



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EUROSTAT

Directorate F: Social statistics
Unit F-5: Education, health and social protection

Doc 2015-ETS-05

**Item 6.1 – Pilot data collection 2014 on IVET learning mobility and
general youth learning mobility**

**Meeting of the
Education and Training Statistics Working Group
Luxembourg, 16-17th June 2015
BECH Building – Room AMPERE**

Executive summary

This document recalls the EU benchmark on IVET learning mobility and the ESS agreement for a pilot data collection on learning mobility via household surveys. It provides general information on the pilots carried out in 16 countries based on the ESS agreement and presents results of the pilots for IVET learning mobility as well as for general youth learning mobility and its components. Further to an evaluation of these results conclusions on the viability are drawn and recommendations on the measurement of different types of learning mobility via household surveys are made.

The ETS Working Group is invited to:

- *Take note and comment on the results of the pilot data collection.*
- *Endorse Eurostat's conclusions on IVET learning mobility:*
 - a) *IVET learning mobility as defined by the EU benchmark cannot be measured robustly via household surveys as the phenomenon is too rare to be captured at a reasonable cost.*
 - b) *administrative data cannot provide the information necessary to monitor the European benchmark.*
- *Endorse Eurostat's conclusions on general youth learning mobility: general youth learning mobility could be measured via household surveys, under the following conditions:*
 - a) *a simplified implementation of the measure is developed and confirmed through testing.*
 - b) *a survey vehicle that provides the necessary sample size is identified.*
- *Take note that the results for learning mobility during tertiary education are encouraging, i.e. this type of learning mobility could be measured via household surveys as long as sample size requirements similar to those suggested for general youth learning mobility are met.*

1 Background

1.1 The EU benchmark on IVET learning mobility

The Council conclusions of 12 May 2009¹ on a strategic framework for European cooperation in education and training (“ET 2020”), among other issues, invited the Commission to conduct work on proposals for possible benchmarks in the area of learning mobility.

In the context of the strategic framework “Education and Training 2020”, a “European benchmark” defines the reference level of European average performance. European benchmarks are used as means of monitoring progress and identifying challenges, as well as contributing to evidence-based policy making.

Against this background, the Council during its meeting on 29 November 2011² agreed on two EU benchmarks for learning mobility, one on learning mobility in higher education and one on learning mobility in initial vocational education and training (IVET).

¹ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2009:119:0002:0010:en:PDF>

² http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/126380.pdf

The benchmark on IVET learning mobility is defined as follows: “By 2020, an EU average of at least 6% of 18-34-year-olds with an initial vocational education and training qualification should have had an initial VET-related study or training period (including work placements) abroad lasting a minimum of two weeks, or less if documented by Europass”.

Moreover, the Council conclusions of 29 November 2011 asked for the development of an indicator on “general youth learning mobility”, that is on “any kind of learning experience abroad in which young people engage.”

1.2 2014 pilot data collection on learning mobility via household surveys – ESS agreement

There is currently no European harmonised data source that could provide data for the benchmark on IVET learning mobility or on general youth learning mobility. Therefore, a Eurostat Task Force (TF) on “Learning mobility” worked during 2011-2012 on technical issues related to the possible use of household surveys for collecting data for the benchmark on IVET learning mobility and setting-up an indicator on youth learning mobility in general.

The conclusions of the TF were discussed by the Directors of Social Statistics (DSS) and the work finally resulted in November 2012³ in an ESS agreement on a “2014 pilot data collection on learning mobility via household surveys”.

The ESS agreement includes the list of variables to be collected, specifies sample and quality requirements as well as the format for data transmission and delays. It also proposes financial support from the European Commission for this exercise. Eurostat prepared explanatory notes for the pilot data collection to take place as well as the template for quality reports and the format for data transmission⁴.

The ESS agreement covers two possible options for the pilot data collection:

- Option 1: two mandatory variables which allow providing data on IVET learning mobility only;
- Option 2: five mandatory variables (two variables as for option 1 – IVET learning mobility – and three variables on other types of youth learning mobility⁵) and three optional variables on duration of the stay abroad.

In line with the EU benchmark, the target population of the pilot data collection is the population aged 18 to 34. For further details on the variables covered see Annex I.

20 countries initially participated in the ESS agreement. For details see Table 1.

³ See 15th meeting of the European Statistical System Committee (ESSC), 15 November 2012, agenda item ESSC 2012/15/9.

⁴ For further information see [CIRCABC](https://circabc.europa.eu) (path: <https://circabc.europa.eu> – Eurostat – Education and Training Statistics – Library – Public – 6. Learning mobility statistics – 2014 Pilot data collection on learning mobility via household surveys).

⁵ These are (1) stay abroad for learning purposes during ISCED levels 2-4 (SECMOB), (2) stay abroad for learning purposes during ISCED levels 5-8 (TERMOB) and (3) stay abroad for non-formal or other learning purposes (OTHERMOB).

Table 1: Participation in the ESS agreement

Country	ESS agreement	Option	Data received	Quality report received	Comments
BE	Yes	2	02/04/2015	13/05/2015	-
BG	Yes	2	26/03/2015	18/05/2015	-
CZ	Yes	2	-	-	No pilot data collection was finally carried out; some estimates based on other sources were provided
DK	No	-	-	-	-
DE	No	-	-	-	Some information was provided
EE	Yes	1	19/03/2015	13/05/2015	-
IE	No	-	-	-	-
EL	Yes	2	-	-	-
ES	Yes	2	17/03/2015	07/05/2015	-
FR	Yes	2	-	-	No pilot data collection was carried out in 2014; pilot data collection is planned for 2016
HR	No	-	-	-	-
IT	Yes	2	09/04/2015	12/05/2015	-
CY	No	-	-	-	-
LV	Yes	1	12/03/2015	24/04/2015	-
LT	Yes	2	25/03/2015	14/05/2015	-
LU	Yes	1	-	-	No pilot data collection was finally carried out; the quality of data collected through the LFS would be insufficient for publication due to reliability problems. Some estimates were provided
HU	Yes	2	23/03/2015	15/05/2015	-
MT	No	-	-	-	-
NL	Yes	1	30/03/2015	30/03/2015	-
AT	Yes	2	30/03/2015	12/05/2015	-
PL	Yes	1	10/04/2015	13/05/2015	-
PT	Yes	2	24/02/2015	14/05/2015	-
RO	Yes	2	01/04/2015	30/04/2015	-
SI	Yes	2	19/02/2015	23/04/2015	-
SK	Yes	1	25/03/2015	11/05/2015	-
FI	No	-	-	-	-
SE	Yes	2	01/04/2015	17/05/2015	-
UK	No	-	-	-	Some estimates were provided

2 2014 Pilot data collection – results

Sections 2.1 to 2.5 concern the data transmitted by countries according to the specifications set out in the ESS agreement only. Section 2.6 provides short information on estimates for learning mobility provided outside the requirements set in the ESS agreement by some countries (CZ, DE, LU and UK).

2.1 General information on the pilot surveys

16 countries in total carried out a pilot data collection according to the requirements set out in the ESS agreement. Five countries chose option 1 and 11 countries chose option 2 for the pilot data collection. Accordingly pilot data for IVET learning mobility are available for 16 countries and data for general youth learning mobility for 11 countries.

Most countries used the Labour Force Survey (LFS) as the vehicle for the pilot data collection. On the other hand, specific stand-alone surveys were conducted in three countries: BG, ES and SE.

Table 2 describes the main features of the national pilot surveys.

Non-response

Unit non-response is very low in nine countries, i.e. between 0 and 3% (BE, EE, IT, LT, NL, PT, RO, SI, SK), and below 7% in two other countries (HU, PL). Unit non-response around 20% is reported for BG, ES and AT. LV's non-response is 28% while SE reports the by far highest non-response (58%). The high unit non-response in particular for stand-alone surveys might merit further consideration (selection effects).

Item non-response is non-existing or very low for most countries (i.e. below 2.5%). The only exceptions are SE (4.4% of item non-response for IVETMOB) and PL (3.9% for IVETMOB and 7.9% for the filter variable QUALVOC).

Validation

Data received were validated against the checking rules outlined in Annex II. The validation covered aspects such as validity of the file structure and codes used, correct use of the filters for each variable, internal (within a file) and external (between files) consistency. When necessary, countries were contacted for clarifications and possible corrections of the data.

Table 2: National pilot surveys – main features

Country	Option	Survey vehicle	Gross sample size	Effective (net) sample size	Unit non-response	Average interview duration	Participation voluntary or compulsory	Proxy interviews allowed	National publication of results
BE	2	LFS Q1-Q4	21,550	21,550	0.0%	Maximum 1 minute	Compulsory	Yes	Yes
BG	2	Stand-alone survey	30,002	23,752	20.8%	25 minutes (for the entire questionnaire)	Voluntary	No	Yes
EE	1	LFS Q2+Q4	2,669	2,669	0.0%	NA	Voluntary	Yes	No
ES	2	Stand-alone survey	17,957	14,707	18.1%	6 minutes	Compulsory	Yes	Yes
IT	2	LFS Q4	23,017	23,017	0.0%	0.7 minutes	Compulsory	Yes	No
LV	1	LFS Q2+Q3	5,139	3,716	27.7%	1 minute	Voluntary	Yes	No
LT	2	LFS Q3	2,521	2,521	0.0%	12 minutes	Compulsory	Yes	Yes
HU	2	LFS Q2	12,130	11,381	6.2%	NA	Voluntary	Yes	No
NL	1	LFS Q1-Q4	80,024	80,024	0.0%	Less than 1 minute	Compulsory	Yes	No
AT	2	LFS Q4	3,970	3,171	20.1%	0.9 minutes	Voluntary	No	Yes
PL	1	LFS Q2	5,131	4,782	6.8%	NA	Voluntary	Yes	No
PT	2	LFS Q4	6,971	6,943	0.4%	5 minutes	Voluntary	Yes	No
RO	2	LFS Q3	10,368	10,078	2.8%	10 minutes	Voluntary	Yes	No
SI	2	LFS Q2	3,230	3,230	0.0%	1 minute	Voluntary	Yes	Yes
SK	1	LFS Q4	4,877	4,877	0.0%	Less than 1 minute	Compulsory	Yes	No
SE	2	Stand-alone survey	10,000	4,233	57.7%	as CATI: 2 minutes	Voluntary	No	Yes

Calculation of results

Results were calculated for the following indicators:

1. IVET learning mobility (during vocational education at ISCED 2011 level 3, based on the variable IVETMOB).
2. General youth learning mobility (i.e. yes to any of the four types of learning mobility, based on the variables IVETMOB, SECMOB, TERMOB and OTHERMOB).
3. Learning mobility during lower secondary, upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education (ISCED 2011 levels 2-4, based on the variable SECMOB).
4. Learning mobility during tertiary education (ISCED 2011 levels 5-8, based on the variable TERMOB).
5. Learning mobility for non-formal or other learning purposes (based on the variable OTHERMOB).

Due to a lack of time the optional variables on duration of the learning mobility were not further analysed.

Reliability thresholds as provided by countries were used in order to indicate whether data could not be published at all because of the sample size being too small (':u') or if they could be published but would have to be flagged 'u' (low reliability) still because of an insufficient sample size.

In addition, coefficients of variation are available from the quality reports for indicators on IVET learning mobility and general youth learning mobility. These were used to calculate confidence intervals.

2.2 IVET learning mobility

16 countries provided data for IVET learning mobility during vocational education at ISCED 2011 level 3 according to the specifications of the ESS agreement.

Table 3: IVET learning mobility
(based on IVETMOB)

Country	Yes %	No %	No answer %	Coefficient of variation %	Confidence interval (95%) %	Total population (aged 18-34) 1,000	Target population*		Sample size
							Weighted population 1,000	%	
BE	3.1	96.7	:u	7.1	[2.7 ; 3.5]	2,385.6	831.2	34.8	7,130
BG	0.4	99.6	0.0	19.4	[0.3 ; 0.6]	1,519.1	603.9	39.7	9,343
EE	:u	94.4	:u	27.6	[1.4 ; 4.8]	301.8	56.7	18.8	495
ES	0.8	99.2	0.0	21.3	[0.5 ; 1.2]	9,198.4	1,410.3	15.3	2,479
IT	4.2	95.7	:u	4.7	[3.8 ; 4.6]	11,128.5	4,632.5	41.6	9,593
LV	:u	95.6	:u	19.5	[1.6 ; 3.6]	435.9	86.6	19.9	790
LT	:u	99.5	0.0	70.7	[-0.2 ; 1.2]	650.6	80.6	12.4	329
HU	1.6	98.4	0.0	14.6	[1.1 ; 2.0]	1,901.4	438.7	23.1	2,834
NL	5.2	94.8	0.0	4.0	[4.8 ; 5.6]	4,926.7	1,087.1	22.1	26,624
AT	3.8	96.2	0.0	11.0	[3.0 ; 4.6]	1,860.0	1,219.1	65.5	2,264
PL	2.5	93.4	4.1	16.0	[1.7 ; 3.2]	8,771.0	4,079.1	46.5	2,183
PT	2.4	97.3	:u	21.1	[1.4 ; 3.4]	1,992.1	328.3	16.5	1,154
RO	0.4u	99.6	0.0	:	:	4,339.2	2,940.9	67.8	5,022
SI	2.1	97.6	:u	19.2	[1.3 ; 2.8]	443.7	245.8	55.4	1,782
SK	4.7u	95.3	0.0	8.2	[4.0 ; 5.5]	1,621.1	1,117.4	68.9	3,033
SE	9.2	86.8	4.0	9.6	[7.5 ; 11.0]	2,160.6	712.3	33.0	1,390

*(HATLEVEL=3 and HATVOC=2) or QUALVOC=1

AT, ES, IT, NL and PL extended the coverage of QUALVOC and included HATLEVEL=3 in order to ensure that anybody having achieved vocational education at ISCED level 3 was included (in line with the explanatory notes).

Remarks on the results

Reliable results with a coefficient of variation below 15% were obtained by six countries: BE, IT, HU, NL, AT, SE. Data for five other countries can still be considered reliable according to sample size requirements on the one hand but have a coefficient of variation of 15% or more on the other hand: BG, ES, PL, PT and SI.

On the other side, the results for IVET learning mobility cannot be published for three countries due to reliability concerns: EE, LV and LT. In addition, the results are of low reliability for two other countries: RO and SK.

Combining the results of the 16 available countries leads to an average IVET learning mobility of 3.1% (weighted average of the 16 countries).

Other remarks

LU had signed the ESS agreement (option 1) and had planned to add the variables to measure IVET learning mobility to the LFS. However, before doing so, LU investigated the size of the target population and concluded that the number of respondents would be very small and that no reliable results could be obtained from the LFS for IVET learning mobility. Consequently, the variables were not introduced in the LFS in the end.

2.3 General youth learning mobility

11 countries provided data for general youth learning mobility according to the specifications of the ESS agreement. Nine countries included the optional variables on duration of the stay abroad but results for these optional variables were not further analysed due to a lack of time.

Table 4: General youth learning mobility
(based on IVETMOB, SECMOB, TERMOB and OTHERMOB)

Country	Yes %	No %	Coefficient of variation %	Confidence interval (95%) %	Total population (aged 18-34)	
					Weighted population 1,000	Sample size
BE	14.5	85.5	1.8	[14.0 ; 15.0]	2,385.6	21,550
BG	2.4	97.6	6.6	[2.1 ; 2.7]	1,519.1	23,752
ES	18.0	82.0	1.9	[17.3 ; 18.6]	9,198.4	14,707
IT	11.7	88.3	1.7	[11.3 ; 12.1]	11,128.5	23,017
LT	7.7	92.3	7.1	[6.7 ; 8.8]	650.6	2,521
HU	5.1	94.9	4.1	[4.7 ; 5.5]	1,901.4	11,381
AT	30.3	69.7	2.8	[28.6 ; 31.9]	1,860.0	3,171
PT	10.6	89.4	4.8	[9.6 ; 11.7]	1,992.1	6,943
RO	0.5	99.5	:	:	4,339.2	10,078
SI	21.6	78.4	4.0	[19.9 ; 23.3]	443.7	3,230
SE	32.4	67.6	2.2	[30.9 ; 33.8]	2,160.6	4,233

Remarks on the results

The results for the combined indicator on general youth learning mobility are reliable and the coefficients of variation are below 10% for all countries. Seven participating countries reported that 10% or more of the population aged 18-34 experienced any learning mobility, for two countries the ratio is between 5% and 10%. However, general youth learning mobility appears to be a rare phenomenon in BG (2.4%) and RO (0.5%), i.e. the statistical relevance of a household survey to measure this phenomenon in both countries is less obvious.

Combining the results of the 11 available countries leads to a general youth learning mobility of 13.5% (weighted average of the 11 countries).

Looking at the components other than IVET learning mobility of this combined indicator, reliability problems are mainly observed for BG and RO, but also for LT, HU, AT and SI for diploma mobility. Results for the components of general youth learning mobility other than IVET learning mobility are shown in tables 5, 6 and 7.

Table 5: Learning mobility during lower secondary, upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education
(based on SECMOB)

Country	Yes %	No %	No answer %	Total population (aged 18-34) 1,000	Target population*		
					Weighted population 1,000		Sample size
BE	6.1	93.9	0.0	2,385.6	2,260.7	94.8	20,451
BG	0.1u	99.9	0.0	1,519.1	1,409.6	92.8	21,940
ES	1.5	98.5	0.0	9,198.4	8,684.4	94.4	13,589
IT	5.0	94.7	0.3	11,128.5	10,931.8	98.2	22,623
LT	1.9	98.1	0.0	650.6	645.2	99.2	2,498
HU	2.6	97.4	0.0	1,901.4	1,896.6	99.8	11,340
AT	9.1	90.9	0.0	1,860.0	1,857.5	99.9	3,168
PT	2.2	97.3	0.5	1,992.1	1,822.8	91.5	6,256
RO	:u	100.0	0.0	4,339.2	4,172.6	96.2	9,741
SI	3.7	95.9	0.4u	443.7	441.9	99.6	3,213
SE	11.6	87.1	1.3	2,160.6	2,160.6	100.0	4,233

*HATLEVEL>2 or (HATLEVEL=0,1 and EDUCLEVL≠1,9)

Table 6: Learning mobility during tertiary education
(based on TERMOB)

Country	Yes			No %	No answer %	Total population (aged 18-34) 1,000	Target population*		
	Diploma mobility %	Credit mobility %	Total %				Weighted population 1,000		Sample size
BE	6.0	9.6	15.6	84.4	0.0	2,385.6	1,118.7	46.9	10,112
BG	1.8	1.8	3.6	96.4	0.0	1,519.1	563.1	37.1	8,416
ES	1.1	9.3	10.4	89.6	0.0	9,198.4	4,427.4	48.1	7,912
IT	4.3	6.0	10.3	88.4	1.4	11,128.5	3,542.2	31.8	7,259
LT	:u	5.5	6.1	93.9	0.0	650.6	347.4	53.4	1,239
HU	:u	4.7	5.2	92.4	2.4	1,901.4	630.3	33.1	3,188
AT	1.7u	15.7	17.4	82.6	0.0	1,860.0	813.7	43.7	1,498
PT	1.4	9.9	11.3	88.2	:u	1,992.1	775.4	38.9	2,536
RO	:u	:u	:u	99.6	0.0	4,339.2	1,289.8	29.7	3,213
SI	1.6u	10.1	11.7	87.8	0.5u	443.7	211.5	47.7	1,522
SE	6.4	10.6	17.0	81.0	2.0	2,160.6	991.1	45.9	2,132

*HATLEVEL=5-8 or EDUCLEVL=5-7

Table 7: Learning mobility for non-formal or other learning purposes
(based on OTHERMOB)

Country	Yes %	No %	No answer %	Total population (aged 18-34)	
				Weighted population 1,000	Sample size
BE	6.9	93.1	0.0	2,385.6	21,550
BG	1.0	99.0	0.0	1,519.1	23,752
ES	15.3	84.7	0.0	9,198.4	14,707
IT	5.1	94.7	0.3	11,128.5	23,017
LT	5.2	94.8	0.0	650.6	2,521
HU	2.0	98.0	0.0	1,901.4	11,381
AT	18.5	81.5	0.0	1,860.0	3,171
PT	6.8	92.8	0.4	1,992.1	6,943
RO	0.2u	99.8	0.0	4,339.2	10,078
SI	17.8	81.4	0.8u	443.7	3,230
SE	23.0	76.5	0.5	2,160.6	4,233

2.4 Problems encountered during the pilot data collection

In the quality reports countries provided comments about their experiences during the pilot data collections. While about half of the countries indicated that the overall implementation of the questions on learning mobility caused relatively few problems, others encountered more serious issues when preparing and conducting the survey. The main problems reported can be summarised as follows:

- Sample size was too small to capture the rare phenomenon (in particular IVET learning mobility);
- Complicated filters: coverage of the target population for variables on learning mobility was not always easy to understand (to capture vocational secondary education completed; inclusion of both students and graduates for tertiary learning mobility; secondary education learning mobility);
- Problems to understand the concept of learning mobility itself (stay abroad, learning purposes), in particular for other learning mobility;
- Additional burden for the LFS (particularly for respondents);
- High unit non-response (in particular in countries with stand-alone surveys).

Other comments:

- Proxies should be avoided;
- Data transmission format to Eurostat caused some problems;
- Information about the country of the stay abroad would be interesting (to better analyse the learning mobility within the EU).

2.5 General evaluation of the data obtained through the pilot data collection

Following more general remarks on the pilot data collection and its results made by participating countries, the following three issues are considered as the most crucial:

- Sample size: despite the fact that several countries conducted the pilot data collection with a sample size larger than that required by Eurostat, the sample was still too small for properly measuring a phenomenon which concerns only a tiny proportion of the population (especially for IVET learning mobility).
- Use of a household survey: a household survey is not the appropriate tool for collecting data on IVET learning mobility because this phenomenon is scarce. General youth learning mobility can be more reliably measured as it encompasses several sub-phenomena and therefore the chances to reach ‘general mobile’ individuals in surveys are higher. But it still causes concerns for countries where these sub-phenomena – or even the overall youth learning mobility – remain scarce.
- Comparison with other sources: most countries could not compare the pilot survey results with any other national data source and opinions differed whether the data were fit for use for policy monitoring or not. Some countries indicated that the pilot data were the first ever available data to measure learning mobility and considered them as appropriate for guidance in policy monitoring. This opinion was mainly expressed by countries where the different types of learning mobility are more common and could be measured reliably (BE, NL, SI). Others pointed out that in view of the reliability concerns and the scarcity of the phenomenon to be measured the results cannot be used (BG, EE, LT, PL, RO and SK). Only NL could compare the results of the pilot data collection with another national source of information on this topic and reported that results were in line with each other.

2.6 Estimates on learning mobility not based on a pilot data collection

Four countries (CZ, DE, LU, UK) provided some estimates for learning mobility from other sources, i.e. not based on a pilot data collection via household surveys as specified in the ESS agreement. The data provided indicate that IVET learning mobility concerns a very small percentage of IVET graduates (or students) in these countries.

CZ did an exercise to estimate IVET learning mobility based on information coming from the school survey. The number of IVET students that have experienced learning mobility in the school year 2013/2014 was then divided by the total number of students in ISCED level 3 vocational programmes to obtain a general IVET learning mobility coefficient. This coefficient was then adjusted using expert estimates to cover the period from 1998 to 2014 and thus the age group 18-34 years in 2014. Based on these calculations, approximately 1.4% of young people aged 18-34 with vocational qualification experienced IVET mobility. Some estimates based on administrative sources on credit and diploma mobility in tertiary education indicate approximately 9.7% of learning mobility in tertiary education.

DE informed about the number of IVET students participating in Leonardo da Vinci and Erasmus+ programmes in the period 2008-2014. The numbers for recent years correspond to approximately 1% of the students in vocational upper secondary education.

LU supplied some estimates on IVET learning mobility from administrative data sources (mainly on the Leonardo da Vinci programme) according to which around 1% of students in vocational upper secondary education are concerned by IVET learning mobility.

UK provided some estimates on learning mobility in terms of students for 2013, based on administrative data. According to these estimates, learning mobility concerns around 0.03% of IVET students and 0.5% of tertiary students.

3 Summary conclusions and way forward

As concerns IVET learning mobility, the pilot data collection has shown that the available data do not allow estimating the EU benchmark. The first reason is the absence of data from 12 countries (including the three biggest Member States in terms of population – DE, FR and UK) which adds up to the non-reliability of results from some countries which did provide data, all in all making such estimation procedure impossible. The second reason is much more fundamental for the discussion on the future of this benchmark. It relates to the scarcity of IVET graduates mobility for learning purposes and also to the relatively small size of the underlying IVET population in some countries. This puts into question the suitability of household surveys in general for measuring this rare phenomenon and calls for a significant increase of sample sizes thereby increasing the cost of the operation in order to make it relevant (statistically robust), having in mind that there is currently no vehicle at EU level to host such a data collection.

Some countries suggested that the possibility to collect data on IVET learning mobility from administrative data sources should be further investigated. The option to use data from the Leonardo da Vinci programme has already been considered at the last meeting of the ETS WG and was further investigated by DG EAC since then. As a conclusion DG EAC is of the opinion that these data are not sufficient to measure the IVET learning mobility benchmark as they are limited in scope and expressed in terms of students and not graduates. National administrative data sources (e.g. school surveys) might contain more comprehensive data in terms of coverage but would also be expressed in students per school year rather than in terms of all IVET graduates aged 18-34, i.e. country-specific estimation procedures would be necessary to obtain a measure that reflects the EU benchmark.

As concerns general youth learning mobility, the estimation of an EU average is also not possible from the results of the pilot data collection as data are only available for 11 countries. While still causing problems in some countries where general youth learning mobility is a rare phenomenon, the overall results are more encouraging and an estimate could be produced if comparable data were to be collected in the future from a common vehicle to be determined. A key characteristic of such a common vehicle for a possible data collection of general youth learning mobility would be a large sample for the age group 18-34. While most countries used the LFS as the vehicle for the pilot data collection, several countries expressed their concerns that the LFS was not the appropriate vehicle for variables on learning mobility⁶. As the Adult Education Survey (AES) on the other hand does by far not meet the requirements in terms of sample size (and under the current legislation only covers the population 25-64), another vehicle would then need to be found for the possible collection of general youth learning mobility information.

⁶ The following main issues were mentioned: limited sample size, use of proxies which decreases the accuracy of the responses, education is not the main focus of the LFS.

If an overall measurement of general youth learning mobility is aimed at, a simpler implementation than collecting data for the four variables specified in the ESS agreement should be considered in order to reduce the respondents' burden. The suggestion made by AT in their quality report merits further consideration: it is proposed to ask in the first place about any experience of learning mobility and to specify only at a second stage to which educational programme the learning mobility episode relates. This would enable to make sure that the broad and straightforward information was collected first. However, the viability of this approach would need to be tested, and if proved to be feasible, an appropriate survey vehicle would need to be found to host the relevant questions.

Last but not least the results obtained from the pilot data collection for learning mobility during tertiary education are reliable for 10 out of 11 countries when considering diploma and credit mobility together. As it is a more widespread phenomenon that can be appropriately operationalised in survey questionnaires, it can be concluded that this type of learning mobility could be measured through household surveys, under the condition that a suitable survey vehicle in terms of sample size can be found.

Annexes

Annex I – 2014 Pilot data collection on learning mobility via household surveys – variables (Excel file)

Annex II – Checks and validation rules

1) Option 1 or 2 as in ESS agreement, file structure

- Data delivered for the option indicated in the ESS agreement
- File structure as requested (including extra variables for validation)
 - If extra variables missing (HATLEVEL, HATVOC and EDUCLEVL) missing
 - ask to include as needed for validation

2) Data source information

- Information on the data source (LFS – if yes which quarter(s) – or other)
- Information on the reliability thresholds

3) Use of valid codes

Validity of the codes used for each variable – see valid codes in data transmission file (2014 Pilot data collection on learning mobility - format for transmission of data.xls)

Use of '9'

- '9' should not be used for HATLEVID
- '9' should not be used for OTHERMOB

4) Correct use of filters – valid codes and use of '9'

QUALVOC

If HATLEVEL = 0-3 \Rightarrow QUALVOC = 9

If HATLEVEL = 4+ \Rightarrow QUALVOC = 1,2,blank

IVETMOB

If (HATLEVEL = 3 and HATVOC = 2) or QUALVOC = 1 \Rightarrow IVETMOB = 1,2,blank

If (HATLEVEL = 0-2 or 4+ or (3 & HATVOC \neq 2)) or QUALVOC = 2,blank,9 \Rightarrow IVETMOB = 9

SECMOB

If HATLEVEL = 2+ or (HATLEVEL = 0,1 and EDUCLEVL=2-8) \Rightarrow SECMOB = 1,2,blank

If HATLEVEL = 0,1 and EDUCLEVL = 1,9 \Rightarrow SECMOB = 9

DURSECMOB (optional)

If SECMOB = 1 \Rightarrow DURSECMOB = 1,2,3,4,blank

If SECMOB \neq 1 \Rightarrow DURSECMOB = 9

TERMOB

If HATLEVEL = 5-8 or EDUCLEVEL = 5-8 \Rightarrow TERMOB = 1,2,3,blank

If HATLEVEL = 0-4 and EDUCLEVEL = 1-4,blank,9 \Rightarrow TERMOB = 9

DURTERMOB (optional)

If TERMOB = 1 or 2 \Rightarrow DURTERMOB = 1,2,3,4,blank

If TERMOB = 3,blank,9 \Rightarrow DURTERMOB = 9

If TERMOB = 1 \Rightarrow DURTERMOB = 4, blank

If TERMOB = 2 \Rightarrow DURTERMOB = 1,2,3,blank

DUROTHERMOB (optional)

If OTHERMOB = 1 \Rightarrow DUROTHERMOB = 1,2,3,4,5,blank

If OTHERMOB \neq 1 \Rightarrow DUROTHERMOB = 9

5) Internal consistency

- Consistency of age groups (18-34=18-24+25-34)
- Consistency HATLEV1D with HATLEVEL
- Consistency HATVOC with HATLEVEL
- Consistency EDUCLEVEL with HATLEVEL

6) External consistency / validity of the weights

- Comparison with relevant LFS quarter and population data (comparison with Pop 18-34 – LFS + Demographic data) by sex

7) Reliability (no answer and sample size)

Sample size (frequency / number or persons in sample unweighted)

- Total sample 18-34, by sex and age group (frequency)

For each variable, by sex and age group

- Sample size after filter, total number and as % of total sample (unweighted)
- Frequency + % distribution (with reliability flags) (weighted)
- Non-response rate
 - If % blank < 10% \Rightarrow OK
 - If % blank 10% < 30% \Rightarrow data + flag 'u'
 - If % blank \geq 30% \Rightarrow no data + flag 'u'