	Educational advisor

Rural Youth Europe  
+358 4523 45629  
office@ruralyoutheurope.com  
www.ruralyoutheurope.com

CEJA  
+32 (0)2 230 42 10  
allusers@ceja.eu  
www.ceja.eu



## Table of Contents

<b>1. Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>54</b>
<b>2. Introduction</b> .....	<b>65</b>
2.1 Background to the session .....	65
2.2 Aims and objectives .....	65
2.3 Profile of the participants.....	76
2.4 Presentation of the organisations .....	76
2.5 Presentation of the topic .....	87
2.6 How Democritical connects to the work of the Council of Europe .....	87
<b>3. Results and conclusions</b> .....	<b>87</b>
3.1 Main findings and conclusions .....	87
3.2 Suggestions for the CoE Youth Department when working with rural youth .....	98
3.3 Contribution of the session to the programme/mission of the Youth Department of the Council of Europe .....	109
3.4 Follow-up foreseen by the organisations.....	109
<b>4. Programme – inputs and discussions</b> .....	<b>1110</b>
4.1 Monday & Tuesday .....	1110
4.2 Wednesday.....	1211
4.3 Thursday.....	1312
4.4 Friday and Saturday.....	1312
<b>5. Action plans</b> .....	<b>1615</b>
5.1 Group: “Toolbox” .....	1615
5.2 Group: “Better image of the rural area” .....	1746
5.3 Group: “Equal education” .....	1746
5.4 Group: “Decentralisation – Benefits for local communities” .....	1746
5.5 Group: “Jobs in rural areas” .....	1817
<b>6. Appendices</b> .....	<b>1918</b>
6.1 Appendix 1 – Biggest learning moments.....	1918
6.2 Appendix 3 – Programme.....	19
6.5 Appendix 5 – Pictures.....	21

## 1. Executive Summary

The year of 2019 is the year of elections as several European countries host national elections as well as the European Parliamentary elections. The year of 2019 is also a year that sees the raise of right-wing nationalist movements supported by fake news and populism. This year is also one in the line of years where rural youth have seen power disappear from local decision making into national and European institutions, where the rural youth feel they do not have a say. With this in mind we introduced the collaboration between Rural Youth Europe and the European Council of Young Farmers in attempt to raise awareness among the young people in our organisations on their role in Democracy.

The Democritical study session collected participants from Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Finland, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Netherlands, United Kingdom, Norway, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden, to discuss democratic processes and the barriers that rural youth face in taking part in these processes. The unique collaboration between RYEurope and CEJA strengthened the partnership between the two organisations, introduced CEJA to the study session scheme and helped the study session reach the special interest group of rural youth.

Rural Youth are in many ways privileged to grow in tight knit, small and safe communities, close to nature. However, in majority-based societies, that seeks the benefit for the most amount of people in the least amount of time, the rural communities struggle with lacks of access to education, services and public institutions. These restrictions in turn limit the rural population's engagement in democratic processes, and increase the distrust in the democratic system where their voices are seldom heard. Rural youth are especially vulnerable to misinformation and fake news that influence their decision making and actions in society. However, it is also important to notice that rural youth have better chances to have their voices heard in their local context and can easily advocate for small scale solutions to their issues. In the rural context little change can reap big benefits. Therefore, we see that the sharing of experience among rural youth is essential in the development of rural areas, which is a topic that both Rural Youth Europe and CEJA feel passionate about.

This study session, created a strong bond both between the participants and the organisations involved, it highlighted rural innovations and gave tools for the young people to engage in the democratic process.

## 2. Introduction

This report wishes to explain what took place during the Democritical study session, as well as the continued collaboration between the participants and the organisations involved. The report is produced by the team behind the study session and aims to inspire rural youth and others to do international collaboration with the aim to increase knowledge about democratic processes and how minorities, such as rural youth, to raise their voices in the democratic arenas and become agents for change and development.

In this report you will find the background and basis on which we built the joint study session, some insight in the content developed, outcomes and finally we will also share the session plans which we used to shape the programme and the flow of the event.

Rural Youth Europe and CEJA had not previously collaboration to this extent on an activity and the Study Session structure allowed both parties bring their strengths and learning points to the table, while engaging with our common target group of rural youth. The study session allowed for both organisations to meet in a neutral setting and to use the facilities of the Budapest youth centre to support the development of common future collaboration and learning opportunities for our members.

### 2.1 Background to the session

Rural Youth Europe and CEJA saw an opportunity for collaboration on a study session that would raise awareness about democratic processes among their members who include young farmers and rural youth in a range of different countries. Young people in rural areas face barriers to participation in democratic processes. Rural Youth Europe and CEJA therefore decided to come together to raise awareness about democratic processes through a study session that would ultimately deepen the knowledge of the participants about democracy and empower them to apply what they learned in their rural areas.

### 2.2 Aims and objectives

The aim of the study session was to understand the complications that rural youth come up against in democratic processes and find innovative and engaging ways to stimulate their participation in these.

The objectives of the study session were the following:

- Learn what democratic process is;
- Analyse how rural youth is involved/not involved in the process and recognise the barriers that hinder rural youth's participation in democratic processes;
- Learn how emotions impact democratic processes;
- Examine the available possibilities and take action;
- Empower rural youth to participate in democratic processes.

### 2.3 Profile of the participants

The 33 participants, aged 18 to 32, came from 16 different countries, some of which are EU Member States, some not. Each participant was a member of an organisation in either Rural Youth Europe or CEJA or both.

All participants were active in their organisations and had experience of youth work. They were interested in working on the study session's aim and objectives, motivated to develop knowledge and skills, and to share experiences with other participants.

### 2.4 Presentation of the organisations

Rural Youth Europe (RYEurope) is a European NGO for rural youth established in 1957 and working to promote and activate young people in the countryside. It provides international training possibilities and works as an intermediary between national organisations, youth organisations and public institutions on a European level. Rural Youth Europe is a member-led organisation: democratically constituted and led by young people for young people. It has 20 members' organisations in 17 countries and represents around 500,000 young people around Europe.

The European Council of Young Farmers (CEJA) acts as a forum for dialogue between young farmers and European decision makers, aiming at promoting a younger and innovative agricultural sector across Europe and creating good working and living conditions for young people setting up in farming and those who are already young farmers. Established in 1958, CEJA represents around 2 million young farmers from 23 countries and 32 national member organisations.

## 2.5 Presentation of the topic

Rural youth is a demographic that does not traditionally have a high participation rate in voting in elections or taking part in democratic processes more broadly. Young people in rural areas face barriers to their involvement in democratic processes, both physical and psychological. Emotion-based decision-making, for example, catalysed by social media and the media in general through misinformation, contributes to this situation.

Young people in rural areas are often unaware of their rights and the possibilities of actively participating in the development of their local realities. The “Democritical” study session, therefore, aimed to address these barriers by examining democracy, analysing the impact of emotion-based decision-making on the daily lives of rural youth and finding innovative ways of empowering them to overcome these barriers and participate more actively in democratic processes.

## 2.6 How Democritical connects to the work of the Council of Europe

The main pillars of activity for the Council of Europe are Human Rights, Democracy and Rule of Law. By focusing on Democratic participation, we looked closer at the second pillar and the different ways young people from rural Europe can play an active part in their communities and have their voices heard in society.

## 3. Results and conclusions

Within this section we focus on our findings during the study session.

### 3.1 Main findings and conclusions

Many young people from rural areas feel lost in the majority driven democracy, where many decisions, that affect their life, are taken far away from them and where they represent a minority whose worries and challenges are often overlooked. With the Democritical study session we introduced tools that many of the participants did not even know were at their disposal, and increased the participants’ notion of agency in society.

We found through the study session out a lot about the different ways that rural youth across Europe view the democratic system they live in. We learnt that already by actively engaging in the activities of NGOs and other civil society organisations is a way of working for the democracy. Raising awareness of issues related to their lives and the local realities they face, help in the public decision making and lead to activism even on a political level.



The participants also learnt that the elections are a tool for democracy, but that it is one of many, no less important. Not all people in the society have a vote, and not all vote, but that the best way to support a healthy democracy is to encourage voting also among people who do not see the relevance of their vote.

In our evaluation we asked the participants to share their biggest learning moments from the study session (appendix 1). These showed the importance of sharing experiences, because the participants found the discussions between and during the sessions to be very fruitful for understanding how things work in relation democracy in the different countries. Another major learning moment the participants highlighted was the different tools, like lobbying and campaigning. We brought in experts to highlight these sessions as we believed an outside perspective was beneficial for the group, as well as in an effort to deepen the knowledge of the participants. With the expertise of Fiona and Jesse from the team, we also developed the participants' knowledge on media's role in establishing and carrying out emotion-based decision making. This was further developed by interviewing local students at two different universities in Budapest. This initiative was not only appreciated as the participants had a chance to explore another part of Budapest, besides the touristic one, but also because this gave them a moment to reflect on the situation outside the study session group and the participants own experience.

### 3.2 Suggestions for the CoE Youth Department when working with rural youth

The target group of rural youth, and in our case the emphasis of rural youth involved in agriculture as 50% of the participants were representing CEJA, is unique. The young people from rural areas and especially in farming are not always inclined to participate in activities like the study session, as being away for a longer period of time can be a great burden for a farm, where animals and crops are dependent on constant care. This means that the participants who decided to join the Democritical study session, found the topic and the setting to valuable and rewarding enough to join. As a team we were aware of this and it made us work hard to make sure that the participants felt like it was a gainful experience that gave them new insights.

It is often said that rural youth suffer from isolation, due to the distances to quality education, services and social experiences. The young people feel a frustration in having to fight for the rights to broad band, access to shops, and venues for meeting their peers.

Therefore, it is important not to underestimate the importance of simple get-togethers outside the official programs where the participants may relax, get to know each other and also share about their lives. The rural youth know how to use the socialising situations to their advantage and this turned the free evenings and especially the international buffet to an important moment for socialising and team building. That added to the pride the young farmers felt in sharing their own or local produce with other youth across Europe, made the evening even more special.

Rural youth have experience on how one person's involvement can make a difference, as they often come from small communities, where their activity can help develop the lives of the other people around them quite significantly. Thus, it is important to take the experience and knowledge of the rural participants into consideration and learn from their small-scale examples, which in turn can come to benefit the bigger communities.

### 3.3 Contribution of the session to the programme/mission of the Youth Department of the Council of Europe

The Council of Europe intends, for example through its Directorate of Democratic Participation, HRE tools and programmes, to enable young Europeans to participate effectively in today's diverse and complex democratic societies. It helps individuals to acquire the attitudes, skills, values, critical understanding and knowledge required to participate in democratic society. This study session focused and built on that work by encouraging young people in rural areas to participate in democratic processes, and providing young people with the competences that may enable them to overcome the barriers to participation and become better at critically analysing the factors that prevent and discourage them from participating.

### 3.4 Follow-up foreseen by the organisations

Due to the success of the study session and the positive collaboration between the organising bodies, it is hoped that similar projects to these can be arranged and implemented in the near future. CEJA is committed to continuing to work on increasing the capacity and involvement of young people in rural areas in democratic processes. Whereas, Rural youth Europe is continuously working on capacity building of rural youth within the non-formal and human rights education framework.

#### 4. Programme – inputs and discussions

Before the actual study session, the team met for the first time face to face in Budapest in December 2018 for the preparatory meeting. During the meeting the roles and flow of the study session was established. We also decided on the participant profile and discussed the delivery of sessions. After the meeting the preparatory team developed the session content and had various Skype meetings deciding on methods and work division during the study session programme.

In this section we will describe the content of the study session in greater detail and the precise methodology can be read in the appendix section (Appendix 2).

##### 4.1 Monday & Tuesday

Having gathered the participants and the facilitators' team, the kick-off day started with several introductions about the Study Session, the partner organisations (RYEurope/CEJA), Council of Europe and European Youth Centre Budapest.

The participants discussed and clarified together the aims and objectives of the programme, through non-formal educational methodology shared thoughts about their expectations of the study session and made up the rules of the programme.

In addition, the team of trainers prepared several ice-breakers and non-formal learning methods for warming up the atmosphere. The participants got to know each other with the help of different ice-breakers, energisers and team-building activities. Soon, the trainers' team started shaping the floor for the topic of the week. At the end of the first programme day, the participants were given a floor for personal sharing their local, rural realities. The participants were encouraged to share realities that reflect living in a rural area. Through several team-building activities they listed strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats regarding democratic processes.

To put it in a nutshell, due to the first programme day, we have reached the goal of building up the team and leading the participants into the workflow of the week.

The second day of the programme started with personal reflections on the definition of democracy. The trainers' team collected various thoughts and definitions from the

participants while using non-formal educational tools. At the end of the first session of the day, the participants acquired a more concrete definition of democracy and started thinking about their level of involvement in democratic processes in their countries. They shared their personal experiences in democratic processes with each other and discussed different levels of participation.

Afterwards, the group explored the barriers and obstacles that they have faced in their realities so far. The participants started to map obstacles and barriers, and make ties between those obstacles and their personal experiences of participation in democratic processes. Having explored both the barriers and the benefits of participation, they realized the consequences of the lack of participation.

While going deeper into the topic, the participants started to explore more about the emotional impact of those barriers and obstacles. They understood their emotional responses when they are not able to participate, explored different outcomes of such responses and, then, explored ways to turn those emotions into motivations to act.

To sum up, the second day of the programme provided the participants with huge information about democratic processes in different countries, existing barriers and obstacles faced with the participants, the forms and the levels of participation in democratic processes and the emotional impact acquired from the mentioned barriers.

#### 4.2 Wednesday

This day was divided into two parts. The first part was about critical thinking and the influence of media, in the second part an expert speaker from the organisation The Good Lobby, came and delivered a session about lobbying.

The first sessions lead by Jesse and Fiona from the team gave an insight in how media uses emotions to engage with the consumers and then twisted this knowledge into practical. In general, the goal to better understand the influence of media on democratic process and how the media uses emotions to present news in different way was reached. The participants took it very well and had an opinion that the first part was very informative, and it opened their mind. The most common comment from them was that they will never ever look on the media with the same eyes. They realised that media indeed uses emotions to influence on us; even more; more than 50% of the news in our newsfeeds are not even 100% real.

The second part of the day divided the group into two parts. One part of the group took this session as the highlight of the week. They described the session as tangible and informative, not just for the week of the study session, but general for the future and for the follow up activities they are going to do after the Study Session in their local organisations. The other part of the group did not really understand the theme and the messenger the expert speaker tried to deliver. They got a bit lost. Even though they did not really understand it, they said that it was useful to hear about it and they will read more the theme soon.

#### 4.3 Thursday

Thursday was also dedicated for an external speaker. Kristen Aigro from European Youth Forum came and delivered a session on campaigning. Why do we do campaign? What's the purpose? How do we do it? What are good examples? The session was very well accepted by the participants. They appreciated the effort she made with showing good, and very different examples from the ones that are professional made from the basis ones. So really every participant had something to take home. Furthermore, she shared her personal experience with failing her own campaign. She explained that even though she did not reach the goal she set with the camping she gained so much experience and that also the participant should not be afraid of failing. It is not always bad. We are the one responsible to turn it around and get the best out of every situation. As mention this really touched the participant and gave them something to think about. After the session on campaigning they had a free afternoon, which helped them to collect all the information, gained through the week and gave them time to relax, and prepare for the rest of the week.

#### 4.4 Friday and Saturday

On Friday, a third pillar of democratic participation was addressed: voting. The morning session touched upon the emotional impact of voting or not be willing or able to vote, and on how citizens can take an active role in advocating for their causes and the right to vote. Working with a concrete (fictional) and relevant simulation, the participants experienced and reflected upon a situation in which they were either voting, willingly not voting or restricted from voting. In three smaller, self-organised working groups, participants then reflected upon the motivations and emotional impact of (not) voting, structured by a number of questions, such as "why do young people (not) vote?", "how do you feel if

someone else votes for you?”, “why is voting important?”, and “what do you think about countries in which voting is mandatory”. The outcomes were presented and briefly discussed in the plenary, followed by a debriefing of the simulation experience on voting or not (being allowed to) vote for the case study. Even though they were visibly engaged in the discussions on voting, participants said that the voting simulation could have been more participatory and applicable to their realities and interests if introduced in more detail. The presentations of the working groups showed the participants’ ability to appreciate (the value of) voting and understand and empathize with people who for various reasons have either lost their trust in voting as an effective mechanism of democratic participation or are unable/not allowed to vote at all.

This session shaped the floor for an outdoor activity that aimed to make a connection with local youth outside of the youth centre and get engaged in conversation with them to see how their perceptions from the morning session related to the motivations of young people in Budapest to (not) vote. In international groups of four, the participants visited two faculties of Hungarian universities in Budapest in order to conduct short interviews with local and international students about their motivations to (not) vote for the European Elections in May 2019. Participants were accompanied and provided with a couple of guiding questions by the facilitators. In three hours, some groups collected a lot of input from talks with local and international young people, whereas others found it difficult to approach people passing by to talk about a loaded topic as elections and voting. One group coincidentally came across and joined a small protest against climate change. In the reflection, sharing and debriefing back at the EYCB, participants emphasized not only the value of learning and understanding about young people’s perceptions on voting and its relation to democratic participation and active citizenship, but also how they learned to make a connection with people they did not know before and adjusted their approaching strategies to facilitate a constructive conversation on a variety of topics that came up. Participants also positively valued the different (outdoor) environment and the time spent in smaller working groups, allowing for a more thorough and personal sharing of the hopes, fears and concerns they are confronted with, related to the topic, back home.

In the late afternoon, action plan groups were formed around a topic – in the form of a common obstacle in the “Gallery of Challenges” – of the participants’ choice. Several topics

were provided based on the outcomes of the sessions, but participants were also given the opportunity to come up with additional areas of interest.

On Saturday, the last day of the Study Session, participants were provided with time and space to prepare their action plans and follow-up activities in small groups around a common obstacle or challenge. After lunch we returned to the plenary where each group was assigned a “feedback group” for the presentations; after every presentation, one group had to provide specific feedback to the group presenting. This method allowed for a more structured and monitored feedback process. The action plans were presented with a short video that the groups uploaded on the Democritical Facebook group page. Among the many creative ideas, there were a Countryside Toolbox to support youth in organizing itself and keep the countryside ~~livable~~liveable for young people, (online) training sessions to develop the educational infrastructure in rural areas, and a promotion video to improve the image of the National Federation of Young Farmers' Clubs. The follow-up section of this report provides more information on action plans and follow-up.

Here below are some quotes of feedback to the study session

*“Thank you, team for the passion. The passion made the week special.”*

“Thank you for inviting us, nice to see this kind of work, to meet new people, experience new ideas. *Thanks to participants.* Good luck in the future.”

“It was nice to see *RYEurope and CEJA together*. Two pretty different organisations shared their experience and I’m thankful for that.”

“I really appreciated it. It was my second session and I did not know what to expect. The group is different, but the experience was the same; I feel I have *a deeper understanding* of everything.”

“I am an idealist. *To meet all of you, gives me energy.* We give a bit of us to others. Thank you for sharing.”

## 5. Action plans

We decided to call the follow up measures as action plans. The aim of the action plan sessions towards the end of the programme was for the participants to think about how they can transform the knowledge they have gotten during the week into concrete actions when they come home. We did not have much of a set format of what the actions should look like but encouraged the participants to take their local realities and capacities into consideration of what change or initiative they would need at home in relation to the topic of democracy.

The working teams gathered according to common interests, we ended up with five different groups each working on a transnational initiative.

### 5.1 Group: "Toolbox"

The action of this group was based on the identification that there is a lack of knowledge among young people as to what their possibilities of participation are. Therefore, the group asked what could be done to remediate this lack and they came up with the "Toolbox". The toolbox would have three key areas festivals, club houses and workshops. The toolbox would include information on how rural youth could set up their own workshops, club houses and workshops. The ultimate aim of this would be to make rural youth feel pride and joy in their surroundings and gain agency in their communities.

The group prepared a promotional video of the toolbox, which they envisioned would be a person having the information and sharing it with the youth directly. While the feasibility of the action relayed heavily on the outside assistance of the toolbox person, the core issues that arose were rural youth's lack of agency in the local context, the distance to social movements and love for the rural environment. While young people appreciate the social environment and the nature of the rural environment they feel they lack knowledge and resources to make or be part of change and development of the rural areas. Also the idea of having an expert you could call for insight on how to organise, especially international, festivals or events or other actions locally, shows that even where these experts are present, they are not well advertised.

In Rural Youth Europe we have developed a learning platform, where young people can find information about how to organise certain events and use the non-formal methodologies we use in our work. The platform is developing and changing to suit the actual needs of young



people in rural areas, and therefore the outcomes of this particular working group was valuable for our work.

#### 5.2 Group: "Better image of the rural area"

This group consisted of the UK young farmers' clubs' representatives, the group had identified a need within their group and decided to work on that rather than the general image of the rural areas. The group shared with the group that the reputation and image of the Young Farmer's clubs across the UK have taken a hit in the last few years, where the media in a follow up to an event, where the crowd control had gotten out of hand, have painted the picture of YFCs being badly behaved youth getting into alcohol infused trouble. This is a big issue for the members as well as the recruitment of new members, as the recent media profiling overshadows the good work the YFCs doing.

The participants of this team envisioned a campaign where they wanted to show the positive actions of the YFC which includes, fundraising for charities, athletic events, training and campaigns on health and well-being of rural youth. The group made a video and a draft plan of how to engage the movement in their local clubs, by sharing testimonials of prominent members in the work of the clubs.

#### 5.3 Group: "Equal education"

The group studied how education could be made more accessible in remote rural areas. The group recognised that the approach to rural education requires the engagement of several stakeholders, including, politicians, business owners, farmers and young people. These would then be core groups in promoting a variety of education initiatives including on-line courses, training camps, educational campaigns and in increased efforts in building educational and research centres in rural areas.

Key to this plan was raising education to be a core concern on different political levels and to look for micro solutions to increase life-long education of the rural areas, rather than one solution suits all.

#### 5.4 Group: "Decentralisation – Benefits for local communities"

The campaign of this group was based on the "old Macdonald had a farm" song and the fact that yes, he HAD a farm. The group expressed their worry in the fact that the decisions and

services are growing ever distant to the people living in the country side, which works as an incentive to making rural people move away.

On national level the rural populations are in minority but the group emphasised that the issues of the few can gain notoriety and become a concern of the many with smart publicity and campaigning, for example based on the image of old Macdonald. The campaign would target most public bodies and encourage certain services instead of continuing to move more central to move out to the country side to improve accessibility for people living in rural areas.

#### 5.5 Group: "Jobs in rural areas"

This group presented the solution tackle the restricted diversity in the rural labour market and brain drain of rural areas. The group presented the initiative of Rural Hubs. These hubs would provide companies with the infrastructure needed for the relocation of their offices to the country side. The campaign to raise funds and awareness of the initiative would engage with prominent members in society, such as CEOs of big corporations, young mayor in a rural town (in Germany), youngest member of the Austrian parliament and young students, the primary target would be small and mid-sized companies that would have an easier time relocating to the rural area.

The group also recognised that the project would be more of a start-up where the outcomes should be measured to know how many new jobs the hub would create, not only directly but also indirectly in supportive infrastructure.

The group also challenged the audience by saying that they should not ask if the project was crazy, but rather if it was crazy enough. Ultimately the group felt that people staying or moving to rural areas would increase their feeling of well-being and life quality, which would justify the move to the companies they work for, as people who feel better also are more productive.

## 6. Appendices

### 6.1 Appendix 1 – Biggest learning moments

#### Biggest Learning Moment during "Democritical"

Mentimeter

Speaker about lobby	Discussing rural coworking spaces during the presentation.	Group works with different kind of people :)
What lobby meant	I can't pinpoint one specific moment, the group discussions and sharing the experiences of other has been my biggest moments!	Lobbying
Sharing moments with other cultures	I just enjoyed learning about lobbying, campaigns, and about media role in democracy.	Throughout session -> exchanging different viewpoints/stories
Discussions between sessions. Especially on friday	The first day when we met each others	Lobbying session was the best for me
Outdoor activity; Reflection group; Campaigning	Learning about the process and importance of voting, along with the barrier and how everyone has a voice and access to supporting organisations	Hearing opinions of those from other countries and organisations. It was also great to learn about a lot of aspects of democracy and the barriers that young rural people face.
I've liked the group work, when we have worked with small projects. It's a good way to learn	Lobby	I think working in groups and as teams with people coming from different countries with different ideas.
Lack of information and lack of interest the Big problema	All discussions besides the program, where I learned how other countries deal with political processes	The cooperation
I have deepened my knowledge in lobbying.	Learning how democracy works in diferent contrules and how to make it better	During this study session I get new skills, knowledge but especially I approve my campaigning and lobbying skills
Working in the teams. And talk about the situation/problems/....	With each exposition, I learnt how different can be youngs around EU and I will bring it to me, ya my rural area. Learning about others let you be more free	The lobbying was interesting but I think all workshops helps me learn and understand different subject. I have not only learned about democracy but also about rural youth all over Europa and learn subjects I never knew of before
The work for the team. And i am understand for the democratic process..	Hearing from those in similar situations and how they overcome the similar barriers to our organisation. Hearing the speakers teach us new methods to adapt to us. A tight team and bond works towards a better future	TOOLBOX
Besides Budapest and the situation of the participants, Campaigning maybe.		



## Democritical

Organised by Rural Youth Europe (RYEurope) and the European Council of Young Farmers (CEJA) in co-operation with the European Youth Centre Budapest

### Day by day programme

#### *Sunday, 24<sup>th</sup> February 2019*

*Arrival of participants*

19:00 Dinner

21:00 Welcome evening

#### *Monday, 25<sup>th</sup> February 2019*

09:00 – 10:30	Opening of the study session and presentation of RYEurope, CEJA and CoE
<b>10:30 – 11:00</b>	<b>Break</b>
11:00 – 12:30	Introduction to the study session: aims & objectives, expectations & programme
<b>12:30 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
14:00 – 15:30	Team building activities: knowing each other!
<b>15:30 – 16:00</b>	<b>Break</b>
16:00 – 17:30	Mapping rural realities
17:30 – 18:10	Reflection group
<b>19:00 – 20:30</b>	<b>Dinner</b>
20:30	Evening activity

#### *Tuesday, 26<sup>th</sup> February 2019*

09:00 – 10:30	Democratic processes: how to define them?
<b>10:30 – 11:00</b>	<b>Break</b>

11:00 – 12:30	Rural youth participation in democratic processes: share your story!
<b>12:30 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
14:00 – 15:30	Barriers and obstacles to democratic participation and processes
<b>15:30 – 16:00</b>	<b>Break</b>
16:00 – 17:30	Emotions: barrier or strength?
17:30 – 18:10	Reflection group
<b>19:30 – 20:30</b>	<b>Dinner</b>
20:30	Evening activity

### ***Wednesday, 27<sup>th</sup> February 2019***

09:00 – 10:30	Critical thinking: the influence of Media
<b>10:30 – 11:00</b>	<b>Break</b>
11:00 – 12:30	Critical thinking: the post-truth society
<b>12:30 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
14:00 – 15:30	Advocacy & lobbying: opportunities for citizens – Mr. Andrea Bocconi (head of Partnership and Education at The Good Lobby)
<b>15:30 – 16:00</b>	<b>Break</b>
16:00 – 17:30	Advocacy & lobbying: opportunities for citizens – Mr. Andrea Bocconi (head of Partnership and Education at The Good Lobby)
17:30 – 18:10	Reflection group
<b>19:30 – 20:30</b>	<b>Dinner</b>
20:30	Evening activity

### ***Thursday, 28<sup>th</sup> February 2019***

09:00 – 10:30	Take action: the civil society campaign – Ms. Kristen Aigro (former board member at the European Youth Forum)
<b>10:30 – 11:00</b>	<b>Break</b>
11:00 – 12:30	Take action: the civil society campaign – Ms. Kristen Aigro (former board member at the European Youth Forum)
<b>12:30 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>

***Free Afternoon in the city***

***19:00 Dinner out in the city***

### ***Friday, 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2019***

09:00 – 10:30	To vote, or not to vote: that is the question!
10:30 – 11:00	Preparing outdoor activity
11:00 – 15:00	Outdoor activity on voting (lunch included)
15:00 – 16:00	Sharing and evaluating the outcomes of the outdoor activity
16:00 – 17:30	Draft of the Action Plan for rural areas
17:30 – 18:10	Reflection group

**19:30 – 20:30**            **Dinner**  
20:30                      Evening activity

***Saturday 2<sup>nd</sup> of March 2019***

09:00 – 10:30            Draft of the Action Plan for rural areas  
**10:30 – 11:00**            **Break**  
11:00 – 12:30            Draft of the Action Plan for rural areas  
**12:30 – 14:00**            **Lunch**  
14:00 – 15:30            Presentation of the final documents  
**15:30 – 16:00**            **Break**  
16:00 – 17:30            Presentation of the final documents  
17:30 – 18:10            Evaluation  
**19:30 – 20:30**            **Dinner**  
20:30                      Evening activity

***Sunday 3<sup>rd</sup> of March 2019***

*Departure of participants*

6.3 Appendix 5 – Pictures











