#### Let's Do It Better

improving quality of education for adults among various social groups



**GRUNDTVIG - Partnership** 

# QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS February / March 2012

Partner: AGORA NICE-EST

Target group: MIGRANTS

- 1. Analysis of local context concerning labor market and social policies
- Number of inhabitants: 20 000 inhabitants (Nice: 380 000 inhabitants): multicultural area, 43 nationalities (foreigners: 32,9 %), several single-parent families (23,70 %) (17,6 % for Nice)
- High rate of unemployment: 22,9 % (15,80 % for Nice)
- Job-seeker rate :

women: 42,8 % (44,6 % for Nice)

• youngsters: - 25 years old: 21,3 % (15% for Nice)

- Area registered in priority zone of « Politiques de la Ville » (a series of State action aiming to redevelop some inner-city areas and reducing social inequalities between territories) characterized by people precariousness and by a strong urban density, especially in public housing. An area restructuration is under way: construction of public facilities (cultural and sportive), transport (tramway)
- The territory has been listed: Prioritary Educational Zone (ZEP) since 1981
- Inner-city area since 1996
- Urban Redeveloping Zone since 2005
- 2. Beneficiaries' knowledge about labor market opportunities

It is very low because the functional illiteracy rate is very high and so are the professional qualifications Moreover there is no fixed sructures dedicated to the job search: employment agency and temping agencies, as well as information centre for job insertion are all quite a long way out from the area. A first Job Forum has been held in premises we share with "la Ville de Nice". (the Initiative got a good reception from the inhabitants)

3. Language skills and qualifications of beneficiaries

The functional illiteracy is very high and professional qualifications are not enough. The lack of French language is reported by the institutions and organizations Undergraduates rate: 33,2 % (through the city 21,2 % except pupils and students) Academic results are not satisfactory.

#### Let's Do It Better

improving quality of education for adults among various social groups



**GRUNDTVIG – Partnership** 

### 4. Level of social and working inclusion of beneficiaries

Social integration level of beneficiaries is less satisfying.

Professional integration level is very low (analyzed in points 2 and 3)

## 5. Life quality level of beneficiaries as well as their professional satisfaction

Population enjoying welfare benefits: 12 476 people over 19 795 inhabitants

The quality of life of beneficiaries is not good: damaged housing, isolation of the area from the downtown, several single-parent families, academic problems for pupils (truancy), lack of servicies and public facilities, lack of green space.

Professional well-being level: unemployment of youngsters, single mothers, many people are doing work less qualified and demanding physical effort: hotel field (chambermaid, maid, cooking), human service and in building fields (men).

6. Level of beneficiaries' satisfaction of community services: strengths and weaknesses identified

Public facilities are little represented: schools, leisure center, sportive platform, social worker, municipal office in area of Pasteur.

#### Weak spots:

The beneficiaries complain about the lack of:

- information and job search and careers guidance spots
- green spaces
- library
- police office
- social services (social help)

### 7. Level of beneficiaries awareness concerning their social and political empowerment

The mediator reports that it is very low especially at the political awareness level: the beneficiaries are very credulous and most of the time they ignore or do not know their right and their citizen duties. They do not know how the public services are working nor their role.

On a social initiative point of view, they are very sceptical of institutions in general during direct contact, but they can take the initiative as well social as political, through organizations that mean to make the link to consciousness-raising, social initiative and political raising.

8. Level of integration of second and third generation migrants in their own culture (only migrants target group)

Those people are « politically » included (institutions), academic, nationality... but are socially withdrawn into themselves.