

OLGU ARAŐTIRMA VE DANIŐMANLIK HİZMETLERİ

NATIONAL REPORT ON
IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPACT
ASSESSMENT OF THE YOUTH
COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMME
(2003-2006)

TURKEY CASE

By

Dr. Soner YILDIRIM – Dr. Müge ADNAN

June 2007 - ANKARA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
I. INTRODUCTION.....	5
II. METHODOLOGY.....	8
III. DESCRIPTION OF INPUTS AND OUTPUTS	13
IV. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME.....	13
V. EVALUATION OF ACCESSIBILITY	16
VI. EVALUATION OF COMPLEMENTARITY	17
VII. ASSESSMENT OF THE UTILITY	18
VIII. EVALUATION OF SUSTAINABILITY	20
IX. ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFICIENCY OF MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES, PROGRAMME STRUCTURES AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	21
X. RECOMMENDATIONS	22
XI. ANNEXIES	25
ANNEX I: INPUT AND OUTPUT INDICATORS	26
<i>A. Input indicators.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>B. Output indicators.....</i>	<i>27</i>
ANNEX II.....	44
<i>Comparative Results Based on Geographical Regions.....</i>	<i>44</i>
ANNEX III.....	65
<i>Summary of Findings.....</i>	<i>65</i>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The YOUTH Programme primarily addresses young people aged between 15 and 25 who are legal residents in one of the Member States of the European Union or other Programme countries. It supports non-formal educational activities, and is administered in Turkey by the Centre for European Union Education and Youth Programmes.

This Report is a quantitative and a qualitative study conducted as part of an impact assessment research of the YOUTH Programme implemented in Turkey (2003-2006). It measures the social, sectoral and economic impact of those projects during this period. Before summarising the findings of this study, it should be noted that the study experienced some difficulties in the field and in reaching the beneficiaries.

An overall evaluation of the Programme shows that the participants are satisfied with the projects both in terms of general and personal objectives and that they believe they will use what they have learned in the future. One significant finding is that the YOUTH Programme has had a positive impact on the participants by helping them develop their skills and personal characteristics. Furthermore, important findings are obtained from the overall positive influence of the YOUTH Programme on the trainers, project leaders and beneficiaries. Their subsequent personal perspectives on the world in general show how the Programme has promoted the support and contribution to human rights and fight against racism and xenophobia.

In general, the respondents consider the YOUTH Programme to be a positive influence on the youth policy of the European Union.

Both personally and in terms of interaction within the group subject to this evaluation, it is observed that the YOUTH Programme has a positive individual influence as participation develops problem solving skills, improves the delegation of roles and responsibilities, strengthens social participation, and supports the learning or improvement of a foreign language. This has a positive impact on the young people's lives in general as well as a positive influence of the participant's view of their environment.

In terms of accessibility, the National Agency should be promoted via all available media throughout the country as many beneficiaries, especially in the field, do not know enough about the National Agency and the projects they participate in.

With regard to the complementarity of the YOUTH Programme with other policies and programmes, the most important finding is that the YOUTH Programme has contributed to the creation of European awareness amongst the individuals.

Regarding the operational procedures of the projects implemented under the YOUTH Programme, the report recommends the promotion of the Programme through various media, more clear and understandable information sources on (Internet and other printed materials), the announcement of the project evaluation criteria for transparency, the use of a special approach for young people who are not experienced in project write-ups, quicker evaluation of project applications, and improved timeliness for payments, contract delivery and detailed feedback for the reports. In this regard, a needs assessment process will be both helpful for determining needs in the field and for the planning of training activities.

Other recommendations include the establishment of a certification system for young people who have benefited from the YOUTH Programme, and a more coordinated relationship between the National Agency and embassies, international offices, foreign relations offices, as well as governorships and municipalities in Turkey.

Regarding the sustainability of the Programme, it is clear that establishment of a database is vital to include information on the youth organisations and projects in order to support the work of both the National Agency and the youth organisations.

I. INTRODUCTION¹

Decision No 1031/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the European Council of 13 April 2000 established the YOUTH Community Action Programme, which set up the legal framework in support of non-formal educational activities for young people, to run from 2000 to the end of 2006. The Programme includes activities already existing under previous programmes such as “Youth for Europe” and “European Voluntary Service”.

The YOUTH Programme primarily addresses young people aged between 15 and 25 who are legally resident in one of the Member States of the European Union or other Programme countries. The YOUTH Programme operates for the interests of young people and youth workers, not only by offering financial support for their projects but also by providing information, training and opportunities to develop new partnerships across Europe and beyond.

The main structure of the YOUTH Programme promotes integration of different Actions, as well as crossovers between them. These five main Actions are:

Action 1 - Youth for Europe

Action 2 - European Voluntary Service

Action 3 - Youth Initiatives

Action 4 - Joint Actions

Action 5 - Support Measures

Following her recognition as a candidate for EU membership in Helsinki in 1999, Turkey signed a Memorandum of Understanding on 15 April 2004 with the EU for her participation in “European Union Education and Youth Programmes” included in the National Plan in 2001. With this Memorandum, Turkey has become the 31st country to participate in the European Union Education and Youth Programmes. As of 1 April 2004, Turkey has fully participated in the second term of the EU Training and Youth Programmes (2000-2006) after an 18-month preparation period.

¹ Information in this Section has been gathered from user guides, information notes and presentations developed for the introduction and implementation of the YOUTH Programme.

Implementation of the YOUTH programme is administered by National Agencies, which operate as implementing and coordinating bodies of the Programme countries. The main aim is “to take the action as close as possible to the beneficiaries and to adapt to the diversity of national systems and situations in the field of youth”.

As in all other participating countries of the YOUTH Programme, a department was established to serve as the Turkish National Agency in January 2002, with the decision of the Council of Ministers, affiliated to the Undersecretariat of the State Planning Organisation (SPO). This department was transformed into a Centre, independent from the SPO, with the Law No. 4968 enacted by the Parliament in August 2003, and named as the Centre for European Union Education and Youth Programmes (ABEGPM). This Centre serves to manage YOUTH funds allocated to Turkey, to supervise the accepted projects, evaluate and disseminate the outcomes of the projects, and provides information and recommendation to the beneficiaries. The Turkish National Agency is a connection between the European Commission, project owners, project beneficiaries and the Turkish youth.

The target audience of the YOUTH Programme in Turkey can be expressed as follows:

- Youth groups;
- Young people with fewer opportunities;
- Young people willing to benefit from European Voluntary Service;
- Youth organisations;
- Youth leaders, project leaders or organisers;
- Local authorities (municipalities, governorships, etc.) and non-governmental organisations;
- Those working on youth-related issues or on non-formal training.

In the context of Turkey, the following national priorities are taken into consideration for evaluation of the applications:

- Involvement of handicapped youth;
- Involvement of young people from socio-economically disadvantaged families;

- Involvement of the young people that have not benefited from the YOUTH Programme before or that have not an overseas experience;
- Contribution to the employability of the young people and to the improvement of their skills;
- Contribution to promotion of the country and its culture.

Below are the prioritised areas for the projects under the YOUTH Programme, as determined by the European Commission:

- environment,
- protection of heritage,
- arts and culture,
- rural/urban development,
- equal opportunities,
- prevention of racism and hostility towards foreigners,
- prevention of drug use and drug addiction,
- socialisation,
- youth information,
- spare time activities,
- sports,
- media and communication systems,
- European consciousness,
- health.

An impact assessment research has been conducted, based on the research methods described below in the Methodology section, for measurement of the social, sectoral and economic outcomes of those projects supported under the YOUTH Programme that was implemented in Turkey during the 2003-2006 period. Findings obtained from this research study are presented in this report.

The report consists of 11 sections, as indicated by the *Guidelines to Programme Countries with regard to the 2007 National Reports on the Implementation and Impact of the YOUTH Community Action Programme* from the European Commission dated 27 September 2006. Accordingly, the next section, Methodology, presents information on the research method used, which is then followed by a description of the inputs and outputs, the impact of the YOUTH Programme, and based on the findings, recommendations for future implementations.

II. METHODOLOGY

This section summarises the methodological approaches used to evaluate the YOUTH Programme (2003-2006) in social, sectoral and economic terms, based on seven geographical regions.

In order to conduct such an assessment study effectively, the target audience and relevant institutions should be analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively in a proper and robust manner. Satisfactory information from the respondents, especially from the participants of the Programme, plays a key role in achieving quality findings at an anticipated level. Thus, this research study was conducted on the basis of two main methods, namely quantitative and qualitative.

Impact assessments are the studies that reveal what kind of changes are experienced by the stakeholders upon achieving the objective of an activity, along with behavioural changes of the relevant communities as a result of this impact. The most important feature of impact assessments is that they put forward clearly whether the programmes in question have achieved their objectives or not. In this regard, the assessment programme is shaped and guided through an analysis of long-term Programme implementation and impact of the Programme on the target audience.

II.1. Quantitative Study

II.1.1 Sampling

Development of the sampling plan for the quantitative study took into consideration the following criteria: geographical, regional, sectoral, socio-economic status, age group, gender, etc. In parallel with a demand from the Turkish National Agency (the Client), it was

planned to include 900 individuals from 14 provinces, two from each of the seven geographical regions. As also stated by the Client, it was decided to select 100 individuals from amongst the project leaders, and 800 from the project beneficiaries.

Despite the fact that the sampling plan had been developed accordingly, the total number of participants in the study was limited to 800, upon the proposal of the research team and approval of the Client, due to the difficulties experienced in the field and in reaching the beneficiaries.

The National Agency of Turkey provided information on the number of projects accepted between 2003 and 2006, by provinces and actions. Sampling design included clustering by actions and by geographical regions. For the selection of two provinces from each geographical region, we considered selecting the biggest province of the region, and the second province with the highest number of projects. Simple random sampling method was used to select the projects from each province, in ratio with the number of projects accepted for each action. It was decided that face-to-face interviews would be conducted with five beneficiaries from each project included in the sample.

Region	Province	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 5	Total
Marmara	İstanbul	17	19	6	7	49
	Bursa	1	1	1	1	4
Black Sea	Trabzon	4	1	3	2	10
	Zonguldak	1	0	1	1	3
Central Anatolia	Ankara	14	24	19	10	67
	Kayseri	0	1	1	0	2
Mediterranean	Antalya	5	9	5	2	21
	Adana	1	2	1	1	5
Aegean	İzmir	5	3	4	2	14
	Uşak	1	0	0	1	2
Eastern Anatolia	Erzurum	3	0	5	1	9
	Van	1	0	2	0	3
South-eastern Anatolia	Gaziantep	2	0	5	1	8
	Batman	1	0	2	1	4
Total		56	60	55	30	201

Table 1 – Sample Projects by Regions and Provinces

Although the number of project leaders and beneficiaries included in the sample was decreased to 800, it was not possible to complete the questionnaires in 14 of the provinces as anticipated due to the aforementioned limitations. Therefore, the research team was only able to achieve 800 participants through expanding the study in neighbouring provinces when it

was not possible in the pre-determined ones. Thus, instead of 14 provinces in seven geographical regions, questionnaires were completed in 23 provinces. Other provinces included in the research study were Bingöl, Diyarbakır, Kocaeli, Konya, Kırşehir, Mersin, Rize, Sakarya and Samsun.

In addition, the research team was not able to include a number of projects per action due to the following reasons:

- Since the participants are young people, they could not be accessed because they were either performing their military service, attending university in another city, or were in a foreign country, etc.
- Despite the higher number of projects in some regions, either the beneficiaries were the same people or the same project team made more than one project.
- Beneficiaries might not necessarily live in the province where they had participated in a project.

II.1.2 Application of the Questionnaires and Interviews

Questionnaires were completed during face-to-face interviews. Participants in other countries were contacted through electronic mail (0,5%), whereas participants with transportation difficulties were contacted by telephone (5%).

Participants were determined through beneficiary lists obtained from the project leaders. Thus, the effectiveness of each field study was dependent on the communication skills of the project leaders, as well as their willingness or unwillingness to provide information.

Reaching the project leaders was a major difficulty for the research team. The research team was not able to reach all the project leaders in a timely and effective manner because the contact information given by the National Agency of Turkey was not up-to-date. Another difficulty was that some project leaders did not have contact information for all beneficiaries.

Appointments were made by telephone with those leaders and beneficiaries reached, and a meeting point was agreed on where the interviewers would meet the interviewees face-to-face.

It was however, possible to complete the field study by obtaining the contact information of other beneficiaries during some interviews.

II.1.3 Data Management and Analysis

All the completed questionnaires were sent to the headquarters by courier periodically. Content and logical checks of the questionnaires were performed by an editor and telephone checks were conducted for 30% of the questionnaires. For those questionnaires which had missing information, the respondents were contacted by telephone and the missing information obtained.

The data obtained was transferred to the computer system, where checks were conducted to see whether any values other than the minimum and maximum values anticipated were found for each variable. Invalid data was corrected based on information contained in the questionnaire. Consistency checks were then applied, where data was examined with more than one variable.

Open-ended questions in all questionnaires were coded on the basis of a prepared coding scale and data entry format, and made ready for direct data entry.

Mean, standard deviation, median and minimum-maximum values were calculated for the quantitative data. Group comparisons were conducted through one-way variance analysis.

II.2. Qualitative Study

II.2.1 Sampling

For the qualitative study, a sample totalling 90+9 individuals were selected for all three groups of promoters/trainers, beneficiaries, and leaders. The list of individuals invited to the evaluation meetings was prepared on the basis of criteria such as geography, region, sector, socio-economic status, age group, gender, etc.

The sample was derived from different social, economical, cultural, geographical and sectoral criteria to cover all real and third persons in compliance with the objectives of the meetings.

A form was prepared to include all necessary information for the meeting and filter questions for determination of the participants. The respondents were invited to Ankara for

the meetings via telephone. The participation form included information on meeting venue, date, accommodation, and services covered.

	MEETING 1: TRAINERS AND PROMOTERS		MEETING 2: YOUTH WORKERS AND LEADERS		MEETING 3: POTENTIAL BENEFICIARIES	
	# of Invited Individuals	# of Actual Participants	# of Invited Individuals	# of Actual Participants	# of Invited Individuals	# of Actual Participants
Adana	1	0	1	1	1	1
Adıyaman					2	2
Afyon			1	1		
Ankara	15	13	1	1	6	4
Antalya	1	0	3	3	2	2
Aydın			1	1		
Batman	1	1				
Bingöl	1	1				
Bolu			1	1		
Burdur			2	2	1	1
Bursa	1	1	1	0		
Denizli			1	1	2	2
Diyarbakır					2	2
Elazığ					1	0
Erzincan			1	1		
Erzurum			3	3	2	2
Eskişehir	1	1				
Hatay	1	1				
Isparta					1	1
İstanbul	4	4	4	4	3	3
İzmir	2	1	1	1	2	2
Kayseri			1	1		
Kırıkkale			1	1		
Kırşehir			1	1		
Mersin			1	1	1	1
Muğla			1	1		
Sakarya			1	1		
Samsun					2	2
Siirt					2	0
Trabzon			2	2		
Uşak			1	0		
Unknown	1	0				
TOTAL	29	23	30	28	30	25

Table 2 – Dissemination of Participants in the Qualitative Study by Roles and Provinces

II.2.2 Meetings

Evaluation meetings for three different groups were held on 25 April – 6 May 2007 in Ankara.

In light of the data obtained for the YOUTH Programme in Turkey in the 2003-2006 period, it was decided that all three meetings would be based on active participation of the

attendees. To ensure objectivity, the usual welcome-orientation activities were not held before the meetings.

The agenda of all three meetings were devised by the participants. Themes to be discussed were gathered through brain-storming, the results then classified, and the meetings were structured according to the results. During the sessions, every single remark from the participants was projected onto the screen, and raw data was gathered with the approval of the participants. At the end of each meeting, a brief evaluation of the meeting was conducted.

II.2.3 Data Management and Analysis

Digital tapes were used to record the data obtained during the meetings. The tapes were subsequently transcribed and coded accordingly. Content analysis method was used to examine the qualitative data obtained from the transcripts.

Chi-square test was used to examine the relationship between and among the qualitative data. Multi-variate analysis was carried out in accordance with the data type in order to determine the factors having an influence on the result variable concerned.

III. DESCRIPTION OF INPUTS AND OUTPUTS

Please see Annex I for the description of inputs and outputs.

IV. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME

An assessment of the impact of the YOUTH Programme was examined under three main titles.

General Impact of the Programme: With regard to the impact of the Programme on the participants, 52% of the participants stated that they were very satisfied with the projects they participated in, whereas 45% were satisfied. Of the participants, 41% considered the projects successful in achieving their personal objectives, whereas 1,5% considered it to be unsuccessful. 39% of the participants believed that they would definitely be able to apply what they had learned in the projects in real life, whereas 48% believed they would be able to apply what they learned. An overall evaluation showed that the participants are satisfied with

the projects in terms of both general and personal objectives, and that they will use what they learned in the future.

53% of the participants believed that participation in the project definitely improved their solidarity feelings, 50% believed that their creativity was definitely improved, and 50% of the participants believed that the project definitely improved their skill for taking initiative. As to definite improvement of entrepreneurial skills of the participants, this ratio went up to 60%. These figures show that the projects have had a positive impact on the participants, and helped them to develop their skills and personal characteristics.

As in individual development options, the projects also had an extensive impact on the trainers', leaders' and potential beneficiaries' viewpoints on the world. 72% of the participants agreed or strongly agreed on the support of the YOUTH Programme for basic values such as human rights and fight against racism and xenophobia. Similarly, 53% of the participants strongly agreed that the Programme encouraged learning and interaction amongst the cultures, whereas only 3% strongly disagreed with that idea. In addition, 81% of the respondents believed that the participants of these projects were informed about various cultures during the implementations.

A Glance to the European Union: It may be concluded that the YOUTH Programme has various levels of impact on ideas and viewpoints of the participants on the European Union. In this regard, 22% of the respondents believed that the Programme definitely contributed to understanding the concept of the European Union and in being European, and 40% believed it contributed to the understanding of the these concepts. Nevertheless, 21% of the respondents remained undecided about this issue. Similarly, 66% of the respondents believed that the projects under the YOUTH Programme improved their consciousness and awareness about European Union citizenship, whereas the ratio of respondents that could not make a decision was 21%. Another item with high ratio of those that could not make a decision was for establishment of the active participation concept for the development of the idea of the European Union. While 62% of the respondents believed in the establishment of this concept, 22% remained undecided. The high rates of those undecided may be explained as a result of the current social and political structure of the country; and also the higher rates of positive views may indicate the YOUTH Programme contributed to respondents' thoughts about the European Union in a positive manner.

Overall assessment of the youth policy of the European Union shows that the respondents believe in the positive impact of the YOUTH Programme. A total of 70% of the respondents believed and definitely believed that the YOUTH Programme contributed to development of youth policies at the European level. Similarly, 68% of the respondents believed that the Programme contributed to development of youth organisations. In a more general manner, 64% of the respondents believed that the YOUTH Programme contributed to creation of a knowledge-based Europe, whereas total 10% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this idea.

Individual and Environmental Impact: With regard to the impact of the YOUTH Programme on the individual participants, it was observed that it had positive reflections both individually and in terms of communication and interaction within the groups. 91% of the respondents stated that they improved their project development and implementation skills, and a total of 94% pointed out the development of team spirit. In this regard, 51% of the respondents strongly agreed that their participation in the projects improved their problem-solving skills. The total sum of those who agreed with this view was 85%. 93% of the trainers, project leaders and potential beneficiaries believed that their consciousness on delegation of responsibility was improved within the framework of the YOUTH Programme, and 92% believed that the Programme strengthened their social participation. A total of 90% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed on the fact that the YOUTH Programme had a positive impact on their lives in general, which confirmed the individual impact of the Programme on the participants. It was also observed that the projects had a positive impact on participants learning a new foreign language or improving what they learned previously. 61% of the respondents believed that the Programme contributed to learning or improving a foreign language, whereas 60% believed that it directly improved their knowledge of a foreign language.

76% of the trainers, project leaders and potential beneficiaries thought that they received the support of their families in their participation to the YOUTH Programme, whereas this went up to 86% for support from their friends. Thus, it was observed that support from friends was stronger than the support from families. 63% of the respondents believed that their families and friends also has a more positive approach to Europe due to their impact on their environment following their participation in the YOUTH Programme. However, 21% of the respondents could not make a decision on this issue. Similarly, a total

of 68% of the respondents thought that, during their activities within the projects, their families and friends started to empathise with other cultures. The percentage of those who could not make a decision was 19%.

V. EVALUATION OF ACCESSIBILITY

The importance of the National Agency of Turkey was at the foreground in evaluation of the accessibility of the YOUTH Programme. Taking into consideration that the sum of those that did not know the existence of an institution called “the National Agency” before the projects was 44%, it was clear that efficiency of the accessibility channels is crucial. The respondents accessed detailed information about the YOUTH Programme mainly through the Internet (65%). Other channels were stated as the brochures issued by the National Agency (37%), information meetings (31%), and information meetings of the university offices (15%). Although the Internet was preferred as the main resource to access information, only 14% of the respondents thought that this resource was definitely sufficient. The respondents that considered this resource as sufficient was 33%. These values were more or less at similar levels for other resources. 8% of the respondents stated that brochures and other publications issued by the National Agency were definitely sufficient, whereas 19% considered them just as sufficient. While 9% of the respondents pointed out that the information meetings of the National Agency were definitely sufficient as information resources, 14% considered these meetings just as sufficient. Besides, 16% of the respondents considered the Internet page of the National Agency as very clear, understandable or sufficient, whereas 17% of the respondents could not make a decision about this issue. In general terms, 16% of the respondents considered the promotion activities of the YOUTH Programme by the National Agency as definitely adequate, while 32% considered them as adequate. Besides these values, 25% of the respondents could not make a decision on this issue, and 25% believed that the National Agency did not conduct sufficient promotional activities at all.

An assessment of the National Agency as an institution is important in terms of understanding the accessibility of the YOUTH Programme. An assessment of the officials working for the National Agency showed that 27% of the respondents stated that the officials were very sufficient, and 42% considered them just as sufficient. Besides, while 60% of the respondents stated that the National Agency staff guided them in preparation of the projects, only 23% thought that this guidance was definitely accurate and adequate, and 32% considered this guidance as accurate and adequate. 31% of the respondents thought that they

were not guided by the National Agency during the project preparation process. Nevertheless, 85% of the participants stated that they did not experience any problems with the National Agency. A total of 75% of the respondents considered the National Agency as very sufficient and successful in terms of evaluation of the projects submitted. Specifically, 28% of the respondents considered the Agency very successful in this regard, and 58% considered in successful.

VI. EVALUATION OF COMPLEMENTARITY

In the evaluation of complementarity of the YOUTH Programme against other youth programmes and policies, the role of the YOUTH Programme projects came to the foreground in the creation of European awareness in individuals. 44,4% of the respondents agreed on the projects implemented under the YOUTH Programme contributed to the establishment of European awareness. However, 3,8% of the respondents strongly disagreed with this idea. There is a tendency that the YOUTH Programme also improved the awareness of European citizenship, besides the establishment of European awareness. 36,9% of the project leaders and beneficiaries agreed that the projects under the YOUTH Programme increased the awareness of European Union citizenship. However, 6,4% of the respondents strongly disagreed that the projects had such an impact on the individuals. Nevertheless, as to the complementarity of the Programme, project leaders and beneficiaries thought that the YOUTH Programme contributed to understanding of the concepts of European Union and to being a European. 40,8% of the respondents agreed on that the impact of the Programme created an understanding of these concepts, whereas 5% strongly disagreed.

With regard to the positive impact of the experience that the project leaders and beneficiaries gained during their overseas visits or during their interaction with foreign stakeholders in Turkey, 33,1% of the respondents agreed on the positive impact of foreign experience on individuals, and 27,5% strongly agreed. 17% of the respondents, however, disagreed or strongly disagreed with this idea. On the other hand, as to the complementarity of the Programme, 34,4% of the respondents stated that the projects contributed to common development and cooperation between and among the countries; 32,3% of the respondents strongly agreed with this remark. However, 5,4% of the respondents disagreed with it. Thus, project leaders and beneficiaries stated the importance of the contribution of the YOUTH Programme to common development and cooperation among the countries.

Another remark made regarding the complementarity of the YOUTH Programme was the contribution of the projects to the knowledge of the project leaders and beneficiaries on European unity and democratic culture. 36,1% of the project leaders and beneficiaries agreed that the projects improved their knowledge, whereas 5,3% strongly disagreed. Besides, 38% of the respondents agreed that the projects promoted establishment of the active participation notion in development of the idea of European Union, while 4,8% strongly disagreed with this remark. This showed that the projects supported under the YOUTH Programme played an important role in the development of active participation. Additionally, project leaders and beneficiaries thought that projects contributed to the development of European-wide youth policies. In this regard, 42% of the respondents agreed that the projects positively contributed to the development of youth policies, whereas 2,8% strongly disagreed with this idea. While 43,9% of the respondents strongly agreed on development of youth organisations throughout Europe, 2,8% strongly disagreed. This indicates that the YOUTH Programme is an active force in the development of youth organisations. Besides, project leaders and implementers also thought that these projects improved the communication between policy makers and the youth organisations. 33,4% of the respondents agreed that this improved communication, whereas 5,1% of the respondents strongly disagreed.

Finally, 40,6% of the respondents agreed that the YOUTH Programme contributed to the unification of formal and non-formal education systems. Only 1,4% of the respondents strongly disagreed with this remark. Trainers and promoters described the YOUTH Programme as a programme that supported formal education, and stated that the Programme funds also supported those institutions and projects that did not support non-formal methods. Based on all these, it can be stated that the Programme supports unification of formal and non-formal education systems.

VII. ASSESSMENT OF THE UTILITY

With regard to the relationship of the impact of the YOUTH Programme to the needs, problems and issues concerned, 66,5% of the respondents agreed that youth policies of the European Union contributed to the creation of a knowledge-based Europe. 2% of the respondents stated that they strongly disagreed with such a statement. This showed that the YOUTH Programme played an important role in the creation of a knowledge-based Europe. Besides, 43% of the respondents strongly agreed that a participatory YOUTH Programme assisted in creating effective citizens. This statement was strongly disagreed by only 0,6% of

the respondents. Thus, it could be stated that the YOUTH Programme supported and improved the chances of young people being active citizens. In addition, 54,9% of the respondents strongly agreed that the YOUTH Programme strengthened social participation, whereas only 0,5% of them strongly disagreed with this idea. Additionally, trainers and promoters stated that this Programme helped the young people to recognise the existence of a life beyond school. Accordingly, it can be pointed out that the YOUTH Programme was an important tool to support and improve young people's social participation.

With regard to the contribution of the YOUTH Programme, especially the European Voluntary Service, to the Lisbon Agenda of the European Union supporting enlargement and employment opportunities through developing human potential, project leaders and beneficiaries thought that they improved their professional capacity with the projects they participated in. In this regard, 83,8% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed on the positive impact of the projects on their professional capacity. Only 0,5% of the respondents stated that they strongly disagreed with that statement. Besides this improvement in the working capacity, 43,3% of the project leaders and beneficiaries strongly agreed that their skills were improved by their participation in the projects, and 41,6% also agreed. Only 0,4% of the respondents strongly disagreed with this remark. Nevertheless, while 36,8% of the project leaders and beneficiaries stated that the projects contributed to their vocational and technical training, 3,9% of the respondents strongly disagreed with this statement. Consequently, it was seen that the projects under the YOUTH Programme contributed to the vocational and technical training of the individuals. Besides, 34,1% of the project leaders and beneficiaries agreed on the projects under the YOUTH Programme having contributed to learning or improvement of a foreign language, whereas 6,9% of the respondents strongly disagreed with it. Thus, it was seen that the projects contributed to the participants learning or improvement of a foreign language.

58,9% of the respondents strongly agreed that the projects under the YOUTH Programme increased the feeling of active participation, while only 0,4% strongly disagreed with that statement. Based on this, it was clear that the projects contributed to the development of a feeling of active participation among the project leaders and beneficiaries. Another benefit from the projects was encouragement of the project leaders and the beneficiaries to have an active contribution to Turkey's integration into the European Union

through the projects under the YOUTH Programme. 71,4% of the respondents strongly agreed with this benefit from the project, whereas 3% strongly disagreed.

31% of the respondents strongly agreed that the YOUTH Programme increased their chances in the business world. However, 5,9% strongly disagreed with that statement. Nevertheless, the project leaders stated that their participation in the YOUTH Programme was a positive point to add to their résumés. This shows that the participation in the YOUTH Programme plays an important role in increasing the participants' future chances in the world of business.

VIII. EVALUATION OF SUSTAINABILITY

Several items in the questionnaire questioned the positive impact of the knowledge, skills and attainments of the participants on their lives. 88,3% of the respondents gave a positive answer to the question “Can you continue to apply those activities you learned within the project?” as a direct indicator of the sustainability. Nevertheless, 2,4% of the respondents provided a negative response to this question. 9,3% of the respondents remained undecided about the sustainability of the project activities.

As another indicator of the sustainability, the respondents were asked whether they had encouraged their friends to participate in the Programme. 95,7% of the respondents gave a positive answer to this question. Only 4,3% of the respondents stated that they did not experience such an encouragement.

Looking at the sustainable positive influence of the YOUTH Programme on the participants, 87,4% of the respondents stated that they had the support of their friends when participating in this Programme. Besides, 77,4% of the respondents stated that their families supported them when participating in this Programme. In addition, 65,7% of the respondents pointed out that families and friends of the participants to the YOUTH Programme started to have a more positive attitude towards Europe. Furthermore, 70,8% of the respondents said their “family and close friends developed positive feelings for other cultures due to the YOUTH Programme.”

Below are the other questions and responses which were used to evaluate the sustainability of the Programme.

As a result of their participation in the projects, 85,2% of the participants stated that they improved their skills, and 93% stated that their knowledge level was increased. Another important finding was that 91% of the respondents championed the positive impact of the Programme in their lives, and that 82% stated that they became a more active citizen. Finally, 93,5% of the respondents advocated that these projects developed and increased their social participation.

In the light of these findings, it was clear that the sustainability impact of the YOUTH Programme was quite positive on the participants. A major part of the respondents pointed out the positive developments in their knowledge, skills and attitudes due to their participation in the projects. They also added that these developments were not only limited to their lives, but extended to the lives of their friends and families.

IX. ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFICIENCY OF MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES, PROGRAMME STRUCTURES AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Under this title, the respondents were primarily asked about their satisfaction of their communication and interaction with the National Agency, as well as the services provided by the Agency during the project preparation period. The responses showed that 60,8% of the respondents were guided by the National Agency staff during the project preparation process, and 93,8% considered this guidance as accurate and adequate. In addition, a quite high number of respondents (91,9%) stated that they did not experience any problems with the National Agency during the project preparation process. The problems experienced by the remaining part of the respondents focused on lack of timely and proper feedback, and delays in payments due to regulations. Lastly, the respondents were questioned about the qualifications of the National Agency in evaluating the projects. 81% of the respondents considered the Agency as successful and qualified. When the respondents were asked about evaluating the Agency in general, 89% of the respondents found it to be successful.

The respondents listed the strengths of the National Agency as follows: quality of the staff, orientation training during the project preparation process, direct interest and guidance by the Agency staff for the project participants, quality of the information meetings held in the regions and EU specialisation of the staff responsible for the meetings. Nevertheless, the respondents listed the weaknesses of the Agency as follows: limited number of officers and

other staff in the Agency, difficulties in accessing the officers, insufficient amount of financial support, and delays in the financial transactions due to the regulations.

82,4% of the respondents stated that they had no difficulties in finding a theme for their projects. 87,7% of the respondents also stated that they did not experience any difficulty in country selection, and that the majority of the problems experienced were communication problems caused by not being able to speak a foreign language. 45,6% of the respondents revealed that they had difficulties in finding a sponsor, and 14,8% considered the sponsor support as inadequate while the others considered it adequate. Finally, a majority of the respondents (71,7%) considered the duration of the projects as sufficient, whereas approximately one fourth of the respondents considered it not sufficient.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

X.1 Accessibility

Below are the conclusions and recommendations derived from the findings of the quantitative and qualitative studies, in terms of accessibility:

- It was observed during the interviews that a great majority of the project beneficiaries, other than the responsible people and leaders of the projects, did not know much about either the National Agency or the project they participated in. Attention should be paid to initiating a nationwide promotion of the National Agency. The Agency and its activities should be promoted at all levels of society, not merely to a certain segment using a specific media such as the Internet, and the public should be informed via the most appropriate media type. Public knowledge about the National Agency is not at the intended level especially locally.
- In order to encourage and reach disadvantaged young people (e.g. those speaking no foreign language, non-readers, or handicapped), appropriate promotion and informational activities should be created to increase their awareness of the YOUTH Programme.
- The major limitation for young people's access to information is a lack of knowledge of a foreign language. Therefore, besides the available guidelines,

booklets, brochures and posters, more unique materials should be produced, translated, published, and delivered to the interested parties in the youth field.

- Qualification and selection criteria should be transparent and clear for the individuals selected for training or of the trainers themselves.
- Since the preparation and writing-up of a project needs a certain level of knowledge and skill, access to this Programme is limited in this criterion. Although the National Agency provides training seminars on this subject area, individuals generally have to be involved in certain social networks or training institutions in order to hear about and participate in these seminars. A special approach should be applied for needy young people, who do not have such an opportunity to be involved in such networks, and access paths should be created for the development of these young people.
- There should be a 24x7, free-of-charge hotline and a crisis solution helpdesk.
- Non-acceptance of applications through electronic mail both increases the paperwork and bureaucracy, and also decreases the number of applications. Nevertheless, if the applications are accepted through electronic mail and formal correspondences are made after the acceptance of the projects, the number of applications will not decrease, and the relationship of the applicant with the institution will be under control.

X.2 Operational Procedures

- In operational terms, the findings indicate that there should be improvements to the timely transfer of funds, timely issuance and delivery of the contracts, timely feedback upon review of the reports, and evaluation of the applications in a shorter period of time.
- Services provided by the National Agency to the field (e.g. training, pre-acting) should be provided in an integrated framework in order to facilitate capacity developments in all subject areas in the field.

- In this regard, operations will be facilitated by determining the needs through a needs assessment process. The same process should be applied for the training activities as well, and a strategic training plan should be developed.
- Final reports should be evaluated in a timely manner.
- The information provided on the Internet site of the National Agency should be clear and easily understood, simplified if needs be in order to reach all young people throughout the country.

X.3 Complementarity

- Recognition of the young people who benefited from the YOUTH Programme by means of a certification system, recognised by other institutions, will support their amateur and professional activities in the future.
- The products of the projects implemented should give clear and clean messages, which will change the perceptions in the local area and will overcome the hesitations.
- The National Agency should have more frequent and intensive relations with the international offices and/or foreign relation coordination offices. Vital improvements will be achieved if these bodies operate more effectively.

X.4 Sustainability

- With regard to the sustainability of the Programme, establishment of an information bank consisting of the youth organisations and projects will facilitate the activities of both the National Agency and the youth organisations.

X.5 Other

As a result of the quantitative and qualitative studies, below are other important issues and recommendations for the effectiveness of future activities:

- The National Agency should be more active with the embassies in the solution of visa problems experienced for those going to foreign countries.

- In order to remove the lack of inter-institutional coordination as in tax exemption, the National Agency should be more active in providing information (e.g. not all of the tax offices know about the tax exemption).
- The National Agency should prepare and activate a black book to prevent difficulties caused by last-minute changes of the foreign partners.
- Detailed information on the project and the project team should be received from the project leaders at the time of the final delivery of the projects, in order to enable registration of the projects and effective monitoring and evaluation.
- Project leaders should be well informed about the social objectives of the youth projects, and they should be warned about seeing themselves as the focal point or considering the projects as a power tool.
- The National Agency should be more autonomous and practical in operations, and the officers should be able to use initiatives in operational procedures, when needed, within the basic framework.
- Since the Action 2 is a long-term activity with a more intensive influence in the European dimension, a limited number of host institutions should be increased in the short-term.
- Brief content and scope of the accepted projects should be announced on the website. Thus, it will be able to prevent from attracting complaints of possible plagiarism.

XI. ANNEXIES

Annex I: Input and Output Indicators

A. Input indicators (financial indicators to be expressed in €):

Please fill in this table

Financial envelope of AGN operating agreements over 7 years	Totally: 3.273.088 Euro * 835.296 Euro in Prep. * 641.833 Euro in 2004 * 906.584 Euro in 2005 * 889.375 Euro in 2006				
Total financial volume of ADEC agreements over 7 years.	10.786.448 Euro				
Funds committed per Action per budget year:					
	Prep.	2004	2005	2006	TOTAL
Action 1	200.226	874.401	1.323.386	2.077.023	4.475.036
Action 2	0	84.144	361.090	570.205	1.015.439
Action 3	39.500	671.352	593.810	1.108.351	2.413.013
Action 5	123.945	592.719	766.691	1.131.436	2.614.791
TOTAL	363.671	2.222.616	3.044.977	4.887.014	10.518.278
Percentage of funds committed per Action in relation with the total decentralised Actions budget.					
		%			
	Action 1	42,5			
	Action 2	9,7			
	Action 3	22,9			
	Action 5	24,9			
	TOTAL	100			
Financial envelope of Eurodesk operating agreements over 7 years (where applicable)	Not applicable				
Financial envelope of SALTO operating agreements over 7 years (where applicable)	Not applicable				
Number of full-time equivalent staff employed in the a) NA, b) SALTO Resource Centre and c) national Eurodesk respectively over 7 years.	a) NA: 80 b) Not Applicable c) Not Applicable				
Number of staff in regional offices of the NA involved in a) the management of the programme and/or b) assuming information and advisory tasks.	Not Applicable				
a) Total direct national contribution to the NA operating costs over 7 years and b) percentage that this represents in relation to the Community contribution to the operating costs.	a) 1.559.493 Euro b) 47,6 %				

B. Output indicators

Please fill in this table

10	<p>Number of participants per Action a) per budget year and b) in total</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>a)</th> <th>Prep.</th> <th>2004</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2006</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Action 1</td> <td>312</td> <td>1.132</td> <td>2.350</td> <td>3.715</td> <td>7.509</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action 2</td> <td></td> <td>27</td> <td>150</td> <td>237</td> <td>414</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action 3</td> <td>42</td> <td>1.125</td> <td>1.800</td> <td>2.850</td> <td>5.817</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action 5</td> <td>221</td> <td>1.137</td> <td>1.600</td> <td>2.529</td> <td>5.487</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TCP</td> <td>80</td> <td>84</td> <td>200</td> <td>316</td> <td>680</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b) Total</td> <td>655</td> <td>3.505</td> <td>6.100</td> <td>9.647</td> <td>19.907</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		a)	Prep.	2004	2005	2006	Total	Action 1	312	1.132	2.350	3.715	7.509	Action 2		27	150	237	414	Action 3	42	1.125	1.800	2.850	5.817	Action 5	221	1.137	1.600	2.529	5.487	TCP	80	84	200	316	680	b) Total	655	3.505	6.100	9.647	19.907
a)	Prep.	2004	2005	2006	Total																																							
Action 1	312	1.132	2.350	3.715	7.509																																							
Action 2		27	150	237	414																																							
Action 3	42	1.125	1.800	2.850	5.817																																							
Action 5	221	1.137	1.600	2.529	5.487																																							
TCP	80	84	200	316	680																																							
b) Total	655	3.505	6.100	9.647	19.907																																							
11	<p>Total number of a) projects and b) participants under the Training and Cooperation Plan</p>	<p>a) 1169 b) 680</p>																																										
12	<p>Number of submitted projects a) per Action and budget year and b) in total (please list Cross-Border Cooperation and Training and Cooperation Plan projects separately)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Projects</th> <th>Applied</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Action 1</td> <td>605</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action 2</td> <td>440</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action 3</td> <td>977</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action 5</td> <td>414</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TCP</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CBC</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>2.436</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Projects	Applied	Action 1	605	Action 2	440	Action 3	977	Action 5	414	TCP	-	CBC	-	TOTAL	2.436																										
Projects	Applied																																											
Action 1	605																																											
Action 2	440																																											
Action 3	977																																											
Action 5	414																																											
TCP	-																																											
CBC	-																																											
TOTAL	2.436																																											
13	<p>Number of approved projects a) per Action and budget year and b) in total (please list CBC and TCP projects separately)</p>																																											

Projects	Granted
Action 1	291
Action 2	398
Action 3	323
Action 5	157
TCP	-
CBC	-
TOTAL	1.169

14	<p>“Success rate” of approved projects in relation with submitted projects (please list CBC projects separately);</p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Projects</th> <th style="text-align: center;">%Granted</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Action 1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">48,10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Action 2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">90,45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Action 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">33,06%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Action 5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">37,92%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">TCP</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">CBC</td> <td style="text-align: center;">-</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: center;">47,99%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Projects	%Granted	Action 1	48,10%	Action 2	90,45%	Action 3	33,06%	Action 5	37,92%	TCP	-	CBC	-	TOTAL	47,99%
Projects	%Granted																
Action 1	48,10%																
Action 2	90,45%																
Action 3	33,06%																
Action 5	37,92%																
TCP	-																
CBC	-																
TOTAL	47,99%																

15	<p>a) Number and b) percentage of control/audit visits to granted projects</p> <p>2004: No audit visits (0 %)</p> <p>2005: An Action 3 project was audited (less than 1 %)</p> <p>2006: An Action 1, and an Action 5 project, totally 2</p> <p>(less than 1 %)</p>	
----	--	--

16	<p>a) Number and b) percentage of on-site monitoring visits to granted projects</p> <p>2004: 9 projects were visited in 2004 (5 for Action 1, 2 for Action 3, and 2 for Action 5). This means that 7 %of the granted projects in 2004 were visited.</p> <p>2005: 16 projects were visited in 2005 (3 for Action 1, 5 for Action 2, 4 for Action 3, and 4 for Action 5). This means that 4,6 %of the granted projects in 2005 were visited.</p> <p>2006: 30 projects were visited in 2006 (10 for Action 1, 13 for Action 2, 5 for Action 3, and 2 for Action 5). This means that 4,7 %of the granted projects in 2006 were visited.</p>											
17	Main age groups of participants in all Actions (apart from Action 5).	15-25										
18	a) Average activity duration in European Voluntary Service per budget year and b) share of short-term projects per budget year.	<p>a. 2004=9,7</p> <p>2005=8,9</p> <p>2006= 8,9</p> <p>b. 2004=0,2%</p> <p>2005= 9%</p> <p>2006= 9 %</p>										
19	<p>Average grant per participant per project for each Action</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Average Grant Per Participant</p> <hr/> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 80%;">Action 1</td> <td style="text-align: right;">596,0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action 2</td> <td style="text-align: right;">2.452,2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action 3</td> <td style="text-align: right;">414,8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Action 5</td> <td style="text-align: right;">424,0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">3.887,0</td> </tr> </table>		Action 1	596,0	Action 2	2.452,2	Action 3	414,8	Action 5	424,0	Total	3.887,0
Action 1	596,0											
Action 2	2.452,2											
Action 3	414,8											
Action 5	424,0											
Total	3.887,0											

20	<p>Distribution of project themes (if insufficient data available: estimation)</p> <hr/> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr><td>Youth Information</td><td style="text-align: right;">14,6%</td></tr> <tr><td>Art and Culture</td><td style="text-align: right;">13,3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Social exclusion (in general)</td><td style="text-align: right;">12,9%</td></tr> <tr><td>European Awareness</td><td style="text-align: right;">10,0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Youth Leisure</td><td style="text-align: right;">7,9%</td></tr> <tr><td>Equal Opportunities</td><td style="text-align: right;">6,4%</td></tr> <tr><td>Environment</td><td style="text-align: right;">6,2%</td></tr> <tr><td>Heritage Protection</td><td style="text-align: right;">5,1%</td></tr> <tr><td>Anti-racism / xenophobia</td><td style="text-align: right;">4,5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Youth Sports</td><td style="text-align: right;">3,3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Other</td><td style="text-align: right;">2,9%</td></tr> <tr><td>Youth Policies</td><td style="text-align: right;">2,7%</td></tr> <tr><td>Rural development</td><td style="text-align: right;">2,7%</td></tr> <tr><td>Health</td><td style="text-align: right;">2,5%</td></tr> <tr><td>Media and communications</td><td style="text-align: right;">1,4%</td></tr> <tr><td>Anti-drugs / substance abuse</td><td style="text-align: right;">1,3%</td></tr> <tr><td>Urban development</td><td style="text-align: right;">1,1%</td></tr> <tr><td>Measures against delinquency</td><td style="text-align: right;">1,0%</td></tr> <tr><td>Social Integration</td><td style="text-align: right;">0,3%</td></tr> </table>	Youth Information	14,6%	Art and Culture	13,3%	Social exclusion (in general)	12,9%	European Awareness	10,0%	Youth Leisure	7,9%	Equal Opportunities	6,4%	Environment	6,2%	Heritage Protection	5,1%	Anti-racism / xenophobia	4,5%	Youth Sports	3,3%	Other	2,9%	Youth Policies	2,7%	Rural development	2,7%	Health	2,5%	Media and communications	1,4%	Anti-drugs / substance abuse	1,3%	Urban development	1,1%	Measures against delinquency	1,0%	Social Integration	0,3%
Youth Information	14,6%																																						
Art and Culture	13,3%																																						
Social exclusion (in general)	12,9%																																						
European Awareness	10,0%																																						
Youth Leisure	7,9%																																						
Equal Opportunities	6,4%																																						
Environment	6,2%																																						
Heritage Protection	5,1%																																						
Anti-racism / xenophobia	4,5%																																						
Youth Sports	3,3%																																						
Other	2,9%																																						
Youth Policies	2,7%																																						
Rural development	2,7%																																						
Health	2,5%																																						
Media and communications	1,4%																																						
Anti-drugs / substance abuse	1,3%																																						
Urban development	1,1%																																						
Measures against delinquency	1,0%																																						
Social Integration	0,3%																																						
21	<p>Distribution of project target groups (if insufficient data available: estimation)</p> <p>15 %– disabled</p> <p>65 %– youngsters with fewer opportunities</p>																																						
22	<p>Share of a) bilateral and b) multilateral Action 1 projects.</p> <p>a) 19 % (55 projects)</p> <p>b) 81 % (229 projects)</p>																																						

23	<p>a) Number and b) percentage of EVS short-term projects in relation to all granted EVS projects per budget year.</p> <p>a) 29</p> <p>b) 6,5</p>	
24	Nationally approved Host Expressions of Interest (HEI) since 1 January 2005.	55
25	Number of external HEI accreditors working for the NA since 2005.	0
26	Number of one-sided funding exceptions for Actions 1.1 and 2.1 since 2004	1 (2.1)
27	<p>a) Number and b) geographic destinations of participants resident in your country having been sent abroad to other Programme Countries and c) top 5 Programme countries or country groups that welcome the most important number of participants from your country and d) that welcome the least important number of participants from your country (per Action).</p> <p>a) Action 1: According to youthlink granted projects data for 2003-2006 period.</p>	
Action 1 sending from Turkey in 2003-2006		
	Line number	Number of participants
	period	
	1	0
	2	4
	3	4
	4	6
	5	11
	6	25
	7	25
	8	25
	9	29
	10	29
	11	32
	12	41

13	Sweden	50
14	Slovenia	55
15	Estonia	84
16	Slovakia	98
17	Denmark	111
18	United Kingdom	116
19	Czech Republic	123
20	Lithuania	124
21	Austria	137
22	Belgium	141
23	Romania	155
24	France	190
25	Greece	201
26	Netherlands	205
27	Italy	207
28	Spain	253
29	Hungary	277
30	Germany	421
Total		3179

- b) All around Turkey. But mainly from western part of Turkey.
- c) Germany, Hungary, Spain, Italy and Netherlands (Please see the table given above showing the number of participants of Action 1 sending projects.).
- d) Slovakia, Bulgaria, Luxembourg, Iceland, Malta (Please see the table given above showing the number of participants of Action 1 sending projects.).
- e)

Germany	204
Italy	129
United Kingdom	111
Poland	108
France	93
Netherlands	84
Spain	75
Belgium	72
Portugal	45
Hungary	42
Latvia	42
Austria	36
Greece	24
Lithuania	24
Slovakia	18
Sweden	18
Czech Republic	15
Denmark	15
Finland	9
Luxembourg	9
Slovenia	9
Estonia	6
Ireland	6
British Indian Ocean Territory	3
Bulgaria	3
Norway	3
Tunisia	3
Ukraine	3

a) Action 2: According to youthlink granted projects data for 2004-2006 period.

Action 2 sending from Turkey in 2004-2006

Line number	period	Number of participants
1	Estonia	1
2	Ireland	2
3	Luxembourg	3
4	Slovenia	3
5	Lithuania	3
6	Finland	3
7	Denmark	3

8	Czech Republic	3
9	Slovakia	4
10	Greece	5
11	Hungary	8
12	Portugal	10
13	Austria	11
14	Latvia	12
15	Belgium	13
16	Spain	14
17	France	16
18	Netherlands	23
19	Poland	27
20	United Kingdom	31
21	Italy	33
22	Germany	44
Total		278

- b) All around Turkey. But mainly from western part of Turkey.
- c) Germany, Italy, United Kingdom, Poland and Netherlands (Please see the table given above showing the number of participants of Action 2 sending projects.).
- d) Estonia, Ireland, Slovenia, Luxembourg and Lithuania (Please see the table given above showing the number of participants of Action 2 sending projects.).

28

a) Number and b) geographic origin of participants visiting your country from other Programme Countries (per Action).

Action 1: According to youthlink granted projects data for 2004-2006 period.

a) 5224 participants from Programme Countries were hosted in Turkey in Action 1 projects.

b) Please see the table given below showing the distribution of visiting participants from other Programme Countries.

Line number	Action 1 Hosting in Turkey in 2004-2006 period	Number of participants
1	Liechtenstein	0
2	Luxembourg	0
3	Cyprus	0
4	Iceland	6
5	Ireland	19
6	Finland	23
7	Norway	36
8	Slovenia	49
9	Czech Republic	57
10	Denmark	81
11	Sweden	93
12	Malta	101
13	Slovakia	103
14	Portugal	112
15	Belgium	116
16	United Kingdom	129
17	Austria	146
18	Netherlands	153
19	France	165
20	Estonia	195
21	Latvia	217
22	Hungary	311
23	Greece	313

24	Bulgaria	331
25	Lithuania	331
26	Germany	332
27	Spain	360
28	Italy	395
29	Romania	519
30	Poland	531
Total		5224

Action 2: According to youthlink granted projects data for 2004-2006 period.

a) According to youthlink granted projects data for 2004-2006 period; 81 volunteers from Programme Countries were hosted in Turkey in Action 2 projects.

b) For the breakdown of volunteers see below table:

Line number	Action 2 Hosting in Turkey in 2004-2006 period	Number of participants
1	Lithuania	1
2	Estonia	1
3	Hungaria	2
4	Latvia	2
5	Czech Republic	2
6	Portugal	4
7	Poland	4
8	Netherlands	5
9	United Kingdom	5
10	Italy	6
11	Spain	7
12	Belgium	10
13	France	16
14	Germany	16
Total		81

Action 3: According to youthlink granted projects data for 2004-2006 period.

- a) 108 participants from Programme Countries were hosted in Turkey in Action 3 projects.
- b) Please see the table given below showing the distribution of visiting participants from other Programme Countries.

Action 3 Hosting in Turkey in 2004-2006

Line number	period	Number of participants
1	Estonia	2
2	Malta	2
3	Portugal	2
4	Sweden	2
5	Greece	3
6	Czech Republic	4
7	Denmark	4
8	Netherlands	4
9	Lithuania	7
10	United Kingdom	8
11	Poland	8
12	Romania	8
13	Bulgaria	8
14	Austria	10
15	France	10
16	Hungary	10
17	Italy	16
Total		108

Action 5: According to youthlink granted projects data for 2004-2006 period.

- a) 2338 participants from Programme Countries were hosted in Turkey in Action 5 projects.
- b) Please see the table given below showing the distribution of visiting participants from other Programme Countries.

Line number	Action 5 Hosting in Turkey in 2004-2006 period	Number of participants
1	Romania	270

	2	Italy	230
	3	Poland	206
	4	Spain	186
	5	Bulgaria	164
	6	Germany	122
	7	Greece	116
	8	Lithuania	114
	9	France	102
	10	Portugal	100
	11	Malta	98
	12	Estonia	84
	13	Latvia	84
	14	Hungary	74
	15	Sweden	68
	16	United Kingdom	68
	17	Austria	44
	18	Netherlands	40
	19	Slovakia	36
	20	Belgium	34
	21	Ireland	20
	22	Slovenia	20
	23	Denmark	18
	24	Finland	16
	25	Cyprus	14
	26	Norway	6
	27	Iceland	4
	Total		2338
29	<p>Distribution of a) outgoing and b) incoming participants in international cooperation projects according to country groups (Eastern Europe and Caucasus, South East Europe, Mediterranean Partner Countries, Latin America).</p> <p>Action 1:</p> <p>Action 1 - Number of participants from Neighbouring Countries hosted in Turkey (incoming)</p>		

Line number	Country	Number of participants
<i>Soth East Europe (38 in total)</i>		
1	Albania	3
2	Serbia and Montenegro (until 2006)	5
3	Macedonia	30
Eastern Europe and Caucaus (187 in total)		
4	Belarus	4
5	Moldova	14
6	Russian Federation	16
7	Armenia	20
8	Ukraine	19
9	Georgia	55
10	Azerbaijan	59
TOTAL		225

Action 1 - Number of participants hosted in Neighbouring Countries (outgoing)

Line number	Country	Number of participants
1	Ukraine	6
2	Belarus	6
3	Turkey	6
4	Portugal	6
5	Lithuania	6
TOTAL		30

Action 2: Only one A2.2 projects were submitted during 2004-2006 period.

1 volunteer from Georgia and 1 volunteer from France were hosted.

Action 5: Only incoming participants (totally 200).

Action 5 - Number of participants from Neighbouring Countries hosted in Turkey (incoming)

Line number	Country	Number of participants
<i>South East Europe (62 in total)</i>		
1	Albania	12
2	Serbia and Montenegro (until 2006)	10
3	Bosnia and Herzegovina	10
4	Croatia	10
5	Macedonia	20
<i>Eastern Europe and Caucasus (132 in total)</i>		
6	Azerbaijan	30
7	Georgia	30
8	Russian Federation	22
9	Moldova	18
10	Ukraine	18
11	Armenia	8
12	Belarus	6
<i>Mediterranean Partner Countries (6 in total)</i>		
13	Egypt	2
14	Israel	2
15	Lebanon	2
TOTAL		200

30

Share of female and male participants per Action and budget year (gender balance) for Actions 1, 2 and 3.

Share of Female and Male Participants				
Year	Gender	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3
2004	Female	49	51	47

	Male	51	49	53
	Female	50	51	42
2005	Male	50	49	58
	Female	47	57	45
2006	Male	53	43	55
31	Share of granted projects involving young people with fewer opportunities (and for Action 5 with the theme of the activity related to the inclusion of young people with fewer opportunities).			70%
32	Share of participants with fewer opportunities (incl. people with disabilities) a) per Action per budget year and b) in total			
	a)			
	2004			
	Action 1 : 18 % Action 2: 27 % Action 3: 85 % Action 5: 15 %			
	2005			
	Action 1 : 21 % Action 2: 30 % Action 3: 75 % Action 5: 18 %			
	2006			
	Action 1 : 24 % Action 2: 33 % Action 3: 80 % Action 5: 21 %			
	b)			
	In total			
	Action 1 : 21 % Action 2: 30 % Action 3: 80 % Action 5: 18 %			
33	Share of participants with disabilities a) per Action per budget year and b) in total			
	a)			
	2004			

	<p>Action 1 : 8 % Action 2: 3 % Action 3: 10 % Action 5: 7 %</p> <p>2005</p> <p>Action 1 : 11 % Action 2: 5 % Action 3: 12 % Action 5: 9 %</p> <p>2006</p> <p>Action 1 : 14 % Action 2: 7 % Action 3: 11 % Action 5: 8 %</p> <p>b)</p> <p>In total</p> <p>Action 1 : 11 % Action 2: 5 % Action 3: 11 % Action 5: 8 %</p>
34	<p>Share of activities under the Training and Cooperation Plan related to the priorities of the programme: active citizenship, inclusion and cultural diversity.</p> <p>Inclusion : 25 %</p> <p>Active citizenship: 35 %</p> <p>Cultural Diversity : 40%</p>
35	<p>Total number of participants in a) SALTO training courses and other SALTO activities (where applicable) and b) Eurodesk activities (where applicable); c) total number of SALTO activities and d) total number of Eurodesk activities (excluding virtual online activities).</p> <p>a) 215</p> <p>b) Not Applicable</p> <p>c) 76</p> <p>d) Not Applicable</p>
36	<p>a) Total budget of volunteer trainings and b) share of volunteers actually participating in these trainings</p> <p>a) 109.000 €</p>

	b) % 83
37	<p>Total number of a) YOUTH information events and b) YOUTH publications of the National Agency, the SALTO Resource Centre and Eurodesk (where applicable).</p> <p>a) 145</p> <p>b) User Guide: 15.000, Poster: 5.000, Brochure (General Info): 5.000, Leaflet (Best Practices): 15.000, Magazine (6 issue): 50.000, ICL Toolkit (Turkish Version): 5.000, Booklet (Youth Project Training): 5.000, Step by Step EVS: 3.000</p>
38	<p>a) Number of EVS certificates disseminated since 2005 and b) percentage of volunteers sent abroad who actually received an EVS certificate since 2005.</p> <p>a) 81</p> <p>b) % 30</p>
39	<p>a) Number of publications aiming to disseminate best practice and results of YOUTH projects and b) target population reached.</p> <p>a) 6</p> <p>b) Approximately 100.000</p>
40	<p>a) Number of events that served the dissemination of best practice and results of YOUTH projects and b) target population reached.</p> <p>a) 5</p> <p>b) Approximately 1000</p>
41	<p>Rate of implementation of annual NA activities in accordance with proposals of the reference work programme (%)</p> <p>90 %</p>

ANNEX II

Comparative Results Based on Geographical Regions

It promoted learning among the cultures.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	46.8	34.5	7.1	9.1	2.4
Marmara	50.4	45.6	1.6	2.4	0.0
Aegean	59.0	33.7	4.8	2.4	0.0
Black Sea	50.0	23.0	8.1	12.2	6.8
Mediterranean	80.8	16.2	0.0	1.0	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	60.5	31.6	5.3	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	45.0	16.3	16.3	7.5	15.0

It supported basic values such as human rights and the battle against racism and hostility towards foreigners.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	25.2	42.8	16.0	10.4	5.6
Marmara	33.1	52.4	8.1	5.6	0.8
Aegean	39.0	45.1	7.3	8.5	0.0
Black Sea	35.1	27.0	17.6	9.5	10.8
Mediterranean	56.5	31.5	8.7	0.0	3.3
Eastern Anatolia	41.3	45.3	9.3	4.0	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	37.5	16.3	17.5	13.8	15.0

It promoted the notion of solidarity.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	52.5	42.1	4.2	0.4	0.8
Marmara	26.4	63.2	8.0	1.6	0.8
Aegean	57.8	38.6	2.4	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	48.6	36.5	12.2	1.4	1.4
Mediterranean	77.0	13.0	4.0	4.0	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	53.9	35.5	5.3	3.9	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	72.5	16.3	11.3	0.0	0.0

It improved my entrepreneurial skills.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	58.3	34.7	4.6	1.5	0.8
Marmara	36.3	48.4	13.7	1.6	0.0
Aegean	57.8	36.1	4.8	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	59.5	32.4	6.8	0.0	1.4

Mediterranean	83.0	11.0	1.0	3.0	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	65.8	25.0	7.9	1.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	82.3	17.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
It improved my creativity.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	43.4	45.0	8.5	3.1	0.0
Marmara	33.1	46.0	14.5	6.5	0.0
Aegean	51.8	37.3	9.6	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	54.1	37.8	5.4	2.7	0.0
Mediterranean	78.0	14.0	4.0	1.0	3.0
Eastern Anatolia	46.1	42.1	6.6	3.9	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	70.0	22.5	7.5	0.0	0.0

It improved my ability to use my initiative.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	48.4	39.8	9.4	2.4	0.0
Marmara	38.4	48.8	12.0	0.8	0.0
Aegean	41.0	53.0	4.8	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	47.3	36.5	14.9	1.4	0.0
Mediterranean	63.5	24.0	6.3	4.2	2.1
Eastern Anatolia	56.0	26.7	16.0	1.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	71.3	22.5	5.0	1.3	0.0

It promoted cooperation between all partners of the youth sector.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	31.9	45.5	19.1	3.1	0.4
Marmara	20.2	53.2	21.0	2.4	3.2
Aegean	37.3	39.8	19.3	2.4	1.2
Black Sea	25.7	44.6	17.6	5.4	6.8
Mediterranean	74.0	17.0	4.0	2.0	3.0
Eastern Anatolia	47.4	31.6	14.5	6.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	57.0	30.4	12.7	0.0	0.0

It enabled me to exchange ideas with my friends					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	55.6	37.8	4.6	1.2	0.8
Marmara	40.3	52.4	4.8	2.4	0.0
Aegean	57.8	38.6	0.0	3.6	0.0
Black Sea	59.5	28.4	6.8	2.7	2.7
Mediterranean	67.0	24.0	4.0	3.0	2.0

Eastern Anatolia	53.9	36.8	3.9	3.9	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	75.0	21.3	3.8	0.0	0.0

It enabled me to learn about different cultures.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	53.4	26.3	6.1	10.5	3.6
Marmara	52.8	42.4	2.4	1.6	0.8
Aegean	61.4	31.3	2.4	4.8	0.0
Black Sea	51.4	25.7	1.4	12.2	9.5
Mediterranean	69.5	20.0	4.2	4.2	2.1
Eastern Anatolia	64.5	18.4	13.2	2.6	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	57.5	12.5	8.8	13.8	7.5

It encouraged me to make an active contribution to the integration of Turkey in to the EU.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	28.4	36.8	24.4	7.2	3.2
Marmara	29.6	44.8	15.2	8.8	1.6
Aegean	27.7	55.4	9.6	7.2	0.0
Black Sea	27.4	23.3	23.3	15.1	11.0
Mediterranean	63.2	21.1	11.6	3.2	1.1
Eastern Anatolia	61.8	23.7	10.5	3.9	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	46.3	17.5	16.3	13.8	6.3

Are you satisfied with the project in general?					
Region	Definitely Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Definitely Dissatisfied
Central Anatolia	48.8	46.9	3.8	0.4	
Marmara	39.2	56.8	0.8	3.2	
Aegean	39.8	59.0	1.2	0.0	
Black Sea	51.4	47.1	0.0	1.4	
Mediterranean	68.6	29.4	2.0	0.0	
Eastern Anatolia	65.8	32.9	0.0	1.3	
SouthEastern Anatolia	63.8	33.8	1.3	1.3	

Do you consider your project to be successful in achieving its objectives?					
Region	Definitely Successful	Successful	Neither Successful Nor Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Definitely Unsuccessful
Central Anatolia	38.8	51.9	8.1	0.8	0.4
Marmara	20.8	65.6	9.6	4.0	0.0
Aegean	25.3	67.5	7.2	0.0	0.0
Black Sea	38.6	50.0	8.6	1.4	1.4
Mediterranean	64.7	33.3	1.0	0.0	1.0
Eastern Anatolia	52.6	44.7	1.3	1.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	60.0	33.8	3.8	2.5	0.0

Was the project implemented in compliance with the planned activity programme?					
Region	Implemented as planned	Implemented with some deviation	Not followed the plan		
Central Anatolia	60.5	37.9	1.6		
Marmara	55.6	44.4	0.0		
Aegean	56.6	42.2	1.2		
Black Sea	60.0	37.1	2.9		
Mediterranean	76.8	23.2	0.0		
Eastern Anatolia	61.8	36.8	1.3		
SouthEastern Anatolia	74.4	23.1	2.6		

Do you think that you completed the project successfully?					
Region	Definitely Successful	Successful	Neither Successful Nor Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Definitely Unsuccessful
Central Anatolia	49.4	47.9	1.9	0.4	0.4
Marmara	33.6	58.4	5.6	2.4	0.0
Aegean	31.3	65.1	3.6	0.0	0.0
Black Sea	51.4	45.7	1.4	1.4	0.0
Mediterranean	70.6	28.4	1.0	0.0	0.0
Eastern Anatolia	60.5	39.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	67.9	28.2	0.0	3.8	0.0

Do you think that the budget provided by the National Agency was sufficient?					
Region	Yes	No	No idea		
Central Anatolia	51.5	30.4	18.1		
Marmara	62.4	27.2	10.4		
Aegean	53.0	31.3	15.7		
Black Sea	32.4	45.9	21.6		
Mediterranean	49.0	27.5	23.5		
Eastern Anatolia	72.4	14.5	13.2		
SouthEastern Anatolia	35.0	31.3	33.8		

Was the applicant institution/group/NGO successful?					
Region	Very Successful	Successful	Neither Successful Nor Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Very Unsuccessful
Central Anatolia	45.7	42.8	9.1	1.2	1.2
Marmara	22.6	71.8	4.8	0.0	0.8
Aegean	43.4	48.2	6.0	2.4	0.0
Black Sea	32.9	56.2	8.2	2.7	0.0
Mediterranean	66.0	29.0	4.0	1.0	0.0
Eastern Anatolia	62.3	37.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	71.3	26.3	2.5	0.0	0.0

To what extent did the project contribute to your learning of or improvement of a foreign language?					
Region	Contributed a lot	Contributed	Neither contributed nor did not contribute	Did not contribute	Did not contribute at all
Central Anatolia	21.2	30.1	18.1	16.6	13.9
Marmara	29.6	50.4	10.4	8.0	1.6
Aegean	27.7	42.2	9.6	18.1	2.4
Black Sea	29.7	32.4	9.5	10.8	17.6
Mediterranean	31.0	28.0	10.0	24.0	7.0
Eastern Anatolia	39.5	32.9	14.5	11.8	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	20.0	25.0	16.3	10.0	28.8

Did you have difficulty in preparing the final report?					
Region	Yes	No	Not written yet		
Central Anatolia	32.9	45.6	21.5		
Marmara	24.3	61.4	14.3		
Aegean	16.7	21.4	61.9		
Black Sea	22.2	50.0	27.8		
Mediterranean	29.2	50.0	20.8		
Eastern Anatolia	12.5	62.5	25.0		
SouthEastern Anatolia	4.5	54.5	40.9		

Do you think you will use what you learned within the Project?					
Region	Definitely I will	I will	I may or may not	I don't think I will	Definitely I will not
Central Anatolia	32.3	55.3	10.5	1.9	0.0
Marmara	35.5	47.6	13.7	3.2	0.0
Aegean	27.7	60.2	10.8	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	38.4	37.0	13.7	9.6	1.4
Mediterranean	46.0	48.0	6.0	0.0	0.0
Eastern Anatolia	51.3	44.7	3.9	0.0	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	60.8	35.4	2.5	1.3	0.0

Did you encourage your friends to participate in the programme after you completed?					
Region	Yes	No			
Central Anatolia	93.0	7.0			
Marmara	96.0	4.0			
Aegean	97.6	2.4			
Black Sea	93.2	6.8			
Mediterranean	99.0	1.0			
Eastern Anatolia	100.0	0.0			
SouthEastern Anatolia	96.1	3.9			

It helped the establishment of European awareness.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	22.8	46.5	18.9	10.2	1.6
Marmara	20.8	62.4	10.4	5.6	0.8
Aegean	32.5	48.2	15.7	3.6	0.0
Black Sea	21.6	40.5	13.5	14.9	9.5
Mediterranean	41.7	37.5	12.5	8.3	0.0
Eastern Anatolia	59.2	38.2	0.0	2.6	0.0

SouthEastern Anatolia	20.0	30.0	11.3	16.3	22.5
-----------------------	------	------	------	------	------

It improved my awareness about EU citizenship.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	10.8	33.9	31.1	19.1	5.2
Marmara	16.8	49.6	19.2	11.2	3.2
Aegean	22.9	43.4	20.5	13.3	0.0
Black Sea	13.5	29.7	21.6	21.6	13.5
Mediterranean	29.2	43.8	19.8	4.2	3.1
Eastern Anatolia	47.4	34.2	11.8	5.3	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	15.0	27.5	13.8	18.8	25.0

It created a more positive perspective about the foreign people I met here or abroad.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	24.6	41.4	22.2	7.9	3.9
Marmara	31.5	52.4	9.7	6.5	0.0
Aegean	25.3	26.5	12.0	9.6	26.5
Black Sea	24.2	46.8	8.1	11.3	9.7
Mediterranean	45.2	32.3	16.1	3.2	3.2
Eastern Anatolia	35.5	14.5	14.5	22.4	13.2
SouthEastern Anatolia	25.6	15.4	14.1	7.7	37.2

I believe I made a good impression as a Turkish citizen.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	63.0	26.9	5.0	2.7	2.3
Marmara	57.3	38.7	1.6	2.4	0.0
Aegean	67.5	28.9	1.2	2.4	0.0
Black Sea	68.8	17.2	3.1	1.6	9.4
Mediterranean	78.8	15.2	2.0	0.0	4.0
Eastern Anatolia	71.1	23.7	3.9	1.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	41.3	13.8	8.8	5.0	31.3

I promoted positive views about the Turkish culture and our country when I went abroad (or for the foreigners who came to Turkey).					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	49.5	28.7	11.9	5.0	5.0
Marmara	45.2	47.6	4.8	2.4	0.0
Aegean	42.5	16.3	3.8	11.3	26.3
Black Sea	62.7	18.6	1.7	8.5	8.5
Mediterranean	60.2	33.3	3.2	1.1	2.2
Eastern Anatolia	34.2	19.7	9.2	32.9	3.9
SouthEastern Anatolia	31.6	19.0	3.8	3.8	41.8

The experiences I had with foreigners led to positive changes in my personality.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	25.1	46.8	16.7	6.4	4.9
Marmara	29.0	58.1	9.7	3.2	0.0
Aegean	26.3	26.3	7.5	13.8	26.3
Black Sea	37.3	32.2	10.2	8.5	11.9
Mediterranean	48.9	35.9	9.8	3.3	2.2
Eastern Anatolia	28.9	15.8	21.1	21.1	13.2
SouthEastern Anatolia	29.9	16.9	9.1	1.3	42.9

It contributed to common development and cooperation between the countries.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	27.6	39.6	21.7	6.5	4.6
Marmara	26.4	52.0	16.8	4.8	0.0
Aegean	28.9	39.8	21.7	4.8	4.8
Black Sea	31.3	29.9	16.4	11.9	10.4
Mediterranean	60.2	26.9	8.6	2.2	2.2
Eastern Anatolia	50.0	35.5	14.5	0.0	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	32.5	23.8	2.5	11.3	30.0

It contributed to the establishment of the concepts of European Union and being a European.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	13.8	43.7	32.0	8.9	1.6
Marmara	18.4	54.4	19.2	7.2	0.8
Aegean	21.7	54.2	16.9	7.2	0.0
Black Sea	15.5	28.2	26.8	14.1	15.5
Mediterranean	32.6	46.3	11.6	6.3	3.2
Eastern Anatolia	52.6	30.3	14.5	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	27.5	22.5	16.3	7.5	26.3

I learned more about European integration and democratic culture.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	18.0	33.5	33.9	11.4	3.3
Marmara	17.6	51.2	23.2	6.4	1.6
Aegean	25.3	49.4	19.3	4.8	1.2
Black Sea	13.9	33.3	22.2	16.7	13.9
Mediterranean	28.4	35.8	21.1	10.5	4.2
Eastern Anatolia	50.0	32.9	15.8	1.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	26.3	23.8	20.0	8.8	21.3

It created an active participation notion in the development of the idea of European Union.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	15.5	38.6	33.1	10.4	2.4
Marmara	24.8	44.0	20.8	10.4	0.0
Aegean	30.1	49.4	15.7	3.6	1.2
Black Sea	17.1	30.0	20.0	17.1	15.7
Mediterranean	36.8	40.0	13.7	7.4	2.1
Eastern Anatolia	44.7	42.1	10.5	1.3	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	26.3	25.0	25.0	2.5	21.3

It contributed to the development of youth policies throughout Europe.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	21.5	47.6	23.6	5.7	1.6
Marmara	23.6	48.0	20.3	7.3	0.8
Aegean	15.9	52.4	29.3	2.4	0.0
Black Sea	21.9	50.7	4.1	13.7	9.6
Mediterranean	49.5	34.4	8.6	5.4	2.2

Eastern Anatolia	58.7	34.7	6.7	0.0	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	30.0	27.5	20.0	12.5	10.0
It contributed to the development of youth organisations throughout Europe.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	17.1	46.7	26.0	8.5	1.6
Marmara	21.0	54.8	15.3	7.3	1.6
Aegean	27.7	45.8	21.7	3.6	1.2
Black Sea	19.2	47.9	9.6	15.1	8.2
Mediterranean	44.7	40.4	6.4	7.4	1.1
Eastern Anatolia	45.3	40.0	13.3	1.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	26.3	33.8	20.0	10.0	10.0

It improved the communication between the policy makers and the youth organisations.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	12.9	27.0	33.5	21.8	4.8
Marmara	13.7	48.4	25.8	11.3	0.8
Aegean	14.5	31.3	34.9	18.1	1.2
Black Sea	16.9	29.6	19.7	22.5	11.3
Mediterranean	18.8	30.2	29.2	10.4	11.5
Eastern Anatolia	43.4	44.7	9.2	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	23.8	37.5	21.3	7.5	10.0

It supported young people who had fewer opportunities.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	38.0	37.6	12.9	9.4	2.0
Marmara	33.1	41.1	16.9	7.3	1.6
Aegean	33.7	50.6	8.4	7.2	0.0
Black Sea	32.9	30.1	15.1	13.7	8.2
Mediterranean	52.1	21.9	19.8	3.1	3.1
Eastern Anatolia	57.9	26.3	7.9	5.3	2.6
SouthEastern Anatolia	40.0	38.8	15.0	1.3	5.0

It enabled equal participation and opportunities for young women and men.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	49.8	36.2	9.7	3.5	0.8
Marmara	35.5	49.2	12.9	2.4	0.0
Aegean	41.0	48.2	8.4	1.2	1.2
Black Sea	43.8	30.1	11.0	8.2	6.8
Mediterranean	58.3	31.3	5.2	2.1	3.1

Eastern Anatolia	52.6	32.9	7.9	1.3	5.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	51.3	28.8	13.8	3.8	2.5
It helped integration of formal and non-formal training.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	32.1	41.7	20.2	5.6	0.4
Marmara	30.6	50.0	17.7	1.6	0.0
Aegean	37.8	43.9	11.0	6.1	1.2
Black Sea	23.5	42.6	19.1	8.8	5.9
Mediterranean	49.0	34.4	11.5	2.1	3.1
Eastern Anatolia	50.7	33.3	13.3	2.7	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	27.5	43.8	22.5	3.8	2.5

It contributed to the creation of a knowledge-based Europe.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	22.1	34.5	30.9	11.6	0.8
Marmara	20.2	48.4	20.2	10.5	0.8
Aegean	21.7	50.6	21.7	4.8	1.2
Black Sea	13.9	30.6	25.0	19.4	11.1
Mediterranean	35.4	46.9	12.5	3.1	2.1
Eastern Anatolia	51.3	36.8	9.2	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	31.3	37.5	25.0	3.8	2.5

It improved my ability and knowledge of how to prepare and implement a project.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	53.1	37.2	6.2	3.1	0.4
Marmara	40.8	55.2	3.2	0.8	0.0
Aegean	60.2	31.3	7.2	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	56.8	33.8	9.5	0.0	0.0
Mediterranean	63.5	28.1	3.1	3.1	2.1
Eastern Anatolia	57.9	38.2	1.3	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	41.3	50.0	8.8	0.0	0.0

It developed my understanding of team spirit.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	59.8	35.9	4.2	0.0	0.0
Marmara	40.0	53.6	5.6	0.8	0.0
Aegean	65.1	32.5	2.4	0.0	0.0
Black Sea	73.0	21.6	1.4	2.7	1.4
Mediterranean	78.2	15.8	2.0	3.0	1.0

Eastern Anatolia	65.8	27.6	5.3	1.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	65.0	32.5	2.5	0.0	0.0
It developed my sense of responsibility and an understanding that “everyone has a right to speak”.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	49.4	44.7	3.9	1.6	0.4
Marmara	35.2	54.4	8.8	1.6	0.0
Aegean	59.0	37.3	3.6	0.0	0.0
Black Sea	56.8	31.1	8.1	4.1	0.0
Mediterranean	65.6	25.0	3.1	4.2	2.1
Eastern Anatolia	57.9	35.5	3.9	1.3	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	70.0	27.5	2.5	0.0	0.0

It developed my ability to delegate responsibilities.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	57.0	37.6	3.9	1.6	0.0
Marmara	43.2	48.8	6.4	1.6	0.0
Aegean	62.7	30.1	7.2	0.0	0.0
Black Sea	68.5	26.0	4.1	0.0	1.4
Mediterranean	72.3	21.8	0.0	4.0	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	67.1	26.3	3.9	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	67.5	31.3	1.3	0.0	0.0

It improved my ability to establish social relationships with citizens of different countries.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	51.4	23.0	12.6	6.3	6.8
Marmara	45.2	52.4	0.8	1.6	0.0
Aegean	56.1	23.2	7.3	11.0	2.4
Black Sea	47.2	20.8	5.6	9.7	16.7
Mediterranean	57.9	27.4	6.3	5.3	3.2
Eastern Anatolia	51.4	40.5	5.4	2.7	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	49.4	28.6	6.5	5.2	10.4

I started to understand what it is to learn a foreign language.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	33.5	33.9	16.3	12.1	4.2
Marmara	32.5	48.0	13.0	5.7	0.8
Aegean	48.2	31.3	14.5	4.8	1.2
Black Sea	38.4	20.5	9.6	15.1	16.4
Mediterranean	49.5	29.5	8.4	8.4	4.2

Eastern Anatolia	35.5	43.4	13.2	6.6	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	29.5	26.9	23.1	10.3	10.3
I have learned or improved a foreign language.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	20.0	37.5	19.6	14.2	8.8
Marmara	25.0	50.8	15.3	8.1	0.8
Aegean	26.5	26.5	21.7	22.9	2.4
Black Sea	34.2	27.4	5.5	13.7	19.2
Mediterranean	40.6	36.5	8.3	9.4	5.2
Eastern Anatolia	25.0	40.8	22.4	10.5	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	22.1	15.6	24.7	23.4	14.3

It contributed to my vocational and technical training.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	16.1	35.3	27.1	15.7	5.9
Marmara	15.3	45.2	16.9	19.4	3.2
Aegean	16.9	33.7	27.7	21.7	0.0
Black Sea	14.1	32.4	26.8	14.1	12.7
Mediterranean	29.0	27.0	27.0	15.0	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	40.8	38.2	17.1	2.6	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	35.0	51.3	10.0	3.8	0.0

It developed my perspective on looking at the problems both in local and global terms.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	28.7	55.1	12.6	3.5	0.0
Marmara	23.2	59.2	12.8	4.8	0.0
Aegean	32.5	51.8	14.5	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	24.7	47.9	16.4	4.1	6.8
Mediterranean	40.2	39.2	14.4	5.2	1.0
Eastern Anatolia	53.9	34.2	9.2	1.3	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	51.3	41.3	7.5	0.0	0.0

Study tours were fun and didactic.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	42.8	41.2	10.8	4.0	1.2
Marmara	31.2	52.8	12.8	3.2	0.0
Aegean	54.2	30.1	7.2	8.4	0.0
Black Sea	47.9	29.6	9.9	1.4	11.3
Mediterranean	73.3	21.8	2.0	1.0	2.0

Eastern Anatolia	65.3	22.7	9.3	1.3	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	55.4	35.1	9.5	0.0	0.0
It increased my environmental awareness and a love of nature.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	27.3	33.6	28.1	7.9	3.2
Marmara	17.7	49.2	18.5	12.9	1.6
Aegean	34.9	32.5	19.3	12.0	1.2
Black Sea	19.2	32.9	24.7	8.2	15.1
Mediterranean	55.4	27.7	8.9	5.9	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	50.7	29.3	16.0	2.7	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	57.0	24.1	13.9	1.3	3.8

It improved my understanding about all kinds of discrimination.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	36.9	42.5	13.5	6.0	1.2
Marmara	25.2	56.9	13.8	4.1	0.0
Aegean	47.6	39.0	11.0	2.4	0.0
Black Sea	24.3	40.5	23.0	2.7	9.5
Mediterranean	49.0	30.6	12.2	6.1	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	58.7	28.0	6.7	5.3	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	48.8	41.3	5.0	3.8	1.3

It improved my interest in sports.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	16.7	15.9	36.5	24.2	6.7
Marmara	9.7	31.5	24.2	26.6	8.1
Aegean	26.5	20.5	31.3	19.3	2.4
Black Sea	11.0	17.8	27.4	23.3	20.5
Mediterranean	35.3	24.5	15.7	19.6	4.9
Eastern Anatolia	49.3	21.9	17.8	8.2	2.7
SouthEastern Anatolia	33.8	27.5	23.8	12.5	2.5

It increased my self-confidence.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	44.6	43.8	8.9	1.2	1.6
Marmara	36.0	48.0	12.0	3.2	0.8
Aegean	59.0	30.1	9.6	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	52.7	36.5	6.8	4.1	0.0
Mediterranean	63.7	19.6	5.9	8.8	2.0

Eastern Anatolia	59.2	32.9	5.3	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	68.8	28.8	1.3	1.3	0.0
It increased my tolerance.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	46.9	44.1	5.9	2.0	1.2
Marmara	31.5	55.6	10.5	2.4	0.0
Aegean	56.6	37.3	6.0	0.0	0.0
Black Sea	41.9	44.6	9.5	4.1	0.0
Mediterranean	56.9	32.4	4.9	3.9	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	61.3	32.0	5.3	1.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	71.3	23.8	3.8	1.3	0.0

It increased my feeling of active participation.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	57.4	39.1	2.7	0.4	0.4
Marmara	36.3	55.6	8.1	0.0	0.0
Aegean	68.7	30.1	1.2	0.0	0.0
Black Sea	55.4	39.2	4.1	1.4	0.0
Mediterranean	73.5	13.7	3.9	6.9	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	63.2	28.9	5.3	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	72.5	22.5	5.0	0.0	0.0

It contributed to my ability to overcome unexpected problems.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	51.8	37.6	7.8	2.4	0.4
Marmara	35.5	47.6	14.5	1.6	0.8
Aegean	56.6	32.5	9.6	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	52.1	30.1	12.3	5.5	0.0
Mediterranean	54.5	25.7	9.9	7.9	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	59.2	28.9	7.9	2.6	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	66.3	31.3	2.5	0.0	0.0

It increased my interest in art.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	26.7	32.5	28.6	9.4	2.7
Marmara	16.1	42.7	28.2	9.7	3.2
Aegean	28.9	24.1	28.9	15.7	2.4
Black Sea	28.8	20.5	24.7	11.0	15.1
Mediterranean	42.0	24.0	16.0	16.0	2.0

Eastern Anatolia	47.4	31.6	17.1	3.9	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	56.3	30.0	12.5	1.3	0.0
Any prejudices I held before are now gone.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	31.9	39.8	17.7	7.5	3.1
Marmara	25.0	51.6	15.3	6.5	1.6
Aegean	39.8	45.8	10.8	3.6	0.0
Black Sea	25.0	36.1	26.4	4.2	8.3
Mediterranean	38.5	37.5	13.5	8.3	2.1
Eastern Anatolia	47.4	34.2	11.8	5.3	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	67.5	23.8	8.8	0.0	0.0
It increased my awareness about NGO's.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	38.1	43.3	14.3	3.2	1.2
Marmara	36.3	51.6	8.9	3.2	0.0
Aegean	48.2	39.8	10.8	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	29.2	36.1	22.2	5.6	6.9
Mediterranean	34.4	34.4	20.8	8.3	2.1
Eastern Anatolia	49.3	38.7	5.3	4.0	2.7
SouthEastern Anatolia	63.3	31.6	5.1	0.0	0.0

It's contributed to an increase my working capacity.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	38.4	43.4	12.8	5.0	0.4
Marmara	25.0	57.3	13.7	4.0	0.0
Aegean	42.7	41.5	12.2	3.7	0.0
Black Sea	31.1	45.9	17.6	5.4	0.0
Mediterranean	51.0	30.4	7.8	8.8	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	59.2	28.9	6.6	3.9	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	67.5	30.0	2.5	0.0	0.0

It improved my ability to cooperate with local and regional officials.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	36.7	45.7	13.3	3.9	0.4
Marmara	31.2	54.4	10.4	3.2	0.8
Aegean	48.2	43.4	2.4	6.0	0.0
Black Sea	35.6	37.0	16.4	8.2	2.7
Mediterranean	47.4	33.7	8.4	8.4	2.1

Eastern Anatolia	48.7	40.8	7.9	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	58.8	37.5	3.8	0.0	0.0
It improved my abilities and skills.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	33.7	53.5	8.5	4.3	0.0
Marmara	28.2	51.6	16.9	2.4	0.8
Aegean	53.0	37.3	7.2	2.4	0.0
Black Sea	36.5	39.2	17.6	6.8	0.0
Mediterranean	50.0	30.4	9.8	7.8	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	53.9	28.9	11.8	5.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	76.3	22.5	1.3	0.0	0.0

It increased my knowledge.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	44.6	50.4	3.5	1.2	0.4
Marmara	36.3	56.5	5.6	0.8	0.8
Aegean	57.8	34.9	6.0	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	51.4	31.1	10.8	6.8	0.0
Mediterranean	63.4	28.7	4.0	2.0	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	55.3	38.2	5.3	1.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	78.8	18.8	2.5	0.0	0.0

It had a positive impact on my life.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	47.7	45.3	5.8	1.2	0.0
Marmara	36.8	53.6	8.0	1.6	0.0
Aegean	68.7	22.9	6.0	1.2	1.2
Black Sea	52.7	24.3	21.6	1.4	0.0
Mediterranean	71.6	19.6	5.9	1.0	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	56.0	34.7	4.0	5.3	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	75.0	22.5	2.5	0.0	0.0

It increased my levels of perception.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	37.0	47.1	10.9	4.3	0.8
Marmara	25.8	55.6	15.3	1.6	1.6
Aegean	53.0	32.5	10.8	3.6	0.0
Black Sea	39.2	33.8	20.3	6.8	0.0
Mediterranean	49.0	27.5	13.7	7.8	2.0

Eastern Anatolia	64.0	29.3	2.7	2.7	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	73.8	21.3	5.0	0.0	0.0
It helped create the characteristics required to be an active citizen.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	36.9	43.9	15.3	2.7	1.2
Marmara	25.8	53.2	17.7	3.2	0.0
Aegean	51.8	37.3	9.6	1.2	0.0
Black Sea	29.7	39.2	23.0	6.8	1.4
Mediterranean	54.1	24.5	9.2	11.2	1.0
Eastern Anatolia	62.7	25.3	9.3	2.7	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	66.3	27.5	3.8	2.5	0.0

It strengthened my social participation.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	48.6	45.9	3.5	1.2	0.8
Marmara	33.9	58.9	5.6	1.6	0.0
Aegean	61.4	34.9	3.6	0.0	0.0
Black Sea	56.8	35.1	5.4	2.7	0.0
Mediterranean	68.6	20.6	4.9	3.9	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	63.2	28.9	5.3	2.6	0.0
SouthEastern Anatolia	76.3	20.0	3.8	0.0	0.0

It increased my future chances in the world of business.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	22.7	27.1	31.1	13.5	5.6
Marmara	24.4	36.6	19.5	9.8	9.8
Aegean	14.5	28.9	32.5	19.3	4.8
Black Sea	28.8	26.0	26.0	8.2	11.0
Mediterranean	45.5	21.2	12.1	15.2	6.1
Eastern Anatolia	43.4	34.2	17.1	2.6	2.6
SouthEastern Anatolia	62.5	22.5	11.3	2.5	1.3

My family supported my participation in the Youth Programme.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	36.2	35.4	13.0	7.5	7.9
Marmara	44.0	31.2	11.2	8.8	4.8
Aegean	67.5	16.9	10.8	4.8	0.0
Black Sea	52.7	25.7	8.1	9.5	4.1
Mediterranean	70.3	16.8	4.0	5.0	4.0

Eastern Anatolia	50.0	28.9	17.1	2.6	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	44.3	32.9	19.0	2.5	1.3
My friends supported my participation in the Youth Programme.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	44.4	42.0	8.6	1.9	3.1
Marmara	40.8	41.6	12.0	3.2	2.4
Aegean	60.2	28.9	4.8	4.8	1.2
Black Sea	54.1	25.7	10.8	8.1	1.4
Mediterranean	75.2	18.8	0.0	3.0	3.0
Eastern Anatolia	51.3	39.5	6.6	1.3	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	53.8	38.8	7.5	0.0	0.0

My family and friends have started to have a more positive attitude towards Europe.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	18.3	33.3	33.3	11.3	3.8
Marmara	29.8	39.5	16.9	8.9	4.8
Aegean	26.5	48.2	19.3	6.0	0.0
Black Sea	21.1	29.6	19.7	14.1	15.5
Mediterranean	49.5	34.7	13.9	0.0	2.0
Eastern Anatolia	46.1	38.2	7.9	6.6	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	26.3	38.8	28.8	5.0	1.3

My family and friends have started to understand other cultures.					
Region	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Central Anatolia	21.8	39.9	26.9	7.1	4.2
Marmara	29.0	42.7	21.0	4.8	2.4
Aegean	33.7	43.4	16.9	4.8	1.2
Black Sea	18.3	28.2	31.0	11.3	11.3
Mediterranean	59.4	28.7	10.9	1.0	0.0
Eastern Anatolia	47.4	42.1	5.3	3.9	1.3
SouthEastern Anatolia	30.0	41.3	21.3	7.5	0.0

ANNEX III

Summary of Findings



Olgu Araştırma

**The Centre for European Union Education and Youth Programmes
(National Agency)
“Impact Assessment for 2003-2006 Youth Programmes”**

Hello, I work for Olgu Research. My name is We are conducting research on behalf of the National Agency of the State Planning Organisation of the Prime Ministry about the impact of the youth programmes. We would like to gain your comments as part of the research. This interview will last approximately 20 minutes. We will not disclose your personal information with third persons or other entities. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Information about the Interviewee		Information about the Interview		
Forename-Surname		Date/...../2007	
Address		Start Time:.....	
		Finish Time:.....	
Province		Forename-Surname of the Interviewer		
Subprovince		Signed		
District		To Be Completed By the Project Manager		
Street		Project Manager		
Road		Controller	Name	Date
No		CheckBack		
Home Phone	0 ()	Accompanied		
Work Phone	0 ()	Edit		
Mobile Phone		Check Phone		
E-Mail	@			

Interviewer's comments:

A- GENERAL INFORMATION (ALL INTERVIEWEES)

A.1. Is the interviewee physically handicapped? (CAREFUL: Check upon observation!)

Handicapped	1	Comments:
Not Handicapped	2	

A.2. Where does the interviewee live at the moment!

Ankara	1	Antalya	8
İstanbul	2	Zonguldak	9
İzmir	3	Kayseri	10
Adana	4	Gaziantep	11
Trabzon	5	Bursa	12
Bingöl	6	Erzurum	13
Uşak	7	Batman	14

Region	Number	%
Central Anatolia	260	32.5
Marmara	125	15.6
Aegean	83	10.4
Black Sea	74	9.3
Mediterranean	102	12.8
Eastern Anatolia	76	9.5
South-eastern Anatolia	80	10.0
Total	800	100.0

A.3. Have you ever participated in the youth programmes of the National Agency?

Yes I Have	100	CONTINUE
No I Have Not	0	END THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A.4. How many project applications have you made to the National Agency as of the end of 2006?

Never	58.5
One project	22.3
Two projects	8.8
Three projects	4.1
Four projects	1.9
Five and more projects	4.5

A.5. How many projects of yours were accepted by the National Agency?

None	12.3	Three projects accepted	6.9
------	------	-------------------------	-----

One project accepted	56.3	Four projects accepted	3.0
Two projects accepted	14.5	Five and more projects accepted	6.9

A.6. Which Action/s have you participated in? (NOTE: SHOW CARD-1)

Actions	
Action 1 Youth for Europe	51.4
Action 2 European Voluntary Service	10.3
Action 3 Youth Initiatives	43.8
Action 5 Support Measures	25.5

A.7. Have your projects completed or still continuing?

Completed	73.8
Continuing	26.3

A.8. How many different projects of the National Agency have you participated?

One project	59.0
Two projects	17.5
Three projects	10.4
Four projects	6.3
Five and more projects	6.8
Other (please explain)

A.9. When did you apply for your project(s) and when was (will be) it completed?

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Application Date	3.8	11.1	21	64.1		
Completion Date	2.0	5.8	13.7	39.9	38.6	0.1

A.10. What position(s) did you undertake in the project(s)? (MULTIPLE ANSWER)

Project Responsible/Leader	29.3
Legal Representative	10.9
Project Beneficiary	79.3
Volunteer	5.4

A.11. Do you speak a foreign language? Which language(s)? At which level? Mark the level from 1 to 5 (1 = advanced level, 5 = beginner's level).

		Language		Score
Yes I do	87.9	1. Language	1	
		2. Language	2	
		3. Language	3	
No I do not	12.1			

A.12. Except from with the National Agency, have you ever been abroad before this project? If yes, for what reason?

		Please explain the reason for being abroad !
Yes I have	30.5	1. Country Name: Reason: 2. Country Name:..... Reason:
No I have not	6 9.5	

B- QUESTIONS ABOUT THE NATIONAL AGENCY (ALL INTERVIEWEES)

B.1. Did you know the National Agency existed as an institution before you participated in the project?

Yes	55.3
No	44.8

B.2. How did you learn about the youth programmes of the National Agency? (NOTE: SHOW CARD-2A)

Internet	28.1	Posters & Brochures	5.6
Friends/Relatives	67.1	TV	2.1
Newspapers/Magazines	4.3	Other (Please explain).....	

B.3. From which sources did you obtain detailed information about the Youth programmes? (NOTE: Complete the below table, show CARD-2B)

B.4. How adequate was your source of information? (NOTE: Score for each information source)
 (NOTE: Show CARD -3)

	B.3	B4				
		Very Adequate	Adequate	Neither Adequate Nor Inadequate	Inadequate	Very Inadequate
Internet	66.0	22.5	52.0	16.3	8.5	0.6
Brochures and other publications of the National Agency	37.3	23.1	51.1	14.7	9.4	1.6
Introductory meeting of the National Agency	31.4	30.7	48.0	13.5	7.0	0.8
University office introductory meetings of the National Agency	15.5	21.1	39.8	22.0	8.1	8.9
Other (Please explain)						

B.5. Please evaluate the National Agency staff you received information from based on the statements on the card. (NOTE: Show CARD-4)

Very Qualified	28.5
Qualified	44.5
Neither Qualified Nor Unqualified	7.9
Unqualified	3.4
Very Unqualified	0.8
I Did Not Receive Information	14.8

B.6. Have you experienced problems with accessing the National Agency?

	Yes I Had Problem	No I Did Not Have Problem
Access through Telephone	11.7	88.3
Access through Internet	8.5	91.5
Transportation	5.2	94.8
Other (Please explain)		

B.7. Did the National Agency staff guide you through the project preparation process?

Yes	66.9	GO TO QUESTION B8
No	33.1	GO TO QUESTION B9

B.8. (NOTE: Ask if s/he said YES to B7!!) How accurate and adequate was the National Agency's guidance? (Show CARD-5)

I think the guidance was definitely accurate and adequate.	39.4
I think the guidance was accurate and adequate.	54.4
I think the guidance was neither accurate and adequate nor inaccurate and inadequate .	4.0
I think the guidance was inaccurate and inadequate.	1.9
I think the guidance was definitely inaccurate and inadequate.	0.4

B.9. Have you experienced a problem with the National Agency during the project preparation process?

(NOTE: Show CARD-6)

No I did not have a problem.	91.9	GO TO QUESTION B11
Yes I had a problem	4.5	GO TO QUESTION B10
I had a partial problem	3.6	GO TO QUESTION B10

B.10. (NOTE: Ask to those who checked 2 and 3 in B.9!!) Specify the problems you had with the National Agency.

1.
2.
3.

B.11. How do you consider the National Agency's project evaluation? (NOTE: Show CARD-7)

I consider it to be definitely very successful/adequate	20.9
I consider it to be successful/adequate	60.2
I consider it to be neither successful/adequate or unsuccessful/inadequate	13.2
I consider it to be unsuccessful/inadequate	4.5
I consider it to be definitely very unsuccessful/inadequate	1.2

B.12. Do you consider the National Agency to be successful in general? (NOTE: Show CARD-8)

I consider it to be definitely very successful.	29.1
I consider it to be successful.	59.8
I consider it to be neither successful nor unsuccessful.	9.8
I consider it to be unsuccessful	1.2
I consider it to be definitely very unsuccessful	0.1

B.13. Please specify the most successful aspects of the National Agency.

1.

- 2.
- 3.

B.14. Please specify the least successful aspects of the National Agency.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

B.15. To what extent do you think the National Agency promoted the Youth programmes? (NOTE: Show CARD-9)

It was definitely promoted to the maximum extent	11.2
It was promoted to the maximum extent	33.3
It was neither promoted to the maximum nor the minimum extent	25.6
It was not promoted to the maximum extent.	25.5
It was definitely not promoted to the maximum extent.	4.3

B.16. What do think of the Internet site of the National Agency? (NOTE: Show CARD-10)

Absolutely adequate, clear and understandable	18.4
Adequate, clear and understandable	55.3
Neither adequate, clear and understandable nor inadequate, unclear and complicated	19.4
Inadequate, unclear and complicated	6.1
Absolutely inadequate, unclear and complicated	0.8

C- YOUTH PROGRAMMES

C.1. Please specify your reasons for participating in the Youth programmes. Start from the most important reason. (NOTE: Write the most important reason in the first column, and others in the second column)

	The most important reason (Single Answer)	Other reasons (Multiple Answers)
To learn a foreign language	5.5	24.1
To go abroad	5.3	21.5
To learn about various cultures	26.5	37.8
To meet new people	7.5	42.1

Entrepreneurship	16.0	29.6
Personal development	21.6	37.8
Other (Please explain)	17.6	

C.2. What was more important in making your decision to join the project: The type of the project or your own personal objectives? (SINGLE ANSWER)

	Single Answer
Type of the project	40.5
My own personal objectives	59.5

**C.3. How qualified were the promoters/trainers you encountered?
(NOTE: Show CARD- 9)**

Definitely qualified	31.8
Qualified	53.4
Neither qualified nor unqualified	11.6
Unqualified	2.3
Definitely unqualified	0.9

C.4. Which Action did you participate in?

Action 1 - Youth for Europe	39.9	GO TO QUESTION D.1 (Page 6)
Action 2 - European Voluntary Service	6.8	GO TO QUESTION Q.1 (Page 8)
Action 3 - Youth Initiatives	39.0	GO TO QUESTION K.1 (Page 9)
Action 5 - Support Measures	14.4	GO TO QUESTION Z.1 (Page 11)

ACTION 1 YOUTH FOR EUROPE

D.1. Name of Your Project:

D.2. From which province was the project application submitted? (Please write down the name of the province and the plate number!)

Province Name	Plate Number
------------------------	-----------------------

D.3. What position did you undertake in the project?

Project Responsible/Leader	22.3
Legal Representative	6.0
Project Beneficiary	71.5
Volunteer	0.3

D.4. How many days did (will) your project last for?8.1 ± 2.1..... days

D.5. How many people participated in your project?

Turkish citizens	9,8±5,4. people
Citizens of other countries	19,7±7,7. people
Total	29,9±14,1. people

D.6. What was the grant amount for the project?

Please specify the amount	14000.....EURO
I don't know	

D.7. Why did you choose Action 1? (Don't give suggestions!!) MULTIPLE ANSWER

My personal decision	32.0
My school guided me	16.3
My family/relatives/friends guided me	19.1
NGO guidance	16.3
Guidance of the specialists of the National Agency	3.8
I participated as a beneficiary	7.8
Other (Please explain)	11.0

D.8. Did you have difficulty in finding a subject matter for the project? (Show CARD-12)

I definitely had difficulty.	2,0
I had difficulty.	5,3
Neither had difficulty nor didn't have difficulty.	10,3
I had no difficulty.	44,9
I definitely had no difficulty.	37,5

D.9. Which foreign country(ies) did (will) you work with in the project?

Country Name

Country Code!

...	
...	
...	

D.10. Did you have difficulty in selecting the country? (Show CARD-12)

I definitely had difficulty.	1.1
I had difficulty.	4.6
Neither had difficulty nor didn't have difficulty.	6.7
I had no difficulty.	52.1
I definitely had no difficulty.	35.6

D.11. (NOTE: Check if 1-2-3 was selected in D.10!) What kind of difficulties did you experience?

1...
2...
3...

D.12. Why did you select country(ies)?

1. Country Code	Country Name.....
Reason.....	
2. Country Code	Country Name.....
Reason.....	
3. Country Code	Country Name.....
Reason.....	

D.13. Did you have difficulty in finding partners?

Yes I had difficulty	12. 9	GO TO QUESTION D.14
No I didn't have any difficulty	87. 1	GO TO QUESTION D.15

D.14. What were the problems and difficulties you experienced in finding partners?

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3.
--

D.15. Did you have a sponsor?

No	52.6
Yes	47.4

D.16. Did you have difficulty in finding a sponsor?

Yes	45.6
No	54.4

D.17. Was the duration of your project sufficient?

Yes it was sufficient.	71.7
It was neither sufficient nor insufficient	13.8
No it was insufficient	14.5

ACTION 2 EUROPEAN VOLUNTARY SERVICE

Q.1. Name of Your Project:

Q.2. From which province was the project application submitted? (Please write down the name of the province and the plate number!)

Province Name	Plate Number
------------------------	-----------------------

Q.3. What position did you undertake in the project?

Project Responsible/Leader	37.0
Legal Representative	9.3
Project Beneficiary	
Volunteer	53.7

Q.4. How many people participated in your project?

Turkish citizens	2.4 people
Citizens of other countries	22.8 people
Total	25.1 people

Q.5. What was the budget of the project?

Please specify the amount	5184 EURO
I don't know	

Q.6. Why did you choose Action 2? (Don't give suggestions!!) MULTIPLE ANSWER

My personal decision	50.0
My school guided me	
My family/relatives/friends guided me	7.4
NGO guidance	9.3

Guidance of the specialists of the National Agency	1.9
Other (Please explain)	51.8

Q.7. Which foreign country(ies) did (will) you work with in the project?

Country Name

Country Code!

--	--

Q.8. How many months did your project last?

1 month	11.3	5 months	1.9
2 months		6 months	28.3
3 months	5.7	12 months	17.0
4 months		Other (Please explain)	35.9

Q.9. Did you have difficulty in selecting the country? (Show CARD-12)

I definitely had difficulty.	3,7
I had difficulty.	5,6
Neither had difficulty nor didn't have difficulty.	
I had no difficulty.	46,3
I definitely had no difficulty.	44,4

Q.10. (NOTE: Check if 1-2-3 was selected in Q.10!) What kind of difficulties did you experience?

1...
2...
3...

Q.11. Did you have difficulty in finding the sender institution?

Yes	9,4	GO TO Q.12
No	90,6	GO TO Q.13

Q.12. What was the biggest problem you experienced in finding the sender institution?

--

Q.13. Did you have difficulty in finding the host institution?

Yes	13,7	GO TO Q.14
No	86,3	GO TO Q.15

Q.14. What was the biggest problem you experienced in finding the host institution?

--

Q.15. What was the grant amount for the project?

Please specify the amount	7549 EURO
I don't know	

Q.16. Was the duration of your project sufficient?

Yes it was sufficient.	75.9
It was neither sufficient nor insufficient	13.0
No it was insufficient	11.1

ACTION 3 YOUTH INITIATIVES

K.1. Name of Your Project:

K.2. From which province was the project application submitted? (Please write down the name of the province and the plate number!)

Province Name	Plate Number
------------------------	-----------------------

K.3. What position did you undertake in the project?

Project Responsible/Leader	18.6
Legal Representative	3.8
Project Beneficiary	77.6
Volunteer	

K.4. How many people participated in your project?

Turkish citizens	38.5 people
Citizens of other countries	1.3 people
Total	39.9 people

K.5. What was the grant amount for the project?

Please specify the amount	8950 EURO
I don't know	

K.6. Why did you choose Action 3? (Don't give suggestions!!) MULTIPLE ANSWER

My personal decision	39.7
My school guided me	9.3
My family/relatives/friends guided me	33.7
NGO guidance	11.5
Guidance of the specialists of the National Agency	3.2
Other (Please explain)	24.3

K.7. Which project of Action 3 did you participate in? (SINGLE ANSWER)

Group initiatives	81.4
Networking projects	2.2
Future capital	6.4
Don't remember	9.9

K.8. How many months did your project last?

1 month	10.0	5 months	12.6
2 months	3.6	6 months	29.1
3 months	17.5	12 months	12.9
4 months	13.2	Other (Please explain)	

K.9. (NOTE: Ask if it is stated “networking projects” in K.7!) In which countries did you implement the project?

Country Name	

Country Code!

K.10. (NOTE: Ask if a foreign country is stated in K.9) Did you have difficulty in selecting the country? (Show CARD-12)

I definitely had difficulty.	
I had difficulty.	11.5
Neither had difficulty nor didn't have difficulty.	
I had no difficulty.	19.2
I definitely had no difficulty.	69.2

K.11. (NOTE: Check if 1-2-3 was selected in K.10!) What kind of difficulties did you experience?

--

K.12. Did you have a sponsor?

Yes	49.7	GO TO K.13
No	50.3	GO TO K.14

K.13. Did you have difficulty in finding a sponsor?

Yes	44.4
No	55.6

K.14. Was the duration of your project sufficient?

Yes it was sufficient.	77.9
It was neither sufficient nor insufficient	7.6
No it was insufficient	14.5

ACTION 5 SUPPORT MEASURES

Z.1. Name of Your Project:

Z.2. From which province was the project application submitted? (Please write down the name of the province and the plate number!)

Province Name	Plate Number
------------------------	-----------------------

Z.3. What position did you undertake in the project?

Project Responsible/Leader	24.3
Legal Representative	7.8
Project Beneficiary	67.8
Volunteer	

Z.4. How many days did your project last for?
.....24,4 days

Z.5. How many people participated in your project?

Turkish citizens8,8..... people
Citizens of other countries16,5..... people
Total	...25,4..... people

Z.6. What was the grant amount for the project

Please specify the amount	15046 EURO
I don't know	

Z.7. Why did you choose Action 5? (Don't give suggestions!!) MULTIPLE ANSWER

My personal decision	30.4
My school guided me	5.2
My family/relatives/friends guided me	20.0
NGO guidance	29.6
Guidance of the specialists of the National Agency	7.0
Other (Please explain)	39.1

Z.8. Which project of Action 5 did you participate in?

Practical training experience	2.6
Feasibility visits	5.2

Study tours	0.9
Seminars	50.4
Training courses	6.1
Youth information	7.0
Partnerships and networks beyond nations	12.2
Capacity development and creativity support	4.3
Don't remember	11.3

Z.9. Did you have difficulty in selecting the country? (Show CARD-12)

I definitely had difficulty.	2.1
I had difficulty.	13.4
Neither had difficulty nor didn't have difficulty.	12.4
I had no difficulty.	45.4
I definitely had no difficulty.	26.8

Z.10. (NOTE: Check if 1-2-3 was selected in Z.9!) What kind of difficulties did you experience?

	1
--	---

Z.11. Did you have a sponsor?

Yes	64.5	GO TO Z.12
No	35.5	GO TO Z.13

Z.12. Did you have difficulty in finding a sponsor?

Yes	33.3
No	66.7

Z.13. Was the duration of your project sufficient?

Yes it was sufficient.	71.9
It was neither sufficient nor insufficient	16.7

No it was insufficient	11.4
------------------------	------

(ALL INTERVIEWEES)

D- EVALUATION OF THE YOUTH PROGRAMMES

D.1. Please tell me if you agree with the statements I will read you aloud. Please indicate you agree or disagree to what extent.

“I participated inProject” (Show CARD-13)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. It promoted learning among the cultures.	54.4	30.7	6.0	5.8	3.2
It supported basic values such as human rights and the battle against racism and hostility towards foreigners.	35.4	39.3	12.6	7.9	4.9
3. It promoted the notion of solidarity.	53.8	37.6	6.1	1.5	0.9
4. It improved my entrepreneurial skills.	61.1	31.2	5.7	1.4	0.6
5. It improved my creativity.	50.9	37.2	8.4	2.9	0.5
6. It improved my ability to use my initiative.	50.8	37.4	9.7	1.9	0.3
7. It promoted cooperation between all partners of the youth sector.	39.3	39.6	16.3	3.0	1.8
8. It enabled me to exchange ideas with my friends.	57.0	35.8	4.1	2.1	0.9
9. It enabled me to learn about different cultures.	57.4	26.4	5.4	7.4	3.3
10. It encouraged me to make an active contribution to the integration of Turkey in to the EU.	37.7	33.6	17.5	8.1	3.1

D.2. Are you satisfied with the project in general? (Show CARD-14)

I am definitely satisfied.	52.3
I am satisfied.	44.8
I am neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.	1.9
I am dissatisfied.	1.0
I am definitely dissatisfied.	

D.3. Do you consider your project to be successful in achieving its objectives? (Show CARD-15)

I definitely consider it to be successful.	41.3
I consider it to be successful.	50.6
I consider it to be neither successful nor unsuccessful.	6.3
I consider it to be unsuccessful.	1.4
I definitely consider it to be unsuccessful.	0.4

D.4. Was the project implemented in compliance with the planned activity programme? (Show CARD-16)

It was implemented as planned.	62.8
It was implemented with some deviation from the plan.	35.9
It did not follow the plan.	1.3

D.5. Do you think that you completed the project successfully? (Show CARD--15)

I definitely consider that I was successful.	50.8
I consider that I was successful.	45.9
I consider that I was neither successful nor unsuccessful.	2.1
I consider that I was unsuccessful.	1.0
I definitely consider that I was unsuccessful.	0.1

D.6. (NOTE: Ask only if 3-4-5 is checked in D.5. Do not make suggestions!!) Please indicate reasons for not being successful. (MULTIPLE ANSWER)

Personal reasons	1.8
Inadequate organisation	1.9
Lack of harmony within the group	0.9
Inadequate budget	0.4
Bad timing	1.3
Other (Please explain)	1.2

D.7. Do you think that the budget provided by the National Agency was sufficient?

Yes it was	51.6
No it wasn't	29.6
No idea	18.8

D.8. Who was the applicant institution/group/NGO?

--

D.9. In your opinion, was the applicant institution/group/NGO successful? (Show CARD-17)

Very successful	47.3
Successful	45.3
Neither successful nor unsuccessful	5.8
Unsuccessful	1.0
Very unsuccessful	0.5

D.10. To what extent did the project contribute to your learning of, or improvement of a foreign language? (Show CARD-18)

Contributed a lot	26.9
Contributed	34.3
Neither contributed nor did not contribute	13.7
Did not contribute	14.7
Did not contribute at all	10.5

D.11. Did you have difficulty in preparing the final report? (NOTE: Ask this question to the person responsible in a project!)

Yes I did	24.0
No I didn't	47.9
I haven't written yet	28.1

D.12. Do you think you will use what you learned within the Project? (Show CARD-19)

I think I definitely will.	39.3
I think I will.	49.0
I may or may not.	9.3
I don't think I will.	2.3
I definitely will not.	0.1

D.13. Did you encourage your friends to participate in the programme after you completed?

Yes	95.7
No	4.3

E- A GLANCE AT THE EUROPEAN UNION

E.1. Now I want to learn about the impacts of the Programme you participated in. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the statements I'll read. (NOTE: Show CARD-13)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. It helped the establishment of European awareness.	28.9	45.1	13.3	8.9	3.8
2. It improved my awareness about EU citizenship.	19.5	37.6	22.2	14.3	6.5
3. It created a more positive perspective about the foreign people I met here or abroad.	29.8	35.2	15.2	9.0	10.8

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. I believe I made a good impression as a Turkish citizen.	63.6	25.0	3.8	2.3	5.4
5. I promoted positive views about the Turkish culture and our country when I went abroad (or for the foreigners who came to Turkey).	46.8	28.3	6.6	7.9	10.4
6. The experiences I had with foreigners led to positive changes in my personality.	30.9	37.3	12.7	7.5	11.7
7. It contributed to common development and cooperation between the countries.	34.8	37.1	15.9	5.8	6.3
8. It contributed to the establishment of the concepts of European Union and being a European.	23.0	42.0	22.0	7.9	5.1
9. I learned more about European integration and democratic culture.	23.6	37.2	24.7	9.0	5.4
10. It created an active participation notion in the development of the idea of European Union.	25.3	39.0	22.7	8.2	4.9
YOUTH POLICY					
11. It contributed to the development of youth policies throughout Europe.	29.1	43.5	18.0	6.5	2.8
12. It contributed to the development of youth organisations throughout Europe.	26.1	45.3	18.1	7.7	2.8
13. It improved the communication between the policy makers and the youth organisations.	18.4	34.3	27.0	15.0	5.3
14. It supported young people who had fewer opportunities.	40.2	36.0	13.9	7.2	2.8
15. It enabled equal participation and opportunities for young women and men.	47.5	37.3	9.9	3.2	2.2

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
16. It helped integration of formal and non-formal training.	35.1	41.8	17.2	4.4	1.4
17. It contributed to the creation of a knowledge-based Europe.	26.4	40.1	22.7	8.7	2.1

F- INDIVIDUAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

F. 1. Now, I want to learn about the impact of the project you participated in. Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the statements I'll read. (NOTE: Show CARD-13)

INDIVIDUAL IMPACT	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. It improved my ability and knowledge of how to prepare and implement a project.	52.8	39.4	5.6	1.9	0.4
2. It developed my understanding of team spirit.	61.9	33.3	3.6	0.9	0.3
3. It developed my sense of responsibility and an understanding that "everyone has a right to speak".	53.7	39.2	4.8	1.8	0.5
4. It developed my ability to delegate responsibilities.	60.4	33.8	3.9	1.5	0.4
5. It improved my ability to establish social relationships with citizens of different countries.	51.1	30.6	7.2	5.8	5.4
6. I started to understand what it is to learn a foreign language.	37.2	34.3	14.3	9.4	4.8
7. I have learned or improved a foreign language.	26.1	35.5	17.2	14.0	7.2
8. It contributed to my vocational and technical training.	21.8	37.3	22.8	14.2	3.9
9. It developed my perspective on looking at the problems both in local and global terms.	34.0	49.4	12.6	3.2	0.9

INDIVIDUAL IMPACT	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
10. Study tours were fun and didactic.	49.9	35.9	9.2	3.1	1.8
11. It increased my environmental awareness and a love of nature.	34.6	33.8	20.3	7.7	3.6
12. It improved my understanding about all kinds of discrimination.	39.8	41.2	12.5	4.7	1.8
13. It improved my interest in sports.	23.3	21.9	27.4	20.7	6.7
14. It increased my self-confidence.	51.8	36.7	7.8	2.9	0.9
15. It increased my tolerance.	50.1	40.6	6.5	2.1	0.6
16. It increased my feeling of active participation.	59.2	34.8	4.2	1.4	0.4
17. It contributed to my ability to overcome unexpected problems.	52.3	35.0	9.2	2.9	0.6
18. It increased my interest in art.	32.4	30.7	23.9	9.7	3.3
19. Any prejudices I held before are now gone.	36.9	39.5	15.4	5.7	2.4
20. It increased my awareness about NGO's.	41.2	40.8	12.8	3.6	1.5
21. It's contributed to an increase my working capacity.	42.6	41.2	11.1	4.6	0.5
22. It improved my ability to cooperate with local and regional officials.	41.6	43.3	9.9	4.4	0.8
23. It improved my abilities and skills.	43.4	41.8	10.3	4.1	0.4
24. It increased my knowledge.	52.1	40.8	4.9	1.6	0.5
25. It had a positive impact on my life.	55.2	35.8	7.2	1.5	0.4
26. It increased my levels of perception.	44.9	38.9	11.4	3.9	0.9

INDIVIDUAL IMPACT	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
27. It helped create the characteristics required to be an active citizen.	43.6	38.4	13.3	4.1	0.6
28. It strengthened my social participation.	55.2	38.3	4.4	1.6	0.5
29. It increased my future chances in the world of business.	31.6	28.2	23.2	11.1	6.0
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT					
30. My family supported my participation in the Youth Programme.	48.7	28.7	11.9	6.3	4.4
31. My friends supported my participation in the Youth Programme.	51.9	35.6	7.5	2.9	2.1
32. My family and friends have started to have a more positive attitude towards Europe.	28.9	36.8	22.5	8.0	3.9
33. My family and friends have started to understand other cultures.	32.2	38.6	20.4	5.8	3.0

G- QUESTIONS ABOUT DEMOGRAPHY

G.1. Gender

GENDER	Male	Female
	55,1	44,9

G.2. What is your date of birth? (NOTE: Write down the age clearly and mark the table!)

Please write the date of birth (then complete the table)	30-34	5.3
15-19	21.5	35-39	2.4
20-24	44.8	40-44	2.6
25-29	21.1	45+	2.4

G.3. What is your marital status?

MARITAL STATUS	
Married	9.5
Single	89.4
Widowed/Divorced	1.1

G.4. What is your education level? (NOTE: Ask about the last school!)

EDUCATION			
Literate	0.3	2-Year Higher Education	1.5
Primary Education (8 Years)	2.9	Undergraduate Degree	21.1
High School Student	13.4	Graduate Student	5.1
High School Diploma	10.4	Graduate Degree	4.9
University Student	39.5	PhD	1.0

G.5. What is your profession? (NOTE: Write down the current profession clearly and in detail).

Profession	

G.6. Are you the household head? (NOTE: Household head is the person who earns the highest income for the family. Ask with an explanation)

Yes	16.9	Go to G.9
No	83.1	Go to G.7

G.7. What is the education level of the household head?

EDUCATION			
Literate	3.8	2-Year Higher Education	3.5
Primary Education (8 Years)	29.1	Undergraduate Degree	28.3
High School	27.2	Graduate Degree	8.1

G.8. What is the profession of the household head? (NOTE: Write down the current profession clearly and in detail).

Profession	
------------	--

A	4	C	2	C	1	D	1	Check the SES!
B	6.1	1	4.3	2	8.1	E	1.5	

G.9. How many people are living in your household including yourselves?

G.10. How many members of your household work?

		1 person	2 people	3 people	4 people	5 or more people
E.9	Number of people living	5.0	8.4	21.6	35.0	29.2
E.10	Number of people working	51.0	37.8	8.6	1.9	0.8

G.11. What is the average monthly income of your family? Please say it from the card? (NOTE: Show CARD 20)

Less than YTL 500	3.5	YTL 2,501-5,000	11.3
YTL 501-1,000	21.1	YTL 5,001-7,500	1.9
YTL 1,001-1,500	18.1	YTL 7,500-10,000	0.9
YTL 1,501 –2,000	15.0	YTL 10,000 and over	1.5
YTL 2,001- 2,500	10.4	No response	16.4

G.12. How long have you lived here?

1-5 years	29.8
6-10 years	11.4
11-15 years	6.0
16-20 years	7.1
21 + years	1.1
Since I was born	44.5

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION