Research-based Analysis of Youth in Action

Results of the special survey on learning in YiA projects 2012 -

Country analysis Belgium (Flemish Community)

Frank Stevens

Table of contents

List of tables

1. Introduction

'Youth in Action' is a Programme of the European Union supporting European youth projects. It aims to improve key competences of young people through non-formal learning. It wants to promote active (European) citizenship of young people and it wants to stimulate European cooperation in the field of youth work (European Commission, 2011).

This report is the result of a special research conducted by the RAY Network, in May and November 2012. RAY stands for Research-based Analysis of Youth in Action and wants to contribute to an evidence-based and research-informed youth policy by studying the outcomes of non-formal learning in youth work (Fennes et al., 2011). In total 13 countries participated in the May 2012-study: Austria, Belgium (Flemish Community), Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Poland, the Slovak Republic, Sweden and Turkey. Germany and France joined the November 2012-study (Fennes et al., 2013). Furthermore, 10 countries (Austria, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Finland, France, Hungary, Luxembourg, Poland and Turkey) participated in a qualitative research, deepening the results of the quantitative research. Belgium did not participate in the qualitative research. The current report only gives an account of the results of the surveys of May and November 2012 for the Flemish Community of Belgium.

The standard surveys of the Ray-network document that participants and project leaders of YiA projects report that participation in a project promotes key competences for lifelong learning (Fennes et al., 2011; Stevens, 2013). The special survey on learning in YiA projects aims to document how YiA projects form a space for new learning experiences. Some central questions of this research are:
- What was learned in a YiA-project by participants according to the participants and project leaders?
- What was learned in a YiA-project by project leaders?
- Which educational approaches, methodologies and methods are used in YiA projects?
- How are key competences developed in YiA projects?
- How do formal, non-formal and informal learning contribute to competence development in YiA projects?
- How do project design, educational approaches, methodology and methods promote learning and competence development (Fennes et al., 2013)?

The coordination and implementation of the study is done by the Institute of Educational Science of the University of Innsbruck. The contact data of the respondents are provided by the National Agency of Youth in Action for the Flemish Community of Belgium, Jint vzw. The research partner of Jint for this report is the University College of West-Flanders, Department of Social Work and Social Care.

Whenever possible or relevant, the 2012 results will be compared with the 2011 Belgian results and with the transnational results of 2012. These comparisons deserve two remarks though. Belgium participated for the first time in the Ray-network and its studies in November 2011. The 2011 study only consists of one wave, the November 2011 wave (see Stevens, 2013). The 2012 report combines the results of two waves, the May 2012 and the November 2012 wave. The number of participants and project leaders are quite similar in both studies. A

similar remark can be made towards the comparisons with the transnational data in this report. At the moment of writing of this report, only an interim transnational report of the May 2012 wave is available (Fennes et al., 2013). Consequently, the Belgian results of May 2012 and November 2012 will only be compared with the interim transnational results of May 2012.

In 2012, the Belgian sample constitutes out of 180 participants and 87 project leaders who filled in the online survey partially or completely. The response rate of the Belgian sample is 34,8% of the contacted participants and 43,3% of the contacted project leaders. These response rates are comparable to the response rates of the transnational sample (31,5% of contacted participants and 42% of contacted project leaders).

Table 1: Country of residence of the YiA-participants and project leaders in the Belgian sample in 2012

Country of residence	Participants (N=180)		Project leaders (N=86)	
	N	%	N	%
Albania	2	1,1	1	1,2
Armenia	2	1,1	-	-
Austria	2	1,1	1	1,2
Azerbaijan	1	0,6	-	-
Belarus	1	0,6	-	-
Belgium	46	31,3	34	39,5
Croatia	2	1,1	1	1,2
Czech Republic	8	4,5	2	2,3
Estonia	14	7,8	1	1,1
Finland	9	5,0	4	4,7
France	3	1,7	-	-
FYROM	1	0,6	2	2,3
Germany	13	7,3	6	7,0
Greece	1	0,6	-	-
Georgia	5	2,8	-	-
Hungary	3	1,7	-	-
Iceland	1	0,6	2	2,3
Ireland	-	-	1	1,2
Italy	6	3,4	5	5,8
Latvia	3	1,7	-	-
Lithuania	-	-	2	2,3
Luxembourg	-	-	1	1,2
Malta	2	1,1	-	-
Moldova	1	0,6	-	-
Morocco	1	0,6	-	-
Netherlands	3	1,7	2	2,3
Poland	5	2,8	2	2,3
Portugal	7	3,9	-	-
Romania	8	4,5	2	2,3
Russian Federation	3	1,7	4	4,7
Slovakia	3	1,7	2	2,3
Slovenia	1	0,6	2	2,3
Spain	4	2,2	3	3,5
Sweden	3	1,7	3	3,5
Turkey	8	4,5	1	1,2
Ukraine	3	1,7	1	1,2
United Kingdom	2	1,1	1	1,2

The largest group of participants and project leaders were living in Belgium at the start of the project. Almost one in three of the participants in the sample were living in Belgium. Most of them live in the Dutch speaking part of Belgium (29 of 47) or in the capital region of Brussels (11 of 47). Seven of the 47 Belgian

residents were living in the French speaking part of Belgium. Not all participants are Belgian or reside in Belgium because foreign partners of a Belgian YiA-project are also included in the sample. Estonia, Germany, Finland, Turkey and Romania complete the top five of most frequently mentioned countries of residence among the participants in the 2012 sample.

Table 2: Place of residence of the YiA-participants and project leaders within Belgium

Region	Participants (N=47)		Project leaders (N=34)	
	N	%	N	%
The Dutch speaking region	29	61,7	26	76,4
The French speaking region	7	14,9	2	6,9
The German speaking region	0	0,0	0	0,0
The bilingual Brussels capital region	11	23,4	6	17,6

Among the project leaders, four out of ten were living in Belgium at the start of the project. Most of them were living in the Dutch speaking part (26 of 34) or in the capital region of Brussels (6 of 34). The two other project leaders were living in the French speaking part of Belgium. Only Germany and Italy are mentioned more than five times as country of residence amongst project leaders.

Not all participants/project leaders in the Belgian sample are funded by Belgium. Most of them (78,3%) were implicated in a project funded by Belgium and 76 out of the 87 (87,4%) of the project leaders are. Other frequently mentioned funding countries by the participants are Estonia (8), Finland (7), France and Germany (6), and Turkey (5). Among the project leaders, Sweden is mentioned five times. Three out of four participants and project leaders participate in a project that takes place within Belgium. Other frequently mentioned venue countries are Germany, France and the Russian Federation (each 6 times), and Estonia, Finland and Turkey (5 times). The Russian Federation is mentioned five times as a venue country by the project leaders. Of the 48 Belgian residents among the project leaders, 29 (60%) participate in a project taking place in Belgium, the other 19 (40%) participate in a project taking place in another country.

Table 3: Participation according to sub-action of YiA among participants and among project leaders

Sub-action	Participants (N=180)		Project leaders (N=87)	
	N	%	N	%
Youth exchange	67	37,2	36	41,4
Youth initiative	9	5,0	7	8,0
Youth Democracy Project	9	5,0	3	2,3
EVS	34	18,9	11	12,6
Cooperation with neighbouring countries of the EU	25	13,9	8	9,2
Training and networking	26	14,4	23	26,4
Training and Cooperation Plans	9	5,0	-	-
Meetings of young people and those responsible for youth policies	1	0,6	-	-

There are different sub-actions within Youth in Action. The most popular action in 2012 among participants and project leaders is a youth exchange. Four out of ten participants/project leaders were involved in this sub-action. In 2011 this was also the most popular action among participants and project leaders in the Belgian sample (Stevens, 2013). One in five participants in 2002 were involved

in an EVS-project, making it the second most popular action among participants. In November 2011, only 5% of the participants were involved in an EVS-project (Stevens, 2013). Among project leaders, this action only comes third (9%), after training and networking projects (26%), while this latter action only comes third among participants (14%). Cooperation with neighbouring countries of the EU reaches one in ten participants/project leaders. A similar percentage was found in the November 2011 sample. Training and cooperation plans are less popular among participants in 2012 than in 2011. Only 5 percent of the participants and no one of the project leaders are involved in this sub-action in 2012. In 2011, 16% of the Belgian participants were involved in this kind of action. Actions aimed at youth workers, attracted together one third of the participants. Youth initiatives and Youth Democracy Projects were the least popular among the participants and project leaders in the Belgian sample. Also in November 2011, these actions were the least popular, but it must be stressed that in 2012 9 participants were involved in a Youth Democracy Project, while in 2011 only one was. In 2012 only one participant joined a meeting with youth policy makers. In 2011, no one of the Belgian sample was involved in this action.

The transnational analysis differentiates the findings of the research according to these sub-actions of the Youth in Action Programme. This is not always possible for the Belgian sample because of the small numbers of participants and especially the small numbers of project leaders in some actions. In the November 2011-analysis of the Belgian sample a differentiation was made according to action type: projects with young people, EVS and projects with youth workers. We will also use this differentiation in this report: projects with young people (N=110 participants/53 project leaders), EVS (N=34 participants/11 project leaders) and projects with youth workers (N=36 participants/23 project leaders). Compared to the transnational dataset, there are more participants in EVS-projects and less participants in projects with youth workers in the Belgian dataset. Percentagewise, there are even twice as much EVS-volunteers in the Belgian data (19%) than in the transnational one (9%).

2. Summary of the conclusions

2.1 Executive summary

In 2012, the RAY-network conducted a special survey on learning in Youth in Action (YiA) projects. Previous standard surveys show that participants and project leaders report an improvement in all key competences for lifelong learning (Fennes et al., 2013). The special survey wishes to corroborate this key finding and aims to investigate which methods (formal, non-formal and informal learning methods) are used in YiA projects and which methods and methodologies contribute to skill development. The special research in learning combines quantitative and qualitative methods. In May and/or November 2012 participants and project leaders of YiA projects from 15 European countries were asked to participate in an online survey. Ten out of these 15 countries also organised focus groups with participants and project leaders to deepen the findings of the quantitative research. Belgium only participated in the quantitative part of the research. In total 180 participants and 87 project leaders filled in a questionnaire, resulting in a response rate of 34,8% and 43,3% respectively.

2.1.1 Competence development

A first question is what is learned through participation in a YiA-project by participants? This question has been asked to both participants and project leaders. The special survey of 2012 confirms in a high degree the findings of the standard survey of November 2011. The rankings of skill development are very similar between the two researches. Participants stress that intercultural skills, foreign language skills, social skills and first language skills have been improved by participation in the project. More than 80% of the participants in the Belgian sample agree that these skills have bettered. Project leaders claim that participants have developed foremost social skills, foreign languages skills, entrepreneurship and first language skills. More than 90% of project leaders report these skill developments. There is a certain scepticism among project leaders towards the advancement of intercultural skills by participants. While this skill only ranks tenth among project leaders, it tops the ranking of skill development among participants. The percentage difference between participants and project leaders reporting intercultural skill development is even 20% in the Belgian sample. Project leaders in the Belgian sample are also a little bit more wary than participants of the development of sense of initiative by participants: they agree to a lesser extent that participants have acquired this skill.

Also project leaders develop their skills by participating in a YiA project. More than 90% of project leaders declare to have advanced their social skills, their intercultural skills, their language skills (first and foreign languages) and non-conventional civic skills (achieving something for the wider community). Although a substantial amount of project leaders have doubts about intercultural skill development by participants, almost all of them agree to intercultural skill development by themselves.

YiA projects do not only offer skill development to project leaders. A project also offers them an opportunity for method development and implementation. Half of the project leaders state they have used methods in the project that they have

never used before and two thirds of them claim to have used unfamiliar methods, methods they only used once or twice before. Furthermore, a majority of them report to have used methods that they have learned in youth work or in youth work training before, a first indication that YiA projects can be considered as a work-related training for project leaders. In sum, for a substantial amount of project leaders, YiA projects fulfil a laboratory function.

2.1.2 YiA projects as a new learning experience

This is even more the case for participants. Three quarters of them are confronted with new methods in the project. More than eight out of ten find the methods interesting and are able to addressing issues seriously. More than half of them think that the methods would even fit in school, college or university. Especially participants, that have never participated before in a YiA project, find the methods used in YiA projects innovative. On the other hand, 25 percent of the participants in the Belgian sample consider the methods childish and not suited to learn anything. Nonetheless, the participants who have a positive appreciation of the methods outnumber the negative ones by a factor three.

The positive appreciation of the projects is also reflected in the intention to participate in future projects. Almost 80% of the participants express this intention and would motivate other young people to participate in similar projects. The reasons why they would participate in the future, is to improve their foreign language skills, their social skills and their intercultural skills. The fact that these skills are also the skills that participants mention the most as improved through participation, corroborate the fact that participants recognize the ability of YiA projects to develop these particular skills.

2.1.3 The learning continuum in YiA projects

Participants and project leaders estimate that half of the time of the project was spent on non-formal learning. Participants claim that the rest of the time is filled with informal learning for 25% and with formal learning for 20% of the time. Project leaders agree on the percentage of time spent on formal learning (20%), but also claim that 20% of the time is spent on informal learning. This difference between formal and informal learning in projects according to project leaders and participants can be observed over all action types. A differentiation of time allocated to the different forms of learning, shows that more time is spent on non-formal learning in projects with youth workers, informal learning is more common in EVS-projects and projects with youth workers allocate more time to formal learning methods.

2.1.4 Specific learning situations, methods and activities in YiA

The methods most frequently used in YiA projects are participatory and interactive of nature: discussions, reflection and presentations by participants. Also outdoor activities, mentoring and input by experts are frequently mentioned. More than half of the participants and project leaders claim that experiential methods (such as field trips, applying what is learned) are used. Digital media and role playing are the two least used methods. On average more than 7 methods were ticked by participants and project leaders. This shows that a mix of methods are used in YiA projects. The broadest variety of methods are used in projects with young people. EVS-project use on average the least number of methods. Projects with young people use relatively more participatory methods (such as discussions), affectionate methods (reflections) and

experiential methods (such as field trips). Projects with youth leaders mix cognitive-formal learning methods (input by experts) with participatory methods (input by participants, discussions) and experiential learning (applying what is learned). In EVS-projects there is not one dominant method, but relatively more work-related and informal methods are applied. The unique blend of methods in the different action types makes it possible to differentiate them: projects with young people have a more non-formal character, EVS-projects are of a more informal nature and projects with youth workers have a more formal trait.

YiA projects comprise different stages from design over implementation to evaluation of a project. All these instances offer participants and project leaders opportunities to learn. On average 6 (participants) to 7 (project leaders) of nine possible situations are ticked. The most frequently mentioned (by more than two thirds of participants and project leaders) are informal time with someone of the project and talking/reflecting during and after a project. More than seven out of ten participants and project leaders name input by experts and free time for individual activities as learning situations in their project. Two thirds mention applying ideas in practice and more than half of them ticked exercises during the project and the preparation of a project as a learning situation. A larger percentage of project leaders state that these learning situations were included in their project than participants. The largest percentage difference between project leaders and participants can be found towards the involvement of participants in the design of the project.

The different action types offer a different set of learning situations. Projects with young people offer a mix of input by experts, free time for individual activities, applying ideas, informal time with others and reflections. EVS-projects are characterized by learning through volunteering in another country, but also through exercises in the projects, mentoring and reflection. Projects with youth workers comprise learning situations as involvement in the design of the project, input by experts, informal time with others and mentoring.

2.1.5 Learning of participants in YiA projects

Exercises and activities are the best situation to learn something for participants. According to project leaders, this is the best situation to learn all 14 skills. Participants consider this situation the best for 12 of the 14 skills. Entrepreneurship and foreign language skills are best learned in informal contact with others according to participants. Also project leaders recognise this learning situation as important and consider informal contacts with others in the project as the second best learning situation. The fact that free time for individual activities is the third best situation for skill development stresses the importance of informal learning in YiA projects for participants. Experiential learning is considered the second best situation for non-conventional civic competences, learning to learn and mathematical skills. Once more a mix of especially non-formal and informal moments are instrumental to skill development. On average participants and project leaders tick 2 to three situations as best to develop competences.

Activities and exercises during the project rank relatively low for occurrence in YiA projects, but rank high for best situation for skill development. This shows that this situation is seen as effective to learn skills for participants. Input by experts on the other hand ranks high in occurrence, but low for best situation for skill development, expressing a certain scepticism towards the effectiveness of this learning situation for skill development.

2.1.6 Learning of project leaders in YiA projects

Project leaders have an educational, an organisational or combine both functions in a project. Most project leaders combine educational and organisational roles in YiA projects. Most of them are involved in the project for more than half of the time. This means that project leaders have to perform several tasks and that a project offers ample opportunities to learn. On average project leaders are confronted with 6 out of a list of 8 tasks. The smallest range in tasks (on average 5 tasks) is taken up by project leaders of projects with youth workers, while project leaders of projects with young people are confronted with the widest scope of tasks (7 on average). Projects leaders who combine educational and organisational tasks have the widest range of tasks and they are even more involved in designing the project than project leaders primarily involved in an educational role. A larger percentage of them perform administrative and organisational tasks than project leaders who have a primarily organisational role. This shows that these project leaders have a very challenging, but instructive job. Remarkably, project leaders, who have a primarily organisational role, also are often implicated in the design, the implementation and evaluation of the project.

Once more, project leaders develop skills best through a mix of situations. On average 2 to 3 situations are ticked as the best tasks to develop skills. Foreign languages, first languages, social skills and intercultural skills are improved in the broadest blend of tasks. The tasks that contribute the most to skill development are designing a project, implementing it, cooperation with colleagues and cooperation with youth workers from a partner country. The two best tasks for skill development are designing and implementing the project, showing that project leaders an participants learn in a YiA-project in a similar way: non-formal and informal moments are very instrumental in improving competences.

Designing and implementing the project are two tasks that rank low for occurrence, but high for best tasks to improve skills, what stresses the perceived effectiveness in skill development of this task. In the Belgian sample, reflection ranks high in occurrence, but relatively low for best task to develop skills, which points to a certain doubt concerning the effectiveness in skill development of this task.

2.1.7 Learning in everyday life

Participants are also asked about their learning in everyday settings. The questionnaire includes 14 of these settings. 12 of these 14 settings are applicable to more than half of the participants in the Belgian sample. Only studying combined with workplace-related learning and following a course on the workplace do not apply for half of the participants. On average, the participants in the Belgian sample consider more than 7 everyday settings as useful to learn. Once more, everyday learning comprises a wide variety of settings ranging from formal over non-formal to informal settings. In everyday life, informal learning settings are reported the most frequent. More than three quarters of the participants claim to have learned something in the past twelve months by getting together with other people, by travelling, during leisure time or just by being at home. School or university only ranks as fifth setting for everyday learning.

The settings for everyday learning differ strongly according to employment status. For participants still in education, school is the most important learning setting, but informal settings and workplace related settings are also very relevant to them. For (full-time or part-time) employed participants a formal setting as school or university is the least important setting to learn in everyday life. Their learning mainly takes place in workplace-related and informal settings. Informal settings are the main learning setting for unemployed participants, who work relatively more as volunteer.

On average participants ticked 2,8 everyday settings as best settings to develop skills. This shows once more that a combination of settings are important to learn something. The best everyday settings for skill development are a non-formal setting (working for a civic organisation with a social or political goal) and a formal one (school, college or university). The second best situations are informal settings, especially travelling abroad is often ticked. Different settings are identified as best everyday learning settings for skill development:

Kind of learning	Setting	Skills best developed
Informal	Interacting with friends	First language, social skills and discussing politics
Informal	Travelling abroad	Foreign languages, intercultural skills, fun in learning
Non-formal	Volunteering in a civil society organisation	Social skills, civic skills, entrepreneurship
Formal	School, college or university	Sense of initiative, mathematical skills and planning of learning

Two settings, volunteering in a civil society organisation and schools, rank low for occurrence in everyday life learning, but top the rank for best everyday situations for skill development. These settings are perceived as relatively effective for skill development. Getting together with others ranks high for occurrence, but relatively low for skill development, which means that this situation is perceived as less effective for skill development.

Does learning in YiA projects differ from everyday life learning or is it an extension of it? In everyday especially two skills rank high across learning skills for development: thinking logically and sense of initiative. These two skills are promoted the most by learning in everyday situations. These two skills rank rather low in YiA projects. The two skills improved the most across situations in YiA projects are foreign language skills and intercultural skills. These skills rank relatively low in everyday learning. This shows that learning in YiA projects complements everyday learning. Different skills are improved, a different mix of methods and learning settings are combined in YiA projects. Therefore it can be considered to be an alternative to everyday learning.

2.1.8 Country-specific results

In general, the results from the Belgian sample are consistent to those of the transnational sample, with a few exceptions. The main differences are about skill development, the methodology of the projects, the variety of methods best-suited for skill development and the relevance and importance of everyday settings for learning.

Normally, project leaders are more enthusiast about skill development by participants than participants themselves. In the Belgian sample, there are two exceptions to this rule. The percentage project leaders agreeing with intercultural skill development by participants is lower than the percentage of participants agreeing with intercultural skill development (by participants), but is much more outspoken in the Belgian sample. Second, a higher percentage of participants than project leaders in the Belgian sample report an improvement in sense of initiative due to participation in the project.

Participants in the Belgian sample are more divided over the appreciation of the methods used in YiA than participants in the transnational sample. On the one hand, a larger proportion of participants in the Belgian sample than in the transnational one think that these methods are more innovative, useful to address issues seriously, and even useful in a formal learning context. On the other hand, a bigger proportion of participants in the Belgian sample compared to those in the transnational sample express a certain doubt: for one in five to one in four participants in the Belgian sample the methods are considered to be childish and not beneficial to learning. This is almost 10% higher than in the transnational sample.

Participants in the Belgian sample identify less learning situations in everyday life as relevant for their own life than participants in the transnational sample. Especially work related situations are less applicable according to Belgian participants. There is also a slightly different view on the role of schools in everyday learning. In the transnational and Belgian sample, schools, colleges and universities rank fifth as a setting for everyday life learning. In the Belgian sample however, a larger proportion of participants agree that they have learned something in the past 12 months in school. Schools, colleges and universities even rank first as best everyday learning situation for skill development amongst participants in the Belgian sample and only second in the transnational sample. This difference in appreciation cannot be attributed to differences in educational status. Almost the same percentage of participants in both samples are still in education. Among those participants in education, there are more pupils still in secondary school in the Belgian data than in the transnational data.

2.2. Samenvatting

In 2012 ondernam het RAY-netwerk een speciaal onderzoek naar leren in Youth in action (YiA) projecten. Vorige onderzoeken wijzen er op dat participanten en projectleiders in een hoge mate signaleren dat ze door participatie in een project allerlei sleutelcompetenties voor levenslang leren hebben ontwikkeld (Fennes et al., 2013). Dit aanvullend onderzoek wenst na te gaan of deze centrale bevinding bevestigd wordt, welke methodes (formele, non-formele en informele methodes) of combinatie van methodes er gebruikt worden in YiA projecten en welke methodes en leersituaties precies competentie bevorderend zijn. Het onderzoek bestaat uit een combinatie van kwantitatief en kwalitatief onderzoek. In mei en/of november 2012 zijn participanten en projectleiders van projecten die gesubsidieerd worden door de nationale agentschappen van vijftien RAY-landen, aangeschreven om deel te nemen aan een online bevraging. Tien van deze vijftien landen nemen ook deel aan het kwalitatief onderzoek. Via focusgroepen wensen ze de inzichten uit het kwantitatief onderzoek te verdiepen. België is één van die landen die enkel aan het kwantitatieve luik deelneemt. In het totaal hebben 180 participanten en 87 projectleiders

deelgenomen aan de enquête. Dit is een responsratio van 34,8% en 43,3% respectievelijk.

2.2.1 Competentieontwikkeling

Het onderzoek van 2012 bevestigt grotendeels de bevindingen van het onderzoek uit 2011. De rangschikking van de competenties volgens de mate waarin participanten en projectleiders beweren dat ze ontwikkeld zijn, zijn vrij gelijkaardig. Het hoogste percentage participanten dat stelt dat een bepaalde competentie is verbeterd, vinden we voor interculturele vaardigheden, vreemde talen, sociale vaardigheden, en moedertaal. Meer dan 80% van de deelnemers stellen dat deze vaardigheden zijn verbeterd door deelname aan het project. Projectleiders zijn dan weer de mening toegedaan dat participanten vooral hun sociale vaardigheden, vreemde talen, ondernemerschap en moedertaal hebben aangescherpt. Meer dan 90% van de projectleiders zijn hiervan overtuigd. Er is een zeker scepticisme bij de projectleiders te bespeuren ten aanzien van de bevordering van interculturele vaardigheden door participanten. Bij projectleiders staat deze vaardigheid slechts op een tiende plaats, terwijl het de rangschikking aanvoert bij de participanten. Het percentageverschil tussen projectleiders en participanten die beweren dat deze vaardigheid door participanten verder is ontwikkeld, bedraagt zelfs 20%. Iets gelijkaardigs, maar minder uitgesproken vinden we ook terug ten aanzien van de ontwikkeling van zin voor initiatief bij participanten: zij zijn hiervan minder overtuigd dan de participanten zelf.

Ook projectleiders ontwikkelen competenties door hun inzet voor een project. Meer dan 90% van de projectleiders beweert hun sociale vaardigheden, hun interculturele vaardigheden, hun talen (zowel moedertaal als vreemde talen) als hun inzet om iets te veranderen in de gemeenschap aangescherpt te hebben. Hoewel sommige projectleiders een zekere twijfel hebben over de ontwikkeling van interculturele vaardigheden door participanten, gaat een overweldigende meerderheid van hen er mee akkoord dat zijzelf wel deze vaardigheid verder hebben ontwikkeld.

Het leren in YiA projecten beperkt zich echter niet tot vaardigheidsontwikkeling bij projectleiders. Het is ook een omgeving om nieuwe methodes te leren toepassen. Meer dan de helft van de projectleiders beweert methodes gebruikt te hebben in het project die ze nog nooit eerder hebben toegepast. Twee derde van hen heeft methoden gebruikt die ze ooit wel één of twee keer eerder hebben toegepast. Een meerderheid van hen beweert methoden te hebben gebruikt waarmee ze in contact zijn gekomen via het jeugdwerk of via een jeugdwerkvorming. Dit is een eerste indicatie dat YiA kan beschouwd worden als werk gerelateerd leren voor projectleiders. Uit de analyses blijkt dus dat YiA projecten een laboratoriumfunctie vervullen voor de projectleiders.

2.2.2 YiA als een nieuwe leerervaring voor participanten

YiA projecten vervullen een nog grotere laboratoriumfunctie voor participanten dan voor projectleiders. Meer dan drie kwart van de participanten wordt geconfronteerd met methodes die nieuw voor hen zijn, meer dan 80% bestempelt de methodes als interessant en beweert dat de methodes onderwerpen aanbrengen op een serieuze manier. Volgens meer dan de helft van de participanten zou de methodes zelfs niet misstaan op school of universiteit. Vooral participanten die voor een eerste keer deelnemen aan een project beschouwen de methodes ervan als innovatief. Aan de andere kant vindt

25% van de participanten de methodes kinderachtig en één op vijf omschrijft ze als niet bruikbaar om iets bij te leren. Het aantal participanten dat akkoord gaat met de negatieve uitspraken is echter in de minderheid. Het percentage participanten dat de methoden positief waardeert, overtreft het aantal negatief ingestelde participanten zelfs met een factor 3.

De positieve appreciatie van de projecten blijkt ook uit de intentie om in de toekomst opnieuw deel te nemen aan een gelijkaardig project. Meer dan 80% van de participanten drukt deze intentie uit en zou anderen aanzetten om ook deel te nemen aan een gelijkaardig project. De belangrijkste redenen om terug deel te nemen aan toekomstige projecten is om vreemde talen te oefenen, en sociale en interculturele vaardigheden te verbeteren. Dit zijn juist de vaardigheden waarvan deelnemers beweren dat ze het meest bevorderd zijn door het project. Dit wijst er op dat participanten zich bewust zijn dat YiA projecten juist deze vaardigheden kunnen verbeteren.

2.2.3 Het leercontinuüm in YiA projecten

Ongeveer de helft van de tijd van het project wordt besteed aan non-formeel leren en 20% aan formeel leren. Over informeel leren is er minder eenstemmigheid. Volgens de deelnemers is 25% van de tijd van het project besteed aan informeel leren. Projectleiders schatten dat 20% van de tijd besteed is aan informeel leren. Dit verschil in inschatting geldt voor alle soorten acties. Een vergelijking tussen deze soorten acties leert dat er relatief veel tijd gespendeerd wordt aan formeel leren in projecten met jeugdwerkers, informeel leren komt dan weer relatief meer voor in EVS-projecten en in projecten met jongeren wordt er relatief gezien het meest tijd gespendeerd aan non-formeel leren.

2.2.4 Specifieke leersituaties, methoden en activiteiten in YiA

De meest gebruikte methodes in YiA projecten zijn participatief en interactief van aard: discussies, reflectie en presentaties door de participanten zelf. Ook buitenactiviteiten, mentoraat en presentaties door specialisten worden door een groot aandeel van de participanten en projectleiders vernoemd. Ervaringsgerichte methodes (zoals uitstappen, toepassen wat geleerd is in en na het project) worden door meer dan de helft van de participanten en projectleiders aangestipt. De minst gebruikte methodes zijn het gebruik van digitale media en rollenspelen. Gemiddeld vernoemen participanten en projectleiders 7 van de 9 methodes. De meest brede mix aan methodes komt aan bod in projecten met jongeren, EVS projecten zijn gemiddeld het minst methodisch gevarieerd. Projecten met jongeren gebruiken het vaakst participatieve methoden (discussies), affectieve methoden (reflectie) en ervaringsgerichte methoden (uitstappen). Projecten met jeugdwerkers vermengen cognitief-formele methodes (uiteenzettingen door experts) met participerende methodes (uiteenzettingen door participanten) en ervaringsleren (toepassen wat geleerd is). In EVS projecten is er niet één methode die er bovenuit steekt. Dit kan zijn omdat er hier meer werk gerelateerd leren optreedt en informeel leren. De unieke mix aan methoden zorgt er voor dat de verschillende soorten acties zich kenmerken door hun methodische aanpak: projecten met jongeren zijn het meest non-formeel, projecten met jeugdwerkers het meest formeel en EVS projecten het meest informeel.

Projecten bestaan uit verschillende stadia: het voorbereiden er van, het uitvoeren van een project en de evaluatie. Deze stadia bieden verschillende gelegenheden voor leren aan. Gemiddeld komen er in een project 6 (volgens participanten) tot 7 (volgens projectleiders) dergelijke situaties voor. De meest voorkomende situaties (volgens drie vierden van de participanten en de projectleiders) zijn informele tijd doorbrengen met anderen die betrokken zijn in een project en het reflecteren tijdens en na het project. Volgens meer dan zeven op de tien participanten en projectleiders zijn er lezingen door experten gegeven in hun project. Eenzelfde hoeveelheid geeft te kennen dat er vrije tijd voor individuele activiteiten was voorzien. Twee derde geeft aan dat ze de gelegenheid hebben gekregen om ideeën uit het project in de praktijk om te zetten. Meer dan de helft stelt dat ze betrokken zijn in de voorbereiding van het project en een even groot percentage erkent dat er oefeningen/activiteiten tijdens het project aan bod gekomen zijn. Hogere percentages projectleiders dan participanten stellen dat deze leermomenten aan bod zijn gekomen in de projecten. Het grootste percentageverschil tussen deelnemers en projectleiders kan teruggevonden worden ten aanzien van de betrokkenheid van de participanten bij het ontwerp van het project.

De verschillende soorten acties bieden een verschillende mix aan leersituaties aan. Projecten met jongeren mengen lezingen van experten, vrije tijd voor individuele activiteiten, het toepassen van ideeën in de praktijk, informele tijd tijdens het project met reflectie. EVS projecten zijn dan weer gekenmerkt door leren via vrijwilligerswerk in het buitenland, maar ook door oefeningen in het kader van het project (zoals taallessen volgen), mentoraat en reflectie. Projecten met jeugdwerkers omvatten leersituaties zoals betrokken zijn in het opzetten van een project, lezingen door specialisten, informele tijd met anderen en mentoraat.

2.2.5 Hoe leren participanten in YiA projecten?

Oefeningen en activiteiten tijdens het project zijn de beste leersituaties voor participanten. Volgens projectleiders is deze situatie de beste voor het ontwikkelen van alle veertien vaardigheden. Volgens participanten is het de beste situatie om twaalf van de veertien vaardigheden in te oefenen. Enkel vreemde talen en zin voor initiatief worden meer ontwikkeld via informeel contact met anderen in het project, volgens de participanten. Ook projectleiders erkennen informeel contact tussen de betrokkenen als een belangrijke leersituatie. Volgens hen is het de tweede beste manier van leren in een project. Als derde beste situatie om te leren komt vrije tijd voor individuele activiteiten naar boven. Dit wijst nogmaals op het belang van informeel leren voor de ontwikkeling van competenties in YiA projecten. Ook ervaringsgericht leren wordt beschouwd als tweede beste manier om bepaalde vaardigheden aan te leren. Dit geldt voor het bereiken van iets voor de gemeenschap, leren leren en voor logisch nadenken. Eens te meer blijkt dat vooral een mengeling van non-formele en informele methodes instrumenteel zijn voor het ontwikkelen van competenties. Gemiddeld stellen zowel participanten als projectleiders dat in 2 tot 3 leersituaties competenties worden ontwikkeld.

Volgens zowel participanten als projectleiders komen oefeningen en activiteiten tijdens het project relatief weinig voor als leersituatie in het project. Tegelijkertijd wordt deze leersituatie het vaakst aangestipt als beste leersituatie voor het ontwikkelen van competenties. Dit wijst er op dat deze leersituatie als vrij effectief voor het ontwikkelen van competenties wordt aanzien. Een lezing

door een expert komt dan weer relatief vaker voor in de projecten, maar wordt relatief weinig beschouwd als een goede leersituatie voor het ontwikkelen van competenties. Dit wijst op een zeker voorbehoud tegenover de effectiviteit van deze leersituatie voor het ontwikkelen van vaardigheden.

2.2.6 Hoe leren projectleiders in YiA projecten?

Projectleiders nemen een educatieve, een organisatorische of beide rollen op in een project. De meeste projectleiders nemen beide op. De meeste projectleiders zijn ook voor meer dan de helft van de duur van het project erin betrokken. Dit wil zeggen dat project leiders meerdere taken moeten uitvoeren. Gemiddeld nemen projectleiders 6 verschillende taken (uit een lijst van 8) op in een project. De minst uitgebreide taakopname (gemiddeld 5 taken) vinden we terug bij projectleiders van projecten met jeugdwerkers. Projectleiders van projecten met jongeren worden dan weer geconfronteerd met het meest uitgebreide takenpakket (gemiddeld 7 taken). Projectleiders die opvoedende en organiserende taken combineren, nemen het grootst aantal verschillende taken op. Ze zijn zelfs in grotere mate betrokken in het ontwerpen van een project dan projectleiders die overwegend een educatieve taak opnemen. Tegelijkertijd voeren ze in grotere getale organisatorische en administratieve taken uit dan projectleiders die overwegend een organisatorische functie in het project hebben. Dit wijst er op dat deze projectleiders een heel veeleisende job hebben. Ze worden echter ook geconfronteerd met heel wat situaties waaruit ze kunnen leren. Opmerkelijk is verder dat projectleiders met een overwegende organisatorische rol in het project ook wel heel vaak betrokken zijn in het ontwerp, de uitvoering en de evaluatie van een project.

Opnieuw leren de analyses dat projectleiders het best leren in een combinatie van leersituaties. Twee tot drie taken worden gemiddeld aangestipt als beste situatie om vaardigheden te ontwikkelen. Vreemde talen, moedertaal, sociale vaardigheden en interculturele vaardigheden worden ontwikkeld in de meest brede mengeling van taken. De taken die het meest bijdragen aan het ontwikkelen van vaardigheden zijn het ontwerpen van een project, het uitvoeren van het project, samenwerken met collega's en jeugdwerkers van een partner land. De twee beste situaties die bijdragen tot de ontwikkeling van alle competenties zijn het ontwerpen en het implementeren van een project. Dit wijst er op dat participanten en projectleider op een gelijkaardige manier leren in een project, namelijk via non-formele en informele situaties.

Nochtans stellen projectleiders dat ze relatief weinig geconfronteerd worden met deze leersituaties in het project. Dit wijst er op dat de relatief weinige projectleiders die hiermee geconfronteerd worden, deze taken als heel effectief beleven. In de Belgische steekproef wordt reflectie aangestipt als veel voorkomende taak. Niettemin staat deze taak niet hoog in de rangschikking van beste taken om vaardigheden te ontwikkelen. Dit wijst op een zekere twijfel over de effectiviteit van deze taak voor het verbeteren van competenties bij projectleiders.

2.2.7 Leren in het dagelijks leven

Participanten zijn bevraagd over leren in 14 dagelijkse situaties. Twaalf van deze 14 situaties zijn relevant voor meer dan de helft van de participanten in de Belgische steekproef. Enkel een periode van studeren met werk gerelateerd leren en het volgen van een cursus op het werk zijn niet van toepassing op de

participanten in de Belgische steekproef. De participanten stellen de ze gemiddeld in het afgelopen jaar in 7 van de 14 voorgeschotelde situaties geleerd hebben, wat er op wijst dat ook het dagelijks leven een wijde variatie aan leersituaties biedt. In het dagelijks leven primeren echter informele vormen van leren. Meer dan drie kwart van de participanten beweert iets geleerd te hebben in de laatste 12 maanden door met anderen samen te zijn, door te reizen, tijdens hun vrije tijd of door gewoon thuis te zijn. School, hogeschool of universiteit staan pas op de vijfde plaats als een dagelijkse leersituatie.

Met welke dagelijkse leersituaties participanten geconfronteerd worden, is sterk afhankelijk van al dan niet onderwijs volgen. Voor leerlingen en studenten is een schoolse omgeving de belangrijkste situatie waarin ze leren. Ook informele vormen van leren en zelfs werk gerelateerde vormen van leren zijn hen echter niet vreemd. Voor (voltijds of deeltijds) tewerkgestelde participanten is een schoolse omgeving de minst voorkomende dagelijkse leersituatie. Voor deze participanten vindt leren vooral plaats op het werk of in informele omstandigheden. Informele leeromstandigheden zijn vooral belangrijk voor werkloze participanten, die relatief veel leren door vrijwilligerswerk te verrichten.

Gemiddeld geven participanten aan dat 2,8 dagelijkse leersituaties het best zijn voor het ontwikkelen van competenties. Dit wijst er op dat ook in het dagelijks leven competenties zich ontwikkelen via een mix van leersituaties. Twee situaties worden het vaakst aangestipt als uiterst geschikt voor het leren van competenties: een non-formele (door het verrichten van werk voor een sociale of politieke vereniging) en een formele situatie (namelijk de school, de hogeschool of de universiteit). De tweede beste leersituaties zijn informeel van aard. Hier wordt reizen vooral vernoemd. Voor de rest is het minder eenduidig welke situatie het best is voor het ontwikkelen van competenties. Bepaalde leersituaties zijn beter geschikt voor de ontwikkeling van een specifieke vaardigheid:

Soort leren	Situatie	Vaardigheid
Informeel	Interacties met vrienden	Eerste taal, sociale vaardigheden en het bediscussiëren van politiek
Informeel	Reizen	Vreemde talen, interculturele vaardigheden, plezier in leren
Non-formeel	Vrijwilligerswerk in het verenigingsleven	Sociale vaardigheden, burgerschapsvaardigheden, ondernemerschap
Formeel	School, hogeschool of universiteit	Zin voor initiatief, wiskundige vaardigheden en het plannen van leren

Twee situaties, vrijwilligerswerk in een vereniging en een schoolse omgeving worden relatief weinig geciteerd als weinig voorkomend in het dagelijks leven, maar worden wel hoog gerangschikt als het op hun vermogen tot leren aankomt. Dit wijst er op dat participanten, waarvoor deze situaties relevant zijn, deze situaties als effectief beschouwen voor het ontwikkelen van competenties. Met anderen samen zijn daarentegen komt dan weer vaker voor als leersituatie in het dagelijks leven, maar wordt relatief weinig aangestipt als er gevraagd wordt naar de geschiktheid van deze leersituatie voor het ontwikkelen van vaardigheden, wat er op wijst dat de deelnemers deze leersituatie als minder effectief beleven.

Leren in een YiA project is een andere vorm van leren dan leren in het dagelijks leven. De twee vaardigheden die overheen dagelijkse omstandigheden het

meest aangeleerd worden zijn logisch denken en zin voor initiatief. In YiA projecten worden deze vaardigheden minder ontwikkeld. Hierin worden over alle leersituaties heen vooral vreemde talen en interculturele vaardigheden bevorderd. Juist deze vaardigheden worden relatief minder bevorderd door dagelijks leren. Dit wijst er op dat YiA projecten andere vaardigheden stimuleren via andere soorten methoden en in andere leersituaties. Dit wijst er op dat leren in YiA projecten dagelijks leren aanvult en een andere manier van leren is.

2.2.8 Enkele resultaten specifiek voor de Belgische steekproef

In het algemeen bevestigen de resultaten van de Belgische steekproef de transnationale analyse. Er zijn echter enkele uitzonderingen. De belangrijkste verschillen betreffen de ontwikkeling van competenties, de methodologie van de projecten, de uitgebreidheid van de methoden die het best geschikt zijn voor het ontwikkelen van competenties en de relevantie en de belangrijkheid van dagelijkse situaties voor het leren.

Doorgaans gaan projectleiders meer akkoord met de ontwikkeling van competenties door participanten dan participanten zelf. In de Belgische gegevens zijn hier twee uitzonderingen op. We hebben reeds gezien dat een zeker percentage projectleiders minder akkoord gaan met de ontwikkeling van interculturele competenties door participanten: het percentage projectleiders dat akkoord gaat met het verbeteren van deze vaardigheden door participanten ligt lager dan het percentage participanten dat beweert deze vaardigheden ontwikkeld te hebben. Deze vaststelling is niet uniek voor België. Het kan ook teruggevonden worden in de transnationale data. Wat wel een verschil uitmaakt is dat het percentageverschil in de Belgische steekproef veel groter is, namelijk 20%. In de transnationale steekproef is dit percentageverschil slechts 6%. De tweede uitzondering is zin voor initiatief. Ook hier zien we dat het percentage participanten dat beweert deze vaardigheid ontwikkeld te hebben groter is dan het percentage projectleiders dat de mening is toegedaan dat participanten deze vaardigheid verder onder de knie hebben gekregen. In het transnationaal onderzoek zijn projectleiders positiever over de ontwikkeling van deze vaardigheid door participanten dan de participanten zelf.

Uit de Belgische data blijkt dat participanten meer verdeeld zijn in hun appreciatie van de diverse gebruikte methodes dan participanten uit het transnationaal onderzoek. Enerzijds gaan participanten uit de Belgische steekproef in veel grotere mate akkoord met positieve uitspraken over deze methodes: ze zijn vernieuwend, geschikt voor het onderwijs en brengen onderwerpen op een ernstige manier ter sprake. Tegelijkertijd gaat een grotere percentage van de participanten uit de Belgische steekproef dan die uit de transnationale steekproef akkoord met uitspraken dat deze methodes kinderachtig en weinig bruikbaar zijn. 20% tot 25% van de participanten in de Belgische data gaat akkoord met deze uitspraken, wat meer dan 10% hoger is dan in de transnationale steekproef.

Minder dagelijkse leersituaties uit de vragenlijst zijn toepasbaar op de participanten uit de Belgische steekproef dan uit de transnationale. Vooral leersituaties die verbonden zijn met werken, worden beschouwd als minder relevant. De participanten houden er ook een ietwat andere visie op na over de rol van het schoolse milieu voor het dagelijks leren. In beide steekproeven vormt het schools milieu de vijfde meest voorkomende situatie voor leren in het dagelijks leven. In de Belgische steekproef is het percentage participanten dat akkoord gaat dat ze de afgelopen 12 maanden iets geleerd hebben in dit milieu

hoger dan in de transnationale steekproef. Het is zelfs zo dat dit milieu, samen met vrijwilligerswerk in het verenigingsleven, het meest als beste dagelijkse situatie wordt beschouwd om allerlei vaardigheden aan te leren. In de transnationale steekproef bekleedt dit milieu slechts de tweede beste plaats. Het verschil tussen beide steekproeven kan niet toegeschreven worden aan het percentage participanten dat nog onderwijs volgt. Deze percentages zijn zo goed als gelijk aan elkaar. Het is wel zo dat meer participanten die onderwijs volgen in de Belgische data in het secundair onderwijs school lopen vergeleken met de schoolgaande participanten in de transnationale data.

3. Effects (on participants and project leaders) from the perspective of participants and project leaders

In the standard surveys, participants and project leaders report changes in several life domains due to participation in a YiA-project. They broadened and internationalized their social network, they deepened their knowledge of European affairs and changed their attitudes towards Europe in the sense that a majority of participants and project leaders report to feel more European after participation. A lot of them report to have gained knowledge about issues that are important to become a more active citizen: they have learned more about disadvantaged people and feel more involved with them and they learned about youth policies. Participants and project leaders are also more convinced of the importance of an active role of young people in politics. Furthermore, a substantial amount of participants and project leaders report to be more self-confident after participating in a YiA-project (Stevens, 2013).

The previous standard surveys document that participants and project leaders report an improvement in all key competences for lifelong learning (Fennes et al., 2013) as defined in the European Framework of Reference for lifelong learning (European Commission, 2007). Especially core competences to YiA projects, such as interpersonal competences, civic competences, but also proficiency in a foreign language are reported to have been improved after participation. A large proportion of participants and project leaders also agree that they have bettered their intercultural competences. Yet participants and project leaders also report significant improvement in competences that are not so essential to the Youth in Action Programme, such as entrepreneurship, learning to learn, creative competences, mathematical competences and sense of initiative. Digital competences and media competences are the least reported to have changed (Fennes et al., 2012; 2013; Stevens, 2013).

The special survey on learning focusses on competence development in YiA projects. This part of the report documents what is developed through participation according to the participants and project leaders. Later sections of this report handle how competences are improved in YiA projects. The original 21 indicators for skill development in the standard surveys were reduced to 14 in the special survey on learning. Some skills were irrelevant for the majority of participants/project leaders, while some proofed to be redundant (Fennes et al., 2013).[1]

---

[1] The omitted skills are: to understand difficult texts and expressions (first language competence), to make myself understood in another language (foreign language competence), to see the value of different kinds of arts and culture (creative and artistic competence), to critically analyze media (media literacy), to plan my expenses and spend my money in line with my budget (mathematical competence), to use new media (PC, internet) e.g. for finding information or communication, and to use PCs, internet and mobile phones responsibly (digital competence).

3.1   Competence development of participants

Once more, in 2012 more than 90% of the participants in the Belgian sample agree that their intercultural competences and their foreign languages have developed through participation in a YiA-project. Interpersonal competences and first language skills complete the top five of most reported developed competences according to the participants.

Table 4: Self-reported competence development by participants

Competence	Not at all	Not so much	To some extend	Definitely
First language competence				
To say what I think with conviction in discussions	8 4,4%	23 12,8%	**96** **53,3%**	53 29,4%
Foreign Language competence				
To communicate with people who speak another language	4 2,2%	6 3,3%	40 22,2%	**130** **72,2%**
Mathematical competence				
To think logically and draw conclusions	13 7,3%	45 25,1%	**78** **43,6%**	43 24,0%
Learning to learn				
To improve my learning or to have more fun when learning	7 3,9%	45 25,1%	61 34,1%	**66** **36,9%**
To plan and carry out my learning independently	14 7,8%	43 23,9%	**73** **40,3%**	50 27,8%
Interpersonal/social competence				
To cooperate in a team	5 2,8%	20 11,2%	61 34,1%	**93** **52,0%**
To negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	9 5,0%	17 9,4%	59 32,8%	**95** **52,8%**
Intercultural competence				
To get along with people who have a different cultural background	3 1,7%	3 1,7%	36 20,0%	**138** **76,7%**
Civic competence				
To achieve something for the community of society	8 4,4%	25 13,9%	66 36,7%	**81** **45,0%**
To discuss political topics seriously	28 15,6%	**58** **32,2%**	54 30,0%	40 22,2%
Entrepreneurship				
To develop a good idea and put it into practice	11 6,1%	22 12,2%	**80** **44,4%**	67 37,2%
Initiative				
To identify opportunities for my personal or professional future	11 6,1%	24 13,3%	64 35,6%	**81** **45,0%**
Creative competence				
To express myself creatively or artistically	21 11,7%	33 18,3%	60 33,3%	**66** **36,7%**
Media literacy				
To produce media content on my own	28 15,6%	**65** **36,3%**	55 30,7%	31 17,3%

Non-conventional active citizenship (achieving something for the community), entrepreneurship and sense of initiative closely follow upon this top five. Eight out of ten participants agree that they have improved these competences by participating in a YiA project. Seven out of ten participants feel they have changed their learning skills and their creative competences. The least reported developed competences are once again mathematical competence, traditional civic competences (discussing politics) and media literacy.

Table 5: Competence development of participants as perceived by project leaders

Competence	Not at all	Not so much	To some extend	Definitely	Can't judge
First language competence					
To say what they think with conviction in discussions	1 1,2%	5 5,8%	28 32,6%	**49** **57,0%**	3 3,5%
Foreign Language competence					
To communicate with people who speak another language	1 1,2%	1 1,2%	11 12,8%	**70** **81,4%**	3 3,5%
Mathematical competence					
To think logically and draw conclusions	4 4,7%	0 0,0%	36 41,4%	**39** **45,3%**	7 8,1%
Learning to learn					
To improve learning or have more fun when learning	1 1,2%	7 8,1%	26 30,2%	**47** **54,7%**	5 5,8%
To plan and carry out their learning independently	2 2,3%	16 18,6%	**31** **36,0%**	29 33,7%	8 9,3%
Interpersonal/social competence					
To cooperate in a team	0 0,0%	1 1,2%	14 16,3%	**69** **80,2%**	2 2,3%
To negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	0 0,0%	3 3,5%	29 33,7%	**51** **59,3%**	3 3,5%
Intercultural competence					
To get along with people who have a different cultural background	2 2,3%	11 12,8%	23 26,7%	**43** **50,0%**	7 8,1%
Civic competence					
To achieve something for the community or society	2 2,3%	5 5,8%	23 26,7%	**52** **60,5%**	4 4,7%
To discuss political topics seriously	7 8,1%	24 27,9%	**25** **29,1%**	**25** **29,1%**	5 5,8%
Entrepreneurship					
To develop a good idea and put it into practice	0 0,0%	3 3,5%	32 37,6%	**46** **54,1%**	4 4,7%
Initiative					
To identify opportunities for their personal or professional future	2 2,3%	13 15,1%	29 33,7%	**36** **41,9%**	6 7,0%
Creative competence					
To express themselves creatively or artistically	3 3,5%	8 9,3%	21 24,4%	**49** **57,0%**	5 5,8%
Media literacy					
To produce media content on their own	9 10,5%	16 18,6%	**30** **34,9%**	29 33,7%	2 2,3%

Also project leaders were asked about the competence development of the participants in the projects they have led. The most developed competences according to project leaders are interpersonal competences, proficiency in a foreign language, entrepreneurship and first language skills. Nine out of ten project leaders see an improvement in these competences among participants.

Table 6: Percentage agreement and rank ordering of competence development of participants as perceived by participants/project leaders in 2011 and in 2012

Competence	Participants				Project leaders			
	2011		2012		2011		2012	
	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank
To say what I think with conviction in a discussion	80,7	7	82,7	5	89,8	5	89,6	5
To communicate with people who speak another language	93,9	1	94,4	2	95,7	1	94,2	2
To think logically and draw conclusions	80,6	8	67,6	12	78,9	9	86,7	7
To improve learning or have more fun when learning	68,2	10	71,0	9	74,2	10	84,9	8
To plan and carry out my learning independently	53,2	13	68,1	11	67,4	11	69,7	12
To cooperate in a team	91,6	3	86,1	3	94,7	2	96,5	1
To negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	88,2	4	85,6	4	90,8	4	93,0	3
To get along with people who have a different cultural background	92,1	2	96,7	1	83,3	7	76,7	10
To achieve something for the community or society	85,2	5	81,7	6	84,6	6	87,2	6
To discuss political topics seriously	59,3	12	52,2	13	39,5	14	58,2	14
To develop a good idea and put it into practice	82,3	6	81,6	7	93,6	3	91,7	4
To identify opportunities for my personal or professional future	69,3	9	80,6	8	56,4	13	75,6	11
To express myself creatively or artistically	67,5	11	70,0	10	80,5	8	81,4	9
To produce media content on my own	49,4	14	48,0	14	58,5	12	68,6	13

More than eight out of ten project leaders agree that non-conventional active citizenship, mathematical competences, learning to learn and creative competences have changed for the better. Remarkably, only three out of four project leaders agree with an improvement of the intercultural competences of the participants. The least developed competences according to project leaders are sense of initiative, media literacy and traditional civic competences.

Although there are differences in the degree participants and project leaders agree with competence development, it must be stressed that there is also a large degree of consistency in the reported competence development between participants and project leaders and there is consistency in the answers over time. To examine this, we used Spearman's ρ.

Table 7: Consistency of competence development of participants as perceived by participants/project leaders in 2011 and in 2012

Consistency between...	Spearman's ρ
... participants answers between November 2011 and 2012	.93**
... project leaders answers between November 2011 and 2012	.94**
... participants answers and project leaders answers in 2011	.83**
... participants answers and project leaders answers in 2012	.70**

The results show that there is a high degree of consistency in the degree participants and project leaders agree with competence development over time. The Spearman's ρ between the rankings of the answers of participants/project leaders in 2011 and 2012 are high and significant. This means that the rankings of competence development in the two samples are very similar. The results also show there is less consensus over the ranking of competence development between participants and project leaders in both samples. Nonetheless, the Spearman's ρ between the answers of participants and those of project leaders are still very high and significant. Finally, there is less consensus over the ranking of competence development in the Belgian sample than in the transnational sample.

In general, project leaders tend to be more positive about competence development by participants than the participants themselves. They agree in a larger degree that skills improve. There are two exceptions to this rule in the Belgian sample. As noted before, project leaders are less convinced of the development of intercultural skills by participants than the participants themselves. The percentage difference between participants and project leaders is even 20% in 2012. While the development of intercultural competences ranks first among the participants, intercultural competence development by participants only ranks tenth among the project leaders. A similar, yet less pronounced sceptical attitude towards intercultural competence development among project leaders was found in the Belgian sample of November 2011 (the percentage difference is less than 9%) and in the transnational sample of May 2012 (the percentage difference is 6% here). Where intercultural competence development ranks second among the participants in the transnational sample, it only ranks tenth among the project leaders (see table 71, Fennes et al., 2013). Secondly, project leaders are less convinced than participants that participants have improved their sense of initiative. Once more, this is not new because the same scepticism towards sense of initiative development amongst project leaders has been found in the Belgian sample of November 2011. This discrepancy between project leaders and participants cannot be found in the transnational sample of May 2012 though.

On the other hand, project leaders are remarkably more convinced of the development of mathematical competences in YiA projects than participants. More than 86% of project leaders are convinced that this competence has been developed through a project against only 67% of the participants. As a result, mathematical competence development ranks higher among project leaders (7th place) than among participants (12th place). A similar finding is reported for the transnational sample of May 2012 where mathematical competence development ranks sixth among project leaders and only eleventh among participants (see table 71, Fennes et al., 2013).

3.2   Competence development of project leaders

Learning is not limited to participants in YiA projects. Also project leaders state that they have developed their skills during the project. More than 9 out of 10 project leaders agree with an improvement in interpersonal and intercultural competences, entrepreneurship, fluency in first and foreign language, and non-conventional civic skills. This reflects the results of the transnational sample (Fennes et al., 2013).

A similar pattern can be found in the ranking of improved skills by project leaders and participants (Spearman's ρ = .83)[2]. Nonetheless, there are some differences. In general, project leaders agree to a higher extent than participants that they have bettered their competences. The largest percentage difference can be observed towards thinking logically and entrepreneurship (percentage difference around 15%). There are only three skills that receive a higher percentage of agreement amongst participants than project leaders: speaking a foreign language, intercultural skills and sense of initiative, but these percentage differences are rather small. For all other skills applies that a higher percentage of project leaders report a stronger skill development. Regarding intercultural skills, there is a difference between the Belgian and the transnational sample. Whereas in the transnational sample a higher percentage of project leaders report an improvement of their intercultural skills, this percentage is higher amongst participants in the Belgian sample.

Table 8: Reported competence development of project leaders (N=87)

Competence	Not at all true	Not very true	Somewhat true	Very true
First language competence				
To say what I think with conviction in discussions	3 3,5%	4 4,7%	**44** **51,8%**	34 40,0%
Foreign Language competence				
To communicate with people who speak another language	5 5,9%	3 3,5%	19 22,4%	**58** **68,2%**
Mathematical competence				
To think logically and draw conclusions	3 3,6%	10 11,9%	**40** **47,6%**	31 36,9%
Learning to learn				
To improve learning or have more fun when learning	5 6,0%	12 14,3%	**38** **45,2%**	29 34,4%
To plan and carry out my learning independently	5 5,9%	15 17,6%	**37** **43,5%**	28 32,9%
Interpersonal/social competence				
To cooperate in a team	0 0,0%	2 2,4%	25 29,8%	**57** **67,9%**
To negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	1 1,2%	6 7,1%	30 35,3%	**48** **46,5%**
Intercultural competence				
To get along with people who have a different cultural background	2 2,4%	3 3,5%	20 23,5%	**60** **70,6%**
Civic competence				

---

[22] A comparison between the ranking of skill development over time (November 2011 and May/November 2012) for project leaders is not possible because in the standard survey of November 2011 project leaders were only questionned about competence development and not about skill development.

To achieve something for the community or society	2 2,4%	4 7,1%	38 44,7%	**41** **48,2%**
To discuss political topics seriously	15 17,9%	22 26,2%	**31** **36,9%**	**16** **19,0%**
Entrepreneurship				
To develop a good idea and put it into practice	0 0,0%	4 4,7%	35 41,2%	**46** **54,1%**
Initiative				
To identify opportunities for my personal or professional future	5 5,9%	13 15,3%	30 35,3%	**37** **43,5%**
Creative competence				
To express myself creatively or artistically	10 11,8%	11 12,9%	**33** **38,8%**	31 36,5%
Media literacy				
To produce media content on my own	7 8,2%	27 31,8%	**38** **44,7%**	13 15,3%

Learning by project leaders is not only limited to skill development. YiA projects are also settings where project leaders learn to apply exercises, games and methods. A large majority of project leaders signal that they have used exercises, games and methods in the Yia-project that they have learned through youth work projects and youth work training, which can be considered as a form of training 'on the job'. Furthermore, more than half of the project leaders in the Belgian sample came in contact with new exercises, games and methods in their YiA-project and a large majority were able to implement exercises, games and methods they only used once or twice before. The percentages in the Belgian sample are comparable to the percentages in the transnational sample, although a larger percentage report to have used methods they only used a few times before (66% in the Belgian sample versus 58% in the transnational sample).

Table 9: Methods used in the project as perceived by project leaders (N=87)

During this project exercises, methods and games were used that…	I disagree completely	1	2	I fully agree
I used for the first time	15 18,5%	21 25,9%	**24** **29,6%**	21 25,9%
I had used one or twice before	14 17,7%	13 16,5%	**40** **50,6%**	12 15,2%
I had used more often before	10 12,2%	12 14,6%	**43** **52,4%**	17 20,7%
I already knew well how to implement	4 4,9%	15 18,3%	**46** **56,1%**	17 20,7%
I got to know through youth work projects	13 15,9%	7 8,5%	**36** **43,9%**	26 31,7
I got to know through youth work training	12 15,4%	12 15,4%	**33** **42,3%**	21 26,9%

In contrast to the transnational sample, the percentage of project leaders reporting to have used exercises, games and methods learned through youth work projects or youth training projects does not increase with previous participations in the Belgian sample. In the transnational sample, project leaders who have participated more frequently in previous projects report more often to use new exercises, games and methods, suggesting that there is a learning curve in YiA projects. We have to be careful however with this result in the Belgian sample. Due to small numbers, only project leaders who have participated less or more than 5 times in previous YiA projects are compared to

each other[3]. The transnational sample is a better sample to investigate how previous participations in YiA projects shape method implementation in current projects. An interesting finding in the transnational analysis is that project leaders experiment more with new methods once they have participated five or more times in projects, suggesting that experiment and experience go together and that project leaders are eager to try out new methods (Fennes et al., 2013).

Table 10: Methods used in the project - perception by project leaders by previous experience of project leader (N=47)

During this project exercises, methods and games were used that… (addition of 3 and fully agree)	Number of previous EU-projects as project leader/team member		
	Less than 5 times (N=26)	More than 5 times (N=19)	All (N=47)
I used for the first time	13 50%	10 55%	23 52%
I had used one or twice before	19 73%	13 66%	32 71%
I had used more often before	22 85%	18 86%	40 85%
I already knew well how to implement	22 85%	18 86%	40 85%
I got to know through youth projects*	26 88%	16 76%	39 83%
I got to know through youth work training	18 72%	17 85%	35 77%

* p<.10

---

[3] The distinction between less or more than 5 previous participations has been made, because of the fact that this was a critical number of previous participations in the transnational sample.

4. Project designs

The previous findings show that YiA projects are for more than half to two thirds of the project leaders a laboratory to experiment with new exercises, games and methods. This is not limited to project leaders though.

4.1 Youth in action as a setting for new learning experiences

More than three out of four participants were confronted with new types of exercises, methods and games in their YiA-project. It is fair to state that YiA projects fulfil an even bigger laboratory function for a larger group of participants. Eight out of ten participants find the exercises, methods and games interesting and addressing serious issues. Six out of ten agree that the approach of the project would not be misplaced in a formal learning environment and the methods used in the project helped them to learn. One in five to one in four participants express some scepticism towards the approach. For them, the exercises, methods and games are childish and unsuitable to learn something valuable.

Table 11: Methods used in the project - perception by participants

The project used exercises, methods and games that…	Not at all true	Not very true	Somewhat true	Very true	N
Were new to me.	4,7%	17,6%	**47,1%**	30,6%	170
Triggered my interest for the project topic.	1,7%	12,6%	**43,4%**	42,3%	175
Addressed important topics	4,5%	10,8%	42,0%	**42,6%**	176
That were somewhat childish.	31,9%	**41,9%**	18,8%	7,5%	160
Helped me learn something more easily	9,1%	29,1%	**43,6%**	18,2%	165
Would also be suited for school or university	9,3%	22,1%	**37,2%**	31,4%	172
Were useless to learn something valuable	**51,0%**	27,5%	11,4%	10,1%	149

The participants in the Belgian sample are more divided in their opinions about the methods used in the projects compared to their counterparts in the transnational sample. On the one hand, a higher percentage of participants in the Belgian sample claim that the project is methodologically innovative (77,7% in the Belgian sample versus 58% in the transnational sample), interesting (87% in the Belgian sample, 70% in the transnational sample), important (85% versus 70%), useful to learn something (62% versus 52%) and suitable for school, college or university (68% versus 58%). On the other hand, the percentage of participants expressing a certain doubt about the methods, is also higher in the Belgian sample than in the transnational one. 25% of participants in the Belgian sample agree that the methods are somewhat childish and 20% think of them as useless. In the transnational sample these percentages are respectively 16% and 11%.

Table 12: Methods used in the project - perception by participants by previous experience of participants

The project used exercises, methods and games that… (addition of somewhat true and very true)	Number of previous EU-projects as participant		
	Less than 3 times	3 or more times	All
Were new to me.**	33 85%	16 64%	49 76%
Triggered my interest for the project topic.	35 85%	25 96%	60 90%
Addressed important topics	31 76%	25 92%	56 82%
That were somewhat childish.	10 26%	2 8%	12 19%
Helped me learn something more easily	22 55%	19 76%	42 63%
Would also be suited for school or university	25 61%	16 62%	41 61%
Were useless to learn something valuable	9 24%	7 29%	16 26%

* p<.05

Especially non-experienced participants agree that new exercises, games and methods are used in YiA projects. Although the other appreciations of the methodology of the projects do not differ according to experience with international youth projects in the Belgian sample, the findings suggest that the appreciation increases with experience. In the transnational sample – which is better suited to investigate this claim – a positive appreciation of the methodology is linked to previous experience[4] (Fennes et al., 2013). Overall, we can conclude that the group of satisfied participants is much larger than the group of sceptics and that young people confronted with these methods recognize the value of these non-formal methods.

This satisfaction is also expressed in the willingness of the participants to be involved in future projects (78%) and in their recommendations to others to participate in a similar project (87%). This enthusiasm is slightly lower in the Belgian sample than in the transnational sample (respectively 87% and 93%), but comparable to the findings of November 2011 (88%)[5].

Table 13: Satisfaction of the project - perception by participants (N=180)

Now that the project is over …	No	Yes
I already recommended to other people participating in a similar project because it allows the development of useful competences.	12,8%	87,2%
I plan to participate in a similar project in the next years because I could further develop useful competences.	22,2%	77,8%

The main reasons why participants would participate in future projects is to improve foreign language skills, interpersonal and social skills and intercultural competences. The fact that these are the most cited competences improved by participants during the project, is a recognition that YiA projects are especially able to develop these particular competences.

---

[4] An exception is – and this can also be traced back in the Belgian sample – is the usefulness of some of the methods.
[5] In the November 2011 the answering categories were different.

Table 14: Reasons to participate in similar projects in the future (N=138)[6]

Reason	Responses		
	N	%	% of cases
Communication in my first language	9	1.1%	6.5%
Communication in a foreign language	116	14,7%	84,1%
Mathematical competence	5	0.6%	3.6%
Basic competences in science and technology	17	2,1%	12,3%
Digital competence	14	1,8%	10,1%
Learning to learn	49	6,2%	35,5%
Interpersonal and social competence	106	13,4%	76,8%
Intercultural competence	113	14,3%	81,9%
Civic competence	65	8,2%	47,1%
Cultural awareness and expression	79	10,0%	57,2%
Sense of initiative	88	11,1%	63,8%
Sense of entrepreneurship	56	7,1%	40,6%
Media literacy	33	4,2%	23,9%
For other reasons	41	5,2%	29,7%

4.2 The learning continuum[7] in Youth in action projects

Participants estimate that 42% of the time of the projects is spent on activities that can be considered to belong to non-formal learning. According to project leaders 54% of the time of the projects is dedicated to these activities. Participants and project leaders reckon that one fifth of the time of the projects is spent on more formal learning activities, while one fifth (project leaders) to one fourth (participants) of the time is allocated to informal learning. This means that YiA projects offer a broad range of learning activities, including all types of learning. If we compare the results of the Belgian sample with those of the transnational sample, than we see not a lot of differences. Participants in the Belgian sample claim that less time is spend on formal learning, while they estimate the time allocated to informal learning a little bit higher than their counterparts in the transnational sample. Project leaders in the Belgian sample (54%) estimate the time spent on non-formal learning higher than project leaders in the transnational sample (49%).

Table 15: Percentage of time allocated to types of activity according to action type – perception of participants

Mean percentages	Projects with young people (N=87)	EVS (N=32)	Projects with youth workers (N=27)	Total (N=146)
Listening to and engaging with presentations/inputs given by experts or group/project leaders	19,4%	13,1%	33,3%	20,6%
Planned activities and exercises which were part of the programme of the project, including its preparation; consultations with a project leader / member of the project team	43,8%	39,1%	38,0%	41,6%

---

[6] This question was only asked to participants who indicated to be willing to participate in future projects.
[7] For the theoretical background, see Fennes et al., 2013

Activities which were not part of the project programme including breaks and meals (spontaneous activities; informal time with other participants and with persons who did not participate in the project; time for individual activities and reflections)	25,1%	32,0%	21,8%	26,0%
Other activities or situations	10,6%	15,6%	6,9%	11,1%

Participants and project leaders of projects with youth workers indicate that a higher percentage of time is allocated to formal learning than participants and project leaders involved in other action types. Formal learning is less prominent in EVS-projects. In these projects a higher proportion of time is spent on informal learning, according to project leaders and participants. Non-formal learning is most common in project with young people. These results are in line with the results of the transnational analysis[8].

Table 16: Percentage of time allocated to types of activity according to action type – perception of project leaders

Mean percentages	Projects with young people (N=50)	EVS (N=9)	Projects with youth workers (N=18)	Total (N=77)
Listening to and engaging with presentations/inputs given by experts or group/project leaders	17,2%	13,3%	25,8%	18.8%
Planned activities and exercises which were part of the programme of the project, including its preparation; consultations with a project leader / member of the project team	56,3%	52,2%	49,2%	54.1%
Activities which were not part of the project programme including breaks and meals (spontaneous activities; informal time with other participants and with persons who did not participate in the project; time for individual activities and reflections)	18,2%	20,6%	15,3%	17.8%
Other activities or situations	8,3%	13,9%	9,7%	9.3%

In the Belgian and the transnational sample, project leaders gauge that there is more time spent on non-formal learning than participants, while participants signal that more time is spend on informal learning than project leaders. This observation holds true for all action types. A possible explanation is that project leaders are busy organizing activities in breaks and experience these times as a non-formal activity while for participants breaks are an informal learning moment.

---

[8] In the transnational analysis a comparison is made on the level of actions and not on the level of action types.

4.3 Specific methods in Youth in action-projects

A broad variety of methods is used in YiA projects. On average participants and project leaders indicate that 7 different methods are used during the project.

Table 17: Specific methods used in the project according to participants (N=179)

Method	Responses		
	N	%	% of cases
Presentations/input by experts/project	115	9,1%	64.2%
Presentations/input by participants	136	10.8%	76.0%
Discussions	147	11.7%	82.1%
Role plays, simulations	109	8.7%	60.9%
Artistic methods (theatre, music, paint)	94	7.5%	52.5%
Field exercises (exploring the environment)	106	8.4%	59.2%
Trying out what was learned	91	7.2%	50.8%
Using digital or online media	72	5.7%	40.2%
Individual reflection or reflection in group	136	10.8%	76.0%
Advice to or mentoring of participants	117	9.3%	65.4%
Outdoor or sports activities	124	9.9%	69.3%
Other	11	0.9%	6.1%

The most used methods according to participants and project leaders are very participatory methods: discussions, reflections and presentations by participants. Also ranking very high are outdoor or sport activities, mentoring and a more formal method like presentations by experts, illustrating that YiA projects use a mix of formal and non-formal methods. Artistic methods and more experiential learning methods such as field exercises and trying out what was learned are mentioned by more than half of the participants and project leaders. The least mentioned method by participants are the use of digital media and role play by project leaders. The rankings of the methods by participants and project leaders are very similar (spearman's ρ =.83). The exceptions are the least mentioned methods: role play (only ranked 11th by project leaders and 7th by participants) and digital media (ranked 8th by project leaders and 11th by participants).

Table 18: Specific methods used in the project according to project leaders (N=85)

Method	Responses		
	N	%	% of cases
Presentations/input by experts/project	63	9.8%	74.1%
Presentations/input by participants	74	11,5%	87,1%
Discussions	77	11.9%	90.6%
Role plays, simulations	37	5,7%	43,5%
Artistic methods (theatre, music, paint)	44	6,8%	51,8%
Field exercises (exploring the environment)	47	7,3%	55,3%
Trying out what was learned	53	8,2%	62,4%
Using digital or online media	52	8,1%	61,2%
Individual reflection or reflection in group	81	12,6%	95,3%
Advice to or mentoring of participants	60	9,3%	70,6%
Outdoor or sports activities	57	8,8%	67,1%
Other	12	1,8%	14,1%

With the exception of reflections, mentoring and outdoor activities, all methods are cited by a larger proportion of participants in the transnational sample than in the Belgian sample. The percentage differences are not that big though (at most 10% for presentations by experts and artistic methods). The same holds true for project leaders, except for discussions, mentoring and reflections. A higher proportion of project leaders in the Belgian sample indicate these methods than project leaders in the transnational sample. Reflection is mentioned by 95% of the project leaders in the Belgian sample, but only by 80% of the project leaders in the transnational sample.

According to action type, the broadest variety in methods can be found in projects with young people (on average 7 according to participants and 8 according to project leaders), closely followed by projects with youth workers (participants: on average 7 methods, project leaders: on average 6 methods). Participants and project leaders in EVS-projects report on average 6 and 5 used methods respectively, indicating that the scope of methods used in these projects is smaller, but still substantial.

Table 19: Specific methods used in the project according to participants by action type (N=179)

Method	Action type		
	Projects with young people (N = 110)	EVS (N = 33)	Projects with youth workers (N=36)
Presentations/input by experts/project	59.1%	57.6%	86.1%
Presentations/input by participants	79.1%	54.5%	86.1%
Discussions	81.8%	72.7%	91.7%
Role plays, simulations	62.7%	45.5%	69.4%
Artistic methods (theatre, music, paint)	58,5%	60.6%	27.8%
Field exercises (exploring the environment)	62,7%	48.5%	58.3%
Trying out what was learned	53,3%	33.3%	58.3%
Using digital or online media	36,4%	45.5%	47.2%
Individual reflection or reflection in group	72,7%	72,7%	88,9%
Advice to or mentoring of participants	65,5%	63,6%	66.7%
Outdoor or sports activities	81,8%	57.6%	41.7%
Other	6,4%	6,1%	5.6%

The broadest variety of methods is used in projects with young people. These projects combine participatory and affective non-formal methods (presentations by participants, discussions and reflection) with experiential methods (especially field exercises and trying out what was learned) and outdoor or sports activities. Projects with youth workers are characterised by a mix of methods that are more cognitive and formal (such as presentations), but that are also participatory (presentations by participants, discussions), affective (reflections and role play) or experiential (especially field exercises and trying out what was learned). In EVS-projects there is not one method that is mentioned particularly more. A remarkable difference in opinion can be found between project leaders and participants in EVS-projects concerning trying out what was learned. Only a third of the participants indicate this method in the Belgian sample, while 8 out of the 10 project leaders claim that this method was used. Once more, we have to be careful with interpretations because of the small number of project leaders

in EVS-projects. In the transnational sample, almost the same proportions of project leaders and participants claim to have been using this method. A possible explanation for the smaller variety of methods used in EVS-projects, is that these projects are characterized by more workplace-related learning and more informal learning (Fennes et al., 2013). The differentiation of methods according to action type corroborates previous finding of this report: projects with young people use more non-formal methods, projects with youth workers more formal ones and EVS-projects more informal learning methods.

Table 20: Specific methods used in the project according to project leaders by action type (N=85)

Reason	Action type		
	Projects with young people (N = 53)	EVS (N = 10)	Projects with youth workers (N=22)
Presentations/input by experts/project	81,1%	30,0%	73,9%
Presentations/input by participants	94,3%	70,0%	77,9%
Discussions	94,3%	70,0%	90,9%
Role plays, simulations	56,6%	10,0%	27,3%
Artistic methods (theatre, music, paint)	62,3%	40,0%	31,8%
Field exercises (exploring the environment)	58,5%	50,0%	50,0%
Trying out what was learned	69,8%	80,0%	36,4%
Using digital or online media	62,3%	50,0%	63,6%
Individual reflection or reflection in group	96,2%	90,0%	95,5%
Advice to or mentoring of participants	77,4%	70,0%	54,4%
Outdoor or sports activities	84,9%	60,0%	27,3%
Other	20,8%	0,0%	4,5%

5. Learning of participants in YiA projects

Youth in Action-projects are characterised by a multi-method approach. These methods are used in several situations and activities for learning: from design of a project, over its implementation to its evaluation. In all these stages of the project, participants and project leaders can learn a lot. This section of the report highlights which instance is the best suited to improve skills.

5.1 Learning situations and activities

In total 9 situations or activities have been offered to participants and project leaders[9]. On average participants indicated 5 to 6 situations or activities that they have met during their project. Project leaders even indicated 6 to 7 such situations or activities. This shows that YiA projects offer a wide range of learning situations and activities.

Table 21: Activities and situations in the project according to participants (N=179)

The following activities or situations occurred as part of the project I participated in:	Responses			
	N	%	% of cases	Rank
Involvement in the preparation or organisation of the project	87	8,5%	48,6%	8
Voluntary work in another country	50	4,9%	27,9%	9
Activities and exercises which were part of the project programme	95	9,3%	53,1%	7
Listening to presentations or input (e.g. given by experts, members of the project team etc.)	130	12,7%	72,6%	4
Informal time/experiences with other project participants or people in the project environment	144	14,1%	80,4%	1
Advice or mentoring by a member of the project team	113	11,1%	63,1%	6
Free time for individual activities during the project	133	13,0%	74,3%	3
Reflecting/talking about the project experiences during or after the project	138	13,5%	77,1%	2
Using/applying during or after the project what I had experienced/learned through the project	119	11,6%	66,5%	5
Other	13	1,3%	7,3%	10

The two activities the most ticked by participants and project leaders are informal learning situations: informal time with other participants or people involved in the project and talking about the project during or after the project. Almost three in four participants and project leaders indicated free time for individual activities and listening to presentations as a learning situation/activity. More than half of the participants and project leaders state that there was room for exercises in the project and there was room for applying acquired knowledge

---

[9] A tenth option, other situations and activities, is omitted in this analysis because of the small number of participants and project leaders who have ticked this option.

and mentoring by a member of the project team. Almost half of the participants and even eight out of ten project leaders claim that the participants were involved in the preparation of the project. The learning situation the least cited is voluntary work in another country. This is a learning situation typical for EVS-projects (and for this reason included in the questionnaire), but is very atypical for other action types in the YiA-programme.

Table 22: Activities and situations in the project according to project leaders (N=87)

The following activities or situations occurred as part of the project I participated in:	Responses			
	N	%	% of cases	Rank
Involvement in the preparation or organisation of the project	68	11,6%	78,2%	4
Voluntary work in another country	35	6,0%	40,2%	9
Activities and exercises which were part of the project programme	63	10,8%	72,4%	6
Listening to presentations or input (e.g. given by experts, members of the project team etc.)	63	10,8%	72,4%	6
Informal time/experiences with other project participants or people in the project environment	77	13,1%	88,5%	2
Advice or mentoring by a member of the project team	65	11,1%	74,7%	5
Free time for individual activities during the project	71	12,1%	81,6%	3
Reflecting/talking about the project experiences during or after the project	80	13,7%	92,0%	1
Using/applying during or after the project what I had experienced/learned through the project	63	10,8%	72,4%	6
Other	1	0,2%	1,1%	

A larger proportion of project leaders than participants claim that these learning situations and activities are included in the projects. Nonetheless, the rankings of the situations by participants and projects leaders are very similar (Spearman's ρ = .80). There are some differences in the rankings: project leaders rank reflections, activities and exercises during the project, mentoring by a project member and involvement in the preparation of a project higher then participants. The largest disagreement between participants and project leaders concerns this last activity. While project leaders rank involvement in the preparation or organisation as fourth, participants only rank this activity as eighth. A possible explanation is that this is wishful thinking on behalf of the project leaders and they overestimate the degree participants are involved in the preparation of the project. Another explanation is that project leaders and participants have a slightly different idea of what constitutes this activity. It must be stressed that this is not a typical Belgian phenomenon. Not only project leaders in the Belgian sample rank involvement in the preparation and organization of a project higher than participants. A similar finding was namely observed in the transnational sample of May 2012.

Table 23: Activities and situations in the project differentiated by action type according to participants (N=179)

The following activities or situations occurred as part of the project I participated in:	Action type		
	Projects with young people (N = 53)	EVS (N = 10)	Projects with youth workers (N=22)
Involvement in the preparation or organisation of the project	48,2%	44,1%	54,3%
Voluntary work in another country	22,7%	61,8%	11,4%
Activities and exercises which were part of the project programme	44,5%	79,4%	54,3%
Listening to presentations or input (e.g. given by experts, members of the project team etc.)	78,2%	44,1%	82,9%
Informal time/experiences with other project participants or people in the project environment	83,6%	64,7%	85,7%
Advice or mentoring by a member of the project team	59,1%	70,6%	68,6%
Free time for individual activities during the project	80,9%	70,6%	57,1%
Reflecting/talking about the project experiences during or after the project	80,9%	64,7%	77,1%
Using/applying during or after the project what I had experienced/learned through the project	68,2%	58,8%	68,6%

There are some differences between the Belgian sample and the transnational sample. A larger proportion of participants in the transnational sample (61%) indicate that they were involved in the preparation of the project than in the Belgian sample (49%), while in the Belgian sample a larger proportion of participants (53%) tick activities and exercises of the projects than in the transnational sample (37%). A larger proportion of project leaders in the Belgian sample than in the transnational sample indicate that the project provides for reflections (92% versus 83%), mentoring (75% versus 67%) and free time for individual activities (82% versus 75%). On the other hand, more project leaders in the transnational sample (80%) than in the Belgian sample (72%) say there is room for applying knowledge during and after the project.

Table 24: Activities and situations in the project differentiated for action type according to project leaders (N=87)

The following activities or situations occurred as part of the project I participated in:	Action type		
	Projects with young people (N = 53)	EVS (N = 10)	Projects with youth workers (N=22)
Involvement in the preparation or organisation of the project	83,0%	63,6%	73,9%
Voluntary work in another country	41,5%	45,5%	34,8%
Activities and exercises which were part of the project programme	77,4%	63,6%	65,2%
Listening to presentations or input (e.g. given by experts, members of the project team etc.)	79,2%	27,3%	78,3%
Informal time/experiences with other project participants or people in the project environment	90,6%	81,8%	87,0%

Advice or mentoring by a member of the project team	81,1%	81,8%	56,5%
Free time for individual activities during the project	94,3%	54,5%	65,2%
Reflecting/talking about the project experiences during or after the project	88,7%	100,0%	95,7%
Using/applying during or after the project what I had experienced/learned through the project	77,4%	72,7%	60,9%

A differentiation by action type shows that listening to presentations, free time with others involved in the project, applying insights during and after the project, but especially free time for individual activities and reflections are typical activities and situations for projects with young people. Projects with youth workers are characterized by involvement in project preparation and organisation, listening to presentations, informal time with others and mentoring. Activities such as volunteering in another country, activities and exercises during the project (what also includes language courses for EVS-projects), but also mentoring and reflection are more typical for EVS-projects.

5.2   How do participants learn best in YiA projects?

One of the central questions of the 2012 research is not only what, but also how young people learn in YiA projects. To answer this question, participants and project leaders were asked to indicate which skills participants developed best in 9 possible learning situations that can occur in a YiA-project.

There is a high agreement in the responses of participants and project leaders on several domains. The percentages of participant and project leaders indicating skill development in a certain activity/situation (the last but one row in table 25 and table 26) are very similar. There is a highly significant correlation of .89 between these percentages. Therefore the rankings of the activities/situations according to importance of skill development by project leaders and participants (the bottom row of table 25 and table 26) are very akin[10]: five situations rank identical, 2 situations differ by one rank and two situations differ by two ranks.

There is also a high agreement between participants and project leaders about skill development across situations/activities (the percentage columns in table 25 and table 26). The correlation between those percentages is .89. Not surprisingly, the rankings of these skills across situations by participants and project leaders, correspond very high[11]. The ranks of four skills are identical, seven skills differ by one rank, two (first language skills and to have more fun in learning) differ by two ranks and one by three ranks. This latter competence is maths, which is not ranked high by participants (9th) and even less by project leaders (12th). Once more, the agreement between participants and project

---

[10] Spearman's ρ is .95.
[11] Spearman's ρ is .95.

leaders in the transnational sample is higher than the agreement between participants and project leaders in the Belgian sample.

The situation in which skill development best occurs is the same for 12 of the 14 skills according to participants and project leaders in the Belgian sample. Skills are best developed through activities and exercises during the project. In the transnational sample, there was an even complete agreement between participants and project leaders on this subject matter. In the Belgian sample, a larger number of participants think that foreign languages are best developed during informal contacts than in activities or exercises during the project. Project leaders disagree. According to a larger number of them foreign languages are best developed during activities/exercises than in informal contact. For eight of the fourteen skills the second best situation for skill development (informal contact with others in the project) is identical for participants and project leaders, which illustrates that the ranking of best situations to learn all skills is similar for participants and project leaders.

The ranking of skill development across situations in projects by participants and project leaders (one but last column in table 25 and table 26) is similar to the rankings of skill development in a direct question to participants and project leaders (see table 6)[12]. First language skills and intercultural skills rank higher among project leaders if asked about concrete skill development in a specific situation than in a direct question. This can imply that project leaders underestimate the occurrence of first language development and intercultural skills development in projects when confronted with a direct question. It also can imply that project leaders, when confronted with a concrete question (which skill development occurs in a specific situation/activity?), perceive that the situations/activities included in a YiA project contribute relatively strong to the development of these two skills.

There is less coherence between the ranking of the activities/situations for best skill development (table 25, 26) and the ranking of activities/situations according to occurrence in the projects (table 23, 24)[13]. This disparity between rankings by participants and project leaders is mainly due to the ranking of activities/exercises as a best learning situation. While this situation only ranks 7th with respect to occurrence according to participants, it is the most ticked situation when asked which situation is best to develop skills. A similar difference in ranking can be found among project leaders. Activities and exercises only rank 6th in occurrence, but first for situations in which skills are best developed. A possible explanation is that participants and project leaders underestimate the occurrence of activities/exercises during projects when a direct question is asked. It also can imply that participants and project leaders perceive less activities/exercises during the project, but that they feel that these activities and exercises are a very potent learning situation, enabling development of several competences. The opposite holds true for listening to a presentation/input for participants. While participants rank this situation as

---

[12] Spearman's ρ for participants is .95, Spearman's ρ for project leaders is .90.

[13] Spearman's ρ is . 48 for participants and .51 for project leaders.

fourth in occurrence, it only ranks 8th in best skill development. This can point to the fact that participants overestimate the occurrence of listening to presentations or input. It can also be indicative that participants feel that this learning method is less suited to develop skills. These disparities in rankings are not limited to the Belgian sample. A similar divergence in rankings of the same situations by participants and project leaders has been observed in the transnational May 2012 sample.

Participants learn best in YiA projects through a variety of methods, showing that a mix of non-formal, informal and formal methods contribute to competence development. On average, participants in the Belgian sample ticked 2.5 situations per skill and project leaders 2.6 situations per skill, which is lower than in the transnational sample where participants ticked on average 3.1 situations per skill and project leaders 3.6 situations per skill. Project leaders in the Belgian sample report on average a slightly higher number of situations in which participants learn, but the difference between participants and project leaders in the Belgian sample is less outspoken than in the transnational sample. Foreign language skills (on average 3.7 situations according to participants and project leaders), intercultural competences (on average 3.4 situations according to participants and on average 2.9 situations according to project leaders) and first language skills (on average 3.0 situations according to participants and project leaders) are trained in the broadest variety of learning situations/settings in a YiA-project, media skills (1.6 situations according to participants, 1.5 situations according to project leaders), discussing politics (1.8 situations according to participants, 1.4 situations according to project leaders) and learning independently (1.9 situations according to participants, 2.2 situations according to project leaders) in the narrowest.

Non-formal education, indicated by the situation activities/exercises during the project, is the most cited situation by participants where they learn best 12 of the 14 skills. According to project leaders, activities and exercises during the project are the best situations to learn all skills. This illustrates how convinced participants and projects leaders are of the usefulness of non-formal education methods in YiA projects.

Also informal education is important in YiA projects. Informal experiences with other project members or people around the project and informal contact during free time are according to participants the second and third best situation to learn several skills overall, but especially to learn a foreign language or to develop a sense of initiative. Furthermore, informal contact with others is the second best situation to learn social and intercultural skills, to improve learning to learn and to improve political awareness according to participants and project leaders, stressing the importance of informal learning in the development of civic competences. Project leaders consider informal contacts with others to be the second best situation to boost creativity among participants, participants tick free time during the project as second best suited to develop creativity, while project leaders consider free time during a project to be very instrumental in learning a foreign language.

Experiential learning (using/applying what I have learned after the project) is the second best situation to learn non-conventional civic competences (achieving something for the community), to learn mathematical competences and to learn how to plan and carry out learning independently according to participants. Project leaders only ticked this last situation as the second best situation to learn to plan and carry out learning. Finally, the preparation of the project is the second best situation to improve media competences and entrepreneurship according to participants and project leaders alike.

Table 25: Learning of the participants in the project - participants (N=149)

Please indicate what you have learned best in which situation / Competences	Sit 1 When preparing the project	Sit 2 During informal contact with other people	Sit 3 During voluntary work in another country	Sit 4 In activities and exercises of the project	Sit 5 When reflecting/talking about the project	Sit 6 When getting advice from a project member	Sit 7 During free time for individual activities	Sit 8 When listening to presentations	Sit 9 When applying what I had learned	Total	Percentage	Ranking	n
To say what I think with conviction in discussions	49	80	23	84	75	37	54	34	50	486	8,80	3	144
To communicate with people who speak another language	53	103	41	96	66	52	95	62	43	611	11,06	1	155
To cooperate in a team	58	58	32	117	45	32	34	26	48	450	8,15	4	147
To produce media content on my own	31	16	16	36	20	18	22	21	22	202	3,66	14	85
To develop a good idea and put it into practice	51	49	25	83	44	41	41	36	49	419	7,59	6	135
To negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	49	66	24	88	56	39	41	29	41	433	7,84	5	137
To achieve something for the community or society	50	46	35	71	41	25	39	35	54	396	7,17	7	122
To think logically and draw conclusions	42	38	21	60	44	36	33	39	44	357	6,46	9	112
To identify opportunities for my personal or professional future	28	61	50	44	43	44	54	26	41	391	7,08	8	124
To improve my learning or have more fun when learning	26	41	28	62	38	31	36	30	37	329	5,96	11	105
To discuss political topics seriously	27	42	10	48	29	19	39	37	27	278	5,03	13	101
To plan and carry out my learning independently	35	28	22	47	31	27	41	18	46	295	5,34	12	105
To express myself creatively or artistically	30	42	19	81	34	24	45	23	36	334	6,05	10	113
To get along with people who have a different cultural background	51	88	39	90	60	42	82	45	45	542	9,81	2	144
Total	580	758	385	1007	626	467	656	461	583	5523			
Percentage	10,50	13,72	6,97	18,23	11,33	8,46	11,88	8,35	10,56	-	100	-	
Ranking	6	2	9	1	4	7	3	8	5				

In each row please tick all situations that apply. If none apply, please do not tick. Frequencies

Table 26: Learning of the participants in the project – project leaders (N=74)

Please indicate what you have learned best in which situation	Sit 1	Sit 2	Sit 3	Sit 4	Sit 5	Sit 6	Sit 7	Sit 8	Sit 9				
Situation / Competences	When preparing the project	During informal contact with other people	During voluntary work in another country	In activities and exercises of the project	When reflecting/talking about the project	When getting advice from a project member	During free time for individual activities	When listening to presentations	When applying what I had learned	Total	Percentage	Ranking	n
	In each row please tick all situations that apply. If none apply, please do not tick. Frequencies												
To say what they think with conviction in discussions	26	36	5	51	47	18	26	19	19	247	8,40	2	74
To communicate with people who speak another language	31	47	15	55	37	21	48	32	20	306	10,41	1	71
To cooperate in a team	34	35	14	61	26	19	21	10	25	245	8,34	3	74
To produce media content on their own	23	13	7	30	13	7	8	10	9	120	4,08	13	54
To develop a good idea and put it into practice	35	26	11	48	28	20	27	14	30	239	8,13	4	70
To negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	26	36	9	53	30	28	21	13	18	234	7,96	5	71
To achieve something for the community or society	28	31	14	41	28	15	20	14	28	219	7,45	8	65
To think logically and draw conclusions	31	27	8	47	36	16	21	24	22	232	7,89	6	67
To identify opportunities for their personal or professional future	17	31	9	30	31	25	20	22	22	207	7,04	9	67
To improve their learning or have more fun when learning	13	32	8	49	24	14	28	15	23	206	7,01	10	63
To discuss political topics seriously	10	20	3	27	13	8	15	8	6	110	3,74	14	48
To plan and carry out their learning independently	24	19	12	28	22	14	19	9	25	172	5,85	11	59
To express themselves creatively or artistically	15	22	8	46	19	12	20	10	20	172	5,85	11	62
To get along with people who have a different cultural background	21	34	15	42	22	18	39	18	21	230	7,83	7	62
Total	334	409	138	608	376	235	333	218	288	2939			
Percentage	11,36	13,92	4,70	20,69	12,79	8,00	11,33	7,42	9,80	-	100	-	
Ranking	4	2	9	1	3	7	5	8	6				

6. Learning of project leaders in YiA projects

Also project leaders learn in YiA projects. Their learning depends on their involvement and their role in the project. Half of the project leaders (51%) are involved in their projects on a voluntary basis. This is less than in the transnational sample of May 2012 (62%), but comparable to the responses in the Belgian sample of November 2011 (53%). This means that the other half are professionally involved in the projects (28% full-time, 20% part-time). This is more than in the transnational sample (23% full-time and 18% part-time) of May 2012, but not completely similar to the Belgian sample of November 2011. In 2012, more project leaders are involved on a part-time basis than in 2011 (34% full-time, 12% part-time).

Table 27: Involvement in the project on a voluntary or employed basis

I was involved in this project	Frequency	Valid percentage
On a voluntary, unpaid basis	40	51,3%
On a full-time employment basis	22	28,2%
On a part-time employment basis	16	20,5%
Total	78	100%

Volunteers are more common in projects with young people and to a lesser extent in projects with youth workers, while project leaders of EVS-projects are more professionally involved. Compared to November 2011, more project leaders of projects with youth workers are voluntarily involved in their project (37% in 2011 versus 56% in 2012).

Table 28: Involvement in the project on a voluntary or employed basis by action type

| I was involved in this project | Action type | | |
	Projects with young people (N = 51)	EVS (N = 9)	Projects with youth workers (N=18)
On a voluntary, unpaid basis	30 58,8%	0 0,0%	10 55,6%
On a full-time employment basis	12 23,5%	5 55,6%	5 27,8%
On a part-time employment basis	9 17,6%	4 44,4%	3 16,7%

One in ten project leaders in the Belgian sample report to have a primarily educational function in the project, more than one in three has a primarily organizational function and more than half of the project leaders report to combine both roles. This is comparable to the transnational sample (16% primarily educational, 31% primarily organizational and 53% both). Compared to the Belgian sample of 2011 less project leaders have an exclusively educational role (20%) and more projects leaders combine both roles (47% in November 2011).

Table 29: Project leader's role/function in the project (N=67)

My role in this project was	Frequency	Valid percentage
Primarily educational	6	9,0%
Primarily organisational	24	35,8%
Equally educational as organisational	37	55,2%

There are not a lot of differences in the roles of project leaders according to action type. Not one project leader of EVS-projects has a primarily educational function.

Table 30: Project leader's role/function in the project by action type

My role in this project was	Action type		
	Projects with young people (N = 45)	EVS (N = 9)	Projects with youth workers (N=13)
Primarily educational	5 11,1%	0 0,0%	1 7,7%
Primarily organisational	15 33,3%	3 33,3%	6 46,2%
Equally educational as organizational	25 55,6%	6 66,7%	6 46,2%

Two thirds of the project leaders report to have been involved in the project during the whole project, one in eight for more than half of the time, a similar percentage less than half of the time and 5% hardly at all. Compared to the transnational sample (78%) less project leaders in the Belgian sample are involved throughout the entire project, while more project leaders are involved less than half of the time of the project (22% of the project leaders in the Belgian sample against 11% in the transnational sample). In November 2011, more than eight out of ten project leaders were involved during the whole duration of the project.

Table 31: Time involved in the project (N=78)

I was directly involved in the project activities	Frequency	Valid percentage
Throughout/most of the time	51	65,4%
For more than half of the time	10	12,8%
For less than half of the time	13	16,7%
Hardly/not at all.	4	5,1%

Projects leaders, involved for the whole duration of a project, are more typical for projects with young people, while half of the project leaders of projects with youth workers are less than half of the time involved in their project.

Table 32: Time involved in the project by action type

I was directly involved in the project activities	Action type		
	Projects with young people (N = 51)	EVS (N = 9)	Projects with youth workers (N=18)
Throughout/most of the time	40 78,4%	5 55,6%	6 33,3%
For more than half of the time	6 11,8%	1 11,1%	3 16,7%
For less than half of the time	4 7,8%	2 22,2%	7 38,9%
Hardly/not at all.	1 2,0%	1 11,1%	2 11,1%

In conclusion, the majority of project leaders combine several functions in the project and a majority of them are involved in the project for at least half of the time. It is therefore reasonable to assume that a lot of them will be implicated in more than one task of the project and in more than one stage of the execution of a project (development, implementation and evaluation).

6.1 Learning situations and activities for project leaders

Table 33: Involvement of project leaders in project activities (N=87)

I was directly involved in	Responses			
	N	%	% of cases	Rank
Designing the project (content, methodology, methods, programme etc.)	63	12,0%	72,4%	6
Cooperating with colleagues from my organisation when preparing, implementing and evaluating the project	74	14,0%	85,1%	2
Cooperating with youth workers/leaders from partners in other countries when preparing, implementing or evaluating the project	61	11,6%	70,1%	7
Organisational or administrative tasks	69	13,1%	79,3%	3
Implementing the project activities for/with the participants	64	12,1%	73,6%	5
Informal time/experiences with participants, the project team or with other people in the project environment	66	12,5%	75,9%	4
Receiving information or advice from other persons or sources (including online media or printed material)	47	8,9%	54,0%	8
Reflecting/talking about my experiences during or after the project	78	14,8%	89,7%	1
Other	5	0,9%	5,7%	9
Total	527	100,0%	605,7%	

This is corroborated by their answers to the question about the tasks they have taken up in the project. On average the project leaders claim to have been involved in six out of the eight development and implementation tasks that have been included in the questionnaire[14]. Also in the transnational sample project leaders were involved in six tasks on average. Furthermore, 95% of project leaders in the Belgian sample were involved in at least two tasks. More than half of them took up at least seven of the tasks and a quarter of them were involved in all eight tasks. This implies that most project leaders are engaging in a broad

---

[14] The answer 'Other' has been omitted because of the low percentage of project leaders that have ticked this option.

variety of tasks within a project. YiA projects are thus a setting offering project leaders several instances to learn and to develop their competences.

The percentages of project leaders involved in a certain task in the Belgian sample are very similar to those percentages of the transnational sample. Project leaders in the Belgian sample are slightly more involved in designing the project, cooperating with members of the own organization, cooperating with youth workers from partner countries, organizational tasks and reflecting during and after the project and they were to a lesser degree involved in implementing the project, informal time during the project and receiving information or advice. Just as in the transnational sample, the largest proportion of project leaders in the Belgian sample are involved in 'reflecting about my experiences during and after the project', underlying the importance of reflection and evaluation in YiA projects.

Table 34: Involvement of project leaders in project activities by action type (N=87)

| I was directly involved in | Action type | | |
	Projects with young people (N = 53)	EVS (N = 11)	Projects with youth workers (N=23)
Designing the project (content, methodology, methods, programme etc.)	75,5%	90,9%	56,5%
Cooperating with colleagues from my organisation when preparing, implementing and evaluating the project	92,5%	81,8%	69,6%
Cooperating with youth workers/leaders from partners in other countries when preparing, implementing or evaluating the project	79,2%	45,5%	60,9%
Organisational or administrative tasks	84,9%	81,8%	65,2%
Implementing the project activities for/with the participants	81,1%	72,2%	56,5%
Informal time/experiences with participants, the project team or with other people in the project environment	83,0%	72,7%	60,9%
Receiving information or advice from other persons or sources (including online media or printed material)	54,7%	54,5%	52,2%
Reflecting/talking about my experiences during or after the project	92,5%	90,9%	82,6%
Other	7,5%	0,0%	4,3%

A differentiation by action type, learns that project leaders of projects with youth workers are to a lesser degree involved in the eight tasks than project leaders of the two other two action types. On average they are involved in 5 tasks, project leaders of EVS-projects on average in 6 tasks and project leaders of projects with young people on average in 7 tasks. There is one task that project leaders of a project with youth workers take up more than project leaders of other action types: cooperating with youth workers from a partner country.

Project leaders of EVS-projects are more than their colleagues of other action types engaged in designing the project. A comparison with the transnational sample is not always possible because in the transnational sample the analysis is done on the level of actions and not action type, but a comparison is possible for EVS-projects. In the transnational sample project leaders in EVS-projects were

the least directly involved in the design and implementation of the projects. They were more organizationally involved.

Project leaders of projects with young people take up more all other tasks. This means that project leaders of projects with young people have the most ample 'job description'. According to Fennes et al. (2013) this is indicative of the weaker organizational structures of these organisations compared to the organisations involved in the other types of actions.

Table 35: Involvement of project leaders in project activities by role/function of the project leader (N=67)

| I was directly involved in | Role/function | | |
	Primarily educational (N = 6)	Primarily organisational (N = 24)	Equally educational as organisational (N=37)
Designing the project (content, methodology, methods, programme etc.)	50,0%	62,5%	83,8%
Cooperating with colleagues from my organisation when preparing, implementing and evaluating the project	83,3%	87,5%	94,6%
Cooperating with youth workers/leaders from partners in other countries when preparing, implementing or evaluating the project	83,3%	66,7%	75,7%
Organisational or administrative tasks	50,0%	87,5%	89,2%
Implementing the project activities for/with the participants	66,7%	75,0%	81,1%
Informal time/experiences with participants, the project team or with other people in the project environment	83,3%	62,5%	89,2%
Receiving information or advice from other persons or sources (including online media or printed material)	50,0%	33,3%	59,5%
Reflecting/talking about my experiences during or after the project	83,3%	79,2%	94,6%
Other	16,7%	0,0%	8,1%

Project leaders equally involved in educational as organizational functions are engaged in the broadest variety of activities in the projects (on average 6,7 tasks). They are to a larger degree involved in designing, implementing and evaluating the project than the other project leaders. They are even more involved in the design of the project than project leaders with a primarily educational role and they are even to a larger extent involved in organisational tasks than project leaders with primarily an organisational role. This means that project leaders with a double function have a very challenging job, but at the same time they have a job with a wide variety of work-related learning opportunities.

Project leaders primarily involved as an educator or as an organiser are the least directly involved in the projects, but still take up on average more than 5 tasks. Project leaders with a primarily organisational role report on average a slightly higher task involvement (on average 5.6 tasks) than project leaders with a primarily educational role (on average 5.5 tasks). A large proportion of them help out in designing, implementing and evaluating a project, pointing out the

necessity of strengthening the educational competences of people organisationally involved in projects.

Remarkable is the fact that the project leaders the least involved in the design of a project are project leaders with a primarily educational role. A stark warning could be in place because of the small number of project leaders with this role in the Belgian sample, but a similar observation has been made in the transnational sample of May 2012 with more cases. In contrast to the transnational sample, project leaders with a primarily educational role in the Belgian sample are very involved through cooperation with youth workers of their own organisation and with youth workers of a country partner. Fennes et al. (2013) attribute the low involvement of these project leaders in the design of the project to a later stage involvement in the project. It could be that project leaders with an educational role only get engaged in a project once it is designed and prepared. According to Fennes et al. (2013), this raises questions about the identification and ownership with the project by these project leaders.

6.2 How do project leaders learn best in a YiA-project?

YiA projects offer different situations to learn and to develop competences to project leaders. They too were asked to indicate in which situation they learn best the different skills/competences. The instances or the same as above and comprise the design, the implementation and evaluation of the project. The skills are the same as the skills asked to the participants.

Just like participants, project leaders indicate that they develop their skills in more than one situation during the project. On average they thick 2.6 situation per skill, which is lower than the transnational sample where project leaders reported on average 3.6 situations per skill. First language, foreign languages, social skills and intercultural skills are developed on average in more than 3 situations, being the skills improved in the broadest variety of situations in a YiA-poject. Media literacy, political skills and creativity are on average developed in less than 2 situations. This makes them the skills developed in the least broad variety of situations in a YiA-project.

In general (see bottom two rows in table 36), project leaders report that they develop their skills the most during designing and implementing the project, by cooperating with their colleagues and also by performing organisational and administrative tasks. In contrary to the transnational sample, cooperating with a youth worker from a partner country has been less ticked by project leaders in the Belgian sample. This situation ranks third among project leaders in the transnational sample and only sixth among the project leaders in the Belgian sample.

Designing and implementing a project are the two situations where skill development occurs the most, according to the project leaders in the Belgian sample. The Belgian project leaders express a slight preference for designing a project in contrast to their counterparts in the transnational sample, who indicate implementing the project as the situation where the occurrence of skill development is the most frequent. First language skills, to think logically, to plan and carry out learning, to do something for the community and entrepreneurship and sense of initiative are best developed during the design of the project, according to the project leaders in the Belgian sample. Half of the 14 skills are best developed during the implementation of the project: foreign languages, learning to learn, social skills, intercultural skills, creative skills and media

literacy. If we take into account the first and second best situation to develop skills, design and implementation of a project feature for all the skills. This reflects the result of the participants who stated to learn most during exercises in the project, showing that participants and project leaders learn in a similar way.

Another similarity between the learning of participants and project leaders is the importance of informal learning for the development of civic skills. Also project leaders indicate that informal moments with people in a project is the best situation to learn to discuss political issues. Informal learning is also important to develop entrepreneurship, foreign language skills and intercultural skills.

Working together with colleagues and youth workers from a partner country are also important instances for learning. They are frequently mentioned in the development of social skills, first language development, civic skills (to achieve something for the community), entrepreneurship and intercultural skills.

The importance of design, implementation and cooperation for learning in YiA projects show that there is a lot of room for work-related learning in these projects for project leaders.

A comparison between the ranking of situations according to occurrence in a project (last column of table 33) and their ranking according to their ability to improve skills (bottom row of table 36), learns that on the one hand situations such as the design and implementation of the project have a low rank for occurrence, but a relatively high ranking for best situation to learn. This means that a relatively smaller proportion of project leaders has been confronted with these situations. But those project leaders who have been confronted with them, consider them to be very well-suited to learn a diverse skill set. This implies that these situations are considered to be very effective for work-related learning. On the other hand, reflection has a high rank for occurrence but a very low rank for best suited to learn, showing that a lot of project leaders are confronted with reflection on projects, but do not consider this situation to be very effective for skill development. In the transnational sample, cooperation with a youth worker from another country was considered to be relatively effective compared to its occurrence in a project, while cooperation with a colleague and informal time during the project were considered to be relatively ineffective compared to its occurrence in the project.

Overall, it can be concluded that the project leaders in the Belgian sample consider YiA projects as a work-related learning environment where they can improve key competences for lifelong learning, regardless their involvement in the project – as a volunteer or as a professional.

Table 36: Learning of the project leaders in the project

Please indicate what you have learned best in which situation	Sit 1	Sit 2	Sit 3	Sit 4	Sit 5	Sit 6	Sit 7	Sit 8	Total	Percentage	Ranking	n
Situation / Competences	When designing the project	When cooperating with colleagues from my organisation	When cooperating with youth workers from other countries	During organisational/ administrative tasks	When implementing project activities for /with participants	During informal experiences with other people in/ around the project	When getting information or advice from other persons/sources	When reflecting/ talking about my experiences during or after the project	Total	Percentage	Ranking	n
	In each row please tick all situations that apply. If none apply, please do not tick. Frequencies											
To say what they think with conviction in discussions	44	40	25	36	37	29	29	24	264	9,51	2	69
To communicate with people who speak another language	38	31	34	32	40	34	33	28	270	9,73	1	65
To think logically and draw conclusions	40	25	17	28	33	17	17	23	200	7,21	7	63
To improve my learning or have more fun when learning	26	29	16	21	35	21	20	17	185	6,67	9	61
To plan and carry out my learning independently	33	17	13	20	20	15	16	22	156	5,62	12	56
To cooperate in a team	42	40	32	38	48	23	20	18	261	9,41	3	68
To negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	37	34	27	30	39	22	19	15	223	8,04	6	67
To get along with people who have a different cultural background	36	32	33	28	44	33	28	20	254	9,15	4	64
To achieve something for the community or society	34	29	21	23	30	22	18	20	197	7,10	8	56
To discuss political topics seriously	8	14	9	11	15	16	14	11	98	3,53	14	44
To develop a good idea and put it into practice	43	34	22	34	36	18	18	19	224	8,07	5	66
To identify opportunities for my personal or professional future	33	21	20	20	24	24	20	17	179	6,46	10	63
To express themselves creatively or artistically	24	16	13	23	33	15	11	12	147	5,30	11	56
To produce media content on my own	24	11	10	21	26	9	8	8	117	4,22	13	49
Total	462	373	292	365	460	298	271	254	2775			
Percentage	16,65	13,44	10,52	13,15	16,58	10,74	9,77	9,15	-	100		
Ranking	1	3	6	4	2	5	7	8			-	

Table 37: Learning of the participants in everyday life

Occupation: 'When I participated in the project, I was mainly in …'		In your opinion, where did you learn something in the last past twelve months? (Only cases who responded with 'yes' on the respective situation)													
		At school, college or university	Attending training courses/sessions in your workplace	Attending training courses/sessions elsewhere	As training placement in a company or as part of an exchange programme	Following a programme combining periods of study with workplace-based learning	Working (learning on the job)	At the workplace	Involvement in social or political work	Being at home	Travelling, studying, working or living abroad	Getting together with other people	Using local libraries, learning resource centres, arts workshops nearby	Leisure activities	A period of voluntary, social or military service
In education or training	Count	75	22	51	40	17	43	44	41	63	71	71	52	74	43
	%	68,8%	35,5%	53,1%	51,3%	53,1%	44,3%	46,3%	52,6%	56,3%	53,8%	53,8%	57,1%	59,7%	43,8%
Employed full-time	Count	9	19	19	13	7	25	24	15	19	24	25	18	21	17
	%	8,3%	30,6%	19,8%	16,7%	21,9%	25,8%	25,3%	19,2%	17,0%	18,2%	18,9%	19,8%	16,9%	19,1%
Employed part-time	Count	8	10	12	10	4	12	13	8	9	12	11	8	9	8
	%	7,3%	16,1%	12,5%	12,8%	12,5%	12,4%	13,7%	10,3%	8,0%	9,1%	8,3%	8,8%	7,3%	9,0%
Self-employed	Count	2	2	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3
	%	1,8%	3,2%	3,1%	3,8%	3,1%	1,0%	2,1%	2,6%	1,8%	1,5%	2,3%	2,2%	1,6%	3,4%
Unemployed	Count	12	8	9	10	3	10	8	7	9	14	14	8	13	13
	%	11,0%	12,9%	9,4%	12,8%	9,4%	10,3%	8,4%	9,0%	8,0%	10,6%	10,6%	8,8%	10,5%	14,6%
A volunteer	Count	12	10	13	11	3	16	14	15	17	21	17	12	15	18
	%	11,0%	16,1%	13,5%	14,1%	9,4%	15,5%	14,7%	19,2%	15,2%	15,9%	12,9%	13,2%	12,1%	20,2%
Not in paid work	Count	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	2	3	4	3	3	3	3
	%	1,8%	3,2%	3,1%	2,6%	3,1%	2,1%	3,2%	2,6%	2,7%	3,0%	2,3%	3,3%	2,4%	3,4%
Other	Count	0	1	2	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
	%	0,0%	1,6%	2,1%	1,3%	0,0%	1,0%	1,1%	2,6%	1,8%	1,5%	1,5%	1,1%	1,6%	2,2%
Answers		120	74	112	90	36	110	109	92	124	150	146	104	139	107
N		109	62	96	78	32	97	95	78	112	132	132	91	124	89
Percentage of cases		110,0%	119,2%	116,6%	115,4%	112,5%	113,4%	114,7%	117,9%	110,7%	113,6%	110,6%	114,3%	112,1%	120,2%

7. Learning in everyday life

Participants were also enquired what and how they learned something in everyday life during the twelve months preceding the survey. In total 14 learning settings were included in the survey. Only one of these settings (following a programme combining periods of study with workplace-based learning) was not applicable to more than half of the participants and one situation (attending courses in your workplace) is not relevant to almost half of the participants. These are the only two settings of the fourteen that are less relevant for learning for half of the participants in the Belgian sample[15]. All other settings are applicable to at least two thirds of the sample. On average, participants ticked more than 7 settings wherein that they have learned something in the last year, which is lower than the on average 9 settings among participants in the transnational sample.

Work-related learning settings apply to a lesser degree for participants in the Belgian sample than in the transnational sample. This is the case for attending a course in the workplace (46% not applicable versus 34% in the transnational sample), a training placement in a company (37% not applicable versus 34% in the transnational sample), following a programme combining periods of study with workplace-based learning (61% not applicable versus 48% in the transnational sample) and learning on the job (29% not applicable versus 24% in the transnational sample). At the same time learning at school or university applies in a lesser extent to participants in the Belgian sample (23%) than in the transnational sample (18%). The same holds true for involvement in social and political work (31% versus 21% in the transnational sample).

Although less settings are relevant to the participants in the Belgian sample, participants in the Belgian sample still identify a wide broad of settings in everyday life as useful to learn. On average, 7,3 everyday life settings are identified as useful to learn. Participants perceive a wide spectrum of learning in daily life and they indicate that the settings included in the survey represent a broad and relevant variety of learning opportunities in their everyday lives.

Informal settings are the most reported situations where participants have learned something in the past twelve months: getting together with other people, travelling, leisure activities and being at home. A formal learning setting (at school, college or university) only comes fifth. The same ranking of situations is found in the transnational sample.

---

[15] In the transnational sample this was only the case for following a programme combining periods of study with workplace-based learning.

Table 38: Learning of participants in everyday life

In your opinion, where did you learn something in the past twelve months?	Yes	No	Don't know	Not applicable
At school, college or university	109 / 71,2%	7 / 4,6%	2 / 1,3%	35 / 22,9%
Attending training courses/sessions in your workplace	62 / 42,2%	16 / 10,9%	1 / 0,7%	68 / 46,3%
Attending training courses/sessions elsewhere	96 / 65,3%	13 / 8,8%	7 / 4,8%	31 / 21,1%
As training placement in a company or as part of an exchange programme	78 / 52,7%	12 / 8,1%	3 / 2,0%	55 / 37,2%
Following a programme combining periods of study with workplace-based learning	32 / 22,8%	18 / 12,8%	5 / 3,5%	86 / 61,0%
Working (learning on the job)	97 / 65,1%	7 / 4,7%	2 / 1,3%	43 / 28,9%
At the workplace (talking to colleagues during breaks, reading newspapers, etc.)	95 / 64,6%	8 / 5,4%	4 / 2,7%	40 / 27,2%
Involvement in social or political work	78 / 52,0%	19 / 12,7%	6 / 4,0%	47 / 31,3%
Being at home	112 / 74,2%	19 / 12,7%	17 / 11,3%	3 / 1,7%
Travelling, studying, working or living abroad	132 / 87,4%	9 / 6,0%	5 / 2,8	5 / 2,8%
Getting together with other people	132 / 88%	5 / 3,3%	8 / 5,3%	5 / 3,3%
Using local libraries, learning resource centres, arts workshops nearby	91 / 62,8%	25 / 17,2%	8 / 5,5%	21 / 14,5%
Leisure activities	124 / 83,8%	7 / 4,7%	12 / 8,1%	5 / 3,4%
A period of voluntary, social or military service	89 / 59,7%	15 / 10,1%	3 / 2,0%	42 / 28,2%

Of course, the settings where participants learn differ according to their occupation at the time of the project (see table 37). Participants still in education report the most that they have learned something at school, college or university in the past year. Participants who are still in school, also report in a high degree that their learning is not limited to school. More than half of them indicate to learn in informal contexts and in work-related settings. For all other groups, with the exception of unemployed participants, a formal setting as a school, college or university is the least important learning setting in everyday life.

Participants in full-employment and self-employment indicate on-the job training as the main setting where learning in daily life takes place. But also informal settings are important. Participants in part-time jobs also have learned in courses in their workplace, but also in training places in a company. This shows that people in employment strive for professional development through learning.

Table 39: Learning of participants in everyday life (N=149)

Please indicate what you have learned best in which situation / Competences	Sit 1 When I am with my friends or family	Sit 2 When travelling, studying, working or living abroad	Sit 3 In an association, civil society organisations	Sit 4 When reading (including online), watching TV, listening to the radio	Sit 5 When looking things up, in the library, internet, info centre, etc.	Sit 6 When attending training courses etc.	Sit 7 At school, college or university	Sit 8 At work, apprenticeship, work placements, internship etc.	Sit 9 During leisure time	Total	Percentage	Ranking	n
To say what I think with conviction in discussions	99	60	69	29	30	68	69	47	56	527	9,00	3	138
To communicate with people who speak another language	49	104	59	42	34	44	42	31	44	449	7,66	4	136
To cooperate in a team	50	50	82	10	15	62	65	52	50	436	7,44	5	131
To produce media content on my own	17	26	33	25	32	27	53	33	36	282	4,81	14	108
To develop a good idea and put it into practice	50	50	71	25	27	55	61	45	61	445	7,60	6	128
To negotiate joint solutions when there are different viewpoints	81	51	64	14	13	46	65	51	40	425	7,26	7	129
To achieve something for the community or society	36	50	85	21	26	30	47	39	44	378	6,45	10	123
To think logically and draw conclusions	64	57	58	52	54	55	87	55	46	528	9,01	2	128
To identify opportunities for my personal or professional future	60	69	60	38	47	63	75	66	56	534	9,12	1	131
To improve my learning or have more fun when learning	44	56	45	42	39	53	52	26	55	412	7,03	8	122
To discuss political topics seriously	65	32	41	27	22	34	55	26	22	324	5,53	13	110
To plan and carry out my learning independently	38	53	36	22	31	42	56	34	45	357	6,09	12	119
To express myself creatively or artistically	57	42	46	16	23	45	33	23	75	360	6,15	11	116
To get along with people who have a different cultural background	45	88	61	19	20	39	50	35	44	401	6,85	9	121
Total	755	788	810	382	413	663	810	563	674	5858			
Percentage	12,89	13,45	13,83	6,52	7,05	11,32	13,83	9,61	11,51	-	100	-	
Ranking	4	3	1	9	8	6	1	7	5				

There are only a few small differences in learning in everyday life according to professional status between the Belgian and the transnational sample. Participants in education or training in the Belgian sample indicate less that they have learned something in the workplace than their counterparts in the transnational sample (35% in the Belgian sample, 43% in the transnational sample). Participants in full-time employment in the transnational sample state to a higher degree to learn in a training elsewhere (20% in the Belgian sample, 25% in the transnational sample) and through working (26% in the Belgian sample and 30% in the transnational one). The same holds true for volunteering (44% in the Belgian sample, 54% in the transnational sample) and getting together with other people (54% in the Belgian sample, 60% in the transnational sample). Participants in the Belgian sample learn more in informal settings than participants in the transnational sample (leisure: 60% in the Belgian sample and 54% in the transnational sample).

Overall, it can be concluded that everyday learning takes place in a mix of learning settings comprising informal, formal and non-formal learning ones, regardless of employment or education status. Informal learning is important to all participants, but especially to people in unemployment (who relatively learn more in voluntary work than other groups of participants). Formal education is more relevant for everyday learning for participants still in education or training, while employed participants learn more in workplace-related settings.

Finally, participants were asked about skill development in everyday learning settings. On average, participants ticked 2.8 settings where they learned the skills the best. The best settings to learn in everyday life are a non-formal setting and a formal setting, because the settings 'in an association, a civil society organization, doing voluntary work or projects' and 'at school, college or university' were the most frequently ticked learning settings (see two bottom rows of table 37). In the transnational sample, learning in a school setting only ranked twice, showing that this learning setting is more important to participants in the Belgian sample than in the transnational one. A possible explanation why a school setting is more important to the participants in the Belgian sample than in the transnational sample, is that there might be more participants still in education in the Belgian sample than in the transnational one. This is not the case though. Practically the same amount of participants in the Belgian and transnational sample were in education or training at the start of the project. However, a larger percentage of participants in the Belgian sample are still in secondary education compared to their counterparts in the transnational sample.

Table 40: Occupation status of the participants at the moment of the project (N=143)

When I was participating in the project, I was mainly in ...	Responses			
	N	%	% of cases	% of cases in transnational sample
In education or training	82	48,5%	57,3%	56,3%
Employed full-time	28	16,6%	19,8%	20,1%
Employed part-time	13	7,7%	9,1%	10,1%
Self-employed	3	1,8%	2,1%	3,7%
Unemployed	16	9,5%	11,2%	9,3%
A volunteer	21	12,4%	14,7%	18,8%
Not in paid work	4	2,4%	2,8%	1,9%
Other	2	1,2%	1,4%	5,3%
Total	169	100,0%	118,2%	125,6%

Table 41: Education status of the participants at the moment of the project (N=138)

When I was participating in the project, I was mainly in ...	Responses			% of cases in transnational sample
	N	%	% of cases	
a pupil at secondary school	52	35,1%	37,7%	25,1%
A student at college, university	36	24,3%	26,1%	44,3%
An apprentice	7	4,7%	5,1%	2,4%
An intern	8	5,4%	5,8%	4,0%
Doing another education/training	6	4,1%	4,3%	8,2%
Not in education	39	26,4%	28,3%	21,0%
Total	148	100,0%	107,2%	105,0%

Informal settings (travelling, when being with friends and leisure time) are also very relevant everyday settings to learn the different skills. The three everyday settings where participants learn the skills the least are: while working or doing an apprenticeship, when looking up information and while reading, watching television and listening to the radio.

In everyday life, informal settings are very well-suited to learn the majority of the skills. Interacting with friends improves first language skills, social skills and conventional civic skills (to discuss political topics). Travelling is the most instrumental in promoting foreign language skills, intercultural skills and to have more fun in learning, while leisure time is the ideal learning setting to develop artistic and creative competences. A non-formal and informative setting as an association, a civil society organisation is the best everyday situation to develop social skills (especially cooperation), civic skills (achieving something for the community) and entrepreneurship. School, college or university are identified as the best everyday setting to learn sense of initiative, mathematical skills and to plan and carry out learning independently. The same pattern emerges when looking to the second best everyday situation to learn these skills: to think logically and creative skills are second best developed when talking to friends and family, travelling abroad is the second best situation to develop sense of initiative and to achieve something for the community, leisure time is the second best everyday situation to improve media literacy and to have more fun in learning.

A comparison between the ranking of these situation according to their occurrence in everyday life and their ability to develop skills, shows that two situations, volunteering in an association and school, college and university have a relative low rank in occurrence, but top the ranking of skill development. This proofs that participants consider these two everyday settings as effective settings for learning a diverse skill set. Getting together with other people ranks first in occurrence, but contact with friends and family only rank fourth as best situation to learn several skills, showing that this situation is perceived as less effective.

Are YiA projects an alternative form of learning for participants or do they promote the same skills as everyday life learning? To answer this question, we can compare the rankings of the skills as promoted by everyday life learning and the rankings of the skills improved by the projects (rank column in table 25 and rank column in table 37). If the same skills are promoted in projects as in everyday life, than the projects can be considered to be an extension of everyday life learning. If they promote skills differently, YiA projects can be considered to be an alternative form of learning. There is a significant, but not a high correlation between the two rankings (spearman's ρ is .60). This shows

that there is a certain consistency between the two rankings, but everyday learning and learning in YiA projects promote some skills in a different degree. The two skills most promoted in everyday life learning situations is to think logically and sense of initiative. These skills are improved less in learning situations in a Youth in Action-project, because they only rank 8th and 9th.   On the other hand, intercultural skills and foreign language skills are according to participants the most developed across learning situations in a YiA-project, while these skills only rank 9th and 4th in everyday life learning situations. Therefore, it is save to conclude that learning in a YiA-project constitutes an alternative form of everyday life learning.

8. Country-specific aspects or conclusions

Throughout this report, the results of the analysis of the Belgian sample have been compared to the results of the analysis of the transnational report of May 2012. In general, the results of the Belgian sample are consistent with the findings of the transnational sample of May 2012. There are some differences though. The main differences are about skill development, the methodology of the projects, the variety of methods best-suited for skill development, the relevance and importance of everyday settings for learning.

One of the recurrent findings in the report is that the rankings of the skills developed in YiA projects are consistent over time and between project leaders and participants. An even recurrent finding, is that these rankings are less consistent in the Belgian sample than in the transnational one. Especially, the rankings of the skills by project leaders and those by the participants differ in the Belgian sample.

Normally, project leaders are more enthusiast about skill development by participants than participants themselves. In the Belgian sample, there are two exceptions to this rule. Some project leaders have doubts about intercultural skill development by participants. The percentage project leaders agreeing with intercultural skill development by participants is lower than the percentage of participants agreeing with intercultural skill development (by participants). This is not an unique Belgian phenomenon. It also has been observed in the transnational sample. The difference is that this doubt is much more outspoken in the Belgian sample. The percentage difference between project leaders and participants in the Belgian sample is 20%, in the transnational sample it is only 6%. Furthermore, a higher percentage of participants than project leaders in the Belgian sample report an improvement in sense of initiative due to participation in the project. In the transnational sample, the percentage of project leaders claiming that participants have improved their sense of initiative is higher than the percentage of participants claiming they have improved this skill.

Participants in the Belgian sample are more divided in their appreciation of methods used in YiA projects than their transnational counterparts. On the one hand, a larger percentage of participants in the Belgian sample than in the transnational sample agree that the methods are innovative, interesting, able to learn serious issues and are suitable for even a formal setting. On the other hand, a larger proportion of them agree that they are childish and unsuited to learn anything.

Some differences can be found in the methodology of the projects. Participants and project leaders in the Belgian sample report a higher percentage of time

spent on informal and non-formal learning and a lesser percentage of time spent on formal learning compared to the participants and project leaders in the transnational sample. A higher percentage of participants in the Belgian than in the transnational one sample state that reflection, mentoring and outdoor activities are part of the project. All other methods are more mentioned in the transnational data. More Belgian project leaders than transnational ones claim that discussions, mentoring and reflection are methods used in the project. Reflection is mentioned by 95% of the project leaders in the Belgian sample, but only by 80% of the project leaders in the transnational sample.

A larger percentage of participants in the transnational than in the Belgian sample claim to have been involved in the preparation of the project 61% versus 49%), while a larger percentage of participants in the Belgian than in the transnational sample claim that there were activities/exercises in the projects (63% versus 37%). Projects leaders in the Belgian sample report to be more involved in the design of a project, in cooperation with colleagues and youth workers from a partner country, in organisational and administrative tasks and reflection during and after a project than project leaders in the transnational sample. The latter group claim in a higher degree than project leaders in the Belgian sample to be involved in the project through informal time with others during the project and by receiving information/advice.

The scope of methods in YiA projects best-suited for skill development is perceived less broad by the participants and the projects leaders in the Belgian than in the transnational sample. On average, participants in the Belgian sample report 2,6 methods as best methods for skill development, while their counterparts in the transnational sample report 3,1 methods. For project leaders these averages are 2.6 and 3.6. According to project leaders in the transnational sample, working together with a youth worker from a partner country is an effective way of developing skills: it ranks low on occurrence, but ranks high in ability to develop skills. In the Belgian sample, we cannot find this difference in ranking of this situation. According to Belgian project leaders, reflection is less effective as a situation in YiA projects to improve skills. It ranks high in occurrence, but it does not rank high as best situation to develop skills. In the transnational sample, reflection does not rank high for occurrence and for best situation to develop skills. On the other hand rank cooperation with colleagues and informal time during a project high in occurrence, but low for ability to develop skills in the transnational sample. This difference in ranking is less outspoken in the Belgian sample.

Less everyday situations, included in the questionnaire, are relevant for learning for participants in the Belgian than in the transnational sample. On average 7 situations apply for participants in the Belgian sample. In the transnational sample this average is 9. This is especially the case for workplace-related learning. For instance, almost half of the participants in the Belgian sample claim that courses on the workplace do not apply to them. Furthermore, a smaller percentage of participants in the Belgian sample report to have learned something in the past 12 months through volunteering in a civil society organisation and through getting together with others than their counterparts in the transnational sample. On the other hand, a larger proportion of them report to have learned something during their leisure time.

There is also a slightly different view on the role of schools in everyday learning. Schools, colleges and universities rank fifth amongst participants in the Belgian sample as a setting for everyday life learning. This is the same in the transnational sample. A higher percentage of participants in the Belgian sample

however agree that they have learned something in the past 12 months in school. Furthermore, school (together with volunteering in a civil society organisation) ranks first as best everyday learning situation for skill development amongst participants in the Belgian sample. In the transnational sample it ranks second.

9. Literature

Europese Commissie (2007), *Sleutelcompetenties voor een leven lang leren. Een Europees Referentiekader*. [brochure], Luxemburg: Bureau voor officiële publicaties der Europese Gemeenschappen.

Fennes, H., W. Hagleitner, K. Helling & A. Rosenthal (2011), *Exploring Youth in Action. Effects and outcomes of the Youth in Action Programmefrom the perspective of project participants and project leaders. Transnational analysis 2011*, Institute of Educational Science, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck.

Fennes, H., Gadinger, S., Hagleitner, W. & K. Lunardon (2013), *Learning in Youth in Action. Results from the surveys with project participants and project leaders in May 2012. Interim Transnational Analysis.*, Institute of Educational Science, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck.

Stevens, F. (2013), *Research-based Analysis of Youth-in-Action. Results of the November 2011 survey with projects participants and project leaders - Country analysis Belgium (Flemish Community)*, Department of Social Work and Social Care, University College of West-Flanders, Bruges.