EUROPEAN
POLICYBRIEF

MOVE

MAPPING MOBILITY – PATHWAYS, INSTITUTIONS AND STRUCTURAL EFFECTS OF YOUTH MOBILITY

The second MOVE policy brief provides recommendations based on overall results of the project, with a specific focus on the analyses done in qualitative and quantitative parts that aim at indicating how to enhance the quality of six mobility types in the EU.

April 2018

INTRODUCTION

Policy Brief II provides research results based on an integrative multi-level approach developed with the aim of studying the patterns of young people's mobility at different levels and from various perspectives. The overall ambition of MOVE is to provide a research-informed contribution towards improvement of the conditions of the mobility of young people in Europe and a reduction of the negative impacts of mobility through the identification of ways of good practice thus fostering sustainable development and well-being.

Within the MOVE project six types of youth mobility were researched in depth: pupil exchange, voluntary work mobility, employment mobility, higher education, vocational education and training and entrepreneurship. The research was conducted in six countries: Germany, Hungary, Luxembourg, Norway, Romania and Spain.

This policy brief is based on the main results within qualitative and quantitative approaches that have been linked together in the project by focussing on the backgrounds and experiences of individuals, their engagement with their environment, their social capital and chains of subsequent mobilities. It particularly focusses on the dimensions that hinder and foster mobility, as well as the positive and negative impacts on mobility. These identified dimensions are:

1. social relations
2. learning
3. individual development
4. organisational membership
5. socioeconomic and opportunity structure
6. duality of existence
7. overlapping mobility.

They are discussed below as central to formulating recommendations on how to enhance the quality of youth mobility in the EU.

EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS

In the qualitative Work Package (WP3), 206 problem-centred, in-depth interviews with young mobile people were carried out with the aim of grasping experiences from the perspectives of young people during their mobilites or reconstructed retrospectively; these interviews were complemented by 36 interviews with experts in the field of youth mobility. The analysis has led to the identification of the following patterns of mobility:

- Peers as mobility incubators
- Learning something through mobility
- Institutionalised work and education as national enabling patterns
- Organisational membership, the crux of mobility
- Youth with ambivalent youth practices
- The dilemma of the revolving door.

The quantitative survey (WP4) has followed the analyses of the results gained in the two previous working packages. The quantitative part of the project addressed the hindering and fostering factors, motivations, experiences and barriers experienced by mobile as well as non-mobile people in regard to mobility, their specific social embeddedness and social background. The survey provided results based on a merged dataset of 8,706 respondents: 5,499 respondents for the panel survey, and 3,207 for the snowball survey with the aim to obtain a more balanced composition among mobility types as well as mobiles and non mobiles. It provided analyses to central aspects in mobility, including:

- main motivations for mobility that differ in education and work-related mobility, as well as vary according to macro-determinants
- sources of information for mobility
- agency and mobility-related behaviours among young people
- the role of social capital and social networks in youth mobility
- expectations with regard to mobility and career plans
- transnational activities and youth identity.

Work Package 5 has brought the results of the previous work packages together with the aim of drawing a complete picture of the mobility patterns of young people. The work in the package included a triangulation of the analyses with regard to the patterns of mobility, strategies of achieving agency, fostering and hindering factors of mobility, and positive and negative effects of mobility. Additionally, an explanation of differences, linking results to the most recent organisational and legal frames, was concluded by a formulation of policy recommendations and the final report of the project.

The section below focusses on the interpretation of the project's results that are particularly relevant to the formulation of policy recommendations for enhancing the quality of youth mobility. The data and analysis offered below are based on the crossing of the perspectives from the different working packages and their applied methodology.

Main results of the project

1. Social relations dimension

Peers as mobility incubators are one of the central mobility patterns that have been identified in the qualitative analysis and show how everyday social relationships and organisations can enable youth mobility. Peer relationships are, in fact, the main context within which youth mobility is bred, induced or hampered. Friends play a significant role in the mobility of young people. Moreover, survey results show that friends play a slightly stronger role for educational mobilities (35.3%) and are less influential for work-related mobility (30%). Furthermore, peer networks are regarded as useful sources of information on mobility. A large number of young people rely on the mobility-related information provided by friends (35.7%) as well as by social media, which are also among popular channels for identifying information (25.7%).

As such, mobility does not occur spontaneously in a vacuum, but is rather rooted (embedded) in social networks. To mobile young people, peers are especially friends with mobility experience; likewise, peers are also other people (i.e. relatives, siblings, acquaintances) with previous or current mobility experience. This can also be found in the results from the quantitative survey that shows that, especially for young people in long-distance mobility, 63.2% of mobile respondents have friends who did a student exchange, 42.4% have friends who have studied abroad, and 51.4% report that their friends have recommended them to study abroad. Furthermore, peers are also influential in the decision-making process: they are of a central importance not only in generating mobility plans but also in providing an accompanying community and in creating a new form of belonging. Thus, peers are presented as a central resource in the actual process of mobility, allowing young people not only to tackle mobility but also to maintain existing forms of social belonging and create new ones as well as to enter into a dialogue with other peers.

2. Learning dimension

Young people's learning processes are closely interwoven with mobility. The preparatory stage in itself is already interpreted as a learning process. Mobility is seen, among other things, as a "huge opportunity" for young people to improve their education. Here, learning a language tops the list. Young people incorporate the language into mobility; they become mobile with the motivation to improve existing language skills or to learn a new language. Learning language is regarded as the most important motivation affecting mobility in almost half of the respondents of the survey. Furthermore, learning and improving English language skills is of a particular importance for all types of mobility; young people link English with future studies and employment opportunities. Following this objective via different mobilities, young people move to English-speaking countries and practice English as a *lingua franca* in international, globalised destinations.

At the same time, language is also the main barrier to any mobility type: over one third of mobile survey participants (32.4%) emphasised a lack of sufficient language skills as a barrier to their mobility, which is also found to be the most important barrier amongst non-mobiles (42.7%).

3. Individual development dimension

As young people account having learned many things, mobility is thus presented as a context in which numerous kinds of learning take place in various ways and can lead to not only language learning, but also new self-positionings, independence, and adaption to organisations. In this way, young mobile people connect their mobility to their wish to become independent and to "go out". These ambitions can be framed as a specific set of youth practices. Mobility is seen as a process of becoming independent, as a chance to learn to get by and make their own way outside the framework of the family. Characteristically, this is also placed in the context of their learning history as young people. The learning effect is particularly obvious with regard to the young people themselves and their own achievements and realisations. The data shows that these practices are contextualised by most young people as relevant to their age group. The qualitative analyses provide examples of "doing youth" by individual coping strategies and by working through bureaucratic challenges. The mobility also allows young people to discover aspects of their personalities, providing a strong impetus for development in both their professional and personal lives. Qualitative data confirms that mobility is understood as a process that helps unveil new perspectives and create forms of social belonging, self-positioning and independence-seeking, all of which fall outside the realm of the familiar. Young people also emphasise the opportunities that mobility gives them to find new ways of positioning themselves in social relationships in the new destinations. All in all, mobility is presented as a context in which learning is not only possible but quite necessary. The young people do as is implicitly societally expected of them as youth: they learn something. This learning process and the possibility of "doing something else" (e.g. instead of learning in formal, institutional contexts such as schools and universities) are seen as legitimising mobility. Mobility itself is not sufficient to be called youth mobility and needs to be enriched by additional activities and processes - of learning – to be youth mobility.

In that way, learning through mobility is equally important to all youth mobility types, including working mobility (i.e. employment, entrepreneurship). To them mobility allows for either improving working conditions (31.2%) or improving opportunities for personal and professional development (28.7%).

4. Organisational membership dimension

The preparation and organisation of mobility are both regarded as a challenging process for young people. The hypothesis is that people are more easily mobile when they are members of a certain organisation. In order to become mobile, young people must become a member with regard to the organisation – not necessarily in the literal sense, but in the sense that they must be assigned a certain membership role, be more or less formally accepted, and prove themselves. The most basic membership is reached by obtaining membership in the category which the mobility programme addresses: in the case of pupil mobility, young people's role would be to be mobile as schoolchildren; in the case of employment mobility, their role is to be mobile workers, etc. Young people are thus always mobile as members of an organisation, and not as single individuals. Once the youth's fit with an organisation is achieved, if they have gained certain organisational membership/role which entitles them to doing so, they then can become mobile.

Often it is through mobility that young people need to get by one's own. Even the preparation for mobility is based on one's own resources. According to the survey results, rather than relying on support from organisations, young people prefer their own, more informal sources of information and use personal sources, such as Internet search engines (48.5%), friends (35.7%), and teacher recommendations (32.1%). Online communities/social networks and university websites are also popular for obtaining information on mobility (over 25%). Relying on different sources of information and contacting mobility-related organisations varies across mobility types. While young people in education mobility tend to rely more on informal sources, i.e. teachers' advice and search engines and less on formal channels, those in employment mobility do not rely on any formal channels: very few (over 1%) mention EURES, followed by specialising portals, employment agencies, and government websites.

5. Socioeconomic and opportunity structure dimension

The significance of peer relations and family also indicates how strongly youth mobility is dependent on personal communities, and thereby on how these communities are integrated into youth mobility as a form of social background security and social, cultural and economic capital. These patterns are presupposed as personal enabling contexts for mobilities. Parents have a major influence on the decision-making process for young people, where over one third of young people (38.2%) reported taking their opinion and support into consideration. The results show that family support is the main source of mobility financing (46.1%) alongside private funds and savings (32.0%). Individual socioeconomic factors determine patterns of mobility or immobility: the level of education of young people and the level of education of the parents (taken as a proxy for socioeconomic status) have a positive impact on mobility. The family background (parents and grandparents) regarding mobility (having lived abroad in their lifetime) also has a positive impact, as does the age of the respondent.

Socioeconomic inequality hinders young people in the process of becoming mobile and is seen as one of the major barriers to mobility. Not all young people have the same good financial conditions to become mobile, they do not come from similar social classes, and, moreover, we found significant country differences in the major part of the analyses produced, which tends to be called the new North-South divide in Europe (Landesmann and Leitner, 2015). Lack of financial resources (21.8%) is therefore a strong barrier hindering people to becoming mobile. Lack of financing for mobility is even higher for non-mobiles (35.6%) and should be considered as a central obstacle for mobility together with insufficient language skills.

6. Duality of existence dimension

In the qualitative results we see how youth associate their mobility and leaving home with the wish to "break out". The idea of breaking out is closely linked to youth. In the classical sense, it involves breaking out of narrow familial contexts and similarly-narrow school contexts. Youth mobility, in turn, features a double connotation of breaking out. On the one hand, the phase of youth is shaped by young people's separation, disengagement and exiting from the above-mentioned contexts. It is about breaking away and freeing up space for oneself, about following one's own path – different from the paths others have taken before. This path of one's own is usually not specified. This is the general idea of youth: each young person may take their own space to develop independently. On the other hand, in this regard, mobility is a geographical form of escape. Being mobile is compared to leaving something behind, going somewhere else, reaching a destination. Nevertheless, it is more a process of "moving in" than one of "moving out" of their space: while becoming mobile, youth experience practices that introduce them to bureaucratic structures and procedures, to new practices of everyday life, to norms and practices of working society, etc. Youth mobility cannot be seen as a way to break out, but should be seen rather as an initiation, an entrance to contexts of society (i.e. education, work and family) in a given country. The dilemma of "breaking out", or "moving in, moving out", is explained in one of the mobility patterns developed from qualitative data and includes the difficulty of adequately managing the distance. Young people are constantly in different locations through the use of social media and telecommunication; in this way, they cannot leave either of the locations. The wish to detach oneself from the known and discover the unknown on one's own can thus only partly be fulfilled due to contextual restrictions and hindrances.

Furthermore, the duality of "moving in" or "moving out" is enhanced by the social transnational practices in which young people are engaged in the country of destination. Both qualitative and quantitative data confirm the fact that, even after mobility, young people tend to maintain more contact with their acquaintances in their country of origin rather than with those of their country of residence. According to the survey results, less than half maintain weekly contact with friends from their destination country. Moreover, more analyses on social transnationalism in the country of destination shed light on the qualitative findings: the whole mobility group – e.g. in the context of student mobility – sometimes seems a world of its own. A bubble is created in which young people may or may not belong. Young people note that such bubbles are formed and exist not only in their private lives, but also at work, where nationals and non-nationals interact in separate circles. In the end, this does not mean that mobility among young people in Europe takes place entirely in the context of peer relationships and that young people never leave the bubble of their peers and the

institution. It is a central situation, but one which is highly permeable. When young people are mobile, this also transnationalises their relationships.

Though this transnationalisation can be planned, it is also something that occurs as part of a process. In the process of mobility there is not just a single step – being abroad and coming back. Instead there is a series of interlinked events (i.e. a person here leads to another person there), as can also be seen from the relationships.

7. Overlapping mobility

First-time mobility is particularly challenging and produces a long-lasting memory, thus shaping the future of young partakers. At the same time, having done it once, young people find themselves eager to be mobile again. Their future expectations also alter: over half (54.5%) of young people who are currently mobile see further mobility in their future, it is also strongly present among young people with previous mobility experience (40%).

Financial, organisational and logistical factors also shape overlapping mobilities: qualitative analysis shows that mobilities are combined with each other. In some cases, young people move from one place to another and once they finish one mobility type they start the next, often linking up to five mobilities in one destination place. Examples of the overlapping of mobilities present strategies of keeping oneself mobile against bureaucratic, legal and financial limitations of some mobility type frames under EU mobility programmes (an example of concatenation of mobilities: a person came to study in a Masters' programme; she then embarked on an internship, in parallel with her study, and started volunteering work, which then led her to entrepreneurship). In other cases, moreover, young people repeat the same mobility types several times, which is common, for example in the case of voluntary service.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Enhancing the quality of youth mobility in Europe

The recommendations provided below have been specifically formulated for Policy Brief II with the focus on the enhancement of quality of six types of mobility.

1. Recommendations concerning higher education mobility

Student mobility within Europe has mostly short-term character, i.e. students spend only one or two semesters at an institution abroad, a well-developed institutional support structure is very important. This includes enough and competent staff providing information within a reasonable timeframe, both at sending and receiving institutions. Pre-established and transparent procedures make the step towards a realised mobility easier, both for students and institutions.

- **Interests towards higher education mobility could be awakened already during pupil mobility.** Mobility produces mobility – awareness towards other mobility possibilities (e.g. higher education mobility) should be raised from an early age. For that, opportunities to gain or maintain **skills in various languages** should be offered extensively and for free, i.e. broadly included in school education and tertiary education, too. The quality of language education should be improved. Existing **multilingualism** among youth should be considered a resource in society and should be politically recognised as such and publicly supported. Learning foreign languages should be encouraged as early as possible at schools.

- Inequalities should be taken into consideration during the selection process. There should be **programmes for disadvantaged students that are tailored** and defined to fit their

needs. Such programmes should also be complemented by virtual mobility programmes and other means of helping students to experience smooth mobility. Often, disadvantaged youth do not even consider taking part in a programme (as it is linked with financial expenses), so the relevant institutions should act first rather than wait for student action.

- **Difficulties in funding:** lack of funding is a big obstacle to mobility, especially in periphery countries. Scholarships are **not enough to cover the costs**, therefore funding for disadvantaged students should be introduced so that mobility decreases existing inequalities rather than perpetuating them. Some flexibility in the economical scheme of the Erasmus+ should be considered in order to permit paid work during the mobility and also other types of mobility could also be increased (shorter-term mobility for those that do not have the means to go for a longer period of time).

- **Sources of information: coordination and support structures in sending and host higher education institutions (HEIs) should be improved**. Different departments are often not in contact with the international offices, which leads to difficulties in accrediting the subjects in certain countries. Further, international students cannot access all classes in host HEIs (or the application process is not clear to all parties involved in the sending and host institutions);

- **Peer-to-peer knowledge transfer** is a very efficient way of spreading information, but it is not so common as there is no concrete system in place. When students return from mobility, there should be a system for spreading their knowledge, which would be a mixture of peer-to-peer exchange and coordination at the HEIs level;

- **Decrease excessive institutional demands.** The process of enrolling in a student exchange programme should be facilitated: currently this process is still bureaucratic, involving a large volume of paperwork between institutions, and lacks coordination between relevant institutions. Programmes, such as exchange programmes without or with less paperwork, should place their priority on simplifying application procedures.

2. **Recommendations concerning voluntary work mobility**

Voluntary work has social relevance in creating social capital and promoting the values of active citizenship and social responsibility, while also stimulating personal and professional development. There are, nevertheless, various obstacles young people encounter before, during and after their mobility as volunteers.

- Financial issues are the main obstacle to young people's becoming mobile. **More elaborate financial support systems** are therefore necessary to ease this issue: both wider financial support and an elaborate system to support young people with less financial resources are needed.

- Lack of information amongst those who are not the main target of youth mobility programmes and general misinformation can be alleviated as follows: In order to inform youth equally about their opportunities, **"new" digital Web** 2.0 media such as Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, etc. should be used more broadly. Questions are answered interactively (filter bubble phenomena; extreme filters and reinforcement effect), therefore it is necessary **to open up interactive spheres of information** that are open, adaptable and youth friendly.

- Volunteering has an impact at both a social level, through developing a good working relationship with international peers, and at the personal level, by virtue of their getting to know themselves better. Mobility experience contributes to self-reflection and to revisiting the way one perceives one's environment: including relations with peers, **encouraging the development of new peer-relations** that increase in importance and serve as inspiration for further mobility experiences. A recommendation here is to offer youth a **possibility to share their experiences** by **creating spaces** to reflect on their experiences, provide **peer-to-peer advice**: When organisations manage to provide support on a very "personal" level

(especially with bureaucracy, e.g. if someone does not understand a form), when there are special structures for help by mentors, former volunteers, etc.: peers mediate between organisations and the young persons.

- In order to **learn from the youth mobility** that they enable, organisations need to create:
  - o **flexible enablement contexts**: participative elements in organisations are needed ("trickling down"), in order for the youths' experiences and knowledge about needs, structural hindrances, processes and organisational possibilities and challenges to add to the institutional knowledge. These "trickling down" processes can be organised participatively and can open up new spaces in which peers and others can simultaneously process their experiences.
  - o Generally, **transparency** at all levels is called for: the application process and the selection criteria should be made transparent for all. The host organisations should make it clear what their expectations are, in order for the young mobiles to know what to expect of their voluntary service. Finally, the sending organisation needs to clearly state beforehand in which ways they will and will not be able to support the young mobiles during their mobility.

3. Recommendations concerning employment mobility

Employment mobility is a transition from youth to adulthood, from education to work, from unemployment to employment. However, this transition is not always direct. Once youth become mobile, they are vaguer about their return. Employment mobility is **not as structured as other mobility types**. Entering the labour market is sometimes problematic for youth in the destination countries.

- **Information** is available for young people, but it is difficult to filter the different sources. It is therefore crucial to engage youth centres and programmes to disseminate information on youth mobility opportunities, including **employment opportunities.**

- Formal information is available if you can find it. However, young people mainly rely on informal channels when searching for jobs abroad. **Informal information sources**, such as a bridging person, the significant person, peer-to-peer communication and active youth organisations should be incorporated into disseminating information on youth employment mobility.

- Employment mobility is an unstructured mobility type. Moreover, in order to enhance youth mobility and help young people with organising it, **profit organisations and private companies** could step in as bridging youth and employment in the destination countries.

- There is a need to **invest in youth workers and youth organisations**, which can guide youngsters before mobility experiences, or they can be the first ones to plant the idea of "being mobile" at an early age.

- Many young people get stuck in the lower segment of a labour market in the destination countries and have no assistance in climbing the job ladder. Some of them do not know their rights and opportunities in the destination countries. They need **job consulting for young employees,** i.e. centres in destination countries.

- First EURES job is a new employment programme; however, as in the case of other existing mobility programmes, it experiences difficulties reaching young people. Thus, EURES needs to put efforts on **quality**, not just quantity in disseminating their programme. **Placement instead of recruitment;**

- **Research evidence/results** on youth employment should be **used by practitioners**. Research should be shared with all those working in the youth sector (the European Commission, national organisations, local authorities, public national services, employment organisations, companies, universities, etc.) to develop their way of working within youth mobility with evidence-based research.

4. Recommendations concerning VET mobility

VET mobility was studied in Germany and Spain, which allows us to make several different recommendations, as VET systems and institutional framings share the same goals but differ in their system developments and results. German VET mobility stands out in comparison to other mobility fields, but also in comparison to European VET mobility practices. This is highly attributable to the strongly institutionalised and standardised implementation of the Erasmus+ programme. German VET mobility is largely framed by its strict regulations of the dual- or school-based vocational training. Spanish VET mobility duration is usually around three months. A majority of participating students receive their grant only upon return.

- A lot of young people are not aware of VET as a mobility field. That is why it is important to develop more **raising awareness campaigns** among young people, and companies to popularise this mobility type, its work, and its benefits for young people and enterprises.

- In order to increase low-level work experiences during apprenticeships, as well as individual mobilities, **a database of European companies** and employers willing to take mobile students on would be helpful, following the model of other mobility types (EVS).

- There should be **more flexibility in funding** vocational and education training mobility. That could be achieved, for instance, by giving **more autonomy to National Agencies** in managing their funds.

- **Improve the language acquisition** in VET study plans. Improve the access to the Online Linguistic Support for all Erasmus participants.

- **Reinforce the VET schools' human resources** creating a "mobility consultant" position integrated in different level networks allowing students and teachers mobilities.

- **Increase teachers' mobilities**. The benefits of sending and receiving teachers result in network development for future students' mobilities and raise awareness among VET students.

- **Improve the funding scheme to** ensure that the money arrives before the student' departure to decrease the economic barrier to VET as well as **improve the monitoring system** to ensure the quality of the training (fit between studies and work) and the working conditions.

- As dual VET students "work" in companies from the beginning, it seems possible to **promote VET student exchanges inside multinational companies** through a specific "internationalisation and mentoring" programme with a reduced bureaucracy process.

5. Recommendations about pupil's mobility

Pupil's mobility is the first mobility experience for most young people; it could motivate and inspire them to follow other mobilities, such as higher educational mobility, vocational and education mobility, volunteer work mobility, etc. That is why various aspects shape not only pupil's mobility that becomes the basis for other consequent mobilities.

- Up until now, information on pupil's exchange mobility has not been harmonised across EU countries. **EU actors should create a cross-sectorial systemised collection of data**. Such a database would also unify experiences and practices established in the field of pupil's mobility as well as allow avoiding duplications of same work carried out by different actors.

- **Connection/cooperation** should also be realised between **research projects** on the same topic on the EU. This could be coordinated by the EU organisations; European umbrella initiatives, as for instance, the European Platform for Learning Mobility, could organise events for researchers and practitioners to enrich knowledge in the field of pupil's mobility.

- **Connection/cooperation** should also be better implemented with regard to funding to enhance pupil's mobility exchange; reciprocal programmes/funding as well as individual/community interactions should exist.

- In order to improve pupil's mobility, we can learn from **already-developed practices** in the fields of non-formal education and use those **non-formal learning practices** organised outside of the established formal system. Some examples could be:
  - **teacher training/mobility**, intercultural learning experience and competence (the importance of having teachers with intercultural or mobility experience and competence to work with multicultural classrooms and multicultural leisure time activities of exchange pupils)
  - **community impact** (awareness about what communities that receive exchange pupils can gain from it and what the challenges are: mobile young interact with their peers, teachers and host families and can promote intercultural understanding and sensitivity in the everyday life setting, also among those who are not mobile themselves. However, youth can also meet hostility, negative stereotypes and underinvestment during their stay. To prevent these negative outcomes, communities need to develop proper strategies and competences for participating in international pupil's exchange)
  - **tools/resources** (non-formal learning provides resources available online that could be used across mobility fields, also for pupil's exchanges)
  - **individual-/group-facilitated learning** (arrangement of workshops, seminars or short courses on various topics to promote intercultural learning)
  - **encouraging and facilitating non-formal opportunities** for intercultural exchange experiences
  - reducing the odds for group contact/**increasing the odds for individual pair interactions**.

- **In order to facilitate pupil's exchange, institutions and programmes should ensure flexible formats of pupil's exchange so that they are more inclusive**. Ensure different choices are available to students, which fit the needs of all young people stepping away from group contact and fostering individual (pair interaction-related) contact.

- It is important to increase **intercultural competences** for young people, interest towards pupil's mobility should be supported by teachers and families who could **introduce a welcoming culture with strategies**, such as host families.

- **National school curricula should ensure recognition of the study period abroad**, so that young people do not have to repeat a year = coordination of degree/merit recognition and internationalisation of accreditation processes. This should be supported and coordinated by the EU as well.

- Establish **mentor-mentee relationships/ peer networks.**

6. Recommendations about entrepreneurship mobility

Entrepreneurial mobility is a specific process: young people emphasise one should "live entrepreneurship". Entrepreneurship mobility is fragile and sensitive to socioeconomic changes both in the sending and in the receiving countries. As a result, to support the interest towards entrepreneurial mobility, an increased offer of trainings about business creation is recommended.

- National stakeholders should **create trainings and possibilities for exchange on business creation abroad**

- To support young entrepreneurship mobility, it is important to broaden and diversify **funding possibilities** and, at the same time, to enhance the transparency of information about access to financial resources and procedures

- In general, entrepreneurship should be promoted equally across the country of origin. It is thus important to ensure **equal opportunities** for people from different regions of the same country

- Establish **mentor-mentee relationships/ peer networks.** Peer support systems are important, especially in order to facilitate access to information on available funding possibilities and procedures, to facilitate familiarisation with administrative systems in the host country.

- Institutional actors succeed if young entrepreneurs return. Actors should thus **enhance competences to support young people to come back**.

- There are different narratives on success between young people and institutions; some young people associate "success" with their becoming transnational entrepreneurs, for some "success" means being competitive and innovative entrepreneurs in their home country. Institutional design of programmes should **take youth narratives into consideration**.
- **Support programmes** should also be designed **according to the needs** of young people and not according to the needs of institutions.

- Enlarge **social protection benefits to Erasmus+ entrepreneurs** (i.e. job seeker allowance) to provide them with enough relevant resources in time, so as to avoid the need to have a job just to survive, and ensuring their full dedication to run their business.

- **Improve coordination** among different institutional actors and levels; there is a multiplicity of programmes on different levels of administration, as well as private ones; there is a strong need for improving communication, as well as the quality and dissemination of relevant information regarding entrepreneurship-related mobility.

- **Harmonise entrepreneurship-related legislation in EU countries** to encourage youth entrepreneurial activities and international mobility for this purpose.

- Entrepreneurial mobility is sometimes hindered because of excessive bureaucratic procedures with regard to the needed documents for setting up a business. The process is even more complex due to new languages in the destination countries. **Online procedures and information** on taxes, insurances, etc., **should be provided in several languages** on social media.

- Entrepreneurial mobility is sometimes seen as having a gender bias. It is, therefore, recommended to **support women's entrepreneurship** through the creation of support structures and programmes for female entrepreneurs, especially those with families.

References:
Landesmann, M. & Leitner, S. M. (2015). *Intra-EU Mobility and Push and Pull Factors in EU Labour Markets: Estimating a Panel VAR Model*. [Working Paper 120.] Vienna: Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies.

RESEARCH PARAMETERS

The overall ambition of MOVE is to provide a research-informed contribution towards improving the conditions of the mobility of young people in Europe and a reduction of the negative impacts of

mobility through the identification of ways of good practice, thus fostering sustainable development and wellbeing.

The **main research question** is: How can the mobility of young people be "good" both for socio-economic development and for individual development of young people, and what are the factors that foster/hinder such beneficial mobility?
Based on an interdisciplinary and multilevel research approach, the main objectives of MOVE are to:

1. carry out a comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon of mobility of young people in the EU;
2. generate systematic data about young people's mobility patterns in Europe based on case studies, a mobility survey and secondary data analysis;
3. provide a quantitative integrated database on European youth mobility;
4. offer a research-based theoretical framework in which mobility can be reflected, thus contributing to scientific and political debates;
5. explore factors that foster and factors that hinder good practice based on an integrative approach with qualitative and quantitative evidence;
6. provide evidence-based knowledge and recommendations for policymakers through the development of good-practice models to
   a. make research-informed recommendations for interventions to facilitate and improve the institutional, legal and programmatic frames of mobility with regard to different forms and types of mobility, as well as to the conditions/constrains of mobility for young people in Europe
   b. give consultation and expertise to those countries facing significant challenges related to geographical mobility of young workers.

Overall Approach and Methodology

MOVE is based on a multi-level and transdisciplinary research design. On the micro level, the young people and cross-border movements, as well as the fostering and hindering factors are the main focus. On the meso level, the organisational field of the respective type of mobility within the given national and international legal regulations is taken into consideration. Finally, on the macro-level, the social and economic data on a national and regional level will be brought together and analysed in regard to the mobility situation of young people.

The research project MOVE consists of six work packages, that include beside the management package (WP 1): secondary data analysis (WP 2); six case studies on different forms of mobility (WP 3); a survey on the situated practices, experiences and influencing factors of mobility, based on a double-stage sampling including a panel (n=5,499) and a snowball sampling (n=3,207) amongst mobile and non-mobile youth (WP 4); the triangulation of the qualitative and quantitative analysis (WP 5); and a work package (WP 6) for communication, dissemination and exploitation.

The case studies are based on six relevant types of youth mobility in Europe, as described above in this Policy Brief:

1. student mobility for higher education
2. cross-border volunteering
3. employment mobility
4. mobility for a vocational training
5. pupil's exchange
6. entrepreneurship mobility.

The focus on these six types of mobility enables us to research the various facets of mobility beyond the structure of specific programmes of youth mobility.

PROJECT IDENTITY

PROJECT NAME

Mapping mobility – pathways, institutions and structural effects of youth mobility in Europe (MOVE)

COORDINATOR

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Birte Nienaber, UNIVERSITE DU LUXEMBOURG, Luxembourg, birte.nienaber@uni.lu

CONSORTIUM

ACADEMIA DE STUDII ECONOMICE DIN BUCURESTI – ASE Bucuresti –
Bucuresti, Romania

AGENCE EUROPEENNE POUR L'INFORMATION ET LE CONSEIL DES JEUNES
ASBL – ERYICA –
Luxembourg, Luxembourg

DEUTSCHES JUGENDINSTITUT EV – DJI –
München, Germany

EURICE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AND PROJECT OFFICE GMBH – Eurice –
Saarbrucken, Germany

WESTERN NORWAY UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES, – HVL –
Sogndal, Norway

ILUSTRE COLEGIO NACIONAL DE DOCTORES Y LICENCIADOS EN CIENCIAS
POLITICAS Y SOCIOLOGIA – ICN –
Madrid, Spain

MISKOLCI EGYETEM – UNI MISKOLC –
Miskolc, Hungary

STIFTUNG UNIVERSITAT HILDESHEIM – UH –
Hildesheim, Germany

FUNDING SCHEME

Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020), Societal Challenge 6 – Europe in a changing world: inclusive, innovative and reflective societies", call YOUNG-2-2014, topic "Youth mobility: opportunities, impacts, policies"

DURATION

May 2015 – April 2018 (36 months)

BUDGET

EU contribution: 2,499,912.00 €

WEBSITE

http://move-project.eu/

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Contact: Michaela Scheid, m.scheid@eurice.eu