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I  Project MOVE
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  
   - Romania  
   - Spain  
   - Norway
5. Pupil’s exchange  
   - Hungary  
   - Romania  
   - Spain
6. Entrepreneurship

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

**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**

$n = 5800+$  
$n = 600$

Combination and evaluation of the preliminary results of the explorative case study data and of 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

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

Country 2
2nd unit of analysis

sub-categories
information flows
(transnational) social networks
European identity
well-being
agency

contrast

SECONDARY DATA ANALYSIS

frame of research
mapping the contexts

1. higher education
Luxembourg
Germany
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

multiple-case design
types of mobility - organisational fields
II Question: how mobility can be good?
Question

• Comparision between mobiles and non-mobiles
  • Socio-economic background / rural-urban

• Are all mobiles the same?
• What is specific?
• What is common?
III Data
Data

- Online survey (only mobile)
  - Representative part + snow ball part; N=5,275
  - November 2016 - January 2017

- Interviews with young mobile people:
  - different stages (during & after)
  - January 2016 - Dezember 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility type</th>
<th>Country 1 NR</th>
<th>Country 2 NR</th>
<th>Country 1 + 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>higher education</td>
<td>Luxembourg 15</td>
<td>Hungary 25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment</td>
<td>Luxembourg 15</td>
<td>Norway 15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocational training</td>
<td>Germany 16</td>
<td>Spain 17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupil’s exchange</td>
<td>Hungary 17</td>
<td>Norway 15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Spain 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV Results
### 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>
Main hindering factors

*mobile: at least 2 weeks abroad other than holiday or family visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>Primary &amp; Secondary</th>
<th>Vocational Training</th>
<th>Credit students</th>
<th>Degree students</th>
<th>Work-related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No obstacles</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings from Interviews

• Positive experiences
• Self-development
• Widening of horizons
• “Mastering a challenge”
• Great memories
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• Great memories

BUT

...also: struggle...
Before
The self

Educational mobilities (pupil, VET, higher education)

• To do the first step
Organisation / Administration / Information

Educational mobilities (pupil, VET, higher education)

- The distribution of information regarding mobility opportunities is not equal in all institutions
- Restricted choice of destinations / time frame (mobility windows)
- Enormous administrative effort

Employment/entrepreneurship -> not many “organisational-related” factors: individual mobility
During
Language

- All but differently

- Educational mobility (short): get in touch with natives
  - Visit a country

- Educational mobility (long) & Employment/entrepreneurship: existential (administrational issues, professional standards in receiving country)
  - Live in a country
Social network

• Without the language ...

• Living in a bubble: just co-national and/or international
  • (pupil, student, VET & employment)

• Loneliness

• Professional contacts / Access to better jobs / Access to clients
  • (employment / entrepreneurship)
Finances (also before)

- Scholarship is not enough
- Need to work to finance the mobility (VET, Spain)
- Shock... awareness of prices / cost of living
- Having fun / earning money
V Discussion
Discussion

• Hindering can be also fostering
• Situational / temporal
• Life course (?)
  • but no age differences in the survey

• Hindering towards WHAT?
  • Have a successful mobility?
  • Have a stress-less mobility?
  • Have a good mobility? What is good?

• Is hindering really bad?
Thank you for your attention!
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