



## Executive summary of IO 4

—

Impact analyses of 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 company survey

The "impact analysis" of P4LLL-tec based on a company survey has reached 137 companies in the five participating countries. Due to different regional or country specific backgrounds, sizes and branches varied (sometimes considerably). Moreover the systemic background of the programs in question has differed a lot, so that all results and comparisons made in this part of the analysis have to consider this.

For example, in Greece and in Spain, companies were rather small or very small, in Germany, the feedbacks referred to much larger companies; the Irish sample represents a good mixture, but contained only half of the targeted group of 30 participants.

As for the type of training provided, basically three different forms (internships as part of a study program), apprenticeships and part-time apprenticeship training (as part of a dual study program) were evaluated where these were offered. Because training opportunities varied between the countries each country survey addressed a (different set of) training arrangements.

When asked about the relevance of the different kinds of programs in view of future employment opportunities, the answers were interesting, above all in those countries, where different training opportunities were provided. For example, in Germany, apprenticeships were still seen as the program of highest relevance compared to all other options - including double qualifying programs.

In the big majority of the cases, selection methods of candidates were in place, the most important ones being an evaluation of formal application documents resume and references. Recruitment tests or assessment centers were often only relevant in programs of longer duration (apprenticeship or dual study programs) and where assumingly an employer engagement would cover a greater financial budget. But in this case one also needs to consider factors like company size in order to understand why in some countries such methods were not so common.

Most of the arrangements between training providers and learners were based on a training contract, in some cases (notably in Latvia and Spain) also involving the theoretical training provider as a third partner. Employment opportunities were judged quite positively in general, also - to a considerable extent - within the training company itself. This finding however does not refer to the Greek survey, basically due to economic constraints but partly also due

to a lack of competence learners would have achieved by the end of a program.

The cooperation of learning venues was estimated with great difference between the participants in the five survey countries. Learning venue cooperation certainly needs to be looked at as a quality criterion of a training program. In Ireland, this cooperation has received highest marks, especially regarding the cooperation on training contents, the coordination of management structures and the match between theoretical and practical training. Internships, as offered for example in Latvia and in Greece were not only received average values, which points to some innovation potential in this regard.

In Spain, the analysis showed some difference between learning venue cooperation in apprenticeships and internships. According to the survey participants, the cooperation between learning venues functioned better in most domains, except for the cooperation on training contents that was better evaluated with regard to internships. Finally, the German sample only showed greater differences between internships on the one hand and apprenticeships or dual study programs on the other. All in all, the results were very good compared to the other samples. One aspect underlying this fact was the frequency of staff meetings between partners and the amount of common training projects conducted together.

Finally and when looking at the motivation of all learners, the degree of contentedness of the training providers seems to be relatively high. The patterns of answers lead to comparable results, the only difference being that in all aspects commented by the survey participants students enrolled in double qualifying programs received the highest marks. This information however is based on a sample with only one country providing information on this type of learning opportunity.