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**MOVE in a nutshell**

- EU H2020 Project
- Call: Young-2-2014-Youth mobility. Opportunities, impacts, policies
- Duration: 01 May 2015 - 30 April 2018 (36 months)
- Beneficiaries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Participant organisation name</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Université du Luxembourg (UL) - Coordinator</td>
<td>LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Universität Hildesheim (UH)</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deutsches Jugendinstitut e.V. (DJI)</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Academia De Studii Economice Din Bucuresti (ASE Bucuresti)</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Miskolci Egyetem</td>
<td>HU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Høgskulen på Vestlandet, Norway</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ilustre Colegio Nacional de Doctores y Licenciados en Ciencias Políticas y Sociología (ICN)</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>European Research and Project Office GmbH (Eurice)</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>European Youth Information and Counselling Agency (ERYICA)</td>
<td>LU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOVE in a Nutshell

Our target
The aim of the MOVE project is to provide an evidence-based contribution towards designing policies for young people in the EU.

The project
In order to investigate various dimensions of youth mobility, MOVE follows a multidisciplinary approach, including secondary data analysis, face-to-face interviews and an online survey.

EU funding
MOVE has received funding from the European Commission Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement no. 957984.

We want to find out:
1. What is the evidence? Why do some young people prefer to move?
2. What makes mobility a ‘good experience’ and what if young people really need?
3. How do patterns of mobility reflect social inequalities (gender, age, income, country of origin)?
4. How do specific types of mobility differ? (educational, vocational training, higher education students, entrepreneurship, jobs, exchange, volunteering, employment)

Our results are for...
...the youth: general public, policy makers, research assistants

Our research
The main research question of the study is thus: can the mobility of young people be used for their personal and professional development? Does it lower the educational and occupational prospects of young people, or should we be aware of the benefits? We focus on young people aged 18-29.

242 interviews
Standardised semi-structured interviews with young people and experts regarding social mobility.

8706 survey questionnaires
Ages range of the respondents: 18-29.

MOVE FOR secondary database
Comprehensive dataset of previously anonymised data.
Research question & Main objectives

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?

1. Carry out a comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon of the 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 analysis
3. Provide a qualitative integrated database on European youth mobility
4. Offer a data-based theoretical framework in which mobility can be reflected, thus contributing to scientific and political debates
5. Explore factors that foster and hinder mobility (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 institutions, legal and programmatic frames 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
Research design

Case studies

**Qualitative Strand**
- **Case Studies**
  - Multiple-case design
  - Types of mobility
    - 1. Higher education
      - Luxembourg
      - Hungary
    - 2. Voluntary work
      - Germany
      - Romania
    - 3. Employment
      - Luxembourg
      - Norway
    - 4. Vocational training
      - Germany
      - Hungary
    - 5. Pupil's exchange
      - Norway
      - Spain
    - 6. Entrepreneurship
      - Romania
      - Spain

  - Explorative collection of autobiographical narrative interviews with young people in every case/country

- **Survey**
  - $n = 5,000 + n = 500$

- **Combination and evaluation of the preliminary results of the explorative case study data and the secondary data analysis**
  - Improvement of the relevant sub-categories on an economic, organizational, & individual level

- **Further collection of qualitative data**
  - Further biographical interviews with a focus on the specific mobility experiences
  - Expert interviews with employers, politicians, and organizations

- **Qualitative data analysis**

- **Quantitative Strand**
  - **Secondary Data Analysis**
    - Framing the context for the case studies according to the focused types of mobility
      - Including Economic Analysis
        - Impacts and relationships between socio-economic and labour market conditions and the regional youth mobilities

- **Survey**
  - $n = 5,000 + n = 500$

- **Development of the surveys questionnaire & implementation of the survey**

- **Quantitative data analysis**

- **Triangulation of the qualitative and quantitative results**
  - Description of patterns of youth mobility in Europe
  - Synthesis of empirical results and identification of good practice

**European and country-related CONTEXT**

**Case - type of mobility organisational field**

- **Country 1**
  - 1st unit of analysis
    - sub-categories
      - Information support & access
      - (transnational) social networks
      - European identity & well-being agency

- **Country 2**
  - 2nd unit of analysis

- **SECONDARY DATA ANALYSIS**
  - Frame of research
  - Mapping the contexts

- **Multiple-case design**
  - Types of mobility - organisational fields

- **1. Higher education**
  - Luxembourg
  - Hungary

- **2. Voluntary work**
  - Germany
  - Romania

- **3. Employment**
  - Luxembourg
  - Norway

- **4. Vocational training**
  - Germany
  - Spain

- **5. Pupil's exchange**
  - Hungary
  - Norway

- **6. Entrepreneurship**
  - Romania
  - Spain
MOVE results: Cluster analysis

The country analyses revealed two main clusters:

1) centre-receiving countries and
2) periphery-sending countries

plus Luxembourg and Norway in a third cluster as outliers.

Finding 1: Only some European countries benefit from long-term incoming mobility; others lose human capital, especially when highly-qualified youth move abroad.

Finding 2: National economies profit from returning young people who gained competences abroad.
MOVE results: Country typology

The country typology:
1) mobility promoters (HU, RO)
2) mobility fallers
3) mobility beneficiaries (ES)
4) mobility utilisers (DE, LU, NO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology of country patterns on youth mobility</th>
<th>Human capital creating by attracting short-term incoming/incoming student mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Low Human capital deploying or exploiting long-term youth mobility or having a high ratio of returning mobility and/or outgoing students' mobility (using human capital from other EU-countries) | Mobility Promoter
Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Finland, Bulgaria ↓, Slovakia ↓, Hungary, Malta, Italy*

Mobility Faller
Czech Republic, Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden ↓

Mobility Beneficiaries
Latvia, France →, Estonia, Greece ↑, Spain ↑, Portugal ↑, Croatia

Mobility Utiliser
Ireland, Norway, Germany, Cyprus, Denmark, UK, Luxembourg, Austria |

| Indefinite countries due to lacking data: Lithuania, Iceland, Switzerland |
1. Peers as mobility incubators

Yes and there was also a friend, who had already studied [there]. She was already there and I lived with her, she was also Luxemburgish. By the way, I wouldn’t FOR SURE go alone to [town A, Belgium] (Higher education student mobility, Luxembourgish sample, N5)

2. Learning something through mobility

In terms of school, I felt that I had really learned in Romania and this gave me trust in myself and trust in Romania, but on the other hand I realised that what you learn in another country is not only in school, but also the cultural side, which is much more important... and you see so many different points of view and that is why I said I want to spend some more time here, at least to learn more, to get to know these different cultures, to see what this is all about. (Entrepreneurship mobility, Romanian sample, N3)

3. Institutionalised work and education

The classrooms are so outdated I can’t imagine how the seminars take place... There was a lot of theoretical curriculum. The situation in Germany is the opposite. There were more seminars than theoretical knowledge. I learnt things that were not down-to-earth and I won’t use in life. There were no projectors, technical tools were not available in every classroom. Classrooms were not well-equipped. Where I was, there were multifunctional projectors, air-conditioning, drapers – everything was provided, you just had to grab your USB, we also had Internet access, which was essential (Higher education student mobility, Hungarian sample, N19)
MOVE results: Patterns of mobility II

4. Organisational membership

And you had said that he actually wanted to go out without an organisation but then he had to [find one]. How come? Y: I don’t know the details. But like it’s about insurance and finances and such things. But they were organisational things, which would have become much much more complicated if you had done it without a supporting organisation (Voluntary work mobility, German sample, N3)

I actually did not expect to survive that long alone, but so far, I am doing well, I am alive, I did not lose weight so it is nice (laughter) yes so far I think I will stay. I moved. I emancipated 3,000 kilometres from my parents’ place. It is quite a big job. It makes me proud of myself; I actually could achieve that on my own. Therefore, for me it was a big experiment, I wanted to do that, I could do it, I did, and I have succeeded at some point (Employment mobility, Norwegian sample, N14)

5. Wish to become independent and to “go out”

So for me it was the first time, that I really was separated by my family, (.) and my parents didn’t really get along with that at the beginning. So they/ they/ they wanted to / they wanted a lot, umm, hear, more or less. (.) So / we agreed on: okay, talking on the phone once a week, Skyping or something like that. And that was even too much for me. I just really wanted to be there. I wanted to concentrate myself on being there and not have that much connection to home (Voluntary work mobility, German sample, N3)

6. Leaving home with the wish to “break out”
MOVE results: Gender aspect

• Being a male increases the probability of being mobile for study reasons by 20.2 percent (Scandinavia is the opposite)

• Males with tertiary education (if unemployed) less work-related mobility, females with tertiary education (if unemployed) more work-related mobility

• Organisations: women maintain larger informal networks whilst men take part in formal organisations, such as associations etc.

• Lower education levels decrease the probability of mobility by studies, 49.8 and 37.4 percent, respectively.
## Mobility rates
*mobile: at least 2 weeks abroad other than holiday or family visit*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>mobile %</th>
<th>non-mobile %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>1016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>5499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>mobile %</th>
<th>non-mobile %</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>2935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>2567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>5499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOVE Results: Hindering factors to mobility

• Non-mobiles would consider work-related mobility more: 13 percent of non-mobiles and 10 percent of mobiles indicated improving work conditions.

• Amongst non-mobiles, high level of reading international news, being aware of all channels of information, radio, blogs, social networks etc.
## MOVE results: Hindering factors (mobile & non-mobile together)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Lack of sufficient language skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lack of support or information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Difficulties to register in education/training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Obstacles or differences in recognition of qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Difficulties finding a job abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Difficulties to obtain a work permit abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A worse welfare system (pensions/healthcare)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 My partner is not willing to move</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Psychological well-being (fear of suffering from stress/loneliness/sadness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Financial commitments in my current place of residency (e.g. bank loans or owning a property)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lack of financial resources to move abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MOVE results: hindering factors (mobile & non-mobile together)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Lack of sufficient language skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lack of support or information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Difficulties to register in education/training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Obstacles or differences in recognition of qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Difficulties finding a job abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Difficulties to obtain a work permit abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A worse welfare system (pensions/healthcare)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 My partner is not willing to move</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Psychological well-being (fear of suffering from stress/loneliness/sadness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Financial commitments in my current place of residency (e.g. bank loans or owning a property)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lack of financial resources to move abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles</td>
<td>MOBILES % (N=1,644)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lack of sufficient language skills</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lack of support or information</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Difficulties to register in education/training</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Obstacles or differences in recognition of qualifications</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Difficulties finding a job abroad</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Difficulties to obtain a work permit abroad</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A worse welfare system (pensions/healthcare)</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 My partner is not willing to move</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Psychological well-being (fear of suffering from stress/loneliness/sadness)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Financial commitments in my current place of residency (e.g. bank loans or owning a property)</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lack of financial resources to move abroad</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOVE results: Mobility is financed by:
MOVE results at a closer look: Social relations dimension

• Peers as mobility incubators
  • stronger role for educational mobilities (35.3%)
  • less influential for work-related mobility (30%)
• Peer networks are regarded as useful sources of information on mobility.
  • (35.7%) of young people rely on the mobility-related information provided by friends as well as by social media, which are also among popular channels for identifying information (25.7%).
• Peers are especially friends with mobility experience
  • 63.2% of mobile respondents have friends who did a student exchange
  • 42.4% have friends who have studied abroad
  • 51.4% report that their friends have recommended them to study abroad
MOVE results at a closer look: Learning dimension

- Mobility as a “huge opportunity” for young people to improve education, stronger role for education, especially language
- English is important for mobility

BUT

- Language is also the MAIN barrier to mobility
  - 32.4% emphasised a lack of sufficient language skills as a barrier to their mobility
  - Language is also the most important barrier amongst non-mobiles (42.7%)
MOVE results at a closer look: Individual development dimension

• Mobility is important during youth, it is one of the youth practices
  • to become independent, “go out” and become autonomous
  • to find new ways of positioning themselves in social relationships in the new destinations

• Even in employment and entrepreneurial mobility: young people learn
  • improving working conditions (31.2%)
  • improving opportunities for personal and professional development (28.7%)
MOVE results at a closer look: Organisational membership dimension

- Organisation of mobility is a challenging process for young people
- Young people rely on own, more informal sources of information and use personal sources
  - Internet search engines (48.5%)
  - friends (35.7%), and teacher recommendations (32.1%)
  - Online communities/social networks and university websites (over 25%)
    - in education mobility young people rely - more on informal sources, i.e. teachers’ advice and search engines than less on formal channels,
    - in employment mobility young people do not rely on any formal channels: very few (over 1%) mention EURES, followed by specialising portals, employment agencies, and government websites
MOVE results at a closer look: Socioeconomic and opportunity structure dimension

- Parents have a major influence on the decision-making process for young people
  - 1/3 of young people (38.2%) take family’s opinion and support into consideration
  - 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 have a positive impact on mobility
    - the family background regarding mobility also has a positive impact, as does the age of the respondent.

BUT

- Socioeconomic inequality is one of the major barriers to mobility
  - Significant country differences: the new North-South divide in Europe
  - Lack of financial resources (21.8%) is a strong barrier hindering people to becoming mobile
  - Lack of financing for mobility is even higher for non-mobiles (35.6%)

Socioeconomic inequality is considered as a central obstacle for mobility together with insufficient language skills
MOVE results at a closer look: Overlapping mobility

- Mobility impacts on youth future, especially first time mobility
- Mobile once– mobile again
  - 54.5% of young people who are currently mobile see mobility in their future
  - 40% with previous mobility experience see mobility in their future

- Mobilities are combined and overlap with each other due to financial, organisational and logistical factors
MOVE results: Negative effects of mobility

• National differences are still there
  • Self-evaluation: 74.7 percent evaluate their mobility experience positively but...
  • Countries reveal differences:
    • Luxembourg shows high national identification
    • Hungary and Romania – face Brain drain
    • German respondents were mostly negative, but more positive on vocational education and training mobility programmes
  • Employment prospects: entrepreneurship and university education clash
  • Socio-economic status still matters a lot despite funds from the EU
MOVE results: Future plans

• “To move to your home country”: higher level for Luxembourg, Norway and Germany than Hungarian, Spanish and Romanian respondents
  • Spain and Romania are in-between
  • Hungary (lowest percentage for moving back)

• “To move to another country”: high amongst Spanish and Romanian respondents compared to German and Luxembourgish

Interviews and surveys show similar results (especially for the highly-skilled ones)
Policy recommendations: on the EU level

- increase the budget for Erasmus+
- improving the cooperation between different EU funds
- increase the funding possibilities for 15- to 17-year-olds
- better advocate the possibilities via youth ambassadors and by campaigning on social media channels
- Take into account new remuneration formula to calculate the amount of scholarship (regarding the socio-economic situation of the individual applicants and different regional inequalities)
- address young people with disadvantages (esp give support during application process)
- lower the level of pre-existing language skills as a selection criterion
- to foster private-public partnership and to include the private sector in the funding of mobility programmes (especially for VET and employment)
Policy recommendations: Higher Education

• differentiated approach in knowledge of foreign languages / intensive language courses in advance

• offer university courses in English to attract foreign students

• provide equal opportunities by adjusting financial instruments (Differentiated approach in selection, student loan)

• European Higher Education Area (EHEA) needs to be finalised

• standardise the organisation of the academic year

• make access the national funding mechanism for foreign students accessible
**Policy recommendations:**

**International volunteering**

- better advocate the possibilities via youth ambassadors and by campaigning on social media

- continuous monitoring (whether on the EU or national level) of the participating organisations

- make transition to European Solidarity Corps clear and precise
Policy recommendations: Employment

• **existing programmes** (esp. the traineeship programme of Erasmus+) should be **better** promoted

• currently unemployed should be **encouraged to apply for jobs abroad** (the service of **EURES** needs to be better disseminated among young people).

• increase **digitalisation of the job application processes** to make it easier for people to apply for jobs in another country

• facilitate **closer cooperation among employment agencies, employers, educational institutions** and **youth centres**
Policy recommendations: Vocational Education and Training

- reduce the differences in VET and adopt good practices from other countries
- Diminish the language barriers
- promote mobility amongst young people, companies, training institutions and teachers via different channels
- Increase cooperation with organisations
- set up of agreements between companies from different member states
- create an online exchange platform where mobility-experienced peers (role models) can inform youth interested in mobility
- Allow pre-payment as Erasmus+ funding is insufficient
Policy recommendations: Pupil’s exchange

• encourage schools to participate in Erasmus+ short-term exchange programmes

• reduce the bureaucratic burden for school teachers

• diversify the funding scheme based on social-economic status

• add a new programme to offer long-term school exchanges at the EU level either under Erasmus + or at the EU level within different funding schemes
Policy recommendations: Entrepreneurship

• encourage schools to participate in Erasmus+ short-term exchange programmes

• promote better Erasmus+ for Young Entrepreneurs

• decrease the bureaucracy hurdle for foreign nationals

• create an EU-wide start-up platform

• support the establishing of an EU-wide crowd-funding platform
MOVE results: Each mobility has a dilemma

- Pupils’ exchange: nationality effect is there, youngsters mostly socialise with those from their own nationalities
- Employment: transitory places, language is a must to be permanent (Norway and Luxembourg show some examples of this)
- Higher education: negative identification with EU if only EU funds are used, forced mobility for Luxembourg and a new case of privatisation in Hungary
- VET: Germany and Spain are so different from each other in terms of implementation, can they learn from each other?
- Voluntary work: organisations as constraints or liberating factors?
- Entrepreneurship and families (gender difference reveals itself)
MOVE results: Each mobility has a dilemma
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