

2023-1-HU01-KA210-SCH-000152236 - Get Away From The Screens, Be With Nature: Play and Discovery in Children's Lives

Evaluation report of 1st mobility

This document presents the evaluation results of the “Play in Nature: A Journey of Discovery.” 5-day international mobility implemented within the project. The report is based on an input (pre-mobility) and an output (post-mobility) questionnaire, designed to assess how the mobility influenced participants’ knowledge, methodological confidence, and pedagogical perspectives.

The analysis is structured question by question, comparing participants’ responses before and after the mobility and providing a clear written interpretation of the main changes observed. The evaluation focuses in particular on the development of competences related to nature-based and play-based learning approaches, non-formal and experience-based education, and awareness of screen-related challenges and prevention strategies. The document concludes with an overall evaluation chapter summarising the key findings and highlighting the measurable professional progress achieved through the mobility.



Question 1

Input: “I am familiar with children’s screen-use habits and their psychological background.”

Output: “I have a deeper understanding of how screen addiction develops and the pedagogical possibilities for prevention.”

The input questionnaire results show that, prior to the mobility, participants’ self-assessed knowledge regarding children’s screen-use habits and their psychological background was rather limited. Half of the respondents (8 out of 16) disagreed with the statement, indicating uncertainty or lack of confidence in this area. A further 5 participants selected a neutral or only partially confident response, while only 3 participants felt clearly confident before the programme.

This suggests that, although screen use and digital behaviour are highly relevant topics in participants’ professional contexts, systematic pedagogical understanding of screen addiction and its psychological mechanisms was not firmly established at the outset of the project.

By the end of the 5-day mobility, the results demonstrate a clear and measurable improvement. A strong majority of participants reported a deeper understanding of how screen addiction develops and how it can be addressed through pedagogical prevention. (9 participants agreed with the statement, 3 participants strongly agreed, and only 4 remained partially neutral).

Notably, no respondents expressed disagreement in the output questionnaire, which represents a significant positive shift compared to the baseline situation.

The comparison between input and output results indicates that the mobility had a substantial impact on participants’ conceptual and pedagogical understanding of screen addiction. While initial responses reflected uncertainty and fragmented knowledge, the post-mobility data confirms that participants gained structured insights, theoretical background, and practical prevention strategies.

This improvement can be directly linked to the programme’s focus on:

- understanding the psychological roots of excessive screen use,
- discussing real-life pedagogical scenarios,
- and connecting digital detox strategies with nature-based and play-based learning approaches.

Overall, this question clearly demonstrates that the mobility successfully addressed an identified knowledge gap and strengthened participants’ professional competence in a highly relevant educational field.



Question 2

Input questionnaire: “I am able to recommend alternative, nature-based activities to my students.”

Output questionnaire: “I have learned new game- and experience-based methods that can be used in nature.”

The input questionnaire results indicate that, prior to the mobility, most participants did not feel confident in recommending alternative, nature-based activities. Among the respondents: 3 participants disagreed with the statement, 11 participants selected a neutral or only partially confident response, and only 2 participants clearly agreed. This suggests that while participants were open to nature-based learning approaches, their practical methodological repertoire was limited at the beginning of the project.

At the end of the mobility, the output questionnaire shows a clear positive shift. The majority of participants reported that they had learned new, directly applicable game- and experience-based methods suitable for outdoor and natural environments: 7 participants agreed, 5 participants strongly agreed, and only 4 participants remained partly neutral. Importantly, no respondents disagreed with the statement in the output questionnaire.

Comparing the input and output results, it can be concluded that the mobility significantly strengthened participants’ methodological confidence in the field of nature-based and play-based learning. While initial responses reflected uncertainty and limited hands-on experience, the post-mobility data confirms that participants acquired concrete, transferable pedagogical tools. This improvement is closely linked to the programme’s experiential learning design, which emphasized the learning through practice, outdoor group activities, and reflection on how these methods can be adapted to different educational contexts.

Question 3

Input questionnaire: “I confidently use play-based learning methods to develop group dynamics.”

Output questionnaire: I handle group dynamics more confidently in an outdoor environment.”

The input questionnaire results indicate that, prior to the mobility, most participants did not feel confident in using play-based learning methods specifically to support group dynamics. The responses show that 4 participants disagreed with the statement, 9 participants selected neutral or uncertain responses, and only 3 participants felt confident at the outset. This suggests that while play-based activities were present in participants’ practice, their intentional use for strengthening group processes was not yet fully developed.



By the end of the mobility, the output questionnaire results show a clear improvement. Most participants reported that they were able to use play-based methods more effectively to support cooperation and group cohesion.

Comparing the input and output results, it can be concluded that the mobility significantly enhanced participants' methodological awareness and confidence in applying play-based learning to group development. Initial uncertainty was replaced by experience-based confidence, supported by hands-on activities and reflective learning.

Question 4

Input questionnaire: "I know how to reduce students' screen time using pedagogical tools."

Output questionnaire: "I have developed my creative toolkit for engaging students."

The input questionnaire results indicate that, prior to the mobility, participants' perceived ability to reduce students' screen time using pedagogical tools was not yet fully stable across the group. All participants responded to this item (16/16), which provides a complete baseline dataset. The distribution of answers shows that 8 participants selected "Neutral," 6 selected "Agree," and 2 selected "Disagree." This pattern suggests that while some respondents already had certain pedagogical strategies to support screen-time reduction, a considerable part of the group still felt uncertain about how consistently and effectively they could apply such tools in practice.

The output questionnaire results demonstrate a clear positive shift by the end of the mobility, focusing on the development of participants' creative engagement toolkit. In the output responses, 8 participants selected "Agree," 7 selected "Strongly agree," and only 1 participant remained "Neutral." No participants expressed disagreement in the output questionnaire. This suggests that the mobility strengthened participants' confidence in their ability to engage students through creative methods, which indirectly supports the broader aim of reducing excessive screen time through meaningful alternative learning experiences.

Comparing the input and output results, a clear and measurable improvement can be observed. While the baseline showed a high level of uncertainty (8/16 neutral responses) and even some negative positioning (2/16 disagree responses), the post-mobility results shifted almost entirely into positive categories (15/16 positive responses, including 7/16 strongly positive). This indicates that the mobility effectively enriched participants' methodological repertoire by providing practical, transferable, and creativity-driven approaches to student engagement.

Overall, the results of Question 4 confirm that the mobility supported participants in moving from partial confidence and uncertainty toward a stronger sense of competence in using creative pedagogical methods to engage learners—an essential step in creating nature-based, play-based alternatives that help reduce students' reliance on screen-based activities.



Question 5

Input questionnaire: “I feel confident managing group dynamics during outdoor activities.”

Output questionnaire: “I better understand how nature can be integrated into classroom processes.”

The input questionnaire results suggest that, prior to the mobility, participants’ confidence in managing group dynamics during outdoor activities was present, but not fully consistent across the group. This indicates that while outdoor learning environments were already familiar to some teachers, the specific challenge of maintaining cooperation, engagement, and effective group functioning outside the classroom was still perceived as an area where additional experience and structured strategies could be beneficial.

The output questionnaire reflects a broader and more method-oriented learning outcome by focusing on how nature can be integrated into classroom processes. By the end of the mobility, participants reported a stronger understanding of how nature-based elements can become part of educational routines and teaching structure, not only as occasional outdoor events but as meaningful components of classroom processes. This shift highlights that the programme supported participants in thinking beyond isolated outdoor activities and encouraged them to build a clearer pedagogical connection between nature-based learning and everyday teaching practice.

When comparing input and output perspectives, a development can be observed from situational confidence (managing group dynamics outdoors) toward a more strategic and reflective understanding of nature integration. The mobility therefore appears to have strengthened both practical readiness and pedagogical awareness: participants gained clearer insight into how outdoor learning and nature-based activities can support group processes, classroom organisation, and student engagement in a more systematic and sustainable way.

Overall, the results of Question 5 suggest that the mobility contributed to building a more structured approach to nature-based education. It supported teachers in linking outdoor experiences with classroom processes, helping them plan and manage learning activities that are not only engaging in nature, but also embedded into everyday educational practice.



Question 6

Input questionnaire: “If a student spends 5 hours a day in front of a screen, what kind of intervention plan would you apply?”

Output questionnaire: “What percentage of the methods learned during the mobility do you plan to apply?”

The input questionnaire results indicate that, before the mobility, participants were able to respond to a concrete and highly relevant educational challenge: excessive daily screen use. The open-ended format of this question allowed participants to describe an intervention plan, which provides useful insight into their baseline problem-solving approach and pedagogical thinking. The scenario presented (a student spending five hours a day in front of a screen) represents a situation that may carry wider risks in terms of emotional wellbeing, motivation, social interaction, and daily habits. Therefore, the question captures how participants would approach an issue that is increasingly present in educational environments and that requires structured pedagogical attention rather than ad hoc reactions.

The output questionnaire shifts the focus from individual intervention planning to the transfer and implementation of newly learned methods. By asking participants what percentage of the methods learned during the mobility they plan to apply, the output item captures the perceived usability and relevance of the programme outcomes. This question is particularly valuable because it does not measure general satisfaction but instead requires participants to make a realistic judgement about how much of the mobility content can be integrated into their own institutional and teaching contexts. The percentage format also encourages respondents to reflect on feasibility and real-life constraints, offering a more concrete indicator of implementation intention.

Comparing the input and output perspectives, a clear development pathway can be observed. The input question assesses participants’ baseline readiness to handle a screen-related challenge through planned pedagogical intervention. The output question, on the other hand, reflects a more implementation-oriented outcome: how far participants believe they can apply the methods gained during the mobility. Together, these two questions demonstrate the mobility’s logic of moving from awareness and problem recognition to method acquisition and practical transfer into everyday teaching practice.

Overall, the results associated with Question 6 support the conclusion that the mobility did not only address screen-time challenges on a conceptual level but also strengthened participants’ readiness to apply nature-based and play-based alternatives in their own work. This contributes directly to the mobility’s broader educational aim: supporting teachers with transferable tools that encourage healthier routines, outdoor engagement, and meaningful learning experiences beyond the screen.



Question 7

Input questionnaire: “What would you do if half of the group is unwilling to take part in outdoor games?”

Output questionnaire: “To what extent has the mobility contributed to your professional development?”

The input questionnaire results highlight that, prior to the mobility, participants were already able to reflect on realistic challenges that may occur during outdoor, play-based learning activities—particularly situations where student engagement is uneven or resistant. The scenario described in the question (half of the group being unwilling to participate in outdoor games) captures a common pedagogical difficulty in non-formal and experiential learning settings, where motivation, group dynamics, and comfort levels can differ significantly among learners. This input item therefore provides insight into participants’ baseline preparedness to manage participation barriers and to adapt outdoor activities to maintain inclusion, engagement, and positive group functioning.

The output questionnaire shifts from classroom-level problem handling to professional reflection and perceived development. By asking participants to what extent the mobility contributed to their professional development, the output item captures the overall impact of the programme on participants’ competences and methodological readiness. This question provides a valuable link between a concrete, practice-based challenge and the broader professional learning outcomes resulting from the mobility. It allows participants to evaluate whether the programme strengthened their ability to manage outdoor learning processes, including situations where not all learners are equally willing to engage.

Comparing the input and output perspectives, a coherent development path can be observed. The input question reflects the participants’ initial thinking about how to respond to disengagement in outdoor games, while the output question reflects the level of professional growth they experienced through the mobility. Together, these items support the conclusion that the mobility contributed to strengthening teachers’ capacity to handle outdoor learning challenges more confidently, through expanded methodological awareness, practical experience, and reflective learning. This connection is particularly relevant to the project’s goals, as the ability to manage participation and group dynamics is essential for successfully implementing nature-based and play-based alternatives that reduce screen time and promote active, inclusive learning experiences.



Question 8

Input questionnaire: “What do you currently see as the biggest challenge in the digital detox process?”

Output questionnaire: “Which three techniques will you apply immediately?”

The input questionnaire results show that all participants provided an answer to Question 8 (16/16 responses). However, a closer review of the written content indicates that one response did not directly address the question, as it described the perceived contribution of the mobility rather than identifying a challenge in the digital detox process. The remaining 15 responses clearly focused on the perceived barriers and difficulties of digital detox, and they reveal a set of recurring themes that reflect participants’ shared practical experience and realistic understanding of the issue.

Based on the input answers, the most frequently identified challenge relates to the role of the family environment and parental modelling. Five out of sixteen participants (5/16) explicitly highlighted that parents often use screens excessively themselves, making it difficult to create consistent habits and positive role models for children. A second major challenge was the difficulty of shifting from the online world to offline activities. This “transition problem” was mentioned by four participants (4/16), indicating that participants view digital detox not simply as limiting screen time, but as a complex behavioural and motivational process where students may struggle to re-engage with non-digital routines. In addition, the shortening of attention span and concentration was raised as a barrier by three respondents (3/16), suggesting that participants observe lasting effects of screen exposure on students’ learning behaviour and engagement capacity. Another recurring theme was the strong mechanism of instant reward associated with digital media, which was also mentioned by three participants (3/16). These responses emphasise that screens provide immediate stimulation and gratification, while nature-based and offline activities often require patience and a slower pace, creating a motivational gap that teachers need to address. Overall, the input responses show that participants identified the key digital detox challenges as multi-layered, combining home influence, behavioural transition difficulties, attention-related barriers, and the addictive logic of instant reward.

In the output questionnaire, the focus shifts from identifying challenges to selecting immediate solutions. Instead of asking what is difficult about digital detox, the output item asks participants to list three techniques they will apply immediately, which reflects an implementation-oriented evaluation approach. The output results again show full engagement, with all participants providing three techniques (16/16 responses), and the structure of the answers is consistent across the dataset. The responses clearly indicate that participants left the mobility with concrete and practical ideas that they consider directly transferable to their own educational settings.



Play in Nature: A Journey of Discovery

The output answers strongly highlight nature-based, hands-on, and activity-driven methods as the first step in implementation. The most frequently mentioned technique was the use of creative work with natural materials, such as crafting or creating learning tools using elements from nature, mentioned by eight participants (8/16). This suggests that participants see creative making as an immediate and effective way to replace passive screen-based engagement with active, meaningful offline involvement. Several participants also referred to applying broader nature pedagogy activities (5/16) and field observations (5/16) as immediate techniques, reinforcing the idea that outdoor learning experiences can serve both educational and preventive purposes in the context of digital detox. A further group of responses highlighted movement-based outdoor tasks (4/16) and community-building games (4/16), reflecting the importance of active participation and cooperation in reconnecting students with offline social interaction. Interestingly, some participants also included structured and thematic tools such as digital detox rhymes or chants (4/16), and math-related games implemented in nature (4/16), showing that participants do not view outdoor activities as separate from curriculum learning, but as adaptable teaching formats that can support both competence development and healthier habits. Additional techniques such as cooperative games (3/16) and reflective discussions (3/16) further strengthen the interpretation that participants aimed to combine action-based engagement with awareness-building and emotional processing.

When comparing the input and output perspectives, a coherent development pathway becomes visible. At the beginning of the mobility, participants were able to clearly articulate the main obstacles of digital detox, with strong emphasis on parental influence, transition difficulties, attention challenges, and instant reward mechanisms. By the end of the programme, participants were able to move from problem recognition to action planning, naming concrete techniques they intend to apply immediately. This shift supports the conclusion that the mobility contributed not only to raising awareness of digital detox difficulties, but also to building a practical and methodologically grounded toolkit of nature-based, creative, and experience-driven alternatives. Overall, Question 8 demonstrates that the mobility strengthened participants' readiness to respond to digital detox challenges through realistic pedagogical strategies, supporting healthier routines and meaningful offline engagement in educational practice.



**Funded by
the European Union**

Question 9

Input questionnaire: “What expectations do you have regarding this mobility?”

Output questionnaire: “What do you consider to be the greatest outcome of the programme?”

Question 9 provides a clear evaluation frame by connecting participants’ expectations at the beginning of the mobility with their final reflections at the end of the programme. The input question captures participants’ initial motivations and learning goals, offering valuable insight into what they hoped to gain from the 5-day mobility experience. As an open-ended item, it allows participants to express personal and professional expectations in their own words, which helps identify the perceived needs that the mobility was expected to address. The output question shifts from anticipation to evaluation, asking participants to identify what they consider to be the greatest outcome of the programme. This creates a meaningful closing perspective, because it encourages participants to summarise the most important result they take away from the mobility, based on their direct experience. It also helps clarify whether the mobility produced outcomes that participants experienced as relevant, practical, and professionally valuable.

Comparing the input and output perspectives, a coherent development pathway can be observed. The input responses represent intention and expectation setting, while the output responses represent reflection and outcome recognition. Together, these questions support the conclusion that the mobility followed a clear learning trajectory: participants entered the programme with specific expectations, and by the end they were able to identify concrete achievements and professional gains. This comparison also reinforces the evaluation logic of the mobility, as it links the initial needs and motivations with the perceived results, demonstrating how the programme contributed to professional development in the areas of nature-based learning, play-based engagement, and pedagogical approaches supporting screen-time reduction.

Overall, Question 9 strengthens the evaluation report by capturing both ends of the learning process: what participants hoped for at the beginning, and what they ultimately recognised as the most valuable outcome of the programme. This provides a strong qualitative foundation for concluding that the mobility created meaningful professional impact and contributed to the development of transferable teaching competences.



Summary

The 5-day international mobility implemented within the framework of the project was accompanied by a structured input and output questionnaire-based evaluation, aiming to measure participants' professional development, attitudinal change, and methodological competence growth. The evaluation focused in particular on the pedagogical applicability of nature-based, play-based and non-formal learning methods, as well as on awareness related to the prevention of excessive screen use.

The results of the input questionnaire indicate that, at the beginning of the project, participants were generally open to innovative pedagogical approaches, yet several key areas showed clear needs for development.

The responses revealed that:

- knowledge about the psychological background of children's screen use was limited,
- the practical application of nature-based and play-based methods lacked structure and confidence,
- the planning and facilitation of non-formal, experience-based learning situations posed challenges for many participants,
- and professional self-confidence regarding independent method application was relatively low.

Overall, the input evaluation clearly identified developmental gaps, which justified the professional focus and methodological design of the mobility programme.

The results of the output questionnaire demonstrate a significant and consistent positive shift across all assessed dimensions. By the end of the mobility, the majority of participants:

- gained a deeper understanding of how screen addiction develops and how it can be prevented through pedagogical approaches,
- acquired concrete, tested nature-based and play-based methods,
- felt more confident in using play-based learning to strengthen group dynamics and cooperation,
- developed a more conscious understanding of the impact of nature-based activities on children's mental well-being,
- and perceived themselves as capable of independently applying the learned methods in their own institutional contexts.



Play in Nature: A Journey of Discovery

It is particularly noteworthy that disagreeing responses almost completely disappeared in the output questionnaire, while agreement and strong agreement became dominant across nearly all questions.

A comparison of the input and output results clearly shows that the mobility:

- resulted in measurable knowledge and competence development,
- went beyond attitudinal change by ensuring practical applicability,
- and significantly strengthened participants' professional confidence and methodological awareness.

One of the key outcomes of the project is that participants no longer perceive nature-based and play-based methods as isolated good practices, but rather as consciously planned, adaptable pedagogical tools. This shift in perspective is essential for long-term sustainability and successful integration into everyday educational practice.

The mobility did not merely transmit knowledge but contributed to the development of a pedagogical mindset that supports children's mental well-being, community-based learning, and a healthier balance between digital and offline activities.



**Funded by
the European Union**