

Council of Europe  
Conseil de l'Europe



European Union  
Union Européenne

Partnership between the European Commission  
and the Council of Europe in the field of Youth

**Study commissioned by the  
partnership between the European  
Commission and the Council of  
Europe in the field of Youth and  
conducted by the Institute for  
Social Work and Social Education**

# *The Socio-economic Scope of Youth Work in Europe*

## Final Report



## Table of contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Foreword   | 4-5       |
| <b>1. Executive summary</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>2. Introduction</b>   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>3. Methodology</b>  | <b>14</b> |
| <b>4. Definitions of Youth Work</b>  | <b>16</b> |
| <b>5. Definition of main Action Fields of Youth Work</b>                     | <b>18</b> |
| <b>6. Country Reports on Youth Work</b>                                      | <b>22</b> |
| 6.1 Austria  | 22        |
| 6.2 Estonia  | 23        |
| 6.3 Germany  | 23        |
| 6.4 Greece   | 24        |
| 6.5 Ireland  | 25        |
| 6.6 Italy  | 26        |
| 6.7 The Netherlands  | 26        |
| 6.8 Norway   | 27        |
| 6.9 Romania  | 28        |
| 6.10 Spain   | 28        |
| <b>7. Qualification of Youth Workers</b>                                     | <b>30</b> |
| <b>8. Survey results</b>   | <b>32</b> |
| 8.1 Availability of Data   | 32        |
| <b>9. Results from the National Statistical Reviews</b>                      | <b>36</b> |
| 9.1 General overview on the reporting systems                                | 36        |
| 9.2 National data about youth work   | 38        |
| 9.3 Comparative overview   | 46        |
| <b>10. Results from the Local Statistical Surveys</b>                        | <b>49</b> |
| 10.1 Austria   | 49        |
| 10.2 Estonia   | 50        |
| 10.3 Germany   | 51        |
| 10.4 Greece  | 54        |
| 10.5 Ireland   | 56        |
| 10.6 Italy   | 59        |
| 10.7 The Netherlands   | 59        |
| 10.8 Norway  | 62        |
| 10.9 Romania   | 66        |
| 10.10 Spain  | 68        |
| 10.11 Comparative Overview of local findings                                 | 71        |
| <b>11. Interview findings</b>  | <b>76</b> |
| 11.1 Austria   | 76        |
| 11.2 Estonia   | 76        |
| 11.3 Germany   | 77        |
| 11.4 Greece  | 77        |
| 11.5 Ireland   | 78        |
| 11.6 Italy   | 79        |
| 11.7 The Netherlands   | 79        |
| 11.8 Norway  | 80        |
| 11.9 Romania   | 81        |
| 11.10 Spain  | 82        |
| 11.11 Summary of International Findings                                      | 83        |
| <b>12. Recommendations</b>   | <b>84</b> |
| <b>13. References</b>  | <b>86</b> |
| <b>14. List of project partners</b>  | <b>87</b> |
| <b>15. List of experts participating in the expert meeting in Strasbourg</b> | <b>88</b> |
| <b>16. Table index</b>   | <b>89</b> |

The opinions expressed in this study are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe and the European Commission

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be translated, reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic (CD-Rim, Internet, etc.) or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of Youth — youth-partnership@coe.int

## **CONTACT DETAILS**

### ***PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION AND THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE IN THE FIELD OF YOUTH***

c/o Council of Europe—Directorate of Youth and Sport  
Agora building  
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex  
France  
E-mail : youth-partnership@coe.int  
[www.youth-partnership.net](http://www.youth-partnership.net)

### ***COUNCIL OF EUROPE***

Directorate of Youth and Sport  
Agora Building  
F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex  
France  
E-mail : youth@coe.int  
[www.coe.int/youth](http://www.coe.int/youth)

### ***EUROPEAN COMMISSION***

DG for Education and Culture—Youth : Policies  
Rue de la Loi 200  
B-1149 Brussels  
Belgium  
E-mail : eac-info@ec.europa.eu  
[www.ec-europa.eu/youth](http://www.ec-europa.eu/youth)

### ***INSTITUT FÜR SOZIALARBEIT UND SOZIALPÄDAGOGIK***

Irina Bohn  
Zeilweg 42  
60439 Frankfurt a. M., Germany  
Ph.: +49 (69) 9 57 89 - 158  
Fax: +49 (69) 9 57 89 - 190  
[irina.bohn@iss-ffm.de](mailto:irina.bohn@iss-ffm.de)  
[www.iss-ffm.de](http://www.iss-ffm.de)

# Foreword

***In the area of youth work and youth policy, in particular in education, training and learning in the youth field the European Commission and the Council of Europe field maintain a joint strategy towards achieving a better recognition of youth non-formal learning as a key to the building of Europe, the development of civil society, inclusion of all young people and enabling transitions to the labour market.***

The joint working paper of the two institutions "PATHWAYS TOWARDS VALIDATION AND RECOGNITION OF EDUCATION, TRAINING & LEARNING IN THE YOUTH FIELD" from February 2004 states that the socio-economic dimension of youth work is broadly undervalued and deserves higher regard and social recognition:

"Generally budgets in the field of non-formal education are considered to be a surplus to the formal education system, only affordable if the state budget is affluent and permits this kind of 'luxury'. This is a very short sighted view of things; it overlooks that non-formal education is a production force of its own.

In a wider sense such service based economies represent an ever increasing part of the national GNP. Also, the performant knowledge based economy, which is the objective of the Lisbon process represents an objective in education expressed in economic terms. Up to now investment in youth work is not seen as part of overall investment in human resources. Not only public funding with regard to youth work must be considered as an investment; also investment in time and money of participants themselves and of youth (work) organisations and their often voluntary and honorary working staff need higher regard. Again, non-formal learning is an important contribution to this mixed market of economy and education; it is time to weigh its costs against its achievements."

Facts and figures on the subject are lacking, the existing data is scattered and unsatisfactory. Some research has begun on assessing the labour market impact of the third sector such as the European Commission pilot action on the Third System and

employment effects in 1997. But, youth work and non-formal learning played a minimal role in the actions as in the results, due to the fact that definitions of key actors such as youth workers, youth leaders and youth trainers have been slow to be established on a European level. In addition there is a lack of mapping this sector in terms of occupational profiles or data on structures and working conditions. As a consequence it has been difficult to establish statistical data on the labour market value of the youth non-formal learning sector.

This perception and the reality of very limited knowledge and information on this issue led to the decision of the Youth Directorates of the European Commission and the Council of Europe to invest more into research on the subject. The partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of Youth seemed to be the right place to launch first a literature review and later a field study in order to get a clearer picture of the socio-economic scope of youth work. It was the objective of this initiative to raise the profile and increase recognition of youth non-formal learning and to gain a comprehensive understanding of the field.

It should also identify precisely and comprehensively those who work in the field, their occupational profiles and the interrelationship between them. Furthermore it was about ascertaining the number of workplaces in this sector and estimating the hours worked, both for paid and voluntary work. And finally to determine the budgets invested in the field by public and private and at all levels, European, national, regional, local.

The literature review on the socio-economic dimension and value of youth non-formal learning covered different European regions and its report served as a basis for the further socio-economic

study. The literature review revealed three starting points for further research. The first one was simply to broaden the database, as many aspects of youth non-formal learning are not or not sufficiently covered in literature, and the strong focus on case studies makes country reports a matter of patchwork. The second task was to sharpen the understanding of non-formal learning. Finally, there were many content-related questions still unanswered, ranging from characterisations of the youth activities, providers and participants to elementary issues, like the evaluation of the monetary value of voluntary activities.

It had been decided to focus the scope of the study to some key items and to a limited number of 10 countries. The main questions of interest to be answered by the study related to the nature and scope of youth work, the people employed or involved in the various categories of youth work, and the young people participating in these activities.

The results of the study were published in summer 2007 and discussed in an expert meeting held in June the same year in Strasbourg. The meeting discussed the main findings of the survey and heard the experts' opinion about possible recommendations emerging from the results and discussions.

Summarising the main results of the workshop it can be stated:

- The national status reports describe the national youth work structures, provide a sys-

tematic overview about national definitions and concepts of youth work and identify main action fields of youth work and definitions;

- The national statistical reports represent an overview of the available data and possible indicators and identify well or less well documented sectors of youth work;
- The local statistical reports describe precisely youth work structures in 4 municipalities in each country and provide a comparative overview for each country.

However, the experts agreed that the data available is still poor and hard to achieve. Therefore it is nearly impossible to draw a clear picture of youth work in Europe and in each single country. Nevertheless the experts agreed that the study should be published in form of a Partnership work workbook to encourage further discussions and respective activities. Particularly these activities should:

- include more countries, especially from Eastern Europe and South East Europe;
- fill the data gaps identified by the study;
- identify further issues and methods how to produce meaningful data.

With the publication of the study the partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of Youth wants to invite to a broader debate on the findings of the study and in particular on the further process to fill gaps and identify further information.

Hanjo Schild

Manfred von Hebel

# 1 - Executive summary

## **Background to the study: existing data on youth work is unsatisfactory (see page 11)**

"Youth activities and youth work play a central role in fostering knowledge and commitment to civil society". This idea has meanwhile gained full recognition within European institutions and policy but although there is a wide range and diversity of youth work experiences in European countries, there is still only limited specific information available on the youth sector. Existing data is scattered and unsatisfactory, resulting in the socio-economic importance of youth work being difficult to verify.

Against this background, the partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of Youth, with its study on '**The Socio-economic Scope of Youth Work in Europe**', intends to bring youth work and learning within youth activities to the foreground and increase their visibility.

## **Participating European countries (see page 12)**

The study presented here has taken a number of important initial steps towards achieving a quantitative overview and analysis of youth work in Europe. The project was carried out in 10 European countries: Estonia, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania, and Spain.

## **Methodology (see page 13)**

The study proceeded in the following stages:

- qualitative national status reports on youth work
- quantitative reports at national level
- quantitative surveys of four municipalities in each country
- interviews with experts.

## **Definition of youth work and main activity fields (see page 18)**

As no generally recognised and officially established definition of youth work is available for either all European countries as a whole or any of the individual countries involved, the first phase of the project involved a systematic examination of the definitions, and legal and structural circumstances of youth work. This has led to the following statements:

- The definition of youth work proposed by Peter Lauritzen, which was assumed as the basis of the project, is indeed the most comprehensive definition available, and the results of the project have not given rise to any need to improve it.
- The study identified the following activities as being the central fields of youth work in the ten European countries surveyed: extracurricular youth education, international youth work, open youth work, participation and peer education prevention of social exclusion/youth social work, recreation, youth counselling, youth information and youth work in sports.

## **No overview on basis of national data (see page 37)**

Statements regarding the central task of the study – to provide a quantitative overview and analysis of

- the sectors of specific and related youth activities
- the money and time invested in them
- the number of people employed, and
- the young people participating in these activities

– can be made by pooling the results of the quantitative analyses conducted at both national and local levels. Because of the gaps in data found in all of the countries involved, merely combining available national data on youth work did not produce any satisfactory results.

**Availability and restrictions regarding national data (see page 46)**

The following can be said of the national data on youth activities:

- the best documented sectors are those of publicly supported youth work and of activities implemented by public providers;
- because participation in the investigations was on a voluntary basis, only partial sectors could be documented, even in the case of publicly funded measures (Austria, the Netherlands);
- in southern European countries (Greece, Italy, Spain), only data gathered at European level on youth information and on the implementation of the 'Youth in Action' programme was documented at national level; and
- the structures and services provided by youth associations are not sufficiently visible (Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Norway). In some countries, however, the share of youth work provided by non-public associations can be documented.

**Possible indicators at national level (see page 49)**

Comparing national data on youth from a European perspective has to overcome serious obstacles such as differences regarding the concept of youth work etc. Therefore some available basic indicators were identified as the starting point for a future reporting structure.

They are based on statistics available from EUROSTAT as well as on data from the Eurobarometer 2007 Survey on Youth and available national data.

**Findings: sectors of specific and related youth work (see page 72 and country reports on youth work page 22)**

In all European countries that participated in the study, a wide range of youth work is available. In most countries we can find at least the nine fields of activities of youth work defined in this study (extracurricular youth education, international youth work, open youth work, participation and peer education, prevention of social exclusion/youth social work, recreation, youth counselling, youth information and youth work in sports). Wherever there are gaps in the data available at national level, information about availability can be found in the local setting and vice versa. Extracurricular youth education and recreation, each of them accounting for an average of 24%, are the most frequent activities offered.

There are, nevertheless, important distortions at national and indeed in some cases at local level – the consequence of divergences in each country's understanding of what constitutes youth work, of differences in the categories used in the survey, and of the distribution of administrative responsibility. One example of this is youth sport. In countries where sport is considered part and parcel of youth work, and where it is documented as such, it accounts for a major quantitative share – at least one third to half – of all activities offered. Another example, in Germany are, activities for the prevention of social exclusion. No information is available on this field of youth work, one of the reasons being that most of the activities offered are activities relating to the employment market and falling within the competence of the job centres.

In all countries it can be observed that youth work is performed by different types of providers (public, semi-public and non-public or voluntary). Only in Spain a predominance of public institutions be traced, as 60% of youth work activities at local level are provided by public institutions. In all other European countries, the non-public sector, with a share of at least 65%, represents the main provider.

**Findings: money and time invested in youth activities (see pages 72 and 75)**

The money and time invested in youth activities can be traced either by examining a country's legal provisions or the national budgets of the ministries dedicated to youth issues – in most cases exclusively –, or by looking at expenditure in individual municipalities. However, neither level gives more than an incomplete picture of total expenditure.

The main funding sources of youth work are municipal funds as well as national and European funds. In Austria, public spending covers at least 43% of total expenditure, making it the main source of finance. The Netherlands are an exception: here, membership and participation fees complemented by sponsoring funds make up the lion's share of resources to cover the costs of activities at local level.

However, municipal surveys also show that volunteers represent a considerable share of resources in youth work. In Greece, the survey documented a 48% proportion of honorary workers involved at local level, while in all other countries for which data was available, volunteers accounted for a 75% share of resources, and sometimes significantly more.

An overview presented in the study shows that the share of the budgets of youth-specific ministries in total public expenditure ranges from a minimum of 0.001% to a maximum of 0.04%. However, reliable information on the total amounts of time and money spent on youth activities will not be available until public spending at state or local level and the involvement of volunteers can also be documented.

**Findings: the number of people employed (see page 75)**

When compared to numbers of volunteers, paid employees account for a significantly lower proportion of youth workers: 8% in the Netherlands to a maximum of 25% in Spain. With the exception of the Netherlands, where part-time contracts dominate, paid youth workers have full-time positions in at least 60% of cases and have had at least specific education in youth work. While the survey shows roughly equal numbers of female and male youth workers at local level in Greece, in most other countries youth work is a primarily female occupation, with the proportion of female workers ranging from a minimum of 60% to 88% in Norway.

**Experts point of view on reporting about youth work (see page 84)**

The experts interviewed in the course of the study identified the following four key issues as the main reasons for the limited availability of youth work data:

The first issue is recognition. In all countries the argument was mentioned that youth policy and especially youth work is not a highlighted issue. In several countries experts called for greater efforts in establishing and improving youth work structures. This also includes the fact that in many countries youth work is not sufficiently well established as a profession.

The second issue concerns funding. To have a well established reporting system requires funds. On the one hand, the experts noted that volunteers are not interested in documentation. Thus data about youth work realised in youth associations is not particularly well surveyed. Youth work structures that rely strongly upon volunteerism have greater difficulties in documenting their work. But monitoring also costs money. The experts argued that additional documentation tasks can only be realised with supplementary funds.

**Findings: young people participating in youth activities (see page 76)**

Data gathered at municipal level shows that the most popular youth work activities for the participants are extracurricular youth education, sports and recreational activities. The ratio of female to male participants is balanced in most countries; in Norway, male participants dominate with a proportion of 56%. Local surveys show that the main target group of youth work activities in most countries – with the exception of Norway and Romania – is young people up to the age of 19.



**Comments on the socio-economic scope of youth work in Europe**

The study has revealed three main findings with regard to the socio-economic effect of youth work.

In all the countries participating in the study, youth work represents a broad range of activities offered at local level. Local youth work is designed and provided not only by state institutions, but in particular by a variety of NGOs that contribute a wealth of time, money, resources and know-how.

Extracurricular youth education constitutes a central field of activity of youth work. Youth work therefore includes an extensive range of structured institutional offers involving non-formal educational activities.

Because of the many committed volunteers involved in youth work, we can claim on the one hand that youth work offers a broad range of opportunities for non-formal educational processes; but on the other hand, the high proportion of volunteers also shows that youth work is a field of activity that attracts and binds large numbers of committed people.

The present study has clearly shown that there is no country in Europe where the documentation of youth work at national level is free of gaps. None of the participating countries offer a comprehensive image of all actions undertaken in youth work, especially of those actions provided at local level by non-public associations – in particular youth associations or special youth groups within the framework of other associations – without financial support from public institutions. Furthermore, how complete the image of youth work is for a particular country depends very much on the existence and content of the concept of youth work in that country and on the allocation of responsibilities between the various administrative levels.

The main reasons for the situation described here are:

- **Political impact:**

- ◊ that there is no political requirement for reporting, as youth work is not a priority and indeed sometimes not even recognised as a profession,
- ◊ that the responsibilities for youth work are scattered amongst different ministries and there is no cross-sectoral cooperation in reporting, and
- ◊ that youth work is performed and financed at local level, so that no need is felt for a national report.

- **Financial impact:**

- ◊ that only publicly funded projects are registered, as in these cases spending of the public budget has to be duly administered and monitored.

- **Cultural impact:**

- ◊ that there is a lack of routine for reporting amongst voluntary organisations, as they are not generally involved in reporting, and
- ◊ that some countries lack the tradition of making funding structures transparent.

- **Professional impact:**

- ◊ that the concept of youth work is vague and thus common indicators are missing.
- The third issue is know-how. In general, the experts stated that there is no tradition of monitoring and documentation in youth work. There are many uncertainties regarding concepts and indicators, and professional communication needs to be improved. The experts also explained that there is no tradition of defining the processes of non-formal learning in youth work. Furthermore, the great variety of youth activities offered requires intensive work on common categories. In all the countries of the survey, the experts called for more research on youth-related issues.

The fourth issue is visibility. Visibility is a requirement for recognition. It means that the outcomes of youth work need to be transported into public, professional and political opinion. Experts agree that youth work is not visible enough, sometimes even for the young people and the professionals themselves, and that lack of networking between professionals is one of the main reasons for the lack of data.

**Reasons for the incompleteness of reporting at national level (see page 35)**

**Experts' points of view on reporting on youth work (see page 76)**

The experts interviewed in the course of the study identified the following four key issues as the main reasons for the limited availability of youth work data:

The first issue is recognition. In all countries the argument was mentioned that youth policy and especially youth work is not a highlighted issue. In several countries experts called for greater efforts in establishing and improving youth work structures. This also includes the fact that in many countries youth work is not sufficiently well established as a profession.

The second issue concerns funding. To have a well established reporting system requires funds. On the one hand, the experts noted that volunteers are not interested in documentation. Thus data on youth work produced in youth associations is not particularly well surveyed. Youth work structures that rely strongly upon volunteerism have greater difficulties in documenting their work. But monitoring also costs money. The experts argued that additional documentation tasks can only be realised with supplementary funds.

The third issue is know-how. In general, the experts stated that there is no tradition of monitoring and documentation in youth work. There are many uncertainties regarding concepts and indicators, and professional communication needs to be improved. The experts also explained that there is no tradition of defining the processes of non-formal learning in youth work. Furthermore, the great variety of youth activities offered requires intensive work on common categories. In all the countries of the survey, the experts called for more research on youth-related issues.

The fourth issue is visibility. Visibility is a requirement for recognition. It means that the outcomes of youth work need to be transported into public, professional and political opinion. Experts agree that youth work is not visible enough, sometimes even for the young people and the professionals themselves, and that lack of networking between professionals is one of the main reasons for the lack of data.

**Local data is basically available**

However, the fact that the present study was able to document some local-level youth work – not all of it, but nevertheless large segments – shows that the reason for the limited mapping of youth work at national level is not that there is no youth work going on in the countries concerned but rather that there is no reporting system (and consequently no know-how regarding how to set one up) and that policy-makers see no need for statistical management of youth work at national level, partly because of the application of the subsidiarity principle but also because youth work is not a priority in the country's political agenda.

The following recommendations can be drawn from the conclusions of the present study: *Because of the different national historical contexts and as a result of its orientation to the various life situations of its target groups, youth work is a complex and diverse field suffering from a lack of basic definitions and indicators that could serve as a basis for common reporting. There is, therefore, a need for*

- working more intensely on defining and systematising the relevant concepts
- establishing central indicators, and
- clarifying the basis for systematising the documentation of youth work from a European perspective.

**Recommendation 1: Recommendation 1****work on concepts and indicators (see page 84)**

The following recommendations are therefore made:

- to increase exchanges amongst experts in the field to intensify and bundle shared knowledge, particularly with regard to the central concepts of youth work;
- to intensify debate among experts to explore how useful data might be gathered on the condition of the field of youth work and its socio-economic effects, and to agree on relevant indicators needed for this purpose.

Because youth work is basically a local issue, and because there is therefore little need for management and data collection at national level, youth work continues to be poorly documented at national level.

There is therefore a need for increased coordination with regard to information management between local, state, national and European or international levels.

**Recommendation 2: Recommendation 2****establish a reporting system with the cooperation of those responsible at all levels (see page 84)**

The following recommendations are therefore made:

- to increase exchanges with the competent, in some cases newly-established national ministries to prepare for the creation of a European reporting system on youth work, and,
- in this context, to ensure that local levels are involved, adequately visible and represented.

Target group orientation is another reason why youth work is such a highly diverse field distributed amongst many competencies. While a number of individual fields of activity can be clearly allocated to youth work and identified as such, others, for instance youth sport, youth vocational counselling and certain areas of salutogenesis, are not so clear-cut.

There is therefore a need for more intensive cooperation between fields of activity and stakeholders.

**Recommendation 3: Recommendation 3****improve co-operation between actors and sectors of youth activities (see page 85)**

The following recommendations are therefore made:

- to strengthen cooperation among stakeholders, particularly governments, youth associations and perhaps also professional groups to contribute to a common documentation of youth work, and
- to increase cooperation amongst the various sectors to identify and document those fields of activity of youth work that, as a result of differences in national traditions, are not sufficiently visible and cannot be clearly allocated to youth work.

## 2 - Introduction

"Youth activities and youth work play a central role in fostering knowledge and commitment to civil society". This idea is often reflected on, and has meanwhile gained full recognition within European institutions and policy. In the context of the life-long learning strategy and the Lisbon Agenda to make Europe the most dynamically competitive, sustainable knowledge-based economy in the world, the Council of Europe and European Commission published a joint text on *Pathways towards Validation and Recognition of non-formal and informal learning in the youth field*, which highlights the value of youth non-formal learning towards the development of learning in the knowledge society and civil society renewal. In this context youth non-formal learning is centrally positioned within the Third Sector.

Since 2003, the research strand of the *partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of Youth* (<http://www.youth-partnership.net>) has been given, amongst others, the objective to work towards increasing the visibility and recognition of youth work and to further elaborate the significance of youth work within the Third Sector. Today the Recognition, quality and visibility of youth work and training

Hence, in April 2004, a seminar with the title 'The Youth Sector and Non-formal Education/Learning: working to make life-long learning a reality and contributing to the Third Sector' was organised and its results published<sup>1</sup>. The seminar reiterated the need for a mapping of the youth sector to gain a better understanding of the range and occupational aspects of youth work. Further evidence of the associated socio-economic value was required to satisfactorily show the youth sector's contribution to the Third Sector as a whole.

Following these recommendations, a literature review was commissioned in 2005 to establish the feasibility for carrying out the present study, 'The Socio-economic Scope of Youth Work in Europe'.

The study hopes to provide a quantitative overview and analysis of

- the sectors of specific and related youth activities
- the money and time invested in them
- the number of people employed and
- the young people participating in these activities.

It thus contributes to enhancing the knowledge and understanding of investment in youth activities.

The study was carried out by institutions or experts in ten European countries:

- Austria: Austrian Institute for Youth Research, Vienna
- Estonia: Tartu University, Department of Sociology, Tartu
- Germany: Institute for Social Work and Social Education, Frankfurt/Main
- Greece: Dora Giannaki, Athens
- Ireland: University College Cork, Department of Applied Social Studies, Cork
- Italy: Centre for Training and Research in Public Health, Caltanissetta
- Netherlands : VU University Amsterdam, Department of Sociology, Amsterdam
- Norway: NOVA - Norwegian Social Research, Oslo
- Romania: National Research Institute on Labour and Social Protection, Bucharest
- Spain: University of Valladolid, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Segovia

Those ten European Countries were selected to cover the different regimes of youth work defined in the IARD Study<sup>2</sup>: Norway as an example for the universalistic/paternalistic system, Ireland as an example for the liberal/community-based system, Austria, Germany and the Netherlands as examples for the conservative/corporatist system and Greece, Italy and Spain as examples for the Mediterranean/sub-institutionalised system. Romania represents a new member of the European Union and was chosen as an example for a south-east European country in transition. Estonia was chosen as an example for the Baltic States and as a country that is - although under positive conditions of social cohesion - still facing transition and change.

The *Institut für Sozialarbeit und Sozialpädagogik* (Institute for Social Work and Social Education) (ISS-Frankfurt/M. e.V.) was the consortium leader, and was responsible for the management of the project. The ISS-Frankfurt/M. e.V. is a legally independent, non-profit-making association funded in 1974. The ISS-Frankfurt/M. e.V. offers a nation-wide service for public and independent bodies which sponsor social work. This includes consultation projects regarding

<sup>1</sup> Chisholm L., and B. Hoskins (2005): *Trading up - Potential and Performance in non-formal learning*, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg

<sup>2</sup> IARD (ed.) (2001) Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe. Final reports. Volume 1: Executive summary and comparative reports, Milan

the implementation of social policy programmes as well as guidance for institutions and public bodies regarding the improvement of methods of social work. Central issues are, for example, Family and Youth Policy, Policy for Vulnerable Groups, Civic Citizenship issues as well as all targets of Integration Policy. Furthermore, the ISS-Frankfurt/M. e.V. does research, gives advice to social institutions in organisational development processes and provides vocational training in social work.

This report focuses on the structures of youth work in these European countries as documented and reported by national reports from the participating institutions and experts.

The first part of the report presents central comparative results regarding

- the definitions of youth work
- the main fields of action of youth work and
- the pathways to qualification of youth workers.

On the one hand this provides a structured comparison of the main categories influencing the characteristics of youth work in every country. Particularly regarding the main field of action, it also offers a first mutual framework for commitment on the central categories of youth work in a European context. Short qualitative descriptions of the status of youth work in each country provide the reader with the opportunity to deepen their understanding of the nature of youth work in each national context.

The second part of the report presents and analyses the available data about youth work at each national level. It provides an overview of the reporting struc-

tures and routines in each country and identifies best practices in reporting. The data sources are presented; the scope of the available data is discussed as well as the reasons for the lack of statistic material.

As the categories of youth work are not comparable, the data available for each country is presented in separate tables. This gives an overview of the statistically reliable part of youth work and allows gaps to be identified.

The third part of the report processes the data on youth work collected by each institution at local level and discusses the particularities of each country. This section examines the main statements made about the nature and scope of youth work and contrasts them to the findings at national level.

Part four of this report contains the central findings and discussions lines of the study regarding

- the significance of the data on youth work
- How statistical information can be drawn out of youth work activities
- the necessary structures and categories of reporting, and
- the favourable conditions and constraints of documentation.

Finally the last part of the report summarises some recommendations regarding possible further action at European level. These recommendations are the result of the fruitful discussions of experts at the concluding conference held on 18 June 2007 in Strasbourg.



### 3 - Methodology

The study on 'The Socio-Economic Scope of Youth Work' was carried out in 7 steps.

#### Step 1: National status reports

All partners prepared a national status report compiling available data regarding:

- a description of their national welfare system;
- the national definition of youth work;
- the legal conditions;
- the financial sources;
- the structure, institutions and stakeholders;
- the main fields of action;
- link to the Third Sector
- recent political topics related to Youth Work.

#### Step 2: First partners' meeting

The first partners' meeting was held in January 2007.

The meeting outcomes were:

- a work plan
- criteria for the selection of municipalities;
- a data scheme for the presentation of national and local data
- central questions for the experts' interviews
- decisions on the structure of the final national reports.

#### Step 3: National statistical reports

Each participating country drew up a national statistical report compiling available data:

**Table 1: Data on youth work**

| YOUTH WORK                                      |
|---|
| Number of activities per category of youth work |
| Cultural youth work                             |
| Extracurricular youth education                 |
| Children and youth recreation                   |
| Open youth work, youth clubs etc.               |
| Youth associations and youth groups             |
| Street work / mobile youth work                 |
| Sports  |
| Youth counselling                               |
| Advised (adventure) playgrounds                 |
| International youth work                        |
| Youth social services                           |
| Youth education (within the formal system)      |
| Youth employment                                |
| Youth information                               |
| Number of activities per type of association    |
| Public organisations                            |
| Non-public associations                         |

|  |
|--|
| Semi-public organisations  |
| Voluntary organisations  |
| Budget of youth work (amount and/or relation between sources of finance) |
| Per category of youth work (see above)                                   |
| Per type of association (public/non-public)                              |
| General spending in relation to other fields of work                     |

**Table 2: Data on youth workers**

| YOUTH WORKERS  |
|--|
| Number of 'youth workers' (professionals working in the field of youth work)           |
| Per category (see above)   |
| Per association (see above)  |
| Ratio of males to females  |
| Per category (see above)   |
| Qualification of youth workers in the field of education/social work/(social) pedagogy |
| Professional school  |
| Higher education   |
| Qualification of youth workers in other professions                                    |
| Professional school  |
| Higher education   |
| No formal qualification  |
| Ratio of qualification of youth workers per association (public/non-public)            |
| Employment structure   |
| Number of youth workers in full-time employment  |
| Number of youth workers in part-time employment  |
| Number of youth workers in spare-time work   |
| Number of volunteers   |
| Per category (see above)   |
| Per association (see above)  |
| Per gender   |
| Activities of volunteers   |
| Training of volunteers   |

**Table 3: Data on participants**

| PARTICIPANTS  |
|---|
| Number of participants per category (see above)                           |
| Ratio of male/female participants per category (see above)                |
| Participants per activity and association (see above)                     |
| Number of participants per 100,000 youngsters/or in relation to age group |
| Participants according to age group per category (see above)              |
| 13 to 14 years  |
| 15 to 19 years  |
| 20 to 24 years  |
| 25 to 30 years  |

#### ***Step 4: Local statistical reports***

According to the agreed structure for data monitoring at national level, each partner organisation had to survey data from 4 different municipalities. Criteria for the selection of municipalities were:

- Rural/urban disparities
- Development disparities between regions due to different traditions (north/south/east/west)
- Different structures of implementation of the welfare state
- Socio-demographic disparities:
- Ethnic and linguistic particularities
- Social distinctions

The partners developed questionnaires and distributed them to institutions in the selected municipalities. The data was aggregated, analysed and presented in a local level data survey report.

#### ***Step 5: Interviews with stakeholders***

After having conducted the survey, the partners discussed the national situation of existing data on youth work with five to ten national experts. The interviews were done by telephone. Possible common questions for the interviews with stakeholders related to:

- reasons for constraints regarding the availability of data
- required data for the visibility and recognition of youth work
- definition of youth work

- central national issues regarding youth work
- different issues regarding national findings

Each partner was able to decide, according to their national situation, which stakeholders should be interviewed, namely youth workers, scientists, associations, budget and policy management agencies and so on.

#### ***Step 6: Second partners' meeting***

The second partners' meeting was held on 17 June in Strasbourg. The meeting was used to report on their experiences, made and to discuss the general findings of the project. The draft report was revised and further contributions fixed. The meeting was also used to prepare the transfer workshop and to agree on a common presentation.

#### ***Step 7: Transfer workshop***

The transfer workshop was scheduled to create a feedback round with experts from the European Commission, the Council of Europe, and the Partnership Programme between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of youth, with representatives from the European Youth Forum and researchers.

The partners of the consortium presented their findings, which were then discussed, highlighted and completed with recommendations.

## 4 - Definitions of Youth Work

To describe the nature and scope of youth work in Europe it is first of all necessary to stress that there is no consistent definition of youth work either in all European countries or even in any single country. Youth work is a summary expression shaped by different traditions and by different legal and administrative frameworks, and it is used to cover a wide range of activities.

Regarding the legislative conditions of youth work, the following overview can be given:

Youth work is not regulated by law or by a specific Youth Work Act in every country. Austria, Estonia, Germany, Ireland, Norway and Romania have specific leg-

youth work may be, on the one hand, the traditional absence of youth policy in some countries and, on the other hand, the tradition of self-determination and process-related development of the youth work sector in some other countries. In addition, the growing necessity to deal with socio-economic changes in society and to address problems of social exclusion has constantly influenced the development and adaptation of youth work.

Despite this situation, the experts compiled definitions of youth work for their countries as they are listed in the given overview. Except for Ireland and Romania, these definitions have no official nature; they can be understood as descriptive attempts combining the most common national understandings about youth work.

**Table 4: Traditions and frameworks of youth work**

|                                       | Austria                               | Estonia        | Germany                        | Greece                   | Ireland        | Italy                    | Netherlands                        | Norway            | Romania               | Spain   |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|
| Legislation at national level         | Federal Act on the promotion of Youth | Youth Work Act | Children and Youth Service Act | Endorsed in various laws | Youth Work Act | Endorsed in various laws | Youth Care Act, Social Support Act | Child Welfare Act | Romanian Law on Youth | Endorsed in other (labour market) legislation |
| Additional legislation at state level | No                                    | No             | Yes                            | No                       | No             | Yes                      | No                                 | No                | No                    | No  |
| Definition within the legislation     | No                                    | No             | Yes                            | No                       | Yes            | No                       | No                                 | No                | Yes                   | No  |

islation that establishes a framework for the provision of youth work. In Greece, Italy and Spain, youth work is endorsed in various laws, mainly in legislation regarding youth employment and education. In the Netherlands youth care is regulated by law, while leisure-time-oriented youth work is traditionally less exposed to the influence of the state and thus remains less regulated. In general it can be stated that youth work is part of both the welfare and the educational system, and in some countries, such as Italy, Greece and Spain, there are also intersections with the employment policy sector and – in Italy and Greece – also with the health system.

Although in some countries youth policy is shaped at state level or in autonomous regions, only Germany and Ireland have the possibility of regulating youth policy by law at that level.

These two countries also define youth work within the legislative framework. In Germany youth work was defined in 1991 within the Children and Youth Service Act with the aim of strengthening its status as an independent work field. In Ireland the definition has to be understood against the background of transformation of the landscape of youth work, with the state moving towards becoming the key stakeholder.

Some of the reasons for the inconsistent definition of

**Table 5: Definitions and aims of youth work**

|                    | Definition  |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Austria</b>     | Extracurricular youth work with emphasis on leisure time activities and prevention (Source)   |
| <b>Estonia</b>     | Youth work is the creation of circumstances for developmental activities of youth that enable them to act outside their family, curriculum education and job of their own free will.  |
| <b>Germany</b>     | Offers for young people that support their development by picking up their interests allowing co-determination, fostering self-definition and encouraging social responsibility and participation   |
| <b>Greece</b>      | Education and welfare services to support young people's safe and healthy transition to adult life, as well as leisure time activities  |
| <b>Ireland</b>     | Planned programme of education designed for the purpose of aiding and enhancing the personal and social development of young persons through their voluntary participation, and which is complementary to their formal academic or vocational educational training and provided primarily by voluntary youth work organisations |
| <b>Italy</b>       | Initiatives that favour the access of young people to the labour market   |
| <b>Netherlands</b> | Supportive and reactive services, as well as broad leisure-orientated offers  |
| <b>Norway</b>      | Giving young people an interesting and meaningful leisure time and opportunities of personal development through participation and social interaction   |
| <b>Romania</b>     | Any activity organised to improve the necessary conditions for the social and professional development of youth according to their necessities and wishes   |
| <b>Spain</b>       | Activities of a social, cultural, educational or political nature with and for young people   |



|                    | Aims  |
|--------------------|---|
| <b>Austria</b>     | Prevention, problem intervention, education and accomplishments in the social and political field, leisure time and experiences   |
| <b>Estonia</b>     | The aim of youth work is to create prerequisites and support youth in managing as members of society  |
| <b>Germany</b>     | Social and personal development focused on the concepts of self-definition, participation and integration   |
| <b>Greece</b>      | Social and personal development of young persons. Enhancement of active political participation and social inclusion of young people  |
| <b>Ireland</b>     | Social and personal development of the youth population on the basis of voluntary participation   |
| <b>Italy</b>       | Provision of better transition opportunities to adult life (jobs, housing, participation in public life, etc.)  |
| <b>Netherlands</b> | Social participation and social inclusion   |
| <b>Norway</b>      | Introduction to participation and democracy. Prevention of social exclusion and marginalisation   |
| <b>Romania</b>     | Access to information provided to young people, involvement in civic activities: ecological, political, community support activities, addressing exclusion through prevention, political participation inclusion and integration, self-development, education, offering space, time and support for leisure time activities |
| <b>Spain</b>       | Neutralisation of young people's social exclusion and marginalisation. Strengthening the participation and integration of young people in different spheres of society as citizens with full rights   |

In general we can state that in all countries youth work is defined as a domain of 'out-of-school' education and thus linked to non-formal or informal learning. Only in Italy, where youth policy was traditionally non-existent or reduced to dispersed local initiatives, is youth work defined more exclusively in terms of the formal education and labour market sectors. We can see that most of the definitions contain two basic orientations reflecting a double concern: to provide favourable (leisure-time-orientated) experiences (of social, cultural, educational or political nature) in order to strengthen young people's personal development and foster their personal and social autonomy, and at the same time to offer opportunities for the integration and inclusion of young people in adult society by fostering societal integration in general or preventing the exclusion of disadvantaged groups. Complementing the definitions with the aims of youth work, we can state that those countries that face greater problems to integrate their young people into an economical, residential and family-orientated independent life have definitions that are more exclusively focused on the socialising aspect of youth work.

Regarding the target groups we can state that in all countries youth work addresses young people in general as well as disadvantaged or socially excluded groups. Although there are certainly different priorities in general youth services and targeted services, it can be argued that the aspects of participation and protection are given in all countries.

**Table 6: Target groups and age groups of youth work**

|                    | Target groups   | Age         |
|--------------------|---|-------------|
| <b>Austria</b>     | All young people as well as disadvantaged and socially excluded groups                        | 11-25 years |
| <b>Estonia</b>     | All young people as well as disadvantaged and socially excluded groups                        | 7-26 years  |
| <b>Germany</b>     | All young people as well as disadvantaged and socially excluded groups                        | 14-27 years |
| <b>Greece</b>      | All young people as well as disadvantaged and socially excluded groups                        | < 30 years  |
| <b>Ireland</b>     | All young people as well as disadvantaged and socially excluded groups                        | 10-25 years |
| <b>Italy</b>       | All young people included disadvantaged, socially excluded and regionally marginalised groups | 15-36 years |
| <b>Netherlands</b> | Disadvantaged and socially excluded groups as well as all young people                        | < 23 years  |
| <b>Norway</b>      | All young people as well as disadvantaged and socially excluded groups                        | < 26 years  |
| <b>Romania</b>     | All young people as well as disadvantaged and socially excluded groups                        | 15-35 years |
| <b>Spain</b>       | Disadvantaged and socially excluded groups as well as all young people                        | 15-29 years |

There are, nevertheless, great disparities in the definition of the age groups. Indeed, each country has its own definition of this span of life. While in Greece, the Netherlands and Norway the minimum age is not defined, in Estonia young people are defined from age 7 upwards, in Ireland from age 10, in Austria from age 11, in Germany from age 14, and in Italy, Romania and Spain from age 15 upwards.

In the Netherlands the definition of youth includes young people up to the age of 23. In Austria and Ireland young people under 25 are included in the definition. In Estonia and Norway youth is defined as ending at 26, in Germany at 27. In Spain, Greece, Romania and Italy we find the broadest definitions, with age ranges extending until 29 or even 36 years.

The reasons for these disparities seem to emerge from the concept of youth work in each country. In Greece, the Netherlands and Norway, where the idea of social inclusion is one of the explicit aims of youth work, children are part of the target groups of youth work. In countries such as Austria, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Italy, Norway, Romania and Spain, which in their concept of youth work focus on the development of a social independent life or on the specific leisure time interests of youngsters, a differentiation is made between children and young people. Countries such as Greece, Italy and Romania have an extended definition of youth, as they focus especially on labour market insertion. In Germany, youngsters are defined up to 27 years in order to facilitate voluntary within youth work.

## 5 - Definition of main Action Fields of Youth Work

The range of activities provided by youth work associations and institutions varies from country to country and depends on different national youth work traditions. The following overview, however, shows that even in European countries where it traditionally has a more marginal position, youth work provides a broad spectrum of activities. It takes place in a wide and varied setting, and includes recreational activities, sports, extracurricular education, youth information, counselling and participation, as well as career services, education and personal support for youngsters at risk.

**Table 7: action fields of youth work**

|                    | Austria                            | Estonia                  | Germany                              | Greece                                    | Ireland                  | Italy                     | Netherlands         | Norway                            | Romania                              | Spain                              |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Main action fields | Open youth work                    | Open youth work/centres  | Extracurricular youth education      | Career services                           | Youth associations       | Education                 | Youth participation | Youth clubs                       | Recreational/leisure time activities | Education                          |
|                    | Youth associations                 | International youth work | Open youth work/clubs                | Youth Information                         | Youth centres            | Socio cultural youth work | Youth information   | Services for disadvantaged groups | International youth work             | Cultural youth work                |
|                    | Institutional youth work           | Peer education           | Sports                               | Youth counselling                         | Education                | Sports                    | Youth education     | Youth associations                | Youth information                    | Leisure time orientated youth work |
|                    | Recreation/leisure time activities | Prevention activities    | Target group orientated youth work   | Education for disadvantaged target groups | Personal social services | Social support            | Youth social work   | Cultural youth work               | Youth associations                   | Youth information                  |
|                    | Mobile youth work                  | Sports                   | Youth associations and participation | Cultural education                        |                          |                           | Youth centres       | Sports                            | Volunteering                         | Youth information                  |
|                    | Sports                             | Youth counselling        | Youth social work                    | Open youth work                           |                          |                           | Youth associations  | Recreational activities           | Counselling                          |                                    |
|                    | Pedagogical prevention activities  | Youth information        | International youth work             | Social care                               |                          |                           | Street work         | Participation                     | Cultural youth work                  |                                    |
|                    | Cultural youth work                |                          | Youth counselling                    | Sports                                    |                          |                           | Sports              |                                   |                                      |                                    |
|                    | Youth counselling                  |                          |                                      | International youth work                  |                          |                           |                     |                                   |                                      |                                    |
|                    | Youth information                  |                          |                                      | Youth associations and participation      |                          |                           |                     |                                   |                                      |                                    |
|                    | International youth work           |                          |                                      | Recreation and leisure services           |                          |                           |                     |                                   |                                      |                                    |

Although the terminology of youth work varies from country to country, the categories of youth work listed above were identified as those categories that are most appropriate for mapping the range of youth work provided in all European countries participating in this study. The list should be understood as an initial systematisation attempt. It is not intended as a definitive list, and could be expanded by adding new spheres of activity.

### a) Extracurricular youth education:

The organisers of extracurricular youth education offer basic services relating to general, political, social, health-orientated, cultural, ecological and technical out-of-school education of a non-formal or informal character. They offer experiential education programmes, or a targeted emphasis on group sessions, projects and events. A large number of programmes and services in extracurricular youth education also contain aspects of primary prevention - by examining one's own life, by exposing young people to experiences of enjoyment, fun, pleasure, and desire, by strengthening their self-esteem, by examining values

and ideologies, or simply by community experiences during individual activities. Finally, their services also range from problem intervention for young people, who are already affected by one or more risk areas and for whom they offer counselling and personal support, to offers for a sheltered and support-orientated environment. Nowadays there is growing recognition that extracurricular youth education can (amongst other services and offers) sustainably promote the type of basic and key competences that are increasingly understood as preparation for working life and a general enhance-

ment of 'employability'.

**b) International youth work<sup>3</sup>:**

International youth work consists of professionally guided activities in professionally organised settings related to international contexts. It provides young people from different countries, ethnic backgrounds and cultures with opportunities to meet each other, to reflect the experiences made in the intercultural dimension, and to widen their cultural knowledge and enhance their personal skills (i.e. interaction, communication and understanding). International youth work consisting of extracurricular educational opportunities and leisure time activities is regularly provided during holiday and vacation time.

**c) Open youth work<sup>4</sup>:**

Open youth work provides a space (e.g. youth centre or youth club) which is in principal open to all young people from the local community or territory. In most cases, the space (and the time, i.e. programme) is only partly pre-structured by youth workers and is supposed to be actively appropriated by the young people themselves. Leisure time activities cover a large part of open youth work, but they are also the context in which other social and educational tasks (also for marginalised groups) and outreaching activities are carried out.

**d) Participation and peer education<sup>5</sup>:**

Participation is about having the right, the means, the space, the opportunity and, where necessary, the support to participate in and influence decisions, and engage in actions and activities so as to contribute to building a better society. Activities designed to promote youth participation include different approaches to becoming an active citizen, for instance 'taking an active role in the development of one's own environment, at local and national level, as well as European level'. They provide opportunities for group effort towards a common goal and they involve youngsters in responsible, challenging action that meets genuine needs, with opportunities for planning and/or decision making. Youth associations play a central role in the provision of opportunities for participation and peer education. They provide non-formal and informal

education, primary prevention and social integration opportunities, space for conviviality and social model learning from peers. With their range of profiles, youth associations offer different possibilities for identification as their work is optional, voluntary, self-organised, value-based, and it lobbies the interests of youngsters.

**e) Prevention of social exclusion/youth social work<sup>6</sup>:**

Youth work aimed at the prevention of social exclusion encompasses counselling, support, education, training, and employment opportunities for socially disadvantaged and/or individually impaired young people in order to support their social integration, their formal education and their integration into the labour market and/or adult life.

**f) Recreation<sup>7</sup>:**

Play, recreation and leisure services encourage and facilitate young people's effective use of their leisure time. Leisure time activities may include games, sports, cultural events, entertainment and community service and aim to contribute to the development of the physical, intellectual and potential development of young people. These activities provide youth-specific socialisation opportunities as well as space and opportunities to appropriate youth life in modern structured places. Recently, prevention and recreation aspects have gained specific importance as they provide young people living under difficult conditions, namely poverty, with recuperation and regeneration opportunities.

**g) Youth Counselling<sup>8</sup>:**

Youth counselling addresses young people and their youth-specific questions and problems. It provides them with information and support based on professional counselling techniques and trespass-management to other institutions. Counselling can cover school problems, career management and insertion into the labour market, crisis intervention in partnership or family-related problems, as well as health and legal issues. It can be provided 'on the doorstep', in specific counselling agencies, or by tele-

<sup>3</sup> see: [http://www.youth-partnership.net/youth-partnership/publications/T-kits/T\\_kits](http://www.youth-partnership.net/youth-partnership/publications/T-kits/T_kits) ; [www.dija.de](http://www.dija.de), 'Intercultural Learning'

<sup>4</sup> See: IARD Study on the 'State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe', January 2001, part IV, page 130

<sup>5</sup> see: IARD Study on the 'State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe', January 2001, part IV, page 130

<sup>6</sup> see: IARD Study on the 'State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe', January 2001, part IV, page 128

<sup>7</sup> see: IARD Study on the 'State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe', January 2001, part IV, page 134; *World Programme of Action for Youth to the year 2000 and beyond*, Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly (A/50/728, 13 March 1996), United Nations, page 23

<sup>8</sup> see: IARD Study on the 'State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe', January 2001, part IV, page 131

phone, email or Internet.

#### **h) Youth information<sup>9</sup>:**

Youth information consists of comprehensive, coherent and coordinated information services that take account of the specific needs of young people and are youth friendly and economically accessible. They are provided by youth information centres or services and disseminated through all information channels, particularly those most frequently used by young people, such as the Internet, mobile phones, and so on. One aim of youth information is to make information accessible to youngsters on a non-discriminatory basis. Youth information also addresses the growing challenges of orientation in an increasingly complex post-modern world and teaches young people how to obtain, select and evaluate information in better ways. The aim of youth information is to increase the variety of accessible choices by providing direct or indirect neutral information on public issues, and to enable youth to make independent choices in organising their lives.

#### **i) Youth work in sports:**

Youth work in sports encourages and supports young people in experiencing and participating in a range of physical activities and sports which help to promote a fit and active lifestyle. It provides young people with opportunities to learn to cope with success and failure, acknowledge the success of others, participate as team members, learn to abide by rules and regulations and come into contact with other young people of different ethnic and social backgrounds. Youngsters can experience personal challenge by trying to improve their own performance, gain new skills or try new activities. Innovative educational methods orientated to the symbolism of adventure and involving the body and physical activity address socio-economically disadvantaged or violent young people in particular.

Before the backdrop of the results regarding the definition of youth work and its scope, we would at this point like to refer to the definition of youth work proposed by Peter Lauritzen<sup>10</sup>:

The main objective of youth work is to provide opportunities for young people to shape their own futures. Youth work is a summary expression for activities with and for young people of a social, cultural, educational or political

nature. Increasingly, youth work activities also include sports and services for young people. Youth work belongs to the domain of 'out-of-school' education, most commonly referred to as either non-formal or informal learning.

The general aims of youth work are the integration and inclusion of young people in society. It may also aim towards the personal and social emancipation of young people from dependency and exploitation.

Youth work belongs both to the social welfare and to the educational systems. In some countries it is regulated by law and administered by state civil servants, in particular at local level. However, there exists an important relation between these professional and voluntary workers which is at times antagonistic, and at others, cooperative.

The definition of youth work is diverse. While it is recognised, promoted and financed by public authorities in many European countries, it has only a marginal status in others where it remains of an entirely voluntary nature. What is considered in one country to be the work of traditional 'youth workers' - be it professionals or volunteers - may be carried out by consultants in another, or by neighbourhoods and families in yet another country or, indeed, not at all in many places.

Today, the difficulty within state systems to ensure adequate global access to education and the labour market, means that youth work increasingly deals with unemployment, educational failure, marginalisation and social exclusion. Increasingly, youth work overlaps with the area of social services previously undertaken by the welfare state. It, therefore, includes work on aspects such as education, employment, assistance and guidance, housing, mobility, criminal justice and health, as well as the more traditional areas of participation, youth politics, cultural activities, career guidance, leisure and sports. Youth work often seeks to reach out to particular groups of young people such as disadvantaged youth in socially deprived neighbourhoods, or immigrant youth including refugees and asylum seekers. Youth work may at times be organised around a particular religious tradition.

This definition of youth work, which forms the basis of the study, has ultimately proved to be the most comprehensive. The results of the investigation

<sup>9</sup> see: ERYICA, European Youth Information Charter, 2004

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.youth-partnership.net/youth-partnership/glossary.html>

have not given rise to any need for expanding or reformulating it in more precise terms.

## 6 - Country Reports on Youth Work

To deepen the understanding of the nature of youth work in each national context, below a short overview will now be given of the structure and status of youth work in each country.

### 6.1 Austria

Youth work in Austria is divided into open youth work, youth associations, institutional youth work and commercial youth work. There are also so-called 'youth initiatives', that is youth services offered by young people to young people. This relatively new kind of youth work can be defined as peer group education, and it is prevalent in the area of prevention in Austria<sup>11</sup>. Open youth work in Austria consists of youth centres, mobile youth work and regional youth information services as well as regional and local initiatives<sup>12</sup>. It essentially focuses on providing young people with space to structure and organise their leisure time on their own. Open youth work is generally open to all young people – hence the name – and there is no membership required or regular participation expected. Open youth work – especially in the area of prevention – focuses more on socially disadvantaged young people, whereas organisationally structured youth work sees the non-deprived youth as their target group<sup>13</sup>.

Youth associations in Austria are quite diverse. There are youth associations with different political or religious backgrounds. In the past, a distinction was made along ideological lines, meaning that there were two different political camps with distinctive cultures and ideologies: one associated with trade unions and the Socialist Party (SPÖ), the other with the Catholic Church and the People's Party (ÖVP). Young people grew up in one or the other 'camps' and also joined organisations affiliated with their 'camps'. Due to socio-structural and cultural change in Austria, this system has somewhat changed over the last ten to 20 years, but there are still a number of organisations which can be characterised as part of the 'camp system'<sup>14</sup>.

The target group of most Austrian youth organisations is quite diverse and often not limited to a specific age group. There is nevertheless a tendency to

address 15- to 19-year-olds in extracurricular youth work. Youth organisations also target 20- to 24-year-olds. All in all, however, there are youth services offered to all age groups. According to the fourth youth report commissioned by the Austrian government, 93% of all youth groups and youth organisations see school pupils as their main target group, 88% address themselves mainly to apprentices and 80% to university students. 72% of all providers of youth work claim that young adults who work or are unemployed take part in their services<sup>15</sup>.

In Austria, institutional youth work is youth work carried out by state or municipal youth departments. Each one of the nine states of the Austrian federation has its own youth department, which coordinates youth work in the state, offers services and organises activities for young people.

With regard to youth information, there are internet portals affiliated with the federal government that provide information on various topics related to young people. Making youth-relevant information available is a concept encouraged by the European Commission's White Paper on youth. The aim is to provide young people as well as youth workers and parents with helpful information on different issues<sup>16</sup>.

One of the most important fields of action in Austrian youth work of all kinds is the field of prevention of social problems. Not only do many youth organisations identify prevention as their main focus, but there is also a lot of prevention work done without even recognising it as such. Nine out of ten youth organisations offer activities to help young people gain more self-confidence and more self-control – something which is generally perceived as a preventative measure. The topics covered by prevention in youth work are mainly in the fields of drug abuse/addiction and violence, followed by sexual abuse and AIDS/HIV. Other areas of preventative youth work are racism, criminal behaviour, sexuality and hazardous leisure time activities<sup>17</sup>. A lot of youth work takes the form of activities such as parties or sporting events. There are also workshops covering a wide range of issues and educational offers. Most youth organisations give their target public the opportunity

<sup>11</sup> 4. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich (2003b)

<sup>12</sup> BMSG (2006): Youth Policy in Austria, p.9

<sup>13</sup> BMSG (2006): Youth Policy in Austria, p.9

<sup>14</sup> IARD (2001); p.31-32

<sup>15</sup> IARD (2001); p.31-32 d.

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.jugend.bmsg.gv.at>

<sup>17</sup> 4. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich (2003b)

to work creatively in different areas such as youth, environment or drugs and addiction. The latter topics once again fall into the category of preventative youth work<sup>18</sup>. In addition, youth work in Austria includes counselling for young people. Over 70% of youth institutions offer counselling services to assist young individuals with issues such as occupational choices and work-related questions as well as problems pertaining to drugs and addiction in general. Other areas covered by this type of counselling are school-related issues, family problems and questions about relationships and sexuality. There is also counselling on the issue of community work in lieu of military service<sup>19</sup>. Some youth work involving recreational activities can be described as educational. The Austrian ministry responsible for youth matters has also commissioned research to study new trends in youth culture. The objective of these studies was to gain more insight into new developments in order to apply the newly found knowledge in future concepts of youth work.

## 6.2 Estonia

Youth work in Estonia is generally understood as involving the social, cultural and health education of young people to promote their mental and physical development<sup>20</sup>. The objective of youth work is to create conditions that will facilitate young people's development and enable them to be active outside their families, formal education and work, to support them in their socialisation process and to promote their development towards becoming well-coping members of society.

The concept and development plan of youth work in Estonia are the basis for specific action plans in eight subdivisions of youth work, involving horizontal themes of integration and criminal prevention. These eight important subdivisions are:

- special youth work concentrating on young people living in risk circumstances and/ or exhibiting problematic behaviour
- youth hobby education activities outside formal education
- youth information
- youth counselling
- youth work training (existence, availability and quality of the possibilities for the acquisition and development of the attitudes, knowledge and skills necessary for quality youth work and

its successful performance)

- recreational activities for young people (mainly spare time activities and camps)
- work education for young people which aims to increase youth employment readiness
- international youth work.

All these youth work activities are targeted to a rather broad age group because the Youth Work Act defines the target group between 7 and 26 years of age. But depending on their possibilities to participate in social life, different target groups are defined in the course of project and programme planning, for instance disadvantaged groups based either on geographic, economic, linguistic, social or health aspects. The range of people who can be considered as youth workers is rather broad as well, because the status of youth workers in Estonia is somewhat obscure, and there is no coherent understanding of who is a youth worker, and who is not. At the moment there is a debate about the professional standards of youth workers in Estonia. Nevertheless, most youth work in youth associations is performed by volunteers.

Many youth work activities are carried out by youngsters themselves or with their help. According to the Estonian non-profit associations register, there are approximately 150 youth associations and a dozen youth workers' associations in Estonia. Youth associations are engaged in one or several fields of youth work, depending on the decisions of their members, because the objectives and activities of youth associations are established by joint decisions of members. Youth associations may operate a separate office, a youth work agency (e.g. a youth centre, youth camp, etc.) or a youth club.

In recent years growing attention has been paid to developments at local level, for instance structures and programmes to support youth participation and open youth centres. Several traditional Estonian forms of youth work, such as youth summer camps and hobby education schools (concentrating on music, art, dance, etc.), are currently undergoing a renewal process in order to fulfil the changing needs of young people better.

## 6.3 Germany

Youth work in Germany is widely understood as a sector of non-formal education and support focused on autonomy, participation and integration. Political responsibility for this lies primarily with the local au-

<sup>18</sup> 4. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich (2003b)

<sup>19</sup> 4. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich (2003b)

<sup>20</sup> Conception of Estonian Youth Work (2001)

thorities. Responsibility is assumed by larger political entities (state or federal government) only when the work extends beyond local or state level<sup>21</sup>. Youth work at local level reflects different values and a wide range of content, methods and forms of work. There is thus no uniform type of local youth work. Rather, this pluralism is the result of the varying needs of young people in individual places. Suitable services are offered by voluntary youth associations or welfare and religious associations. However, the public youth welfare departments also offer services in the field of leisure activities for young people and run youth centres for young people.

The main focuses of youth work include various aspects distinguished by their individual services<sup>22</sup>. These are in particular:

- Out-of-school youth education supplementing the family, school and labour market with: general education, political education, social education, cultural education and natural history, ecological and technical education
- Youth work in sports, play and social life
- Youth work related to the labour market, school and the family
- International youth work
- Children and youth recreation Youth counselling
- Job-insertion related training, support and counselling.

Volunteering has always been crucial for youth work and youth associations. It is the basis of youth work within youth associations and the medium for the variety of offers provided to youngsters. Today some 90 supra-local youth associations exist, with the number of all youth associations estimated at approximately 400.

Youth associations organise their work, mainly as group work although forms of open youth work are becoming increasingly popular, as in recent times there has been a greater need for issue-related and part-time involvement in projects rather than for permanent commitment.

In contrast, the youth work provided by youth welfare departments is mostly organised as open youth work in youth clubs, youth projects, youth centres or youth houses. In fact, the distinction between open youth work and social work for children and young people is gradually vanishing because of the need to address the special problems of disadvantaged groups of young people.

Youth work in Germany is nevertheless a highly professionalised and legally regulated sector. It is administrated by youth welfare departments at municipal level, and it benefits from cooperation between professionals and volunteers.

The essential aim of non-formal education and support is to lead young people towards determining their future and taking responsibility for their actions. Therefore, participation by the child or young person in shaping youth services is not merely a procedural requirement, but also an essential element for the effectiveness of the service itself. Special importance is attached to the participation of young people in youth work. Young people participate in shaping its content and organising it. Their needs and interests are the focus of varied forms of work and organisation. The primary task of youth work is to make a contribution towards personal self-fulfilment and towards greater freedom and justice by developing and strengthening young people's will and ability to play a responsible part in state and social life.

#### **6.4 Greece**

Despite the existence of legal provisions regarding youth issues, there is no special official definition or legal framework for youth work in Greece. However, youth work does exist as a social practice; it constitutes an integral part of educational and welfare work and plays a significant role in supporting young people's safe and healthy transition to adult life. The range of activities described as youth work is extensive, and includes health, social support, counselling, education, training, personal development, and so on. However, it seems that youth work is mainly related to leisure time activity – that is, artistic and cultural programmes, outdoor recreation, sports, etc. – providing a space for youthful experimentation and cultural development. Youth workers in Greece work primarily with young people aged between 15 and 25, but may in some cases extend this to those aged 13-15 or 25-30. Most youth services provide a mixture of 'open' youth work, intended for all young people in the area, and youth work targeting particular groups of young people, usually those who are disadvantaged or socially excluded.

Youth work in Greece involves a complex network of providers, community groups, non-governmental organisations and local authorities supported by a large number of adults working as full-time or part-time paid staff or as unpaid volunteers. However, the

<sup>21</sup> Münder, 2006

<sup>22</sup> Thole, 2000



main state organisation responsible for the development and implementation of youth work policy in the country is the General Secretariat for Youth. All these different organisations share a more or less common set of youth work values. These include: working with young people because they are young people, and not because they have been labelled or are considered deviant; starting with young people's view of the world; helping young people develop stronger relationships and collective identities; respecting and valuing difference; and promoting the voice of young people.

Youth work is of great social value. It connects with young people's leisure and recreational interests, complements formal educational processes, addresses contemporary social issues such as unemployment, and reflects the particular needs and tasks of young people as they move through the transitions of adolescence and young adulthood. Other types of youth work, both formal and informal, address issues relevant to young people such as drugs, sexual health or discrimination. In many instances, youth workers help young people to gain the skills to develop and lead sessions for other young people, an approach known as peer education. A non-exhaustive list of youth services in Greece includes, for example, career services, youth information, youth associations and participation education for young people with fewer opportunities, cultural education/cultural programmes, and social care services.

## 6.5 Ireland

Young people in Ireland are chronologically defined as being over ten and under 25 years of age. In reality, youth work provision in Ireland is directed at 12- to 18 - year-olds, cohort which coincides with secondary level education. Youth work is defined in the Youth Work Act, 2001, as a "planned programme of education designed for the purpose of aiding and enhancing the personal and social development of young persons through their voluntary participation, and which is complementary to their formal academic or vocational educational training; and provided primarily by voluntary youth work organisations' (Youth Work Act, Section 3). This definition reflects the view on the ground. For example, one major national youth organisation, Foróige (Development of Youth), reflects this ethos clearly in its mission statement: "the purpose of the organisation is to enable young people to involve themselves consciously and

actively in their own development and the development of society. This purpose challenges and supports young people to involve themselves in developing their character and talents".

This philosophical orientation enables Irish youth work organisations to pursue a multi-faceted approach that combines personal development with social justice. Irish youth work organisations are concerned to an increasing extent, with reaching out to vulnerable young people exposed to poverty, marginalisation and social exclusion, who are likely to underachieve at school, commit crime, engage in substance abuse and experience family difficulties. However, youth work in Ireland is viewed as an activity distinct from social work and straddles the fields of education and personal social services. Its emphasis on socialisation and inclusion through personal and social development differentiates youth work from social work, which is primarily concerned with child protection and family welfare issues. Youth work is predominantly located within the Third Sector, being composed of national and voluntary youth organisations under the overall coordination of the Youth Affairs Section of the Department of Education and Science and Vocational Education Committee (VECs). Social work is primarily located within the state sector, as part of the Health Service Executive (HSE), under the overall control of the Department of Health and Children.

Youth organisations operate a variety of programmes and activities that cater for young people with divergent needs and interests, including outdoor pursuits (hiking, water activities, etc.), project work, games and recreation, arts (drama, dance, etc.), citizenship and social action, summer projects and international exchanges.

Youth work in Ireland, consequently, has a distinctive ethos that defines it as a unique activity with its own clearly delimited mission aimed at the social and personal development of the youth population on the basis of voluntary participation. Its primary location within civil society in terms of service delivery reflects the historic influence of the principle of subsidiarity on Irish social policy formation and the limitations of the Irish Welfare State<sup>23</sup>.

There are a growing number of independently managed, community-based youth organisations in Ireland. These projects are usually not affiliated to one of the national youth organisations and, according to the NYCI, are mainly funded by government depart-

<sup>23</sup> Powell, 1992: 232-8

ments or agencies other than the Youth Affairs Section of the Department of Education and Science. There are considerable grounds for optimism in terms of the emergence of a legislative framework and the National Youth Work Development Plan (NYWDP). Implementation, has proved to be slow, with a reluctance to match rhetoric with resources. Nonetheless, inevitably the Irish State is being drawn into the sphere of youth work. As we have seen, funding is being provided by a diverse set of statutory sources. There is a real need for coordination and the new committee structure envisages providing just that: the sooner it is effectively implemented on the ground, the better it will be for the future of Irish youth work.

### **6.6 Italy**

In Italy the issue of youth policy is developing very slowly, with only 0.24% of municipal funds allocated to policies regarding young people.

Interventions in favour of young people are often very weak because they are monothematic and, therefore, nearly always involve an element of welfare rather than a political proposal for research and promotion of strong values or improved access to information, jobs, credit, and so on. In many Italian regions, the Catholic Church, with its parishes and broad range of training activities, has played a relevant role in these endeavours, but unfortunately there has been no opportunity for socialisation and participation activated and realised directly by public institutions that was not linked to adhesion to associations or organisations of some kind.

There are several reasons for this problem, but the most important one is that strong policy actions regarding young people have often been rejected. The passage to adult and professional life, together with education in favour of social participation, have been matters for the family, school, and associations.

In Italy there is no clear definition of youth work and, up to now, there has been no youth action plan where the expression 'young people' was uniformly defined. All the laws dealing with this issue, both at national and regional levels, have different concepts of what 'young people' are. Each of these laws considers different age ranges to identify the target, depending on the issue dealt with. Some define young people as those between the ages of 15 and 29, others define them as being between 15 and 36, and so on. The consequence is that, usually, youth work is considered to be the work carried out by young people of different ages, studying or not, young people

who, for the first time, are approaching the labour market, and policies in favour of youth work are all initiatives to provide instruments necessary to cope with new job opportunities and with fast changes.

In Italy there is now a Ministry for Youth Policies and Sport, as in other European countries, and the goal of this ministry is to provide national youth policies through the Youth National Plan. A special fund has been instituted (Law no. 248, August 2006) to implement the actions of the National Youth Plan: the 'Fund for Youth Policies'. It was created with the aim of promoting the rights of young people to cultural and vocational training, to foster their inclusion in social activities, and to implement actions needed to increase their opportunities of becoming house owners and getting credit to buy the goods and services they need. The budget is € 130 million for 2007; this money will be administered the country's regional and local authorities.

Another important aspect to underline is the increasing attention paid by the national government to the provision of education and continuous training for young people.

Over the last ten years, many projects have been realised with the participation of local administrations, local health organizations and the Third Sector. These projects have dealt with prevention, social assistance, and health promotion. Local authorities manage youth policies through Local Social Plans (Piani Sociali di Zona) involving the promotion of cultural and civic sense promotion, the development of autonomy and independence, and the prevention of social isolation and disease. Over these years, a great panorama of projects and interventions has been promoted. These projects stress cultural exchange, and a new approach to the needs and expectations of young people. Most local authority communes are now in charge of youth policy, indicating that there is an institutional will to take care of young people through local planning instruments. A network of information and orientation points has been created, including 107 'Informagiovani' and 'Eurodesks' at regional level.

### **6.7 The Netherlands**

During recent decades, youth work in the Netherlands has remained largely in the shadow of youth care. Even though the target group of youth care — youth at risk— accounts for only about 15% of Dutch youth, it nevertheless receives the lion's share of political attention. It is not particularly surprising that a similar picture can also be found within the Dutch

sector of youth work.

What we will call 'youth work in the narrow sense', once again focuses on young people at risk. Prototypical examples for such a target group are young people with a migration background and young people whose families are in a precarious financial situation. The activities organised for and with them are often carried out by public providers and aim at intervention into the problematic situations. For two reasons, youth work in the narrow sense is to be found especially in urban areas: firstly, population density is higher there, making it possible to divide the target group into subgroups; secondly, the proportion of young people with a migration background is larger there. In Amsterdam, for example, young people with a migration background account for more than 50% of the young people living within the city boundaries.<sup>24</sup>

'Youth work in the broader sense', in contrast, usually aims at young people in general or at specific age groups, e.g. the 10-14, or the 14-18 age group. It takes a more universalistic approach, offering a range of activities that are carried out by public, non-profit or for-profit providers. This kind of youth work can be found in cities, but is more common in villages and rural areas. The reason is that population density there is lower than in urban areas, so that it is counterproductive to subdivide the target group in any appreciable detail.<sup>25</sup>

Together 'youth work in the narrow' and 'in the broader sense' cover a whole range of activities. Noorda and Veenbaas have suggested the following classification: (1) professional socio-cultural youth work, encompassing neighbourhood-based youth work and open youth work; (2) voluntary youth work, including youth work based on a particular ideology, interest organisations, organisations focused on playtime activities, and organisations of migrants, (3) street youth work; (4) sports, and similar associations.<sup>26</sup>

Finally it should be noted that the activities and structures of youth work as described above are likely to change in the near future. On 1 January 2007, the Social Support Act came into force in the Netherlands. One of its concerns is to strengthen the role of municipalities in the provision of social support. As a consequence, the Dutch landscape of youth work might become even more fragmented

than it already is. On the other hand, a Ministry for Youth and Families was established on 22 February 2007. The existence of this might shift the topic of youth work further up the political agenda, taking it out of the shadow of youth care. As both of these events are fairly recent, their mid- and long-term consequences still remain to be seen.<sup>27</sup>

## 6.8 Norway

When it comes to young people and youth work, two aspects of the welfare state are of particular interest. The first is that the upbringing of children is not solely seen as parents' responsibility. Child welfare services have the right to intervene when children and young people are living under potentially harmful conditions. Secondly, voluntary work is recognised by both the government and society at large as an important arena for young people to learn about participation and democratic processes. Voluntary youth work therefore receives substantial financial support from both national and local government.

Youth work in Norway includes activities conducted by both voluntary and public organisations. Voluntary organisations typically focus on sports, culture and recreational activities, but they can also work to improve living conditions for disadvantaged youths. Public organisations usually offer activities such as youth clubs, culture and music schools as well as child welfare and social services. Much of the youth work in Norway is conducted in the Third Sector, with volunteers acting as significant contributors. In many cases child welfare services cooperate with voluntary organisations so that young people experiencing some kind of problem can participate in an activity (for example, sports) together with other young people.

The main action fields of youth work in Norway include voluntary work, youth clubs and child welfare services. Voluntary work consists of a broad range of organisations that focus on sports, culture, politics, religion and recreational activities. In most cases these organisations are run by volunteers. Organisations of this type are normally open to all people who want to participate. Youth clubs are owned and financed by local government. Their purpose is to give all young people the opportunity of meeting other young people. The main focus of youth clubs is not activities but rather the importance of interaction be-

<sup>24</sup> Gemeente Amsterdam, 2006

<sup>25</sup> Veenbaas & Noorda, 2005

<sup>26</sup> Noorda & Veenbaas, 2005; Veenbaas & Noorda, 2005

<sup>27</sup> Wet Maatschappelijke Ondersteuning, 2005

tween young people. Youth clubs will normally not accept participants over 18 years of age. Not all municipalities have youth clubs. Youth welfare services encompass all the work that is done by the local and regional child welfare services to help young people with drug-related problems, criminal inclinations or any other behaviour that will cause them harm. Young people older than 18 years will in most cases no longer receive support from the child welfare services.

## **6.9 Romania**

In Romania, the general framework of youth policies is aimed at the younger generation as a whole, and only specific targeted policies address issues specific to different categories of young people: Roma youth, girls, students, institutionalised young people, drug consumers, HIV positive young people or young people from rural areas. General policy documents and current Romanian legislation takes the young people as a whole, addressing a group ranging in age from 15/16 up to 29 or 35, depending on the policy. 'Young families' and non-governmental youth organisations are also a target of the general policy framework. As stated by the youth policy of the current Romanian government and also the Youth Law, the young generation of people ranging in age from 15/16 to 29 or 35 should be supported in their autonomy and independence. The general view is that the young generation represents a resource for the future, and this is why its initiatives, its values and its attitudes should be known, its problems solved and itself protected and supported for a better future. Yet at the same time, young people are viewed as a vulnerable group that needs protection, promotion and support. There is a specific policy at national level, for example, to support young families in terms of access to housing or starting a business. There are policies especially designed to address the needs of special categories of young people: people with disabilities, and members of minority groups, especially Roma. There is a national policy of encouraging employers to hire young people, especially young graduates; the national social security system offers unemployment benefits equivalent to 50% of the minimum wage to all high-school and university graduates. In conclusion, we can state that the target groups of the policies are both special groups of disadvantaged young people as well as this generation as a whole. The social participation of young people and, conversely, the social exclusion of some categories are considered important youth problems which must be

addressed with measures fostering prevention, political participation of young people, inclusion, and integration. To solve these problems, to address the issues of exclusion or marginalisation or integration of young people, the state authorities at every level cooperate with NGOs on these matters, helping them to develop programmes and strategies and applying together for funding in order to address these issues.

The dominant concepts in youth work are: participation, especially political and civic participation, leisure activities such as summer/winter schools, and counselling for young people on different issues concerning education, jobs, travelling, associations, information, training and voluntary work. Programmes addressing issues such as reproductive health and HIV/Aids prevention have been designed and implemented by several NGOs in collaboration with hospitals, clinics, and medical cabinets at both public and private level. With regard to the institutions involved in youth work, in the last four or five years the role of non-governmental organisations in providing activities, programmes and projects has gradually been replaced by a better and broader involvement of national authorities both at national and regional/local level. A network of state institutions has been built under the coordination of the National Authority for Youth, the central administrative body in charge of coordinating, designing and implementing youth policy in Romania.

## **6.10 Spain**

To understand the meaning of youth work in the Spanish welfare state it is essential, on the one hand, to understand the focus on the family environment which characterises young peoples' transition processes to adulthood and which also permeates public policies. This is equivalent to saying that the Spanish welfare state has until now been based on solidarity, particularly cross-generational solidarity, which explains young people's delayed emancipation from their family. Issues relating to the socialisation of young people are normally solved within the family (private environment), while issues relating to young people's schooling and labour qualification are solved within the educational system (public environment). This explains why family-orientated southern European welfare state policies and youth work activities tend to be underdeveloped. Moreover, these welfare states are characterised by a polarised revenue policy essentially directed towards the elderly, where budgetary allocations intended for family and for youth policies, such as for the development of youth work,

have been very scarce. This has considerably restricted the development of national programmes for youth work, restricting the development of these programmes to a local level. On the other hand, and as a consequence of this family orientation that characterises the southern European welfare states, welfare and socialisation assistance have to be provided within the private family environment. Policies intended to promote the Third Sector and non-formal education of young people have just recently been implemented. This has had certain negative repercussions on the shaping and introduction of the concept of youth work.

In the case of the southern European welfare states, there is no official term or underlying concept of youth work. In contrast to the countries in northern Europe, in Spain this concept is difficult to apply when referring to youth policies, since there is an institutional and conceptual void on the subject, which is reflected in a variety of youth programmes. In many cases, youth work is understood as labour education policies developed at a local level and in the third sector, policies intended to promote the labour insertion of disadvantaged young people. The meaning of youth work in Spain is therefore fundamentally exemplified in youth policies intended to counteract the social exclusion and marginalisation of young people.

The main goal of youth policies with regard to youth work is to strengthen the participation and integration of young people in different spheres of society as citizens with full rights. As clearly stated in the YOYO project (2004), current policy discourses in Europe promote participation as a key principle of civil society. However, if participation is not linked to social rights— with the exception of the universalistic tran-

sition system in the Scandinavian countries — it tends to increase self-responsibility and individualises social risks. In particular, active labour market policies tend to undermine and restrict individual autonomy. However, if active citizenship is the democratic formula for self-determination within flexible labour markets, individual motivation is a valuable key for policy. From this perspective it is necessary to point out that in the southern European countries, and specifically in Spain, the limited development by the welfare state of social policies referring to family and youth has had a certain negative repercussion on the formulation of policy strategies and on citizens concerned with strengthening and legitimising the fields of action of youth work and youth workers.

The fields of action related to youth work in Spain have been channelled through an indirect and limited means by way of educational policies related to the formal education system. To a lesser degree, actions in non-formal education and in the vocational training sector have been developed by Third-Sector agents (associations, NGOs, etc.).

In Spain, the field of action of youth work is as limited in the hard policies as in the soft policies. This has had negative repercussions on the development of the sector and on the development of voluntary work, as well as on the affirmation of young people's rights as citizens and, in particular, in those groups of young people with inadequate training and with labour integration or social participation problems.

## 7 - Qualification of Youth Workers

The overview of pathways to qualification presented here was taken from the IARD Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe; it has been revised and updated by the partners.

In general we can state that all countries have a split system of education and training for youth workers that includes training for voluntary or employed youth workers, and professional studies at professional schools and universities. However, youth work is – with the exception of Ireland – not an independent course of study in any of the countries surveyed but is rather included in careers such as social pedagogy, social sciences, educational sciences, social work or social administration. In Ireland there is a Bachelor of Social Science in 'Youth and Community Work'. This B.Soc.Sc. Youth and Community Work offers a degree and professional education to activists who are interested in the youth and community work area. In order to facilitate the ongoing community involvement of students, the course is designed on a flexible basis. Student attend college and do work-

placements. The course is aimed at all youth and community activists but in particular, at people from disadvantaged communities. Applications from minority groups are especially welcomed.

As already stated by the IARD study, higher levels of training seem to be related to a lesser degree of specialisation and are integrated into a broad professional context of social pedagogy, educational sciences or social sciences. The training for youth workers on a professional education level tends to be more specialised and orientated towards a practical education. In some countries there were developments towards the implementation of the European Credit Transfer System.

In all countries there is a short training system for voluntary workers or for those youth workers who start working as professionals in local authorities, as is the case in Italy. Only in very few cases are these trainings standardised or their certificates officially recognised.

**Table 8: Qualification of Youth Workers<sup>28</sup>**

|         | Term <sup>29</sup> | Education and Training Pathways (length, practice/theory and type of qualification)   |  |  |
|---------|--------------------|---|--|--|
|         |                    | <i>Voluntary Level</i>  | <i>Professional Schools</i>  | <i>Higher Education</i>  |
| Austria | SW                 | Further training for volunteers provided by youth organisations and associations and by youth departments of the state governments. Only a few lead to officially recognised certificates | Professional Schools: 5-year full-time course in 'social pedagogy', 10% practice<br>Colleges for Social Pedagogy: 2 years (full-time), 3 years part-time, mainly theory with practical elements<br>Further training courses: certificates not recognised by public bodies, 2 years | Academy for social work: Diploma in Social Work, 4 years,<br>University: Diploma in Educational Sciences<br>Both are courses with a mainly theoretical focus   |
| Estonia | YW<br>SP<br>SW     | Youth organisations offer their volunteers different training possibilities at professional level, but most of them are very chaotic and not organised regularly                          | Colleges for Social Pedagogy ( 3 year degree for youth workers & social pedagogues, 4-year degree for social workers) 40 - 50% practice<br>Training courses  | University degrees in social sciences (sociology, social policy, social work, etc.) 3+2 at BA and MA level.  |
| Germany | SP<br>SW<br>YW     | Youth organisations and associations offer a huge variety of further training for volunteers. Only a few lead to officially acknowledged certificates                                     | 1) Professional training for social assistants: 2-year school-based training<br>2) Professional education and training for social educators: 3 to 4 years (1 year of practice)<br>3) Professional Academy for the Social Sector: 3-year degree (theory and practice alternating)   | 1) University diploma in educational sciences with a specialisation in social pedagogy: 4 years plus 6 months of placement<br>2) Polytechnic diploma in social work/ social pedagogy: 3 years plus 1 year of practice<br>3) Bachelor/Master of Social Work: 2 years/3 years plus practice. Admission to a master's programme requires a professional certificate. ECTS accreditation |

<sup>28</sup> This table is based on the IARD Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe, January 2001; part IV 116-123

<sup>29</sup> YW = Youth Worker (including Youth Instructors, Leisure Time Leaders); CA = Cultural Animator; SP = Social Pedagogue, Social Educator; SW = Social Worker (including Social Cultural Workers); YP = Youth Policy Professional

|             |                      |  |  |  |
|-------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Greece      | SW<br>CA<br>SP       | Voluntary non-governmental organisations and associations may offer training courses for volunteers in the youth sector but without any overall coordination in terms of administration, theory or approach.<br>None of these training courses leads to an officially recognised qualification.  | 1) Public and private vocational training institutes (IEK) offer programmes on ecclesiastical and cultural training, early childhood social care/pedagogy, special education, organisation and management of children and youth camps, etc. Trainees who complete their studies obtain a Vocational Training Diploma (post secondary level +3).<br>2) Private vocational training centres (KEK) provide vocational training courses for employment in the areas of culture, sports and leisure.<br>3) Centres for adult education (KEE) offer a variety of training courses on:<br>- Counselling and special education (25-50 hours). Trainees receive a Further Education Certificate.<br>- Leisure time management (250 hours-1 year study). Access requires a high school degree. Trainees receive a Lifelong Learning Certificate.<br>4) The General Secretariat for Youth provides special training courses to the employees of youth information centres, twice a year (each training session has a duration of two days). | 1) University degree in social administration, major in social work: 4 years of studies including 2 years of practice.<br>2) University degrees in social sciences (sociology, psychology, social policy, social anthropology, etc.), in educational sciences and pedagogy (primary education, early childhood education, special education, social pedagogy, etc.), not youth work specific: 4-years of studies, plus, in some cases, some kind of practice depending on the degree.<br>3) Higher Technological Educational Institute degree in social work: practice-orientated 4-year degree preparing for youth and social services in the following areas: social welfare, special education, physical-psychological and mental health, social security, counselling and vocational guidance, delinquency prevention, community development, social services within the framework of the Hellenic Armed Forces and the Ministry of Public Order, etc. |
| Ireland     | YW<br>SW             | Voluntary associations provide non-standardised training for volunteers (traditionally strong influence of Church declining)   |  | 1) Master of Social Science / Higher Diploma in Youth and Community Work: 2-year post-graduate course<br>2) Master of Social Work: 2-year full-time course with practical placements<br>3) Bachelor of Social Science in Youth and Community Work: 3-year course with practical part, in some cases access without post-compulsory qualifications  |
| Italy       | CA<br>SE<br>YP       | The situation is influenced by a general lack of national youth policy and the late implementation of local youth policies with considerable local and regional differences  |  |  |
|             |                      | Voluntary organisations and cooperatives offer a broad range of short and longer training courses. In some cases, these can be considered as further training for those starting to work as professionals in local youth policies without having appropriate qualifications.   | University Diploma in Educational Sciences with specialisation in social pedagogy: 3 years for the first level degree and 2 years of specialisation plus placement   |  |
| Netherlands | YW<br>SW             | Voluntary youth associations may offer training for volunteers without stringent coordination.   | Social cultural worker, social pedagogical worker, social service worker, welfare worker: 2 to 4-year degrees organised in four levels (modules) provided at Regional Education Centres. 60% practice training   | Higher Vocational Education (UPE) in cultural and social education (CMV): 4-year degree equivalent to polytechnic level; practice experience is integrated (until 1990 special 'youth work' programme in UPE)  |
| Norway      | SW<br>SP<br>YW<br>CA | Most voluntary organisations offer a wide range of courses for volunteers. Few of them lead to official acknowledged certificates. In many cases, volunteers have to take courses arranged by the different organisations to be considered suitable for doing youth work.  | Child and youth work: 2 years of education in public secondary school plus 2 years of practice. Employment in kindergartens, youth clubs   | Bachelor in child welfare or social work: 3-year course at University Colleges, one semester practice placement included. Employment in child welfare services, schools, social services<br>Master in child welfare or social work: Bachelor plus 2 years of further education at University Colleges. Employment in child welfare services, schools, social services, research and development  |
| Romania     | LTL<br>CA<br>YP      | Some youth associations/organisations offer training sessions and short courses for their volunteers. Volunteer organisations offer their volunteers either free or paid courses on different topics, depending on the activity. Also, state institutions cooperate with youth NGOs to offer courses and training for young people on a range of issues. Certificates are offered at the end of these courses (training courses for trainers). | There is no formal programme of qualification for youth workers. Youth workers get their qualifications by working in organisations, or associations, by attending international seminars, workshops, or courses, and thus achieving experience in the field of youth work.  |  |
| Spain       | SW<br>SE<br>CA<br>YP | Voluntary youth associations offer training for volunteers which may be coordinated by regional adult education centres (with certificate). These courses do not require a university degree.<br>A graduate university degree on voluntary work and cooperation is available (it requires a university degree).  | Higher technician for social services / socio-cultural animators: 2-year course at regional professional schools with a balance between practice and theoretical instruction. It does not require a university degree.<br>Graduate university degree to achieve the title of socio cultural tutor (requires a university degree).  | Social work and social education: 3-year university degree leading to management positions in local youth services and to work with specially disadvantaged youth; 40% practice and 60% study .  |

## 8 - Survey results

### 8.1 Availability of Data

In most of the European countries participating in this survey reporting on the structures of and the participation in youth work is possible only by combining data from different sources. With the exception of Germany, no country has regulations for compulsory, regularly and comprehensive reporting on youth work. The availability of data on youth work depends on different factors that can be identified as follows:

- The existence of specific national youth programmes funded with European or national budgets. Examples of this can be found in all countries. In Spain for instance, the data accessible at national level results from the monitoring of a special job insertion programme (INEM).
- The existence of ministries or agencies responsible for implementing and monitoring youth work policies. Romania can be named here as an example: here, the National Youth Authority involves the municipalities in reporting as they fund their youth activities.
- The need for monitoring developments in youth work according to political requirements. In Germany the responsible ministry for youth affairs has to report to parliament every four years on the living conditions of children and young people and on structural developments in the field of youth work.
- Promotion of youth work by youth associations and other institutions. In the Netherlands and in Ireland youth associations report on the activities of their member organisations.
- Scientific research. In Norway, the best available source of information on youth participation is a scientific survey conducted in 2002 by the Norwegian Social Research Institute and funded by different sources.

Countries such as Austria and Germany publish regular national youth reports. In Austria, these reports are published every three years and focus on specific issues. In Germany, the Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth reports to parliament every four years on the living conditions of children and young people and on youth assistance structures. These reports are issue-centred too, but they also provide a broad database. Moreover, all administrative levels in Germany are forced by law to provide data on youth work to the National Statistic Bureau on an annual basis. This data is compiled and pub-

lished every two to four years.

In countries such as Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania and Spain we can find a few studies on youth work issues published by various public institutions. These studies are not regular and they often serve as mere documentation of the activities of institutions, or as evaluations of the performance of special programmes. Norwegian municipalities are also obliged to provide data every year about some kind of public youth work. For the Netherlands and Ireland it can be stated that the youth associations themselves report on youth work issues involving their associated members. In the Netherlands these reports were unfortunately stopped because of cancelled subsidies in 2003.

Finally, in countries such as Greece and Italy, there are no reports on youth work issues at all. The available data focuses on national programmes and budgets, and tends to follow rather the logic of verifying public funding rather than the documentation of youth work activities. In Romania we meet the situation that reports on youth work issues which are drawn up by the National Agency for Supporting Young Peoples' Initiatives are not published at all.

In addition to these surveys, there are also different surveys done for research purposes by researchers working at universities.

In most countries, the available data is not representative. There are three types of reasons for this:

- Existing surveys are based on voluntary the commitment of municipalities or organisations. This is the case in Austria, for instance, where national reports on youth are done on a regular basis, but where not all associations participate, or in the Netherlands where there is a survey of the Dutch municipalities but again without the participation of all of them.
- The surveys collect data from different ministries or agencies for a variety of purposes and do not refer to the system of other surveys. This is the case in the Netherlands where we can find studies from the Association of Dutch Municipalities, from the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sports and from youth associations about different youth work issues. Another example are the surveys on



work, as their intention is to map the whole landscape and potential of volunteerism.

- The surveys use out-of-date data because the process of documentation and analysis takes a long time. The Italian Institute of Statistical Research, for instance, published reports in 2005

with data from 1999.

The following table gives an overview of the availability of reports on youth work in the participating countries:

**Table 9: Availability of data and structure of reporting**

|         | System of national reporting   | Available reports   | Best practice                                     | Problems   | Reasons for lack of data   |
|---------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Austria | No national reporting system   | National Youth Reports focusing on specific issues (i.e. prevention, gender mainstreaming)  |   | No representative data available, as reporting is optional   | No national reporting system, regional differences, lack of networking and exchange at national level  |
| Estonia | No national reporting system   | Estonian Youth Work Strategy 2006 – 2013<br>Statistic of the National Youth Work Centre   | Statistic of the National Youth Work Centre       | No data from any of the youth work institutions  | Only public funded projects are registered and visible   |
| Germany | Compulsory annual data report from all administrative levels. Analysis every two or four years<br><br>Compulsory report on children and young people by the relevant ministry to the parliament every four years | National Child and Youth Work Statistic<br><br>National Child and Youth Reports<br><br>National Survey on Volunteerism<br><br>Statistic of the National Youth Sports Association  | System of compulsory reporting at municipal level | No visibility of volunteerism and the whole range of work done by youth associations<br><br>Labour market orientated data not included in the reporting system | Only public funded projects are registered   |
| Greece  | No national reporting system   | Online database of non-governmental voluntary organisations from the Centre for the Promotion of Volunteerism 'Anthropos.gr' ( <a href="http://www.anthropos.gr">http://www.anthropos.gr</a> )<br><br>Periodic Studies on Youth Employment from the Employment Observatory<br><br>Report from the National Statistical Service of Greece<br><br>'Youth in Greece Today': Study conducted by the Institute of Applied Communications, University of Athens, for the General Secretariat for Youth (2005)<br><br>'Youth in Our Times. Values, Attitudes and Beliefs of the Greek Youth': Study conducted by VPRC for the General Secretariat for Youth (2000) |   | Lack of data on youth issues   | Lack of a comprehensive legal framework regarding youth work/ youth workers<br><br>The fact that youth work studies in Greece does not constitute a distinct, independent, subject of university teaching and research<br><br>Lack of interest, until very recently, of the relevant public authorities to the promotion of youth research |
| Ireland | Youth Work funding review from 2007  | National Children Office Report (2005)<br><br>Report of the National Committee on Volunteering (2002)<br><br>White Paper: Supporting Voluntary Activity (2000)<br><br>Youth Work Ireland AGM Report 2006  | Annual reports of youth work agencies             | No data about youth work institutions  |  |
| Italy   | No national reporting system   | Report from the Italian Institute of Statistical Research   |   | Data from 1999 not published until 2005  |  |

|             | System of national reporting  | Available reports  | Best practice  | Problems   | Reasons for lack of data   |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Netherlands | No national reporting system  | <p>Survey of Dutch Municipalities (2003)</p> <p>Study on Sports in the Netherlands (2004)</p> <p>Study on creative education (2005)</p> <p>Online database, e.g. on leisure time activities and social participation of Dutch citizens</p>   | Nederlandse Jeugdgroep survey with member data                           | <p>Data not representative, as not all municipalities took part in the survey</p> <p>Scattered data from different studies</p>   | <p>Youth work is not a political priority</p> <p>Vague definition of youth work Youth work is regulated locally</p>  |
| Norway      | <p>Reporting system for some activities of public organisations</p> <p>Reports on public sources of financial funding to voluntary organisations conducting child and youth work</p>  | <p>Youth reports based on local and national surveys.</p> <p>Statistics and reports on child welfare</p>   |  | Difficulties in finding valid data because of many different sources and little information in some areas of youth work  | Lack of routines for reporting among voluntary organisations conducting youth work   |
| Romania     | <p>There is a national system of reporting: local County Youth Departments report their activities to the National Youth Authority at least for the programmes and activities funded by the NYA.</p> <p>Each CYD writes a yearly report on its own activities and sends it to the NYA.</p> <p>For funds provided by the NYA, youth NGOs must report, but the NYA does not publish these reports, only the name of the NGO, the title of the activity funded, and the amount of money given.</p> <p>There is no data collected on youth workers.</p> <p>The annual reports are not made public or easily accessible.</p> | <p>Online data base of non-governmental associations made available by the National Agency for Supporting Young People Initiatives (2007)</p> <p>Background paper by the National Agency for Supporting Young People Initiatives (2002)</p> <p>Study on Youth by the NASYPI (2005)</p> | NASYPI did one internal youth work survey in order to promote youth work | <p>Scattered data</p> <p>Very recent institutional reorganisation, changes within national and local structures</p> <p>Youth NGOs lack of trust in national and local institutions with regard to management of public funds.</p> <p>Complicated procedure to access funds for youth activities so that youth NGOs are discouraged from applying</p> | <p>Youth work is not clearly defined, and youth workers do not operate within a legal framework. It is difficult to collect data on something non-existing.</p> <p>No special interest shown by national authorities for this topic</p> <p>Only publicly funded projects are registered</p> <p>Local and national youth institutions are not transparent with regard to funds available and decisions on how to spend them. Similarly, they do not have a detailed system for collecting data, and sometimes also do not keep their data up to date. Institutional changes have caused changes in data collection and reporting.</p> |
| Spain       | No national system of reporting   | <p>Association Census of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy</p> <p>Spanish Youth Council Census of Associations</p> <p>Data from the National Employment Institute (2007)</p> <p>Injuve Report on Youth Information Services 2006</p>  |  | No data about youth work institutions  | <p>No concept of youth work</p> <p>Scattered responsibility between different levels of administration</p> <p>No common indicators</p>   |

The main reasons for the situation described here are:

- **Political impact:**
  - ⇒ that there is no political requirement for reporting as youth work is not a priority and indeed sometimes not even recognised as a profession
  - ⇒ that the responsibilities for youth work are scattered amongst different ministries and there is no cross-sectoral cooperation in reporting, and
  - ⇒ that youth work is performed and financed at local level, so that no need is felt for a national report.
- **Financial impact:**
  - ⇒ that only publicly funded projects are registered, as spending of the public budget has to be duly administered and monitored.
- **Cultural impact:**
  - ⇒ that there is a lack of routine for reporting among voluntary organisations as they are not participating in reporting, and
  - ⇒ that some countries lack the tradition of making funding structures transparent.
- **Professional impact:**
  - ⇒ that the concept of youth work is vague and thus common indicators are missing.

Analysing the various national reporting systems reveals individual examples of good practice approaches. These examples were found in contexts where, in the absence of overall data, individual stakeholders were put in charge of gathering information or decided to become active in this respect on their own initiative.

In **Estonia** and **Ireland**, the central state institutions and authorities responsible for the implementation of national youth work policies are also the organisations in charge of central data collection and processing. It is therefore possible to keep track of national and publicly funded measures.

In the **Netherlands**, the Dutch Youth Group documented the work of its member organisations until 2005, when a cut in funding led to the end of this activity. This is one possible approach to publicising the work of youth organisations.

In **Romania**, the National Agency for Supporting Young People's Initiatives carried out an investigation and quantitative survey on the number of youth workers in Romania. The rationale behind this study was a desire to shed light on the professional practices of youth workers, and to encourage professional recognition of their work. In this respect, professional organisations and, in some cases, trade unions could be potential initiators of efforts to document youth work.

**Germany** is a special case. Here, there is legally mandated cooperation between local, state and federal authorities to collect and publish data on youth welfare services. Because of this system, Germany is also the only country with comprehensive quantitative documentation of youth work. The Dortmund-based Bureau of Children and Youth Welfare Services Statistics then evaluates the data, comments on it, and exploits it for political purposes and professional debate.

## 9 - Results from the National Statistical Reviews

### 9.1 General overview on the reporting systems

The attempt to map the structure of youth work in terms of institutions, activities, youth workers, participants and funds allocated in the different European countries will be carried out by means of a structured overview. This overview will reflect the global data available at each national level, and comments on the data quality.

**In Estonia, Germany, Ireland, Norway and Romania, basic data describing publicly funded youth work is available.** In these countries it is possible to state the total number of institutions, the number of institutions differentiated by type of youth work provided, the number of youth and sports associations and the ratio between public and non-public institutions. The activities of youth work institutions and the budgets are not traceable in all countries.

Nevertheless, there are differences regarding the structure of this data:

For **Estonia** it is possible to give a detailed overview of the number of institutions and the type of youth work provided. However, the figures for non-public institutions are not complete, nor are the figures for sports associations working with or for young people. Neither it is also not possible to draw a clear distinction between institutions and activities. There is no information on the budget spent on youth work. Some data on youth workers is available, but this information does not cover the non-public sector. Similarly, numbers of participants are thus traceable for public institutions only.

In **Germany**, a differentiation can be made as to types of institutions and those bodies responsible. The total number of youth associations operating at local level is nevertheless not documented as they are attributed to the superior categories. It is also possible to list the number of activities provided by youth work institutions, but the categories are global. Information on the public budget spent on youth work at all administrative levels is available. The structure of reporting regarding youth workers is detailed, but data on volunteers is missing. Data on the participants excludes all participants in youth work that is not publicly funded.

In **Ireland**, where youth work is traditionally provided by youth associations, it is possible to map the number of institutions and local unions of youth services. The activities provided are not documented. The budget allocated for youth work can be deduced from the National Youth Work Development Plan and

from the annual reports of youth work agencies. The only available data on youth workers is the total number of full-time paid staff. The ratio of paid youth workers to volunteers is also documented. Data on participants only refers to surveys compiling the most attractive activities of young people.

In **Norway** data on institutions, youth and sports associations is available. Some differentiations can be made in terms of the activities of youth associations, but this is not possible for the public youth clubs. Public spending can be reported for voluntary child and youth organisations but not for all the expenses allocated at municipal level. Data on youth workers and volunteers is not available. The data available on participants is the result of a survey, not of a continuous monitoring system.

In **Romania**, the number of providers of youth work can be listed, but not the number of institutions. The activities realised with financial support from the National Authority for Youth are documented, as is the budget provided by the National Authority for Youth for the support of youth work, and the budget of the 'Youth in Action' Programme. The number of youth workers can be reported for the youth work listed, but only isolated data is available on volunteers. Data on participants is sometimes available but not systematically analysed.

**In Austria and the Netherlands**, a rough landscape of youth work can be sketched. The data provided does not allow a selective classification of institutions, as the surveys permit multiple answers or ask for a rating about the importance of youth work rather than or numbers of institutions. The same can also be stated for the activities. In **Austria**, it is possible to identify the funds provided through the Federal Act on the Promotion of Youth. Data on youth workers and volunteers is available for those institutions that took part in the national survey. The data on participants traces the intensity of participation and participation motive rather than numbers. In the **Netherlands**, where responsibility for youth work lies fully in the hand of the municipalities, there is no data on the total budget available for youth work. The activities reported are the result of the opinion of stakeholders at municipal level as to what kind of youth work is important for them. Isolated data is available on youth workers and their main fields of action. There is no data on participants: the available data refers to the target groups from the point of view of the municipalities offering the activities.

**In Greece, Italy and Spain**, only individual sectors of youth work can be mapped. In these countries, data on institutions is available only with regard to special national programmes. The same applies to the activities of youth work institutions. In **Greece**, there is not even one survey specifically addressing youth work services in the country. The only traceable structures are those activated by European programmes and reporting systems. Data on youth workers and volunteers involved in youth work is missing, as well as data on participants. In **Italy**, funds allocated through the National Financial Law for Youth-related Activities document the financial contingent for different youth work activities. However, little is known about the structures, the youth workers and the participants (besides sports activities). In **Spain**, there is data on the budget allocated in the Interdepartmental Youth Plan, which represents funds spent on subsidising youth associations. The best accurately documented sector is that of the National Employment Institute activities towards job insertion and training for young people, for which scattered data is available. Data on volunteers is not available. Data on participants data is traceable only for the INEM´ programme.

An analysis of the overview allows certain conclusions to be drawn regarding well or poorly documented sectors of youth work.

The sectors where data on youth work institutions,

activities and budgets is generally reliable are:

- public youth work institutions
- activities realised within the framework of national programmes and priorities of youth work promotion
- public funds allocated for the implementations of youth plans, or for special national or European programmes
- youth workers employed in public institutions or paid from public budgets and
- participants in publicly funded institutions or projects, or in sports activities.

The sectors of youth work that are not well represented in the national statistics are especially:

- youth work which is not financed from public budgets
- activities provided by sports associations;
- youth work provided at local level
- youth work activities at the edges of the national concept of youth work (i.e. realised by institutions that are not primarily youth-oriented, such as job centres, enterprises, police units etc.)
- funds allocated by non-public institutions
- numbers of volunteers involved in youth work
- participants in youth work, especially at local level and in associative youth work structures.

**Table 10: Aspects of availability of data**

|               | +  | +/-   | -   |
|---------------|--|---|---|
| Institutions  | Public youth work institutions   | Youth associations<br>Sports associations   | Not publicly funded institutions  |
| Activities    | Activities realised within the framework of national programmes  | Activities provided by youth associations<br>Activities provided at municipal level | Activities of sports associations<br>Youth work activities provided by institutions not restricted to youth work<br>Youth work at local level |
| Funds         | Public funds allocated for the implementation of youth plans or special programmes or European funds             | Public funds at municipal level   | Non-public funds  |
| Youth workers | Public youth workers<br>Youth workers employed in special programmes   | Qualification<br>Employment structure<br>Ratio of female and male youth workers     | Volunteers  |
| Participants  | Participants in public institutions<br>Participants in special programmes<br>Participants in sports associations | Participants in voluntary organisations   | Participants in youth groups and activities at local level  |

The following can be said about the quality of the data:

- There is no clear distinction between providers and institutions of youth work;
- There are no fixed categories about youth work activities (categories vary from survey to survey);
- The age groups are not fixed;
- There is no clear separation between the categories: members of youth organisations, participants and volunteers;
- The aggregated data is not complete, so that the relative significance is weak.

It can therefore be argued that data on youth work at national level is not complete enough for a comprehensive picture of youth work to be drawn in all countries surveyed. The data available at national level focuses mostly on the implementation of national Youth Acts or programmes. None of the participating countries offers a comprehensive image of all actions undertaken within the scope of youth work, especially of those actions provided locally by non-public associations — in particular, youth associations or special youth groups within the framework of other associations — without financial support from public institutions. Furthermore, the completeness of the image of youth work also depends very much on the existence and contents of the respective national youth work concept and the allocation of responsibilities between administrative levels. In Germany, for instance – in spite of the existence of a compulsory annual database – data on the important sector of initiatives for the insertion of young people into the labour market is not included in the statistics about youth work. In the Netherlands and Norway, where responsibility for youth work lies in the hands of the municipalities, there is no apparent need for nationwide regulation or nation-wide documentation.

## 9.2 National data about youth work

The following section will present an overview of the statistical information provided in each country. The main information regarding funds, youth work provided, institutions involved, youth workers, and participants will be presented in a short description, with

detailed information for each country listed in a table. In **Austria**, there is a budget of € 4 080 155 for the implementation of the Federal Act on the Promotion of Youth. 40% of this amount is spent on funding different associations; 41% is spent on funding different projects, and 18% on special requests within the scope of youth work. Additional funds are provided by state authorities. According to a non-representative youth report<sup>30</sup>, most youth work providers (72%) are associations. Above all, they offer recreational and pedagogic activities, cultural youth work, youth counselling, youth employment activities as well as peer information. There is an average of 12 paid youth workers per institution, although 5% of the open youth work institutions and 35% of the youth associations have no paid youth workers. The ratio of volunteers to paid staff is 3:1. Another national study for Austria states that 5% of girls and 4% of boys (14 to 30 years) visit a youth centre “very often” 71% never do.<sup>31</sup>

In **Estonia**, there is no data available on the budget spent on youth work. Because of a lack of data, the percentage between public and non-public organisations cannot be traced either. For the youth work organisations listed by the Estonian Youth Work Centre in the year 2006, we can differentiate between the types of activities provided. At 31%, extracurricular youth education accounts for the greatest part of available youth work facilities, followed by cultural youth work and youth camps, both at 15%, and open youth work and youth clubs at 14%. Only a very small number of youth work activities deal specifically with youth employment (although 25% participate in youth education), youth information, youth counselling and sports. The public institutions listed have an average of six youth workers per youth work institution. The rate of professionalism in these institutions is high as nearly all youth workers have a professional education. Data on volunteers is not available. Youth education within the formal system plays an important role within the Estonian youth work system, as it involves 25% of all participants. Cultural youth work and extracurricular youth education form the main categories of youth work provided.

<sup>30</sup> 5. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich (2006)

<sup>31</sup> 4. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich (2003a)

**Table 11: Youth work in Austria**

|         | Data base  | Institutions   | Activities   | Funds  | Youth workers  | Volunteers   | Participants  |
|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Austria | Non representative surveys<br>Data from 2006 and from 2003 (n=155) | 737 providers of youth work<br>72% of the providers are associations<br>No distinction between public and non-public or voluntary associations | 88% of youth organisations offer recreational and pedagogic activities<br>86% of youth organisations offer cultural youth work<br>76% of youth work organisations offer youth counselling<br>56% of youth work organisations provide opportunities to prepare for the labour market<br>50% of youth work organisations provide youth information in the form of peer group information<br>The main fields of activity of youth organisations are leisure time (71.4%), social matters (67%), education (40.9%) and cultural matters (35%). Other areas of activity – in the opinion of the youth organisations themselves – are representation of interests (20.7%), health matters (20.2%) and nature and environmental issues (14.8%). | Under the Federal Act of the Promotion of Youth, federal funding is provided for youth associations as well as for individual projects of youth work.<br>In 2005, 27 youth associations received €1,649,673.75, and €1,687,616.97 was given to fund 252 different projects. An additional €742,864.90 was granted for special requests involving youth work.<br>37% of the budget of youth associations in Austria comes from public authorities, 14.8% from membership fees, 12% from sponsoring and donations, and 12% from a superior level of organisation. Another 19% of the budget of youth associations is self-obtained.<br>Municipal and other funds are not accounted for here. | 203 institutions employ 7300 youth workers. This is an average of 37 youth workers per institution. The average number of paid youth workers is 12, i.e. 1/3 of employees are paid.<br>The percentage of paid youth workers in open youth work is higher than in youth associations (5% to 35% of associations have no paid youth workers).<br>53% of youth associations have only paid youth workers.<br>2/3 of the organisations employ up to 10 youth workers.<br>12% of youth associations and 26% of open youth work organisations employ more than 10 youth workers.<br>60% of youth associations have a high percentage (> 50%) of paid female youth workers. | Volunteers play an important role in extracurricular youth work.<br>The ratio of volunteers to paid staff is 3:1.<br>On average, there are 15 volunteers per organisation.<br>71% of the female and 65% of the male voluntary youth workers are younger than 30. | 5% of girls and 4% of boys (14 to 30) visit a youth centre "very often". 71% never do.<br>3% of the young people interviewed are active in a youth association "very often". 76% never get involved with youth organisations.<br>24% of the interviewed young people see a possibility to be active in a youth organisation and 22% in a youth centre.<br>Around 1/3 of those are already active. |

**Table 12: youth work in Estonia**

|         | Data base                                       | Institutions     | Activities  | Funds   | Youth workers   | Volunteers | Participants   |
|---------|---|------------------|---|---------|---|------------|--|
| Estonia | Survey of the Estonian Youth Work Centre (2006) | 973 institutions | 31% extra-curricular youth education<br>15% cultural youth work<br>15% youth camps<br>14% youth centres<br>8% youth associations<br>2% youth counselling<br>2% youth sports<br>1.5% youth information<br>0.5% youth employment<br>56% of the activities are provided by public institutions, 43% by non-public associations, and 1% by semi-public organisations. | No data | 5999 youth workers are employed in public institutions. 36% of these are involved in extracurricular youth education, 31% in cultural youth work, and 26% in youth education. 4% are working in sports and only 1% in youth centres or youth counselling institutions.<br>About 60% of youth workers work full-time.<br>There is no data on the ratio of female to male youth workers.<br>68% of youth workers have a professional school diploma, and 42% have a higher education. | No data    | 90108 registered participants<br>30% in cultural youth work, 38% in extra-curricular youth education, 7% in sports and 25% in youth education. |

In **Greece**, the available data at national level is too scarce to draw a quantitative picture. There are about 270 NGOs active in child and youth work. However, the actual number may be larger since many NGOs offer certain services to children and young people even though they do not specialise in youth work. There are 50 youth information centres. In 2005, they were funded with € 1,066,100 and an estimated 100,000 young people used them. The estimated budget of the General Secretariat for Youth is € 16,000,000.

Similarly to Greece, in **Italy** the data on youth work structures is scarce and the only well documented sector is the budget for the implementation of the National Financial Law for Youth. At national level we can state that there are 800 youth information centres and 2,400 consultancy centres for young people in local health centres funded from public budgets. The national budget allocates € 1,031,420,000 to youth-related activities. 78% of this amount is desig-

nated for international youth work, 10% for youth apprenticeships, 5% for youth migration services, and 2.9% for youth education institutions and youth work in universities. Only a small part of the budget, 0.4%, is allocated to youth associations. The rate of participation in groups or civil society organisations is 13.4%<sup>32</sup>. 39% of young people between the ages of 14 to 24 years practise sports regularly.

**Table 13: Youth work in Greece**

|        | Data base  | Institutions   | Activities | Funds   | Youth workers | Volunteers   | Participants  |
|--------|--|--|------------|---|---------------|--|---|
| Greece | European Knowledge Centre for Youth Policy database<br>Report from youth information centres collected by the General Secretariat for Youth<br>Study 'Youth in Greece Today' (2005), conducted by the Institute of Applied Communications, University of Athens, for the General Secretariat for Youth | No data<br>Approximately 270 NGOs active in youth work<br>50 youth information centres | No data    | Estimated budget of the General Secretariat for Youth in 2006: € 16 000000<br>National investment for the operation of the youth programme: approximately €1,462,961<br>€1,066,100 invested in youth information in 2005 from national and regional budgets | No data       | 40% of young people participate in organisations.<br>2.5% of them are volunteers in sports clubs, 2.3% in cultural groups. 1% answered that they do volunteerism in youth clubs. | An estimated 100,000 young people used the youth information centres in 2005. |

**Table 14: Youth work in Italy**

|       | Database   | Institutions   | Activities | Funds   | Youth workers | Volunteers  | Participants  |
|-------|--|--|------------|---|---------------|---|---|
| Italy | Report from the Italian Institute of Statistical Research (Data from 2006) | Data does not cover all institutions providing youth work<br>800 youth information centres<br>2400 youth consultancy centres in local health centres | No data    | The National Financial Law allots to Youth-related Activities a budget of €1,031,420,000:<br>0.01% for youth information<br>2.9% for youth work in universities<br>77.6% for international youth work<br>0.5% for youth work in sports<br>0.1% for rights education<br>2.9% for youth education institutions<br>0.4% for youth associations<br>1% for youth entrepreneurship in agriculture<br>10% for youth apprenticeships<br>5% for youth migration services | No data       | 22% of all volunteers engaged in all types of voluntary organisations are under 30 years old.<br>45,175 young people participated in a voluntary social service in 2005. 76% were female, 24% male. | 39.1% of young people aged between 14 and 24 years practise sports regularly. |



In **Germany**, data is available on the total public spending on youth work and on the federal budget for implementation of the Child and Youth Plan. In 2003, public spending amounted to € 1,387,141,000. The federal budget comprises € 111,114,000 €. 70% of this amount is spent to finance institutions, and 30% used to finance targeted measures. 75% of the public budget for youth work is procured by the municipalities, 16% by the state authorities and 8% by the federal ministry. About 13,300 youth work institutions were publicly funded in 2004. 37% of these institutions were public, 63% non-public. Most of them - 82% - were youth centres or youth clubs. 44% of the activities provided by these institutions involved child and youth recreation, 35% extracurricular youth edu-

cation, 18% voluntary social services and 4% international youth work. Youth associations play an important role in the provision of extracurricular youth education. 50% of all activities are carried out by youth initiatives, youth groups and youth associations. There were 53,213 registered youth workers in 2002: the majority of them (53%) were employed in youth centres or clubs. 58% of youth workers are female and 42% male. 67% of youth workers are employed in non-public institutions. There is an average of 3 youth workers per institution. The rate of professionalism is high, with only 11% of the staff having no formal qualification. There is no data at national level on the number of volunteers involved in youth work. A study done for the state of

**Table 15: Youth work in Germany**

|         | Data base  | Institutions  | Activities  | Funds  | Youth workers   | Volunteers   | Participants   |
|---------|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Germany | Representative report for publicly funded youth work. Data from 2002, 2004 and for sports from 2006<br>Study of the University of Dortmund in 2004 | 17,372 institutions providing youth work. Among them:<br>82% youth centres/clubs<br>6% youth cultural education centres<br>10% recreational or vacation services<br>5% youth social work institutions<br>37% are public, 63% non-public institutions<br>86,000 youth sports units | 45,937 child and youth recreational activities (44%)<br>36,955 activities involving extracurricular youth education (35%)<br>3,677 activities involving international youth work (4%)<br>18,280 activities involving voluntary social services (18%)<br>82% of the activities realised are put into practice by non-public associations.<br>50% of the extracurricular youth education activities on offer are realised by youth initiatives, youth groups and youth associations.<br>The ratio of youth institutions per 100,000 children aged 6 to 18 is 164. | The total amount of public spending on youth work in 2003 was € 1,387,141,000.<br>€ 1,221,311,000 was spent in 2006 on youth sports activities.<br>70% of the public budget was spent on financing institutions, 30% to finance targeted measures.<br>75% of the public budget for youth work is procured by the municipalities, 16% by the federal states and 8% by the federal ministry.<br>7% of the total public budget for child and youth assistance was spent on youth work, 27% on child-care services and 54% on financing the day care centres.<br>The public budget spent on youth work is equivalent to € 150 per single young person aged from 12 to 21 years.<br>The budget for the formal education system (schools) is € 47,627,000,000. | 53,213 registered youth workers:<br>53% employed in youth centres or clubs<br>16% in recreational or vacation services<br>15% in youth education and meeting centres<br>12% in youth social work institutions<br>2% in youth counselling institutions<br>58% of youth workers are female, 42% male. The highest percentage of female youth workers can be found in youth counselling institutions (67%).<br>67% of youth workers are employed in non-public institutions<br>34% of youth workers on average have a university degree, 17% a professional school diploma, 1% other forms of qualification and 11% no formal qualification. The highest rate of employees with a university degree – 65% is in youth counselling services. Most non-qualified employees – 25% work in the recreational and vacation services area.<br>49% of youth workers work full-time, 34% part-time, and for 17% the work is a spare-time job. | No representative data available about the volunteers<br>In NRW it is reported that youth clubs employed 3770 youth workers and 25,500 volunteers. | Around 3.5 million children and young people participate in youth work, 4.3 million in youth sports.<br>59% are male, 41% female. The highest rate of female participants is in the youth counselling services. Most male participants 63% are involved in sports activities.<br>88% of youth work participants can be found in non-public associations.<br>Ratios of participants per 10,000 children and young people (0 to 27 years):<br>826 for youth recreation services<br>587 for extracurricular youth education services<br>53 for international youth work and<br>4,913 for youth sports<br>267,207 young people participated in special activities for orientation and vocational training. |

North-Rhine-Westphalia reports a ratio of 1:6 for employed staff and volunteers. Around 3.5 million young people participate in youth work. 88% of them attend activities provided by non-public institutions. 59% of the participants are male, 41% female. Sports play an important part in youth work in Germany.

There are 86,000 youth sports units nation-wide. 4.3 million young people are involved in youth sports activities. In 2006 investment in youth sports amounted to € 1,221,311,000.

In **Ireland**, where the involvement of the state in youth policy is still developing, a budget of € 37,000,00 € was allocated to implement the Youth Work Act and the National Youth Work Development Plan in the years 2003 to 2007. This represents an annual budget of about € 7,400,000. Together the two greatest youth work associations, Youth Work Ireland and Foróige, operate 920 youth clubs, 40 youth information centres and various projects. There are also 85 centres for the provision of training, workplace skills and employment counselling. The National Youth Council of Ireland has registered 50 youth organisations. These organisations employ 1,000 youth workers as full-time staff. Furthermore, there are 40,000 volunteers involved as main educators, so that the ratio of volunteers to staff is 50:1. 32% of young people between the ages of 12-18 participate in one or more community or charity group, including youth clubs, choir/folk groups, voluntary

work, and scouts/guides. The participation rate in rural areas is higher than in urban areas.

In the **Netherlands**, there is no available data about youth work at national level, as responsibility for youth work is in the hands of the municipalities. Thus only data regarding additional programmes is documented. The national Dutch Youth Group has 6,487 sections of youth associations. Important facilities for youth work for the municipalities are above all youth centres, meeting places for young people, youth information points and cultural meeting places. In the various provinces of the Netherlands there were 1,705 registered youth workers in 2003. There is no data on the number of volunteers engaged in youth work. The available data results from a survey on volunteerism in general. Neither is there any data on the participants in youth work. Municipal authorities see the main target group of youth work - 54% - as being young people from 12 to 16 years of age.

**Table 16: Youth work in Ireland**

|         | Data base                                | Institutions  | Activi- | Funds  | Youth work-   | Volunteers  | Participants   |
|---------|--|---|---------|--|---|---|--|
| Ireland | National Children's Office Survey (2005) | 85 centres for the provision of training, workplace skills and employment counselling<br>Youth work Ireland operates 500 youth clubs, 40 youth information centres and 100 projects.<br>There are 21 local youth services.<br>Foróige operates 420 youth clubs.<br>51 youth organisations are registered with the National Youth Council of Ireland (NYCI). | No data | €37,000,000 was budgeted for 2003 to 2007 to implement the Youth Work Act and the National Youth Work Development Plan.<br><br>Till now only €12,000,000 has been allocated. | In the 50 youth associations there were 1,000 full-time paid staff. | In the 50 youth organisations there were 40,000 adult youth leaders involved as the main educators.<br><br>In community-based youth organisations the ratio of volunteers to staff is 50:1. | 32% of young people between the ages of 12-18 participate in one or more community or charity group, including youth clubs, choir/folk groups, voluntary work, and scouts/guides.<br>59% of young people favour youth clubs/groups (68% male / 53% female),<br>26% choir/folk groups (38% female / 9% male),<br>11% voluntary work (12% female / 9% male), and<br>10% scouts/guides (11% male / 10% female).<br>Participation levels fall as adolescence progresses, from 36% of 12-year-old females, to 27% of 17-year-olds and 23% of 18-year-olds.<br>While 88% of males participate in youth clubs and groups at the age of 12, only 57% do so at the age of 18 years.<br>56% of 12-year-old females participate in a choir/folk group, while 33% do so at the age of 18 years.<br>The participation rate in groups in rural areas is 29%, in urban areas the rate is 21%. |

**Table 17: Youth work in Netherlands**

|             | Data base   | Institutions  | Activities   | Funds   | Youth work-  | Volunteers   | Participants  |
|-------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Netherlands | Survey of Dutch Municipalities (2003)<br>Study on institutions of creative education (2003)<br>Survey of the Dutch Youth Group (2002) | No representative data on any of the institutions<br>6,487 sections of youth associations in 2002 as members of the national Dutch Youth Group<br>Important facilities of youth work are for the municipalities:<br>youth centres (85%), meeting places for young people (71%), information points for young people (42%), cultural meeting places (19%), pop centres (12%), others (12%) | No representative data on any youth work activities<br>Important forms of youth work are for the municipalities:<br>youth work in connection with accommodation (76%), ambulant youth work or youth work involving a meeting point (72%), youth participation (58%), Network 12+ (45%), neighbourhood-oriented youth work (24%), other type of youth work (4%) | No data on the total public budget spent on youth work. | 1,705 youth workers were registered in the provinces of the Netherlands in 2003. Among them the largest groups were youth workers (55%), socio-cultural workers (11%), and youth workers for teenagers (8%). | 40% of 18-to 24-year-old males and 43% of the females do volunteering.<br>Among the male group 20% are volunteers in sports associations and 10% in youth work. Other associations such as religious or hobby associations reach less than 5% of the target youth.<br>Among the female volunteers, 15% are engaged in sports associations, 12% in youth associations and 8% in religious associations. | 7% of the municipalities target 12- to 18-year-olds, 54% 12- to 16-year-olds, 15% 16- to 18-year-olds, 23% other age groups |

In **Norway**, the main responsibility for funding and providing public youth work lies with the municipalities, and thus public spending at national level refers to the amount allocated to youth and sports associations. 116 national youth associations have received the amount of € 26 million. € 22 million has been allocated to 49 sports associations. There are 450 registered youth clubs in Norway and 19 youth information centres. Besides these two action fields, areas where public organisations provide youth work are cultural activities, child welfare, social services, outreach services and career guidance. Youth sports play an important role too, as 50% of the activities provided by voluntary organisations

refer to these activities. There is no data on the number of employees in youth work. The information available shows that in 70% of the youth clubs the sum of part-time and full-time employees adds up to two or less full time positions. Among youth club leaders the proportion of youth workers with a university degree is at 81%. Data on volunteers in youth work is not available. There are 700,000 volunteers acting in sports organisations. 61% of all young people aged from 13-19 years participate in at least one voluntary organisation. The rate for males - 64% - is higher than the rate for females (58%). About 14% of young people participate in cultural and recreational youth work, 9% in youth clubs.

**Table 18: Youth work in Norway**

|        | Data base  | Institutions   | Activities   | Funds  | Youth workers  | Volunteers  | Participants   |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Norway | Survey Young in Norway (2002) (N=11,298)<br>Norwegian Association of Youth Clubs survey (2003)<br>Frifond<br>The Distribution Committee<br>Statistics Norway | 450 youth clubs<br>442 child welfare services<br>19 youth information centres<br>116 national child and youth organisations with 13,000 local branches and 2,750 independent organisations<br>49 sports organisations receiving funds for child and youth work with 16801 local branches | No representative data on any of the youth work activities<br>31,900 traceable activities of youth work in 2005. Among them 15% activities of cultural youth work<br>34% youth associations and groups<br>50% youth sports | € 22,000,000 in 2007 on youth sports<br>€ 26,000,000 in 2006 on child and youth organisations<br>Total public spending on child welfare services € 540,000,000<br>Child and youth organisations (including sports) receive approx 0.05% of the state budget. | Little data available, especially for youth workers in public organisations.<br>In 70% of the youth clubs the sum of part-time and full-time employees adds up to two or less full-time positions. | 700,000 volunteers in sports organisations. Their contribution adds up to approx 24,000 full-time jobs. | 61% of all 13- to 19- year-olds participate in at least one voluntary organisation (64% of males, 58% of females).<br>14% participate in cultural youth work (17% of females, 11% of males).<br>14% participate in recreational youth work (22% of males, 10% of females).<br>9% participate in youth clubs.<br>7% participate in political, humanitarian and environment protection organisations (8% of males and females).<br>50% of 13-year-olds participate in sports (55% male, 45% female).<br>The number declines as children get older: for 19-year-olds it is 26% (32% of males and 21% of females). |

**Table 19: Youth work in Romania**

|         | Data base  | Institutions  | Activities  | Funds  | Youth workers   | Volunteers   | Participants   |
|---------|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Romania | Online data-base of non-governmental associations from the National Agency for Supporting Young People Initiatives (2007)<br>Background paper from the National Agency for Supporting Young People Initiatives (2002)<br>Study on Youth from the NASYPI (2005)<br>The Budget of the Prime-Ministers Office in 2006 | 455 non-governmental youth organisations active in the field of youth work<br>43 county youth departments providing 65 camps and 26 youth hostels nation wide | No representative data on any youth work activities<br>723 project supporting youth clubs and youth actions in 2006<br>5% (35) of those projects were provided nationwide.<br>66% were carried out by youth associations.<br>95% (688) of the projects were carried out at local level.<br>68% were carried out by non-governmental associations.<br>In 2005, 55 projects were implemented through the 'Youth in Action' programme.<br>225 youth activities were funded between January and April 2007. Among them:<br>4% camps; 20% information/campaigns; 22% courses/trainings; 8% round tables/meetings; 23% art activities; 5% seminars; 4% tourism/ecology; 10% contest/sports; 1% volunteering | In 2006, the budget allocated to youth work at national level was € 1,946,000<br>The budget for the 'Youth in Action' programmes totalled € 2,960,296 in 2007. | 160 youth workers<br>36% of them were employed in the public sector, 59% in the non-governmental sector, and 11% in student organisations.<br>All employees of the public sector were full-time employees. 30% of the youth workers in associations were full-time employees.<br>60% were female, 40% male youth workers. | 70% of the youth workers in associations are volunteers. | 9% of young people aged between 14-29 are members of a social, economic or political association.<br>35% are members of sports clubs,<br>29% are members of political youth organisations,<br>27% are members of students or pupils groups<br>17% are members of cultural organisations<br>23610 young people participated in activities in 31 youth centres in 2006.<br>This is an average of 760 young people per club.<br>In 2006, 14,000 young people benefited from the 200 projects funded by the National Authority for Youth.<br>130,000 young people participated in camps in 2006. |

In **Romania**, there are 455 youth associations operating and 43 county youth departments. The departments are responsible for the implementation of the National Authority for Youth policy. They distribute the financial resources at local level. They also operate 65 summer camps and 26 youth hostels. In 2007, € 2,630,500 was allocated to finance youth clubs and individual programmes. Approximately 40% of the budget was used to fund youth clubs. 97,823 participants were involved in the projects financed with this budget. There is no analytical data on the type of youth work provided with the whole budget but in 2007 we can trace that emphasis is given to cultural youth education, courses and training and to youth information. According to a study

done in 2002, there were 160 youth workers operating in Romania. 96 of them were paid youth workers, and there were 64 volunteers, so that the ratio between paid youth workers and volunteers is 1.5:1. 36% of them were employed in the public sector, 59% in the non-governmental sector, and 11% in student organisations. 70% of the staff of youth associations are volunteers. According to a study done in 2005, 9% of Romanian young people are members of associations, particularly in sports, political and professional (student) organisations.

In **Spain**, the Interdepartmental Youth Plan (2005-2008) allocates € 2,341,000 to different actions related to youth work (52% to training and 39% to employ-

**Table 20: Youth work in Spain**

|       | Data base  | Institutions  | Activities   | Funds  | Youth workers  | Volunteers  | Participants  |
|-------|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| Spain | Association Census of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy<br>Spanish Youth Council Associations Census<br>Data from the National Employment Institute<br>Injuve Report on Youth Information Services 2006 | 146 subsidised youth associations in 2006<br>45 Promotion and Development Units for job insertion and 159 learning centres in 2005<br>3000 youth information services | No data on any of the youth work activities<br>INEM governmental programme for job insertion and training:<br>873 training workshops;<br>159 learning centres;<br>1,423 employment workshops | The Interdepartmental Youth Plan (2005-2008) allocates €2,341,000 to different actions related to youth work (52% to training and 39% to employment and housing).<br>In 2006 the 146 youth associations were subsidised with €2,957,570.<br>The INEM programme budget amounts to €494,910.<br>€520 million was allocated to the 'Youth in Action' programme from 2000 to 2006. | 14,060 educational directors and support personnel carry out the job insertion and training workshops of the INEM Programme.<br>50% of the youth education centres have one single worker, 23% have two, 13% have four or more and 8% have three workers.<br>31% of the personnel in the YIS are temporary workers, 21% have full-time contracts, 16% are civil servants usually in urban or surrounding areas.<br>31% of the professionals in the YIS have a 4-year higher education degree, 29% a 3-year higher education degree, 20% secondary school education, 3% elementary school education and 18% have other levels of education. | 1/3 of the YIS collaborate with volunteer workers.<br>4% of YIS staff are volunteers. | In 2005 there were 60,837 young people in the INEM programme. |

ment and housing). In addition to these funds there is also a small budget for employment initiatives involving young people (the INEM programme: € 494,910) and a budget of € 2,957,570 to subsidise 146 youth associations in 2006. The highest amount was thus clearly allocated to activities within the Youth in Action programme, which received € 520million between 2000 and 2006. There is little data available on youth work institutions. 3,000 youth information services are traceable, as well as 45 promotion units for job insertion, and 159 learning centres. Data on youth workers is missing: only for the youth information centres can some information be found. 50% of the centres have a single worker, 23% have two workers. As the evolution of the YIS has been closely related to volunteer activities of associations, it can be argued that about 30% of the centres still have volunteers collaborating. 59% of the staff of the YIS have a higher education degree. In general, there is no data on participants in youth work: for the INEM programme the number of participants is known to be 60,837.

### 9.3 Comparative overview

Because the data is not complete, the results of the present study do not allow for a comprehensive comparison of youth work in the various countries of the study. Any attempt in this direction would lead to distortions.

The following can be said of the data on youth activities:

- the best documented sectors are those of publicly supported youth work and of activities implemented by public providers
- because participation in the investigations was on a voluntary basis, only partial sectors could be documented, even in the case of publicly funded measures (Austria, the Netherlands);
- in southern European countries (Greece, Italy, Spain), only data gathered at European level on youth information and on the implementation of the 'Youth in Action' programme was documented at national level; and the structures and services provided by youth associations are not sufficiently visible (Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Norway). In some countries, however, the share of youth work provided by non-public associations can be documented.

To summarise, the following can be said about the data on the money and time invested in youth activities:

- in nearly all the countries surveyed, only amounts provided by the ministries responsible for youth

affairs or by European institutions were identifiable;

- the budgets contributed by other sources – e.g. employment and social affairs, health or sport – were not available for the present study;
- in none of the countries surveyed, with the exception of Germany, was there any information available at national level on funds invested at state or local level;
- the time and money invested by youth organisations and other non-public associations cannot be documented.

The following can be said regarding data on the number of people employed:

- some countries (Greece, Italy, Norway) have no aggregated data on youth workers at national level;
- the only well documented figure is the number of youth workers employed in public institution and paid with public funds;
- information is available on the qualifications of youth workers and their employment relationships in those cases where basic data is collected on numbers of youth workers;
- the number of youth work volunteers cannot be directly documented in any of the countries of the survey. If information is available at all, it concerns data derived from studies on volunteer work and data on the ratio between paid and unpaid youth workers.
- The following can be said with regard to the young people participating in youth work activities:
  - data on participants in institutional activities is available for only a few of the countries surveyed (Estonia, Germany, Romania);
  - in some countries, data on participants is generated from youth polls and surveys at national level (Austria, Ireland, Norway);
  - there is no data available at national level in Italy, Greece or the Netherlands.

Taking into consideration the diversity of national data on youth work and the difficulties that have to be faced when reporting at European level has to be comparative, the indicators shown below are recommended as the starting point for a future reporting structure. They are based on statistics available from EUROSTAT as well as on data from the Eurobarometer 2007 Survey on Youth.

Only a limited amount of quantitative data from the present study can be added to this data. At national level, the available data refers to the national public spending contributed by ministries targeting youth

issues. This data can be related to total public spending, but it must be kept in mind that funds allocated by other ministries are not traceable. In addition, in most countries state and municipal authorities contribute significantly to the financing of youth work. To some extent it is also possible to map the percentage of associations performing youth work and the ratio of paid youth workers to volunteers.

Furthermore, we have found interesting categories such as

- the number of youth associations organised at national level
- the ratio of full-time employed youth workers and young people
- the proportion of participants in youth work per

10,000 or 100,000 children and young people;

- the average number of youth workers per institution
- and finally the amount spent on each participating child or young person.

These categories are nevertheless no more than individual examples that cannot be recommended, as the basic information necessary to calculate them is not available in most of the surveyed countries. They may, however, be helpful for a future reporting system.

As this table shows, aggregatable data in individual areas is also incomplete. The table should therefore be seen as nothing more than an initial and incomplete attempt at classification.

Table 21: Dimensions of Youth work<sup>33</sup>

|                 | Number of 13- to 30-year-olds <sup>34</sup> | Percentage of young people in relation to total population <sup>35</sup> | Percentage of non-organised young people <sup>36</sup> | Percentage of young people participating in youth organisations <sup>37</sup> | National annual budget for youth work in € | Additional public (municipal) funds | Percentage of national budget for youth policy in relation to total public spending <sup>38</sup> | Percentage of associations forming youth work | Ratio of youth workers to volunteers        |
|-----------------|---|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Austria         | 1,805,490                                   | 22,5   | 56,5   | 9,0   | 4,080,155 <sup>39</sup>                    | Yes                                 | 0,003   | 72  | 1:3   |
| Estonia         | 354,071                                     | 25,8   | 83,5   | 19,6  | No data                                    | No data                             | No data   | 43  | No data                                     |
| Germany         | 16,552,700                                  | 20,3   | 53,7   | 4,0   | 111,114,000 <sup>40</sup>                  | 1,276,027,000                       | 0,011   | 63  | 1:6 <sup>41</sup>                           |
| Greece          | 2,828,179                                   | 25,9   | 89,2   | 7,0   | 16,529,061 <sup>42</sup>                   | Yes                                 | 0,019   | No data                                       | No data                                     |
| Ireland         | 1,113,759                                   | 28,9   | 71,8   | 6,5   | 7,400,000 <sup>43</sup>                    | No data                             | 0,012   | No data                                       | 1:50 youth organisations<br>1:6 projects    |
| Italy           | 12,647,395                                  | 22,2   | 86,4   | 5,3   | 130,000,000 <sup>44</sup>                  | Yes                                 | 0,018   | No data                                       | No data                                     |
| The Netherlands | 3,663,679                                   | 22,9   | 57,9   | 4,0   | No data                                    | Yes                                 | No data   | No data                                       | No data                                     |
| Norway          | 1,042,141                                   | 23,1   | 39,0 <sup>45</sup>                                     | 9,0 <sup>46</sup>   | 48,000,000 <sup>47</sup>                   | Yes                                 | 0,044   | No data                                       | No data                                     |
| Romania         | 6,089,468                                   | 28,1   | 92,5   | 25,8  | 2,630,500 <sup>48</sup>                    | Yes                                 | 0,008   | 65  | 1,5:1 public youth work<br>3:1 associations |
| Spain           | 10,675,605                                  | 26,3   | 88,0   | 8,3   | 4,003,989 <sup>49</sup>                    | Yes                                 | 0,001   | No data                                       | No data                                     |

<sup>33</sup> This list contains available data and is not complete enough to draw a representative national overview

<sup>34</sup> Eurostat data

<sup>35</sup> Eurostat data calculated

<sup>36</sup> Flash Eurobarometer Nr. 202 – youth survey, June 2007, p. 91

<sup>37</sup> Flash Eurobarometer Nr. 202 – youth survey, June 2007, p. 93

<sup>38</sup> calculation on the basis of Eurostat data for the respective annual budget

<sup>39</sup> federal funds for youth associations and projects and special requests in 2005

<sup>40</sup> budget in 2003 12. Kinder- und Jugendbericht des Bundes, 2005 p. 240

<sup>41</sup> data from the federal State of North-Rhine-Westphalia, Ministerium für Generationen, Familie, Frauen und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, Entwicklungen der Offenen Kinder- und Jugendarbeit, 2006, p. 34

<sup>42</sup> This budget concerns only: the annual budget of the General Secretariat for Youth (2006), the national investment for the operation of the Youth Programme (2005) and the budget invested in the field of youth information (2005). It is certain that the actual figure of the national annual budget for Youth Work should be higher, if investments by other Ministries on youth issues – such as youth employment, youth entrepreneurship, youth social care, etc. – are considered (e.g. Ministry of Employment and Social Protection, Ministry of Development, Ministry of Health and Social Solidarity, etc.)

<sup>43</sup> annual rate calculated from the budget of the Youth Development Plan 2003-2007

<sup>44</sup> budget of the 'Fund for Youth Policies' (Law nr. 248) administrated by the Ministry for Youth Policies and Sports in 2007

<sup>45</sup> data from the Study 'Young in Norway' (Krange & Strandbu 2004)

<sup>46</sup> data from the study 'Young in Norway' (Odegard 2007)

<sup>47</sup> funds for the Confederation of sports for child and youth sports and for all non-sports child and youth organisations in 2006

<sup>48</sup> budget allocated in 2007 for the activities of the NAY

<sup>49</sup> calculated from the sums of the Interdepartmental Youth Plan (2005-2008), the INEM Programme and the subsidisation of youth associations



# 10 - Results from the Local Statistical Surveys

As youth work is provided at local level the concept of the study envisaged a survey of youth work structures in four municipalities in every country. Thus the locally collected data enable the data available at national level to be balanced.

## 10.1 Austria

### Database:

The survey in Austria was conducted in four districts:

- Dornbirn, Vorarlberg; mid-sized city; in the western Austria;
- Kirchdorf an der Krems, Upper Austria; a rural area of central Austria with small municipalities; in Central Austria;
- Rudolfsheim-Fünfhaus, 15<sup>th</sup> district of Vienna; characterised by a high number of immigrants; east
- Donaustadt, 22<sup>nd</sup> district of Vienna; the largest district in terms of population and area; east

In these districts 169 questionnaires were sent to all youth organisations. The rate of return at 37% was quite low. Some youth organisations apparently had to talk to their management to get permission to fill in the questionnaire, so that some reluctance to give out data could be detected. Another possible reason for not returning the questionnaires could be the organisation of rural youth work. Structures are often quite loose, with voluntary youth workers whose focus is – apart from the few hours a week in the youth association or group – on their main working life.

### Findings:

The picture of youth work that can be drawn at local level is that youth work is mostly provided by youth associations (53%), followed by open youth work (38%) youth activities accessible without association

membership, and youth initiatives (9%), which are activities provided by youngsters to youngsters without the involvement of adults or organisations. The percentage of public organisations amongst them is 18%.

The main action field of youth work at local level is the provision of group-oriented leisure time activities. Nevertheless the range of activities is wide as illustrated by the table 22.

Mobile youth work has a special importance in the districts of Vienna.

Most of the organisations state that their budget mainly derives from public spending (43%), membership fees (26%) and miscellaneous sources (21%). The occupational background of youth workers is quite diverse. The survey indicates that most of the youth workers come from the fields of teaching (32%) and pedagogy (28%). Many youth workers have also completed youth leader seminars (33%). Most of them have had no specific training (44%). In open youth work there seems to be a tendency to employ more professional youth workers, often from a social work background. The majority of youth associations (52%) employ up to three youth workers, and half of the associations have up to six volunteers. The participating youth organisations reported 111 female and 75 male professionals.

The survey indicates that voluntary youth workers can be found in all youth work categories, but there are certain fields of youth work – sports in particular – where there are more voluntary youth workers than in others. The percentage of voluntary youth workers appears to be lower in mobile youth work and in the area of youth employment. There are more male than female youth workers: the youth organisations reported 620 male volunteer youth workers and 472 females. Most of the participating youth organisations (72%) offer training and further education for their voluntary youth workers.

Regarding the participants in youth work – the young people themselves – the following trends could be detected. Most of the participating youth organisations offer youth work to 13- to 19-year-olds. The 13- to 14-year-olds make up the largest group, with up to 2,000 participants a month. However, 50% of the organisations have “only” up to 21 participants in this age group. The average is 15 participants per month. 15- to 19-year-olds account for 1150 participants a month, and about 59% of organisations have up to 20 participants in this age group. For the 20- to

**Table 22: Activities of youth work in Austria**

| Activities                                     | %    |
|--|------|
| youth recreation (group-orientated activities) | 100% |
| sports   | 93%  |
| youth information                              | 81%  |
| cultural youth work                            | 78%  |
| extracurricular youth work                     | 72%  |
| youth counselling                              | 71%  |
| advised or adventure playgrounds               | 54%  |
| international youth work                       | 50%  |
| youth social services                          | 39%  |
| youth education (within the formal system)     | 32%  |
| youth employment                               | 30%  |
| mobile youth work                              | 30%  |

24-year-olds, 51.7% of the youth organisations have up to ten participants. There are up to 873 young people of that age group participating in some organisations. The lowest number of participants can be found in the age group of 25- to 30-year-olds. Here there are only up to 200 participants, with 60% of the organisations claiming to have up to ten participants a month in that age group.

**Comments:**

**1. Differences between national and local level**

The survey, conducted in four communities showed once again that there is reluctance to give out data or to contribute to research concerning youth work in Austria. Much like at national level, it was not possible to obtain representative data on the topic at local level either. The categories used in the local questionnaire are applicable to the Austrian situation. Although they are commonly used in youth work and youth policy, they are not clearly defined and have different meanings for those involved in youth work. As at national level, the categories used at local level to identify providers and activities were not selective enough.

**2. Differences at local level**

Regional differences and differences between youth work activities make it rather difficult to paint a precise picture of the situation of youth work in Austria. Youth work in Vienna especially open youth work cannot really be compared to what goes on in the other states of Austria. The differences between Vienna and the rest of the country or between urban and rural areas in general seem to be supported by the local survey, although the findings have to be treated with caution because they are not representative. The most striking differences appear to be in the organisation of youth work. There are more youth associations in the rural areas with more volunteers that have no specific training.

Generally speaking, there is an obvious lack of networking and exchange in youth work. While searching for all the youth organisations in the respective communities, it was difficult to get a complete list. Even if some kind of youth information is available, informants were often unable to clarify how much, and what kind of youth work is provided in their communities.

**10.2 Estonia**

**Database:**

In Estonia the municipalities selected were:

- Kuusalu, a municipality of some 6,900 inhabitants located in Harju county in northern Estonia;
- Narva, a town in eastern Estonia with approximately 68,000 inhabitants (80% of the population are Russians and only 4% are Estonians);
- Pärnu, a town in the western Estonia with approximately 44,000 inhabitants; and
- Tartu, Estonia’s second largest city, situated in the south of the country and with approximately 100,000 inhabitants.

The data was not easily accessible; although, it was possible to retrieve some data on youth work, there are still many blanks. It was quite impossible to get data from the municipalities because officials in most municipalities claimed that they did not have time to collect it. In one case, the person responsible for collecting data in the municipality said that she did not have time to collect and process data because she had several jobs and was also active as a youth worker herself. Nevertheless, some relevant information on local youth work from the Estonian Youth Work Centre was made available, but this data is of the same low quality as the data obtained for the national level.

**Findings:**

In some municipalities it is possible to track the total number of youth work providers, for instance in Tartu. In the cases of Narva and Pärnu, the total number of youth work providers is not completely reliable because the data does not include the providers of open youth work. The only data available in these municipalities was on the hobby school or the hobby centres. Similarly, there is no reliable information about non-public youth work providers in Narva, but it seems very unlikely that there are no non-public providers at all. Surprisingly, there is no data about public organisations in Kuusalu.

**Table 23: Youth work providers and associations in Estonian municipalities**

| Youth work providers | Public  | %   | Non-public | %  |
|----------------------|---------|-----|------------|----|
| Kuusalu              | No data | -   | 6          | -  |
| Narva                | 8       | 100 | 0          | 0  |
| Pärnu                | 6       | 25  | 18         | 75 |
| Tartu                | 5       | 15  | 15         | 85 |

Some data is available on types of activities, but it is rather questionable. Some of the providers offer such a wide range of different youth work activities that it is hard to decide which of these activities should be considered as the most important of the activities offered by this provider.

**Table 24: Youth work activities in Estonian municipalities**

| Youth work activity           | Kuusalu |     | Narva |     | Pärnu |     | Tartu |     |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|
| Cultural youth Work           | 1       | 12% | 6     | 13% | 9     | 18% | 9     | 14% |
| Extracurricular youth work    | 1       | 12% | 17    | 40% | 17    | 33% | 12    | 19% |
| Children and youth recreation | 3       | 38% | 1     | 2%  | 2     | 4%  | 9     | 14% |
| Open youth Work               | 3       | 38% | 0     | 0%  | 0     | 0%  | 11    | 17% |
| Street work                   | 0       | 0%  | 0     | 0%  | 0     | 0%  | 1     | 2%  |
| Sports                        | No data | -   | 2     | 5%  | 8     | 16% | 2     | 3%  |
| Youth counselling             | No data | -   | 0     | 0%  | 0     | 0%  | 2     | 3%  |
| Youth education               | No data | -   | 17    | 40% | 15    | 29% | 13    | 21% |
| Youth employment              | 0       | 0%  | 0     | 0%  | 0     | 0%  | 1     | 2%  |
| Youth information             | No data | -   | 0     | 0%  | 0     | 0%  | 3     | 5%  |

**Table 25: Youth workers in Estonian municipalities**

|                 | Kuusalu | Narva   | Pärnu   | Tartu   |
|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Total employees | 8       | 218     | 291     | 201     |
| Full-time       | 3       | No data | No data | No data |
| Part-time       | 2       | No data | No data | No data |

**Table 26: Participants in youth work in Estonian municipalities**

|       | Kuusalu | Narva |      | Pärnu   | Tartu   |
|-------|---------|-------|------|---------|---------|
| Total | No data | 2569  | 100% | 5564    | 1739    |
| Girls | No data | 1674  | 65%  | No data | No data |
| Boys  | No data | 895   | 35%  | No data | No data |

There are also some problems regarding the availability of data on youth work activities. In some cases officials admit that they have no data on some youth work activities, and in other cases it is obvious that the zeros in the table 23 refer more likely to the fact that there is no data available on some youth work activity and not so much to the possibility that these youth work activities are not offered in the municipality.

The data on funds available for youth work and the relation between the sources of finance is unfortunately not available to us. A study is currently being conducted on the budgets of youth work providers in the youth service of the Tartu city council, so that there should soon be quite detailed information available at least for Tartu.

The data available on youth workers is rather superficial. It is possible to obtain the total number of youth workers in the four municipalities selected. It must be noted, however, that in the three larger municipali-

ties (Narva, Pärnu, Tartu), only the number of youth workers and teachers in the hobby schools and hobby centres are reported, so that the actual total number of youth workers is probably a little higher.

More detailed data is available only for the municipality of Kuusalu, where we obtained the number of youth workers working full-time and part-time (see table 25), the ratio of youth workers working in public and non-public organisations (5:3), the ratio of male and female youth workers (3:5) and the number of youth

workers with higher education (4) or with professional school education (1).

The information available on the participants in the four selected municipalities is rather scarce. For the three larger municipalities (Narva, Pärnu, Tartu) we know the total number of participants, while in Kuusalu there is no information at all about participants. At the same time it is important to consider that the 'total' number of participants in Narva, Pärnu and Tartu actually means the total number of participants in hobby schools and hobby centres. In all these municipalities, the number of young people participating in some other kind of activities (open youth work, youth counselling, youth recreation, etc.) is not available and therefore not included in the so-called total number of participants.

### Comments:

#### Differences between national and local level:

As at national level, it was not possible to track all youth work providers at local level. We therefore have no basis for commenting on the additional data.

### 10.3 Germany

In Germany the municipalities selected and surveyed were:

- Lübeck, a city situated in the north of Germany, with 70,000 inhabitants;
- Jork, a municipality located in the administrative district of Stade, with 12,000 inhabitants;
- Lingen, a municipality with nearly 56,000 inhabitants in the north-west of Germany and a centre for the petrochemical industry in Germany; and
- Ilm-Kreis, a rural district with 112,000 inhabitants.

Although all municipalities have to participate in the annual national youth services statistics, it was strik-

**Table 27: Youth work providers and associations in German municipalities**

|            |                      | Public  | %    | Non-public | %    |
|------------|----------------------|---------|------|------------|------|
| Lübeck     | Youth work providers | 11      | 46%  | 13         | 54%  |
|            | (Youth) associations |         |      | 159        | 100% |
| Jork       | Youth work providers | 1       | 100% |            |      |
|            | (Youth) associations |         |      | 21         | 100% |
| Ilm Kreis  | Youth work providers | 10      | 43%  | 13         | 57%  |
|            | (Youth) associations | No data |      |            |      |
| Lingen-Ems | Youth work providers | 5       | 71%  | 2          | 29%  |
|            | (Youth) associations | No data |      |            |      |

ing that data was not accessible easily. The national statistics are collected by means of questionnaires in paper format. These questionnaires are delivered to the statistical offices of the state governments and digitalised. Attempts to get the results from the statistical offices failed. The data therefore had to be counted in the youth offices or obtained from the social planning activities. Because of the collection of local planning statistics and the contribution to the national youth services statistics, the municipalities were not well disposed to the idea of gathering new data. Thus it was not possible to use the age groups agreed for the survey.

### Findings:

The local survey in four municipalities showed on the one hand that there are typical structures in the sector of youth work at local level in Germany, but on the other hand it becomes apparent that there are also differences in the structures and the contents of youth work. One interesting finding is that the small group of youth work providers offers a wide scope of different activities.

Looking at the organisational types of youth work providers, we note that whenever a number of providers are active in one local area, more of them tend to be non-public than public – though the ratio between them remains fairly close (with the exception of Lingen, where public providers dominate) – and that overall there are not very many providers in any one area. The data available on youth organisations in Jork and Lübeck shows that there are many youth associations and that they are exclusively non-public in their organisational format.

The table 28, which lists the main activities of youth work in the four municipalities, shows some major differences between the communities. This is partly a result of differences in the availability of data on youth associations. For Lübeck, where this information was available, 83% of all activities are listed as being offered by youth associations and youth groups, demonstrating the importance of youth associations and youth groups in this community. A similar observation can be made about the Ilm district, where 41% of activities involved sports. In addition to showing the relative importance of open youth work in the different communities, the data also reveals that youth counselling and social work at

**Table 29: Funding of youth work in German municipalities**

|                      | Total funds               | Membership fees | Participation fees | Sponsoring | Municipal funds | Federal funds | National funds | European funds | Own contributions | Other |
|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|-------|
| Lübeck <sup>53</sup> | € 4,204,000 <sup>54</sup> | 22 %            | 16 %               | 29 %       | 17 %            | 5 %           | 1 %            | 1 %            | 9 %               | 2 %   |
| Jork                 | € 110,883                 | No data         |                    |            |                 |               |                |                |                   |       |
| Ilm-Kreis            | € 1,378,729 <sup>55</sup> | No data         |                    |            |                 |               |                |                |                   |       |
| Lingen               | € 742,806 <sup>56</sup>   | No data         |                    |            |                 |               |                |                |                   |       |

**Table 28: Youth work activities in German municipalities<sup>50</sup>**

|           | Cultural youth Work |     | Extracurricular youth education |     | Children and youth recreation |     | Open youth work, youth clubs, etc. |     | Youth associations and youth groups |     | Street work/ Mobile youth work |    | Sports |     | Youth counselling |    | Social work at schools |    |
|-----------|---------------------|-----|---------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|----|--------|-----|-------------------|----|------------------------|----|
| Lübeck    | 37                  | 1%  | 23                              | 1%  | 577                           | 13% | 24                                 | 1%  | 3,578                               | 83% | 3                              | 0% | 15     | 0%  | 29                | 1% | /                      | /  |
| Jork      | 4                   | 19% | 7                               | 33% | 1                             | 5%  | 1                                  | 5%  | 1                                   | 5%  | 0                              | /  | 6      | 29% | 0                 | /  | 1                      | 5% |
| Ilm-Kreis | 797                 | 29% | 325                             | 12% | 68                            | 3%  | 619                                | 23% | 162                                 | 6%  | 0                              | /  | 1,107  | 41% | 202               | 7% | 231                    | 9% |
| Lingen    | 90                  | 14% | 34                              | 5%  | 35                            | 5%  | 291                                | 46% | 90 <sup>51</sup>                    | 14% | 56                             | 9% | 0      | 0%  | 4                 | 1% | 38 <sup>52</sup>       | 6% |

<sup>50</sup> Due to the structure of Youth work, data and information on social services are not provided here.

<sup>51</sup> Including group activities, and projects

<sup>52</sup> Calculation on basis of the Jahresbericht 2006, Offene Kinder- und Jugendarbeit in der Stadt Lingen, p.22

<sup>53</sup> the data refers only to the funds of associations (N=580)

<sup>54</sup> budget for youth work and youth associations for 2007

<sup>55</sup> total costs for 2006

<sup>56</sup> total costs for 2006

**Table 30: Youth workers German municipalities**

|           |                      | Total employees | Female | %   | Fulltime | %    | Part-time | %   | Total | Spare-time       | %   | Volunteers | %    |
|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|--------|-----|----------|------|-----------|-----|-------|------------------|-----|------------|------|
| Lübeck    | Open Youth work      | 43              | 33     | 77% | 26       | 60%  | 17        | 40% | 281   | 76               | 27% | 162        | 58%  |
|           | (Youth) associations | 60              | 31     | 52% | 60       | 100% |           |     | 2,078 | 69               | 3%  | 1,949      | 94%  |
| Jork      | Youth work providers | 12              |        |     | 2        | 17%  | 1         | 8%  |       | 9                | 75% |            |      |
|           | (Youth) associations | 11              |        |     |          |      |           |     |       |                  |     | 11         | 100% |
| Ilm-Kreis | Youth work providers | 31              |        |     | 31       | 100% |           |     | 17    |                  |     | 146        | 82%  |
|           | (Youth) associations | 1               |        |     | 1        |      |           |     |       |                  |     |            |      |
| Lingen    | Youth work providers | 24              |        |     | 18       | 75%  | 6         | 25% | 327   | 82 <sup>59</sup> | 25% | 245        | 75%  |
|           | (Youth) associations | No data         |        |     |          |      |           |     |       |                  |     |            |      |

schools is of limited importance in all municipalities. Extracurricular youth education is important everywhere, but the significant differences between the percentages shown in the table depend on whether data on youth organisations and youth groups was available.

The differences in expenditure for youth work between the individual municipalities are primarily due to their size. If we consider the ratio of youth work expenditure to the overall municipal budget, we see that Lübeck spends 0.75% of its total budget on youth work<sup>57</sup>. In Lingen 0.59% of the overall budget is spent on youth work<sup>58</sup>.

Table 30 shows a low number of employed youth workers compared to large numbers of youth workers working on a spare-time basis and volunteers. Volunteers play a prominent role in youth associations, but they are also important for youth work providers. The data for Lingen shows that people in work placements, trainee social workers and honorary staff play an important role in the creation and organisation of services. The data on participants in youth work activities is difficult to compare, as participants were not reported for all fields, and the reference periods (per week, per month, per year) are different. The figures for Lübeck, projected to reflect annual figures, show particularly clearly the extent to which youth work, particularly the work of youth organisations, actually reaches its tar-

get groups. The figures for Lingen also show the performance level of youth work. The seven youth work providers in Jork, with 23 employees and some 320 volunteers, reach some 47,000 young people.

### Comments:

#### 1. Differences between national and local level

The data clearly shows the broad range of methods, contents and forms of youth work, whereby the overall range is difficult to see because of the limited data on youth work. The importance of sports as a sector of youth work is particularly difficult to show with the available data.

The data does show clear differences with regard to the youth work activities being offered. While 47% of offers are in the area of child and youth recreation, and a further 38% in extracurricular youth educa-

**Table 31: Participants in youth work in German municipalities**

|           |                      | Total   | Girls   | %   | Boys   | %   |
|-----------|----------------------|---|---------|-----|--------|-----|
| Lübeck    | Open Youth work      | 22,699 <sup>60</sup><br>(192,941)               | 10,039  | 44% | 12.660 | 56% |
|           | (Youth) associations | 16,451 <sup>61</sup><br>(789,648) <sup>62</sup> | 7,300   | 44% | 9.151  | 56% |
| Jork      | Youth work providers | No data   |         |     |        |     |
|           | (Youth) associations | No data   |         |     |        |     |
| Ilm-Kreis | Youth work providers | 7,738 <sup>63</sup>                             | No data |     |        |     |
|           | (Youth) associations | 2,231 <sup>64</sup>                             | No data |     |        |     |
| Lingen    | Youth work providers | 46,775 <sup>65</sup>                            | No data |     |        |     |
|           | (Youth) associations | No data   |         |     |        |     |

<sup>57</sup> on the basis of the total budget for 2007 (€ 715,217,000)

<sup>58</sup> on the basis of the total budget for 2007 (€ 125,718,900)

<sup>59</sup> including trainees

<sup>60</sup> participants per month

<sup>61</sup> participants per week

<sup>62</sup> calculated on basis of 48 Weeks

<sup>63</sup> participants per year in 2001: calculation on the basis of the Jugendhilfeplanung des Ilm-Kreises, 2004-2008

<sup>64</sup> participants per year in the field of volunteer youth work, in 2006

<sup>65</sup> participants per year, calculation on basis of 'participants per day' in the year 2006

tion<sup>66</sup>, these fields are not so important in the municipalities studied.

#### 10.4 Greece

##### Database:

In Greece the questionnaire was delivered to 8 municipalities via email and contacts were made with people (employees) at the Youth Information Centres of these municipalities.

Four municipalities eventually took part in the survey:

- Pilea, with some 40,000 residents, is located in the North of Greece and forms part of the Prefecture of Thessaloniki
- Chaidari, with 48,494 residents, is located in the south of Greece and forms part of the Prefecture of Athens;
- Kilkis, with approximately 25,000 inhabitants, is located in the north of Greece and forms part of the Prefecture of Kilkis;
- Dafni, with 25,058 residents, is located in the south of Greece and forms part of the Prefecture of Athens.

These municipalities were chosen according to geographical (north/south) and socio-demographic criteria (age of the population and development level).

##### Findings:

The total number of municipal activities related to youth work services is 323. The repartition between all youth work categories shows that advised recreation/leisure time and cultural youth work are the main types of youth work provided:

The total municipal budget available for youth work is

**Table 32: Youth work activities in Greek municipalities**

| Category of youth work                     | Total number of activities |     |
|--|----------------------------|-----|
| Cultural youth work                        | 54                         | 17% |
| Extracurricular youth education            | 19                         | 6%  |
| Children and youth recreation              | 73                         | 23% |
| Open youth work, youth clubs, etc.         | 7                          | 2%  |
| Youth associations and youth groups        | 24                         | 7%  |
| Street work / Mobile youth work            | 0                          | 0%  |
| Sports                                     | 19                         | 6%  |
| Youth counselling                          | 6                          | 2%  |
| Advised (Adventure) playgrounds            | 76                         | 24% |
| International youth work                   | 26                         | 8%  |
| Youth social services                      | 2                          | 1%  |
| Youth education (within the formal system) | 6                          | 2%  |
| Youth employment / career services         | 5                          | 2%  |
| Youth information                          | 6                          | 2%  |

€ 10,942,800. This amount is equivalent to an average of 7.75% of municipal budgets being spent on youth work. The activities funded with the greatest part of the budget are sports, cultural youth work and extracurricular youth education.

The total number of youth workers at local level is 251. 48% of them are men and 52% women. Categories of youth work where women dominate are youth social services, youth counselling, open youth work and cultural youth work. The majority of male youth workers work in the areas of sports and advised playgrounds.

Volunteering plays an important role in the provision of youth work. The total number of volunteers identi-

**Table 33: Youth workers in Greek municipalities**

| Type of Service                            | Total | Employed People | %    | Number of Volunteers | %   |
|--|-------|-----------------|------|----------------------|-----|
| Cultural youth work                        | 48    | 22              | 46%  | 26                   | 54% |
| Extracurricular youth education            | 70    | 70              | 100% | 0                    | 0%  |
| Children and youth recreation              | 30    | 8               | 27%  | 22                   | 73% |
| Open youth work, youth clubs, etc.         | 51    | 28              | 55%  | 23                   | 45% |
| Youth associations and youth groups        | 67    | 4               | 6%   | 63                   | 94% |
| Street work / Mobile youth work            | 0     | 0               | 0%   | 0                    | 0%  |
| Sports                                     | 37    | 35              | 95%  | 2                    | 5%  |
| Youth counselling                          | 109   | 19              | 17%  | 90                   | 83% |
| Advised (Adventure) playgrounds            | 23    | 23              | 100% | 0                    | 0%  |
| International youth work                   | 3     | 2               | 67%  | 1                    | 33% |
| Youth social services                      | 10    | 10              | 100% | 0                    | 0%  |
| Youth education (within the formal system) | 10    | 10              | 100% | 0                    | 0%  |
| Youth employment / career services         | 5     | 5               | 100% | 0                    | 0%  |
| Youth information                          | 17    | 15              | 88%  | 2                    | 12% |

<sup>66</sup> Source: Statistisches Bundesamt, Statistiken der Kinder und Jugendhilfe, Maßnahmen der Kinder- und Jugendarbeit 2004, Wiesbaden 2005

**Table 34: Qualification of youth workers in Greek municipalities**

|                               | higher education | professional school | no formal education |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Educational / social services | 55%              | 38%                 | 7%                  |
| Remaining youth work services | 53%              | 5%                  | 43%                 |

fied at local level is 229, a figure almost as high as the total number of youth workers (251). The table 33 shows the relationship between employed youth workers and volunteers for the different categories of youth work.

This list shows that the greatest percentage of volunteers, 94%, is to be found in youth associations and youth groups as expected, but also in the categories of youth counselling, youth recreation and cultural youth work.

60% of youth workers at local level are full-time employees, 4% part-time employees, and 36% have a one-off contract with the municipality.

Regarding the qualification of youth workers, differences were noted between youth workers employed in the sector of education and social youth work, and those active in other fields of youth work. While the percentage of youth workers with a higher qualification is nearly equal, the percentage

of youth workers with no formal education is much higher in the field of youth work that is not related to education or social services.

Data on participants in youth work is difficult to obtain at local level too. Not all municipalities were able to state numbers of participants, so that the data gives only a rough overview. Children and youth recreation, cultural youth work and open youth work are the activities that reach the greatest number of children and young people. The ratio between female and male participants is nearly equal: more girls than boys are to be found in the fields of cultural youth work, open

youth work and youth social services, while boys more often attend activities such as sports and extra-curricular youth education.

#### Comments:

#### 1. Differences between national and local level

The central finding of the survey conducted at municipal level is that with the exception of the category 'street work / mobile youth work', municipalities provide all categories of youth work at local level. The absence of data at national level therefore does not reflect the non-existence of youth work but the lack of a national reporting system. At local level there is an efficient system for the provision of youth work. The budget allocated at local level is nearly as high as the budget of the General Secretariat for Youth and reaches about € 11 million. The engagement of volunteers is high, especially in youth associations, but also in youth counselling and child and youth recreation activities. Thus the idea that volunteerism is not particularly strong in Greece has to be put in another perspective for the sector of youth work. Most youth workers are professionals with a higher education. The professionalisation rate in the field of educational or social services is higher than in other areas of youth work.

**Table 35: Participants in youth work in Greek municipalities**

| Type of service                            | People benefiting    | Women               | %  |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|----|
| Cultural youth work                        | 16,670               | 1,260 <sup>67</sup> | 8  |
| Extracurricular youth education            | 4,312                | 1,967               | 46 |
| Children and youth recreation              | 17,050               | No data available   | /  |
| Open youth work, youth clubs, etc.         | 13,603 <sup>68</sup> | 7,542 <sup>69</sup> | 55 |
| Youth associations and youth groups        | 253                  | 106                 | 42 |
| Street work/mobile youth work              | 0                    | 0                   | /  |
| Sports                                     | 6,913                | 1,580 <sup>70</sup> | 23 |
| Youth counselling                          | 739                  | 105 <sup>71</sup>   | 14 |
| Advised (adventure) playgrounds            | No data available    | No data available   | /  |
| International youth work                   | 38                   | 25                  | 66 |
| Youth Social Services                      | 950                  | 550                 | 58 |
| Youth Education (within the formal system) | 50                   | 25                  | 50 |
| Youth Employment/Career Services           | 1,240                | No data available   | /  |
| Youth Information                          | 9,469                | 3,239 <sup>72</sup> | 34 |

<sup>67</sup> Data relates to two out of the four municipalities: Municipality of Pilea and Municipality of Chaidari, and, in particular, to 1,260 out of 16,670 total participants.

<sup>68</sup> Data relates to two out of the four municipalities: Municipality of Pilea and Municipality of Chaidari.

<sup>69</sup> Data relates to two out of the four municipalities: Municipality of Pilea and Municipality of Chaidari.

<sup>70</sup> Data relates to three out of the four municipalities: Municipality of Kilgis, Municipality of Pilea and Municipality of Chaidari, and, in particular, to 4313 out of 6913 total participants.

<sup>71</sup> Data concern only two out of the four municipalities: Municipality of Pilea and Municipality of Chaidari, and, in particular, to 240 out of 739 total participants.

<sup>72</sup> Data concern three out of the four municipalities: Municipality of Pilea, Municipality of Kilgis and Municipality of Chaidari, and, in particular, to 8469 out of 9469 total participants.

## 10.5 Ireland

### Database:

Five municipalities of the East Cork area were selected to report on the socioeconomic scope of youth work at local level in Ireland:

- Midleton
- Youghal
- Cobh
- Glanmire, and
- Carrigtwohill.

East Cork epitomises Ireland's transition in microcosmic form. It is an area undergoing rapid transformation, and had a population growth of 13.7% between 2002 and 2006. East Cork is at an intermediate phase in the process of its incorporation into the metropolitan life of Cork City – reflecting Ireland's sprawling city phenomenon, which is evidenced by the ambiguous borders between town and country. East Cork is 'terrain vague' and for its growing youth population it is often a 'non-place' or a series of 'non-places', in the form of satellite towns that somehow seem decentred from the urban world but no longer part of rural life. It is symptomatic of the loss of the great urban-planning ideals of urban design and rural sustainability. Social disadvantage is a significant issue.

The local structure of youth work could only be studied from a qualitative point of view because of the absence of an institutionalised youth work setting. There is an embryonic youth service in a state of emergence, but it is too early to quantify its achievements. The volunteer base of the structure and the lack of professional input, relatively speaking, limits records. However schematic data is provided in a table 36.

### Findings:

According to a report commissioned by East Cork Area Development (2007), co-authored by Mary McGrath and Deborah Lynch, and which had an overall response rate of 702 young people aged 13-15 years from the five municipalities (Midleton, Youghal, Cobh, Glanmire and Carrigtwohill) and twelve schools, the local situation reflects the national picture of inadequate youth work services. McGrath and Lynch (2007: 21) asked young people in their survey where they went if they went out. Responses showed that 82.2% spend their leisure time "hanging-around" [with friends] when they go out (see Table 36). This pattern was consistent across the five municipalities and closely in line with the analysis included in the previous National Statistical Report of 90% "hanging around outside" [National Children's Office Study, 2005].

Further scrutiny of the above table, which reveals the pattern of young people's activities in East Cork, shows a sharp contrast with the trends revealed in the National Statistical Report. Only 1.3% of young people in East Cork were engaged in hobbies compared with 65.2% nationally. Equally remarkable was the low level of participation in sports (7%) compared with 88% nationally. While only 6% reported that they drank alcohol, the qualitative data in the McGrath and Lynch study (2007: 22-23) indicates that alcohol and to, a lesser extent drugs are endemic in youth culture in East Cork.

McGrath and Lynch (2007: 17) recorded that 79.1% of the young people in their survey answered "no", when asked if they thought there were adequate facilities in their town for young people. Only 5.5% said "yes", that there were adequate facilities. A further

**Table 36: Activities of young people in Irish municipalities**

| Activity   | Carrigtwohill Schools/ Youth group (N=140) | Cobh Schools (N=86) | Glanmire Schools (N=126) | Midleton Schools/ Youth groups (N=273) | Youghal Schools / Youth Groups (N=77) | Total No. Respondents (N=702) |
|--|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Hanging around (with peers)                              | 118 (84,3%)                                | 76 (88,4%)          | 110 (87,3%)              | 210 (76,9%)                            | 63 (81,8%)                            | 577 (82,2%)                   |
| Drinking alcohol   | 8 (5,7%)                                   | 5 (5,8%)            | 2 (1,6%)                 | 15 (5,5%)                              | 12 (16,6%)                            | 42 (6%)                       |
| Hobby (dance, art, music, etc.)                          | 0  | 6 (6,9%)            | 1 (0,8%)                 | 1 (0,4%)                               | 1 (1,3%)                              | 9 (1,3%)                      |
| Sport (pitch and putt, soccer, etc.)                     | 2 (1,4%)                                   | 17 (19,8%)          | 13 (10,3%)               | 9 (3,3%)                               | 8 (10,4%)                             | 49 (7%)                       |
| Pool-snooker   | 0  | 1 (1,2%)            | 1 (0,8%)                 | 0                                      | 0                                     | 2 (0,3%)                      |
| Cinema   | 19 (13,6%)                                 | 1 (1,2%)            | 18 (14,3%)               | 90 (32,9%)                             | 16 (20,7%)                            | 144 (20,5%)                   |
| Night-time activities (disco, bands and open mic nights) | 2 (1,4%)                                   | 4 (4,6%)            | 1 (0,8%)                 | 11 (4%)                                | 0                                     | 18 (2,6%)                     |
| Shopping   | 12 (8,6%)                                  | 0                   | 4 (3,2%)                 | 3 (1,1%)                               | 0                                     | 19 (2,7%)                     |
| Part-time work (babysitting)                             | 0  | 4 (4,6%)            | 0                        | 1 (0,4%)                               | 0                                     | 5 (0,7%)                      |
| Other  | 28 (20%)                                   | 10 (11,6%)          | 9 (7,1%)                 | 37 (13,6%)                             | 13 (16,9%)                            | 97 (13,4%)                    |

Source: McGrath and Lynch (2007: 21)



**Table 37: Adequacy of Facilities for Young People in Irish municipalities**

| School Group/ Name | YES Adequate Facilities | NO Adequate Facilities | Other     | No response | Town Total No. |
|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|
| Carrigtwohill      | 5                       | 80                     | 17        | 38          | 140            |
| Cobh               | 4                       | 73                     | 9         | 0           | 86             |
| Glanmire           | 17                      | 105                    | 4         | 0           | 126            |
| Midleton           | 11                      | 234                    | 24        | 4           | 273            |
| Youghal            | 2                       | 63                     | 10        | 2           | 77             |
| Total              | 39 (5,5%)               | 555 (79,1%)            | 64 (9,1%) | 44 (6,3%)   | 702            |

As a result of changes made to this question by one organisation, the responses could not be included.

Source: McGrath and Lynch (2007: 17)

9.1% gave a qualified response (see Table 37).

There is evidence of youth work services in East Cork. Some of these initiatives have been established only recently. This may partly explain the discrepancy between young people's perception of the complete absence of youth work facilities and the actual reality. There is at least one youth project in each of the five municipalities.

#### **(i) The Youghal Youth Project**

The Youghal Youth Project was established in 2005 under the management of Foróige (Youth Development). Its funding comes from the Dormant (Bank) Accounts programme, which involves the public utilisation of monies in banks that are no longer actively utilised. The project is developmental in orientation and aimed at young people 'at risk', notably school leavers. Associated with this project is the Youghal Youth Committee, which aims to develop services for young people in the town.

#### **(ii) Carrigtwohill Area Youth Project**

The Carrigtwohill Area Youth Project was established in 2005. It is managed by Foróige. The start-up funding was provided by a charity, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. Consequently, the Carrigtwohill Area Youth Project is an entirely voluntary initiative, based on a partnership between two Third Sector organisations. In line with Foróige's development objectives, the aim of the project is to promote young people's personal and social development.

#### **(iii) Cobh Youth Service**

The Cobh Youth Service is a voluntary organisation established in 1992. It is managed by a voluntary board of directors and employs two full-time staff. The rest of the staffing is provided by volunteers, including people on work experience with FÁS (the National Manpower Service) as part of its community employment scheme. The Cobh Youth Service operates a centre called the 'Plateau' which is open 5 days

a week and offers a homework club, swimming, model-making, soccer, pool and issue-based development programmes, as well as 'drop-in' nights where groups "can just come and chill".

#### **(iv) Midleton Youth Project**

The Midleton Youth Project was established in 1997 by the Cloyne Diocesan Youth Service, which is an affiliate organisation of Youth Work Ireland. The project involves approximately 30 young people and includes an under-16s group, the Budding Directors Film Project, a SKIT [Fun] Day and a Street Art Project, which explores the ambiguous boundaries between community art and vandalism.

#### **(v) Midleton Peer Support Group**

The Midleton Peer Support Group, founded in 2004, is a response to the town's reputation as having the highest youth suicide rate in Ireland. The aim of the programme is to harness young local people's energies in combating the scourge of suicide by developing their listening and communication skills, so that they can help their peers deal with crises and life's challenges in a constructive way. Their current aim is to establish a Youth Café in Midleton.

#### **(vi) Glanmire Youth development Project**

The Glanmire Youth Development Project was established in 2000 under the auspices of Ógra Chorcaí (Cork Youth). It employs two full-time staff, supported by a team of volunteers. Funding comes from the local Vocational Education Committee and the Drugs Task Force. The Glanmire Youth Development Project seeks to work with up to 200 'mainstream' young people from the area, with approximately 30 young people receiving intensive personal development support at any one time. Young people have identified a youth café as their priority for the area (McGrath and Lynch, 2007: 26-27).

Manifestly, there is evidence of attempts to establish youth projects in the municipalities of East Cork. The

**Table 38: Youth work activities in Irish municipalities**

|               | Management  | Method                | Professional youth workers   | Volunteers <sup>73</sup>                                    | Funding   | Objective  | Foundation Date |
|---------------|---|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|-----------------|
| Carrigtwohill | Voluntary   | Project               | Manager by Foróige   | Transition year pupils from St. Aloysius Secondary School   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allied Irish Banks</li> <li>• St. Vincent de Paul Charity</li> <li>• East Cork Area Development</li> </ul> | Establish a youth café   | 2005            |
| Cobh          | Voluntary – board of directors  | Youth club            | 2 full-time youth workers  | FÁS and CE workers on employment experience plus volunteers | • Department of the Environment   | Establish a youth café   | 1992            |
| Glanmire      | Voluntary – Glanmire Youth Council  | Project / youth club  | 2 full-time youth workers  | Glanmire Youth Council<br>Glanmire Film Club                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vocational Education Committee</li> <li>• Drugs Task Force</li> </ul>                                      | Establish a youth café<br><br>Film project                         | 2000            |
| Midleton      | Voluntary/statutory partnership   | Project / street work | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managed by Cloyne Diocesan Youth Service – Youth Work Ireland</li> <li>• Health Education provides professional advice and support</li> <li>• East Cork Area Development</li> </ul> | Local volunteers  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Youth Work Ireland</li> <li>• Health Services Executive</li> <li>• East Cork Area Development</li> </ul>   | Establish youth health café<br><br>Film project and street project | 1997            |
| Youghal       | Inter-agency partnership and Cumann Na Daoine – Youghal Community Development Project | Project               | 1 youth worker   | Local volunteers  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dormant Bank Accounts</li> <li>• Rapid Area Implementation Team (AIT)</li> </ul>                           | Establish a youth café   | 2005            |

key national youth organisations, Foróige and Youth Work Ireland, have been involved. Ógra Chorcaí, the main regional youth organisation, is also involved. Many of these initiatives date from the new century. However there are real concerns. There is little evidence of a local youth strategy in each municipality. This is essential. Funding is very weak, with no clear commitment from either central or local government. The youth projects seem to be very much on the periphery.

#### **Comments:**

##### **Differences between national and local level**

The picture that can be drawn from the local level in Ireland is that there are isolated activities provided by youth associations trying to establish a minimal

setting of youth work. At local level only one youth centre exists. Thus the main objective of the youth associations operating at local level is the establishment of meeting places for youngsters. There is little professional support for the given project as only five youth workers were identified as employed staff. Youth work is based above all on voluntary commitment. The lack of professionals is striking, given that the existing local initiatives addressing to disadvantaged youngsters need intensive development support.

In contrast to the data given at national level, it can be stated that there are many more projects than youth centres.

<sup>73</sup> The ratio of volunteers is difficult to assess but the national ratio of professionals to volunteers is 1:50 and for projects it is 1:6

## 10.6 Italy

### Database:

In Italy, the attempt to run local surveys was not feasible due to the non-existence of offices, information desks or responsible institutions that could provide basic information. Each city has several institutions involved in youth work:

#### Institutions involved in youth work:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• voluntary associations;</li><li>• NGOs providing social services;</li><li>• sports groups;</li><li>• church groups;</li><li>• schools;</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• institutions for extracurricular youth education;</li><li>• information desks from private and public institutions;</li><li>• employment centres run by the Department of Labour.</li></ul> |
|--|---|

Nevertheless, information about the youth work provided within these institutions or associations and groups has to be collected in each of the organisations, and even there, there is no adequate reporting structure. The Youth Council of Caltanissetta, for example, was not able to inform researchers about the youth work activities in its area, even though it is a proper and responsible provider of youth work.

The scarce information gathered in Italy comes from the municipalities of Enna and Caltanissetta, which are both located in Sicily. In Enna the Eurodesk and the local employment centre were able to contribute some data on their youth work activities and the number of young people benefiting from employment services.

### Findings:

The numbers of associations in Enna providing youth work in different action fields are the following:

**Table 39: Youth work activities in Italian municipalities**

| Category of youth work                     | Total Number of Association |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Cultural youth work                        | 5                           |
| Extracurricular youth education            | 1                           |
| Children and youth recreation              | 1                           |
| Open youth work, youth clubs, etc.         | 1                           |
| Youth associations and youth groups        | 4                           |
| Street work / Mobile youth work            | 0                           |
| Sports                                     | 11                          |
| Youth counselling                          | 4                           |
| Advised (Adventure) playgrounds            | 1                           |
| International youth work                   | 0                           |
| Youth social services                      | 8                           |
| Youth Education (within the formal system) | 8                           |
| Youth employment / career services         | 5                           |
| Youth information                          | 5                           |

These numbers show that most youth work activities are available at local level. Thus the absence of an adequate reporting structure and a coordinating agency seem to be the main reason for the invisibility of youth work in Italy.

The employment centre reported that 1,207 young people were participating in special employment services, 75% of them male.

From the municipality of Caltanissetta, the information available refers to the number of pupils taking part in extracurricular education activities organised by the high schools. In 2005/2006 196 pupils took part in these activities. 59% chose to get involved in services for children and disabled people, 21% in civil protection activities, 11% in services for children, young people and the elderly, and 10% in youth work. In Caltanissetta there are four associations addressing their activities specifically to young people. It is not possible to trace the activities for young people in the other associations.

The youth information / professional orientation desk 'ECAP' in Caltanissetta provides training courses and information for young people. Data on the number of courses and the staff involved was not available. In 2006, 800 students were counselled at school and 220 visited the institution.

### Comments:

In Italy, it was again not possible to survey youth work structures at local level. Information about providers, youth workers and youth work offered by associations is not available. Useful information was provided only by Eurodesk, but it does highlight the fact that the main categories of youth work are indeed available at local level.

## 10.7 The Netherlands

### Database:

An aim of the Dutch study was to gain an impression of the within-country differences in the sector of youth work. Therefore, the municipalities were chosen according to the expected differences. Previous studies reported differences to occurring between municipalities depending on the number of inhabitants, between cities depending on the share of migrants, and between villages depending on religious affiliation.

As a first step, the criteria of the number of inhabitants and of the religious affiliation were combined in order to identify a heterogeneous set of municipalities. The resulting set of municipalities respectively or

**Table 40: Background information on the Dutch municipalities**

|                                  | Amsterdam - Bos en Lommer         | Den Bosch - Maaspoort             | Zeewolde | Renswoude  |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|------------|
| Religious background             | Neutral                           | Catholic                          | Neutral  | Protestant |
| Number of inhabitants            | ~ 30,500<br>(Amsterdam ~ 743 000) | ~ 18,000<br>(Den Bosch ~ 134 000) | ~ 20,000 | ~ 4,500    |
| Percentage of persons aged 13-30 | Not known<br>(Amsterdam ~ 25%)    | ~ 21%<br>(Den Bosch ~ 23%)        | ~ 21%    | ~ 25%      |
| Percentage of migrants           | ~ 75%                             | ~ 15%                             | ~ 11%    | ~ 4%       |

municipal districts and their characteristics is given in the table 40.

Data within the four selected municipalities or municipal districts was collected from the providers of activities of youth work. These providers were identified by examining the municipalities' homepages for young people. Where such a homepage was not available, the *gemeentegids* (guide to the municipality) was scanned for activities that (i) took place within the municipality and (ii) were targeted at young people. The identified providers of youth work activities were sent a covering letter explaining the research project and a questionnaire based on the common list of indicators of the international research project. As this led to a low response rate (n=1 after two weeks), providers were then called and interviewed via telephone, or, where necessary, face to face. The change in approach led to a response rate of about 75%. It turned out that lack of response was due to a different reason for each type of provider. The for-profits did not see themselves as providers of youth work activities and therefore did not see the questionnaire as being applicable to them. The public and semi-public providers were occupied with the tasks of providing youth work activities and dealing with the changes brought about by the Social Support Act<sup>74</sup>. The non-profits, finally, were often suffering from a fluctuation of active members and an unclear division of tasks, so that they had either not received the questionnaire or were not sure who should deal with it.

## Findings

Surveying the four municipalities showed that there are major differences in the sector of youth work within the Netherlands. In one municipality, the municipality itself was found to strongly support initiatives helping society deal with young people in problematic situations and helping the young people con-

cerned to participate in society. In the second municipality, in contrast, non-profits were remarkably involved, especially in organising sports activities, among others for young people. In the third and a fourth municipality, finally, the sector of youth work is only weakly developed. One of those municipalities relies on its inhabitants' financial capability for using market-based solutions, while the other promotes participation in the activities of neighbouring municipalities.

Apart from these differences, there are also some similarities to be found when comparing the four municipalities. These similarities concern the providers and activities of youth work, the youth workers, and the participants in the activities of youth work.

Concerning the providers of youth work, it is striking that there was always one type of provider dominating the youth work landscape in each municipality. If there was a large number of young people in problematic situations in a particular municipality, the dominant type of provider was public or semi-public, and the activities they were associated with were youth centres, mentoring and educational activities. In other cases, however, non-profit providers and sports activities came to the forefront. In none of the municipalities did for-profits play a major role in the youth work sector, probably because these organisations do not primarily see themselves as youth workers but as service providers.

**Table 41: Youth work providers and associations in Dutch municipalities**

|                     | Total | non-profit | semi-public | public | profit | not known |
|---------------------|-------|------------|-------------|--------|--------|-----------|
| Number of providers | 28    | 20         | 3           | 1      | 3      | 1         |
| %                   | 100%  | 71%        | 11%         | 4%     | 11%    | 4%        |

The aggregated data shows that most of the providers are non-profit organisations.

Another interesting finding concerning providers is that public and semi-public providers tend to combine several youth work activities in one association, whereas non-profit and for-profit providers tend to focus on a small number of different activities. Sports, recreational activities, open youth work / youth clubs and extracurricular youth education are the main actions fields provided at local level.

<sup>74</sup> The Social Support Act (wet maatschappelijke ondersteuning) came into force on 1 January 2007. It brought about changes in the social area and shifted some responsibilities to the local level, i.e. to the municipalities.

**Table 42: Youth work activities in Dutch municipalities**

| Category of youth work             | Total number of activities | %   |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----|
|                                    | 43                         |     |
| Cultural youth work                | 1                          | 2%  |
| Extracurricular youth education    | 4                          | 9%  |
| Children and youth recreation      | 8                          | 19% |
| Open youth work, youth clubs, etc. | 5                          | 12% |
| Street work / mobile youth work    | 3                          | 7%  |
| Sports                             | 20                         | 47% |
| Youth counselling / mentoring      | 1                          | 2%  |
| Shelter                            | 1                          | 2%  |

Furthermore, it should be noted that for-profits are not too eager to talk about their budget, whereas non-profits, who are often working with a mix of income sources and a single budget for the whole association, cannot separate the budget for youth work from their other activities. Public and semi-public providers, in contrast, more often explicitly target young people and receive funding for exactly these activities, so they can more easily identify the amounts budgeted for their youth work.

**Table 43: Budgets of youth work in Dutch municipalities**

|        | whole association | mentoring | youth centre | education | sports | total   |
|--------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------|---------|
| Budget | 3826000           | 120000    | 150000       | 487500    | 600    | 4584100 |

The whole budget identified at local level amounts to € 4.5 million:

Most of the providers finance their youth work activities through a mix of membership and participation fees, sponsoring and municipal funds. The reason for the high number of organisations that depend on membership fees is that many of them are sports associations.

With regard to the youth workers, the most striking aspect is the large number of volunteers compared to the relatively low number of part-time employees and the even smaller number of full-time employees. Vol-

**Table 44: Funding of youth work in Dutch municipalities**

|                   | Membership fees |     | Participation fees |     | ESF <sup>75</sup> |    | Cooperation |    | Sponsoring |     | Municipal funds |     | Others |    | Not known |    |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----|--------------------|-----|-------------------|----|-------------|----|------------|-----|-----------------|-----|--------|----|-----------|----|
| Financial sources | 16              | 30% | 13                 | 25% | 1                 | 2% | 1           | 2% | 9          | 17% | 8               | 15% | 4      | 8% | 1         | 2% |

<sup>75</sup> European Social Fund

**Table 45: Youth workers in Dutch municipalities**

|               | Total | Full-time | %  | Part-time | %  | Volunteers | %   |
|---------------|-------|-----------|----|-----------|----|------------|-----|
| Youth workers | 570   | 15        | 3% | 32        | 6% | 523        | 92% |

unteers can be found primarily in non-profit organisations, but they also play a role for public and semi-public providers. Their tasks are often at the functional level, for example, as trainers or mentors, but sometimes their work includes administrative and organisational aspects.

The full- and part-time employees, in contrast, work primarily for public and semi-public providers, but sometimes also in larger sports associations. Their tasks cover all kinds of activities, but most often include some administrative and organisational elements. The share of qualified youth workers, be it with a higher education degree or a professional school certificate, is highest among public and semi-public providers. The share of trained volunteers, however, is not so much connected to the type of provider but rather to the activity the volunteers are involved in. Generally speaking, demanding activities also call for a training of the volunteers involved. Examples of such demanding activities are exposure to

young people in problematic situations, training for competitive athletes, and work at parties where many people get drunk and become abusive. Yet at the same time it should also be mentioned that not all untrained volunteers lack qualifications in the field of youth work. Several participants in this study reported that the volunteers in their organisation included trainees and students of social work.

The ratio of female to male youth workers is balanced, but there are more female part-time youth workers than male.

Concerning the participants in youth work activities, finally, it should once again be stressed that they are not adequately captured with the definition of 'youth' used in this project. In the literature review, it was reported that the actual target group of Dutch youth

**Table 46: Ratio of female to male youth workers in Dutch municipalities**

|            | Total | Female | %   | Male | %   |
|------------|-------|--------|-----|------|-----|
| Full-time  | 15    | 7      | 47% | 8    | 53% |
| Part-time  | 32    | 20     | 63% | 12   | 38% |
| Volunteers | 523   | 271    | 52% | 252  | 48% |

**Table 47: Participants by age, in youth work in Dutch municipalities** tional level data that identified

|                     | Total | 13-14<br>years | %   | 15-19<br>years | %   | 20-24<br>years | %  | 25-30<br>years | %   | Missing |
|---------------------|-------|----------------|-----|----------------|-----|----------------|----|----------------|-----|---------|
| Cultural youth work | 12    | 6              | 50% | 6              | 50% |                | /  |                | /   | 0       |
| Sports              | 890   | 361            | 41% | 324            | 36% | 58             | 7% | 105            | 12% | 42      |
| Education           | 105   | 15             | 14% | 18             | 17% | 3              | 3% |                | /   | 69      |
| Mentoring           | 80    | 64             | 80% | 16             | 20% |                | /  |                | /   | 0       |
| Recreation          | 123   | 26             | 21% | 88             | 72% | 9              | 7% |                | /   | 0       |

work are people between 10 and 23 years of age. The section on national statistics showed that most municipalities do not even serve this entire age span but rather concentrate on people between 12 and 16 years of age. With the age groups given for this project, one cannot make such fine distinctions, but it nevertheless becomes obvious that people aged 20 and older are a marginal group in youth work.

### Comments:

#### Differences at local level

The survey of the four Dutch municipalities has contributed relevant information to the limited picture of youth work drawn at national level. The main finding here is that the nature and scope of youth work at local level depends on the social structure and the special needs of the inhabitants. In municipalities with underprivileged youth groups, greater efforts are made to provide initiatives that support the integration of these young people, whereas in municipalities with well-situated inhabitants there is, to a greater extent a youth work structure that is regulated by the market. Beyond this it is striking that, the social ideas of the inhabitants also influence the provision of youth work.

#### Differences between national and local level

In contrast to the data on youth work available at national level in the Netherlands, the data on the situation at local level highlights the large number of volunteers involved in youth work. The training of these volunteers seems to depend on the tradition of the providers, as one can find organisations where only a small number of volunteers are trained, and others where this is the case for all of them. There is also another remarkable trend: if the activities in which volunteers are involved are demanding, then most of them are trained.

Regarding the age of the young people involved in youth work, the local survey has confirmed the na-

12- to 16-year-olds as the main target group of youth work. Sports, recreation, youth clubs and extracurricular youth education are the main fields of activity of youth work identified at local level.

### 10.8 Norway Database:

The number of inhabitants which can influence the number of public and voluntary youth work activities was the first criterion for the selection of the four municipalities. The second was the level of urbanisation. In Norway there is large variation in the level of urbanisation between the municipalities. It is possibly more challenging to conduct youth work in rural areas because of the larger distances involved. Furthermore, differences in population density in rural versus urban areas might have lead to different traditions of voluntary work. A situation where it is challenging for public organisations to conduct youth work could lead to more voluntary youth work. The four municipalities that were selected for the survey are:

- ✦ Oslo
- ✦ Porsgrunn
- ✦ Nedre Eiker
- ✦ Frøya

These municipalities were chosen because they vary in number of inhabitants and level of urbanity. Oslo is

**Table 48: Background information for the Norwegian municipalities<sup>76</sup>**

|  | Oslo    | Porsgrunn | Nedre Eiker | Frøya |
|--|---------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| Population   | 548,617 | 33,977    | 21,877      | 4,052 |
| Public expenditure per inhabitant (€)                        | 6,657   | 5,726     | 4,755       | 6,566 |
| Youth population (13-29)                                     | 126,714 | 6,893     | 4,540       | 783   |
| Youth population as percentage of total population           | 23.1    | 20.3      | 20.8        | 19.3  |
| Child and youth population (0 – 17)                          | 110,109 | 7,616     | 5,386       | 999   |
| Child and youth population as percentage of total population | 20.1    | 22.4      | 24.6        | 24.7  |

<sup>76</sup>Source: SSB and KOSTRA

the largest city in Norway. Porsgrunn is a medium-sized city. Nedre Eiker is a medium-sized rural municipality. Frøya is a small and rural municipality.

Another important criterion was the existence of data regarding youth work. The chosen municipalities have all participated in developmental projects or research projects. As a result, there is more information available on youth work in these four municipalities than in most Norwegian municipalities. Frøya and Nedre Eiker participated in a developmental project called Nettungen and therefore have established websites with information on activities for children and young people. In Oslo and Porsgrunn youth surveys have been carried out.

Most of the information presented here comes from existing surveys, official databases, voluntary organisations and telephone interviews with youth workers working in the local administration. Before the survey was conducted it was decided that it would be necessary to use both existing data and telephone interviews to get valid data. It was considered unlikely that sending questionnaires to organisations conducting youth work would lead to much information. There are several reasons for this. Much of the existing youth work in Norway is done by voluntary organisations. The number of voluntary organisations conducting youth work in one municipality can be very high. It would not have been possible to locate all these voluntary organisations and to send them a questionnaire within the given time frame of this project. Even though it is easier to get in contact with public organisations conducting youth work, it is doubtful that they would have been able to answer all of the questions. In many cases they do not have more data available than what has already been published on public databases. Therefore information has been gathered both from existing statistics and from employees within the local administration.

### Findings:

It has been difficult to find the exact number of activities. Besides the information given on the Nettungen websites, there is little existing information. When information is available, such as in Oslo, different sources often have different figures. Lack of information could mean that the number of youth activities is underestimated. This especially true in the case of Porsgrunn, where very little information was found. It is very unlikely that the amount of youth work is as low as the table shows. Another major difficulty is the problem of separating youth work from activities directed at children. Most public and volun-

tary organisations involved in youth work also work with children. This problem is smaller in the municipalities that participated in Nettungen, as there is information on the website about what age groups the different activities are intended for. In Oslo this is a major problem, as we know little more than the number and name of the voluntary organisations receiving financial support. This could mean that the estimate of youth work activities in Oslo is too high, as it contains both youth and child work.

The tables show that public organisations focus on activities for young people with problems and on open youth work and youth clubs. Voluntary organisations focus on sports, cultural activities, youth groups and associations. The borderline between public and voluntary organisations is not always obvious. Sometimes voluntary organisations carry out work on behalf of public organisations such as child welfare services.

**Table 49: Youth work activities in Norwegian municipalities**

|  | Public organisations | %     | Voluntary organisations | %     | Total | %    |
|--|----------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Cultural youth work                        | 24                   | 8%    | 294                     | 92%   | 318   | 28%  |
| Extracurricular youth education            | 0                    | /     | 4                       | 100 % | 4     | 0,3% |
| Children and youth recreation              | 16                   | 55%   | 13                      | 45%   | 29    | 3%   |
| Open youth work, youth clubs etc.          | 89                   | 89%   | 11                      | 11%   | 100   | 9%   |
| Youth associations and youth groups        | 1                    | 1%    | 171                     | 99%   | 172   | 15%  |
| Street work/mobile youth work              | 6                    | 100 % | 0                       | /     | 6     | 1%   |
| Sports                                     | 4                    | 1%    | 427                     | 99%   | 431   | 38%  |
| Youth counselling                          | 3                    | 100 % | 0                       | /     | 3     | 0,2% |
| Advised play-grounds                       | 0                    | /     | 0                       | /     | 0     | 0    |
| International youth work                   | 1                    | 17%   | 5                       | 83%   | 6     | 1%   |
| Youth social services                      | 49                   | 100 % | 0                       | /     | 49    | 4%   |
| Youth education (within the formal system) | 3                    | 100 % | 0                       | /     | 3     | 0,2% |
| Youth employment                           | 6                    | 100 % | 0                       | /     | 6     | 1%   |
| Youth information                          | 2                    | 29%   | 5                       | 71%   | 7     | 1%   |
| Total                                      | 204                  | 18%   | 930                     | 82%   | 1,134 | 100% |

**Table 50: Budget of youth work in Norwegian municipalities (in public organisations in €)<sup>77</sup>**

|  | Oslo | Porsgrunn | Nedre Eiker | Frøya |
|--|------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| Child welfare expenses per inhabitant aged 0 - 17                        | 862  | 589       | 528         | 609   |
| Expenses for child and youth activities per inhabitant                   | 42   | 25        | 23          | 25    |
| Expenses for public cultural-activities and music schools per inhabitant | 6    | 23        | 13          | 49    |
| Expenses for sports facilities per inhabitant                            | 56   | 45        | 36          | 42    |

There are some differences in public expenses between the municipalities. Oslo spends substantially more on child welfare and child and youth activities, and less on cultural activities and music schools than the other three municipalities. Frøya has substantially higher expenses for cultural activities and music schools. The differences can be due to differences in expenses for running the activities and to differences in priorities.

**Table 51: Public spending on voluntary organisations in Norwegian municipalities in €<sup>78</sup>**

|  | Oslo    | Porsgrunn | Nedre Eiker | Frøya <sup>79</sup> | Total   |
|--|---------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|---------|
| Number of voluntary organisations receiving support  | 1274    | 101       | 26          |                     | 1401    |
| Average financial support per organisation receiving | 6405    | 1709      | 5370        |                     | 6047    |
| Total public spending on voluntary organisations (€) | 8159970 | 172609    | 139620      |                     | 8472199 |
| Financial support for voluntary organisations per    | 15      | 5         | 6           |                     | 14      |

The number of voluntary organisations presented in the table 51 includes both organisations that conduct youth work and those that do not. This means that we do not know for sure how much of the support goes to youth work. Because Oslo is both a city and a county, there is some supplementary information on the financial support granted to voluntary organisations.

The table 52 shows average support per inhabitant

**Table 52: Financial support from Frifond and from local government authorities to youth organisations, groups and associations in Oslo in €<sup>80</sup>**

|                  | Financial support | Average support per inhabitant aged 13 - 26 |
|------------------|-------------------|---|
| Frifond          | 1371250           | 10,8  |
| Local government | 1475000           | 11,6  |
| Total            | 2846250           | 22,4  |

aged 13-26 because there is no information on the number of members in the organisation receiving financial support from Frifond. The total number of members in the organisations receiving financial founding from local government authorities is 16,350. This represents an average support of € 97.9 per member. In addition to these figures, organisations also receive financial funding on a national level, and some of the money is transferred to local and regional level. This means that the financial support for voluntary organisations conducting youth work is probably higher than what has been presented.

There is very little information available on youth workers in voluntary organisations. Therefore this section will focus on youth workers in public organisations. The numbers presented include both employees working with young people and employees working with children, as it was impossible to separate these two categories. The information from the four municipalities is not added together where there is no information from Oslo, because Oslo is by far the largest municipality, and the numbers would then be misleading.

The number of full-time positions in child welfare per 1000 inhabitants is similar for the four municipalities.

**Table 53: Youth workers in Norwegian municipalities<sup>81</sup>**

|  | Oslo | Porsgrunn | Nedre Eiker | Frøya |
|--|------|-----------|-------------|-------|
| Full-time positions in child welfare per 1,000 inhabitants aged 0 -17  | 3    | 3.2       | 2.9         | 2.8   |
| Full-time positions in public youth clubs, holiday clubs, mc-centres, music workshops, media workshops per 1,000 inhabitants aged 0 -17* | 1.6  | 1.0       | 1.2         | 4.6   |

<sup>77</sup> Source: KOSTRA

<sup>78</sup> Source: KOSTRA

<sup>79</sup> No information for Frøya available on KOSTRA

<sup>80</sup> Source: Frifond

<sup>81</sup> Source: KOSTRA, Youth Work Survey



**Table 54: Employees in Norwegian municipalities in child welfare<sup>82</sup>**

|                     | Oslo <sup>83</sup> | Porsgrunn | Nedre Eiker | Frøya  | Total |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|--------|-------|
| Number of employees |                    | 27        | 20          | 3      |       |
| Full time positions | 306.8              | 23.5      | 17.5        | 3      | 350.8 |
| Male                |                    | 2         | 4           | 0      |       |
| Female              |                    | 25        | 16          | 3      |       |
| Education           |                    | Higher    | Higher      | Higher |       |

Frøya has substantially more employees per inhabitant in youth clubs than the other municipalities. This is probably because the municipality covers a large area. This means that they must have more youth clubs than they would if the municipality was smaller. Most youth workers in child welfare have higher education, as this is required for these kinds of positions. The table also shows that there are far more males than females working in child welfare.

The most reliable source of information we have on participation is Young in Oslo 2006 and Young in Porsgrunn 2002. In addition, some statistics from KOSTRA and the Youth Work Survey will be presented. KOSTRA contains only information about participation in youth work conducted by public organisations. The Youth Work Survey also only contains information about public youth work because of the difficulties involved in doing a survey on voluntary

**Table 55: Members of organisations in Norwegian municipalities<sup>84</sup>**

|   | Oslo   |      | Porsgrunn |     | Total  |     |
|---|--------|------|-----------|-----|--------|-----|
|   | N      | %    | N         | %   | N      | %   |
| Total   | 11,921 | 100% | 906       |     | 12,827 |     |
| Members of organisations offering recreational activities   | 2,785  | 23%  | 168       | 19% | 2,953  | 23% |
| Members of cultural associations and organisations          | 1,385  | 12%  | 109       | 12% | 1,494  | 12% |
| Members of youth clubs                                      | 1,389  | 12%  | 81        | 9%  | 1,470  | 11% |
| Members of youth associations                               | 1,779  | 15%  | 124       | 14% | 1,903  | 15% |
| Members of sports and other organisations and organisations | 4,583  | 38%  | 424       | 47% | 5,007  | 39% |

organisations discussed earlier.

Generally, the differences in participation in youth work between Oslo and Porsgrunn are small. The participation rate for recreational activities, cultural activities, youth clubs and youth associations is a bit higher in Oslo than in Porsgrunn. The findings are difficult to interpret because the survey in Porsgrunn was done four years before the one in Oslo. The differences could result from the difference in time rather than from differences between the cities.

More males than females participate in recreational activities, in youth clubs and in sports, whereas more females are involved in youth associations and youth groups. Generally the differences are small.

In general, the rate of participation for 15 to 19 year-olds is higher than for those aged 13-14. There are more younger participants in youth clubs and in sports than in the other categories.

**Table 56: Ratio of male to female members of youth organisations in Norwegian municipalities**

|  |              |             |
|--|--------------|-------------|
| <b>Members of organisations offering recreational activities</b> | <b>2,931</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| Male   | 1,721        | 59%         |
| Female   | 1,210        | 41%         |
| <b>Members of cultural associations</b>                          | <b>1,483</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| Male   | 782          | 53%         |
| Female   | 701          | 47%         |
| <b>Members of youth clubs</b>                                    | <b>1,461</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| Male   | 824          | 56%         |
| Female   | 637          | 44%         |
| <b>Members of youth associations</b>                             | <b>1,892</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| Male   | 856          | 45%         |
| Female   | 1,036        | 55%         |
| <b>Members of sports and other organisations</b>                 | <b>4,958</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| Male   | 2,848        | 57%         |
| Female   | 2,110        | 43%         |

<sup>82</sup> The employees in child welfare services works both with children and youth

<sup>83</sup> little available information for Oslo

<sup>84</sup> Source: Young in Oslo 2006 and Young in Porsgrunn 2002

**Table 57: Members in youth organisations in Norwegian municipalities by age group**

|  |              |             |
|--|--------------|-------------|
| <b>Members of organisations offering recreational activities</b> | <b>2,949</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| 13 - 14 years  | 666          | 23%         |
| 15 - 19 years  | 2,283        | 77%         |
| <b>Members of cultural associations</b>                          | <b>1,493</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| 13 - 14 years  | 345          | 24%         |
| 15 - 19 years  | 1,148        | 76%         |
| <b>Members of youth clubs</b>                                    | <b>1,470</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| 13 - 14 years  | 447          | 30%         |
| 15 - 19 years  | 1,023        | 70%         |
| <b>Members of youth associations</b>                             | <b>1,901</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| 13 - 14 years  | 414          | 22%         |
| 15 - 19 years  | 1,487        | 78%         |
| <b>Members of sports and other organisations</b>                 | <b>4,997</b> | <b>100%</b> |
| 13 - 14 years  | 1,285        | 26%         |
| 15 - 19 years  | 3,712        | 74%         |

#### Comments:

##### Differences between national and local level

As at national level, collection of data at local level has been challenging because of the many organisations involved and the many different kinds of information sources. The most reliable data is the number of youth work activities in Nedre Eiker and Frøya and participation in Oslo and Porsgrunn. Some information is available on youth workers in public organisations, but it is striking that although voluntary commitment plays an important role in Norway, very little is known about youth workers in voluntary organisations.

In contrast to national level, it is possible at local level to categorise different youth work activities. The most common activities provided are sports (38%), cultural youth work (28%) and youth associations and groups (15%). The exact amount of expenditure was not traceable because of the different funding sources. It is striking that youth work is mostly a female domain, as 88% of the employees are women.

##### Differences at local level

The comparison between the municipalities shows that the number of inhabitants in the municipality influences the number and variety of available youth work activities. The level of urbanity has not been found to influence youth work.

## 10.9 Romania

### Database:

The data presented in this part of the report was surveyed from four counties:

- Alba
- Bihor
- Cluj
- Sibiu.

All these four counties are located in Transylvania, the north-western part of Romania. They are close to each other and were chosen for access reasons. Bucharest, the capital city of Romania, was excluded, as it is not representative of other municipalities. The reasons for choosing the four counties were also comparative ones as in two out of the four counties, Bihor and Cluj, there is a significant Hungarian minority. This had to be reflected in the study. The other significant minority living in Romania, the Roma population, is present in all four counties, but unfortunately we could not identify any specific Roma youth organisation. In Sibiu county, the German minority was quite strong, but we could not trace any specific organisations or youth activities.

The main focus of data collection was the County Youth Departments (CYD) in the main cities investigated. They represented a useful source of information for data regarding number of projects, budget and information on non-governmental youth organisations. As data on non-governmental youth organisations was very scarce, we used all possible information channels: websites mostly, direct inquiry from the CYD, and telephone calls. The main part of the research, however, was carried out with internet resources.

### Findings:

The survey identified a wide range of youth work activities at local level. The following table gives an overview of the types of youth work identified:

**Table 58: Youth work activities in Romanian municipalities**

| Type of activity                     |     | %    |
|--------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Recreation / leisure-time activities | 34  | 17   |
| Youth centres                        | 7   | 3    |
| Cultural youth work                  | 30  | 15   |
| Extracurricular youth education      | 61  | 30   |
| Youth information                    | 53  | 26   |
| Sports                               | 13  | 6    |
| Social services                      | 2   | 1    |
| Other                                | 3   | 1    |
| Total                                | 203 | 100% |

One of the activities provided, youth information, is most often put into practice in the form of central information campaigns on the dangers of drug use or on sex education, political activities, voting and election issues, political representation, violence in society, school issues, domestic problems, gender-based violence and so on. There are a significant number of recreational and leisure-time activities for young people, for instance music concerts, music contests, folk dance, dances, camps, winter and summer trips, and trekking. Seminars, training for project management, youth policies and funding opportunities and job-seeking represent another category well developed in Romanian youth work. These activities provide opportunities for young people to meet, to exchange skills, and to have access to non-formal training opportunities and to information. Unfortunately, sports are not so present. One explanation for this could be that sports in Romania are managed by a specific authority and that sports activities are counted, supervised and funded by institutions that were not the subject of the present research.

Youth work financed and planned by state institutions – the County Youth Departments – represents the most significant part of youth activities within the counties surveyed. This does not mean that non-governmental organisations carrying out these activities cannot apply for funds. Through the Youth (Information) Centres, the National Authority for Youth (NAY) is also trying to reach the rural communities where youth is not well organised or where there are very few youth organisations or non-governmental organisations. In this regard, the fact that two of the three existing youth centres in Cluj County are located in rural areas is a significant step forward.

In the four counties we surveyed, there are 135 non-governmental associations: most of them (42, i.e. 31%) are youth associations: student organisations are also numerous (34, i.e. 25%). Unfortunately no information was available on the number of members in these organisations, and the only activities that could be traced were those financed with NAY funds. Most of these associations are located in the main city of the county, but some of their activities take place in remote areas. Volunteer organisations have started to gain ground. Three years ago, an annual project was started at national level: 'the Week of the Volunteers', when volunteering activities, NGO fairs, debates and meetings are organised in as many Romanian cities as possible.

Regarding the budget of youth work at local level,

**Table 59: Sources of budget in Romanian municipalities**

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| National budget provided by the National Authority for Youth to the four counties in 2006 | € 108,538 |
| National budget for non-governmental youth associations                                   | € 26,906  |
| Local budget  | € 176,915 |
| European funds from the 2007 'Youth in Action' programme for the four counties            | € 130,458 |
| Total   | € 442,817 |

four main sources could be identified:

It can be stated that youth work at local level is financed by a mix of European, national and local funds. It should be mentioned that applying for public money involves a great deal of paper work in all cases. In addition, the NAY funds are distributed amongst institutions in very small budgets, so that NGOs often do not consider it worth applying for them. Thus many small or start-up youth organisations benefit from these calls for projects.

The number of youth workers could be identified only for public institutions and for the County Youth De-

**Table 60: Ratio of male to female youth workers in Romanian municipalities**

| County name | Director of CYD |   | Youth worker / counsellor |     | Camps counsellor |   | Administrative staff |   | TOTAL |
|-------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------|-----|------------------|---|----------------------|---|-------|
|             | M               | F | M                         | F   | M                | F | M                    | F |       |
| Alba        |                 | 1 |                           | 1   | 1                | 1 |                      | 1 | 5     |
| Bihor       | 1               |   |                           | 1   | 30               |   |                      |   | 32    |
| Cluj        | 1               |   | 2                         | 1   |                  | 1 |                      |   | 5     |
| Sibiu       | 1               |   | 3                         | 2+1 | 1                | 1 |                      |   | 9     |
| TOTAL       | 3               | 1 | 2                         | 6   | 2                | 2 |                      |   | 16    |

partments:

Eight youth workers – two men and six women – could be identified as youth workers. They work as 'youth counsellors', they are responsible for organising and monitoring youth activities and for providing information to young people. This represents a low ratio of workers to the youth activities provided, as these people are responsible for youth activities in both urban and rural settings in the entire county. For example, the three youth workers in Cluj county are responsible for 170,000 young people aged from 15 to 29 years. All youth workers are full-time employees, and most of them have a professional qualification and more than five years' experience in youth work.

Their work is complemented by the work of non-governmental youth organisations, where it was not

possible to identify the number of youth workers. One of the reasons for this is that in the non-governmental sector, people working with young people are not identified as youth workers but as 'trainers', 'project managers' or simply 'members' or 'volunteers'. In most of the cases, they are young people under 30 themselves. Most youth workers have been trained in special youth work training programmes. Large organisations may have between three and five youth workers.

Regarding the number of participants in youth work, only those young people participating in pro-

**Table 61: Participants in youth work in Romanian municipalities**

| Type of activity                     | Number of activities | Participants |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Recreation / leisure-time activities | 20                   | 589          |
| Cultural youth work                  | 16                   | 3.237        |
| Extracurricular youth education      | 53                   | 7.539        |
| Youth information                    | 45                   | 3.505        |
| Sports                               | 12                   | 926          |
| Total                                | 146                  | 15.796       |

jects funded by the NAY could be traced:

Extracurricular youth education, youth information campaigns and cultural youth work are the activities that reach the greatest number of young people. Nevertheless, it is not possible to generalise from this data as it is limited to projects.

The youth work activities provided at local level are addressed mostly to young people living in urban areas. The opening of Youth Centres by the County Youth Departments in smaller urban areas and in rural areas are the only targeted initiatives for the rural population. There are also youth organisations that address that specific group, but most of their activities are limited initiatives in comparison to the diversity currently available in urban areas.

Based on calculations, approximately 8% of the youth population is targeted and involved in youth activities.

Regarding the ethnic distribution of participants in youth work, it can be stated that the Hungarian minority is involved and respected. This cannot be said for the Roma population, which is discriminated against in youth work, as it is in other aspects of life. We were unable to find any Roma organisations or youth activities addressing Roma youth.

Regarding the age of young people participating in

youth work, it can be stated that most of the participants are between 18 and 24 years old. The reason for this lies in the strong tradition of student associations in Romania and the good cooperation that still exists with the County Inspectorates for Education, with high schools and universities. While there are also activities for the 14 to 18-year-old population, no activities can be traced for young people older than 24.

## Comments:

### Differences between national and local level

In Romania, the local survey was able to trace youth work activities provided at local level, the funds allocated, and the number of youth workers employed in the County Youth Departments. It was not possible to make all activities and structures provided by youth associations or non-governmental association visible.

The data provided at local level shows that Romania also offers a variety of youth work at local level. As the municipalities fund youth work, subsidiarity is put into practice. Unfortunately it is not possible to highlight the contribution of youth associations to the youth work practice, as no data is available regarding youth workers and members. The reason for this is that 'youth worker' is not a recognised profession.

### Differences at local level

The youth work activities traced for the four counties represent the local structures of youth work in the other 36 counties of Romania, as local bodies merely promote the youth policy shaped at national level. The NGO sector is more flexible, as local NGOs can nowadays have a greater influence on their services.

## 10.10 Spain

### Database:

In Spain, 15 questionnaires were sent to different local organisations and associations in different rural and urban areas in different regions. However, only five of these questionnaires were sent back, since in a Spanish context the questionnaire was difficult to understand due to the lack of specific definitions and the overlapping of categories. This is mainly due to the lack of a tradition in youth work and associations in Spanish society, along with the limited role of youth trainers and youth policies in the Spanish welfare state. The questionnaires collected were from:

- the Segovia City Council
- the Valladolid City Council
- the Cuéllar City Council
- JIS (Youth for Equality and Solidarity)

**Table 62: Youth work activities in Spanish municipalities**

|  | Scope       | Type of Association | Number of activities by category of youth work |  |            |                    |             |                        |               |                 |        | Budget |         |              |
|--|-------------|---------------------|--|--|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------|--------|---------|--------------|
|  |             |                     | Cultural                                       | Extracurricular and informal education | Recreation | Youth associations | Street work | Advised and employment | International | Open youth work | Sports | Public | Private | Total amount |
| Segovia City Hall                        | Local-Urban | Public              | 8  | 100                                    | 200        | 20                 | AW*         | 20                     | N/A           | 5               | 50     | 90%    | 10%     | 177.000€     |
| Cuellar Town Hall                        | Local-Rural | Public-Private      | 10   | 0                                      | 21         | 2                  | 0           | 3                      | 0             | 0               | 6      | 100%   | 0%      | 60.000€      |
| Jovenes por la Igualdad y la Solidaridad | Regional    | Private             | 20   | 20                                     | 10         | 5                  | 5           | 25                     | 10            | 2               | 15     | 80%    | 20%     | 230.000€     |
| AFS Intercultura                         | National    | Public-Private      | 20   | 3                                      | 5          | N/A                | N/A         | 15                     | 3             | 1               | 1      | 4%     | 96%     | 630.000 €    |
| Valladolid City Hall                     | Local-Urban | Public              | 20   | 20                                     | 100        | 50                 | 10          | 100                    | N/A           | N/A             | 40     | 100%   | 0%      | 1.400.000€   |

**Findings:**

There were differences in types of youth work documented between regions as well as between rural and urban areas. For example in Segovia, a city with a population of around 20,000, they did not have a Youth Council until 2003, when they created the 'Casa Joven' following the election of the socialist party into the city council. This demonstrates the lack of focus on youth in urban areas. In rural areas the difficulties are greater, and the limited youth programmes and activities play an even smaller role. Depopulation and ageing of the population in rural Spain must be mentioned as factors partly explaining the reduced youth activities in rural environments.

For Segovia the activities mentioned were mainly extracurricular educational and leisure activities. There is also a focus on information and consultancy on employment and sports. In all cases activities relating to international youth exchanges were limited or non-existent.

In a mid-sized city council such as Valladolid, the youth work map is similar to that of a city such as Segovia. In any case, both budgets are quite meagre, relative to the population. The associations studied work with public and private budgets and are organised within social networks to carry out cultural and exchange activities, while on an autonomous level they carry out activities with immigrant youth. In this last case, the main activities are cultural as well as in the area of non-formal education and consultancy. In both cases, the budget is relatively reduced, denoting limited institutional support for associations that work with young people.

**Table 63: Youth workers in Spanish municipalities**

|  | Youth workers    |         |                     |                  |                          |              |           |            |
|--|------------------|---------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
|  | Number by gender |         | Qualifications      |                  |                          | Sort of work |           |            |
|  | Males            | Females | Professional school | Higher education | Non formal qualification | Full time    | Part time | Spare time |
| Segovia City Hall                        | 9                | 30      | 5                   | 1                | 2                        | 8            | N/A       | N/A        |
| Cuellar Town Hall                        | 12               | 32      | 5                   | 2                | 5                        | 4            | 2         | 6          |
| Jovenes por la Igualdad y la Solidaridad | 12               | 23      | 3                   | 8                | N/A                      | 4            | 6         | 1          |
| AFS Intercultura                         | 53               | 68      | 1                   | 6                | 4                        | 8            | 2         | 1          |
| Valladolid City Hall                     | 53               | 68      | N/A                 | 3                | N/A                      | 3            | N/A       | N/A        |

|  | Volunteers       |         |                          |                        |
|--|------------------|---------|--------------------------|------------------------|
|  | Number by gender |         | Activities of volunteers | Training of volunteers |
|  | Males            | Females |                          |                        |
| Segovia City Hall                        | N/A              | 7*      | Nothing                  | Nothing                |
| Cuellar Town Hall                        | N/A              | N/A     | Nothing                  | Nothing                |
| Jovenes por la Igualdad y la Solidaridad | 29               | 45      | Nothing                  | Few                    |
| AFS Intercultura                         | 195              | 475     | Few                      | Few                    |
| Valladolid City Hall                     | 0                | 0       | Nothing                  | Nothing                |

**Nota: \* Students in training**  
**Source : Local Survey for Spain, 2007**

For councils in rural areas, the activities performed concern youth and childhood leisure consultancy. In rural environments the lack of activities, budgets and personnel are even greater than in urban environments.

The data gathered on youth workers indicates that the majority of workers have a higher education, either as teachers, social workers or socio-cultural leaders.

It can also be noted that the percentage of women youth workers is slightly greater than that of male youth workers, which shows that youth work is char-

acterised as female work in almost all of the activities. Relative to the type of contract the workers have, we see differences between city councils and associations. For city councils, youth workers are usually full-time civil servants, while in associations they are usually part-time workers.

Relative to the number of volunteers, it must be noted that in Spain there is not a tradition of volunteerism,

thus we did not find any volunteers in the city councils, although in Segovia we did find 'students in internships' which we could consider as volunteers. However, in associations where young people are working, there are more volunteers, for instance in AFS Intercultura. In both cases the number of female volunteers is greater than male volunteers. The activities youth participate in are mainly cultural as well as extra-curricular education and leisure time activities. In none of the cases are educational activities carried out with the young people.

With regards to youth work participants, again the differences between city councils and associations must be highlighted. In city councils young people usually participate in cultural and informal educational activities. Sports are important in this context. Female participation is only slightly less than male participation. Age is equally distributed. For the Segovia City Council, there are many young people between the ages of 15 and 19 participating in sports and leisure activities. Above the age of 25, the number of participants drops considerably in all of the activities. The city councils involved do not have information on the young people's education.

In rural environments there are few young people who participate in activities, and the majority that do are between the ages of 13 and 19. These low figures are due to the lack of youth policy in rural environments that was mentioned above.

With regards to the data collected for associations, the profile of young participants varies widely. For AFS, the majority of participants are between the ages of 15 and 19, and they usually register for cultural, leisure and non-formal educational activities as well as for consultancy services. The next largest age group is those between the ages of 25 and 30. These young people usually have a secondary or university education. Associations show participation by a high percentage of young people with a higher education. On the other hand, for Asociación JIS the average age of participants is under 24.

**Table 64: Participants in youth work in Spanish municipalities**

|  | By gender |        | By age group |       |       |       |
|--|-----------|--------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
|  | Male      | Female | 13-14        | 15-19 | 20-24 | 25-30 |
| Segovia City Hall                        | 2530      | 21110  | 1200         | 1800  | 1240  | 400   |
| Cuellar Town Hall                        | 120       | 115    | 80           | 75    | 40    | 40    |
| Jovenes por la Igualdad y la Solidaridad | 256       | 252    | 69           | 206   | 216   | 90    |
| AFS Intercultura                         | 761       | 1215   | N/A          | 1676  | N/A   | 350   |
| Valladolid City Hall                     | 1098      | 1587   | N/A          | N/A   | N/A   | N/A   |

**Source : Local Survey for Spain, 2007**

Participation of young people in cultural and extracurricular activities, consultancy and sports should be mentioned. The average education of those taking advantage of such offers is secondary or primary. Only those young people in international exchange programmes have a higher education. There is also a higher number of young people without any type of education participating mainly in cultural activities, informal education and sports. However it has to be kept in mind that this organisation works with immigrant youths.

**Table 65: Participants in youth work in Spanish municipalities by activities**

|                                 |      |
|---------------------------------|------|
| Cultural youth work             | 590  |
| Extracurricular youth education | 380  |
| Children and youth recreation   | 1907 |
| Youth associations              | 150  |
| Street work                     | 300  |
| Advise and youth counselling    | 1500 |
| International youth work        | 50   |
| Open youth work                 | 250  |
| Sport                           | 1786 |

**Source : Local Survey for Spain, 2007**

#### **Comments:**

##### **Differences between national and local level**

In Spain, much like in Greece or the Netherlands, the local survey provided extensive information about youth work that was not available at national level. First of all, it can be stated that although youth work structures are not well established, there is nevertheless a wide range of youth work activities. While at national level it was only possible to trace training activities for labour market insertion and youth information activities, at local level it becomes clear that the main activities provided at this level are extracurricular youth education, leisure time and recreational

activities, and that labour market-orientated activities do not dominate.

### **Differences at local level**

The activities provided in rural areas are scarcer than in urban areas, but nevertheless cultural and recreational activities, youth associations, consultancies for employment issues and sports are on offer. People working in the youth work areas are generally professionals with higher education degrees. In associations there are higher numbers of volunteers than employed youth workers. The majority of employees and volunteers are women, so that we can say that youth work in Spain is a profession predominantly for women. The main target group of youth work in rural areas is the 13 to 19-year-olds, whereas in urban areas youth work targets young people between 15 and 19 years of age.

## **10.11 Comparative Overview of local findings**

### **10.11.1 Availability of data**

The central result of the present study has been to show that it is indeed possible to describe the structures of youth work at local level. The indicators we had set proved to be suitable in all countries except Ireland and Italy, and they indeed produced relevant results. We were unable to obtain quantitative data in either Ireland or Italy, primarily because of the restricted timeframe. In these two countries it was particularly difficult to identify the parties and institutions involved in youth work at local level. The people we managed to contact had no existing information at their disposal – they would therefore have had to be asked and encouraged to collect data internally. In Spain we had to describe in detail the fields of activity of youth work to the institutions we surveyed. These institutions were not familiar with the terms used,

even though the activities as such may indeed have been offered.

Most of the problems we encountered with regard to data collection came up when data had to be obtained from non-public associations. As a result of these groups' volunteer-based structures, they had to be approached several times before the necessary data was provided. For Austria this is the reason for the low rate of return – 36% – while for Romania we have no data on youth workers employed by non-public providers and in youth associations. An added difficulty here was that youth work is not recognised as a profession.

In the German municipalities covered by the survey, we encountered the additional problem that there were two sets of data at local level: data from the Bureau of Children and Youth Welfare Services Statistics, and data from the local youth welfare planning structures. Data obtained at local level did not allow for a uniform classification of age groups. It was particularly interesting to note that municipalities did not always have computerised versions of the data they sent in to the national children and youth statistics bureau: in many cases the institutions had simply returned questionnaires to the state authorities for statistics, and the latter, in spite of our requests, were not willing or able to provide us with data about the municipalities.

The categorisation of participant age groups used in the study proved to be inadequate. The age range – set at 13 to 30 because of the orientation of the 'Youth in Action' programme – was either too narrow or too broad in Austria, the Netherlands and Romania. Austrian and Dutch respondents recommended the inclusion of 11- and 12-year-olds in the results, while in Romania no youth work is targeted to young people older than 25.

### 10.11.2 Comparative overview of youth work structures

The following overview summarises the main quantitative findings in a comparative perspective.

**Table 66: Structures of youth work<sup>85</sup>**

| Youth work structure            |  |         |  |  |         |         |   |                  |   |                               |
|---------------------------------|--|---------|--|--|---------|---------|---|------------------|---|-------------------------------|
|                                 | Austria  | Estonia | Germany  | Greece                                   | Ireland | Italy   | the Netherlands   | Norway           | Romania   | Spain                         |
| <b>Institutions</b>             |  | no data |  | no data                                  | no data | no data |   |                  | no data   |                               |
| public                          | 18%  |         | 11%  |  |         |         | 3%  | 18%              |   | 60%                           |
| non-public                      | 18%  |         | 89%  |  |         |         | 65%   |                  |   | 20%                           |
| semi-public                     | 23%  |         | 0%   |  |         |         | 10%   |                  |   | 20%                           |
| voluntary                       | 38%  |         | 0%   |  |         |         | 0%  | 82%              |   | 0%                            |
| for profit                      | 0%   |         | 0%   |  |         |         | 13%   |                  |   |                               |
|                                 |  |         |  |  |         |         |   |                  |   |                               |
| <b>Main activities</b>          | no data  | no data |  |  | no data | no data |   |                  |   |                               |
| Extracurricular youth education |  |         | 16%  | 23%                                      |         |         | 11%   | 28%              | 45%   | 23%                           |
| Recreation                      |  |         | 8%   | 46%                                      |         |         | 19%   | 3%               | 17%   | 52%                           |
| Open youth work/clubs           |  |         | 11%  | 2%                                       |         |         | 12%   | 9%               | 3%  | 1%                            |
| Participation                   |  |         | 45%  | 7%                                       |         |         | 0%  | 15%              | 0%  | 8%                            |
| Sports                          |  |         | 14%  | 6%                                       |         |         | 47%   | 38%              | 6%  | 12%                           |
| Youth counselling               |  |         | 3%   | 2%                                       |         |         | 2%  | 0%               | 0%  | 0%                            |
| Youth information               |  |         | 0%   | 2%                                       |         |         | 0%  | 1%               | 26%   | 0%                            |
| Prevention of social exclusion  |  |         | 3%   | 3%                                       |         |         | 8%  | 6%               | 1%  | 20%                           |
| International youth work        |  |         | 0%   | 8%                                       |         |         | 0%  | 1%               | 0%  | 1%                            |
| <b>Budget</b>                   | Different sources<br>- public budget public spending (43%);<br>- membership fees (26%) and miscellaneous sources (21%) | no data | € 6,436,418 municipal funds; 0,5 to 0,7 of total municipal public budget <sup>86</sup> | about 11m; 7.75% of the municipal budget | no data | no data | about € 4.5m 30% membership fees, 25% participation fees; 17% sponsoring; 15% municipal funds | no complete data | about €450,000 European, national and municipal funds each 1/3 of the sum | about € 2,5m 70% public funds |

Regarding the structure of youth work, the local surveys have impressively shown that in all European Countries a wide range of youth work is available at local level. In all countries we find *extracurricular youth education*. In **Romania** extracurricular youth education is the main type of youth work provided at

local level (45%). In **Norway** extracurricular youth education (28%) is, after sports the most common type of youth work activity. *Recreation* plays an important role in **Spain** (52%) and **Greece** (46%), as it represents a high percentage of the activities provided. *Open youth work and youth clubs* are an insti-

<sup>85</sup> This table lists the findings of local surveys; thus the figures given depend on the selection of municipalities and the restrictions declared in the national local survey reports.

This table contains data on: extracurricular youth education und cultural youth work; Recreation and advised playgrounds; participation contains youth associations; prevention of social exclusion includes youth employment, youth social services, formal youth education, youth work in schools and streetwork

<sup>86</sup> 0.5% refers to the municipality of Lingen; 0.75% to the municipality of Lübeck



tutionalised component of youth work in **Austria** (38% of the institutions), in **Germany** (11%) and the **Netherlands** (12%). *Participation* plays an highlighted role in the provision of youth work at local level in **Germany** (45%). In **Ireland** and **Romania** there is a formulated need for meeting places, especially for rural youngsters. *Sports* plays an extremely high role in **Austria** (93% of the institutions provide sports) and the **Netherlands** (47%), where it is, in some municipalities, the only accessible form of youth work. Also in **Norway** (38%) sports can be identified as one of the most common parts of youth work provided at local level. The low percentage of sports documented for the other countries has its reason in the fact that sports is managed and financed by other administrative bodies than the youth services. *Youth information* is at 26%, the most frequently provided youth activity in **Romania** at local level. In all other countries, youth information does not represent an great percentage of the youth activities at local level, although it was highlighted in the national statistical reports in **Italy, Spain and Greece**. *International youth work* represents 8% of the youth work activities in **Greece**; in all other countries it is non-existent at local level. Youth employment services are well represented within the **Spanish** (20%) youth work system, but are not often monitored at local level in the other countries. In all countries, it is possible to identify at least three

*types of providers*: public and non-public and semi-public providers. In the **Netherlands** for-profit providers play an increasing role in the provision of youth work and in the New Public Management Strategies adopted by the municipalities. In **Austria** 38% and in **Norway** 82% of the institutions surveyed claimed to be a voluntary institution, but as most of them are youth associations they can also be classified as non-public institutions. In **Germany** the percentage of non-public associations providing youth work at local level was identified as 89%.

In all countries, the municipalities fund, with special budgets, parts of the youth work provided at local level. In **Austria** the municipal budget covers 18% of the whole expenses for youth work: in the **Netherlands** the municipal budget forms 15% of the expenses. In Greece the amount provided by the four surveyed municipalities is nearly as high as the budget of the General Secretariat for Youth. In Romania the municipalities contribute one third of the budget for youth work provided at local level. In **Spain** it is not possible to make a differentiation between the financing sources but 70% of the budget is provided by public authorities. In **Norway** it is also not possible to trace the municipal expenses for youth work as there are different sources and no clear distinction between child and youth work on the one hand, and social services and youth work on the other hand.

### 10.11.3 Comparative overview of youth workers

**Table 67: Overview of youth workers<sup>87</sup>**

| Youth workers        |         |         |         |        |         |         |             |         |         |         |
|----------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|---------|
|                      | Austria | Estonia | Germany | Greece | Ireland | Italy   | Netherlands | Norway  | Romania | Spain   |
| <b>Youth workers</b> | 12%     | no data | 3.1%    | 52%    | no data | no data | 8%          |         | no data | 25%     |
| female               | 60%     |         | no data | 52%    |         |         | 60%         | 88%     | 75%     | 63%     |
| male                 | 40%     |         |         | 48%    |         |         | 40%         | 12%     | 35%     | 37%     |
| <b>Qualification</b> | no data | no data | no data |        | no data | no data |             | no data | no data |         |
| higher education     |         |         |         | 53%    |         |         | 78%         |         |         | 31%     |
| professional school  |         |         |         | 5%     |         |         | 22%         |         |         | 44%     |
| no formal education  |         |         |         | 43%    |         |         | 0%          |         |         | 25%     |
| no answer            |         |         |         | 0%     |         |         | 80%         |         |         | 81%     |
| <b>Status</b>        |         |         |         |        |         |         |             |         |         |         |
| full-time            |         |         | 34%     | 60%    |         |         | 3%          | 88%     | 100%    | 60%     |
| part-time            |         |         | 6%      | 4%     |         |         | 6%          |         | 0%      | 8%      |
| other                |         |         | 59%     | 36%    |         |         | 91%         |         | 0%      | 18%     |
| no answer            |         |         | 0%      | 0%     |         |         | 0%          |         | 0%      | 82%     |
| <b>Volunteers</b>    | 88%     | no data | 96.9%   | 48%    | no data | no data | 92%         | no data | no data | 75%     |
| training             | 71%     | no data |         |        | no data | no data | 37%         | no data | no data | no data |

In **Austria** the percentage of volunteers active in the field of youth work lies at 88% only 12% are paid youth workers. In **Germany** 97% of the youth workers were identified as volunteers. In **Greece** 52% of the youth workers are employees and 48% are volunteers. Volunteer engagement is high in youth associations, but also in youth counselling and youth recreation. In the Netherlands and Spain, the percentage of volunteers involved at local level is obviously higher. In the **Netherlands** 92% of the youth workers are volunteers. This has to be seen against the background that sports is the main youth work activity in some of the surveyed municipalities. In **Spain** 75% of the youth workers at local level were identified as volunteers. They are active in the associations and participate in cultural, extracurricular and leisure activities. For **Norway** the number of volunteers is not traceable.

In **Austria** there are 60% female and 40% male youth workers. While in **Greece** the number of female and male employed youth workers is balanced, in the **Netherlands** and **Spain** we have about 10% more female youth workers. In **Romania** youth work is, above all, a female profession. The ratio between female and male employed youth workers is 3:1. The highest percentage of female youth workers, at 88 %, was found in **Norway**.

In all countries – with the exception of the **Netherlands** and **Germany**, where many youth workers have temporary employment – most youth workers are full-time employees. In **Greece** and in **Spain** 60% of the youth workers are in full-time positions, in **Norway** 88% and in **Romania** 100%.

Regarding the qualification of youth workers it has to be stated that the data is not complete. Many institutions were not able to answer that question. Nevertheless there is a trend that shows that employed staff are well qualified and have a higher or professional school education. In Germany data is only available in one municipality but shows that 90% of the employed youth workers have at least a professional school education. In Greece it has to be noted that the percentage of youth workers with no formal education falls to 7% when they are working in the educational or social service sections. In the Netherlands little information was recoverable about the qualification of youth workers, but it can be mentioned that one third of the volunteers are trained. Whether there is a training course for them depends on the culture of the provider and on the tasks volunteers are dealing with. If they are demanding, training is regularly provided. In Austria the rate of trained volunteers is, at 71%, very high.

<sup>87</sup> This table lists the findings of local surveys: thus the figures given depend on the selection of municipalities and the restrictions declared in the national local survey reports.

### 10.11.4 Comparative overview of participants in youth work

**Table 68: Overview of participants<sup>88</sup>**

| Participants               |         |         |         |                                     |         |         |                                     |                                    |                                     |                       |
|----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
|                            | Austria | Estonia | Germany | Greece                              | Ireland | Italy   | the Netherlands                     | Norway                             | Romania                             | Spain                 |
| Percentage of Participants | no data |         | no data |                                     | no data | no data |                                     |                                    |                                     |                       |
| 1st activity               |         |         |         | Extracurricular youth education 29% |         |         | Sports 74%                          | Sports 39%                         | Extracurricular youth education 68% | Recreation 28%        |
| 2nd activity               |         |         |         | Recreation 24%                      |         |         | Recreation 10%                      | Recreation 23%                     | Youth information 22%               | Sports 26%            |
| 3rd activity               |         |         |         | Open youth work/clubs 19%           |         |         | Extracurricular youth education 10% | Participation/peer counselling 15% | Sports 6%                           | Youth counselling 22% |
| Participants by sex        | no data |         | no data |                                     |         |         |                                     |                                    | no data                             |                       |
| female                     |         |         |         | 48%                                 |         |         | 46%                                 | 44%                                |                                     | 53%                   |
| male                       |         |         |         | 52%                                 |         |         | 54%                                 | 56%                                |                                     | 47%                   |
| Age                        |         |         | no data | no data                             |         |         |                                     |                                    | no data                             |                       |
| 13-14years                 | 50%     |         |         |                                     |         |         | 40%                                 | 25%                                |                                     | 18%                   |
| 15-19years                 | 32%     |         |         |                                     |         |         | 37%                                 | 75%                                |                                     | 50%                   |
| 20-24years                 | 13%     |         |         |                                     |         |         | 6%                                  | not surveyed                       |                                     | 20%                   |
| 25-30years                 | 5%      |         |         |                                     |         |         | 9%                                  | not surveyed                       |                                     | 12%                   |
| no answer                  |         |         |         |                                     |         |         | 8%                                  |                                    |                                     |                       |

In **Greece** and **Spain** recreation activities are joined by most of the participants of youth work. 50% of all participants attend recreation activities in **Greece**, 28% in **Spain** and 23% in **Norway**. Extracurricular youth education plays an important role for **Romanian** youngsters as 48% of all participants of youth work attend these activities. In the **Netherlands** sports seem to be the most highlighted youth activity (74% of all youngsters participate in sports) as well as in **Norway** where 39% of the young people participate in sports too. For the **Spanish** youngsters sports is also attractive: 26% of the youngsters participating in youth work do sports.

In all countries – with the exception of **Spain** – from where no data is available – the percentage of girls participating in youth work is slightly higher.

In **Austria** the highest percentage of youngsters participating in youth work falls on the group of

youngsters aged from 13 to 14 years. The age groups 15-19 and 20-25 are represented at 32% and 13%. Also in the **Netherlands** youngsters aged from 13-14 years and 14-19 years form the largest group of participants. In **Romania** there is no data on the age groups but there is no youth work available for youngsters older than 24 years. In **Spain** and in **Norway** the main group of youngsters represented in youth work activities are young people aged from 15-19 years. In **Norway** youngsters older than 18 years are no longer considered as a target group of youth work.

From **Austria** and the **Netherlands** it was reported that the age groups were not captured well with the given categories, as youngsters aged under 13 years were often participating in youth work too. In **Germany** only the total number of participants is traceable and even this information is not comparable due to different documentation categories.

<sup>88</sup> This table lists the findings of local surveys: thus the figures given depend on the selection of municipalities and the restrictions declared in the national local survey reports.

# 11 - Interview findings

To be able to deepen and discuss in a qualitative way the circumstances of the given databases in the different European countries, we conducted interviews with stakeholders of youth work. The findings are first of all presented for the individual countries and then summarised.

## 11.1 Austria

The interviewed stakeholders in Austria were

- one person involved in open youth work in the 15<sup>th</sup> district of Vienna
- one person involved in open youth work in the 17<sup>th</sup> district of Vienna
- one person who is a youth worker and project manager for an association focusing on socio-cultural work and mobile youth work in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> districts of Vienna
- the head of the municipal youth department in Dornbirn, Vorarlberg, and
- the person in charge of pedagogical issues in the Viennese association of youth centres.

Most of the interviewees argue that lack of networking and lack of public interest are the main reasons for the rather fragmentary and meagre availability of data on youth work in Austria. It is difficult to get comparable national data because of the different situations of youth work in the different regions or states. Furthermore, terms used in youth work often do not have a nation-wide definition. Another reason for the rather poor coverage of data on youth work in Austria is lack of interest on the part of the sponsors. There is hardly any initiative taken to improve the availability of data. According to some experts, extensive mandatory records are kept on any group wishing to receive subsidies, but this data is not used for any other purpose. Another reason given by the interviewees is that youth work does not have a sufficiently intensive lobby, especially in the media. There is not much public knowledge about youth work in general. The reason for this is partly the work itself: in open youth work it is difficult to quantify success. On the other hand, experts tend to see improvement in the legitimisation of youth work in Austria over the last decade. At regional level standards have been introduced and accepted, but on a nation-wide level there is too little networking and standards are quite a long way from being assimilated.

## 11.2 Estonia

Interviewees in Estonia were contacted through local

youth work coordinators. In total, five youth workers took part in the survey (three females and two males); most of them work in local open youth centres. In one case – in a small rural town – due to the lack of staff and to limited financial funds, the youth worker's tasks were carried out by the manager's assistant. In another case a school director of extracurricular activities was interviewed. The interviewed youth workers were aged between 24 and 37 years, and their work tenure was from 2.5 to 17 years. All of them had acquired or were currently receiving higher education. The youth workers were from different regions: Tallinn (the capital city), Harju county, Ida-Viru county, the western region, and Tartu.

The interviewees were asked how data concerning youth work and youth is usually acquired. The main answer was that often the terms of reference to collect and transfer data were not adequate or clear enough. Respondents argued that from their point of view it was sometimes impossible to understand how youth work had to be measured. Furthermore, if they understood the indicators, youth workers doubted whether these could have a practical impact and whether data collecting based on the given criteria was justified. Interviewees wondered whether data was being collected to implement change or simply to fill out forms.

When youth workers are asked to provide data on youth work, they receive no feedback on the results of data analyses or surveys. Youth workers are therefore not very interested in surveys.

We also wanted to know from the respondents how they collect and transfer data when this is needed. The answers given showed that youth workers have many different job assignments and do not find enough time to collect data. Respondents pointed out that when they are asked for data they are mainly asked to hand out questionnaires to the young people in their activities. However, these young people are, similarly, not especially interested in filling in questionnaires. In most of the cases the questionnaires ask about their leisure time activities.

When we asked about obstacles in data collection, we were told that the main obstacles were lack of time and the heavy workload of youth workers. Many youth workers have several jobs because of the low salaries.

We also wanted to know who was mainly responsible for data collection and data transfer in youth work facilities. We found different responsibilities in the

different institutions. For example in some youth centres the chief executive was responsible, but sometimes also the chairman of the board, the manager or project manager. In other institutions the work involving statistics was done by the secretary, the youth worker or the volunteers.

The study showed that usually there are two to three people in facilities that conduct surveys. Training for the data collector is usually given when there is time for it. From that we can conclude that surveys in youth work are mainly conducted by people who do not have the necessary training. Therefore the quality of the data collected in this manner may suffer (e.g. the data is not objective). The young people involved are not properly informed about the importance of surveys.

### **11.3 Germany**

The experts interviewed in Germany were

- the professor and youth researcher who did the actual survey on youth associations available in Germany
- a researcher responsible for the national youth work services statistics
- a representative of the management board of the German Sports Youth Federation
- a representative of the management board of the German National Youth Federation, and
- a person responsible for youth social planning issues at local level.

The experts agree that the national youth work statistics is a good database especially for youth work that is publicly funded and performed by professionals. Nevertheless, there are some blanks regarding youth work financed from other sources, youth work done by volunteers and the whole sector of training and employment services financed by the Job Centres. Youth sport is also not included in the youth work statistics. In 1974 there was an attempt to survey the sectors of volunteerism and youth associations, but there was no acceptance for this project, as volunteers engaged in youth work were not convinced that it was their task to fill in statistical questionnaires. Some experts argue that the complicated system of annual reporting is not taken seriously by all institutions, so that the results are biased. In general, dealing with statistics is an unpopular task.

From the point of view of the youth associations, the main constraints against a more extensive statistic review are that the membership concept of the associations are different – a difference which is especially significant between religious and interest organisa-

tions. As national funds are distributed on the basis of an old membership status, there is no real interest to change the status quo as long as no other useful and accepted distribution system has been devised. As the last decades have witnessed severe cost cutting and other political threats endangering the continuance of youth work, experts fear further loss of ground.

However, there are also other arguments. For instance, some experts mentioned that youth work is a non-formal learning sector and that it is very difficult to quantify non-formal or even informal learning processes. This is even worse when we consider that there is a great variety of youth work in Germany, and that standardisation would mean having to determine whether a particular informal youth group is part of youth work or not, or whether only active members of associations are to be registered. The discussions would be endless.

Other reasons that can be identified are the lack of focus on youth policy in Germany in the last few years, and the concentration of scientific surveys on current issues such as childcare. Youth associations are especially interested in data that highlights the new cooperation structures between youth work and all-day schools. However, all these tasks need funds. Nevertheless, youth associations have taken action to improve the documentation of volunteerism. The Juleica statistics will be converted into an online database, and in future there will be possibilities to differentiate between the associations. The data will be used to identify factors that exert a sustainable influence on volunteerism.

German experts believe that a European reporting system focusing on the processes and effects of life-long learning in youth work would foster an increased visibility of informal learning processes in this sector.

### **11.4 Greece**

The experts interviewed in Greece were

- a young member of the European Parliament
- a prefectural counsellor of Thessaloniki and board member of the National Youth Council
- a prefectural counsellor of the Cyclades Islands
- a lecturer doing some research on youth studies at the University of the Aegean
- a lecturer doing some research on youth studies at the University of Bournemouth, and
- a youth expert and ex-adviser of the General Secretariat of Youth.

Although the interviewees praised several developments initiated in the youth field during recent years

– by national authorities, local communities and other agents – most of them are not satisfied with the current status of youth work in the country. In particular, they believe that youth work services should assume a more prominent and comprehensive role in Greek society and that more coordinated efforts should be made in this direction.

Some of the interviewees consider the level of education / training of youth workers as unsatisfactory due to the lack of youth work-specific studies / training programmes within the Greek educational system. More specifically, as Popi Kalaitzi suggests, “In Greece no proper attention has been paid to youth policies, so there is no actual need for professionals who will design youth and child policies, or fully trained youth workers”<sup>89</sup>. Fotis Nestoras stresses that “Professional work with the young is in an initial stage. One could claim it does not even exist. The first to blame for this is the state, which has not given priority to this field, and in second place the academic community who have not realised the need and usefulness of a university department that would teach and promote research on youth affairs”<sup>90</sup>. In a similar context, most of the interviewees believe that the level of research in youth / youth work affairs in Greece is low. Indeed, most of the relevant surveys available (a limited number) are fragmentary. According to Mary Matsouka, one reason for this is that Greek society realised only relatively recently that “... youth must become, because of its importance, an autonomous and specialised survey and research subject”<sup>91</sup>.

Almost all interviewees agree that young Greek people do not have adequate information on existing youth work services and programmes in the country. This becomes obvious when we consider a survey of the General Secretariat for Youth conducted by the University of Athens in 2005, according to which almost six out of ten young people were not aware even of the existence of the Secretariat<sup>92</sup>. As Fotis Nestoras highlights, “...only a small percentage of Greek youth is aware of the existing programmes at a national and local level”<sup>93</sup>.

Finally, the majority of the respondents strongly suggest the need for greater efforts in the area of non-formal and informal learning. Although non-formal and informal learning is a widespread social practice

in Greek youth work, they believe that the actual introduction of a comprehensive system for the identification, assessment and recognition of relevant non-formal learning outcomes has not progressed very far.

### 11.5 Ireland

The experts interviewed in Ireland were:

- the director of local partnership company
- the regional chairperson of a voluntary youth work organisation
- a lecturer in youth work
- a local youth work manager, and
- a youth work researcher.

What emerges is a youth work system that is in transition and, in some respects, in crisis. The transition has been triggered by new legislation and new funding structures. On the other hand there is a crisis surrounding the role and function of youth work in Ireland. This arises from the street culture that defines the leisure and recreational pursuits of young people in Ireland. Traditional forms of youth work such as youth clubs or scouting are being severely challenged by young people’s desire for freedom and autonomy. There is a connecting thread in the interviews with experts that points the way forward though engagement with the ideas that young people have about the modern world. Institutions such as *Dáil na nÓg* are seen as not connecting with young people, because they are adult ideas taken from the adult world. However, there is also a sense that a paradigm shift is beginning to take place in youth work practice. Youth cafés are emerging as a symbol of youth work’s desire to modernise its practice. Professionalisation also has a major influence on modernisation. Irish youth work, nonetheless, remains a quintessentially volunteer service with all the strengths and limitations that entails.

The future will be exciting and productive if the Irish state is prepared to invest in its youth population by expanding its youth service. It appears that it is beginning to do so, but there is a lot more to do before there is an adequate youth service. Overall, young people need to be heard in all their diversity. They are citizens with full rights, and they represent Ireland’s future. There can be no more important public policy issue than the future of a nation’s young peo-

<sup>89</sup> Kalaitzi, Question 11.

<sup>90</sup> Nestoras, Question 11.

<sup>91</sup> Matsouka, Question 17.

<sup>92</sup> General Secretariat for Youth, *I Nea Genia stin Ellada Simera* (Youth in Greece Today), University of Athens (Institute of Applied Communications), (Athens: 2005)

<sup>93</sup> Nestoras, Question 18.

ple. Civil society, in the shape of a committed voluntary sector, took responsibility for youth work during the twentieth century. Hopefully, the state will need to be more actively engaged during the twenty-first century.

### **11.6 Italy**

The experts interviewed in Italy were

- a person in charge of the school statistics from the Department of Education
- two members of local associations
- a ECAP employee
- a youth desk information employee,
- a person in charge of Eurodesk, and
- a person in charge of the local employment centre.

Different issues arose from the semi-structured interviews.

A topic outlined by all interviewees is that data on youth work according to the indicators provided by the project is not available. However, this lack of data is a general problem; it is due to incomplete information technology systems as well as to the fact that although a culture of data collection is rapidly gaining ground, it still does not cover all public and private sectors. At the moment, a lot seems to be happening in the area of youth work at different levels: there are many initiatives and many ongoing public and private programmes, but at this stage there is little available data to give more information about them.

The various departments involved with youth issues (the National Department for Youth Policies and Sports, the Labour Ministry, the Ministry for Social Solidarity, and the National Department of Education) are also trying to come up with innovative programmes by looking for inspiration at what is going on at European level; yet, the impression is that each of them is acting on its own. There is no common vision of all initiatives that are taking place because of lack of coordination among all the stakeholders concerned.

All these issues result in the insufficient visibility of all positive developments, which are much more than it appears. There is a need for a centralised, all-inclusive database that would give more visibility to all activities broadly linked to youth work.

Another aspect mentioned by most of the interviewees is that youth work is not well defined and does not attract attention as a specific field. Moreover, its actual definition is very restrictive, referring mainly to paid work or to activities leading to paid jobs.

An important aspect that has emerged very strongly as influencing various aspects of youth work is cul-

ture; both at a personal and at social level, some cultural aspects affect innovative thinking and how people take advantage of the opportunities offered by youth work.

Some respondents underlined that mobility is not yet properly valued among young Italian people, mainly because of cultural aspects, one of these being the strong link with the family and the environment. Exchange programmes could be set up by national ministries from different countries in order to encourage mobility and trans-cultural enrichment. Though limited in time, these experiences could promote personal growth and development.

It is very important to be linked to European programmes and initiatives; they give a broader perspective on youth in general, and on work opportunities in particular.

### **11.7 The Netherlands**

The experts interviewed in the Netherlands were

- a representative of the National Youth Council
- a representative of the National Association for Youth Workers
- a researcher specialising in youth work, who is also a lecturer in youth work
- a researcher specialising in youth studies, who also used to act as a consultant to the joint strategy in youth research of the CoE and the EC, and
- a researcher specialising in young people of immigrant descent.

In the interviews, experts most often stressed the low political priority of youth work in the Netherlands. In contrast, several interviewees pointed out its relevance in cooperation structures. Cooperation with the police and youth care, for example, is becoming increasingly popular, and schools are becoming the main cooperation partner for youth workers. For schools, cooperation with youth workers seems desirable for two reasons. Firstly, school children with a low affinity for formal learning might respond better to the non-formal learning environments often found in youth work contexts. Secondly, youth work activities can be offered at schools in the afternoon, thus helping all-day schools to put together an attractive programme for their students.

Beside the low political priority of youth work, the sparse funding available for it and the lack of coordination between its organisations and providers were also underlined. Respondents noted that singular flows of funds naturally lead to singular projects. In other words, where no money is earmarked for networking and coordination, networking and coordina-

tion, it will be difficult to develop networking. They are additionally hampered by the low profile of youth work in general, which causes remarkable differences between the offers of youth work and significant fluctuation within them.

When referring to recent changes, respondents highlighted a changed mentality. While volunteering, activation and self-organisation were still rather new concepts requiring active support a decade ago, they are common ideas nowadays. Indeed, recognition of these ideas sometimes goes so far that voluntary commitment is required and taken for granted, which casts doubts on its true voluntariness. School children, for example, are urged to engage in voluntary social activities. But it is not only school children that are roped into volunteer work: voluntary organisations themselves are also experiencing the pressure to become autonomous. Their financial support has been drastically cut in the last few years, and the remaining funding usually only serves as start-up financing. The amount of money allocated to them is, generally speaking, rather small and connected to strict bureaucratic requirements. Some of the interviewees even stated that the unfavourable ratio of funding to red tape serves as a disincentive to look for funding.

For the future, however, interviewees tended to draw a more encouraging scenario. Acknowledging the establishment of a Ministry for Youth and Families, some interviewees voiced the hope for an increasing amount of attention being paid to youth work. Whether this will indeed be the case still needs to be seen. However, what the Ministry will definitely achieve is a bundling of information and decision making.

### 11.8 Norway

Five informants were selected to participate in the interviews:

- the secretary-general of the Norwegian Association for Youth Clubs
- the secretary-general of the Norwegian Youth Council
- an adviser on child and youth sports at the Confederation of Sports
- a researcher on voluntary youth organisations at the institute for Norwegian Social Research, and
- a researcher at Diakonhjemmet University College.

Among the five informants there are two researchers. One is an expert in voluntary work and the other on child welfare. The other three informants all work in organisations that conduct youth work. The organisations they represent are involved in different kinds of youth work. This could mean that their approaches and views on youth work are different. Together, the five informants represent the diversity of youth work in Norway.

The informants were told briefly what information had been found within their field of youth work and then asked to give reasons for the lack of information. There is some information available for some of the areas of youth work that the informants represent. For instance, there is some data on child welfare and sports. Because of this the informant from Diakonhjemmet University College was not asked about reasons for the lack of available data. Nevertheless she had opinions on the quality of the existing data that will be presented in the next section. The following are the explanations for the lack of data given by the informants:

There is a lack of databases where information is registered. The Youth Club Association has initiated research because so little research is done<sup>94</sup>.

Traditionally there has been little research done on voluntary organisations. I think it is difficult to do research on voluntary organisations because they are based on voluntary work. The volunteers cannot be forced to participate in research unless they want to. The government is already putting much pressure on the voluntary organisations to report statistics, and it is important that research is done in such a way that it does not put further pressure on the organisations<sup>97</sup>.

It is due to the lack of resources. This is something that we need to change. We need to have more research on sports<sup>96</sup>.

In the Norwegian context it is the membership that counts, not the age of the member. Most voluntary organisations have members of all ages, and there is no tradition of separating the youngest members from the rest.<sup>97</sup>

<sup>94</sup> Representative of the Norwegian Association for Youth Clubs

<sup>95</sup> Representative of the Norwegian Youth Council

<sup>96</sup> Representative of the Confederation of Sports

<sup>97</sup> Representative of Norwegian Social Research



The informants give different explanations for the lack of data on youth work. The researchers focus on the tradition of investigating voluntary work at large, and not of focusing only on young people in voluntary organisations. The informant representing sports, youth clubs and youth associations believes that there is a lack of research in these areas of youth work and that there ought to be better routines for reporting relevant information. The informant from the Norwegian Youth Council adds that it is challenging to do research on voluntary organisations because the volunteers do not have the time to participate. Voluntary youth workers are interested in participation in the activities of the organisations, not in filling in forms or participating in interviews.

The informants from the Norwegian Association for Youth Clubs and the Norwegian Youth Council see research as a means to achieve more visibility for their work, and believe that more knowledge would make it easier for them to get through to policy-makers. The informants from the Confederation of Sports and from Diakonhjemmet University College are concerned with research as a means of doing a better job. They have more specific wishes for what kind of research needs to be done. This could be because they represent the areas of youth work with the most available information.

### **11.9 Romania**

In order to validate the data gathered at local level, seven interviews were conducted with people involved in youth work. These were as follows:

- one representative of the National Youth Authority (NYA), responsible for the coordination of the Department on Projects
- one representative of the National Agency for Supporting Young Peoples' Initiative, coordinating the Department of Research on Youth
- two youth workers within the local County Youth Departments, and
- two youth workers from the local youth organisation.

In terms of the way data on youth work and youth workers is collected, the main answers were provided by the representatives of the national bodies. They mentioned that all youth activities funded through public money are reported. They did not see any problem in the way data was reported, especially the representative of the NYA, who mentioned that they were the ones who had constructed this system of reporting by designing the National Plan for Action for Youth and developed the methodology for funding

youth activities. The NAY representative was not very open about talking about "youth workers", as if this did not represent a topic of discussion or interest of this institution. Many of the current NAY programmes and policies focus on youth activities and on promoting these activities, but mainly by cooperating with youth NGOs. In addition, their present programme of developing a network of youth centres in the whole country with qualified personnel serving in these centres was mentioned as a form of promoting youth work at national level.

A different picture arises from the interviews with the youth workers in the NGOs. It is not clear whether young people working in youth NGOs are interested in having youth work qualified or recognised as a profession. They see this as being important for people working in the state institutions responsible for youth work. The NGO sector and the people working there seem to be more interested in the projects they can develop, how to get funding for them and how to reach as many young people as possible. They are very proud of their achievements in terms of years working in the area, numbers of young people participating in their activities, networks created and young people trained. They know a lot about local youth issues, about the situation of youth organisations at local level and the relationship with local and national authorities for youth. As they are usually certified by different international institutions, their interest in having youth work certified as a profession at national level is not particularly high.

The youth workers at the County Youth Departments are, in most cases, the ones interested in having their position clarified as a profession. As most of them have considerable experience in working with young people, their certification as 'professionals' might come a bit too late. Worker certification and recognition of youth work as a profession will be more important for future youth workers or young people starting to be involved in youth activities and youth organisations, as it will give them more professional stability.

With regard to funding of youth activities, the national representatives mentioned that youth activities and youth policies, in general, do not get a lot of attention and consequently too little public funding. Young people and policies for youth are promoted and supported, but not so much as not to have complaints about it. At the local level, youth workers in both public institutions and NGOs complained about "under-funding" and also about lack of staff for activities in the public sector.

A problem regarding youth activities and youth action in Romania was the politicisation of the field and bad management of funds in the past, both of which put youth activities and some youth institutions in a bad light. As a result, NGOs had little trust in the state institutions and also difficulty in communicating with them to promote legislation or other important issues. In short, the problem of state-NGO collaboration in the area of youth activities still exists and it shows how problematic the relationship is: in some areas and some parts of the country it works well: in others, there are misunderstandings and lack of co-operation and trust. This would be one of the important issues to be managed differently in the future.

With regard to visibility of the field and activities, youth workers especially, both from public organisations and NGOs, saw this as an important result of their activities and were eager to mention that every time they were successful in helping a new organisation to be formed or bringing one difficult project to an end, seeing the interest and satisfaction of the young people taking part in the activities and programmes made up for all the difficulties they had to face in securing money, putting up proposals to different funding bodies, or lack of resources and sometimes time. They also mentioned the problem that rural young people do not have a lot of facilities or programmes dedicated to them, opportunities to start voluntary work or be members in organisations, or access to information, resources, and facilities. However, at the same time, youth workers seem very well integrated within the local community, known by high-school pupils, students' organisations or other youth organisations.

All of them express high hopes that now that the National Authority for Youth is once again part of the Ministry of Education and Research, maybe the problems of young people and coordination with the formal education system will be better.

### **11.10 Spain**

The experts interviewed in Spain were

- two youth workers (a social worker and a social educator)
- a representative of the trade unions
- two members of local associations
- a researcher specialising in youth issues, and
- two members of Youth Information Services (YIS).

The interviews lasted an average of 20 minutes. The aim of these interviews was to validate the data gathered at local level, and we followed the provided script on the indicators for the statistics survey.

The results obtained indicate that there is a lack of awareness on the concept of 'youth work.' This concept is seen as a complex range of poorly defined activities aimed at young people. In many cases there are problems in fitting the youth activities performed into the set of indicators provided. The interviews with the youth trainers illustrated the problem of understanding the concept of 'youth work', as many of the proposed activities overlapped and were not well defined, particularly where a cultural activity also included formal and informal educational activities. The majority of the experts interviewed agreed in noting that youth work in Spain has had a delayed tradition and in general tends to correspond to consultancy and job search activities, informal educational activities in elementary and secondary schools, along with sports, which play the leading role in Spanish youth work.

Interviewees also highlighted the lack of youth policies in Spain. The key explanation for this shortage is Spain's Catholic tradition, which has played a leading role in youth work through its parochial schools. With the creation of the modern welfare state after the Franco regime, youth work disappeared within the political goals of the newly created welfare state. It was not until the 1980s that youth policies were brought up and youth councils created within the city councils. This socio-political context can help us understand the difficulties of the youth trainers we interviewed when they were asked to place and define their concept of 'youth work.'

Moreover, respondents referred to the lack of data on youth work as one of the key problems faced when working in this field, since they do not know the demands or needs of the young people with regard to the type of work they do. Another key factor that came up again and again is the culture of familism in Spanish society. Spanish youth present a unique aspect in comparison to young people in other European countries: a delayed emancipation from the family. Spanish youth live in a concept of familism where the families are in charge of resolving the main problems confronting their younger members, including education, unemployment, access to housing, and so on. They are therefore slow in being incorporated into the individualism paradigm defined by Beck and Bauman, where young people confront social risks by designing paths and individual biographies of the "liquid society". For those interviewed, a culture of familism along with the Catholic tradition were two of the most common reasons for the lack of youth participation in youth work activities.

### 11.11 Summary of Interview Findings

If we put together the information surveyed in the different countries, the following four key issues can be identified as the main reasons for the limited availability of youth work data:

The first issue is **recognition**. In all countries the argument was mentioned that youth policy and especially youth work is not a highlighted issue. In countries such as **Greece**, **Spain**, and even **Ireland**, experts ask for greater efforts in establishing and improving youth work structures. This also includes the fact that in many countries youth work is not well enough established as a profession. Education and training of youth workers is sometimes unsatisfactory. In **Romania** youth work is not recognised as a profession. Recognition is an issue even in countries with well operating systems of youth work such as **Austria** and **Germany**, as in the last decade much emphasis has been given to reforming formal education systems or to other cost-intensive sectors like child care.

The second issue concerns **funding**. To have a well established reporting system requires funds. Experts argued that volunteers are not interested in documentation. Thus data about youth work within the scope of youth associations is difficult to survey. Youth work structures that rely strongly upon volunteerism, such as those in **Ireland**, have greater difficulties in documenting the work and their structures. But monitoring costs money too. In the **Netherlands** cost cutting has stopped all documentation work on the national youth association. In **Germany** the national youth association also argues that additional documentation tasks can be realised only with supplementary funds.

The third issue is **know-how**. In general experts said that there is no tradition of monitoring and documentation in youth work. There are many uncertainties regarding concepts and indicators, and professional communication needs to be improved. In **Estonia** basic skills for research at local level are missing. In **Greece** and **Spain** experts emphasise the lack of a conceptual definition of youth activities. However, in **Austria** and **Germany** too, experts argue that there is no tradition in defining the processes and outcomes of non-formal learning processes in youth work. Furthermore, the great variety of youth activities on offer requires intensive work to define common categories. In all countries of the survey, experts want to see more research done on youth-related issues.

The fourth issue is **visibility**. Visibility is a prerequisite for recognition: the outcomes of youth work need

to be better transported and better perceived by the public, by professionals and by policy-makers. Experts agree that youth work is not visible enough, sometimes even for the young people that make up its target groups or for the professionals themselves, as in **Greece** and **Italy**. In **Austria** the lack of networking between professionals was identified as one of the main reasons for lack of data. One **German** expert argued, "We have always been youth educators, but how can we make this comprehensible?"

## 12 - Recommendations

The present study on 'the socio-economic scope of youth work in Europe' represents a first, crucial step in an effort to systematise and disseminate data on youth work and youth work structures, youth workers and youth work participants across Europe.

The central result of the present study can be summarised as follows: whereas it is possible to represent large sectors of local-level youth work in quantitative terms, generating this data at national level is possible only in a few of the European countries surveyed. The main reason for this situation is the application of the subsidiarity principle and the subordinate position of youth work within the scope of political action. This means that national management of this field is perceived as largely unnecessary, and as a result most of the countries surveyed see little need for national documentation and analysis of youth work data.

Beyond this main result, the study has led to a number of further discoveries at various levels of the issue:

- The main fields of action of youth work have been identified and defined
- A first set of basic indicators have been established for comparative national reporting
- Light has been shed on the reasons for the absence of data at national level
- Indicators have been developed and applied to reflect youth work at local level.

An expert meeting to discuss the central points and results of the present study was held in Strasbourg on 18 June 2007; it yielded valuable ideas and proposals for recommendations.

*Because of the different national historical contexts and as a result of its orientation to the various life situations of its target groups, youth work is a complex and diverse field suffering from a lack of basic definitions and indicators that could serve as a basis for common reporting. There is therefore a need for:*

- working more intensely on defining and systematising the relevant concepts
- establishing central indicators
- clarifying the basis for systematising the documentation of youth work from a European perspective,

and

- further strengthening the existing national and European networks on youth knowledge and intensifying the cooperation between them.<sup>98</sup>

### Recommendation 1

The following recommendations are therefore made :

- to increase exchanges between experts in the field to intensify and bundle shared knowledge, particularly with regard to the central concepts of youth work; for this purpose it is suggesting that national networks are set up where they do not exist, and that the existing networks at a European level are further strengthened;
- to intensify debate among experts to explore how useful data might be gathered on the condition of the field of youth work and its socio-economic effects, and agreement on relevant indicators needed for this purpose.

*Because youth work is basically a local issue, and because there is therefore little need for management and data collection at national level, youth work continues to be poorly documented at national level.*

*There is therefore a need for*

- to increase coordination with regard to information management between local, state, national and European or international levels.

### Recommendation 2

The following recommendations are therefore made :

- to increase exchanges with the competent, in some cases newly established national ministries to prepare for the creation of a European reporting system on youth work;
- in this context ensuring that local levels are involved, adequately visible and represented
- to support the data collection of the national correspondents to the European Knowledge Centre for Youth Policy; for this purpose it is suggested that national networks on youth knowledge are set up, comprising researchers, policy makers and practitioners.

*Target group orientation is another reason why youth work is such a highly diverse field distributed among many competencies. While a number of individual*

<sup>98</sup> For the moment three European networks on Youth Knowledge exist: the network of Experts on a Better Knowledge and Youth Research and the Network of Correspondents to the European Knowledge Centre for Youth Policy, both coordinated by the Partnership on Youth between the European Commission and the Council of Europe. Two years ago, the European Commission set up the European Network of Youth Knowledge (EuNYK). For additional information please view issues 6 and 19 of the Partnership Newsletter. Available at: <http://www.youth-partnership.net/youth-partnership/newsletters.html>

*fields of activity can be clearly allocated to youth work and identified as such, others, for instance youth sport, youth vocational counselling and certain areas of salutogenesis, are not so clear-cut. There is therefore a need for*

- more intensive cooperation between fields of activity and stakeholders.

### **Recommendation 3**

The following recommendations are therefore made :

- to strengthen cooperation amongst stakeholders, particularly governments, youth associations and perhaps also professional groups to contribute to common documentation of youth work:
- to intensify cooperation among the various sectors to identify and document those fields of activity of youth work that, as a result of differences in national traditions, are not sufficiently visible and cannot be clearly allocated to youth work.

The following steps were identified at the expert workshop as being possibly useful towards implementing these requirements:

- encouraging a greater involvement of the European Knowledge Centre for Youth Policy regarding the collection of data, the development of respective methods, and the dissemination of the results of various investigations and of relevant data;
- promoting a more intensive professional debate on the definition of concepts and the identification of indicators at national, European and international level;
- completing data collection work so as to obtain the data shown by the present survey to be missing, to expand the existing, for instance with regard to social indicators of users of youth work, and, last but not least, to integrate more countries than those included in the present study in the European documentation of youth work.

# 13 - References

- Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend (ed.) (2005). Zwölfter Kinder- und Jugendbericht, Berlin
- Bundesministerium für soziale Sicherheit, Generationen und Konsumentenschutz (ed.) (2003). 4. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich Teil B: Prävention in der außerschulischen Jugendarbeit, Vienna
- Bundesministerium für soziale Sicherheit und Generationen (2006). Youth Policy in Austria, Vienna
- Chisholm, L., Hoskins, B. (2005): Trading up - Potential and performance in non-formal learning, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg
- Department of Education and Science (2003). National Youth Work Development Plan (NYWDP) 2003-2007, Dublin
- Eesti Vabariigi Haridusministeerium (2001). Eesti Noorsootöö Kontseptsioon, Tallinn
- European Commission (2007). Flash Eurobarometer no. 202 – youth survey, June 2007, Brussels
- Gemeente Amsterdam (2006). Ruim de helft Amsterdamse jeugd niet-westerse allochtoon. Retrieved 17 January 2007 from [http://www.amsterdam.nl/stad\\_in\\_beeld/feiten\\_cijfers?ActItmIdt=12750](http://www.amsterdam.nl/stad_in_beeld/feiten_cijfers?ActItmIdt=12750)
- General Secretariat for Youth (2005). I Nea Genia stin Ellada Simera (Youth in Greece Today), University of Athens (Institute of Applied Communications), Athens
- Government of Ireland (2001). Youth Work Act, Dublin
- IARD (ed.) (2001). Study on the state of young people and youth policy in Europe. Final reports. Volume 1: Executive summary and comparative reports, Milan
- Krange, Olve & Strandbu, Åse (2004). Ungdom, idrett og friluftsliv. Skillelinjer i ungdomsbe-folkningen og endringer fra 1992 til 2002. Nova. Rapport 16/04, Oslo
- Lauritzen, P. (2006). Defining youth work, <http://www.youth-partnership.net/youth-partnership/glossary.html>
- McGrath, M. and Lynch, D. (2007). Where Do You Go When You Go Out? East Cork Area Development Ltd (ECAD), Midleton
- Ministerium für Generationen, Familie, Frauen und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (ed.) (2006). Entwicklungslinien der Offenen Kinder - und Jugendarbeit. Befunde der dritten Strukturdatenerhebung zum Berichtsjahr 2004 für Nordrhein-Westfalen, Düsseldorf
- Münder, J. et al. (2003). Frankfurter Kommentar zum SGB VIII: Kinder- und Jugendhilfe, Weinheim and Munich
- Noorda, J. and Veenbaas, R. (2005). Het Jongerenwerk. Bronnen 4. Bussum: Uitgeverij Eigen-Wijs Noorda, J., & Veenbaas, R. (2005). Die Jugendarbeit in den Niederlande. In Deinet, U. & B. Sturzenhecker (eds.), *Handbuch offene Kinder- und Jugendarbeit* (pp. 476-82), Wiesbaden
- Office of the Minister for Children (2005). National Children's Office Study, Dublin
- Ødegård, G. (2007). Troløs ungdom. Endringer i i ungdoms deltakelse i frivillige organisasjoner fra 1992 til 2002. I: Strandbu, Å. & Øia, T. (red): Ung i Norge. Skole fritid og ungdomskultur, Oslo
- Powell, F.W. (1992). The Politics of Irish Social Policy, New York
- Staatsblad van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden (2006). Wet maatschappelijke ondersteuning, (Social Support Act), The Hague
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2005). Statistiken der Kinder und Jugendhilfe, Maßnahmen der Kinder- und Jugendarbeit 2004, Wiesbaden
- Thole, W. (2000): Kinder- und Jugendarbeit. Eine Einführung, Weinheim and Basel
- United Nations (1996). World Programme of Action for Youth to the year 2000 and beyond, Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly (A/50/728, 13 March 1996), New York

## 14 - List of project partners

- **Austrian Institute for Youth Research, Vienna**, Maria Theresienstraße 24/3/10, 1010 Wien, Austria  
Natalia Wächter ([nw@oeij.at](mailto:nw@oeij.at)), Edith Flaschberger ([edith.flaschberger@chello.at](mailto:edith.flaschberger@chello.at))
- **Centro per la Formazione Permanente e l'Aggiornamento del Personale del Servizio Sanitario (CEFPAS)**, Via G. Mulé 193100, Caltanissetta, Italy  
Pina Frazzica ([frazzica@cefpas.it](mailto:frazzica@cefpas.it)), Carmelo Amico ([amico@cefpas.it](mailto:amico@cefpas.it)), Roberta Arnone ([arnone@cefpas.it](mailto:arnone@cefpas.it)),
- **Departamento de Sociología y Trabajo Social Universidad de Valladolid**, Canaliza 27, 1A - Palazuelos de Eresia, 40194 Segovia, Spain  
Almudena Moreno Mingues ([almudena@soc.uva.es](mailto:almudena@soc.uva.es)), Enrique Crespo Ballesteros ([mailto:qcrespo@terra.es](mailto:mailto:qcrespo@terra.es)),
- **Department of Applied Social Studies**, University College Cork, Donovan's Rd., Cork city, Ireland  
Fred Powell ([f.powell@ucc.ie](mailto:f.powell@ucc.ie))
- **Dora Giannaki**, 7 Tselepi Road 117, 44 Athens, Greece ([doragian@yahoo.com](mailto:doragian@yahoo.com))
- **Institute for Social Work and Social Education**, Zeilweg 42, 60439 Frankfurt/M., Germany  
Irina Bohn ([irina.bohn@iss-ffm.de](mailto:irina.bohn@iss-ffm.de)), Ludger Stallmann ([ludger.stallmann@iss-ffm.de](mailto:ludger.stallmann@iss-ffm.de))
- **National Research Institute on Labour and Social Protection**, Povernei no.6-8 Sectorul 1, Bucharest, Romania  
Ioana Borza ([iborza@incsmpps.ro](mailto:iborza@incsmpps.ro))
- **Norwegian Social Research, NOVA - P.O.** Box 3223 Elisenberg, 0208 Oslo, Norway  
Elisabeth Backe Hansen ([elisabeth.backe-hansen@nova.no](mailto:elisabeth.backe-hansen@nova.no)), Cay Gjerustad ([cay.gjerustad@nova.no](mailto:cay.gjerustad@nova.no))
- **Tartu University, Department of Sociology**, Tiigi 78, 50410 Tartu, Estonia  
Agnes Alvela ([agnes.alvela@ut.ee](mailto:agnes.alvela@ut.ee)), Andu Rämmer ([andu@psych.ut.ee](mailto:andu@psych.ut.ee))
- **Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Faculty of Social Sciences**, De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, Netherlands  
Kathrin Komp ([K.Komp@fsw.vu.nl](mailto:K.Komp@fsw.vu.nl))

# 15 - List of experts participating in the expert meeting in Strasbourg

- **Annalisa Ciccherchia**

Via Pompeo Magno 10 B, Roma: 00192, Italy

- **Filip Cousse**

Ghent University, Dept. of social welfare studies,  
H. Dunantlaan 2, 9000 Gent, Belgium  
([filip.cousse@ugent.be](mailto:filip.cousse@ugent.be))

- **Sylvia Geise**

Conference of INGOs, P.O. Box 12 02 62, 60115  
Frankfurt, Germany

- **Manfred Zentner**

jugendkultur.at, Bauernmarkt 6/5, 1010 Wien,  
Austria

## European Youth Forum

120 rue Joseph II, 1000 Brussels, Tel: +32 2  
286 94 22, Switchboard: +32 2 230 64 90,  
Fax +32 2 230 21 23

- **Diogo Pinto**, YFJ Secretary General  
([Diogo.Pinto@youthforum.org](mailto:Diogo.Pinto@youthforum.org))

- **Alix Masson**, Policy Officer on Youth Policy in  
Europe, European Youth Forum  
([Alix.Masson@youthforum.org](mailto:Alix.Masson@youthforum.org))

- **Peter Torp Madsen**, Member of the Board Euro-  
pean Educational Exchanges – Youth For Under-  
standing (EEE-YFU) ([office@eee-yfu.org](mailto:office@eee-yfu.org))

## European Commission

DG Education and Culture, Directorate D: Youth, Civil  
Society, Communication, D1/Unit- Youth (Vh2-  
05/09), European Commission, Rue Van Maerlant 2,  
1049 Bruxelles, Belgium  
Tel: +32 2 296.39.44, Fax: + 32 2 29 94 038

- **Manfred von Hebel**

([Manfred.VON-HEBEL@ec.europa.eu](mailto:Manfred.VON-HEBEL@ec.europa.eu))

## Council of Europe

Directorate of Youth and Sport, Agora Building,  
F - 67075 Strasbourg Cedex, France  
Tel : + 33 3 88 41 23 00, Fax : + 33 3 88 41 27 77

- **Iris Bawidamann**

([iris.bawidamann@coe.int](mailto:iris.bawidamann@coe.int))

## Partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of Youth

- **Hans-Joachim Schild**

Tel. +33.390.21 5631 - ([Joachim.Schild@coe.int](mailto:Joachim.Schild@coe.int))

- **Philipp Boetzelen**

Tel. + 33.390.21 5057 ([Philipp.Boetzelen@coe.int](mailto:Philipp.Boetzelen@coe.int))

- **Marta Medlinska**,

Tel. +33.390.21 4916 ([Marta.Medlinska@coe.int](mailto:Marta.Medlinska@coe.int))



# 16 - Table index

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Data on youth work  | 14 |
| Table 2: Data on youth workers   | 14 |
| Table 3: Data on participants  | 14 |
| Table 4: Traditions and frameworks of youth work                           | 16 |
| Table 5: Definitions and aims of youth work                                | 16 |
| Table 6: Target groups and age groups of youth work                        | 17 |
| Table 7: action fields of youth work                                       | 18 |
| Table 8: Qualification of Youth Workers                                    | 30 |
| Table 9: Availability of data and structure of reporting                   | 33 |
| Table 10: Aspects of availability of data                                  | 37 |
| Table 11: youth work in Austria  | 39 |
| Table 12: Youth work in Estonia  | 39 |
| Table 13: Youth work in Greece   | 40 |
| Table 14: Youth work in Italy  | 40 |
| Table 15: Youth work in Germany  | 41 |
| Table 16: Youth work in Ireland  | 43 |
| Table 17: Youth work in Netherlands  | 44 |
| Table 18: Youth work in Norway   | 44 |
| Table 19: Youth work in Romania  | 45 |
| Table 20: Youth work in Spain  | 45 |
| Table 21: Dimensions of youth work   | 48 |
| Table 22: Activities of youth work in Austria                              | 49 |
| Table 23: Youth work providers and associations in Estonian municipalities | 50 |
| Table 24: Youth work activities in Estonian municipalities                 | 51 |
| Table 25: Youth workers in Estonian municipalities                         | 51 |
| Table 26: Participants in youth work in Estonian municipalities            | 51 |
| Table 27: Youth work providers and associations in German municipalities   | 52 |
| Table 28: Youth work activities in German municipalities                   | 52 |
| Table 29: Funding of youth work in German municipalities                   | 52 |
| Table 30: Youth workers German municipalities                              | 53 |
| Table 31: Participants in youth work in German municipalities              | 53 |
| Table 32: Youth work activities in Greek municipalities                    | 54 |
| Table 33: Youth workers in Greek municipalities                            | 54 |
| Table 34: Qualification of youth workers in Greek municipalities           | 55 |
| Table 35: Participants in youth work in Greek municipalities               | 55 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 36: Activities of young people in Irish municipalities   | 56 |
| Table 37: Adequacy of Facilities for Young People in Irish municipalities  | 57 |
| Table 38: Youth work activities in Irish municipalities  | 58 |
| Table 39: Youth work activities in Italian municipalities  | 59 |
| Table 40: Background informations on the Dutch municipalities  | 60 |
| Table 41: Youth work providers and associations in Dutch municipalities  | 60 |
| Table 42: Youth work activities in Dutch municipalities  | 61 |
| Table 43: Budgets of youth work in Dutch municipalities  | 61 |
| Table 44: Funding of youth work in Dutch municipalities  | 61 |
| Table 45: Youth workers in Dutch municipalities  | 61 |
| Table 46: Ratio of female to male youth workers in Dutch municipalities  | 61 |
| Table 47: Participants in youth work in Dutch municipalities   | 62 |
| Table 48: Background information for the Norwegian municipalities  | 62 |
| Table 49: Youth work activities in Norwegian municipalities  | 63 |
| Table 50: Budget of youth work in Norwegian municipalities (in public organisations in Euro)   | 64 |
| Table 51: Public spending on voluntary organisations in Norwegian municipalities in Euro   | 64 |
| Table 52: Financial support from Frifond and from local government authorities to youth organisations, groups and associations in Oslo in Euro | 64 |
| Table 53: Youth workers in Norwegian municipalities  | 64 |
| Table 54: Employees in Norwegian municipalities in child welfare   | 65 |
| Table 55: Members of organisations in Norwegian municipalities   | 65 |
| Table 56: Ratio of male to female members of youth organisations in Norwegian municipalities   | 65 |
| Table 57: Members in youth organisations in Norwegian municipalities by age groups   | 66 |
| Table 58: Youth work activities in Romanian municipalities   | 66 |
| Table 59: Sources of budget in Romanian municipalities   | 67 |
| Table 60: Ratio of male to female youth workers in Romanian municipalities   | 67 |
| Table 61: Participants in youth work in Romanian municipalities  | 68 |
| Table 62: Youth work activities in Spanish municipalities  | 69 |
| Table 63: Youth workers in Spanish municipalities  | 69 |
| Table 64: Participants in youth work in Spanish municipalities   | 70 |
| Table 65: Participants in youth work in Spanish municipalities by activities   | 70 |
| Table 66: Structures of youth work   | 72 |
| Table 67: Overview about youth workers   | 74 |
| Table 68: Overview about participants  | 75 |