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## **Executive summary.**

This report describes the findings of the baseline data for SKYE CLUBs in their first year of operation and comparisons between the profiles of SKYE Club youth with data from youth in control sites.

The research observes the socio-demographic status of youth participating in SKYE clubs and concludes that to fulfill World Vision’s programmatic objectives we need to diversify the membership of the Clubs to have a more balanced representation of youth with different education levels and statuses. The average SKYE club member is 22 years old, they are single have obtained a Bachelor’s degree and are still studying, whereas 80% of youth in the control sites have completed education and 60% of the control are married.

This report shows that unemployment is more prevalent among youth in the control sites than among SKYE Club members. Moreover, youth with more than 9 months of involvement into SKYE Clubs are almost twice as likely to be employed as youth with shorter involvement. The most powerful factors leading to statistically significant differences in employment status are education levels and the current education status. Comparison of data sets also reveals that youth exposed to the SKYE model are more likely to actively articulate the idea of establishing business as well as taking initial steps towards this outcome relative to those from the control sites. Another important conclusion is that over 50% of SKYE youth applied more than two methods when looking for a job versus 2-3 % of youth in control sites.

The research identifies a common trend among all youth to “blame” external factors such as insufficient number of workplaces, for not begin able to get a decent job and a low recognition of the impact of appropriate professional qualifications and other important labor market requirements.

At the time of the baseline, SKYE Club youth demonstrated an average of 70% of the maximum possible scores for the competencies under the domains of Citizenship, Leadership, Employability and Entrepreneurship. The maximum self-assessment score for preparedness observed and proven by a variety of cross check questions lies under the Employability domain, and minimum score is in the Citizenship domain. SKYE Youth indicate that they are less prepared to mobilize and be engaged in advocacy initiatives. Results for demonstrated actions are somewhat contradictory. While the vast majority of youth indicated that they took many actions to find a job, only half of them confirmed they were looking for a job during the previous 4 weeks preceding the interview. This and other inconsistencies in responses may potentially mean that some of the tools measuring self-reported preparedness and perceived needs to be revised.

This report also evaluates different socio-physiological constructs and concludes that some are associated with the key competencies we have sought to measure. Youth who demonstrate grit, have a higher degree of self-efficacy and those who show growth mindsets tends to indicate that they are more prepaid and better demonstrate actions to gain employment and/or start an entrepreneurial project.

**Observations**

1. Findings demonstrate that SKYE Club members tend to have higher educational levels than the control sites which means that we are inadvertently attracting youth who already have more options. This is in contradiction to our aim of providing options to a diversity of vulnerable youth through the SKYE Club model.
2. Half of the SKYE members are students. The proportion of SKYE youth with full-time employment is significantly less than that observed in control sites. We have been unable to gain a true picture of impact on employment of participation in SKYE Clubs as the cohort is so different to the control groups. As the model is designed also to include a diversity of educational attainment and socio economic backgrounds, diversification of Club participation will yield a better causal relationship between Club participation and employment.
3. Despite the fact that employment is significantly more prevalent among SKYE members than among control site youth, the difference may be explained by different socio-demographic composition of SKYE and control sites’. It is recommended to analyses T2 data by adjusting results given factors that cause difference between intervention and control sites.
4. The longer a young person has been part of a SKYE Club seems to significantly increase likelihood of getting a full/part time job. But, other intermediate outcomes (willingness to work, demonstrated actions, etc.) are the same regardless how many months youth have been involved in Clubs. Thereof, at this stage observed difference in employment cannot be directly attributed to the project.
5. Unemployed youth in SKYE Clubs and control sites prefer blaming “others” for being unemployed. The majority of intervention site unemployed youth simply do nothing while searching for a job. In addition to that, informal channels are the most popular ways applied by the youth while looking for a job. These findings should be taken into consideration while working with the youth. The research identifies an inconsistency in responses between some of the domains; for example it shows what seems to be an overestimated perception about the preparedness of SKYE youth to undertake a range of activities and low scores reported for actual demonstration. We recommend revisiting some of the tools and amending those for T2 measurements.

## **Methodology**

Baseline assessment methodology was built on quasi-experimental design with pre-post setup to enable building stronger and robust evidence. During the design **one** intervention and **two control** sites was employed. The intervention site was comprised of SKYE CLUB members, whereas the two control sites involved: youth of similar age living in SKYE communities but not exposed to the project (Control 1), and youth living outside WVA communities (Control 2). This was done to adequately track spillover effect of the project.

To ensure comparability among the sites, a two stage matching was applied. First, the three sites were matched by participants’ age and area of residence before data collection; following data collection, the sites were then matched using other factors, such as gender, education level, education status, etc.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Groups | Status | Mean age | Sample size | Sampling method | Area of residence |
| SKYE youth | Intervention site | 22 | 95 | Purposive sampling (90-95% of members reached) | Gegharqunik and Syuniq Regions |
| Youth living in WV communities (where the clubs are located) but not attending IMPACT clubs | Control Site 1 | 24 | 2131[[1]](#footnote-1) | Proportionate 2 stage cluster sampling (cluster=school) |
| Youth living out of WV communities | Control SIte 2 | 23 | 146 |

The sampling strategy relies on the *probability sampling approach* and is comprised of different techniques selecting for each of the three target groups. SKYE youth were selected based on purposive sampling to reach as many respondents as possible and to cover as many members of the SKYE Clubs as possible.

Selection of the youth in both control site 1 and 2 took place according to sampling frame required for WVA Strategy Baseline evaluation. Proportionate sampling with respect to size was applied to each age group (between 18-29) with random selection of the respondents.

## **FINDINGS**

## **Hypothesis: As a result of participating in SKYE Clubs, members will have an increased income (through employment or self-employment).**

**Dependent variables:** *Employment status; Self-reported Preparedness to find a job/to establish a business; Job search methods and factors hindering employment; Labor market knowledge, Increased Income.*

***Confounding factors:*** *Age, Gender. Education status, Education level, Level of Well-being*

***Independent variable***: Length of time youth are engaged in SKYE clubs.

Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of youth from intervention (SKYE Club) and the control sites. Apart from age, SKYE club members are different from the control sites’ youth on a number of demographic characteristics:

* *Gender*: there are more females and fewer males among the youth in control sites compared to those in SKYE clubs.
* *Marital status:* 80% of SKYE club members are single, whereas more than 50% of youth from the control sites report being married.
* *Highest level of education completed:* there is a much greater proportion of control area youth who have completed secondary or vocational education compared with SKYE Club members who have generally completed Bachelor’s or Master’s degrees.
* *Current education status:* Compared to SKYE Club members, the control site youth have recently completed their higher education; whereas more than 50% of SKYE club members are still studying at university.
* Total of 40% of club members are from vulnerable families. [[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of SKYE clubs and Control site youth | SKYE youth | Control 1 site | Control 2 site |
| Gender[[3]](#footnote-3)\* |  |  |  |
| *Female* | 60 | 74 | 73 |
| *Male* | 40 | 26 | 27 |
| Average Age | 22 (Std: 3.9) | 24 (Std.3.2) | 23 (Std: 3.3) |
| Marital status\*\* |  |  |  |
| *Single* | **83%** | 31.4 | 29.5 |
| *Having a partner* | **8.4** | 5.6 | 4.1 |
| *Married* | **8.4** | 61 | 65.8 |
| *Other (divorced, widowed)* | 0 | 2.1 | 1 |
| Highest level of completed education\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| *Secondary* | 41.6 | 46.2 | 58.5 |
| *Vocational* | 12.4 | 26.1 | 31.7 |
| *Bachelors’ degree* | 38.2 | 20.6 | 8.1 |
| *Master’s degree* | 7.9 | 7.0 | 1.6 |
| Recent education status\*\*\*\* |  |  |  |
| *I have never studied* | 2.1 | .3 | 0 |
| *I left before finishing high school* | 1.1 | .9 | .7 |
| *I left before finishing college or university* | 9.6 | 2.8 | 2.1 |
| *I have completed my higher education* | 30.9 | 81.8 | 84.2 |
| *I still study* | **56.4** | **14.2** | **13.0** |
| Socio-economic status |  |  |  |
| Well-off | **25%** | **N/A** | |
| Middle class | **35%** |
| Vulnerable | **40%** |

**Dependent variable:** ***Employment status***

Youth employment status in the SKYE clubs and control sites is shown Figure1. Unemployment rate is defined as percent of youth aged 18-29 not involved in the labor market, but seeking employment during the 4 weeks preceding the interview.

Data reveals significant differences[[4]](#footnote-4) in employment status between the SKYE youth and those from the two control sites In particular, unemployment is more prevalent among control sites’ youth (73% and 74% respectively) than among SKYE members (49%). Meanwhile the proportion of SKYE youth with full-time employment is significantly lower (68%) than that observed in control areas (80% in both control sites). This is no doubt due to the fact that half of SKYE youth are currently studying with limited/no opportunity for a full-time employment.

Table 2 (below) compares youth employment status by demographic characteristics (gender and education) in the SKYE clubs and at the and control sites.

There is a significant association between **gender and employment** only in Control 1 site (non-SKYE youth), where **young women have significantly higher chances than males to be unemployed.** For SKYE club members and Control 2 site, males and females are equally distributed among employed and unemployed youth.

**The highest level of education completed proved to be another significant factor associated with employment**. In particular, unemployment is significantly higher among youth with either secondary or vocational education.

**Current educational status also brings differences with regards to the employment status of young men and women**. This difference is evident among SKYE youth and Control site 1 youth. For both sites unemployment is higher among students.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2. Employment status by gender, education status and current education activity** | | **Unemployed** | **Employed** | **Other engagement** | **Self-employed** |
| ***Gender[[5]](#footnote-5)*** | | | | | |
| SKYE\* youth | Female | 38% | 37% | 19% | 6% |
| Male | 67% | 20% | 10% | 3% |
| Control 1 site\*\* | Female | 81% | 14% | 5% | 1% |
| Male | 51% | 38% | 5% | 6% |
| Control 2 site \*\*\* | Female | 77% | 14% | 6% | 3% |
| Male | 65% | 25% | 8% | 3% |
| ***Education Status[[6]](#footnote-6)*** | | | | | |
| SKYE youth\* |
| Graduate | 38% | 46% | 4% | 12% |
| Student | 51% | 20% | 27% | 2% |
| Control 1 site\*\* |
| Graduate | 73% | 21% | 3% | 2% |
| Student | 67% | 18% | 13% | 1% |
| Control 2 site\*\*\* |
| Graduate | 75% | 16% | 6% | 3% |
| Student | 58% | 32% | 11% | 0% |
| ***Highest level of obtained education[[7]](#footnote-7)*** | | | | | |
| SKYE youth\* | Secondary/vocational Education | 62.5% | 17.5% | 12.5% | 7.5% |
| Higher education (BA, MA, post-graduate) | 32.4% | 45.9% | 18.9% | 2.7% |
| Control 1 site\*\* | Secondary/vocational Education | 79.6% | 14.8% | 3.3% | 2.3% |
| Higher education (BA, MA, post-graduate) | 57.1% | 37.1% | 3.1% | 2.7% |
| Control 2 site\*\*\* | Secondary/vocational Education | 80.0% | 12.7% | 3.6% | 3.6% |
| Higher education (BA, MA, post-graduate) | 33.3% | 41.7% | 25.0% | 0.0% |

Wealth cluster, marital status and previous work experience are not significantly associated with employment status in either SKYE clubs or the two control sites.

There is an association between youth employment status and their length of engagement with SKYE Clubs. In particular, youth with more than 9 months of involvement in SKYE are much more likely to be employed than those with less involvement[[8]](#footnote-8).

***Dependent variable: Self-reported Preparedness to find a job/to establish a business***

Self-perceived preparedness to engage in the labor market is high, as revealed by all the data for each group. The vast majority of unemployed SKYE youth report being ready to accept a long-term job offer (97%) and those who reported having skills to work for 6 months and longer were nearly as high (92%). This is not different from the level of self-perceived preparedness among youth from the two control sites.

Similarly high proportions were observed when measuring self-perceived preparedness of youth to start a business.

Lower percentages were observed when measuring demonstrated actions to find a job. Only 50% of SKYE youth looked for a job within the 4 weeks preceding interview. Similar proportions were observed in the two control sites.

In terms of starting a business a comparison of youth preparedness and demonstrated action in the intervention and control sites revealed that youth exposed **to the SKYE model are more likely to articulate the idea of establishing business and taking initial steps towards the outcome (44.8%) than those from the control sites (11-13.6%)**

There is no association of the length of engagement in SKYE clubs with youth preparedness and demonstrated action to find a job/establish a business.

Confounding factors, such as wealth clusters and age are not associated with preparedness and demonstrated action in all 3 sites.

There is an association between **gender** and preparedness to work /actions to find a job among youth in control 1 site. In particular, young girls and women located in WV areas but not involved in SKYE clubs, are **less confident** about having skills to get long-term, decent work and **passive in terms of searching for a job** or trying to establish own business. No such association is identified either in SKYE clubs, where gender composition is more or less balanced, or in Control 2 site, where gender composition is similar to the one observed in Control 1 site.

**The highest education level attained shows a correlation** with both preparedness and demonstrated action. In SKYE Clubs and Control 1 communities, youth with higher education indicate they are **more prepared** to take up a long-term job offer than youth with secondary/vocational education. In addition, a greater proportion of youth looking for a job, thinking and trying to establishing business have completed higher educational levels.

Significant association between **Completion of education** and **job searching** activities is evident only for SKYE members: youth with completed education more actively search for a job than those who currently study.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3. Distribution of confounding factors per intervention and control sites** | | ***SKYE*** | | ***Control 1*** | | ***Control 2*** | |  | ***SKYE*** | | ***Control 1*** | | ***Control 2*** | |
| ***Preparedness to work*** | | | | | |  | ***Demonstrated actions to find a job*** | |  | |  | |
| I would take an opportunity to work for 6 month and longer | | | | | |  | I wanted to work? | | | | | |
| Gender | ***All*** | **97.40%** | | **84.10%** | | **88.80%** | | **All** | 74.10% | | 77.50% | | 77.60% | |
|  | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |  | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| F | 95.0% | 5.0% | 82.9% | 16.8% | 86.4% | 13.6% | F | 80.0% | 20.0% | 74.6% | 25.1% | 73.6% | 26.4% |
| M | 100.0% | 0.0% | 89.3% | 10.7% | 96.2% | 3.8% | M | 66.7% | 33.3% | 89.6% | 10.4% | 88.5% | 11.5% |
| **Current Education status** | Graduate | 100 | 0% | \*83.6%[[9]](#footnote-9) | 16.2% | 89.1% | 10.9% | Graduate | 87.5% | 12.5% | 77.2% | 22.6% | 77.6% | 22.4% |
| Student | 100 | 0% | 86.2% | 13.8% | 90.9% | 9.1% | Student | 62.5% | 37.5% | 75.8% | 23.6% | 70.0% | 30.0% |
| **Level of education** | Sec. | 69.7% | 30.3% | 76.5% | 23.5% | 96.1% | 3.9% | Sec. | 75.0% | 25.0% | 76.3% | 23.5% | 78.0% | 22.0% |
| Higher | 0 | 0 | 89.3% | 10.7% | 93.3% | 6.7% | Higher | 66.7% | 33.3% | 80.6% | 19.4% | 66.7% | 33.3% |
|  |  | I have skills to prepare me working 6 months and longer | | | | | |  | I looked for a work | | | | | |
| **Gender** | *TOTAL* | 92.10% | | 84.70% | | 84.10% | | *TOTAL* | 48.30% | | 38.00% | | 36.70% | |
| F | 90.0% | 10.0% | \*\*83.5% | 15.4% | 81.5% | 18.5% | F | 41.2% | 58.8% | 30.1% | 69.7% | 23.6% | 76.4% |
| M | 94.4% | 5.6% | 90.0% | 9.3% | 92.3% | 7.7% | M | 58.3% | 41.7% | 70.7% | 29.3% | 73.1% | 26.9% |
| **Current Education status** | Graduate | 100.0% | 0.0% | 83.0% | 13.9% | 83.7% | 16.3% | Graduate | 66.7% | 33.3% | 38.3% | 61.5% | 28.2% | 71.8% |
| Student | 90.9% | 9.1% | 86.7% | 12.3% | 90.9% | 9.1% | Student | 41.2% | 58.8% | 39.9% | 59.6% | 90.0% | 10.0% |
| **Highest Level of education** | Sec. | 70.1% | 29.9% | 82.8%\*\*\* | 15.8% | 84.1% | 15.9% | Sec. | 41.2% | 58.8% | 35.1% | 64.6% | 28.0% | 72.0% |
| Higher | 83.3% | 16.7% | 93.1% | 6.9% | 75.0% | 25.0% | Higher | 50.0% | 50.0% | 49.8% | 50.2% | 33.3% | 66.7% |
|  | Preparedness to establish a business | | | | | | |  | Demonstrated actions to establish a business | | | | | |
|  | **I often think about ideas and ways to start a business** | | | | | | |  | **Pursued an idea for starting a company talking about it more than once** | | | | | |
| **Gender** | Total | 83.7%\* | | 55% | | 42% | |  | 44.8%\*\* | | 13.6% | | 11.2% | |
| F | 22.2% | 77.8% | 48.0% | 52.0% | 56.8% | 43.2% | F | 43.8% | 56.3% | 10.7% | 88.8% | 6.9% | 93.1% |
| M | 10.5% | 89.5% | 31.7% | 68.3% | 61.5% | 38.5% | M | 46.2% | 53.8% | 25.5% | 74.5% | 23.1% | 76.9% |
| **Current Education status** | Graduate | 22.2% | 77.8% | 45.7% | 54.3% | 57.6% | 42.4% | Graduate | 33.3% | 66.7% | 13.4% | 86.2% | 11.8% | 88.2% |
| Student | 17.4% | 82.6% | 36.9% | 63.1% | 63.6% | 36.4% | Student | 37.5% | 62.5% | 14.0% | 85.4% | 10.0% | 90.0% |
| **Level of education** | Sec. | 13.0% | 87.0% | 48.5% | 51.5% | 58.0% | 42.0% | Sec. | 50.0% | 50.0% | 11.0% | 88.7% | 12.2% | 87.8% |
| Higher | 27.3% | 72.7% | 36.1% | 63.9% | 50.0% | 50.0% | Higher | 33.3% | 66.7% | 22.9% | 76.7% | 0.0% | 100.0% |
|  | **At least once I will have to take a chance and start my own company** | | | | | | |  | **tried to establish your own business?** | | | | | |
|  | Tota; | 89% | | 68% | | 22% | |  | 20.00% | | 13.10% | | 11.20% | |
| **Gender** | F | 5.6% | 94.4% | 33.5% | 66.3% | 50.6% | 49.4% | F | 17.6% | 82.4% | 9.7% | 90.0% | 5.6% | 94.4% |
| M | 15.8% | 84.2% | 23.8% | 75.8% | 61.5% | 38.5% | M | 23.1% | 76.9% | 26.6% | 73.4% | 26.9% | 73.1% |
| **Current Education status** | Graduate | 0.0% | 100.0% | 33.3% | 66.5% | 54.3% | 45.7% | Graduate | 33.3% | 66.7% | 12.4% | 87.4% | 9.4% | 90.6% |
| Student | 17.4% | 82.6% | 19.2% | 80.3% | 36.4% | 63.6% | Student | 16.7% | 83.3% | 14.0% | 85.4% | 30.0% | 70.0% |
| **Level of education** | Sec. | 13.0% | 87.0% | 36.6% | 63.2% | 54.5% | 45.5% | Sec. | 22.2% | 77.8% | 11.1% | 88.7% | 8.5% | 91.5% |
| Higher | 9.1% | 90.9% | 22.3% | 77.7% | 50.0% | 50.0% | Higher | 10.0% | 90.0% | 17.6% | 82.4% | 33.3% | 66.7% |

***Dependent variable:*** *Job search methods and factors hindering employment*

Youth were asked to select as many methods to find a job as possible, based on their recent experience and preferences. **Social network/capital (including friends, relatives, etc.) and direct referrals to employers** turned out to be the most popular methods utilized by SKYE club youth and Control site youth while looking for a job. All other formal/non formal options are either less (only slightly) preferred or are not accessible. In addition, a significant portion of youth in the control and intervention sites prefer *doing nothing* while ‘looking’ for a job.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 4. Number of preferred job search methods in intervention and control areas | | |
|  | **At least 1 method** | **More than 2 methods** |
| SKYE Youth | 15% | **57%** |
| Control 1 | 22% | **3%** |
| Control 2 | 29% | **2%** |

When comparing how many methods youth were applying while seeking a job, the figures differ significantly among SKYE and control sites[[10]](#footnote-10). In particular, over a half the youth participating in SKYE applied more than 2 methods when looking for a job versus only 2-3% of youth in control areas. The length of participation in SKYE clubs was not associated with the number of job search methods used.

In control areas the vast majority of young women and girls either do nothing to search for a job or apply only one method, in contrast to young men who applying more than one method while searching for a job. In SKYE clubs, gender is equally distributed among youth with minimum and maximum number of applied job search methods.

Other factors do not prove to be significantly associated with the number of job search methods.

As already mentioned above, unemployment is more prevalent among youth who have completed secondary/vocational education and previous work experience had no correlation with the employment status of either male or female youth. Nevertheless, when youth were asked about the main reasons hindering their employment, the majority highlighted the following two factors as showing reciprocal causality: **lack of work experience and lack of available jobs.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 5. Youth reported factors hindering employment | SKYE youth | Control 1 | Control 2 |
| *Lack of work experience*[[11]](#footnote-11)\* | *43%* | *15%* | *8%* |
| Lack of available jobs | 42% | 42% | 21% |
| *Age* | *17%* | *2%* | *6%* |
| Low wages in available jobs | 17% | 10% | 11% |
| *Lack of training opportunities* | *14%* | *3%* | *4%* |
| *Corruption* | *11%* | *4%* | *0%* |
| Unsuitable education | 11% | 7% | 11% |
| Mismatch between education and market | 6% | 4% | 3% |

Table 5 shows a range of factors perceived as most significant among SKYE youth compared to those from the control sites. This potentially means that these factors were discussed with Club members and as a result they are more knowledgeable about labor market requirements and development trends.

***Dependent variable: Labor market knowledg****e (local, national, international)*

Higher education is perceived as the main prerequisite to securing a decent job for the majority of youth in the intervention and control sites. At the same time SKYE youth and control sites’ youth have different perceptions of the most important skills currently required to secure a decent job. In particular, youth in the control sites identified language as the most important skill to obtaining a job, while SKYE club youth gave higher importance to soft skills. (communication, team work, etc.).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Table 6. Youth reported labor market knowledge | | | | | | | |
|  | **Skills** | | | **Education** | | | | |
| Education | Secondary | Vocational | Higher | IT skills | Vocational skills | Languages | Soft skills (communication, team work) | Good General education |
| SKYE club | 15.4% | 12.8% | 71.8% | 15.4% | 10.3% | 20.5% | 33.3% | 20.5% |
| Control 1 | 11.7% | 23.2% | 63.9% | 17.5% | 5.9% | 31.2% | 10.6% | 32.3% |
| Control 2 | 9.0% | 27.0% | 64.0% | 27.1% | 5.6% | 29.0% | 13.1% | 24.3% |

## **HypothesIs. As a result of participating in SKYE Club meetings and community service-learning projects, SKYE Club members will have improved competencies in the areas of active citizenship, leadership, employability and entrepreneurship.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Dependent variables*: Self-reported preparadness/knowledge and demonstration/action in 4 core domains:  *Confounding factors:* Age, Gender. Education status, Education level, Level of Well-being  Independent variable: Length of time youth are engaged in SKYE clubs. | | | | | | | |  |
| **Domains** | **CITIZENSHIP** | | **LEADERSHIP** | | **EMPLOYABILITY** | | **ENTERPRENUERSHIP** | |
|  | **PREP**  **(max scale score 60)** | **DEMO (max scale score 25 )** | **PREP**  **(max scale score 60 )** | **DEMO**  **(max scale score 25)** | **PREP**  **(max scale score 60** | **DEMO**  **(max scale score 25)** | **PREP**  **Maximum 70)** | **DEMO (maximum 25)** |
|  | **Mean score** | | | | | | | |
| **Total** | **78% (mean score 47; Std. 9** | **68% (mean score 17; Std. 5)** | **78% (mean score 47.3 (Std. 9)** | **72% (mean score17.8 (Std. 5)** | **80% (mean score 48 (Std. 6))** | **72% (mean score 18; Std.5)** | **78% (mean score 55 (Std. 9)** | **72% (18 (Std. 5)** |
| \*No significant correlation with confounding factors (gender, age, education level and status, employment status) observed | | | | | | | | |

At the stage of the baseline, where maximum length of participation is 12 months, we can identify no significant association between length of participation and preparadness/demonstration.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 7: Relationship between preparedness and demonstration | | | | |
| *Predictor* | ***Dependent*** | ***b*** | ***Std. Error*** | ***R2*** |
| *Employability Prep\** | *Employability\_ Demo.* | *0.18* | *.092* | *.061* |
| *Entrepreneurship*  *Prep.\*\** | *Entrepreneurship*  *Demo.* | *0.27* | *.054* | *.306* |
| *Leadership*  *Prep.\*\*\** | *Leadership*  *Demo..* | *0.37* | *.049* | *.69* |
| *Citizenship*  *Prep\*\*\*\** | *Citizenship*  *Dem.* | *0.41* | *.048* | *.074* |
| *\*p=0.04; \*\*p=0.000; \*\*\*p=0.000; \*\*\*\*p=0.000* | | | | |

As shown in Table 7 preparedness is significantly predicting demonstration in all domains. The more youth are prepared for civic activism, leadership, entrepreneurship and employability, the better they should be able to demonstrate actions in respective domains.

While total average registered scores for preparedness and demonstration are high, several categories under each domain require specific attention from the project. In particular, youth seem to be less knowledgeable in defining local advocacy initiatives and engaging in different steps of advocacy campaigns. Youth are less competent when describing team management, social entrepreneurship/business projects and other similar terms, as well as having less experience in in developing business plans, leading/initiating community development projects, job interviewing or finding a personal mentor to support them in finding work.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Table X | | | |
|  | **Citizenship** | Mean score | **Leadership** | Mean score |
| Preparedness | I feel comfortable defining what a community is. | **4.2** | I am able to explain the values and character traits of a good leader. | **4** |
| I am able to define a problem or community need. | 4.2 | I understand how leaders can misuse their power if not guided by moral values. | 3.8 |
| I am able to write a clear and concise problem statement and goal statement. | 4 | I can provide examples of the various roles that leaders hold and different styles of leadership they use. | 3.9 |
| I feel comfortable defining advocacy. | 3.9 | I know how to define the term management. | 3.7 |
| I am able to identify and distinguish between various forms of civic engagement. | 3.8 | I am able to explain how management is necessary in order to transform leaders' visions into reality. | 3.7 |
| I can describe three advocacy methods. | 3.6 | I can explain the necessity of teamwork and cooperation. | 4 |
| I feel comfortable describing the steps in advocacy campaigns. | 3.5 | I am comfortable identifying characteristics of an effective team and team member. | 4 |
| I am able to identify and assess gender stereotypes in culture. | 3.7 | I can explain how good leaders can contribute to the formation of strong teams. | 4 |
| I understand what corruption is and how it is manifested. | 4 | I am able to list the characteristics of useful and constructive feedback. | 3.8 |
| I can list five costs of corruption. | 4 | I know how to explain the differences between experiential, active learning and formal, passive learning | 3.8 |
| I am able to list five causes that lead to violence. | 4 | I can distinguish between a group and a team. | 4 |
| I can explain what discrimination is and why it is harmful to people in my community. | 4 | I am able to provide three examples of ways leaders can motivate group members to achieve shared goals. | 3.9 |
| Demonstration | I have participated in multiple parts of an advocacy campaign | 3.1 | I have written a personal leadership development plan. | 3.5 |
| I have interviewed a local community leader | 3.2 | I have led / coordinated a project in my community. | 3.5 |
| I have organized meetings with local community leaders or organizations | 3.1 | I have pursued a public speaking opportunity in my community or more broadly. | 3.5 |
| I have created a community map and can identify at least two needs and two assets of my community. | 3.7 | I have led/facilitated a group activity. | 3.4 |
| I have participated in a project to improve my community | 3.8 | I have represented my community/group/club at a meeting or event | 3.6 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Entrepreneurship** | Mean score | **Employability** | Mean score |
| Preparedness | I can list and describe the 10 Personal Entrepreneurial Competencies | **3.9** | I can describe my personal strengths and their connection with my career and life goals | **4.1** |
| I can explain the difference between an enterprise and a social enterprise | 3.8 | I feel comfortable explaining what a personal brand is and why it is important in job-seeking. | 3.8 |
| I am able to describe three ideas for social entrepreneurial projects that I could initiate in the community, based on community needs. | 3.7 | I am able to describe various methods that can be used while looking for a job. | 3.9 |
| I know how to define the term "market demand.” | 3.9 | I able to explain the principles and rights I have as an employee. | 3.9 |
| I am comfortable listing the main elements that define a product or service. | 3.8 | I am able to define time management and explain how it can help me achieve personal goals. | 3.9 |
| I can define the premises for a good decision-making process. | 3.8 | I can explain the benefits of a résumé or CV and its role in being hired for a job. | 4.1 |
| I know how to identify the most important conditions of a successful distribution location. | 3.6 | I am able to describe what factors for success must be taken into consideration before, during, and after a job interview. | 3.9 |
| I know how to describe a business plan. | 3.9 | I feel comfortable listing the main expectations employees have for their employers. | 3.9 |
| I am comfortable listing the pieces needed to develop a business plan. | 3.8 | I can explain the benefits of tracking the flow of money in my personal life. | 3.8 |
| I am able to define what a market and target group is. | 4 | I am able to explain the goal of a budget and the necessary steps in creating one. | 3.9 |
| I can describe the idea of consumer behavior and how it affects business decisions. | 3.9 | I can describe the possible consequences of not repaying a loan. | 4 |
| I am able to explain the connections between a business's marketing mix and target group. | 3.7 | I feel comfortable listing the characteristics used by lenders to evaluate the creditworthiness of possible borrowers. | 3.8 |
|  | I can identify financial statements such as a profit and loss statement and a balance sheet. | 3.7 |  |  |
|  | I know how to distinguish between fixed and variable costs. | 3.8 |  |  |
| Demonstration | I have assessed my own strengths and weaknesses from among the Personal Entrepreneurial Competencies. | 3.8 | I have written a resume or CV | 4 |
| I have written a business plan for a small business or social entrepreneurship project | 3.6 | I have created a saving plan to meet my personal financial goals. | 3.6 |
| I have selected an opportunity with potential to become a viable business or social business, and I am actively working on developing it. | 3.5 | I have completed an application or letter of inquiry to apply for an opportunity (training, event, leadership role etc.) | 3.8 |
| I have consulted with my business mentor about my business idea. | 3.4 | I have participated in a job interview (real or practice) and answered questions appropriately | 3.7 |
| I have written the product/service part of my business plan using specific terms to describe my product/service. | 3.5 | I have sought out a personal mentor or coach or have found an apprenticeship where I can learn skills for my future | 3,7 |

The observed percentages of civic preparedness and civic actions was validated by applying several cross-checking questions. As reveled by the data, 73.2% of SKYE Club youth indicated that they have the skills required to address community issues and that half of them are well aware of the main priorities at their community level. In contrast, when asked relatively low proportion of youth indicated that they had actual engagement into tangible community projects: more than half of SKYE Club youth (57%) did not take part in a community project during the previous 12 months.

**Hypothesis: As a result of participating IN SKYE Clubs, members will have improved self-image and future orientation**

*Dependent variables*: **Self-efficacy, Grit, Mindset**

*Confounding factors****:* Age, Gender. Education status, Education level, Level of Well-being**

**Independent variable: Length of time youth are engaged in SKYE clubs.**

## **Self-efficacy**

As evidenced by the baseline data, 55.4% of SKYE Club members’ self-efficacy scores fall within the **above average** category. This indicates that their confidence in their ability to successfully handle situations is about the same as most people. They generally believe in their ability to problem-solve in most situations, but this doesn’t mean they are not susceptible at times to anxiety or depression with regard to challenging or stressful events and situations. At the stage of the baseline, none of the confounding factors (age, gender, education, well-being and employment status) have significant association with the level of self-efficacy.

An interesting association was observed between levels of self-efficacy and the other competencies measured. Youth with higher self-efficacy levels tend to feel there are more prepared for employment, entrepreneurship and civic activism. But, when it comes to tangible action, there is no significant correlation between perceived self-efficacy and corresponding action.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Employment\_ Prep | Entrepreneurship\_ Prep |  | Citizenship \_Prep |
| Self-efficacy | *P=-0.01* | *P=0.03* |  | *P=0.01* |

## **Grit**

The *mean* score reported for Grit is **4.3** (Std 0.4) out of a 5 point scale where 5 means extremely gritty and 1 means not gritty at all.

There were no apparent o associations with confounding factors or with current employment status.

The only domain where Grit is associated, is with Entrepreneurship. More gritty youth feels to be indicate they are more prepared for entrepreneurial activities[[12]](#footnote-12).

At the stage of the baseline, the length of time youth have been involved into SKYE Clubs is not showing a significant increase in the level of Grit observed

## **mindset**

As revealed by the baseline assessment, 57% of SKYE club members have a so called “Fixed mindset with regard to growth ideas.”

There is no association between reported types of mindset and any of the confounding factors, or for employment status.

At the stage of the baseline, the length of time youth are involved in SKYE Clubs is not demonstrating any significant increase in the level of (Growth?) Mindset.

Types of Mindset are however significantly associated with demonstrated actions in the areas of employment and entrepreneurship. In particular, youth with growth mindset with some fixed ideas are more likely to demonstrate actions in the areas of employment\* and entrepreneurship than youth with fixed mindset\*\*[[13]](#footnote-13).

## **Limitations**

1. Low internal reliability of the tool measuring socio-economic status of intervention site youth.
2. Methodological issues regarding Life-orientation tool
3. Comparison between intervention and control groups only against two hypotheses.
4. Lack of qualitative data

1. Sample size defined by WVA Strategy baseline evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Different tools were used to measure wealth index in SKYE clubs and Control sites. Given critically low internal reliability of the tool used for Control sites, wealth score data is available only for SKYE clubs. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. \*p=0.009; \*\*p=0.000; \*\*\*p=0.000; \*\*\*\*p=0.000 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. P=0.000 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. \*p=0.10; \*\*p=0.000; \*\*\*p=0.45 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. \*p=0.009; \*\*p=0.000; \*\*\*p=0.233 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. \*p=0.019; \*\*p=0.000; \*\*\*p=0.000 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. p=0.000 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. P=0.022; \*\*p=0.02; p=0.000; \*\*\*\*p-0.04 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. P=0.000 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. \*p=0.01; \*\*p=0.000; \*\*\*p=0.000; \*\*\*\*p=0.001 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. P=0.045 [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. \*p=0.03; \*\*p=0.03 [↑](#footnote-ref-13)