RESULT 1 & QUALITY ASSURANCE

Consolidated Focus Group Report Template

A template for combining the three national focus group reports into one set of cross-country findings and design recommendations.

Co-funded by the European Union

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

G-PRO · Green Prompt · Erasmus+ KA210-ADU · Project number 2025-1-PT01-KA210-ADU-000355316 · Free open educational resource · g-pro.elnlab.eu

RESULT 1 & QUALITY ASSURANCE

Consolidated Focus Group Report Template

A template for combining the three national focus group reports into one set of cross-country findings and design recommendations.

How to use this template

RRINOVA OÜ (P2) prepares the consolidated report using the three national reports from Portugal, Estonia and Poland. The report compares findings across countries and turns them into shared recommendations for the G-PRO game, handbook and training.

Text in italics is guidance; replace it with your own content. Aim for about 12 to 18 pages.

NOTE

Use only the information in the national reports. Do not add new data or participant details. Quote national reports using participant codes only.

Cover information

Project: G-PRO – Green Prompt: Promoting Healthy & Sustainable Ageing Through AI and Interactive Learning

Programme: Erasmus+ KA210-ADU Small-scale Partnership in Adult Education

Prepared by: _____

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

Version: _____

1. Executive summary

One page. Summarise the purpose, the overall participation, the main shared themes, the key differences between countries, and the top five recommendations. Write this section last.

2. Purpose of the consolidated report

Explain that this report brings together the national focus group findings and provides evidence-based recommendations for the design of the G-PRO game, the handbook and the training activities.

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

3. Methodology overview

Briefly summarise the shared methodology: aims, target groups, 90-minute session format, surveys, scenario activity, and simple thematic analysis. Note any differences in how partners carried out the focus groups.

Country	Partner	Number of sessions	Mode	Seniors taking part	Educators taking part
Portugal	P1 Associação de Melhoramentos e Bem Estar Social de Pias (AMBESP)				
Estonia	P2 RRINOVA OÜ				
Poland	P3 Fundacja Edu Active				
Total					

3.1 Synthesis method

Describe how the national themes were compared, for example by listing all national themes, grouping similar ones, and noting where they appear in one, two or all three countries.

4. Combined participant profile

Combine the summary tables from each national report. Use counts only.

Characteristic	Portugal	Estonia	Poland	Total
Seniors aged 60–69				
Seniors aged 70–79				
Seniors aged 80 or over				
Seniors using the internet every day				
Seniors who had used an AI tool before				
Educators with more than 5 years' experience				
Educators using AI tools in their own work				

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

5. Survey results across countries

5.1 Seniors

Survey item	Portugal average	Estonia average	Poland average	Overall average
I know what AI is				
I have used an AI tool				
I would like to learn more about AI				
I try to save water at home				
I try to save energy at home				
I sort my rubbish for recycling				
I think about the environment when I shop				
I enjoy learning with games				

5.2 Educators

Survey item	Portugal average	Estonia average	Poland average	Overall average
I understand what AI is and how it works in simple terms				
I use AI tools in my own work				
I feel confident teaching seniors about AI				
I include sustainability topics in my teaching				
I use games or gamification with adult learners				
I know how to adapt digital learning for seniors				

Comment on the main patterns. With small groups, treat differences as indications, not proof.

6. Cross-country themes

6.1 Shared themes

Themes found in all three countries.

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

Theme	Description	PT	EE	PL	Example evidence

6.2 Themes found in some countries

Theme	Description	Countries	Possible reasons for difference

6.3 Differences between seniors and educators

Describe where seniors and educators agree and where they see things differently.

7. Findings by research question

7.1 Views and knowledge of AI

Synthesise across countries.

7.2 Sustainability habits and green ageing

Synthesise across the five themes: Water, Energy, Nature, Recycling, Shopping.

7.3 Barriers to digital learning

Synthesise digital, physical, emotional, social and language barriers.

7.4 Response to early game concepts

Synthesise responses to the G-P-R-O stages (Green Literacy, Prompt Intelligence, Real-World Reasoning, Own It) and the ASK–EVALUATE–DECIDE method.

7.5 Educators' needs

Synthesise what educators need to teach AI and sustainability to seniors.

8. Consolidated recommendations

Combine and prioritise the national recommendations. Show which countries support each one. Indicate who in the partnership is responsible for acting on it.

8.1 For the G-PRO game

Recommendation	Supported by	Priority	Responsible partner	Action taken

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

8.2 For the G-PRO handbook

Recommendation	Supported by	Priority	Responsible partner	Action taken

8.3 For the educator training and senior workshops

Recommendation	Supported by	Priority	Responsible partner	Action taken

8.4 For accessibility and inclusion

Recommendation	Supported by	Priority	Responsible partner	Action taken

TIP

Keep the "Action taken" column up to date during development. It shows how the focus group findings shaped the final tools.

9. Limitations

Note limitations across the study, such as small sample sizes, differences in delivery between countries, and translation of quotes.

10. Conclusions and next steps

Summarise the main messages and explain how and when the recommendations will be used in game development, handbook writing and the training programme.

Approval

Partner	Name of reviewer	Date approved
P1 AMBESP		
P2 RRINOVA OÜ		
P3 Fundacja Edu Active		

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