

TACKLING SOCIAL EXCLUSION

by Examining, Testing and Improving Service Quality

Table of contents

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 1. | Background | 2 |
| 2. | Zorgproject | 4 |
| 2.1. | Theoretical substantiation | 4 |
| 2.2. | Process evaluation | 5 |
| 2.3. | Evaluation of the results | 13 |
| 2.4. | Partial conclusion from the care project | 14 |
| 3. | Watch Out | 15 |
| 3.1. | Theoretical substantiation | 15 |
| 3.2. | Process Evaluation | 16 |
| 3.3. | Evaluation of the results | 22 |
| 3.4. | Interim conclusion from Watch Out | 25 |
| 4. | Nieuwe Instroom in de haven | 27 |
| 4.1. | Background | 27 |
| 4.2. | Results | 30 |
| 4.3. | Participants' perspective | 31 |
| 4.4. | Interim conclusion from Nieuwe Instroom in de haven | 34 |
| 5. | Conclusions | 36 |

Shantie Jagmohansingh



1. Background

In the context of the international TSE (Tackling Social Exclusion) project, the Municipality of Rotterdam has assigned three projects that are aimed at preventing and combating social exclusion, namely: Nieuwe Instroom in de Haven [New Influx in the Port], Watch Out and the Zorgproject [Care Project]. The Social Sciences Department has evaluated these projects in a commission by DAAD, the service point for employers that concentrates on the gap between supply and demand in the labour market. The TSE project has two partner towns: Southampton and Ghent. Projects aimed at limiting social exclusion have also been started in both of them. They will be evaluated by the partner towns and so fall outside this study report.

The study began in 2009 and was completed in September 2011. The evaluation had a two-fold purpose:

Professionalising DAAD's projects and organisation on the basis of the results of the study;

Exchanging knowledge with the TSE partners.

What the Rotterdam projects had in common was that they were aimed at candidates who were far removed from the labour market. They had no basic qualifications and no experience of work, which was often connected with other impediments, such as a poor social-economic situation and/or poor command of the language. The intention was to give them regular participation in work by means of a work learning process, a combination of working and following a training course, thereby reducing or preventing social exclusion.

Two measurements were used when monitoring the projects in order to classify the results for the evaluation. The projects started in September 2009 and the TSE project lasted two years. The measurement periods were determined depending on the project's progress.

The monitoring of the projects consisted of three parts:

- An analysis of the theoretical substantiation
- An evaluation of the process
- An evaluation of the results

The theoretical analysis was used to examine the underlying problem of the project, what choices had been made and why the project had added value and could be successful.

Descriptions of the three projects and notes on them were studied from July to December 2010 in order to arrive at answers to the following questions:

-
- What is the problem that is the foundation of the project?
 - What are the project's specific characteristics or key elements?
 - What other projects have been used as examples?
 - What theoretical insights have been used as inputs to the project description?
 - What are the major objectives of the project?
 - Are they based on theoretical or practical insights?
 - What is the added value of the projects?

It gradually became clear that the number of descriptions and notes for each project was fairly limited, so it was decided in addition to interview the project leaders in order to make the information comprehensive.

The second part of the study consisted of a project evaluation, which mapped out the way the intervention itself worked and its effect on the target group. A distinction was made within the process evaluation between the project workers and the participants, with the latter taking part in a customer satisfaction survey.

There were also interviews with project workers and the participants. The project worker interviews consisted of discussions with project leaders, key informants and people involved in the practical aspects, such as teachers, employers and supervisors. Topics covered in the discussions included the organisational context, the criteria for selecting participants, the quality of the participants, dropping out, project objectives and points for improvement.

The interviews with the participants covered their experience with the project to date and the projects' added value in terms of social inclusion.

The third part of the study was an evaluation of the results. As the term suggests, this involved project results. Had the project objectives been achieved and how much outflow had been realised? Had there been insight into the sustainability of the outflow?

Attempts were made to collect information for the following measurement indicators:

- The number of participants selected for the project
- The inflow of participants
- The number of dropouts and the reasons for them
- Background information about participants if possible (age, sex, etc.)
- Project outflow

The evaluation of the results consists of an analysis of the recording system of the projects and the data available from Social Affairs and Employment Rotterdam.

2. Zorgproject

2.1. Theoretical substantiation

The Zorgproject was started in 2007 by the managing director of Rijnmond Reintegratie BV, who saw an opportunity in the convergence of particular developments in the labour market. On the one hand, the care sector was struggling with a persistent shortage of personnel, and on the other hand it saw that there were enough single mothers who wanted to work in order to support their families but didn't know how to go about doing so because of a lack of qualifications and experience of working.

The start of the project was extremely practical. There was no project plan or anything similar as a basis, but there was a clear objective: participants were not just going to work at Rijnmond Reintegratie BV, but would go on to enter into an employment contract with an employee in the care sector. It was therefore envisaged from the start that all participants in the care sector would go on further in a sustainable manner.

At Rijnmond Reintegratie the participants signed an employment contract, were given guidance from a job coach, and went to work for one of the care facilities in Rotterdam. The intention was that after a year of good work, participants would go on to have regular jobs.

Participants in the project worked as household help, mainly with older people, all over the city. Work was carried out individually at each address. Several participants and project workers considered that the term 'household help' did not really describe the work adequately.

"You're much more than a cleaner, you're actually more of a carer. If you notice, for example, that people are beginning to suffer from dementia, you have to pass that on to various bodies. The position is described as household help, but it's much more than cleaning a house, which is something that's sometimes forgotten."

Because the project was aimed at single mothers who were looking after children, that group's needs were taken into account from the beginning.

The working day began after school has started, so that participants could take their children to school.

The working day ends at about the time the children come out of school. Participants had to arrange childcare themselves, including during school holidays.

Participants got a contract for 28 hours, which was enough to stay off benefits and at the same time to be able to combine their work and care. They actually worked for 24 of the 28 hours, with the remaining 4 hours being intended as travelling time (from one client to the next) and other job coaching support.

It turned out after a number of years that the majority of participants were women. There were few men in the scheme and it was difficult to place those that there were because the older people involved were somewhat nervous about them.

Participants started off with an interview at Rijnmond Reintegratie BV. Any impediments were examined at this stage, with financial impediments in the shape of debts often being involved at the start. The job coach looked at what help could be provided, for example by setting up a payment schedule or registering with the debt help service. There was regular contact with the job coach throughout the year, and they could act as a mediator if there were problems with a client or an employer, for example. There was also a final interview when the participant moved on from the project, a three-way meeting involving the job coach, the employee and the employer.

Before the work part of the process, some of the participants followed a training course that was provided by the care facility. Participants were first of all trained and then gained practical experience to see whether they understood the training properly. Attention was paid to a professional attitude, what working in the care sector meant, and what was expected of the participant. Topics such as confidentiality and maintaining clients' privacy, clients' lifestyles, observing and reporting, communication, dealing with stress and dissatisfaction, etc. were dealt with. If everything went well during the period of practical experience, the participants were placed in the neighbourhoods.

Participants with experience of work in the care sector did not have to follow the training course.

2.2. Process evaluation

2.2.1. Project organisation

Rijnmond Reintegratie BV has had about a hundred entrants a year since 2007, which has gradually become the objective. This number has fallen slightly recently because of:

-
- The economic crisis
 - Financial shortages in the care sector
 - The tardiness of the Municipality of Rotterdam in issuing care indications, which meant that the availability of vacancies fell behind

In general, Rijnmond Reintegratie BV was satisfied with the selection:

“They don’t always tell you everything, of course. People come in here sometimes and say: “I’m here because I have to be, otherwise my benefits will be cut.” That’s poor for motivation, but in general it’s very good.”

According to the respondents there were no problems in matching up with employers/commissioning parties. They say that this was thanks to the structured weekly contact between the employers and the job coaches.

“We have not yet had any organisations that want to withdraw from taking part. There are always participants who drop out, of course, for reasons of health or because the work doesn’t suit them, or they don’t like the work. It works well in most cases, and the employers tell us that as well.”

Participants who dropped out usually did so for medical reasons. Respondents told us that participants seldom left because they didn’t find the work pleasant. Participants were nevertheless not always suitable, some of them finding the individuality of the work to be very difficult.

“It can be hard work, which is why there are also contracts for 24 hours a week, because 40 hours a week can be too much. There are sometimes dropouts because of behavioural problems, persistent lateness, or problems with adapting, and you always have that sort of thing. People almost never drop out because they don’t like the work. In general they are very caring people who find this work satisfying.”

According to the Rijnmond Reintegratie BV respondents, this concept could work well in other towns, as long as a number of conditions are met. Proper supervision of the participants is important, as are short lines of communication within the organisation and with the employers.

“The main results are achieved primarily because this taps into a group of people who are usually ignored as a potential workforce.”

2.2.2 Employers

Participation in the project

Respondents gave the following reasons for their agreeing to participate in the project:

- Personnel shortages in the sector;
- The 5% rule: a municipal regulation concerning the involvement of local jobseekers in large-scale projects in home care;
- Social involvement.

One respondent expressed it as follows:

“As I understood it, it was in any case before the 5% rule and we thought it was right to take part – it’s good to give people on benefits a chance in this way. If you do it, you have to do it right, and that means a process such as the one we’ve outlined here. There are always shortages in care, so participation in this project was another way of getting people involved.”

All respondents were satisfied with the selection of the participants by Rijnmond Reintegratie BV. They mentioned that the participants had limitations such as a poor command of Dutch, limited education or experience of work, but they commented especially on the participants’ motivation and ambition.

“What is noticeable is that the participants are single mothers, and despite it being difficult to combine work and care they really do want to work, even if their incomes don’t increase by much as a result. Their motivation is nearly always good. It’s a job they have to work hard in, and a lot is asked of them. It’s not always pleasant, and involves household help for the elderly. It occasionally happens that it doesn’t involve the elderly, but in most cases it’s about older people who these days are encouraged to stay in their own homes as long as possible, and need household help and care as a result.”

It struck the respondents that many participants wanted to progress in the care sector, but the team leaders and teachers were realistic as far as ambitions were concerned.

“Many participants in the project ask: How can I learn more and move on? These women often want to get better jobs, higher up the social ladder. Of course I want them to progress, but years of experience have shown me how hard that is in combination with children, and that most participants do it when they’re on their own. I’ve seen it go wrong too often, no matter how enthusiastically the participants started off.”

Most participants were enthusiastic about working as household help for the elderly. If it didn't suit them, finding them something else to do in the participating organisations was very difficult. Participants could apply for jobs in the field of work they had been active in after a year has passed. Training was required for anything else, and if participants wanted to do that, they had to take and pass a pre-assessment in the same way as ordinary employees. How did participants in the care project perform in comparison with ordinary employees? According to the respondents, there was little difference in productivity, but there were issues with the participants more often.

“There is indeed a difference. One group consists of women who had children after they married, and now they have grown up feel the need to have a part-time job in addition to their husband's full-time work. That is quite a different point of view from that of the participants, who are often single mothers and therefore dependent on an income or benefits in order to maintain their family. I have noticed during the course that this has an effect on the things that are asked. They are a different sort of question. They are more often organising things and if they don't call Social Affairs and Employment in time that can have all sorts of consequences, leading to even more stress. It's therefore less stable, they are women who have more to lose compared with a housewife who decides to work for a few hours.”

This did not lead to resentment on the part of other colleagues, because the work was so individual. Fellow participants or other employees in household help were seldom encountered or spoken to, once or twice a year at most during team meetings.

2.2.3 Project participants

As has already been said, the participants' opinions were an important part of the evaluation. The meetings were used mainly to discover whether the project had contributed to reducing social exclusion. All the respondents were women, aged from 28 to 44 years old, coming from various ethnic backgrounds and often having had experience of working in the care or retail sectors. They were single parents or just single.

Reasons for participating in the project

Nearly all the respondents were referred to the project by their client manager because they were unable to find a normal permanent job. Most of them said they had felt no pressure in that respect, but there were a few exceptions.

“My client manager put me forward for the care project and I felt apprehensive about it. I didn't know how to sort that out with the childcare. I've got five children, so I thought it would be too expensive. I was fed up with sitting around at home, but I did get the impression that my client manager had thrown me in at the deep end. I didn't really feel I'd been supported.”

After registering for the course, participants had an introductory interview in which they were given information about their taking part in the project. They were also told at work about the tasks associated with the position. Most of the respondents were happy with this, and there were a number of participants who felt it happened very quickly:

“You went to the interview and could start the next day. That was good and bad at the same time, because your whole life changed completely in a single day. There was no chance to make a gradual change, and that was a considerable switch for people who used to sit at home all day long.”

Most of the participants stood out because of their motivation and work ethic. They said that they absolutely didn't want to be dependent on Social Services but wanted to earn their own money.

“I thought that depending on Social Services and being checked by them was awful. I want to earn my own money for as long as I'm healthy enough to do so.”

Training

The participants had to follow a training course or could get to work immediately, depending on their experience. Respondents who followed a training course found it useful, but a few were critical of the amount, intensity and speed, mainly because most of them had finished their education some time ago.

“The training at Rocare was five days long right away. We learned there how to clean and after two weeks were awarded a diploma. There was then three weeks of catering at Roteb, but I didn't think that was all that relevant. We got no travel expenses from Rocare or Roteb, and that was a pity. There was then two days at school every week for six weeks, one day at Zadkine and then one day with Roteb on the Schuttevaerstraat in Blijdorp, and then three days' work experience. Fortunately you got a season ticket for that. During the training we learned about getting on with clients at a personal level, professional confidentiality, first aid, nutrition and hygiene, as well as how to cope with people who are ill or aggressive.”

It was also noticeable in the interviews that the respondents stood out not just because of their work ethic but also because of their ambition to progress in the care sector. They also wanted to have more training.

“The work has been OK up to now, but there are enough times when I think: Is that it? Do I have to keep on doing this for the rest of my life? I don't want to do that, so I look at the opportunities for getting on, even though that's difficult without qualifications. People with diplomas get preference.”

Experience at work

Participants who already had experience in the care sector had differing opinions about their experiences in their work. There were satisfied responses:

“Performing domestic tasks for people at home is less comprehensive than my package of tasks in the care sector, but it fits in well with my experience of work.”

Others reacted negatively about working as household help compared with working in care.

“We worked more closely together in the care sector, you helped each other out if things got on top of you. I miss the mutual communication with colleagues. The work was more varied too. You're on your own in this work, which I think is a shame. Working as household help is actually quite lonely.”

Many respondents were proud of the work they did. They found it important that they could provide help for people who needed it.

“One of the best rewards in this work is the gratitude, especially from older clients. I've helped people who were totally isolated socially, who were too frightened to go shopping. At the end of the day it makes me feel good that I've been able to make a difference to those people's lives.”

“You're a carer, not a cleaner. That's often underrated, people often don't know that you're more than just a cleaner.”

A minority of the respondents were critical about the work. This had to do with the arduousness of the physical work, the undervaluation of the work and the amount of pay.

“You sometimes get little respect as household help. I do have pleasant clients, but there are also people who ask me to clean their windows in the freezing cold. That makes you feel underappreciated and treated without respect. They really treat me as the person who's come to do the dirty jobs.”

What cropped up many times is that participants didn't get a real break or lunch break, because breaks were reckoned as the travelling time to the next address.

A number of respondents said there was a lack of involvement and empathy on the part of the care facility for whom they worked. They regretted that the care facility always took the client's side if they had a complaint or were dissatisfied. On the other hand they did admit that the job coach took their side.

"They have no idea what happens with us. They have never come with us to see how arduous our work really is. They have desk jobs, drink coffee all day long and do their paperwork."

"My employer's attitude is: 'Do as you're told'. As a result I once stood ironing for three hours, including for children who were in their twenties. My job coach stepped in then. At least she does something for me."

The individual nature of the work meant that people could feel lonely doing it.

"I made good friends during the training, but it's a pity that I can't maintain those friendships, because you have absolutely no contact with your colleagues while you're working. The work is very individual, which means that you can't exchange experiences."

Another effect of the individual work was that participants sometimes didn't know how to cope with strange requests from clients.

"I once went to some people at their home and what I found there was a total mess. They expected me to clean everything up in three hours! What I would have liked to have done was to discuss an action plan with a colleague."

Income

Respondents thought they got too little money for the work they did. The pay was about the same as was paid in benefits.

"I work hard but only get as much as I would in benefits, 880 euros a month. It's difficult to make ends meet, especially with two children."

"I'm worse off financially as a result of my own contribution to childcare. That does feel strange sometimes."

Most respondents were nevertheless satisfied with the fact that they were then earning money themselves. They expected that their pay would increase in the future.

"It's not a problem at the moment. You have to start somewhere, and it's better than holding out your hand without doing anything for it

and without developing yourself. On the other hand, I hope that the financial situation will improve in the future when I have more experience and have finished my training. Financial independence is very important to me.”

Many respondents hoped to work for more hours in the future in order to earn more money.

Support

In the opinions about support we have made a distinction between the course (job coach), the work (team leader) and Social Affairs and Employment (client manager). In general the respondents were the most satisfied with their job coach.

“My job coach is great, she's always there for me. I get in touch with her three or four times a month, and I can always go to her.”

The respondents were generally satisfied with the support at work, even though, as has already been said, they felt there was a lack of involvement and empathy. They also regretted that they no longer had any say in selecting regular clients.

Reactions to Social Affairs and Employment vary.

“They try to keep you in your place. You have to do this work, there's nothing else, and you do have to eat, so you put up with it.”

It is noteworthy that two respondents were very positive about Werkende, their client manager.

“Because I found the switch from being unemployed to working to be huge, I was assigned Werkende as client manager. They're there to look after people who are going back to work. They're really fantastic, I'm so satisfied with them, they've done so much for me.”

Social inclusion/exclusion

Respondents were asked what the effect of taking part in this course was in the context of social inclusion. Many of them said that participation in the course mainly encouraged them to make plans for economic self-sufficiency, development, social contacts, improving their financial situation, improving their living situation, etc.

A number of noteworthy statements:

“One of the best things about this course is that my children can see and experience the fact that I'm working. That I can be an example to them in this way.”

“Participation in this course has helped me learn the Dutch language. The real world has been of much more help to me in this than

the lessons during the civil integration course. My social network is wider and I've learned more about the city I live and work in."

2.3. Evaluation of the results

The numerical results are presented for two different measurement periods. First there is a description of the characteristics of the target group, followed by the results.

Measurement period 1: June 2010 to 1 January 2011

- Selected for the course: 85
- Started the project: 49
- Sex: 100% female
- Age: 22 – 52 years old
- Ethnicity: 14 different ethnic groups
- Education: Pre-vocational secondary education (10%), 90% no diploma
- Composition of the family: 90% single mothers, 10% married / cohabiting or single without children
- Average period of receiving benefits: 6 months to 3 years, sometimes combined with temporary jobs
- Experience of work: mainly temping jobs, such as chambermaid, kitchen assistant, salesperson, catering employee
- Number of dropouts: 8

Measurement period 2: January 2011 to June 2011

- Selected for the project: 45
- Started the project: 30
- Sex: 100% female
- Age: 21 – 62 years old
- Ethnicity: 9 ethnic groups
- Educational level: general secondary education, secondary economic and administrative education, lower economic and administrative education, pre-vocational secondary education, secondary vocational education
- Composition of the family: 50% single mothers, 40% single without children, 10% married / cohabiting

-
- Duration of benefits: 6 months to 3 years, sometimes combined with temporary jobs
 - Experience of work: household help, chambermaid, secretary, cook, care and welfare
 - Dropouts: 14
 - Reasons for dropping out: pregnancy, inability to cope with the work psychologically, insufficient effort, no childcare, sick leave, illiteracy, left for unknown destination

2.4 . Partial conclusion from the care project

The care project is one of the rare projects that is intended to steer people coming under the Work and Social Assistance Act into a regular job. One of its strongest points is that practically all the participants who complete the project successfully go on to have a permanent job in the care sector.

The numerical objectives (100 participants a year) were not achieved during the measurement period, however, and taking the economic crisis into account the influx will in all probability continue to lag behind for a while. All the same, that is not a reason not to continue with the project. In general the project organisation, the employers, teachers and participants were positive (criticised points will be dealt with below under 'Lessons and points for improvement'). It is a project that has actually succeeded in guiding a group with undiscovered employment potential into the labour market.

As far as it can be studied, the outflow effects can be considered sustainable, because people coming out of the course get an employment contract with the commissioning parties if they have been working well. A further study after about a year is desirable in order to establish whether this is in fact the case.

Notable development:

The figures show that a large number of the participants in the second measurement period were single women without children.

Success factors

- Adapting to the motivation and needs of the target group, such as working hours, etc.;
- Good collaboration between various parties throughout the city;
- The job coach's support and mediation;
- Participants go on to regular jobs;
- Short lines of communication within organisation and with employers.

The interviews did of course reveal the necessary lessons and points for improvement, which are discussed below.

Lessons and points for improvement

Offer participants the opportunity to have a fixed contract with an income that is at least a little higher than the level of benefits;

- Offer proper support and organise work-related meetings a number of times a year. Working in the care sector is very individual, but many respondents feel the need to share their experiences with colleagues. There is a need for feedback meetings. Consultation meetings can be organised for people working in the same neighbourhood or district.
- The individual character of the work means that some participants find it difficult to cope with clients who are very demanding and/or seriously ill. For that reason it is important to train participants in communication skills and assertiveness;
- Some participants finished their education some time ago, so it can take a while before they get back into the rhythm of learning. Give them the time and space to do that.
- Clients tend to trust young employees less than older ones. Additional advice about clients can be useful here.
- Employees mainly issue 24-hour contracts, which is a pity because 28 hours are required in order to come out of benefits. It will perhaps be possible to negotiate this point with the care facilities.
- Applications from DAAD are qualitatively better than those from regular client managers. It pays therefore to work with specialist selection personnel.
- The reimbursement of travel expenses (to work and training) by the employer could be better, considering that participants only have limited incomes.

3. Watch Out

3.1. Theoretical substantiation

Analysis of the theoretical substantiation of the project makes it clear that only the Watch Out project is based solidly on experience with a previous project. It is a project by SDW that has been in operation since 2005 in the Municipality of Vlaardingen (a town in the Rijnmond Region). Based on this experience and positive results, SDW has set up and operated the project in several subdivisions of municipalities in Rotterdam since 2008. Watch Out offers young people who are unemployed or have no basic qualifications the

opportunity to follow a training for becoming a security officer, to get paid work experience and subsequently be supported in applying for a job in security. The project does not offer any guarantee of a job linked to good performance by the participant.

The project is a direct consequence of the Investment in Sustainable Work for Young People Act (Wet WIJ). According to this Act, every young person up to 27 years old who is receiving benefits should apply to start work or follow a training course. Municipalities are obliged to make these young persons an offer, and one of these is the Watch Out project.

It has various objectives:

- Offering young people a basic qualification and work experience for a job in security;
- Tackling the feeling of insecurity that residents have in certain districts in Rotterdam by bringing in participants in Watch Out.
- Contributing to the cleanliness, integrity and security objectives within the districts of Rotterdam.

Participants in the project are busy for 32 hours a week: three or four days as supervisor in a district and one day in the week at school. The young people do their work experience in the districts of the participating subdivisions of the municipality in Rotterdam, where they keep an eye on the streets, the shopping centres, doorways, storage passages and playgrounds.

3.2. Process evaluation

3.2.1. Project organisation – employers and teachers

Watch Out collaborates with a number of security companies (employers in the project). A number of employers who had been taking part in Watch out for years as security companies were selected for the interviews. The motivation for taking part in Watch Out can be summarised as follows:

- Social involvement: offering opportunities to young people who deserve a chance or a second chance;
- An economical way of recruiting personnel outside the usual recruitment channels;
- Labour cost subsidy;
- Good support from Enter Werk;
- More and more job hoppers in the security sector, with the result that taking participants on for a longer period is attractive.

Respondents said about this:

“It’s becoming increasingly difficult to get personnel. There are more and more job hoppers, people who leave after a couple of months because they can earn more somewhere else. This often happens just at the moment you’ve made quite an investment in them. It was really bad a while ago, when the demand was much greater than the supply.”

The respondents were satisfied with the quality of the participants and ascribed this largely to the support from Enter Werk.

“The quality is good, and of the people I’ve taken on through Enter Werk, one left at our request and one of his own accord. That’s quite reasonable, isn’t it?”

The instructors did notice certain differences. They described the participants as a special group with certain impediments. According to one respondent, there was a question of group behaviour, which disappeared whenever the respondents were spoken to individually. It then appeared that the participants were indeed motivated. It was also noticeable that many participants had to become self-reliant at an early age and therefore didn’t get to develop themselves enough.

Based on the project and the training, the instructors tried to use the power of the city to make the young people as attractive as possible on the labour market.

“Rotterdam is famous for its port, so in addition to the normal training I give my students from Rotterdam and the surrounding area the opportunity to be trained as a port security officer. This means that they get not only a basic qualification but also that little bit extra, making them more employable. It’s just a question of working with demand and supply and the power of a city.”

3.2.2 Participants

The respondents consisted of ten participants in Watch Out. Their ages ranged from 19 to 27, with two being women and the other eight men. They came from various ethnic backgrounds: indigenous, Turkish, Moroccan, Pakistani, Antillean and Surinamese. Three of the respondents lived at home with their parents, two lived alone, one participant was cohabiting, two were cohabiting and had a child, and the last was married with a child.

Reasons for participation

Most of the respondents came via the Jongerenloket [young people’s helpdesk] or applied on their own initiative after friends told them about the

course. For most young people, participation in Watch Out means that they have grasped a second or third opportunity with both hands, because it gives them a chance to obtain a diploma and to gain work experience. The respondents also said that they didn't feel they were under pressure when taking part and were satisfied with the amount of information during the introductory meeting and the intake interview. Most of them were told immediately after the intake interview that they were suitable for participation in the course.

What attracted the respondents about the work varied. Some said they were already interested in the sector as a result of having family or friends working with the civil or military police. Many others said it was mainly the combination of work and training that was the deciding factor. Working actively outdoors and not sitting behind a desk all day was also mentioned.

"I find a job in security attractive because it's so different from the retail industry. You're outdoors, you don't have to sell people anything and you're doing something useful for the district. I'm not a 9-to-5 person, I don't like monotony."

"It's good to be in contact with people, you can really mean something. They also talked about hospitality or construction at the UWV [Employee Insurance Agency], but I deliberately chose Watch Out."

Training

The participants had one day's training a week. Lessons were given in the classic way and there were about twenty people in each group. It was some time since most of the participants had been to school.

"The school desks certainly took some getting used to. You had to get up early again and do homework. But it was a pleasant experience, I learned a lot of things about legal concepts. The students in the group were very different as far as age, class and background were concerned."

All respondents were satisfied with the combination of training and work.

"The combination of training and work is pleasant and good to do. And you get a diploma so quickly!"

"Once you get to a certain age you don't want to go to school any more, you want to work, earn money and so build something up."

One respondent had a critical comment about the size of the groups:

"I'm satisfied with the training and found the subject matter accessible. I do think there were too many participants in a group, which meant that that it was more difficult for the ones with a language deficiency to get enough attention."

Experiences at work

The respondents spoke enthusiastically and at length about their experiences on the streets. None of them was unhappy about the work they did. There are young people who consciously choose to work in the district where they live, but most would rather not do so.

“You learn the most in practice. That way you really get to know life on the streets, the shopkeepers, the customers, the young people. I do the rounds in Zuid, oud-Charlois and Pendrecht. I don't live in the district where I work, I'd rather not do that, I don't want people from my own area treating me differently. I notice that my uniform gives me authority on the street. We are often confused with the police or the Stadstoezicht.”

It has also become clear that using these young people is a clever move. Young people who cause problems listen more readily to other young people, according to the respondents. Some participants have the advantage that they can make use of their knowledge of the street.

“I used to be a kid that hung around, so I know more quickly who's really annoying and who isn't. Most kids just stand in front of their parents' door, which I think indigenous or older police realise less easily.”

The respondents also made a number of comments:

“Thanks to my image I usually have authority on the street, but I also find that my appearance combined with the colour of my skin can lead to other young people challenging me. Are you a bootlicker or aren't you?”

A number of young people also said that security problems can play a part in the way they do or don't act:

“Sometimes you come across things on the street that you don't know how to deal with in the best way, because we're still in training. I pay close attention to my own safety, I can't just accost someone because I don't have as much authority as the police, I don't have any weapons or so. There was no training in physical self-defence or combat sport during the course, even for the female security officers at work.”

Opinions about the irregular working hours and weekend shifts were divided.

“Starting in the afternoon is not a problem in itself, but not seeing my child after school and before bedtime is not so good.”

Going on to a permanent job

The intention is that participants apply for a permanent job in security after the course. They get assistance in this during the course (assistance and help

in drawing up a letter and a CV). Some get an opportunity of working with the local council (Stadstoezicht). Ambitions differ.

“Going on to have a job in the Stadstoezicht seems good to me, but I'd really like to work in the military police.”

“I hope through Watch Out to specialise in building security and to end up in an arrest team.”

“Working as a security officer in the port is also a possibility. I also did the additional training straight away.”

“I'm now a supervisor and I see opportunities for advancement in the security sector. Most of all I would like to be a store security officer.”

Many participants complained about the limited opportunities for going on to have a regular job after the course. Watch Out has never given a guarantee of a job.

“One disadvantage of the course is that there is no guarantee of a job. That means it's an investment in yourself, but with an uncertain result. I've already seen a number of participants leave without a job. I think that's a point for improvement.”

The trainer and the respondents try to work with this by making intelligent use of the opportunities in the city.

“I'm also doing the training for port security officer. Our trainer is the only one who offers this in addition to the security officer training. My teacher sees it as a golden opportunity, as then we not only have a basic qualification but we are also very attractive for the port.”

Income

The respondents were happy with the opportunity to follow a training course via the process without having to pay anything for it. They were not entirely satisfied with the level of income, because in principle that was the same as a minimum income.

“I'm pleased that everything is paid for, the training and the uniform, but you're paid only the minimum wage for the contract. That could well be a bit more for the work you do, it's not stacking shelves at Albert Heijn.”

“The pay is a bit tight, I now see it as an investment, but after this year I'd have to be mad to continue working for that amount.”

“I'm worse off financially after taking part in this course. I earned about 1300-1400 euros in the retail sector and now I earn minimum pay of 1016 euros. I just had to swallow that.”

Support

The participants are supported in their work by a team leader and a job coach. The team leader provides the day-to-day support of the participants, the hour-by-hour direction. They are also responsible for achieving the participants' training objectives as far as the practical part is concerned. The job coach is on site every week, and there is an individual meeting every month. A foreman is appointed from among the participants in each group. The teacher at the work is also a contact person.

“The support is great, I'd give it 7 out of 10, in other words more than satisfactory.”

The young people on the course have little contact with the Jongerenloket at Social Affairs and Employment, so little can be said about it.

Social inclusion/exclusion

It is noticeable that a number of male participants said that they had become more mature as a result of taking part in the course. They have created a daily routine and are making plans for the future. Some are also aware that they are an example to others. It can therefore be said that this project is contributing to social inclusion by getting the young people going again.

“One of the greatest benefits of participating in this process is that I have finally got some structure. I have fixed daily routine at last. There were no limitations to this. I used to sleep until four in the afternoon, was then grouchy and had a headache. Time passed so slowly then. Now it flies by. I enjoy my work, I've become mature. I've also made a lot of social contacts.”

“Before I took part in this course I was one of the street kids. I didn't cause trouble but knew that I was seen as a possible problem kid because so many others my age were. Now I'm the youngster in a uniform and a role model for the kids on the street. I have the advantage that I can use my knowledge of the street. I can decide easily if someone is a troublemaker or is just hanging about on the street. The disadvantage of my appearance and knowledge of the street is that some of the kids try to test me. They want to see if I'm a security officer who really means it or not. You have to know how to deal with that in an intelligent way.”

3.3. Evaluation of the results

The recording systems in Watch Out make it possible to describe the participants in the Watch project in table format. It involves the participants from April 2010 to April 2011, in all a group of 93 participants.

Table 1: Gender in Watch Out

| Gender | % |
|---------------|-------------|
| Male | 85% |
| Female | 15% |
| Total | 100% |

The majority of the participants in the Watch Out project were male, which considering the sector in which the project was running is not surprising. 15% of the participants were female.

Table 2: Ages in Watch Out

| Age | % |
|--------------|-------------|
| < 20 | 22% |
| 21 - 25 | 52% |
| 26 - 30 | 15% |
| 31 - 35 | 4% |
| 36 - 40 | 3% |
| > 41 | 4% |
| Total | 100% |

More than half the participants were between 21 and 25 years old. Just over one fifth were younger than 21 and 15% were between 26 and 30 years old. 11% of the participants were over 31, and the oldest person in Watch out was 50 years old.

Table 3: Basic qualifications in Watch Out

| Basic qualifications | % |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Yes | 27% |
| No | 73% |
| Total | 100% |

A little over a quarter of the participants had a basic qualification at the beginning of the project. That was unexpected, because the project was actually aimed at young people without a basic qualification.

Table 4: Results of Watch Out training course

| Security Officer Diploma 2 | % |
|--|-------------|
| Passed | 43% |
| Still on the course | 41% |
| End of general education not (yet) reached | 9% |
| Stopped | 3% |
| Never started | 3% |
| Dismissed | 1% |
| Total | 100% |

More than 40% of the participants were awarded the diploma. It is not clear whether the objective of 60% was achieved, however, because 41% were still following the training at the time the measurement was made. Reasons for stopping the training: level too high (1%), found another job (3%), dismissal (1%), or moving to another municipality (21%).

Table 5: SDW Watch Out

| No longer working at SDW | % |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Yes | 58% |
| No | 42% |
| Total | 100% |

More than half the participants have finished the course and are no longer working at the SDW [service work department].

The following table shows the results of Watch Out. The table shows the Watch Out details linked to the files of Social Affairs and Employment in order to show how many of the participants who moved on are back on benefits.

Table 9: Watch Out results

| | No longer working at SDW | % | Still working at SDW | % | Total | % |
|--|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| Not (yet) started training | 3 | | 0 | | 3 | |
| Started training | 48 | 100% | 42 | 100% | 90 | 100% |
| Passed | 33 | 69% | 7 | 17% | 40 | 44% |
| Still busy | 3 | 6% | 35 | 83% | 38 | 42% |
| End of general education not (yet) reached | 8 | 17% | 0 | | 8 | 9% |
| Stopped in the meantime | 4 | 8% | 0 | | 4 | 4% |
| Total | 51 | | 42 | | 93 | |

Table 10: Back on benefits again after April 2011

| | No longer working at SDW | % | Still working at SDW | % | Total | % |
|--|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| Known to benefits office | 5 | 10% | 5 | 12% | 10 | 11% |
| Already stopped after starting general education | | | 4 | 10% | 4 | 4% |
| Already stopped | 1 | 2% | | | 1 | 1% |
| Still on benefits | 4 | 8% | 1 | 2% | 5 | 5% |

The Social Affairs and Employment details for April '11 are linked to the Watch Out file. This shows that 10 people are back on benefits, five of whom are still in the process at the SDW. Asking the organisers revealed that four of them

are no longer on benefits, having got a contract with SDW after a preliminary course with retention of benefits. The one still on benefits has had a contract since 1-9-2011, according to the SDW.

Of the five others on benefits after the end of the course, one stopped after a month. This means that four of the participants out of the 51 who moved on are on benefits again, a dropout figure of 8%.

3.4. Interim conclusion from Watch Out

There are various angles of approach to drawing conclusions from the Watch Out project. If we look at the numerical results, we see that Watch Out performed well as far as the number of training courses taken by the participants was concerned. Good results are also seen if we look at the objective of getting young people to move on sustainably after the course. Only 8% of them were back on benefits a couple of months after the course ended. To be able to say something accurate about the sustainability of the outflow, the figures will have to be examined again after six months, however.

The point is still that there are no guaranteed jobs in connection with the Watch Out project. This makes the outcome of taking part in the course uncertain for participants, even if their results are good. Other points from the project are its strengths and weaknesses, the collaboration and the co-financing. The project will continue only if there is agreement from every link in a long chain. If a couple of them should fail, then the whole enterprise will collapse. It is probably advisable for the future not just to stay in a single sector, in this case security, but to use the structure and working methods that have already been set up more widely in other sectors. This could increase the stability of the project.

If we look at other factors, we can see that the Watch Out project has performed well in increasing young people's social inclusion. Participation in the project meant that young people who had appeared to have partly lost faith in themselves were got moving again. They have begun to develop self-confidence, are making plans for the future and want to be economically independent again.

Success factors

Companies in the security sector have come into contact with a workforce they would otherwise never have noticed. They suddenly want to work with a target group whose CVs would have been at the bottom of the pile at first.

- Young people have got an opportunity or a second one to follow a training course and to do paid work experience

-
- Well-structured collaboration
 - Connection with the neighbourhood
 - Making use of young people's knowledge
 - Using the city's supply and demand, plus its power
 - Young people are actually got moving: they have become more mature and have developed more ambitions for participation in the project

Points for improvement:

Consider giving training courses in physical self-defence or combat sport, bearing especially the female security officers in mind. Participants don't have as much authority or powers as the police (no weapons and so forth), but if things go wrong on the street they have to have something to fall back on.

Many respondents said that it was friends who told them about the Watch Out project. In the light of that it could be useful to work on increasing awareness of the project by other means.

One of the strengths of Watch Out is the collaboration and co-financing, but at the same time it is also a weakness. It would be a good idea in the future not to restrict it to the security sector alone, but to expand the project into other sectors as well.

- Ensure there are enough uniforms for each participant, considering they are compulsory dress at work as well as during training.
- Pay enough attention during training to people with a language deficiency.
- Various employees have said that the procedure concerning labour cost subsidies could be made clearer and more comprehensible.

Lessons for expanding the project:

This is the only project without the guarantee of a job. To compensate for this, participants who move on get support when applying for jobs and attempts are made to use the city's strengths to make them more attractive as employees. In the case of Watch Out: train the participant to be not just an ordinary security officer, but broaden the training to include becoming a port security officer.

- Make use of the 'knowledge of the street' that the young people bring with them;

-
- Make use of the fact that young people take things on board more readily from their peers (rather than from older security officers who are not so streetwise).

This project depends on collaboration and co-financing by other parties. Conclude clear agreements about this, otherwise the project will be vulnerable in times of economic crisis.

4. Nieuwe Instroom in de haven

4.1. Background

There was a long history preceding the start of the Nieuwe Instroom in de Haven [New influx in the port] project, formerly known as Revit, in which the changes in the nature of the work in the port and the development of the composition of the workforce played an important part. Those developments are outlined in the first part of this section.

Large numbers of workers were required in the port before 1980, as general cargo was still being brought in by ships. Unloading this required a large workforce. It often used to be the case in Rotterdam that entire generations plus friends and acquaintances worked in the port. The changeover to containers and other computerisation happened quite quickly, and where there once used to be 23 men working around a crane, only 1.5 were needed instead. Nevertheless there were no redundancies, thanks to the efforts of the powerful trades unions. The consequence was that at one point there were too many port workers.

All the same, the demand for port workers has increased again in recent years. There are two reasons for this:

A considerable number of port workers will soon reach pensionable age, which will create employment opportunities.

Computerisation has created a demand for a different type of worker. The port now resembles a collection of ghost terminals. Everything is computerised (for example the vehicles that move around without a driver on board). The only workforce needed now is just stevedores, whose job is to stack containers as though they were Lego blocks.

Responses to the demand for port employees are not the same as they used to be. One of the main reasons for this is that the port is constantly moving further away from the town (forty kilometres from the centre of Rotterdam), which has made it a separate area that is difficult to reach. This increased distance means that working in the port is not an immediately obvious choice for many young people.

The Nieuwe Instroom in de Haven project was set up with the aim of bringing more employees to work in the port. The objective of creating more diversity in the workforce came about gradually after the realisation that the port as a blank canvas by no means reflected the town. The fact that the change came about was initially a side effect, because after all the majority of the young people in Rotterdam are not indigenous. This changed to a separate objective at one point, however.

Key figures from the port and Werkstad set up the initial version of the project in 2004. The plans met with resistance at first, but the project did get off the ground because it had the support of key people. It was decided at the time that young people (at the time young people receiving benefits) would work for their benefits for six months as supernumeraries. They were therefore taken on as additional personnel, so that nobody would be displaced. They would go to school for one day and work for four. Instructors were then appointed, because learning social skills in the workplace was part of the course. At the end of the course, participants who had performed well could go on to have a permanent appointment in the port.

The set-up of the project has changed a few times over the years, partly because of amendments to legislation and regulations. The project is intended to guide young people towards permanent employment in the port, with a diploma. They follow a course at the Scheepvaart en Transport College [Shipping and Transport College] that trains them to be an operational employee. The school day is paid for by the employer¹, which means that there are strict conditions attached. Participants are considered to be absent if they are late or do not attend.

The type of work varies, and different requirements are imposed for the various positions. Stevedores must most of all be strong. Education is less important, but participants must be able to write and speak Dutch. There are also participants who are trained to be operational employees, crane radiomen on board ship or crane drivers.

Selection and support

The first step for project employees is mobilising the companies. First of all they look at how many places are available, and that isn't always easy.

Selection of the participants then takes place. The requirements the participants must satisfy are:

- Not more than 27 years old (there are exceptions to this);

¹ Employers could be partly subsidised in this, but the arrangement has recently been stopped.

-
- Participants must not have police or criminal records, a requirement that is difficult to enforce in practice. A sharp lookout for drugs and terrorism is kept in the port. If someone has a criminal record, they are always asked for the reason. There are sometimes instances of doubt, in which case a certificate of good character is applied for. If this is refused, the members of the project and the participants can lodge an appeal.
 - Be in good physical condition.
 - Be able to write and speak Dutch.

Another selection criterion is the participants' resilience. The people running the project employ an unorthodox way of interviewing for this, in which personal and direct questions are asked. There is a tough culture in the port, and according to the respondents there is also discrimination. Participants, most of who are not of indigenous origin, therefore need to be thick-skinned.

As was said earlier, being of indigenous origin has never been an official criterion. It was a coincidence that participants so often turned out to be non-indigenous, as a result of which the subsidiary aim of more diversity became one of the main objectives. Participants from the neighbouring municipalities in the Rijnmond region are mainly indigenous.

Nevertheless, the project was not always equally popular everywhere among the port workers, in particular because of the diversity of the participants. In the end the project was so burdened by this that the name Revit was changed to Nieuwe Instroom in de Haven.

According to the respondents, the following three factors make the port attractive for participants:

- The level of pay;
- Diploma not required;
- A tough man's world where physical strength still counts.

Income

Participants in this project can get considerable pay rises, the longer they work. The amount of income depends on the port company for which the participant works. During the initial period the participants work only for pay at benefit level, but that increases quickly if they perform well. In general, pay increases considerably after the age of 23. What also determine the amount of pay are the supplements for evening and weekend work or working five shifts. These can be up to 30% for some companies in the port. As a result the incomes of participants who have moved on are clearly higher compared with the other two TSE projects.

Further description of the target group

Practically all the participants in this project are male, but occasionally there are female participants. Respondents say that the latter often take a desk job after a year. A number have also become instructors. A small group of women are working successfully as port employees.

As was stated earlier, the composition of the group of participants varies widely. Respondents notice that in general there is a difference between indigenous and non-indigenous participants when it comes to obstacles. If indigenous workers have a problem, it is often related to problems at home in the family, inappropriate behaviour or a reduced work ethic. Some of these young people are seen by their families or neighbours as losers because they have jobs. The problems of non-indigenous young people arise mainly from culture clashes or disadvantages as a result of an immigration background.

Recent developments

The working methods of a number of companies have changed since September 2011, with young people increasingly being taken on straight from school. They get a paid job straight away, instead of working for four months for their benefits. The internship/probationary period lapses as a result.

It is expected that in the future certain work opportunities in the port will be reduced because of increasing computerisation. Employment will also move to Maasvlakte 2. Employees will therefore be taken on less readily on a permanent basis because of this. There will be a lot more hired labour and temporary work.

4.2. Results

Results January – December 2010

| | |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Selected | 74 |
| Started | 61 |
| Started with internship | 8 |
| Started with contract | 53 |
| Dropped out | 13 |
| Total | 183 |

Results January 2011 – December 2011

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| Selected | 210 |
| Started | 189 |
| Started immediately with contract | 157 |
| Dropped out | 15 |
| Total | 174 |

Characteristics of participants:

- Sex: 100% male
- Age: 18 to 26 years old
- Ethnicity: various
- In general there is an outflow figure of 70%.

The respondents say that there are relatively few dropouts. These are almost never because of the work itself but nearly always down to behaviour. Most dropouts occur in the first three months.

4.3. Participants' perspective

The respondents who took part in the interviews were all male and between nineteen and twenty-two years old. They had all started a training course in the past, but didn't complete it because of circumstances. They also have work experience. The respondents came from various backgrounds: indigenous, Surinamese, Hindustani and Antillean origins. Some live alone and others are still at home with their parents. They are all single. All the respondents use scheduled transport to travel to the port.

Reasons for participation

The respondents found about the project in the port via the Jongerenloket or from friends and acquaintances. For many of them it was the first time they had given serious consideration to working in the sector.

“Up to the end of 2009 I was doing ICT Level 3 training, but it didn't appeal to me. I found out about the Revit project through the Jongerenloket. I came along to the application project with a friend. When he got there I took the plunge and asked if I could take part as well, and that's what happened.”

Training and experience at work

The courses in the port can vary, depending on the port company with which the participant is taking the course.

“I came here via the Jongerenloket and heard about the Revit project. I had an intake interview with the selectors and then started an extensive 4 months' internship. I'm very satisfied with that because in this way I've got to know the ins and outs of the port, including customs, management and first aid. I've now been here for six months and am really enjoying it, only there's not yet been any discussion about a contract. I wish I'd discovered this earlier, as I'd have started earlier, even when I was 16, like a couple of others in my class.”

A key figure from the organisation reacted as follows after the meeting:

“It's very nice that he says that. It's great that he enjoys it so much, but what is regrettable is that if he'd applied when he was 16, he'd probably not have been taken on. Most bosses in the port companies still prefer to put an application with a non-Dutch name on it on one side.”

Respondents who work for other port companies stand a chance of getting a permanent contract more quickly:

“I followed a two-week training course and got a contract for a year. I now go to school (Waalhaven) once a week and am taking a training course to become a port worker (Level 2) and I work on the other four days. I got a one-year contract on 1 October 2010.”

Participants have various occupations in the port, such as crane radioman on board ship, operational employee, or stevedore. The last one requires physical strength. Most respondents have had to get used to the varying working hours. The work can also be physically arduous.

“I work as a crane radioman on board ship. Two-thirds of the job consists of checking. You are, as it were, the eyes of the crane. I do the C shift, which means that I work in alternating day and night shifts.”

“I work five shifts as a stevedore, alternating between day and night shifts. I find the changeover to be awkward now and then. The work is also physically arduous, you stand there working in the wind and rain, even in -10 degrees at night. A cup of coffee now and then is practically a luxury. It took a lot of getting used to, because the ICT training was all indoors with the heating on.”

The training is easy to follow for most of the respondents, and the combination of work and learning is appreciated.

“I now work for four days and go to school for one day. I'm training to be a Level 2 port employee. That's quite easy for me, because I'd previously done Level 3 training. I'm in a class of 30, all of them from ECT, and 8 of them are in Revit.”

“I'm happy with the combination of work and training, because sitting at a school desk for the entire week doesn't appeal to me.”

A few respondents mentioned the tough culture in the port, where discrimination seems to be part of the working day.

“The culture in the port can be tough and there certainly is discrimination, especially by the older Rotterdammers. Because of their age they work a bit more slowly than the youngsters. You have to try to get on with them peaceably, make sure you don't cause an argument, and then it's OK, but it's far from being pleasant.”

Going on to a permanent job

Respondents are positive about their opportunities in the port:

“There is an assessment and an interview after a year, and I find out then whether I can do the level three training in my second year. I'm optimistic: More than 5000 'old Rotterdammers' will be retiring from the port in 2013 and the second Maasvlakte will be ready then.”

The respondents are critical about the reduced numbers going on to have fixed contracts. More and more work in the port is being carried out on a project basis. A number of respondents from a certain port company said they thought it was a shame they couldn't follow a training course for Level 3 if they'd successfully completed Level 2.

“I assume I can stay after this year, but on a project basis. Almost no permanent contracts are being offered, which makes me sick. What's more, you can't go on at Maattrans to follow a training course at Level 3 either, as you can at ECT.”

Income

One of the plus points about working in the port, according to key informants, is the level of pay.

“My income is an enormous step forward compared with my previous situation, because at first I had absolutely nothing, with bills coming in all the time.”

“I'm very satisfied with my income, it's twice as much as benefits.”

Support

It was noteworthy that none of the respondents had much to say about the support. In general they were positive about it.

“Yes, I can't say anything about the support other than it's good. I can always go to my foreman.”

Social inclusion/exclusion

The respondents from the project organisation as well as the participants made various comments about this. The following quotes show the range of opinion about this topic.

Project organisation and teachers

“The interviews are often surprising, because there is often lots of potential there. There are many good people there who have just missed something in their upbringing and often can't do anything about it. And if their IQ isn't all that high either, then they have to have what it takes in order to get on the right track straight away. There are people who lived in a street where absolutely everyone was on benefits. So when the youngsters got up very early for six months to work for their benefits or their work experience, they were told they were crazy. But at a certain moment the same youngsters got a contract, their pay increased, they could buy a car and at some point a house, so they grew out of the street. That had a snowball effect on the other young people in the neighbourhood.”

“Many people say ‘We don't want to’, but it's more that they have no idea how they ought to go about it. There are also people who for generation after generation haven't seen how work should fit in with their daily lives.”

Participants

“Because my income has doubled compared with my situation before the course, I feel more mature and am making plans for the longer term. Once I've saved enough, I want to buy a car so that I can drive to the port myself. At the moment I take a special bus to the port. I also have the feeling that I'm doing something useful with my day.”

4.4. Interim conclusion from Nieuwe Instroom in de haven

As far as the primary major objective is concerned, the progression of young people without a basic qualification towards a permanent job with completed training, Nieuwe Instroom in de Haven has performed well. Not only have nearly all the participants who started on the project gone on to take permanent jobs in the port, the participants have also made considerable progress in their pay. The increase in income enables the participants to have greater ambitions, such as living independently and getting a car.

The Nieuwe Instroom in de Haven project, like the others, depends on the economy, which determines the influx of candidates and their going on to have a permanent job. One disadvantage of the present system is that

participants are increasingly being taken on on a project basis. This is for higher pay, it's true, but it's nevertheless on an uncertain project basis.

Success factors:

Working directly with the supply and demand in the labour market

Guaranteed job and opportunity to follow a training course

Successfully following the course means a considerable increase in pay for some of the participants

Tapping into a large group of workers that was previously difficult to employ

Points for improvement:

Invest in driving licences for the participants. This is more important than it used to be because of the increasing distance between the town and the port. A driving licence also leads to the participants having more independence. They can also use carpooling, which in turn is good for team building and thereby also good for countering dropping out.

It isn't possible for all young people to go on to a training course for Level Three, but it is advisable however to encourage them in order to keep on increasing their chances in the labour market.

Not all the participants in the project can expect to receive pay that is higher than the standard benefits, but aiming for it is good for young peoples' motivation and increasing their social inclusion.

Lessons for possible expansion:

Aftercare by a job coach at the work location contributes to successful placement and going on to having and keeping a permanent job, so invest in that.

Some participants have to make an effort to keep up with the speed of the training, whereas they are indeed suitable for employment in the port. This can be helped by increasing the training period for this group somewhat, so they have more time to study the lesson material.

Prepare young people for the tough culture in the port, where they might encounter discrimination.

Working with weekly schedules: Participants often say that it's sometimes impractical to have to call the planners every day themselves to find out how and where they will be working that day. This can involve long waiting times, because all employees have to call in for the same reason. This could be changed by working with weekly schedules, which would mean participants would have a better idea of what they were going to be doing.

5. Conclusions

In the context of the international TSE (Tackling Social Exclusion) project, the Municipality of Rotterdam has assigned three projects that are aimed at preventing and combating social exclusion, namely: Nieuwe Instroom in de Haven, Watch Out and the Zorgproject. The SWA has evaluated these projects in a commission from DAAD.

The projects have all been successful with respect to the most important objective: moving people who are far removed from the labour market towards a job, thereby reducing social exclusion. It is therefore worthwhile continuing in the future. In any case, the problem of unemployment among young people is still high on the agenda in Rotterdam. The study shows that the specific application of these projects is a good way of working on social exclusion.

Factors making the continued existence of the projects problematical:

All projects are subject to the vagaries of the economic and political wind, which determines whether they go ahead or not. The Zorgproject has been successful because of the staff shortages in the care sector. As a result of the cutbacks, the continued existence of the Watch Out project is uncertain. The demand for permanent employees in the port sector is also subject to economic developments.

The evaluation examined the theoretical context of the projects, the numerical results and the process. Evaluating the process involved talking to employers, teachers/mentors and participants about their experiences with the project. The results in numerical and statistical forms are important, but are also strongly subject to developments in the economy. The evaluation of the process has been shown to be the most important way of gaining real insight into the results in terms of social inclusion and exclusion. This shows the stories behind the numbers, and it is these stories that show how the projects contribute to reducing social exclusion.

These projects each contribute in their own way and working methods to bringing participants to the labour market with a diploma in their hands. More important is that the participants, who before taking part had no idea what to do about their situation, have been given direction once more. Taking part in the projects has given the participants a new perspective for the future, a structured day, self-confidence and the opportunity for further growth.

The evaluation study was not carried out on all aspects, as was intended beforehand. There was different access to data sources and respondents in each project, which meant that the one project could be studied in greater depth compared with the others. The research material nevertheless turned out to be sufficient for providing a clear picture of the projects.

The most important learning points for each topic are now examined:

Participants

Positive about:

- The content of the work, the training, and the opportunity for self-development
- Increase in social contacts
- Improving Dutch language skills
- Building a structured daily routine
- Becoming mature and thereby developing a better self-image
- Economic independence
- Being a role model for the children
- The opportunity to contribute knowledge without a basic qualification (Watch Out – knowledge of the street)
- Good project support

Negative about:

- No job guarantee in the Watch Out project
- The income is the same as or a little higher than benefits (Zorgproject and Watch Out)
- No opportunity for having their say in the workplace
- Little recognition
- Not being properly informed about what awaited them in practice (tough culture in the port)

Employers / work mentors

Positive about:

- The participants' motivation and the good pre-selection of candidates
- Unexpected new personnel, who probably wouldn't have been taken on without the project
- Collaboration with other partners
- Support of the participants by the project organisation
- Making a contribution to society: giving young people an opportunity or second opportunity in the labour market

Negative about:

- Transparency of the labour cost subsidy

-
- The participants needed more attention sometimes; more information about this beforehand would be desirable
 - What lessons are relevant if we look at the broader European context?
 - How can employers be encouraged to take part in the projects?
 - Make employers emphatically aware of the opportunity of taking people on through taking part in the projects, and the social contribution they make as a result. As things stand, employers are not quick enough by themselves in taking the initiative in participating in such projects when they are looking for new personnel;
 - Inform employers comprehensively about the participants' possibilities and strengths, and also about the possible impediments with which that group has to cope, otherwise the employers might possibly develop false expectations;
 - Ensure there is proper pre-selection of candidates, which will ensure satisfied employers. It is worthwhile working with organisations such as DAAD that specialise in this;
 - Good internal support for the participants is important, but external support is as well. An example of this is contact with client managers at Social Affairs and Employment;
 - Where creating jobs for young people and reducing social exclusion are concerned, try to make use, together with the employers, of the city's strong points. One example is the additional port security officer training for the Watch Out project, so that young people are better employable as security officers in the port city of Rotterdam.

What are the major points for attention as far as the participants in the projects are concerned?

- Give people who drop out additional attention, ensure they can move on to a different project in order to prevent social exclusion;
- Make sure there is aftercare for the participants who go on to have permanent jobs after taking part in the project. Some are not yet used to their situation without support. Aftercare can prevent a return to being on benefits.
- It is a long time for many participants since they had any education, so it can take a while before they become accustomed to a school routine again. Give the participants the time and opportunity to fit in with this.

-
- Offer participants the opportunity, if they perform well, of going on to have a permanent job with an income that is at least a little higher than the level of benefits, so as to keep them motivated
 - Aftercare from a job coach on site or at the workplace contributes to a successful placement
 - Give participants good information about what they can expect: the positive and negative sides of the project.

It is important to evaluate projects in order to be able to improve them.

Lessons for evaluation studies in the future:

- A proper recording system for each project is essential if, as an investigator, you want to follow the numerical developments in the project. It is advisable to set this recording system up in collaboration with a researcher.
- It is important for the successful outcomes of interviews that respondents feel at ease, so they can tell their stories. Make sure the questionnaire is comprehensive, by conducting a few test interviews before the real ones. Give the participants a small gift as thanks for their taking part, especially if you want to talk to them for a second time.
- The level of response in the research world is generally quite low among young people. Response figures of 25 to 30 percent are not exceptional, and the figure among those who have dropped out is even lower. Try therefore to reach young people through job coaches or other members of the organisation, and meet them in a place they prefer.