Fouli Papageorgiou

The Impact of Lifelong Learning Policies on the Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups

Abstract

This paper presents the findings of a research project aiming to evaluate the "Impact of Lifelong Learning Policies on the Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups". The research approached lifelong learning as a "mediator" of social inclusion policies, especially those aiming at the integration of vulnerable groups in the labour market. The rural-urban dichotomy and the question of immigration, both in the rural and urban contexts, have also been central issues in the research. Fieldwork was conducted through personal interviews, Internet surveys and focus groups in the eight countries participating in the research. In 7 countries: Greece, Denmark, Germany and Spain the research concentrated on immigrants and ethnic minorities; while in UK, Poland and Hungary they concentrated on disadvantaged rural communities.

Keywords: Lifelong learning policies; social inclusion, labour market

Introduction

This paper presents the findings of a research project[1] conducted in seven European countries[2] aiming to evaluate the "Impact of Lifelong Learning

Policies on the Inclusion of Vulnerable Groups" The research approached lifelong learning as a "mediator" of social inclusion policies, especially those aiming at the integration of vulnerable groups in the labour market. The rural-urban dichotomy and the question of immigration, both in the rural and urban contexts, have also been central issues in the research.

Fieldwork was conducted through personal interviews, Internet surveys and focus groups in the eight countries participating in the research. This included:

— A survey of "key" persons in public agencies with a central role in the formulation and implementation of NAP/incl policies. The sample of this survey was complemented with NGOs that support public policy through their own independent activities.

— A survey of service providers, mostly organisations offering education and training, guidance and counselling services to vulnerable groups and experience day-to-day contact with them.

— Focus group discussions, involving the main stakeholders in the social inclusion policies, i.e. government departments with a direct involvement in forming NAP/incl policies, public organisations implementing NAP policy, members of the civil society and local service providers for the target groups.

Surveys and focus groups were conducted in 7 countries: in Greece, Denmark, Germany and Spain the research concentrated on immigrants and ethnic minorities; while in UK, Poland and Hungary they concentrated on disadvantaged rural communities.

The Background

Social exclusion is a multidimensional phenomenon, linked to a variety of disadvantaged situations created by poverty, unemployment, disability, immigration and ethnic diversity, also referring to such marginalised groups as drug addicts, the homeless, street children etc. Social exclusion affects the individual's opportunities to take part in the economic and social life of the wider

---

- The European Academy for Sustainable Rural Development "Euracademy Association" (EU) – project leader.
- PRISMA-Centre for Development Studies (GR)
- The Danish National Institute of Social Research (DK)
- The Institute for Social Work and Social Education (DE)
- Nicolaus Copernicus University (PL)
- Centre for Regional Studies, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HU)
- Norton Radstock College (UK)

community, resulting in very limited access to services necessary to ensure quality of life and employment. There is a high correlation between poverty and social exclusion, although the two concepts must be distinguished (Room, 1994). Social exclusion covers both causes and effects of poverty, discrimination and disadvantage. According to the Lothian Anti Poverty Alliance (2001) groups, communities and individuals who are unable to realise their potential by participating and contributing to society due to deprivation, poverty or discrimination, are excluded.

In the literature, the term "social exclusion" is interpreted in many distinct ways (Lee & Murie, 1997), but the most widely accepted definition emphasises the inability to participate effectively in economic, social and cultural life, resulting in alienation and distance from mainstream society (Duffy, 1995). Thus the exclusion of socially vulnerable groups can be defined in terms of economy, society and culture, emphasising that economic marginalisation can threaten the social fabric, leading not only to exclusion of groups but also more generally to social unrest (Cohen, 1987, Wessels & Rometsch, 1996, Spencer, 2003).

Socio-economic inclusion is a dynamic process which requires not only the socially disadvantaged groups to adapt but also EU member states to create the necessary opportunities for the full economic, social, cultural and political integration of these groups. In 2001, EU member states produced their first National Action Plans (NAPs) on Social Inclusion, which were the concrete outcome of the new stage in the development of the European social agenda agreed at Lisbon (Commission of the European Communities, 2003, 2005). The PISA study (2000) has shown that human capital investment in post-compulsory education increased the employment and earning capacity of the individual. However, high participation rates in lifelong learning seemed to be a privilege of mostly those who were already well educated. Subsequently, the knowledge economy may seem threatening to those with low skills and low educational aspirations and this is evident in the division between those having access to lifelong learning for employment and adaptability, personal development and active citizenship and those who remain excluded (Philip & Shucksmith, 2003). In line with the previous statement are the main findings of CEDEFOP (2003).

In response to these emerging trends, recent measures concerning lifelong learning have been implemented in all EU member states. The majority of the NAPs showed that participation rates in lifelong learning vary widely between EU countries. Thus, whereas in Scandinavian countries the participation rates are around 30%, most European countries struggle to reach the 5% mark with

the European average being 9.9% and the Lisbon objective being 12.5% (Jenkins et al. 2002). In some countries (e.g. Hungary and Germany) weaknesses in the national education systems were highlighted while the most startling conclusion was the realisation that social background is the most decisive factor for access to and success in education. In some other EU member states (e.g. Greece and Poland) the inability of certain vulnerable groups to benefit educationally becomes significantly augmented by such factors as poverty and residence in rural territories, especially remote ones (CEDEFOP, 2001). In general, socially vulnerable groups, especially ethnic minorities and rural inhabitants, remain significantly under-represented in education across Europe, tend to enrol in schools with lower academic standards, have higher dropout rates and are mostly affected by the digital divide.

EU Member States agreed at the Feira European Council to develop and implement coherent strategies for lifelong learning with a view to making quality learning opportunities accessible for all, on an ongoing basis (European Council, 2002). In order to create a learning culture and combat social exclusion, all relevant actors, inside and outside the formal systems, must collaborate in order that strategies work "on the ground", focus on the transparent allocation of resources, increase learning opportunities, raise participation levels and stimulate demand for learning (Dennis & Guio, 2004).

The two target groups of this study, immigrants and disadvantaged rural communities share two characteristics: they settle in communities with a strong local dimension, requiring support from local stakeholders and they experience difficult access to the labour market, due to insufficient education. Moreover, it should be noted that rural social exclusion is a concept that has not been researched systematically and is difficult to measure. The academic literature on social exclusion tends to concentrate its interest on urban poverty and deprivation and on the generic causes of exclusion, usually remoteness and lack of accessibility from the main economic and political centres at national and European level. (Shucksmith, 2000; Vandenbrande, 2006). On the other hand, national policies designed to manage immigration are rarely accompanied by strong policies to support integration, particularly where this relates to the adaptation of labour market and education policies to the needs of immigrants (OECD, 20006a, 2006b). It is evident, therefore, that the gap between immigrants and native learners as well as between rural and urban communities persists, augmented by existing barriers to education and training and limited access to the labour market, thus accentuating the problem of social exclusion (CEDE-FOP, 2007).

Implementation and Management of Lifelong Learning Policies

The aim of this part of the research was to provide information on the conception and formulation of social inclusion policies as well as on the management of these policies at their implementation stage. The focus has been on lifelong learning policies addressing by priority immigrants and related groups (refugees, asylum seekers, repatriates etc.) or disadvantaged rural communities.

The experience of the implementing agents was sought, regarding the positive and negative aspects of policies and the perceived impact on the target groups. The information collected was of a qualitative nature, based in most countries on face-to-face interviews, using a semi-structured questionnaire. In total, 96 officials from government departments, local authorities and NGOs implementing public policy in the field of social inclusion took part in the surveys. In addition, seven Focus Groups were conducted, one in each country, drawing together the views of the main "stakeholders" of social inclusion policies.

The information collected from the surveys and the focus groups covers the following broad subjects:

— Role and responsibilities of implementing agency — input in NAP

— How the links between the needs of target groups and policies are established

— Successes and failures of the implementation process

— Evaluation and monitoring of policies and actions against social exclusion.

The results of the implementation agencies' surveys and the focus group discussions showed that the impact of policies aiming to combat social exclusion is mediated by a number of factors that reflect the implementation framework of the policies, their wider environment, the engagement of the target groups and the quality of service provision. These factors, which affect the successes and failures of the implementation frames adopted in different countries, operate at three levels:

— At policy formulation and policy management level.

— At service provision level

— At vulnerable group (client) level

The **"policy-related"** factors reflect a number of universally recognised aspects of policies concerning the management of policy implementation, that have been identified across all national samples as important factors affecting the success of policies. These are:

— Lack of integrated lifelong learning policies for the target groups targeting their inclusion in the labour market and their overall welfare.

— Lack of continuity of funding, which in most countries is project-based and does not guarantee the long term sustainability of services, although all respondents agreed that the effects of lifelong learning policies can only be seen in the long term.

— Too much bureaucracy which hinders the delivery of services and creates inequalities between urban and rural providers, especially when funds are allocated to service providers on the basis of competitive tenders.

— Inadequate inter-agency cooperation across different administrative levels (national, regional, local) and at service delivery level (local agencies).

The **"service-related"** factors have been linked to a number of issues across countries, that would determine the results of policies. Such issues include:

— Provisions made by policies and also practices adopted by service providers to engage the target groups and maintain their engagement.

— Allowing flexibility to adapt policies at local level according to the needs of the target groups and local conditions.

— Assuring quality of services delivered to target groups.

— Observing the gender aspect and ensuring equality of access to services for both men and women.

The **"client-related"** factors reflect the profile of the individual members of the target group, in relation to their education, training, skills and cultural or social characteristics. These characteristics have been shown to play an important role in the definition of the needs of target groups, which must be reflected in the goals of inclusion polices to ensure their success.

Ideally, a long-term impact assessment would be carried out by a longitudinal study. If this is not possible, one has to adopt an alternative approach, which would give a short to medium term estimate of the impact in as good an approximation as possible. The best alternative to the long term impact assessment may come from establishing "measures of success" of policies that relate to a number of measurable parameters identifiable during the process of policy implementation. Thus, a measure of success may, arguably, be obtained by the extent to which constraints operating on the target groups from the policy implementation and service delivery frameworks — as experienced by target groups "on the ground" — are eased. One of the main tasks of the next step of this study has been to identify such constraints in more detail across a wide range of national contexts.

Delivery of Lifelong Learning Services

The second part of the research sought the opinions and experience of organisations that have frequent contact with the target groups, by delivering lifelong learning and/or support and care services to them. The aim of these surveys was to explore, through the experience of service delivering agencies, the operation of the inclusion policies "on the ground" concerning such aspects as the extent to which they address the needs of the target groups; and the main factors that mediate, positively or negatively, the impact of policies on the target groups at service delivery level.

In total, 305 agencies took part in the survey, 143 of which are service providers targeting immigrants, refugees etc. and 162 disadvantaged groups in rural areas. The majority of agencies that took part in the survey were non-profit NGOs and public organizations, although in some countries, the presence of the private sector was exceptionally strong (e.g. Greece).

The surveyed agencies offer a variety of services to their clients. The majority offer training (VET and/or language or literacy/basic skills training) and some kind of counselling and guidance, including employment guidance, education counselling, psychological and social counselling. Most agencies combine these two major types of service (see table 1 in Annex).

The questionnaire used for these surveys was common to all countries, although some variations were introduced by national teams, in the form of additional questions, to tap the particularities of the national context. It has taken a semi-structured format, although each national team had the option to further structure the questions or leave them "open". The construction of the questionnaire was guided by the hypotheses of the study. Based on the results of the implementation agencies surveys and the review of policies included in the NAPs/incl, and by consulting the literature in the participating countries and the EU more generally, three main hypotheses were proposed to guide the research design:

Hypothesis 1. The relevance of lifelong learning services to the social and economic needs of the target groups largely determines the impact of lifelong learning on the inclusion of these groups.

Hypothesis 2. There is a number of "push" and "pull" factors mediating the impact of lifelong learning on the inclusion of the target groups. The incentives and constraints of users of services provide an indication of these mediating factors.

Hypothesis 3. The quality of services delivered by the agencies to the target groups play an important role on the inclusion impact of lifelong learning policies.

All three hypotheses have been validated by the survey results.

Hypothesis 1. The relevance of lifelong learning provision to clients' needs determines the inclusion impact

Needs assessment is a practice followed by service providers in most countries, either as a statutory requirement or on their own initiative. Formal assessment includes standardised testing of skills, while informal assessment undertaken by the agencies includes more qualitative methods, such as interviews and personal learning itineraries that set personalised targets for the individual. However, the research showed that lifelong learning needs do not make sense in a vacuum, but they must be seen in the context of the total spectrum of the individual's needs, including all the vital aspects of his or her life, such as employment, housing, health, culture and formal education. In two countries, Greece and Spain, respondents were asked to rank the needs of their clients in relation to the prospects of their inclusion, taking account of 6 vital aspects of a person's life: housing, initial education and training, lifelong learning, employment, cultural identity and health. The relative weight (score) and the rank of each aspect revealed that lifelong learning needs only made sense after other vital needs, such as employment, housing and health were satisfied (see Table 2 in Annex).

In particular, the interaction between lifelong learning and employment was emphasised by all agencies across countries, serving the primary target of inclusion of vulnerable groups in the labour market. However, in countries that currently experience a weak or inflexible labour market (such as Poland or Greece), lifelong learning cannot guarantee improved employment opportunities to vulnerable groups; consequently, the provision of training courses that may not lead to employment has been shown to undermine the value of lifelong learning among the target groups of this study. In countries with a better structured labour market (e.g. Germany, Denmark), further learning opportunities were considered necessary anyway, because they would build new targets for the individual and would improve his or her chances to successfully enter the labour market.

Thus, it has been shown across all countries that it is imperative to provide guidance to the vulnerable groups to build their own learning itinerary, set targets in relation to employment and personal development, and create their

own perspective of continuous education throughout life. It was also concluded that the vulnerable groups have multiple needs, which may be more complex and pressing than those of other social groups, and demand coordination, an integrated response from public services and an approach that balances material needs with psychological and social ones.

Hypothesis 2. Client-related "push" and "pull" factors mediate the impact of lifelong learning

The pull and push factors that affect the target groups' opportunities to take up lifelong learning and facilitate their inclusion into the social and economic life of the wider community are reflected in the incentives and constraints experienced by clients of the surveyed agencies, as assessed by the staff of the agencies. As this information was elicited in most surveys by open questions, the answers present a remarkable diversity, which is summarised, as best as possible, in the annexed tables 2 and 3.

The "pull" factors define the incentives and motives of the target groups to take up lifelong learning and guidance services and relate primarily to the overall needs of the members of these groups, as mentioned above. In all four countries that had immigrants as their target group, the language competence and vocational skills development incentives were imperative. In Greece, Spain and Denmark the social networking component was brought out as an important incentive for clients, who valued the opportunity to get in contact with the native population and with organised networks of self-help addressed to immigrants, through lifelong learning activities. Good access to services, a friendly environment and good communication that builds trust were mentioned as added incentives for participation.

The disadvantaged rural residents were mostly directed to the opportunities for further education and training, aiming at securing employment or getting a promotion or a better job. It is also interesting to note that a small proportion of agencies in Poland and a fair proportion in Hungary considered the incentives of their clients to be family-centred, addressing the needs of their children for a better life. The UK agencies identified personal and community development as additional incentives to take part in lifelong learning.

"Push" factors or constraints are more complex and varied, reflecting both the individual's own situation and the provided services' outlook. The most prominent of these refer to access, which in rural areas becomes a defining factor of the inhabitants' uptake of lifelong learning. Even in the UK, a major obstacle was lack of availability and high cost of travel to lifelong learning

opportunities. The lack of motivation also emerged as an important constraint, although results differed between countries: for example, in Poland this constraint was reported by almost half the sample, while in the UK lack of personal motivation was not seen as an obstacle. Low levels of education counted for lack of interest in further education and training, while some of the agencies blamed the family environment and a high occurrence of trans-generational unemployment in rural communities for this (Poland).

Further constraints that pertained to some national contexts, with special reference to immigrants, included bureaucracy, lack of legalisation documents that would make the individual eligible for service, poor use of the local language and some personal constraints, such as long working hours and cultural (religious) inhibitions. The gender dimension appeared to create additional constraints, especially for women migrants, who are usually directed to traditionally feminine jobs, without much prospect for self-development and self-actualisation. The Danish and German policies that have a part-focus on the early age of the second generation immigrants or the young children of newcomers, supported by a family-centred approach to inclusion, offer an example of best practice: lifelong learning provision runs throughout the life-cycle, involving parents as trainers in the lifelong learning careers of their children. Moreover, the inter-agency referral system was pointed out by the agencies as a valuable means to overcoming these constraints, calling for close cooperation and coordination across the whole spectrum of agencies serving the needs of the target groups, both public and NGOs.

Hypothesis 3. The quality of services delivered to vulnerable groups impacts the inclusion process

The surveys of service delivering agencies revealed three types of factors that determined their modus operandi and the quality of the services provided. These included:

— Firstly, the wider policy, funding and labour market environment within which the agencies operate at national and EU levels;

— Secondly, the resources of the agencies both financial and human, and their internal organisation and efficiency; and

— Thirdly, the response of their clients to the services, regarding their willingness and ability to take them up, as described under Hypothesis 2.

These types of factors reflect three distinct but complementary strands of evaluation regarding the agency's services and their impact on the inclusion of clients.

Lack of targeted policies, fragmented funding with a limited time scale, inflexible rules of project management introduced by local/national authorities or the EC, bureaucracy, lack of efficiency by the authorities are some of the negative characteristics of the policy and funding environment that were reported to affect the quality of the agencies' output. Political and authority frames were reported as factors seriously limiting the agencies' capacity in Greece and Spain, while in Denmark and Germany the efficiency of the bureaucratic administration of services to immigrants were questioned.

Social inclusion policies for immigrants or rural communities suffering disadvantage cannot be separated from labour market policies and the necessary education and training for integration in the labour market. However, it seems that in most countries the relationship between labour market policies and lifelong learning policies for the target groups were not in harmony, leaving the lifelong learning and guidance providers to act as "mediators" between their clients' needs and a non-responsive, weak labour market (e.g. Poland). This is bound to create serious doubts among clients regarding the effectiveness of services, leading to their de-motivation and indifference. The Benefit System may also act as a de-motivator (e.g. UK), because the earnings from benefits, in countries with a strong welfare state, compare favourably with the low wages a weak labour market can offer, especially in rural areas. Development of small businesses has proved vitally important in rural regions and many Rural Development Agencies were seeking through lifelong learning to stimulate and rejuvenate business opportunities in rural areas.

A major issue raised in all countries referred to the project-based nature of service provision, instigated in most countries by the EC funding which is strictly structured in terms of time and measures/actions. Although EC funding has opened the door in many of the participating countries to large scale lifelong learning activities that would otherwise have been impossible to take place, it has at the same time introduced the model of "projects", with beginning and end, which do not guarantee the continuity of services in the long term. This affects in particular the agencies that serve vulnerable groups which have a slow response to lifelong learning and need a long time-horizon to capitulate the benefits of learning, such as the immigrants and disadvantaged rural communities.

The resources of the agency, both financial and human, represent the most important factors for sustaining the quality of services. More than money, the skills and qualifications of staff have been assessed by agencies across all countries as their most important resource, that needs to be developed,

sustained and expanded. Operation on the basis of projects does not help to build staff resources on a long-term basis. Besides, to achieve a "comprehensive service", which most agree that is the only effective way for a valid inclusion result, internal coordination as well as external cooperation with other agencies — government institutions or NGOs offering services to the same target groups — should be assured, and a closer contact between agencies and target groups should be established.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The recommendations below reflect and summarise the main points of the conclusions, as indicated by the results of the research, summarised under four basic headings:

The need for an integrated policy approach to social inclusion:

— Lifelong learning services for vulnerable groups should be part of an integrated policy that places lifelong learning at the centre of their overall needs for economic and social inclusion, comprising employment, health and social care, housing, social security, culture and education.

— Social inclusion policies, in the context of an integrated approach, should be harmonised with labour market policies, so that education and lifelong learning addressed to vulnerable groups can lead to employment.

— The above implies that skills training should be adjusted to the capacities, prior learning and employment history of the individual, as well as reflecting real employment possibilities.

Meeting the lifelong learning needs of the target groups:

— Needs assessment practices should be introduced at service provision level, extending beyond vocational and communication/language skills, to include a wide spectrum of vital aspects in the client's life, such as employment, housing, health, culture, education etc. Such an assessment would facilitate the implementation of the integrated policy, provided that a "comprehensive" provision would also be available to cater for the needs of the vulnerable person.

— The needs of individuals/groups need to be fully understood and provision should reflect these as well as meeting the policy targets regarding learning achievement, skills acquisition and social inclusion.

Overcoming the constraints that do not allow vulnerable groups to benefit from lifelong learning:

— More funding is necessary to improve accessibility of services, either through the improvement of transport for clients to access provision or for delivering agencies to take the provision to the clients. This is particularly important for disadvantaged rural communities.

— Limited accessibility of services due to social and cultural constraints should also be accounted for. This is particularly relevant to immigrants and related groups.

— Good information should be available, accessible to the target groups who may not have a high language competency or access to Information and Communications Technology.

— A lifelong learning culture should be introduced among the target groups, starting early in childhood in the family context, involving parents as partners for the education of their children. This is particularly important for immigrant families.

Ensuring the delivery of quality services by lifelong learning providers:

— To have a real impact on the inclusion of vulnerable groups, lifelong learning services should operate with a long term horizon; moreover, the necessary resources should be secured, so that service providers can build up their human resources and operating practices to the best advantage of their clients. Sustainability must be built in for good quality provision.

— Service providers should complement each other rather than be in competition, and cross-referral of clients between service providers should be smooth and coordinated.

— A reduction in bureaucracy increases the efficiency of the providers and saves time to be devoted to clients.

— Services should be delivered in a way that does not discriminate, are gender-sensitive and adjusted to the stage in the life cycle of clients.

— Guidance plays a vital part for promoting lifelong learning to vulnerable groups; it should start at the "reception" or "orientation" phase and continue through the life cycle of the client. Lifelong learning itineraries and action plans setting long-term individualised targets are useful tools making the client aware of the prospects and goals of lifelong learning for his or her personal development and integration in the wider community and the labour market. Existing skills and qualifications should be taken into account when defining

the next step of an individual lifelong learning itinerary. Language training for immigrants should form an initial part of their lifelong learning itineraries.

References

CEDEFOP, (2001), *Memorandum of Life-Long Learning Consultation: A Review of Member State & EEA Country Reports*, CEDEFOP, Thessaloniki.

CEDEFOP, (2003), *LLL: Citizens' Views*, CEDEFOP Series 4025, Luxembourg.

CEDEFOP, (2007), *Zooming in 2010: Reassessing Vocational Education & Training*, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Cohen, S., (1987), *Visions of Social Control*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Commission of the European Communities, (2003), *Joint Report on Social Inclusion Summarising the Results of the Examination of the NAPs for Social Inclusion (2003–2005)*, COM (2003) 773 final, 12.12.2003, Brussels.

Commission of the European Communities, (2005), *Joint Report on Social Protection & Social Inclusion*, SEC (2005) 69, 27.01.2005, Brussels.

Dennis I. and Guio, A., (2004), *Poverty & Social Exclusion in the EU*, Eurostat, Brussels.

Duffy, K., (1995), *Social exclusion and human dignity in Europe*, The Council of Europe.

European Commission, (2003), *Communication on Immigration, Integration & Employment*, COM (2003) 336, Brussels.

European Council, (2002), *Council Resolution of 27 June 2002 on Lifelong Learning*, Official Journal of the European Communities, Luxembourg.

Jenkins, A., Vignoles, A., Wolf, A. and Galindo-Rueda, F., (2002), *The Determinants & Effects of LLL*, Centre for the Economics of Education, London.

Lee, P. and Murie, A., (1999), *Literature Review of Social Exclusion*, The Scottish Office Central Research Unit, Edinburgh.

Lothian Anti Poverty Alliance, (2001), *Working Together to End Poverty*, Publications: SPIU Briefings, Briefing Sheet 13, April 2001.

OECD, (2006a), *From Immigration to Integration – Local Solutions to a Global Challenge*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

OECD, (2006b), *Where Immigrant Students Succeed – A Comparative Review of Performance & Engagement in PISA 2003*, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Philip, L. and Shucksmith, M., (2003), "Conceptualising Social Exclusion in Rural Areas", *European Planning Studies 11 (4)*, pp. 461–480.

PISA Report, (2000), *Knowledge and Skills for Life – First Results from the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment*, OECD, Paris.

Room, G., (1994), "Poverty Studies in the EU: Retrospect and Prospect", paper to conference on *"Understanding Social Exclusion: Lessons from Transnational Research Studies"*, Policy Studies Institute, London.

Shucksmith, M., (1994), "Conceptualising Post-industrial Rurality". In: J., Bryden, (eds.), *Towards Sustainable Rural Communities*, University of Guelph, Guelph.

Shucksmith, M., (2000), *Exclusive Countryside? Social Inclusion & Regeneration in Rural Areas*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

Shucksmith, M., (2004), "Young People & Social Exclusion in Rural Areas", *Sociologia Ruralis 44 (1)*, pp. 43–59.

Spencer, S., (2003), *The Challenges of Integration for the EU*, Greek Presidency Conference, Athens.

Vandenbrande, T., (2006), *Mobility in Europe: Analysis of the 2005 Eurobarometer Survey on Geographical & Labour Market Mobility*, EUR-OP 2006, Luxembourg.

Wessels, W. and Rometsch, D., (1996), *The EU & the Member States: Towards Institutional Fusion?*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

CEDEFOP 2006a

Annex

Table 1. The service provision outlook of the surveyed agencies

Type of service targeting immigrants	Spain		Greece		Denmark		Germany	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Counselling for employment/ entrepreneurship	15	75,0	27	64,3	0	0,0	17	34,0
Counselling for education/training	16	80,0	23	54,8	11	35,5	0	0,0
Psychological/social support/social integration activities	1	5,0	22	52,4	15	48,8	11	22,0
Legal Advice	1	10,0	16	38,1	0	0,0	1	2,0
Education/vocational training	15	75,0	25	59,5	18	58,1	30	60,0
Language training	16	80,0	28	66,7	27	87,1		
Information, awareness campaingns, conferences	0	0,0	40	9,5	2		11	22,0
Other: Co-development programmes, train the trainers courses, understanding the local society courses, gender issues	2	10,0	7	16,6	18	64,6	6	12,0
Total (questionnaires)	**20**		**42**		**31**		**50**	

Ciąg dalszy tab. 1

Type of services targeting rural communities	Hungary		Poland		UK	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Employment services and career guidance/ Counselling for education/training	31	65,9	56	88,9	5	9,6
Psychological/social support/legal activice	21	44,7	57	90,5	4	7,7
Education/training	33	70,2	54	85,7	20	38,5
Other: Youth service, social reintegration, information service	25	53,2	2	3,2	5	9,6
Support for development of rural communities	0	0,0	0	0,0	18	34,6
Total (questionnaires)	47		83		52	

Table 2. Aggregate scores based on rank ordering of needs

Greece	Spain
1. Employment (4,4)	1. Employment (5,6)
2. Housing (3,9)	2. Housing (4,2)
3. Health (3,8)	3. Health (4,1)
4. Initial education (3,0)	3. Initial education (2,5)
5. Lifelong learning (2,1)	5. Cultural Identity (2,4)
6. Cultural identity (1,9)	6. Lifelong learning (2,1)

Table 3. Incentives of clients to use the services of the agency

Incentives (immigrants)	Spain		Greece		Denmark		Germany	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Financial benefits	5	25,0	22	52,4	8	25,8	4	8,0
Education and training opportunities	11	55,0	29	69,1	22	71,0	25	50,0
Improvement of language skills	14	70,0	33	78,6				
Acquiring new job skills/job finding support	12	60,0	27	64,3	11	35,5	4	8,0
Develop social skills, improve social networks	12	60,0	27	64,3	15	48,4		
Psychological and social support	9	45,0	24	57,1	7	22,6		
Promotion at work					3	9,7	16	32,0
Childcare, help their children					5	16,1	2	4,00
Good access, meet familiar people					9	29,0		
Personal interest							10	20,0
Other: keep own culture, keep residence permit, attractive services, participation opportunities			6	16,7	1	3,2	9	18,0
Total (questionnaires)	20		42		31		50	

Incentives (rural communities)	Hungary		Poland	
	No	%	No	%
Financial			38	60,3
Education and training opportunities	30	63,8	52	82,5
Opportunity to increase their chances in the labour market	29	61,7	59	93,6
Promotion at work	10	21,3	6	9,5
Opportunity to help their children	12	25,5	7	11,1
Total (questionnaires)	47		63	

Table 4. Constraints of clients to use the services of the agency

Clients' constraints (immigrants)	Spain		Greece		Denmark		Germany	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Access/travel difficulties	8	40,0	7	16,7	8	25,8	8	16,0
Time	9	45,0	12	28,6	11	35,5		
Financial			7	16,7	9	29,0	3	6,0
Lack of motivation, interest	6	30,0	4	9,5	9	29,0		
Lack of information (of the providers, of the possibillities open to them)			4	9,5	10	32,2		
Bad guidance or lack of guidance, bureaucratic rules			2	4,8	7	22,6		
Poor use of host country's language			2	4,8				
Lack of legalisation documents	16	80,0	2	4,8				
Problems of cooperation with other agencies							5	10,0
Age, physical capacity							8	16,0
Too many participants with immigrant background					3	9,7		
Religious, cultural or family constraints					6	19,4		
Total (questionnaires)	**20**		**42**		**31**		**50**	

Clients' constraints (rural communities)	Hungary		Poland	
	No	%	No	%
Access/travel difficulties	20	42,6	45	71,4
Financial	21	44,7	33	52,4
Time	7	14,9	2	3,2
Lack of motivation, interest	29	61,7	51	80,9
Legal	12	25,5		
Total (questionnaires)	**47**		**63**	