



Executive summary of IO 3

—

Commitment studies on partnerships for Lifelong Learning (LLL)

in Germany, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, and Spain at a glimpse



Compiled 2017 by P4LLL-tec* Projectteam (Coordinator U. Hauschildt)
Bremen. 2017
www.p4llltec.uni-bremen.de



This work is licensed under a
Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

You are free to:

Share - copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format

Adapt - remix, transform, and build upon the material.

The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms.

Under the following terms:



Attribution — You must give **appropriate credit**, provide a link to the license, and **indicate if changes were made**. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.



NonCommercial — You may not use the material for **commercial purposes**.



ShareAlike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the **same license** as the original.

No additional restrictions — You may not apply legal terms or **technological measures** that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

Notices:

You do not have to comply with the license for elements of the material in the public domain or where your use is permitted by an applicable **exception or limitation**.

No warranties are given. The license may not give you all of the permissions necessary for your intended use. For example, other rights such as **publicity, privacy, or moral rights** may limit how you use the material.

Comparative synopsis of commitment studies

Participants: About 50% of the total sample (n= 896) were in the first year of training, a result that particularly refers to the group of German and Latvian sample. In Greece, almost 100% of students were in their first year of training and in Spain, the group consisted of nearly equal shares of learners in a first and in a second year of training. Due to small size of Irish sample no statistical interpretation possible.

Duration: Most of the learners were enrolled in programs with duration of 4 years. In Spain, about half of the sample belonged to a group of learners, trained at IMHs 2 year program, and the other half was in the four-year study program. In Germany – as a matter of fact, some learners were participating in traditional dual VET courses of 3 years or longer, others were participants of a double qualifying dual VET study program, which takes about 4 year in total. In Latvia, about two thirds of the sample was in a four-year program (281 of 400 learners), while the remaining third was composed of participants of a mix of programs lasting one, two or three years.

A central question of the survey was to find out about the major reasons to take up a certain study or training course. To this end, the questionnaire was structured in a way that this question could be answered free. Learners were asked to provide up to three major reasons to explain this decision. "Acquiring competence or skills/knowledge" was the major reason, followed by a "general interest" in the profession learnt. An analysis without the Latvian group (almost half of the sample) leads to a different picture: A very strong interest in the vocation/profession trained counts for a strong majority of the learners over all countries (without Latvia).

Our Latvian partner commented on this issue as follows:

"Most interesting was that learners choose VET because of skills gained not qualification or profession. It contrasted a lot with other countries. First we thought that is lack of carrier guidance or –maybe lack of concrete workplaces or willingness of learners to work in this concrete profession. But then we think that the in VET education comparing with academic education- learners gain more practical skills and that's a reason why they choose VET."

Highest degrees of occupational and organisational identity and commitment were found in Greece (applied science university degree program) as well as in the German dual study programs, but especially the programs offered at LEAG. In two cases (the Greek one and the German LEAG example), the P4LLL teams had evaluated these programs as cases of best practise (case study Greece and Germany), so that the analysis in this part of the survey also supports the previous findings.

Compared to other countries Latvian learners were often less motivated / committed to the vocation and also less to the training company compared to learners in other countries. Here, it is possible to argue, that this needs to be linked to the duration of training in a company (or in different companies). In Latvia, internships don't take any longer than 6 months – a period, probably too short to develop high degrees of commitment and identity. Moreover, there is no employer obligation to pay remunerations during the times of internship.