



# HOW DO 'YOUNG PEOPLE WITH FEWER OPPORTUNITIES' (YPFO) BENEFIT FROM THE YIA PROGRAMME?

---

The examples of France, Luxembourg and Belgium

Presentation for the workshop on 18.09.2013 at the RAY-Conference in Vienna

Francine Labadie, INJEP, France  
Christiane Meyers, UL, Luxembourg  
Frank Stevens, Belgium

## Introduction

Three reasons for studying the impacts of YiA programme on YPFO :

- *Research issue:*

The participation in YiA projects contributes to the development of all key competences for lifelong learning but a big proportion of the participants have a high education attainment : what about for the YPFO ?

- *Political issue :*

It is even more important that the inclusion of these young people is a political priority (Social inclusion strategy)

- *Definition issue :*

To be able to measure the effects of YiA programme on YPFO, it is necessary to consolidate this category

## Definition of YPFO in YiA programme Guide

*“ Young people with fewer opportunities are young people that are at a disadvantage compared with their peers because they face one or more of the situations and obstacles mentioned in the non-exhaustive list below. In certain contexts, these situations or obstacles prevent young people having effective access to formal and non-formal education, trans-national mobility and participation, active citizenship, empowerment and inclusion in society at large.”*

= a flexible definition :

- **by country** : in France eg. disabled young people and from rural or urban sensitive areas, in Germany young people with low level of qualifications
- **by individuals** : subjective assessments of obstacles

## Outline of the presentation

1. Profile of the national participants regarding the obstacles and difficulties they meet
2. Toward a deeper comprehension of YPFO situations  
How can we try to better analyse the YPFO profiles ?  
How is this YPFO group represented in the YiA programme ?
3. The competences developed by the YPFO
4. Lessons to be learned

# 1. Definition of YPFO: What resources can we use?

- 33 questions in the standard survey concern subjects related to YPFO:
  - The variables can be categorized as **subjective** (24 variables e.g. Compared to other people in your country do you get a fair share?; Are you confronted with obstacles in your access to education?; What type of obstacles are you confronted with?; Do you belong to a minority in your country?)
  - or as **objective** (9 variables e.g. highest educational attainment; languages spoken at home; type of living place; educational attainment of parents)
  - They cover different dimensions: education, work, financial, immigrant origins, ethnicity, living place and mobility, health etc.
- 2 standard surveys were conducted in each country: May 2012 and May 2013 for France, November 2011 and May 2013 for Luxembourg and Belgium (Flanders)
- Size of total samples: 879 PP in France, 196 PP in Luxembourg, 340 PP in Belgium (Flanders)
- Size of national samples (**residents of the country**): 399 PP in France, 89 PP in Luxembourg, 180 PP in Belgium (Flanders)

# 1. Profile of the national participants

## What is the subjective evaluation of their situation?

Compared to the way other people live in your country do you think ...	FR	LUX	BE-FL
you get more than your fair share	3%	25%	21%
you get your fair share	56%	48%	45%
you get less than your fair share	15%	7%	8%
you get much less than your fair share	3%	4%	2%

Table based on national samples

- Only a small group of young people consider themselves as disadvantaged or as a minority

Belonging to a minority	FR	LUX	BE-FL
Yes	13%	13%	10%
Autochthonous/indigenous	2,5%	3%	2%
Ethnic/cultural	2,5%	2%	2%
Religious	3%	1%	3%
Linguistic	1%	5%	3%
Immigrant (1st gen.)	2,5%	3%	2%
Migration background	4,5 %	1%	2%

# 1. Profile of the national participants

## What kind of obstacles are they confronted with?

Confronted with obstacles in access to:	FR	LUX	BE-FL
Work + employment	30% (33%)	18% (22%)	23% (28%)
Mobility	20% (21%)	9% (13%)	8% (13%)
Active participation	15% (19%)	14% (16%)	9% (16%)
Education	15% (18%)	17% (16%)	11% (15%)

Table based on national samples and total samples (in braquets)

- Difficulties in access to labour market most important in 3 countries
- Differences between 3 countries: mobility more important for French PP, education more important for Lux. PP → national explanations

# 1. Profile of the national participants

## What kind of obstacles are they confronted with?

Type of obstacles (6 most important):	FR	LUX	BE-FL
Not having enough money	21% (26%)	7% (13%)	9% (15%)
Other	18% (19%)	8% (12%)	12% (12%)
Living in remote area with poor transport	7% (7%)	5% (6%)	4% (4%)
Insufficient educational attainment	5% (6%)	7% (5%)	4% (5%)
My social background	5% (5%)	2% (2%)	3% (3%)
Official language	1,5% (1,6%)	3% (3%)	4% (3%)

- Same order for type of obstacles in 3 countries, except problems with official language in BE-FL
- Problem to interpret category of 'other'

Table based on national samples and total samples (numbers in brackets)



# 1. How do project leaders see YPFO?

Participation of YPFO in project	FR	LUX	BE-FL
Yes	26%	26%	46%
No	13%	22%	13%
Don't know	7%	7%	16%
Missing	54%	44%	25%

Types of obstacles faced by YPFO	FR	LUX	BE-FL
Economic	20%	19%	38%
Social	15%	11%	36%
Cultural differences	12%	4%	21%
Geographical	11%	0%	10%
Education	8%	4%	16%

- High percentage of PL did not answer the question -> difficulty to appreciate the situation of the YPFO?
- Over-estimation in BE-FL of obstacles concerning education when comparing to PP in FR and LUX ?

Tables based on national samples

## 2. Toward a better comprehension of YPFO situations

### How can we try to better analyse the YPFO profiles ?

- Construction of sub-groups for **3 different dimensions**:
  1. Educational success
  2. Living place and mobility
  3. Social background
- Combination of 2 subjective variables with 1 **objective** variable linked to each dimension
- Different statistical treatments' procedures:
  - Option 1: objective variable must be fulfilled to be included  
→ more restrictive approach → smaller group  
Subjective variable OR subjective variable AND objective variable
  - Option 2: combination of all 3 variables  
→ less restrictive approach → larger group  
Subjective variable OR subjective variable OR objective variable
- Construction of a **YPFO group** by combining the 3 sub-groups

## 2. The construction of a YPFO group: 1<sup>st</sup> dimension on educational success

- Objective variable: Highest educational attainment = primary school, lower secondary school or technical school
- Subjective variables: confronted with obstacles in access to education OR insufficient educational attainment as an obstacle

	FR	LUX	BE-FL
Option 1 (restrictive)	3% (10)	5% (4)	2% (4)
Option 2 (extended)	27% (109)	31% (24)	30% (49)

- Nearly similar results for the three countries
- In France and Belgium-Flanders the percentage of YPFO is rather low, because a lot of young people attain a diploma of secondary education ('bac')

## 2. The construction of a YPFO group: 2<sup>nd</sup> dimension on living place and mobility

- Objective variable: mainly living place = a village with fewer than 3.000 people or in the countryside
- Subjective variables: confronted with obstacles in access to mobility OR living in a remote area with poor transport connections as an obstacle

	FR	LUX	BE-FL
Option 1 (restrictive)	4% (17)	5% (4)	2% (4)
Option 2 (extended)	30% (120)	30% (27)	22% (36)

- Nearly similar results for France and Luxembourg
- BE-FL: densely populated

## 2. The construction of a YPFO group: 3<sup>rd</sup> dimension on social background

- Objective variable: highest educational attainment of father / mother = primary school, lower secondary school or technical school
- Subjective variables: not having enough money as an obstacle OR social background as an obstacle

	FR	LUX	BE-FL
Option 1 (restrictive)	9% (37)	2% (2)	2% (3)
Option 2 (extended)	41% (163)	36% (29)	23% (38)

- Different result for FR and LUX/BE for restrictive option
- In Luxembourg the social background of the family doesn't seem to be such a big obstacle for the YPFO as in France
- In BE-FL, there is not an association between educational attainment parents and not having enough money

## 2. The construction of a YPFO group: combination of 3 sub-groups

- YPFO = member of sub-group 1 OR sub-group 2 OR sub-group 3

	FR	LUX	BE-FI
Option 1 (restrictive)	15% (14)	12% (10)	6% (11)
Option 2 (extended)	60% (66)	62,7% (47)	51,3% (81)
in 1 sub-group	26,3% (26)	32% (24)	33% (53)
in 2 sub-groups	23,9% (28,5)	23% (17)	12% (19)
in 3 sub-groups	9,8% (11,5)	8% (6)	6% (9)

Table based on national samples (numbers in braquets)

- Comparison of results with numbers of Youthlink for France:  
26% of PP were YPFO

### 3. The competences developed by the YPFO: **What did the YPFO learn more ?**

- The questionnaire used the 8 key competences for lifelong learning plus «media literacy» and a focus on intercultural competences : for 21 skills the PP were asked to say if they learned them better by participating in the project
- We will compare the competences of YPFO (option 1 restricted) with the national sample:
  - 1. by taking the percentages of those answering «definitely»
  - 2. by using the mean values

### 3. The competences developed by the YPFO:

Competences (« definitely »)	YPFO FR	ALL FR	YPFO LUX	ALL LUX	YPFO BE-FL	ALL BE-FL
Intercultural competences (Ray)	<b>1 (82%)</b>	1 (67%)	<b>1 (40%)</b>	2 (27%)	<b>2 (70%)</b>	3 (54%)
Social competences	<b>2 (60%)</b>	2 (54%)	4 (21%)	3 (26%)	<b>3 (60%)</b>	1 (66%)
Foreign language competences	<b>3 (58%)</b>	3 (43%)	<b>2 (40%)</b>	1 (30%)	<b>1 (90%)</b>	2 (65%)
Cultural awareness and expression	6 (39%)	7 (36%)	<b>3 (25%)</b>	5 (13%)	4 (50%)	5 (39%)
Sense of initiative and entrepreneurship	5 (39,6%)	5 (39%)	<b>5 (20%)</b>	5 (19%)	4 (50%)	8 (34%)
Civic competences	7 (37%)	4 (41%)	5 (20%)	4 (23%)	<b>3 (60%)</b>	3 (54%)
Mathematical competence	6 (37,5%)	8 (32%)	6 (15%)	7 (9%)	4 (50%)	6 (38%)
Digital competence	9 (23,2%)	9 (19%)	7 (10%)	8 (6%)	4 (50%)	9 (20%)
Learning to learn	4 (44,6%)	6 (38%)	7 (10%)	8 (6%)	4 (50%)	7 (35%)
Communication in the mother tongue	8 (25,9%)	3 (43%)	5 (20%)	6 (11%)	9 (40%)	8 (22%)

- Caution : Other method in BE-FL
- First rank for intercultural competences in FR and LUX
- First rank for foreign language competences in BE-FL



### 3. The competences learned by the YPFO: means

Competences (means)	YPFO FR	All FR	YPFO LUX	All LUX	YPFO BE-FL	All BE-FL
Intercultural competence	<b>3,8 (1)</b>	3,6 (1)	<b>3,2 (1)</b>	2,7 (3)	<b>3,7 (2)</b>	3,3 (4)
Social competence	<b>3,5 (2)</b>	3,4 (2)	<b>2,9 (2)</b>	2,9 (1)	<b>3,6 (3)</b>	3,6 (1)
Foreign language competence	<b>3,3 (3)</b>	3,1 (3)	<b>3,2 (1)</b>	2,7 (4)	<b>3,9 (1)</b>	3,4 (3)
Cultural awareness and expression	3,1 (5)	3,0 (4)	2,6 (5)	2,2 (7)	3,2 (7)	3,1 (8)
Sense of initiative and entrepreneurship	3,2 (4)	3,1 (3)	2,7 (4)	2,7 (5)	3,5 (5)	3,1 (6)
Civic competence	3,1 (5)	3,1 (3)	2,8 (3)	2,9 (2)	<b>3,6 (3)</b>	3,4 (2)
Mathematical competence	2,9 (6)	2,9 (5)	2,3 (7)	2,2 (7)	3,4 (6)	3,2 (5)
Digital competence	2,5 (6)	2,5 (7)	2,1 (8)	2,1 (8)	3,1 (9)	2,5 (10)
Learning to learn	3,1 (5)	3,0 (4)	2,1 (8)	2,1 (8)	3,1 (9)	2,9 (9)
Communication in the mother tongue	2,9 (6)	2,8 (6)	2,5 (6)	2,3 (6)	3,2 (7)	3,1 (7)

YPFO give a higher rating to the developed competences on average  
 E.g. Intercultural competence and Foreign language competence

## 4. Lessons to be learned?

- **In terms of data analysis**

**Some effects on YPFO competences are confirmed :**

- Relational competences first in FR and LUX, in higher proportion for YPFO group, but what about the more cognitive skills (maths eg.)?
- Influence of the context explaining the rank of foreign language competence (BE-FL and LUX) ?
- A further analysis of the YPFO group (based on a transnational sample) would give the possibility :
  - to analyse effects for different actions,
  - to use different methods for profile building
  - to explore other knowledge learned in the projects
  - to test indicators on a transnational and national basis

**Still a low access to the programme for YPFO, noted when using the restrictive option, to be confirmed ?**

- *Find new possibilities to reach more young people with fewer opportunities through the development of specific strategies and pedagogies*

## 4. Lessons to be learned?

- **In terms of methodological approach for the RAY network**
  - Special study on YPFO with specific methods to better reach them (and with big samples)
  - Integrate more objective questions in the standard survey to better evaluate the situation of the YPFO
    - e.g. Family Affluence Scale (FAS) used by the WHO in the HBSC study
    - Number of books to evaluate cultural capital used in PISA Study by the OECD
  - *Improve existing questions to better fit national realities*
    - E.g. differentiate items of question concerning living place and integrate 'suburbs' and 'village close to city'
  - *Improve the data quality of the YPFO in Youthlink to have better data bases*
  - *Improve the assessment of the competences of the PP by the PL*

# Further reading

- ABED, N., VAN RAALTEN, J., “European youth mobility and inclusion among those with fewer opportunities through three mechanisms”, in *Learning mobility and non-formal learning in European contexts. Policies, approaches and examples*, Council of Europe and European Commission pp. 131-138, march 2013.
- BOYCE, W., TORSHEIM, T., CURRIE, C., & ZAMBON, A. (2006). The Family Affluence Scale as a Measure of National Wealth: Validation of an Adolescent Self-Report Measure. *Social Indicators Research*, 78(3), 473–487.
- CAREL, S., DELOYE, F. Mazouin, A., « International mobility for ‘young people with fewer opportunities’: a project evaluation, in *Training and Employment*, CEREQ, n°96, november-december 2011
- KRISTENSEN, S., “Mobility as a pedagogical tool for young people with fewer opportunities”, in *Learning mobility and non-formal learning in European contexts. Policies, approaches and examples*, Council of Europe and European Commission, pp. 95-108, march 2013.
- PAOLINI, G. et al., *Youth social exclusion and lessons from Youth Work. Evidence from literature and surveys*. Report produced by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA), 2013