



*Better youth workers ?*  
***Better citizens?***

**The impact of the pilot courses  
on European Citizenship**

*The participants' perspective*

**Results of the impact survey**

*Conducted by Andreas Karsten*

<b>A. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>B. PARTICIPANTS' PROJECTS ON EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1. THE COURSE PROJECTS .....	4
2. OTHER PROJECTS.....	7
<b>C. CONTACT AMONG PARTICIPANTS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1. GENERAL CONTACT WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS .....	9
2. CONTACT WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS REGARDING YOUTH WORK.....	10
3. WORKING ON PROJECTS WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS .....	11
<b>D. DEVELOPMENT OF PARTICIPANTS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
1. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT .....	12
2. EFFECTS ON THE CAREER OF PARTICIPANTS.....	16
<b>E. FURTHER YOUTH WORKER TRAINING .....</b>	<b>17</b>
1. FURTHER TRAINING OF PARTICIPANTS.....	17
2. RECOMMENDATIONS OF PARTICIPANTS TO OTHER PEOPLE .....	18
<b>F. POSITIONS OF PARTICIPANTS IN YOUTH WORK.....</b>	<b>19</b>
1. POSITION OF PARTICIPANTS IN YOUTH WORK .....	19
2. DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL AND VOLUNTARY YOUTH WORKERS .....	19
<b>G. INTEREST IN THE EVALUATION IMPACT SEMINAR .....</b>	<b>20</b>
1. INTEREST EXPRESSED AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY .....	20
2. PARTICIPATION IN THE EVALUATION IMPACT SEMINAR.....	20
<b>H. PROJECT INDEX .....</b>	<b>21</b>
1. TRAINING COURSE 1 .....	21
2. TRAINING COURSE 2 .....	22
<b>I. QUESTIONNAIRE.....</b>	<b>23</b>
0. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.....	23
1. YOUR PROJECTS .....	24
2. YOU AND THE OTHERS .....	26
3. AND LAST BUT NOT LEAST: YOU .....	26

## A. Introduction

European Citizenship has been the Number One Priority in the Partnership Agreement between the Council of Europe and the European Commission on European Youth Worker Training. During the past three years several publications about European Citizenship were written and published and two pioneering training schemes have been developed and tried out.


One of these training schemes consists of a pilot course on European Citizenship in Youth Work. It intends to support the professional development of experienced youth workers by extending their competencies to integrate European citizenship within their youth work projects and practice.

Developed by a group of experts in 2000 and 2001, the pilot course was run twice, once in October 2001 and a second time in 2002. Both courses were assessed internally, as is usual in the youth sector, and additionally evaluated externally by two participant-observers. The results of the internal evaluations can be found in the notes of relevant team meetings, whereas the findings of both external evaluations have been published in separate documents.

In addition to the entirely formative evaluation so far it was decided to carry out a summative evaluation of the pilot courses as well. Covering – with an impact survey on the one hand and an impact evaluation seminar on the other – both quantitative and qualitative aspects it is expected to analyse the impact of the pilot courses. By relating the results of the summative evaluation with the previously published findings of the formative assessment, specific recommendations can be made on the concept, the curriculum, the implementation and the follow-up of the pilot courses.

This document presents the results of the first part of the summative evaluation process – the impact survey. The survey was carried out in the period between April and June 2003 by means of a questionnaire that was sent to all former participants of the two pilot courses. With feedback rates of 50 % for the first course and 80 % for the second course all results can be seen as fully representative (in total 39 participants of 60 participated in the study - that is an overall response of 65 %).

The results of the impact survey as presented in this document and the conclusions of the Impact Evaluation Seminar will be combined in a final document, which will also contain the main findings of the external evaluations and will most likely be available after the seminar in early autumn 2003.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andreas Karsten'.

Andreas Karsten (author)

## B. Participants' Projects on European Citizenship

### 1. THE COURSE PROJECTS

During both pilot courses participants had to develop a project idea – related to European Citizenship – into a project plan. Consequently the questionnaire invited former participants to reflect on the quality of both: the idea and the plan made.

**Quality of the project idea**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid very good	13	33.3	33.3	33.3
good	13	33.3	33.3	66.7
mediocre	5	12.8	12.8	79.5
bad	4	10.3	10.3	89.7
very bad	4	10.3	10.3	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	

While the majority of respondents believe their project idea's quality to be very good or good, the quality of the developed project plans is assessed considerably lower.

Almost 67 % of all respondents say their project ideas have been very good or good, but only 36 % say the same about their project plans. Barely 13 % evaluate the quality of their project idea as mediocre, but remarkable 41 % place their project plans into this category. Roughly 21 % of all interviewees believe their project ideas were bad or very bad, and approximately the same percentage - 23 % - thinks alike about their project plans.

**Quality of the project plan**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid very good	4	10.3	10.3	10.3
good	10	25.6	25.6	35.9
mediocre	16	41.0	41.0	76.9
bad	6	15.4	15.4	92.3
very bad	3	7.7	7.7	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	

Regarding the quality of the project idea, there are hardly any differences between the two courses noticeable. The only remarkable distinction is indeed, that no participant of the first course believes his or her project idea to be **very** bad, whereas 16.7 % of the respondents from the second course do.

More distinct are the opinions on the quality of project plans.


Participants of the first course assess the quality of their project plans in general significantly better than participants of the second course.

40 % say the project plans of the first course are very good or good, while only 33 % say the same about the project plans of the second course.

**Quality of the project plan \* Course Crosstabulation**

		Course		Total	
		Course 1	Course 2		
Quality of the project plan	very good	Count	1	3	4
		% within Course	6.7%	12.5%	10.3%
	good	Count	5	5	10
		% within Course	33.3%	20.8%	25.6%
	mediocre	Count	6	10	16
		% within Course	40.0%	41.7%	41.0%
	bad	Count	1	5	6
		% within Course	6.7%	20.8%	15.4%
	very bad	Count	2	1	3
		% within Course	13.3%	4.2%	7.7%
Total		Count	15	24	39
		% within Course	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

When it comes to the implementation of the projects as developed during the courses, it needs to be clearly stated that hardly any project has been implemented at all. The clear difference between the assessment of the project idea on the one hand and the project plan on the other hand already suggested what the figures are proving:



Less than one fifth of the participants was or is involved in the implementation of their project as developed during the course. The distinction between the two courses is quite unmistakable: While more than one quarter of the participants from the first course were involved in putting their projects into practise, this is only true for 12.5 % of the participants from the second course. Whether or not this difference can be explained with the time – obviously participants of the first course had six months more time to implement their projects – will be looked at later.

**Course project implemented ? \* Course Crosstabulation**

			Course		Total
			Course 1	Course 2	
Course project implemented ?	yes, implemented already	Count	3	1	4
		% within Course	20.0%	4.2%	10.3%
	yes, implemented at present	Count	1	2	3
		% within Course	6.7%	8.3%	7.7%
	no	Count	11	21	32
		% within Course	73.3%	87.5%	82.1%
<b>Total</b>	Count	15	24	39	
	% within Course	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

One of the underlying reasons for not carrying the course project out can already be observed from the assessments of the quality of the project idea and the project plan. It is striking that in fact for each unsuccessful project there are clear differences between the different members of the project team when it comes to the evaluation of the quality of their project idea and project plan. Already the quality of the idea is not homogeneously assessed, and even less so the project plan.

The contrary is true for the projects which were implemented: At least the quality of the project idea was undisputed in these cases – by every member of the project team.

Needless to say, participants were asked as well for their personal opinion on the reasons which led to the unsuccessfulness of their projects. The results are illustrated on the next page. Since the differences between the two courses are marginal, the replies are shown all together.

<b>Why was the course project not implemented ?</b>		true
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
1. One or more of the persons involved in the planning didn't want to.		25,6
2. One or more of the organisations foreseen for the implementation didn't want to.		12,8
3. We couldn't raise enough funding.		12,8
4. We couldn't find enough partners.		15,4
5. We couldn't find enough participants.		2,6
6. We decided to wait with the implementation.		20,5
7. We decided to start another common project first.		2,6
8. There were other reasons.		48,7

The responses given in reply to answer 8 (other reasons) essentially fit in three main categories:

- a) *Time of the people involved*  
7 former participants replied that they and/or other members of their project team couldn't dedicate enough time to the implementation of the project.
- b) *Priorities of the background organisation*  
2 respondents stated that the project didn't fit the aims of their organisation / employer.
- c) *Other difficulties*  
10 interviewees explained the unsuccessfulness of their project with a variety of other reasons, such as "team constellation was not ideal". One reason should be noted in particular: Apparently a National Agency overlooked an application of a project team, which delayed the implementation considerably.

With the exception of three reasons – namely "next step wasn't taken", "technical problems" and "really don't know" – all other explanations actually match one of the first seven answers provided in the questionnaire. Given that, the distribution of answers is now as follows:

<b>Why was the course project not implemented ?</b>		true
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
<b>1. One or more of the persons involved in the planning didn't want to.</b>		<b>58,9</b>
2. One or more of the organisations foreseen for the implementation didn't want to.		17,9
3. We couldn't raise enough funding.		15,4
4. We couldn't find enough partners.		15,4
5. We couldn't find enough participants.		2,6
6. We decided to wait with the implementation.		20,5
7. We decided to start another common project first.		2,6
8. There were other reasons.		7,7

Unmistakably, the critical aspect for the successful implementation of a project has been the commitment of the people involved in its planning.

## 2. OTHER PROJECTS

The questionnaire also encouraged former participants to state whether, next to the course project, any other project had grown out of the course. If that was the case, they were invited to briefly specify some aspects of the project, such as the aim and objectives, target groups, type of activities, the time scale and the relation of the project to European Citizenship.

23 former participants have implemented another project but the one they developed during their course, which equals 60.5 %. 15 of the 39 respondents, equalling 39.5 %, have not implemented another project. 14 of these also didn't implement their course project. In consequence this means that almost 36 %, slightly more than one third, has not implemented any project at all.

The different projects that were implemented can be grouped into four main categories:

**Type of the project**



	Frequency	Percent
Training / Study Session	7	30.4
Youth Exchange	8	34.8
Information Campaign / Project	6	26.1
Other	2	8.7

The two other projects are a media literacy project and an EVS training scheme.

The quality of the projects as implemented is generally assessed very positively: 75 % believe the quality of the project as implemented is very good or good.

**Quality of the project implementation**

	Frequency	Percent
Valid very good	9	45.0
Valid good	6	30.0
Valid mediocre	5	25.0
Total	20	100.0



There are hardly any differences between the two courses in their assessment of the quality of their projects. The only striking distinction is, that the youth workers who participated in the second course are slightly more convinced that the quality of their projects is very good.

As before, respondents had the possibility to express their opinion on possible reasons why no other project was implemented after the course. The results are illustrated on the following page, again all together, as the differences between the two courses are hardly perceptible.

<b>Why has no other project grown out of the course ?</b>		true
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
1. There were no appropriate partners.		12,8
2. There were no convincing ideas.		10,3
3. There were no funding opportunities.		17,9
4. We decided to wait with the implementation.		2,6
5. We decided to start another common project first.		12,8
6. There were other reasons.		10,3

The explanations given in reply to answer 6 (other reasons) can again be matched with the first five answers. The distribution now looks like this:

<b>Why has no other project grown out of the course ?</b>		true
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
<b>1. There were no appropriate partners.</b>		<b>23,1</b>
2. There were no convincing ideas.		10,3
3. There were no funding opportunities.		17,9
4. We decided to wait with the implementation.		2,6
5. We decided to start another common project first.		12,8
6. There were other reasons.		0,0

Like before, having appropriate partners is the critical aspect deciding whether or not a project is successfully implemented.




## C. Contact among participants

### 1. GENERAL CONTACT WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS

The following chart illustrates the level of contact participants maintained with other participants generally.

**General contact with other participants**



The differences between the two courses are not very significant: 53.3 % of the participants of the first course and 54.1 % of the participants of the second course say they keep in touch with other participants all the time or most of the time. The disparity in replies to answer 4 (yes – in the beginning) can not be fully explained, but it is likely that the disproportions are caused by the different length of the time period between the end of the respective course and the time of the survey.


**General contact with other participants \* Course Crosstabulation**

			Course		Total
			Course 1	Course 2	
General contact with other participants	yes - all the time	Count	2	2	4
		% within Course	13.3%	8.3%	10.3%
	yes - most of the time	Count	6	11	17
		% within Course	40.0%	45.8%	43.6%
	yes - occasionally	Count	4	10	14
		% within Course	26.7%	41.7%	35.9%
	yes - in the beginning	Count	3	1	4
		% within Course	20.0%	4.2%	10.3%
Total	Count	15	24	39	
	% within Course	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

## 2. CONTACT WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS REGARDING YOUTH WORK

The following chart illustrates the level of contact participants maintained with other participants regarding youth work.

**Contacts with other participants reg. youth work**



As can be seen, the majority of participants has stayed in contact with 1-5 other participants regarding their field of work. Comparing the two courses, it is remarkable that participants of the first course have more intense contact with each other regarding youth work – despite the longer period of time since the end of the course. While only 33.4 % of participants of the second course have contact with more than 4 other youth workers, this is true for astonishing 46.7 % of participants of the first course.


**Contacts with other participants reg. youth work \* Course Crosstabulation**

			Course		Total
			Course 1	Course 2	
Contacts with other participants reg. youth work	1-5	Count	8	16	24
		% within Course	53.3%	66.7%	61.5%
	5-10	Count	6	6	12
		% within Course	40.0%	25.0%	30.8%
	10-15	Count	1	1	2
		% within Course	6.7%	4.2%	5.1%
	15-20	Count	0	1	1
		% within Course	.0%	4.2%	2.6%
<b>Total</b>		Count	15	24	39
		% within Course	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

### 3. WORKING ON PROJECTS WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS

The following chart illustrates the level of contact participants maintained with other participants to work on projects.

**Working on projects with other participants**



Even though every participant is in contact with at least one other participant *regarding youth work*, the number of people working together on projects is no more than 59 %. Consequently, 41 % of the participants of the two pilot courses on European Citizenship do not work on a common project with another youth worker from these courses.

Again there are noticeable differences between both courses. While two thirds (66.7 %) of the youth workers participating in the first course work on projects with at least one other youth worker from the same course, this is true for just a little more than half of the youth workers who took part in the second course (54.2 %).

**Working on projects with other participants \* Course Crosstabulation**

		Course		Total	
		Course 1	Course 2		
Working on projects with other participants	0	Count	5	11	16
		% within Course	33.3%	45.8%	41.0%
	1-5	Count	7	12	19
		% within Course	46.7%	50.0%	48.7%
	5-10	Count	2	1	3
		% within Course	13.3%	4.2%	7.7%
	10-15	Count	1	0	1
		% within Course	6.7%	.0%	2.6%
Total	Count	15	24	39	
	% within Course	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

## D. Development of participants

### 1. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The survey also intended to explore if and how intense the courses have contributed to the professional and personal development of participants on different levels. Respondents assessed their development on the cognitive level (knowledge and understanding), the practical level (skills and competencies) and the personal level (values and attitudes). Additionally, they could specify any other type of development and its intensity.

The impact of the courses on the development of participants is generally very high. It is highest on the personal level with a lot or very much development at a rate of 82.1 %, followed closely by the cognitive level (74.3 %) and, with a considerably lower rate, the practical level (51.3 %).

**Development on cognitive level**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid hardly	2	5.1	5.1	5.1
a little	3	7.7	7.7	12.8
fairly	5	12.8	12.8	25.6
a lot	16	41.0	41.0	66.7
very much	13	33.3	33.3	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	

**Development on practical level**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid a little	6	15.4	15.4	15.4
fairly	13	33.3	33.3	48.7
a lot	9	23.1	23.1	71.8
very much	11	28.2	28.2	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	

**Development on personal level**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid a little	4	10.3	10.3	10.3
fairly	3	7.7	7.7	17.9
a lot	14	35.9	35.9	53.8
very much	18	46.2	46.2	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	

While the development on the cognitive level is assessed considerably higher by the participants of the second course, there are no major differences regarding the development on the practical and the personal level, as the following tables and illustrations demonstrate.

**Development on cognitive level \* Course Crosstabulation**

			Course		Total
			Course 1	Course 2	
Development on cognitive level	hardly	Count	1	1	2
		% within Course	6.7%	4.2%	5.1%
	a little	Count	1	2	3
		% within Course	6.7%	8.3%	7.7%
	fairly	Count	4	1	5
		% within Course	26.7%	4.2%	12.8%
	a lot	Count	4	12	16
		% within Course	26.7%	50.0%	41.0%
	very much	Count	5	8	13
		% within Course	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Total	Count	15	24	39	
	% within Course	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	


**Development on practical level \* Course Crosstabulation**

			Course		Total
			Course 1	Course 2	
Development on practical level	a little	Count	4	2	6
		% within Course	26.7%	8.3%	15.4%
	fairly	Count	4	9	13
		% within Course	26.7%	37.5%	33.3%
	a lot	Count	4	5	9
		% within Course	26.7%	20.8%	23.1%
	very much	Count	3	8	11
		% within Course	20.0%	33.3%	28.2%
Total	Count	15	24	39	
	% within Course	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	


**Development on personal level \* Course Crosstabulation**

			Course		Total
			Course 1	Course 2	
Development on personal level	a little	Count	2	2	4
		% within Course	13.3%	8.3%	10.3%
	fairly	Count	1	2	3
		% within Course	6.7%	8.3%	7.7%
	a lot	Count	6	8	14
		% within Course	40.0%	33.3%	35.9%
	very much	Count	6	12	18
		% within Course	40.0%	50.0%	46.2%
Total	Count	15	24	39	
	% within Course	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	


### Development on cognitive level



### Development on practical level



### Development on personal level



16 respondents stated that they experienced a development on a level not specifically mentioned in the questionnaire, 13 of these also clarified the development they had. The different explanations can not be plausibly categorised and are therefore presented in alphabetical order and with no explicit classification:

- Access to international partnerships
- Confidence in making workable partnerships
- Development as a trainer
- Friendships
- General (mentioned three times)
- Group work, multicultural learning
- Importance of EYC courses
- Intercultural Learning (my own and professional use)
- Links, Relations
- Management of trainings
- New reflections on intercultural education
- Partnerships
- Self-confidence
- Team work, partnerships

## 2. EFFECTS ON THE CAREER OF PARTICIPANTS

The questionnaire invited respondents as well to express whether the courses and their participation in them had any effect on their career.

<b>Has the course had any effect on your career ?</b>		true
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
1. Yes – I got more responsibility.		46,2
2. Yes – I got a promotion.		10,3
3. Yes – I got a new job.		15,4
4. Yes – other.		33,3
5. No.		10,3
6. Don't know / Won't say.		10,3

Almost 80 % say their participation in the course had an effect on their career, 10 % indicate that their participation in the course had no impact on their career and 10 % either don't know or won't say. Almost half (46.2 %) got more responsibility, only 10 % got not only more responsibility but also a promotion, and 15 % even got a new job.

<b>Has the course had any effect on your career ?</b>	TC 1	TC 2
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
1. Yes – I got more responsibility.	46,7	45,8
2. Yes – I got a promotion.	13,3	8,3
3. Yes – I got a new job.	6,7	20,8

While more participants of the first course got a promotion, more youth workers who participated in the second course found a new job.

13 respondents say that their participation in the course had an impact on their career not specifically mentioned in the questionnaire and also clarified the effect they have experienced. The different explanations can not be reasonably grouped and are therefore presented in alphabetical order and with no explicit classification:

- admitted to MA on Human Rights
- became more suitable for employer
- established a new NGO
- global awareness in my job
- grew professionally
- have become reference person for citizenship in my organisation
- it helps me in my job
- more able to promote / justify my work
- more EU projects
- more respect by employer
- my organisation recognises me as an expert
- new projects
- our projects have a better quality



## E. Further youth worker training

### 1. FURTHER TRAINING OF PARTICIPANTS

The questionnaire also explored whether participants had applied and/or participated in any further training event by the Partnership, the Council of Europe, a National Agency or any other training institution.

Slightly more than half of all participants have not applied for any further training since their course finished. Consequently, a little less than half of all participants did apply for further training.

<b>Have you applied for any further training since the course ?</b>		true
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
1. Yes – a training organised by the Partnership.		12,8
2. Yes – a training organised by the Council of Europe.		28,2
3. Yes – a training organised by a National Agency.		7,7
4. Yes – a training organised by a training institution.		20,5
5. No.		51,3

The National Agencies applied to are Germany and Estonia (one respondent only stated “several” without mentioning the countries specifically). The training institutions applied to are:

- ADICE France
- Deutsche Welthungerhilfe
- Employer
- European Youth Centre
- Helsinki Human Rights Foundation
- Kent Youth Council
- Salto
- Tolerance of Colours

In general, participants of the first course applied more for the different types of training than participants of the second course:

<b>Have you applied for any further training since the course ?</b>	TC 1	TC 2
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
1. Yes – a training organised by the Partnership.	20,0	8,3
2. Yes – a training organised by the Council of Europe.	33,3	25,0
3. Yes – a training organised by a National Agency.	20,0	0,0
4. Yes – a training organised by a training institution.	20,0	20,8
5. No.	46,7	54,2

While 19 participants (48,7 %) had applied for some kind of training, 15 attended one (38,5 %). Not all youth workers who attended a training also applied for one, which explains why the percentage of persons who attended a training organised by a training institution (23,1 %) is higher than the percentage of persons who had applied to this kind of training (20,5 %). The following table shows in detail which type of training activities were attended:

<b>Have you attended any further training since the course ?</b>		true
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
1. Yes – a training organised by the Partnership.		10,3
2. Yes – a training organised by the Council of Europe.		7,7
3. Yes – a training organised by a National Agency.		2,6
4. Yes – a training organised by a training institution.		23,1
5. No.		51,3

And again the overview differentiated by course:

<b>Have you attended any further training since the course ?</b>	TC 1	TC 2
All figures are percentages. Multiple choices were possible.		
1. Yes – a training organised by the Partnership.	20,0	4,2
2. Yes – a training organised by the Council of Europe.	6,7	8,3
3. Yes – a training organised by a National Agency.	6,7	0,0
4. Yes – a training organised by a training institution.	26,7	20,8
5. No.	46,7	70,8

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS OF PARTICIPANTS TO OTHER PEOPLE

The questionnaire inquired whether participants had recommended anyone else to apply for a training event run by the Partnership or the Council of Europe. And the majority of participants did: 61.5 % recommended a partnership activity to someone else, and 74.4 % suggested a Council of Europe training to somebody. There are no major differences between the two courses.

## F. Positions of participants in youth work

### 1. POSITION OF PARTICIPANTS IN YOUTH WORK

The questionnaire, in addition to exploring opinions of respondents, also asked which type of positions participants are holding in youth work at present – whether they are full-time or half-time youth workers and whether they work on a professional or a voluntary basis (meaning whether they get paid or not).

As the following illustration shows, more than half of all respondents are paid and full-time youth workers, another quarter is engaged in youth work on a voluntary and part-time basis.

**Type of engagement in youth work at present**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid full-time, paid	21	53.8	53.8	53.8
part-time, paid	5	12.8	12.8	66.7
full-time, voluntarily	3	7.7	7.7	74.4
part-time, voluntarily	10	25.6	25.6	100.0
Total	39	100.0	100.0	

The main difference between both courses is the higher percentage of full-time, paid youth workers in the first course (66.7 %) compared to the second course (45.8 %).

**Type of engagement in youth work at present \* Course Crosstabulation**

			Course		Total
			Course 1	Course 2	
Type of engagement in youth work at present	full-time, paid	Count	10	11	21
		% within Course	66.7%	45.8%	53.8%
	part-time, paid	Count	1	4	5
		% within Course	6.7%	16.7%	12.8%
	full-time, voluntarily	Count	0	3	3
		% within Course	.0%	12.5%	7.7%
	part-time, voluntarily	Count	4	6	10
		% within Course	26.7%	25.0%	25.6%
Total	Count	15	24	39	
	% within Course	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

### 2. DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL AND VOLUNTARY YOUTH WORKERS

Interestingly enough, there are noticeable differences between the two groups of youth workers: (professional – merely standing for being paid in this context – and voluntary – merely standing for not being paid in this context).

One astounding dissimilarity is that a higher percentage of voluntary youth workers implemented their course project (30.8 % of all voluntary youth workers) compared to the percentage of professional youth workers who did (11.5 % of all professional youth workers).

The situation changes looking at other projects that were implemented after the courses: While 65.4 % of all professional youth workers implemented another project, no more than 46.2 % of all voluntary youth workers did.

## ***G. Interest in the Evaluation Impact Seminar***

### **1. INTEREST EXPRESSED AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY**

At the time of the survey, which took place between April and June 2003, 56.4 % of all respondents expressed their interest in participating in the Impact Evaluation Seminar. Those 22 interested persons represent 36.7 % of all 60 former participants.

41 % of the interviewees (26.7 % of all participants) said they would be interested but are not available.

Only 1 respondent stated he would not be interested in the Evaluation Impact Seminar.

### **2. PARTICIPATION IN THE EVALUATION IMPACT SEMINAR**

Despite the high level of expressed interest in the Evaluation Impact Seminar, merely 14 former participants are actually going to participate in the seminar. This low number equals 23.3 % of all participants of both courses.

## H. Project Index

> Implemented projects have a star \*. Some projects were only implemented by some of the team members.  
The detailed project descriptions can be found in the documentations / reports of the two courses.

### 1. TRAINING COURSE 1

#### 1 Training Course for Pupils on Projects against Discrimination

Sergiu Tomsa, Külvi Noor, Sean McDermott and Antje Ruppert

#### 2 \* Young People's Participation in the Society – Citizenship and Young Europeans

Vusal Verdiyev, Alexandre Lavrinenko, Sonia Kostadinova, Agnes Villemur, Chrysafo Arvaniti, Bernard Borg, Amelia Oei, Natalia Estrelo, Esperanza Barranco, Jaime Noguera, Bengt Soderlind and Sean McDermott.

#### 3 Formation sur la citoyenneté européenne

David Régnier

#### 4 Europolis

Marios Georgiades, Larisa Zmaher, Jaime Noguera, Agnieszka Pawlik, Anastasiya Trotska, Charlotte van Hees, Agota Illyes and Irfan Polimac.

#### 5 Local Communities – Inhabitants of the Global Village

Vusal Verdiyev, Alexandre Lavrinenko, Sonia Kostadinova, Agnes Villemur, Chrysafo Arvaniti, Bernard Borg, Amelia Oei, Natalia Estrelo, Esperanza Barranco, Jaime Noguera, Bengt Soderlind, Sean McDermott.

#### 6 \* Multimedia Intercultural Youth Exchange

Lisa Bacialli, Esperanza Barranco Montero

#### 7 \* ACEPA, Apprentissage de la Citoyennete Europeenne Par les Arts

Agnes Villemure, Agnieszka Pawlik, Giuliana Montefusco, Sonia Kostadinova, Aleksandre Lavrinenko

#### 8 From Vikings to Greeks

Anna Gulevskaya, Alexander Lavrinenko, Sonia Kostadinova, Kulvi Noor, Chrysafo Arvaniti  
Bengt Soderlind

#### 9 EVS Training for disadvantaged young people

Isabelle Rousselet

## 2. TRAINING COURSE 2

- 10 Environmental Action of Young People in Europe**  
Alex Froede, Manuela Mirando and Mirjana Mijanovic
- 11 \* Citizenship and Youth Policy**  
Atom Mikhirtayan, Jasmina Ivosevic, Carmen Besu Poliana and Lasha Merabishvili
- 12 E-mail / Internet group TC European Citizenship**  
Angie Tonnauer
- 13 Intercultural Dialogue, Peace and Action**  
Ajay Ray
- 14 Building Youth Bridges 12 days training course**  
Dina Kisseleva, Dmitry Savkin, Ilja De Coster, Tatjana Doroshko
- 15 European Intercultural Garden**  
Evre Kaynak, Fernanda Vaz, Lyudmila Sedloeva, Matteo Fornaca
- 16 \* Citizenship and Nationality – Key concepts for European integration**  
Marianne Bonnard
- 17 Youth Participation in Eastern, Western, Southern and Northern Europe**  
Mark Graham and Diell Bakali
- 18 Spanish and Irish Local Youth Council Exchange Visit**  
Luisa Manez and Ruth Griffin
- 19 Spectacles Multiactivités Itinerants**  
Said Chaibi
- 20 European Citizenship in Youth Work with Ethnic Minority Youth Workers**  
Samiuela Elone
- 21 Animation of Children Course**  
Catherine Stevens, Paola Pertegato, Isabelle Palanchon, Zini Kore and Zuzana Palencikova

## I. Questionnaire

> The original questionnaire can be found on the following pages, excluding the title page.

### 0. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

#### About the questionnaire:

---

Soon the Partnership between the Council of Europe and the European Union will discuss its next phase of co-operation – time to evaluate the present situation and analyse the achievements and failures of the past years. This questionnaire, focusing on the impact of the two pilot courses on European citizenship from your (the participants') perspective, is one of the tools to do so. It has been developed in co-operation with the chair of social and environmental sciences at the Brandenburg University of Technology.

The questionnaire aims to collect reliable and representative data on how the participants of the two pilot courses assess the impact of the training on their work, their professional and their personal development. By relating the results to the set aims and objectives and comparing them with other impact studies, we will be able to describe advantages and disadvantages of the used training concept.

#### A few things you should know:

---

- ▶ Please answer as many questions as possible, but you don't have to answer all of them.
- ▶ Be honest.
- ▶ Please write comprehensibly and use clear hand-writing (unless you fill it out with a PC).
- ▶ If later questions influence answers given earlier – go back and change!
- ▶ Naturally, all your replies will remain anonymous. Following the strict regulations regarding data protection is of our highest concern!

#### How to return the questionnaire:

---

Please return your questionnaire as soon as possible.

- ▶ by fax to the number +49 355 69.22.95 or, preferably,
- ▶ by email to the address [aka@spreefabrik.de](mailto:aka@spreefabrik.de).

#### Questions?

---

In case you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Andreas via phone on +49 355 4302277 or by sending an e-mail to [aka@spreefabrik.de](mailto:aka@spreefabrik.de).

**And now let's begin...**

# 1. YOUR PROJECTS ...

The following questions are all related to the projects you developed during the course as well as other projects you may have developed afterwards.

## 1. How would you assess the project you developed during the course ?

Please assess the quality of the following aspects.

very good: 1 –  
very bad: 5

Quality:

Project idea in general

\_\_\_\_\_

Project plan as developed during the course

\_\_\_\_\_

## 2. Was the project you had planned during the course implemented after the course ?

- yes – it was implemented already
- yes – it is being implemented at the moment
- no – *please proceed with question 4 !*

## 3. How would you assess the project you implemented?

Please assess the quality of the following aspect.

very good: 1 –  
very bad: 5

Quality:

Project as implemented after the course

\_\_\_\_\_

*Please proceed with question 5 !*

## 4. Why was the project not implemented ?

Multiple choice possible.

- one or more of the persons involved in the planning didn't want to
- one or more of the organisations foreseen for the implementation didn't want to
  
- we couldn't raise enough funding
- we couldn't find enough partners
- we couldn't find enough participants
  
- we decided to wait with the implementation
- we decided to start another common project first
  
- other reasons: \_\_\_\_\_



**5. Has any other than the planned project grown out of the course ?**

- yes – it was / they were implemented already
- yes – it is / they are being implemented at the moment
  
- no – *please proceed with question 8 !*

**6. Could you briefly describe the project(s) ?**

If available, you can also attach project descriptions on separate pages or in separate documents, respectively.

Aim of the project \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Objectives \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Target group(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Activities \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Time Scale \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Relation to European Citizenship \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**7. How would you assess the project you implemented?**

Please assess the quality of the following aspect.

very good: 1 –  
very bad: 5

\_\_\_\_\_ Quality: \_\_\_\_\_

Project as implemented after the course \_\_\_\_\_

*Please proceed with question 9 !*

**8. Why has no other project grown out of the course ?**

Multiple choice possible.

- there were no appropriate partners
- there were no convincing ideas
- there were no funding opportunities
  
- we decided to wait with the implementation
- we decided to start the project first which we had planned during the course
  
- other reasons: \_\_\_\_\_

## 2. YOU AND THE OTHERS ...

The next couple of questions are related to your interaction with other participants of your citizenship course.

### 9. Have you been in touch with other participants of the course ?

- yes – all the time
- yes – most of the time
- yes – occasionally
- yes – in the beginning
- no

### 10. With how many participants have you had regular contact regarding youth work ?

- |                                  |                                  |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0       | <input type="checkbox"/> 15 - 20 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - 5   | <input type="checkbox"/> 20 - 25 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 - 10  | <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 30 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10 - 15 | <input type="checkbox"/> 30 - 35 |

### 11. With how many participants did you work / are you working on projects ?

- |                                  |                                  |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 0       | <input type="checkbox"/> 15 - 20 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 - 5   | <input type="checkbox"/> 20 - 25 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5 - 10  | <input type="checkbox"/> 25 - 30 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10 - 15 | <input type="checkbox"/> 30 - 35 |

## 3. AND LAST BUT NOT LEAST: YOU ...

The last set of questions deals with your personal and professional development and your possible interest in the Impact Seminar.

### 12. Has the course contributed to your professional and/or personal development ?

Please assess the intensity of the following aspects.

not at all: 0 –  
very much: 5

	Intensity:
development on the cognitive level (knowledge and understanding)	_____
development on the practical level (skills and competencies)	_____
development on the personal level (values and attitudes)	_____
other development _____	_____

### 13. Has the course had any effect on your career ?

Multiple choice possible.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> yes – I got more responsibility | <input type="checkbox"/> yes – other: _____     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> yes – I got a promotion         | <input type="checkbox"/> no                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> yes – I got a new job           | <input type="checkbox"/> don't know / won't say |

**14. Have you applied for any further training since the citizenship course ?**

Multiple choice possible.

- yes – a training organised by the Partnership
- yes – a training organised by the Council of Europe
- yes – a training organised by the National Agency of \_\_\_\_\_
- yes – a training organised by \_\_\_\_\_
- no

**15. Have you attended any further training since the citizenship course ?**

Multiple choice possible.

- yes – a training organised by the Partnership
- yes – a training organised by the Council of Europe
- yes – a training organised by the National Agency of \_\_\_\_\_
- yes – a training organised by \_\_\_\_\_
- no

**16. Have you recommended anyone to apply for a Partnership or Council of Europe activity ?**

Multiple choice possible.

- yes – a Partnership activity
- yes – a Council of Europe activity
- no

**17. Are you at present engaged in youth work ?**

- yes – full-time, paid
- yes – part-time, paid
  
- yes – full-time, voluntarily
- yes – part-time, voluntarily
  
- no

**18. Would you be interested and available to attend the Impact Evaluation Seminar ?**

The seminar will be held in the beginning of June (4-7 June) at the European Youth Centre Budapest.

- yes – interested and available
- yes – interested but not available
- no

**And your name is:** \_\_\_\_\_

Your name will only be used in relation to question 18. All other answers will remain anonymous!

*Thank you very much for your participation!*