EVALUATION OF CURANT

Rilke Mahieu & Laura Van Raemdonck – Centre for Migration and Intercultural Studies (CeMIS) & Noel Clycq (Edubron)
GOAL
To support the social and structural integration of young unaccompanied refugees in Belgium

MAIN STRATEGIES
A. Communal Living
   Strengths & Challenges
B. Case Management
   Strengths & Challenges
HOW? Mixed-method, longitudinal evaluation approach

- Interviews with project team
- Observations of project activities

Interview 1  Interview 2  Interview 3

CURANT TRAJECTORY OF A NEWCOMER OR BUDDY

- Baseline survey
- Final survey
- Secondary data of project partners
Has CURANT supported young unaccompanied newcomers’ social and structural integration in Belgian society?

If so, how did this happen?
### Newcomers’ self-evaluation

1. **Dutch language skills**
   - 9% Worse
   - 15% Same as before
   - 27% CURANT
   - 49% A little better
   - 49% Better
   - 49% A lot better

2. **Feeling confident to speak Dutch**
   - 18% Worse
   - 36% Same as before
   - 46% CURANT
   - 46% A little better
   - 46% Better
   - 46% A lot better

3. **Understanding Dutch**
   - 3% Worse
   - 21% Same as before
   - 39% CURANT
   - 37% A little better
   - 37% Better
   - 37% A lot better

4. **Finding my way through the Belgian/Flemish/local administration**
   - 3% Worse
   - 3% Same as before
   - 12% CURANT
   - 49% A little better
   - 49% Better
   - 49% A lot better

5. **My well-being (my happiness, satisfaction with my life)**
   - 16% Worse
   - 55% Same as before
   - 29% CURANT
   - 29% A little better
   - 29% Better
   - 29% A lot better

6. **How often I use Dutch**
   - 3% Worse
   - 6% Same as before
   - 6% CURANT
   - 61% A little better
   - 24% Better
   - 24% A lot better

7. **My social skills (talking to people, making friends, …)**
   - 3% Worse
   - 30% Same as before
   - 46% CURANT
   - 21% A little better
   - 21% Better
   - 21% A lot better

8. **Understanding Flemish/Belgian habits**
   - 3% Worse
   - 3% Same as before
   - 27% CURANT
   - 49% A little better
   - 18% Better
   - 18% A lot better

9. **My knowledge of Flanders/Belgium and the Flemish/Belgian society**
   - 33% Worse
   - 55% Same as before
   - 12% CURANT
   - 12% A little better
   - 12% Better
   - 12% A lot better

10. **Managing my finances**
    - 15% Worse
    - 33% Same as before
    - 43% CURANT
    - 9% A little better
    - 9% Better
    - 9% A lot better

© CeMIS
A. Communal Living

MAIN STRENGTHS (1): Almost permanent availability of various types of informal support to newcomers

“What I used to do [before], when I did not understand something: I took a picture of it, and showed it to my teacher or social worker when I saw her. But the people here [in this house], they support you on the spot… I can go downstairs if I have a question or so, it is perfect.” (Syrian newcomer)
A. Communal Living

MAIN STRENGTHS (2):
A stimulating environment for **mutual informal learning**

**EVERYDAY PRACTICES** *Learning to recycle, to fix something small, to get around in the city, ...*

**LANGUAGE LEARNING** *Practicing Dutch language in a safe environment*

**CULTURAL EMPATHY** *Getting to know about one another's lives, backgrounds and cultures*
“My Dutch is quite better than before, because before I lived alone. Now I live with other people. **Now I feel more confident to ask questions.** For example, when we’re watching TV together, then I’m not afraid to ask what the programme is about, or what the meaning of this word is.” (Iraqi newcomer)

More than 3 out of 4 newcomers say that their Dutch language skills, confidence to speak Dutch and understanding of Dutch have improved significantly due to CURANT
It is almost impossible to not learn a lot after living together with people from a completely different culture. My way of discussing sensitive topics with people that have another opinion and frame of reference has changed a lot.” (male buddy living together with different newcomers).

Almost all buddies indicate that their knowledge about the cultures and habits of refugees has expanded.
A. Communal Living

MAIN CHALLENGES

• For almost 1 out of 5 matched newcomer-buddy duos, communal living did not work out well
• In many houses, social contact between newcomers and their buddies remained rather superficial
• The sustainability of buddy-refugee relationships is uncertain

39% of the newcomers and 61% of the buddies indicate they do not know if they will keep in contact after CURANT.
Amount, depth and nature of daily social contact among housemates varies due to following reasons:

• diverging motivations and conflicting expectations
• busy daily schedules
• language barriers
• type of accommodation
• gender, SES
B. CURANT’s Case Management

MAIN STRENGTHS

- Multi-disciplinary cooperation → quality of guidance
- A low number of individual cases per case manager → accessibility, quality, and flexibility of professional care and support
B. CURANT’s Case Management

MAIN CHALLENGES

• Too ambitious
• Information sharing
• Position of case manager
• More care vs. more control
CURANT’s approach, offering
• housing
• professional and informal support
• learning opportunities contributes to young unaccompanied newcomers’ inclusion in society.
Main evaluation outcomes

- Not a one-size-fits-all solution
- Intensive, temporary care vs. long-term needs
- Individual versus structural problems
Thanks for your attention!
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