



# **Research-based Analysis and Monitoring of Erasmus+: Youth in Action**

Results of the 2015/2016 Survey with Projects Participants and Projects  
Leaders

Country analysis Belgium / French speaking community

**Dr. Grégoire Lits and Prof. Geoffrey Pleyers**

Université catholique de Louvain  
Centre de recherche Institutions, démocratie, subjectivité

**March 2017**

## Table of content

Table of contents	2
List of tables	3
Introduction	5
II. Profiles of Project Participants and Project Leaders	8
1. The profile of Project Participants funded by the FSC of Belgium	8
2. The profile of Project Leaders funded by the FSC of Belgium	16
3. The profile of Project Participants living in Wallonia and of the Project Participants living in the Region of Brussels (and funded by the FSC)	20
4. The profile of Project Leaders living in Wallonia and of the Project Leaders living in the Region of Brussels (and funded by the FSC)	26
5. Analysis of the impact on Project Participants Funded by the FSC (n=153) and Project Participants living in French speaking Belgium (n=85)	29
6. Analysis of the impact of project on Project Participants, views of the Project Leaders	34
7. Analysis of the impact of projects on Project Leaders Funded by the FSC (n=30) and Project Leaders living in French speaking Belgium (n=15)	36
8. Conclusions	41

## List of tables

- Table 0. *Types of activities funded by the FSC by Project Participants (n=153)*
- Table 1. *Gender of PP funded by the FSC (n= 153)*
- Table 2: *Age (in categories) of the participants (n=153)*
- Table 3: *Living environment of participants (n=145)*
- Table 4: *Highest educational degree (n = 142)*
- Table 5: *Country of residence (before the project, if it involved international mobility)*
- Table 5b: *Main language of instruction/Work language*
- Table 6: *Affiliation to an ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic minority among participants (n=144)*
- Table 7: *Mother tongue of participants (n=143)*
- Table 8: *Language spoken at home and in family (n=147)*
- Table 9: *Occupation of the participants just before the project (n=152 , several answers possible)*
- Table 10: *Paying the fee was... (n=152)*
- Table 11: *"Compared to the way other people live in your country, do you think..." (n=140)*
- Table 12: *Obstacles of participants in their access to education, work, active participation and mobility (=146)*
- Table 13: *Reasons of previous travels abroad of participants by country or residence (n=147)*
- Table 14. *Gender of PL funded by the FSC (n= 30)*
- Table 15: *Age (in categories) of PL (n=30)*
- Table 16: *Highest educational degree of PL (n=23)*
- Table 17: *Country of residence (before the project, if it involved international mobility) (n=30)*
- Table 18: *Affiliation to an ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic minority among project leaders (n=26)*
- Table 19: *Occupation of the PL just before the project (n=30)*
- Table 20: *Project leaders' previous involvement in EU youth programmes (n=29)*
- Table 21: *Age of the PP living in French speaking Belgium (n=85)*
- Table 22: *Living environment of the PP living in French speaking Belgium (n=78)*
- Table 23: *Highest educational degree (n = 78)*
- Table 24: *Affiliation to an ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic minority? (n=76)*
- Table 25: *Participants' mother tongue (n=78)*
- Table 26: *Language spoken at home and in family (n=80)*
- Table 27: *Occupation of the participants just before the project (n=85, several answers possible by PP)*
- Table 28: *Paying the fee was... (n=84)*
- Table 29: *"Compared to the way other people live in your country, do you think..." (n=73)*
- Table 30: *Obstacles of participants in their access to education, work, active participation and mobility (=66)*
- Table 31: *Reasons of previous travels abroad of participants by country or residence (n=78)*
- Table 32. *Gender of PL (n= 15)*
- Table 33: *Age (in categories) of the PL (n=15)*
- Table 34: *Highest obtained diploma of PL (n=11)*
- Table 35: *Affiliation to an ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic minority? (n=13)*
- Table 36: *Occupation of the PL just before the project (n=15)*
- Table 37: *Project leaders' previous involvement in EU youth programmes (n=15)*
- Table 38: *What did the PP learn when taking part of the project?*
- Table 39: *Impact of the project on the abilities of the PPs*
- Table 40: *Were the PP affected by the project? Table for PP funded by the FSC (n=153)*
- Table 41: *Were the PP affected by the project? Table for PP living in French speaking Belgium (n=85)*
- Table 42: *Were the PP affected by the project? Result of the project (question 13)*
- Table 43: *Were the PP affected by the project? Did the project have any further impact on you? (Question 14)*
- Table 44: *Which of the following effects of the project on participants did you notice or hear about? (Question 8)*

*Table 45: Which of the following skills did the participants develop through their participation in the project? (Question 9)*

*Table 46: Impact of the project on PL abilities*

*Table 47: Impact of the project on PL activities (PL funded by the FSC n=30)*

*Table 48: Impact of the project on PL activities (PL living in French speaking Belgium n=15)*

*Table 49: Impact of the project on PL career and other prospect*

*Table 50: Impact of the project on the work of the PL in the youth field*

*Table 51: Impact of the project on the organisation/group/body of the PL*

## Introduction

The RAY research project aims at exploring the characteristics and effects of the ERSAMUS+ Youth in Action program (E+/YiA) in order to assess the program, support it and suggest improvements.

This report focuses on the implementation of the E+/YiA actions that were either funded by the French speaking Community (FSC) of Belgium or that concerned Project Participants (PP) and Projects Leaders (PL) that were living in the French speaking Regions of Belgium<sup>1</sup> when the E+/YiA project started. This report will provide two different sets of analysis for these two sub-samples of the 2015/2016 survey. This study was conducted within the 'Research-based Analysis of Erasmus+: Youth in Action' (RAY) by the RAY Network, which includes the National Agencies of Erasmus+: Youth in Action and their research partners in currently 29 countries<sup>2</sup>.

The data for this study was collected through multilingual online surveys, which were conducted in 25 languages by the RAY Network between October 2015 and April 2016. These surveys addressed participants and project leaders/team members involved in projects funded through the European Union Programme Erasmus+: Youth in Action (2014-2020). This research project was designed by the Institute of Educational Science at University of Innsbruck and the Generation and Educational Science Institute in Austria in cooperation with the RAY Network.

The Belgian sample gathers 720 different participants (PP) and 139 project leaders (PL). Not all the Belgian projects were funded by Belgium. 19,3% of the participants and 20,1% of the project leaders were involved in project funded by other countries. In this report we will only provide analyses for projects funded by the Belgian FSC (concerning 21,3% of the Belgian sample of PP, n=153 ; and 21,6% of the PL sample, n=30) and for projects that concerned inhabitants of the French speaking Regions of Belgium (12% of the PP and 10,8% of the PL).

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of this analysis focusing only on the Belgian French speaking Community, we excluded from this analysis Participant and Projects Leaders that were living in Brussels but attached to the Flemish speaking Community.

<sup>2</sup> Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom.

Participants of the survey were contacted by email on October 26<sup>th</sup> 2015. The response rate for Belgian participants varied between 42% and 45,5% according to the language spoken by the participant (Flemish, French or German). The response rate of Project leaders varied between 96% and 100%.

This report will focus on two sets of research questions. In the first part, we analyse the profile of Project Participants (PP) and Projects Leaders (PL). The second part is dedicated to the impacts of the different projects on these Participants and Leaders.

This report has been realized for the Bureau International Jeunesse (Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles) by Grégoire Lits and Geoffrey Pleyers<sup>3</sup>, senior researchers at the Université Catholique de Louvain, with the assistance and collaboration of Amélie Anciaux and Ana Suzina.

---

<sup>3</sup> Contact : [Grégoire.Lits@uclouvain.be](mailto:Grégoire.Lits@uclouvain.be), [Geoffrey.Pleyers@uclouvain.be](mailto:Geoffrey.Pleyers@uclouvain.be)

## I. Types of activities funded by the program

Before getting into the core of the report, it is important to have in mind the topics of the projects that have been funded by the FSC. The table below shows that three kinds of initiatives gather about 75% of PP: Youth Exchanges (partner countries and programme countries, 48% of the PP) and Mobility for young workers in programme countries (25,5% of the PP).

*Table 0. Types of activities funded by the FSC by Project Participants (n=153, variable name = attribute\_6)*

Activity type	n	%
Youth Exchange - Partner Countries	38	24,8
Youth Exchange - Programme Countries	35	22,9
National meeting between young people and policy makers	11	7,2
Mobility of Youth Workers - Programme Countries	39	25,5
Mobility of Youth Workers - Partner Countries	3	2,0
Transnational meeting between young people and policy makers	15	9,8
European Voluntary Service - Programme Countries	12	7,8
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>

It is important to note that some of the Belgian participants have a particular profile, namely young people living in Brussels and applying to Erasmus+ programme through international or EU related organisations established in Brussels. These young people can come from all over Europe. The proportion of this population amongst the Belgian sample is difficult to estimate. It has certainly had an impact on the overall socio-economic characteristics of the sample as these young European have specific profiles in terms of mobility, education and language skills.

## II. Profiles of Project Participants and Project Leaders

### 1. The profile of Project Participants funded by the FSC of Belgium

This section provides an analysis of the profile of Project Participants involved in projects funded by the French speaking Community of Belgium. 153 Project Participants (PP) have replied to the questionnaire and constitute our sample, which represent 21% of the total number of participants in projects funded between 2015 and 2016. 35% of the participants were living in Belgium before the project begun, 65% were living in other European countries (see table 5).

#### 1.1. General sociodemographic characteristics

*Table 1. Gender of PP funded by the FSC (n= 153, variable name = q1GEND)*

Sex	n	%
Female	98	64,1
Male	55	35,9
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>

Young women are overrepresented amongst PP in projects funded by the FSC (64%).

Regarding the age of the PP funded by the FSC: slightly more than half of them were between 18 and 25 years old, which is the core of the age usually referred to as “young people” or “post-adolescence”. 15% were younger than 18 years, 33% older than 26 years.

*Table 2: Age (in categories) of the participants (n=153, variable name =q2Age)*

Age of PP	n	%
0 - 14	3	2
15 - 17	20	13,1
18 - 25	79	51,6
26 and older	51	33,3
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>

Regarding the living environment of the PP, 55% were coming from urban areas, 12% from towns ranging from 25.000 to 100.000 inhabitants, and 33% from small towns or rural areas.



*Table 3: Living environment of participants (n=145, variable name =q31ENV)*

Living environment	n	%
A metropolitan area (500.000 inhabitants)	51	35,2
An urban area (100.000 to 500,000 inhabitants)	28	19,3
An intermediate area (25.000 to 100.000 inhabitants)	18	12,4
A small town (5.000 to 25.000 inhabitants)	19	13,1
A rural area close to an urban/a metropolitan area (fewer than 5.000 inhabitants but within 45 minutes' travel time)	29	20
Total	145	100
Missing	8	
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	

The education level of our sample can be linked to the age of the PP. Interestingly, 55% of the PP have obtained a superior degree (post-secondary or university degree). This data should be completed by further research, as a significant number of young people of this age are students.

*Table 4: Highest obtained diploma of participants (n = 142, variable name = q32EDU)*

Diploma obtained	n	%
Primary school	3	2,1
Lower secondary school	9	6,3
Technical school	4	2,8
Upper secondary school	38	26,8
Upper vocational school	9	6,3
University, Polytechnic, post-secondary/tertiary level College	79	55,6
Total	142	100
Missing	11	
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	

35% of the PP financed by the FSC are Belgian residents. Other frequent countries of residence amongst PP funded by the FSC of Belgium are Italy and Macedonia . The wide variety of countries testifies a strong ability to gather participants from diverse origins.

*Table 5: Country of residence (before the project if the project involved international mobility, variable name = q4RES)*

County	n	%
Albania	3	2
Algeria	1	0,7
Austria	3	2
Belgium	54	35,3
Bulgaria	9	5,9
Croatia	3	2
Czech Republic	1	0,7
Estonia	1	0,7
France	7	4,6
Germany	6	3,9
Greece	4	2,6
Georgia	5	3,3
Hungary	1	0,7
Italy	11	7,2
Latvia	2	1,3
Lithuania	1	0,7
Montenegro	2	1,3
Morocco	1	0,7
Poland	2	1,3
Portugal	2	1,3
Romania	2	1,3
Serbia	5	3,3
Slovakia	4	2,6
Slovenia	1	0,7
Spain	7	4,6
Macedonia (The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)	11	7,2
Turkey	2	1,3
Other	2	1,3
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>

*Table 5b: Main language of instruction/Work language (n = 153, variable name =attribute 14)*

Language	n	%
DE	2	1
EN	89	58
ES	1	1
FR	34	22
RO	1	1
MISSING	26	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>

## 1.2. Cultural characteristics

Almost 8% of the project participants declare they belong to an ethnic, cultural or linguistic minority.

*Table 6: Affiliation to an ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic minority? (n=144, variable name = q41MIN1)*

Affiliation	n	%
Yes	11	7,6
No	133	92,4
<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>100</b>
Missing	9	

Only 30% (43 out of 143) of the PP funded by the FSC of Belgium use French as first language.

*Table 7: First language for participants (n=143, variable name = q23LANG1)*

First language	n	%
French	43	29,8
Other	101	70,2
Missing	9	
<b>Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>

91% of the PP use at home one of the official languages of their country of residence, meanwhile, 41% of the PP have family relatives that speak another language at home. This number may indicate that the program only funds a limited number of first or second generation migrants, who are more likely to speak at home a language that is not an official language of their residence country. This assumption would however need to be confirmed

by additional data.

Table 8: Language spoken at home and in family (n=147, variable name = q24LANGfam1 and q24LANGfam2)

	Yes	No
Is the language mainly spoken in your family of origin an official language of the country where you live?	91,10%	8,90%
At home, does your family (including grandparents) also speak languages other than an official language of the country or region where you live?	40,80%	59,20%

### 1.3. Finance, employment and social difficulties

43% of the participants were students at the time of the project. 25% were employed and 2% unemployed.

Table 9: Occupation of the participants just before the project (n=152, several answers possible, variable name = q34OCC)

Occupation	N	%
In education or training	69	43
Employed full-time	26	16
Employed part-time	15	9
Self-employed	4	2
Unemployed	4	2
A volunteer	23	14
An intern/doing a work placement	12	7
Other	8	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100</b>

About half of the participants (44,7%) took part in a fully funded projects, with no required personal fees. Among the 55% who had to pay some fees, three quarters (74%) state they could easily pay for it, while 26% mention difficulties for doing so. Overall, 14,5% of the participants thus faced difficulties to pay the fees.

Table 10: Paying the fee was... (n=152, variable name = q8PAYfee)

	n	%
... easy for me.	62	40,8
... difficult for me.	22	14,5
... not necessary – all costs were covered by the project.	68	44,7
<b>Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>100</b>
Missing	1	

### Perception of opportunities

About half (44%) of participants consider they have a fair share of opportunities. Approximately 23% of the PP think that they are getting less or much less shares of opportunities than other people living in their country.

Table 11: “Compared to the way other people live in your country, do you think...” (n=140, variable name = q38FAIR)

	N	%	Valid % (without missing, do not know and don't understand)
... that you are getting your fair share of opportunities?	62	44,3	52,9%
... that you are getting more than your fair share of opportunities?	23	16,4	19,6%
... that you are getting somewhat less than your fair share of opportunities?	24	17,1	20,5%
... that you are getting much less than your fair share of opportunities?	8	5,7	6,8%
I do not know	11	7,9	-
I don't understand the question.	12	8,6	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100</b>	-
Missing	13		-

The lack of opportunities indicated above is clearly observed in two fields. One in each 4 participants feels that it is hard to get included in active participation in society and politics, while 1 in each 3 finds it difficult to get access to work and employment.

Table 12: Obstacles of participants in their access to education, work, active participation and mobility (=146, variable name = q39OBST)

Obstacles...(answers yes)	n	%
in accessing education	29	19,9
in accessing work and employment	44	30,1
to your active participation in society and politics	37	25,3
to mobility	36	24,7
<b>Total</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>100</b>

## 1.4. Previous international experience

Only 32% of the PP have taken part in similar international experiences previously. It highlights the program capacity of reaching young people for whom such an experience may be particularly relevant, which is an important aim for the National Agency.

Another question searched the reasons for previous international mobility experiences (even non similar to the Erasmus + program). The most frequent reason was travel for holidays (73%). The second more important reason was travel for education purposes (49%).

Table 13: Reasons of previous travels abroad of participants by country or residence (n=147, variable name = q27MOBEXP)

	n	% of responses	% of cases
I went abroad for holidays	112	27,10%	73,20%
I went abroad with my class at school	75	18,10%	49,00%
I participated in a youth exchange	46	11,10%	30,10%
I went to school in another country	17	4,10%	11,10%
I lived in another country with my parents	14	3,40%	9,20%
I studied at a university in another country	18	4,30%	11,80%
I did a language course abroad	27	6,50%	17,60%
I did a work placement or an internship abroad	23	5,60%	15,00%
I did a vocational training course abroad	5	1,20%	3,30%
I worked as an au-pair	2	0,50%	1,30%
I had a job abroad	18	4,30%	11,80%
I went to another country to live with my partner	6	1,40%	3,90%
I live near an international border and can easily cross it	19	4,60%	12,40%
I was born in another country	13	3,10%	8,50%
I lived in another country for another reason	13	3,10%	8,50%
I have never been abroad before this project	6	1,40%	3,90%
	414	100,00%	270,60%
* Column 4 goes over 100% because respondents could give multiple responses			

## 2. The profile of Project Leaders funded by the FSC of Belgium

30 Project Leaders were involved in projects funded by the French speaking Community of Belgium. This is a very limited sample. It may however point to some interesting indications that need to be placed in a wider scope, notably through the overall European survey.

### 2.1. General sociodemographic characteristics

Among the Project Leaders, 70% were women. Women are thus slightly more represented amongst PL than among PP (64%) in FSC funded projects.

Table 14. Gender of PL funded by the FSC (n= 30, variable name = q1GEND)

Gender	n	%
Female	21	70
Male	8	26,7
Other	1	3,3
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

30% were older than 18 and younger than 25 years. 33% were older than 36 years. Given the experience and responsibility required to lead such a project, project leaders' average age is significantly higher than the average age of project participants. Two third of the project leaders are however below 36 years old and thus considered as young people in most categorizations.

Table 15: Age (in categories) of the PL (n=30, variable name = q2AGE)

Age	n	%
18 till 25	9	30
26 till 30	4	13,3
31 till 35	7	23,3
36 and older	10	33,3
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

95% of the PL had a university degree at the time of the project, which is extremely high. It is however important to mention that 7 out of 30 (23%) haven't answered this question, which gives a weak meaning to the results.



*Table 16: Highest obtained diploma of PL (n=23, variable name = q22EDU)*

Diploma	n	%
Upper secondary school	1	4,3
University, Polytechnic, post-secondary/tertiary level College	22	95,7
Total	23	100
Missing	7	

36% of the PL of projects funded by the FSC were living in Belgium before the project. Serbia and Macedonia are the second more frequent places of residence for PL (with 4 PL each).

*Table 17: Country of residence (before the project if the project involved international mobility) (n=30, variable name = q4RES)*

Country of residence (PL)	N	%
Belgium	11	36,7
Bulgaria	2	6,7
France	1	3,3
Germany	1	3,3
Greece	1	3,3
Georgia	1	3,3
Italy	3	10
Serbia	4	13,3
Spain	1	3,3
Macedonia (The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)	4	13,3
United Kingdom	1	3,3
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

## 2.2. Cultural characteristics

15% (4) of the PL were affiliated to a cultural, religious or linguistic minority in their country.

*Table 18: Affiliation to an ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic minority? (n=26, variable name = q21MIN1)*

	n	%
Yes	4	15,4
No	22	84,6
Total	26	100
System	4	

### 2.3. Finance, employment and social difficulties

43% of the PL were employed before the project. 13% were unemployed and 16% were following their studies.

*Table 19: Occupation of the PL just before the project (n=30, variable name = q23OCC)*

Occupation	N	%
employed full-time	6	20,00%
employed part-time	7	23,30%
self-employed	1	3,30%
Unemployed	5	16,70%
Volunteer	4	13,30%
in education or training	5	16,70%
Other	2	6,70%
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

## 2.4. Previous international experience

34% of PL have no previous involvement in EU youth programmes. 34% have already had an experience as project leader previously, and 31% as participant.

*Table 20: Project leaders' previous involvement in EU youth programmes (n=29, variable name = q21YIAEXPI)*

	n	%
Yes, as project leader	10	34,5
Yes, as participant	9	31
No	10	34,5
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100</b>

### 3. The profile of Project Participants living in Wallonia and of the Project Participants living in the Region of Brussels (and funded by the FSC)

The second section of the report provides analyses on the profile of Project Participants involved in projects included in the Belgian sample that were living in the French speaking part of Belgium before engaging in the project.

We have included in this sub-sample all the PP that were living in Wallonia (Belgian Region where French is the only official language) and the PP that were living in the Region of Brussels Capital. As the Region of Brussels is bilingual (Flemish/French), we selected in this subsample only the PP that were funded by the FSC.

Among the 720 individuals included in the Belgian sample, 329 were Belgian residents before the project (45,7%). Among these 329 residents, 67 were living in Wallonia (9,3% of the Belgian sample), and 74 in Brussels (10,3% of the sample). Among the 74 living in Brussels, 18 were funded by the FSC.

This subsample is composed of the 67 Walloons and the 18 inhabitant of Brussels who are attached (by funding) to the French Speaking Community.

The total numbers of PP gathered in this subsample is thus 85 (11,8% of the total Belgian sample).

#### 3.1. General sociodemographic characteristics

*Table 20: Gender of the PP living in French speaking Belgium (n=85, variable name = q1GEND)*

Gender	n	%
Female	53	62,3
Male	32	37,7
Total	85	100

Among these 85 PP, 62% (53) are women.

Table 21: Age of the PP living in French speaking Belgium (n=85, variable name = q2Age)

Age	n	%
15 - 17 y	13	15,3
18 - 25 y	46	54,1
26 and older	26	30,6
Total	85	100

15% of the PP living in French speaking Belgium are younger than 17 years. 30% are older than 26.

Table 22: Living environment of the PP living in French speaking Belgium (n=78, variable name = q31ENV)

Variable	N	%
A metropolitan area (500,000 inhabitants).	18	23,1
An urban area (100,000 to 500,000 inhabitants).	22	28,2
An intermediate area (25,000 to 100,000 inhabitants).	7	9
A small town (5,000 to 25,000 inhabitants).	10	12,8
A rural area close to an urban/a metropolitan area (fewer than 5,000 inhabitants but within 45 minutes' travel time)	21	26,9
Total	78	100
Missing	7	
	85	

51,2 % are living in a urban environment. 27% are living in a rural area.

Table 23: Highest obtained diploma of participants (n = 78, variable name = q32EDU)

Diploma obtained	n	%
Primary school	1	1,3
Lower secondary school	3	3,8
Technical school	3	3,8
Upper secondary school	20	25,6
Upper vocational school	8	10,3
University, Polytechnic, post-secondary/tertiary level College	43	55,1
Total	78	100,0
Missing	7	
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	

55% of the PP have a university degree.

### 3.2. Cultural characteristics

17% of the PP have declared they belong to an ethnic, cultural or linguistic minority. This proportion is much higher than the one of PP funded by the FSC in general (8%) (see table 6).

Table 24: Affiliation to an ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic minority? (n=76, variable name = q41MIN1)

Variable	N	Percent
Yes	13	17,1
No	63	82,8
Total	76	100
Missing	9	

60,3% of the PP living in the FSC of Belgium use French as a first language.

Table 25: First language for participants (n=78, variable name = q23LANG1)

First language	n	%
French	47	60
Other	31	30
Total	78	100
Missing	7	

86% of the PP use at home one of the official language of their country of residence, while 39% of the PP have relatives that speak another language at home.

Table 26: Language spoken at home and in family (n=80, variable name =q24LANGfam1 and q24LANGfam2)

	Yes	No
Is the language mainly spoken in your family of origin an official language of the country where you live?	86,3%	13,8%
At home, does your family (including grandparents) also speak languages other than an official language of the country or region where you live?	38,8%	61,3%

### 3.3. Finance, employment and social difficulties

49% of the PP were pursuing their studies at the time of the project. 23% were employed and 4% unemployed.

*Table 27: Occupation of the participants just before the project (n=85, several answers possible by PP., variable name = q34OCC)*

Occupation	N	%
In education or training	47	49
Employed full-time	12	13
Employed part-time	10	10
Self-employed	3	3
Unemployed	4	4
A volunteer	9	9
An intern/doing a work placement	8	8
Other	3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>100</b>

For 10,6% of the PP, paying fees for participating in the project was difficult.

*Table 28: Paying the fee was... (n=84, variable name = q8PAYfee)*

	N	%
... easy for me.	37	44
... difficult for me.	9	10,6
... not necessary – all costs were covered by the project.	38	45,2
<b>Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100</b>
Missing	1	

Approximately 15% of the PP consider they are getting less or much less shares of opportunities than other people living in their country. This proportion rises to 23% for the FSC funded sample. This higher rate in the FSC sample shows the success of the National Agency strategies to target young people with fewer opportunities in their communication about ERASMUS+ programs and projects.

Table 29: “Compared to the way other people live in your country, do you think...” (n=73, variable name = q38FAIR)

	n	%
... that you are getting your fair share of opportunities?	43	58,9
... that you are getting more than your fair share of opportunities?	9	12,3
... that you are getting somewhat less than your fair share of opportunities?	8	11,0
... that you are getting much less than your fair share of opportunities?	3	4,1
I do not know	2	2,7
I don't understand the question.	8	11,0
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100,0</b>
Missing	12	

The areas in which PP feel more strongly the lack of opportunities are access to work and employment, and mobility. 24,2% (against 25% of the FSC funded sample) think that they encounter obstacles that prevent their active participation in society and politics. This proportion rises to 30% when it comes to access to work and employment as well as to mobility.

Table 30: Obstacles of participants in their access to education, work, active participation and mobility (n=66,, variable name = q39OBST)

Obstacles...(answers yes)	n	%
in accessing education	10	15,2
in accessing work and employment	20	30,3
to your active participation in society and politics	16	24,2
to mobility	20	30,3
<b>Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>100</b>



### 3.4. Previous international experience

36,3% of the PP took part of a similar international experience previously. Another question was devoted to the reasons for previous international mobility experiences (even non similar to the Erasmus + program). The most frequent reason was travel for holidays (80%). The second most important reason was travel with school (61,2%).

*Table 31: Reasons of previous travels abroad of participants by country or residence (n=78, variable name = q27MOBEXP)*

	n	% of responses	% of cases
I went abroad for holidays	68	27,2%	80,0%
I went abroad with my class at school	52	20,8%	61,2%
I participated in a youth exchange	27	10,8%	31,8%
I went to school in another country	10	4,0%	11,8%
I lived in another country with my parents	9	3,6%	10,6%
I studied at a university in another country	6	2,4%	7,1%
I did a language course abroad	14	5,6%	16,5%
I did a work placement or an internship abroad	13	5,2%	15,3%
I did a vocational training course abroad	2	0,8%	2,4%
I worked as an au-pair	2	0,8%	2,4%
I had a job abroad	10	4,0%	11,8%
I went to another country to live with my partner	4	1,6%	4,7%
I live near an international border and can easily cross it	14	5,6%	16,5%
I was born in another country	7	2,8%	8,2%
I lived in another country for another reason	10	4,0%	11,8%
I have never been abroad before this project	2	0,8%	2,4%
	250	100,0%	294,1%
* Column 4 goes over 100% because respondents could give multiple responses			

## 4. The profile of Project Leaders living in Wallonia and of the Project Leaders living in the Region of Brussels (and funded by the FSC)

15 Project leaders were involved in projects funded by the French Speaking Community of Belgium.

### 4.1. General sociodemographic characteristics

Among these PL, 73% were women.

Table 32. Gender of PL (n= 15, variable name = q1GEND)

Gender	n	%
Female	11	73,3
Male	4	26,7
Total	15	100

13,3% were older than 18 and younger than 25 years. 33% were older than 36 years.

Table 33: Age (in categories) of the PL (n=15, variable name = q2AGE)

Age	n	%
18 till 25	2	13,3
26 till 30	3	20,0
31 till 35	5	33,3
36 and older	5	33,3
<b>Total</b>	15	100,0

81,8% of the PL had a university degree at the time of the project. This could be explained by the fact that, in French speaking Belgium, most of the PL are youth workers.

Table 34: Highest obtained diploma of PL (n=11, variable name = q22EDU)

Diploma	n	%
Upper secondary school	2	18,2
University, Polytechnic, post-secondary/tertiary level College	9	81,8
Total	11	100
Missing	4	

## 4.2. Cultural characteristics

38,5% of the PL were affiliated to a cultural, religious or linguistic minority in their country.

Table 35: Affiliation to an ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic minority? (n=13, variable name = q21MIN1)

	n	%
Yes	5	38,5
No	8	61,5
Total	13	100
System	2	

## 4.3. Finance, employment and social difficulties

40% of the PL were employed before the project. 6,7% were unemployed and 33,3% were following their studies.

Table 36: Occupation of the PL just before the project (n=15, variable name = q23OCC)

Occupation	n	%
employed full-time	3	20,0%
employed part-time	3	20,0%
self-employed	2	13,3%
unemployed	1	6,7%
volunteer	1	6,7%
in education or training	5	33,3%
Other	3	20,0%
<b>total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

## 4.4. Previous international experience

40% of PL have had no previous involvement in EU youth programmes. 40% have already had an experience as project leader previously.

*Table 37: Project leaders' previous involvement in EU youth programmes (n=15, variable name = q21YIAEXP1)*

	n	%
Yes, as project leader	6	40,0%
Yes, as participant	3	20,0%
No	6	40,0%
<b>total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100,0%</b>

## 5. Analysis of the impact on Project Participants Funded by the FSC (n=153) and Project Participants living in French speaking Belgium (n=85)

Table 38: What did the PP learn when taking part in the project? (variable name = q10KNOW1 -> q10KWOW24)

Did you learn something about...?	PP funded by the FSC		PP Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N yes	%	N yes	%
Youth, youth work	81	53%	34	40%
Non-formal education/learning, informal learning	63	41%	30	35%
Personal development	63	41%	38	45%
Education, training, learning	57	37%	34	40%
Project development and management	53	35%	28	33%
Environmental issues	49	32%	22	26%
European issues	48	31%	19	22%
Solidarity with people facing difficulties	47	31%	26	31%
Active citizenship and participation in civil society	47	31%	26	31%
Cultural diversity	45	29%	56	66%
Policies or structures of the European Union	41	27%	16	19%
Inclusion of disadvantaged or marginalised people in society	41	27%	24	28%
Discrimination and non-discrimination	39	25%	25	29%
Sustainable development	36	24%	13	15%
Entrepreneurship, using my initiative	36	24%	22	26%
Human rights, fundamental rights	30	20%	9	11%
Youth policies	30	20%	14	16%
Health, well-being	26	17%	18	21%
Democracy	25	16%	12	14%
Youth policy development	25	16%	12	14%
Work, professional development	21	14%	13	15%
Media and ICT	19	12%	7	8%
Non-violence	14	9%	7	8%
I did not learn anything new in this project	1	1%	1	1%
<b>Total PP</b>	<b>153</b>		<b>85</b>	

Only 1% of the PPs declared that they did not learn anything during the project. The four topics most frequently highlighted by PP as learning outcomes are: Youth and youth work, Non-formal education/learning, Personal development, and education.

Among the topics which were considered by PP as less relevant in terms of learning outcomes, there are: Human Rights, Democracy, Youth policy development, Media and ICT, Non-violence and Work, professional development.

It is worth noting that for almost all topics, in both sub-samples, less than 50% of the PP declared to have learnt something.

An interesting difference between the two sub-samples occurs regarding the topic “Cultural diversity”. While only 29% of the PP funded by the FSC declared to have learnt something about cultural diversity, this proportion rises to 66% (making it the first ranked topic) for PP living in French Belgium.

The PP were asked if through the participation in the project their abilities to do some activities evolved. The table below shows the results for the different kind of activities.

Table 39: Impact of the project on the abilities of the PPs (variable name = q11aKCI\_1 -> q11bKCI\_14)

Through my participation in this project I improved my ability to...	PP funded by the FSC		PP Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N Agree <sup>4</sup>	%	N Agree <sup>2</sup>	%
cooperate in a team	150	98%	80	94%
get along with people who have a different cultural background	146	95%	78	92%
communicate with people who speak another language	142	93%	74	87%
negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	139	91%	77	91%
say what I think with conviction in discussions	136	89%	67	79%
develop an idea and put it into practice	132	86%	72	85%
achieve something in the interests of the community or society	132	86%	75	88%
learn or to have more fun when learning	123	80%	68	80%
identify opportunities for my personal or professional development	119	78%	73	86%
express myself creatively or artistically	118	77%	60	71%
think logically and draw conclusions	110	72%	65	76%
to plan and carry out my learning independently	104	68%	54	64%
produce media content on my own	94	61%	51	60%
to discuss political topics seriously	91	59%	49	58%
Total PP	153		85	100%

As we can see in the table, the PP declared that the projects have had an important impact on their abilities. Almost all the PP declared that taking part in the Erasmus program improved their ability to cooperate, to get along with people who have a different cultural background, and to communicate with people who speak another language.

<sup>4</sup> Count of PP who responded agree or strongly agree.

The two abilities that were less impacted are producing media content and discussing political topics seriously.

Table 40: Were the PP affected by the project? Table for PP funded by the FSC (n=153, variable name = q12EFFcit\_1 -> q12EFFcit\_10)

How did the project affect you in the end?	less than before the project	to the same extent (as before the project)	more than before the project	
	N	N	N	%
I appreciate cultural diversity	0	52	95	65%
I feel European	3	80	62	43%
I am interested in contributing to youth policy development	5	81	60	41%
I keep myself informed on current European affairs	1	87	58	40%
I engage in voluntary activities	4	84	57	39%
I am committed to work against discrimination, intolerance, xenophobia or racism	1	91	56	38%
I actively support the inclusion of people with fewer opportunities	2	90	55	37%
I actively contribute to environmental protection	1	89	55	38%
I engage in civil society	0	104	42	29%
I participate in democratic/political life	10	106	29	20%

The only proposition that seems to be more supported by PP after the project is the appreciation of cultural diversity. For all the other propositions, most of the PP responded: “to the same extent”, meaning that they were not especially affected by the project.

Table 41: Were the PP affected by the project? Table for PP living in French speaking Belgium (n=85, variable name = q12EFFcit\_1 -> q12EFFcit\_10)

How did the project affect you in the end?	less than before the project	to the same extent (as before the project)	more than before the project	
	N		N	%
I appreciate cultural diversity	1	32	47	59%
I feel European	1	44	35	44%
I am interested in contributing to youth policy development	2	49	30	37%
I actively contribute to environmental protection	1	51	29	36%
I actively support the inclusion of people with fewer opportunities	1	52	27	34%
I am committed to work against discrimination, intolerance, xenophobia or racism	1	54	26	32%
I keep myself informed on current European affairs	0	56	24	30%
I engage in voluntary activities	2	53	24	30%
I engage in civil society	1	55	23	29%
I participate in democratic/political life	3	63	15	19%

Table 42: Were the PP affected by the project? Result of the project, variable name = q13EFFintl\_1 -> q13EFFintl\_7)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements as a result of the project?	PP funded by the FSC		PP Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N Agree <sup>5</sup>	%	N Agree	%
I got to know people from other countries who I am still in contact with	132	86%	74	87%
I intend to continue the contact with networks I have established through the project	123	80%	64	75%
I am now better able to move around on my own in other countries	117	76%	62	73%
I intend to go abroad to study, work, do a work placement (an internship) or live there	112	73%	61	72%
I have established contacts with people in other countries, which are useful for my involvement in social or political issues	104	68%	59	69%
I intend to develop joint activities or projects with people I got to know through the project	98	64%	50	59%
I intend to become a member of a political and/or social movement, association or organisation	83	54%	44	52%
Total PP	153		85	

<sup>5</sup> PP who responded “agree” or “strongly agree”.



The two more consensual results of the project are related to the constitution of network and interpersonal contact. 86% of the PP funded by the FSC declared that they keep in contact with people met during the project, 80% intend to pursue these contacts over time.

The lower score here is 54% of PP funded by the FSC, who intend to join a political or social movement as a result of the participation in the project.

*Table 43: Were the PP affected by the project? Did the project have any further impact on you? (Variable name = q14EFFedu\_1 -> q14EFFedu\_9)*

Did participating in the project have any further impact on you?	PP funded by the FSC		PP Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N Agree <sup>3</sup>	%	N Agree	%
I plan to develop my foreign language skills	128	84%	70	82%
I plan to make use of non-formal* education and learning opportunities	125	82%	68	80%
I plan to engage in further education and training	122	80%	62	73%
I have become aware which of my competences I want to develop further	109	71%	59	69%
I have a clearer idea about my professional career aspirations and goals	99	65%	54	64%
I have established contacts with people in other countries, which are useful for my professional development	94	61%	51	60%
I have a clearer idea about my further educational pathway	90	59%	49	58%
I have a better understanding of my career options	83	54%	45	53%
I believe that my chances of getting a job have increased	84	55%	42	49%
Total PP	153	100%	85	100%

If we look to the questions about the “further impact” of the projects on PP, we can see that 84% of the PP funded by the FSC and 82% of PP living in French speaking Belgium intend to develop their language skills. In the same line, 80% of PP funded by the FSC intend to engage further in education as a consequence of taking part in the project.

The lower scores for this question are for issues related to work. Only 54% of PP funded by the FSC have a better understanding of their career option after taking part in the project and 55% believe that their chances of getting a job are higher<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Questions 15 and 17, that also assess the impact of projects on the PP, are not exploitable as more than 80% of the respondents didn't respond to them.

## 6. Analysis of the impact of project on Project Participants, perspectives of the Project Leaders

Project Leaders were asked to evaluate the effect of the project on the Project Participants. Two questions were available. The first one (question 8) asked the PL if they agree or disagree that the project had the following effect on the PP.

*Table 44: Which of the following effects of the project on the participants did you notice or hear about? (Variable name = q8PPEFF\_1 -> q8PPEFF\_10)*

Which of the following effects of the project on the participants did you notice or hear about?	PL funded by the FSC		PL Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N agree	%	N agree	%
appreciate cultural diversity more	26	87%	14	93%
intend to develop joint activities or projects with people they got to know through the project	25	83%	14	93%
know their strengths and weaknesses better	25	83%	14	93%
plan to engage in further education and training	22	73%	13	87%
are more self-confident	24	80%	13	87%
Now feel more European	10	33%	10	67%
intend to go abroad to study, work, do a work placement (an internship) or live there	23	77%	9	60%
have a clearer idea about their professional career aspirations and goals	18	60%	7	47%
are more interested in contributing to youth policy development	19	63%	5	33%
believe that their job chances have increased	10	33%	3	20%
<b>Total PP</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

The responses of the PL are concordant with the responses of PP to the same questions. Impact on job perspectives are evaluated as less important than the effect on the appreciation of cultural diversity, interpersonal interaction and network constitution. Only 20% of PL think that the project will have an impact on possible job prospects.

Project leaders living in French speaking Belgium feel that the project had a strong impact on their European identity, in a proportion that is twice as high as the overall project leaders.

An explanatory factor is that the turnover is much higher among Belgian PL than in other countries.

The following question focuses on the skills developed by the participants during the project and that the first project has a more significant impact on the European identity”.

Besides, the National Agencies (NA) mostly works with small organizations with strong roots in

popular neighbourhood while other NAs may work more directly with organizations that focus on European politics.

*Table 45: Which of the following skills did the participants develop through their participation in the project? (Variable name = q9PPKC\_1 -> q8PPKC\_7)*

Which of the following skills did the participants develop through their participation in the project? The participants have learned better ...	PL funded by the FSC		PL Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N agree	%	N agree	%
to communicate with people who speak another language	27	90%	12	80%
to cooperate in a team	26	87%	14	93%
to get along with people in their country whose cultural background is different from theirs	26	87%	13	87%
to learn or to have more fun when learning	24	80%	12	80%
to produce media content on their own	22	73%	12	80%
to identify opportunities for their personal or professional future	17	57%	8	53%
to discuss political topics seriously	14	47%	8	53%
<b>Total PP</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

Responses are also in line with those provided by participants (see table 39). The main difference is located in the “produce media content on their own” item, that is much more valorised by PL than by PP. Comparatively to other NA, the French speaking Belgian NA focuses less on youth employment and more on increasing citizens’ participation and personal and collective skills. It is consistent with its strong relationship with local Youth Centres, who rather focus on citizen education. The NA sustains that ERASMUS+ project first aim is to empower young people, to ignite their participation as citizens and to foster their critical perspective.

## 7. Analysis of the impact of projects on Project Leaders Funded by the FSC (n=30) and Project Leaders living in French speaking Belgium (n=15)

Table 46: Impact of the project on the PL abilities (variable name = q10aPLKCI\_1 -> q10aPLKCI\_11)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Through my involvement in this project I have improved my ability ...	PL funded by the FSC		PL Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N Agree	%	N Agree	%
to develop an idea and put it into practice	27	90%	14	93%
to negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	27	90%	14	93%
to get along with people who have a different cultural background	27	90%	13	87%
to say what I think with conviction in discussions	26	87%	13	87%
to achieve something in the interests of the community or society	26	87%	13	87%
to plan and carry out my learning independently	26	87%	13	87%
to communicate with people who speak another language	26	87%	11	73%
to identify opportunities for my personal or professional development	25	83%	13	87%
to produce media content on my own	22	73%	11	73%
to think logically and draw conclusions	22	73%	10	67%
to express myself creatively or artistically	22	73%	10	67%
<b>Total PP</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

The PL are fairly positive about the impact of the project on the improvement of their abilities. For most of the options investigated, more than 80% of the PL, in the two subsamples, agree or strongly agree that their participation in the project had improved their abilities.

Table 47: Impact of the project on the PL activities (PL funded by the FSC n=30, variable name = q11EFFcit\_1 -> q11EFFcit\_8)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements as a result of the project?	less than	to the	more than before the project	
	before the project	same extent (as before the project)	N	%
I keep myself informed on current European affairs	0	14	14	50%
I appreciate cultural diversity	0	14	13	48%
I am interested in contributing to youth policy development	1	15	12	43%
I feel European	1	15	12	43%
I engage in civil society	0	17	11	39%
I actively support the inclusion of people with fewer opportunities	0	18	10	36%
I am committed to work against discrimination, intolerance, xenophobia or racism	0	18	10	36%
I participate in democratic/political life	0	23	5	18%

Table 48: Impact of the project on the PL activities (PL living in French speaking Belgium n=15, variable name = q11EFFcit\_1 -> q11EFFcit\_8)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements as a result of the project?	less than	to the	more than before the project	
	before the project	same extent (as before the project)	N	%
I keep myself informed on current European affairs	0	10	5	33%
I appreciate cultural diversity	0	10	5	33%
I am interested in contributing to youth policy development	1	10	4	27%
I participate in democratic/political life	0	12	3	20%
I actively support the inclusion of people with fewer opportunities	0	13	2	13%
I feel European	1	12	2	13%
I am committed to work against discrimination, intolerance, xenophobia or racism	0	13	2	13%
I engage in civil society	0	15	0	0%

The effect on PL living in the French speaking Belgium seems to be less important than the effect of the project on PL funded by the FSC (except for the item “I participate in democratic/political life”).

Table 49: Impact of the project on the PL career and other prospect (variable name = q12EFFedu\_1 -> q12EFFedu\_9)

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements as a result of the project?	PL funded by the FSC		PL Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N agree	%	N agree	%
I plan to develop my foreign language skills	27	90%	12	80%
I have become aware which of my competences I want to develop further	26	87%	13	87%
I am now better able to move around on my own in other countries	25	83%	11	73%
I know my strengths and weaknesses better	25	83%	14	93%
I have a clearer idea about my professional career aspirations and goals	23	77%	11	73%
I have a better understanding of my career options	22	73%	9	60%
I intend to go abroad to study, work, do a work placement (an internship) or live there	19	63%	8	53%
I have a clearer idea about my further educational pathway	19	63%	9	60%
I believe that my chances of getting a job have increased	15	50%	5	33%
<b>Total PL</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

Lower scores are observable for the items: “I intend to go abroad to study, work, do a work placement (an internship) or live there” and “I believe that my chances of getting a job have increased”. It is worth noting that the percentage of agreement is calculated in regard to the total number of PL in the two subsamples (including missing responses).

Table 50: Impact of the project on the work of the PL in the youth field (variable name = q13aYWC1\_1 -> q13aYWC1\_21)

Please indicate the effects of your participation in this project on your work/involvement in the youth field:	PL funded by the FSC		PL Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N agree	%	N agree	%
I have learned something which I intend to use in my work/involvement with young people	27	90%	13	87%
I am better equipped to assure the quality of a youth project I am organising	26	87%	13	87%
I have improved my skills to design an activity/project for young people based on their interests and learning needs	26	87%	13	87%
I have learned better how to work in an international team	26	87%	13	87%
I have learned better how to choose, modify or develop adequate methods for working with young people	26	87%	13	87%
I have learned better to deal with unexpected situations in educational activities with young people	25	83%	11	73%
I have already applied knowledge and skills acquired during the project in my work/involvement in the youth field.	25	83%	13	87%
I now understand the connections between formal, non-formal and informal education and learning	24	80%	10	67%
I have learned more about how to foster non-formal learning in youth work	24	80%	10	67%
I have learned how to better develop and implement an international youth project	24	80%	12	80%
I have established contact with youth workers/leaders in other countries who I intend to develop a project with	24	80%	10	67%
I have learned more about how to actively involve young people in the preparation and implementation of projects	24	80%	11	73%
I am now better able to deal with ambiguity and tensions in my engagement in the youth field	24	80%	11	73%
I now understand the concept of non-formal education and learning better	23	77%	10	67%
I am now involved in partnerships or networks providing opportunities for future cooperation in the youth field	23	77%	11	73%
If relevant I now consider how to include an international dimension in my work with young people	23	77%	12	80%
I have improved my skills for the assessment of learning outcomes and competence development in/through (international) youth work	23	77%	12	80%
I now know more about the content of youth policies at European level	22	73%	10	67%
I now plan to develop my youth work competences through adequate education and training activities	21	70%	9	60%
I now better understand how I can contribute to youth policy development	20	67%	7	47%
I am now better able to acquire financial support for activities	14	47%	7	47%

involving young people			
<b>Total PL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

The only item where we observe a low score for this set of questions is: “I am now better able to acquire financial support for activities involving young people” (only 47% of the PL agrees).

*Table 51: Impact of the project on the organisation/group/body of the PL (variable name = q14EFForg\_1 -> q14EFForg\_13)*

What effect did the project have on your organisation/group/body?	PL funded by the FSC		PL Living in French speaking Belgium	
	N agree	%	N agree	%
More contacts/partnerships with other countries	24	80%	10	67%
More networking at the European level	24	80%	10	67%
Increased appreciation of cultural diversity	23	77%	9	60%
More international projects	22	73%	12	80%
Increased project management competences	22	73%	10	67%
Increased knowledge transfer and implementation of good practices within the organization	22	73%	9	60%
Increased participation of young people in the organisation/group	21	70%	10	67%
Increased competences for the provision of non-formal education	21	70%	11	73%
Increased commitment to include young people with fewer opportunities	19	63%	9	60%
More intensive involvement in European issues	18	60%	9	60%
Increased application of open educational resources	17	57%	9	60%
The network/links with local structures were strengthened	16	53%	9	60%
Improved processes of recognition and validation of competences of young people other than Youthpass	14	47%	7	47%
<b>Total PL</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

For this question, scores are also very high. One item is scoring lower than the others: “Improved processes of recognition and validation of competences of young people other than Youthpass”, with 47% of agreement.

We can see, in these three last tables, that the PL generally fully agree that the project they were taking part in had a positive impact on their abilities, on their prospects and on their organisations.



## 8. Conclusions

### **Methodological limits**

Deeper and more solid analyses would require a broader sample, particularly for the Project leaders. It would thus be particularly important to put these results and analyses in perspective through a comparison with results of the surveys in other countries. This was the first survey specifically analysed for the French speaking Belgian participants. Further surveys are needed to compare the evolution of the results across time, which will allow more solid analyses. It would be particularly relevant to conduct a survey with participants who took part in a training or a project 2 to 5 years ago, and collect more objective data on the real impact of such a training on their values, personal experience, acquired skills and professional career.

It has also to be reminded that this survey reflects the way participants and project leaders perceive the impact of the trainings. It does not measure the concrete impact that such project indeed has on their professional career, new skills or international mobility. Caution should particularly be taken in the interpretation of the (very positive) evaluation expressed by the project leaders (PL), both because of the reduced samples (N=30 and N=15) and because they may personally benefit from a positive evaluation of the perceived impact of their own project.

### **Main outcomes in terms of profile of Participants and Project Leaders**

In terms of participation profile, it is worth noting that the majority of participants and project leaders are women (64% of the PP and 70% of PL funded by the FSC, and 62% of PP 73% of PL living in French speaking Belgium). The fact that the proportion of women is higher among project leaders than among participants is an interesting fact that should be investigated in further studies. Information over the motivations of female and male participants and project leaders to participate in Erasmus+ projects would be worth collecting in next studies.

It is also interesting to note that among participants (funded by the FSC), 43% were in education or training just before the project. This proportion decreases at the level of 17% for project leaders. The FSC attracts younger project participants.

Concerning project leaders (funded by the FSC), 65% (19 out of 29) of them had a previous experience with EU youth programmes. The same pattern exists for PL living in French speaking Belgium with 9 out of 15 PL (60%) that have had previous experiences. This suggests that, at least for project leaders, involvement with European youth programmes is envisaged on the long term.

Finally, this survey provides highly interesting insights about the participation of population “at risk” or “fragile individuals” to EU youth programmes. Among PP funded by the FSC, 8% declare they

belong to an ethnic, cultural, and religious or linguistic minority. This proportion rises to 17% for PP living in French speaking Belgium. This suggests that projects involving Belgian French speaking residents are more prone to engage with precarious population than project involving resident of other countries (this conclusion should however be seen as exploratory as the size of the sample of French speaking residents is very small).

The French-speaking Belgian agency seeks to give an opportunity to more young people to take part in European projects rather than to select people who have already participated in similar projects. This survey shows that this approach is particularly efficient: 78% of the project participants funded have not taken part in an ERASMUS+ meeting previously.

The NA is also particularly concerned about obstacles that may prevent participants from poorer background to take part in European youth meetings. This survey points out that only 14,5% of the participants faced difficulties to pay the fees to take part in the project (table 10). Some further analyses would be useful to determine the profile of this group to better target financial support to these young people.

### **Main outcomes in terms of impact on Participants and Project Leaders**

Concerning the perceived impact of the projects, there is a consistent trend among the responses to different questions. It is that participants and project leaders perceive that these trainings allow participants to acquire or strengthen a wide range of skills and values.

The positive appreciation of cultural diversity (65%, see table 40), the opposition to racism (38%) and the feeling of being European (43%) are particularly important results in this epoch were racism and xenophobic parties and movements attract an increasing number of citizens and young people across Europe.

It is worth mentioning that Europe itself is not considered as one of the main topics PP learned about (only 31%, see table 38, of PP declare having learned something about European issues). However, the international experience they value in the survey, the will of many respondents to develop further international experience (73% of PP, see table 42), the value of cultural diversity and rejection of racism (table 40) are directly connected to the core values of the European project. In sum, these trainings offer an opportunity to “experience Europe” more than to “learn about Europe”. It fits very well with the “non-formal education” approach of the Erasmus+ program and its main actors (such as SALTO).

The survey shows that it is crucial to offer an opportunity for such an international/European experience to young people and that it has a clear impact on their future projects. About 75% (table 42) of the participants state, for example, that they feel “better able to move around on my own in other countries”, and about 85% (table 43) plan to develop their foreign language skills after the training.

The personal development and self-assessment of one's skills and future projects are other strong points of these trainings impact.

Conversely, participants attribute much less impact of these trainings in terms of increasing the chances to get a job (see tables 43 and 44). Overall, the training is perceived as an important international experience and an opportunity for personal development and self-assessment much more than a way to access job opportunities. This result is consistent with the objective assigned to most of these trainings as well as with the fact that many participants are students and are thus probably not seeking for a skilled job in the short term after the training.

More surprisingly, answers to various questions also point to the limited impact of these trainings in terms of learning about ICTs and media (see table 38). As ICTs and media have become core dimensions of today's democracy and public space, as well as of young people daily life, these relatively low results suggest that more emphasis should be put on sharing experience, skills and knowledge about media and ICTs in future trainings. The fact that there is a difference between PP and PL in the way they assess the impact of the project on the ability of the PP "to produce media content on their own" (73% and 80% agree among PL, see table 45; and 60% and 61% among PP, see table 39), also suggest that there is still room for improvement in this matter.

Participants perceive the projects as highly relevant and efficient to experience and favour cultural diversity, both as practices and learning. This is a particularly significant result, as it is at the core of the cosmopolitan European identity and is currently at risk both in Europe and globally. Given the current challenges faced by the European Union, more focus may be given to the aim of strengthening the European identity and learn more about Europe, as these two items have not be pointed out as major results of the participants in the projects.

### **Paths for future surveys and studies**

As National Agencies play a key role in the recruitment of project participants, it suggests that the French speaking Belgium Agency is *better able to recruit participants with less privileged background. The proportion of individuals coming from this population is twice as higher among the French speaking Belgian participants than among the participants from other countries.* If confirmed, it points to an important achievement in terms of including people from less privileged background in the Erasmus+/Youth in Action activities and it would be worth *sharing the "good practices" developed by people in charge of recruiting participants in Wallonia and Brussels* with other National Agencies. The limited size of the sample requires to remain cautious and to wait for further surveys to confirm this result. It would be particularly worth to further explore this result to both quantitative surveys among the program participants and qualitative research both with the program participants and with the project leaders and with the people responsible for recruiting the participants.



## Annex: Suggestions for future surveys and studies

Methodological limitations and biases are part of every research. A series of biases may however be considerably decreased with some limited changes in the questionnaires or other technical solutions. Here are a few suggestions:

- The overall response rate to the questionnaire is quite low and raises some methodological problem and bias. Pro-active strategies by the NA to increase the response rate would be very welcome. Project leaders may also be mobilized to contact participants and ask them to reply to the questionnaire.
- There is a strong methodological bias in the questions on the European identity. The question is framed to get a positive answer, following the expectations of the meeting organizers and of the funders.
- Project leaders who fill the form may take it as self-evaluation, as the meeting they were hired to organize is supposed to have positive effect on themselves and on the participants.

### ***Other useful questions***

A few additional and simple questions would allow to deepening the analysis. The French-speaking Belgium NA being particularly mobilized to include young people from different background and with unequal opportunities, we particularly recommend to insert the following set of questions.

We would particularly like to have a better grasp of two different forms of internationalization that have sometimes been referred to as “internationalization from above and internationalization from below”. Each one needs different kind of support and may reinforce the European identity and young people participation at local, regional, national and European levels.

- A question on the respondent’s mother tongue will be useful in that perspective. Moreover, it would ease the repartition of the questionnaires between Flemish and French-speaking Belgium, that are the focus of different reports.
- Knowing the respondent’s nationality may also contribute to a better distinction between different profiles among the participants and project leaders who live in French speaking Belgium.
- Knowing the professions of the parents and their higher diploma would be a better indicator of students’ social and economic condition than their own economic situation and higher diploma.
- Some data on their personal economic situation would however be useful, notably to know if they work, they study or have to work during their studies.

It would also be relevant to add a few questions concerning the respondent organization if s/he took part in the project as a member of a youth centre or an NGO.

As this is the first analysis of the data for French speaking Belgium, we lack a comparative perspective over time. It will be particularly interesting to conduct longitudinal research on these data and analyse how the responses differ through the years, both at the national and at the European level. It would also ensure a larger and more solid sample.