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Introduction

Since 2009, the Youth Builders Program, implemented by the Health Promotion Center (CEDAPS), contributes to the development of young people from favelas and urban peripheries through its social technology of training-action, so that they can become transformational agents in their families and communities. The program promotes personal and professional growth, including employment support, tied to the mobilization and development of families and grassroots organizations.

Beyond professional placement, the program works to foster young people’s human, political and technical development, seeking to include them in a network of protection and care. To effect change upon these aspects, we as the program staff understood that there was a need for indicators that could represent them and methods to keep track of participants during and beyond the program, building instruments that could demonstrate its impact beyond retention and placement. As such, we developed a logical framework with impact indicators and activities that guide all phases of the program.

As the first strategy for data collection, we elaborated a questionnaire with demographic data, alumni’s status on schooling and work, their perception of freedom in their choices, their sense of safety, their perceptions on leaders in their territory, and on the support received from the program on various aspects. The survey was administered by representatives from each edition to alumni in their territories, and 309 responses were collected - 55% of the entire 560 Youth Builders alumni network.

This report contains the sistematization and analysis of the alumni survey results, and has as main goals to:

- Evaluate the achievement of the program’s objectives based on the aforementioned logical framework;
- Structure the survey’s main results to guide future engagement and monitoring activities of the Youth Builders network;
- Shed light on the current state of the alumni network and the program’s impact on their trajectories to project staff, partners and alumni themselves.

With the motto “once a Youth Builder, always a Youth Builder” in mind, this process also has as goal to foster connection and engagement among the alumni network. In addition to this report, we also produced an info sheet with the survey's main findings to be shared with the alumni network, for graduates to know about their peers and to have available the information on communication channels and possibilities of engagement with the program.
Analysis

Participant profile

The survey obtained responses from alumni graduated from 18 editions of the program:

- About 55% of respondents were men and 45% were women, in addition to one respondent who is a transgender woman and one who is non-binary. A great majority of respondents are black (almost 84%), approximately 15% are white, 3 are of Asian descent, and 2 are indigenous.¹

About 55% of respondents were men and 45% were women, in addition to one respondent who is a transgender woman and one who is non-binary. A great majority of respondents are black (almost 84%), approximately 15% are white, 3 are of Asian descent, and 2 are indigenous.¹

1. Due to the low number of respondents who are of Asian descent, Indigenous, trans women and non-binary, these categories were not included in the gender and race analyses.
Participants’ racial identities are compatible with the program's presence in the city's most vulnerable territories, where young black people are a majority and the most affected by the many forms of inequity that exist in the country.

Additionally, 44% of respondents have children, and 17% have more than one child.

Participants’ income is still low, with almost 40% earning up to 1 minimum wage monthly, only nine participants having an income of up to 3 minimum wages, and only one with income of over 4 minimum wages. Furthermore, over 20% of respondents do not have income. About one third considers that the program helped them improve their income, and almost half considers that it did not.

**Well-being**

Well-being is a rough translation of ‘bem-viver’, a way of living which looks at life in its many dimensions. We included questions relating to participant well-being, namely their sense of freedom and safety, based on the understanding that information on placement and schooling by themselves were not enough to understand young people's lives in their territories and their access to basic rights.

In other words, the program does not only seek to increase income, but to increase income with well-being; the same for schooling and professional placement.
The vast majority of respondents feels free or partially free in their personal, professional and educational choices - although the sense of freedom is not necessarily an indication of their actual access to these rights.

Participants are divided in relation to their sense of safety and fulfillment where they live.

Subsequently we cross-checked each category with gender, race, presence of children, and monthly income. Due to the importance of well-being to the program, it was also included in the analysis of the other categories (citizenship, schooling and leadership).

There are no major differences between genders in relation to participants’ sense of freedom. However, women feel significantly less safe than men in their territories. 
With regards to race, there are no significant differences in sense of freedom and security of respondents.

Participants with children claim to feel more free and slightly less safe that participants without children.

“I feel free because I own my own business and the only thing that motivates me to be even better is my son, he doesn’t restrain me in anything, only motivates me in everything I do.”
Lastly, all of the respondents that do not feel free also do not have income, and those with lower income seem to feel less free.

**Citizenship, work and Schooling**

This section includes three important pillars developed during the program: insertion in formal schooling, qualified inclusion in the labor market, and access to basic services in participants’ territories.

Starting with access to services, the vast majority of participants accesses health services in their territories, and about 43% accesses education services.

However, access to other services is still low, and over half of alumni only access one service.

Do you feel free in relation to your life choices?

- Feels free: 61%
- Feels partially free: 33%
- Does not feel free: 75%

No income: 22%
 Percent minimum wage: 67%
 Up to 1 min wage: 13%
 Up to 2 min wage: 25%
 3 or more min wage: 17%

Do you feel safe and fulfilled where you live?

- Sim: 50%
- Não: 56%

No income: 50%
 Percent minimum wage: 44%
 Up to 1 min wage: 50%
 Up to 2 min wage: 50%
 3 or more min wage: 50%

“Most of the time [I feel] oppressed in a world where I see a lot of greed, and us poor people don’t get what we deserve, we seek money through work that most of the time is pure exploitation!”

Number of services each respondent accesses:

- 0 services: 123 (39.8%)
- 1 services: 21 (6.8%)
- 2 to 3 services: 155 (53.4%)

Which public services do you access?

- Education (school, university, technical course): 137 (42.7%)
- Social services (welfare, social assistance): 103 (32.1%)
- Health (Family Clinic, Basic Health Unit): 227 (70.7%)
- Culture (cinema, festivals, others): 82 (25.5%)
- Carioca Youth House: 23 (7.2%)
Even with the low access, most participants agree that the program helped them understand and access services in their territory.

Did the program help you understand and access public services in the territory?

- Yes: 189 (61.2%)
- I don't know: 44 (14.2%)
- No: 75 (24.6%)

"When Youth Builders arrived in Mangueira no one believed in it and it became everything in the lives of everyone that could participate. KEEP YOUTH BUILDERS IN OUR COMMUNITIES."

Now we move on to the analyses: in all topics we analyse gender, race, children, income and well-being.

It is notable that women access more services than men, and black respondents access more services than white respondents.
Though there are no major disparities, alumni with greater income seem to access less services.

On the other hand, responses relating to well-being show greater disparities: participants who feel less free access less services, and participants who do not feel safe access more services.
In terms of labor, most participants are working, whether formally or informally. However, it is important to note that about 40% are not working. Also worth mentioning is the fact that over 83% of respondents state that the program helped them structure and qualify their CVs.

The gender analysis shows that men are more included in the labor market than women both in employment and entrepreneurship. Black participants are more included in the labor market, possibly due to having to access it prematurely. Participants with children have less access to the labor market.
Naturally, participants who work have higher incomes. However, it is worth questioning whether low income also works as a factor that hinders access to the labor market, generating a cyclical exclusion.

Finally - and possibly related to the well-being and income analysis in the previous section - participants who do not feel free are in their majority seeking work, and participants who are working feel slightly less safe.

“I don’t feel free because of my lack of financial sustainability. Maybe I will feel free as soon as I find a job.”
Next, we analyze the aspect of formal education. We can see that more than half of the respondents completed secondary education. Almost half of the respondents believe that the program helped them elevate their schooling.

Access to educational opportunities has shown disparities based on gender, race, and presence of children. In general, female respondents have a higher level of education than men. Regarding race, of the respondents who stopped studying all are black, and white respondents have more access to Higher Education. Participants with children have a lower education level and less access to Higher Education.
The higher the income of the participants, the higher their level of education - and access to Higher Education is much higher among those with more income.

And a higher level of education, especially access to Higher Education, seems to have the effect of making participants feel less free in relation to their choices and less safe and fulfilled in their territories.

“\[I\] feel free in parts, because I feel there should be more opportunities for people who don’t have many resources to have a good education, to get good jobs. It’s all much more difficult\]”

Do you feel free in relation to your life choices?

Do you feel safe and fulfilled where you live?
Leadership

By supporting young people in their relationships with family and community, access to services and to spaces to which they did not previously have access, this process can also impact their perceptions of themselves and support them in their development as leaders in their territories.

Therefore, a fifth of young respondents see themselves as leaders, almost 15% say they would like to be leaders, and 48% do not see themselves as leaders.

At the same time, it is interesting to note that almost 40% of young people do not see themselves represented by leaders in their territories, and more than 40% say they are not satisfied with the political representation in Rio de Janeiro.
Male respondents perceive themselves more as leaders than women, but women demonstrated more desire to become leaders. Consistent with the composition of favela and marginalized territories, black respondents perceive themselves more as leaders than white respondents. Having children does not seem to influence the perception of leadership.

Respondents who have no income are those who feel less like leaders, and those with higher income are those who feel more like leaders.

“I feel free in all of my community but outside I still feel stuck and coerced with all the structural racism in Brazil”
Finally, it is noteworthy that respondents who do not feel free see themselves more as leaders than others, and that those who feel safe see themselves more as leaders.
Conclusions

There are aspects where we perceive the effects of the program on the lives of participants are more clearly - such as support in structuring curriculum or increased access to services in the territory - and others where this relationship is less visible, either due to the difficulty of establishing a direct connection - such as in access to the labor market - or due to the difficulty of understanding whether the program was actually unable to support participants, or they did not have a clear perception of the support they received - such as on the topic of income.

Concretely, the survey's results demonstrate that the program helped the network improve their education and insertion into the job market. In relation to aspects such as well-being and leadership, the program appears in some participants' answers as a factor that strengthens young people and their territories. It is worth emphasizing that these results relate to our obtained sample of 55% of the graduate network.

The inequalities that affect Brazilian youth are also present in the Young Builders network. Women with less access to the job market, men with a lower level of education and accessing fewer services, people with children with less access to work and formal education.

Income appears as a factor in several analyses, making it difficult to determine how much having a lower income is a factor in preventing access to certain rights or how much not having access to these rights reduces income. An example is formal education, where the lower the income, the lower the level of education. It may be that young people had to leave school to work, and thus obtained jobs with lower pay due to their level of education; or, because they left school early for other reasons, they are unable to increase their income. It is likely that these two mechanisms operate together, and jointly with other factors - such as race or motherhood/fatherhood - (re)producing a cycle of exclusion for young people. It is important to point out that this also affects other aspects of their lives, such as well-being.

Issues related to race are present in the network in different ways: black participants having less access to formal education, and simultaneously being more inserted in the job market - indicating their earlier insertion in this world, possibly after their exclusion from
educational spaces (including due to the need work). At the same time, they stand out as leaders in their territories. This indicates that racism operates by producing the exclusion of young black men and women, but that they are acting to transform reality - possibly having some influence from the program in this process.

In their replies, respondents often stated to feel free due to the perception that they “can make their own choices”. It is notable that young leaders feel less free in their choices, but more secure in their territories. In addition to leadership, increased education also seems to make young people feel less free, indicating that both aspects bring a change in perspective of their realities. Well-being, therefore, does not only stem from access to spaces such as work and formal education, but from a way of perceiving the world, oneself and one's surroundings. More than feeling free, it is realizing how one may not yet be free, and acting collectively to transform this reality.

Among what respondents listed doing to feel well and fulfilled, leisure activities, sports, work, their children, friends and family stand out. In other words: meaningful connections, financial support, leisure, free time. When asked what they would change in their territories, violence and insecurity stand out, whether coming from the police or from the territory itself, in addition to access to basic services such as sanitation, education, transport.

These are relevant points to reflect upon when considering Youth Builder's - both the program and the network of graduates - next steps. Young people's roles as leaders do not depend only on themselves, but on conditions that allow them to occupy this position in their territories, and beyond that, recognize themselves as occupying this position. This includes personal - how satisfied, safe, or free they feel - and structural dimensions - such as racism, access to basic services, and poverty. Understanding how to act on these two aspects is one possible step in our search as Youth Builders to improve access to basic rights in a qualified manner that promotes well-being.