LEARNING MOBILITY, SOCIAL INCLUSION AND NON-FORMAL EDUCATION
Access, processes and outcomes

Youth Knowledge #22

Youth Partnership

Partnership between the European Commission
and the Council of Europe in the field of youth

EUROPEAN UNION

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

LEARNING MOBILITY, SOCIAL INCLUSION AND NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

Access, processes and outcomes

Maurice Devlin (Editor-in-Chief)
Søren Kristensen
Ewa Krzaklewska
Magda Nico

Contents

Introduction

Maurice Devlin, Søren Kristensen, Ewa Krzaklewska and Magda Nico

Why this book?

This publication, part of the Youth Knowledge series of the partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the field of youth, is a follow-up to the first volume on transnational learning mobility published in 2013. With contributions by researchers, practitioners and policy makers from all over Europe, *Learning mobility and non-formal learning in European contexts* was an attempt to present a "state-of-the-art" overview of learning mobility in the very complex and heterogeneous European youth field. It was thought that a lot of effort was being expended, and much useful knowledge generated, in very compartmentalised zones, and that it was necessary to distil and disseminate this knowledge in such a way that it could be presented in concise form to a wider audience.

The decision to produce a new book was prompted by similar considerations, but also by several additional factors. First of all, learning mobility is not static but is constantly evolving, and new knowledge is being produced on an ongoing basis; especially in the research field, where learning mobility is now clearly attracting attention on a larger scale than previously. Secondly, however, the editorial committee (which is different from the 2013 publication) thought that it was necessary to narrow the focus somewhat and sacrifice some breadth in order to achieve more depth. The theme of social inclusion recommended itself because young people have been hit particularly hard by the economic crisis and its aftermath, with large numbers long-term unemployed, facing social exclusion and poverty, or otherwise at risk of socio-economic marginalisation and discrimination. Such a theme also allowed us to build on the focus of the 2015 conference of the European Platform on Learning Mobility. Finally, the increasing recognition of youth work in youth policy development at European level in recent years encouraged us to place a particular emphasis on the non-formal education sector.

The book attempts to address two interrelated issues, specifically in the context of non-formal education. The first is learning mobility in the inclusion agenda: how learning mobility can be used as a tool for inclusion by providing opportunities and assets to the disadvantaged and excluded. Recent evaluative research has clearly demonstrated that learning mobility can be a very powerful tool for inclusion, but if it is not handled with proper consideration of the target group, it may produce the opposite effect to that intended. The second is inclusion in the learning mobility agenda: learning mobility has arguably so far mainly been the preserve of privileged, resourceful young people, and projects have perhaps been designed with such participants in mind. We therefore need to focus on how we involve less advantaged young people in mobility projects, and how we engineer and implement these projects to make participation a realistic option for all.

Challenges

We set out to highlight a number of challenges relating to learning mobility and disadvantaged young people, often referred to in European programmes as "young people with fewer opportunities".

One is knowledge creation and dissemination. Despite a growing interest in learning mobility as a tool for inclusion, it remains an under-researched subject, and consequently there are still many lacunae in our knowledge. In particular, the long-term effects of participation are still not properly understood, due to a lack of longitudinal research on young people's learning outcomes. Also, the compartmentalisation of knowledge is still a problem, and many interesting experiences from practitioners all across Europe are kept within a small circle, and are not disseminated to relevant actors and stakeholders to the extent that is desirable.

A special challenge is motivation and recruitment. Even though we know that participating in a learning mobility project is a powerful tool to develop the competences needed for inclusion, it is not easy to convince a 17-year-old early school-leaver with no prior experience of being abroad to leave his or her home environment and spend a significant amount of time in an unfamiliar setting among strangers. Youth work relies on voluntary participation, and applying too much pressure may have an adverse effect. If we hope to increase substantially the number of young people from this target group participating in learning mobility projects, we have to find ways of (a) reaching out to them (they are unlikely to have an existing involvement in structured youth work activities); and (b) encouraging and motivating them. Otherwise there is the risk that projects and programmes remain accessible only to young people who already have advantages and opportunities, for whom the prospect of a transnational experience carries no fears or apprehensions.

A genuine effort to promote inclusion within learning mobility also has consequences for structure, content and pedagogical supports. The important thing is not that we can send 1 000, 10 000 or even 100 000 young people from a given target group abroad and get them back alive, but rather that they return with new knowledge, skills and competences that will enhance their lives and enable them to contribute more actively to society in the future. There should be an alignment between learning objectives and the target group on the one hand, and methodology on the other. We cannot simply cut and paste pedagogical approaches from one target group to another. We must develop nuanced forms of project design and pedagogical support that reflect the diversity of our target groups, including vulnerable and excluded young people.

Contents and structure

Like the first youth knowledge book on learning mobility, it is hoped that this volume will be of interest to a wide readership that includes practitioners, researchers and policy makers. In the present case, however, there is a particular focus on the research angle and on the interface between research and practice; a number of the contributors might be described as "practitioner-researchers".

After an introductory chapter by the editors addressing the three key concepts that comprise the book's main title – "learning mobility", "social inclusion" and "youth work and non-formal education" – the remainder of the volume is divided into three parts.

Part I, on "Access, reach and target", contains contributions that are for the most part discursive in approach and which explore the background and context of learning mobility and social inclusion, as well as questions regarding how widely, equitably and effectively opportunities are disseminated and distributed.

Part II, entitled "Processes, strategies and practices", provides a series of detailed and concrete accounts of learning mobility projects, giving the rationale for how they were approached and implemented and discussing the challenges, opportunities and issues arising.

Finally, Part III deals with "Effects, outcomes and follow-ups" and includes contributions that are mainly of an evaluative nature, looking at intended and non-intended results of youth mobility schemes at both national and European level.

To assist and guide the reader, the editorial committee has provided a short introductory text for each chapter, summarising the main points and its relation to the overall theme of the volume.

Learning mobility, social inclusion and non-formal education: understanding the concepts

Maurice Devlin, Søren Kristensen, Ewa Krzaklewska and Magda Nico

The title of this volume refers to several major concepts, each of which is open to interpretation and discussion. In this chapter we provide the editors' perspectives on these concepts, and on the current debates and discussions surrounding them, with different editors taking the lead in writing about different concepts.

First there is learning mobility. This is self-evidently a complex or "composite" concept, bringing together the ideas of "learning" and "mobility". Not all learning requires physical mobility, and not all mobility has a learning focus (at least not deliberately). Below we set out the parameters of the concept as it is used here, with a particular focus on the pedagogical approach that underpins it.

Secondly, there is the question of target group. What do we mean when we say that learning mobility should be "socially inclusive"? "Young people with fewer opportunities" are identified as a key concern in the context of major European mobility programmes, but that is an elastic term whose meaning can vary with context; in a sense, all young people could be deemed to have "fewer opportunities" in some way or at some stage. Both the term and the thinking that underlies it are therefore in need of critique.

Finally, there is the context in which learning mobility takes place and the methods used to promote it. In this volume, the emphasis is on the non-formal education sector. When practised with young people, non-formal education is increasingly seen as synonymous with "youth work", which in historical terms is relatively recent as both a concept and a practice. Although youth work has developed in different ways and to different extents in different parts of Europe, a common understanding and shared vocabulary seem to be emerging, centred on the process of non-formal learning, as discussed in the final part of this chapter.

Learning mobility as a pedagogical tool

Søren Kristensen

"Learning mobility" is defined as physical cross-border mobility consciously organised for pedagogical purposes and for a limited period of time (European Platform on Learning Mobility (EPLM)). Because in this publication it is embedded in youth work, a further important point is that it is undertaken in a non-formal context and that participation is voluntary. This means we are not concerned with mobility organised within the formal school system. In addition, migration (forced or voluntary) is outside our scope; despite the fact that it certainly may contain opportunities for learning, it is

not undertaken for pedagogical purposes. The refugee situation in Europe, which is one of the burning issues of the day, is therefore not covered by this definition (although the contribution by Charles Berg explores what learning mobility initiatives today can learn from migratory movements of children and young people in the past).

"Learning mobility" is a phenomenon that is growing in Europe, both in formal and non-formal contexts. The "Study on mobility developments in school education, vocational education and training, adult education and youth" from 2012[1] tried to assess the number of persons participating in learning mobility schemes in the EU (both in formal and non-formal contexts, but excluding university students), and estimated – albeit with a considerable margin of error due to the lack of availability of precise data – that it comprised some 430 000 persons annually. Not least due to the increased budgets for the European programmes (notably, of course, Erasmus+), the number seems to be increasing.

In a sense, there is nothing new under the sun. Students in higher education as well as craftsmen have, since medieval times, travelled abroad in order to acquire knowledge, skills and competences that they could not find at home. In the context of youth work, however, it is a fairly recent development that only gathered momentum after the Second World War, when several youth organisations and structures were set up in order to provide frameworks for youth exchanges across borders. The primary aim was to instil in young people, through stays abroad and encounters with peer groups there, an intercultural awareness that would prevent the rise of prejudices and nationalism, and lead to a more peaceful world.

The reasons for undertaking learning mobility go beyond intercultural awareness, however, and it is also seen as a way in which to develop personal competences, active citizenship and employability of participants. A policy paper from the European Commission outlines the rationale for the phenomenon in the following terms:

> Learning mobility, meaning transnational mobility for the purpose of acquiring new knowledge, skills and competences, is one of the fundamental ways in which young people can strengthen their future employability, as well as their intercultural awareness, personal development, creativity and active citizenship. Europeans who are mobile as young learners are more likely to be mobile as workers later in life. (Council of the European Union 2011)

Learning mobility activities for young people under the umbrella of youth work cover diverse activities. Broadly, we can identify three categories:

- ▶ project-based, short-term bi- or multilateral encounters of groups of young people;
- ▶ individual, long-term school stays in a framework of formal upper-secondary education, as organised by exchange organisations such as AFS and Youth for Understanding;
- ▶ individual placements in organisations and institutions under the European Voluntary Service (EVS) or similar schemes.

---

1. http://bookshop.europa.eu/en/study-on-mobility-developments-in-school-education-vocational-education-and-training-adult-education-and-youth-exchanges-pbNC3113987/.

From evaluations and evaluative research – some of which is documented in this publication – we know that good-quality learning mobility can indeed bring about such outcomes. What the research also tells us, however, is that such outcomes do not come about by themselves merely as a function of being abroad. The fact that 100, 1 000 or even 10 000 young people went abroad is in itself of no importance; what is important is what they brought home with them in terms of new knowledge, skills and attitudes, and how this contributes to the development of societies and individuals. Equally important, they cannot all be realised within one and the same project: there are many types of learning mobility, and specific types of mobility are conducive to specific kinds of learning outcomes. Working with learning mobility is therefore a pedagogical activity, and not merely a matter of logistical arrangements and co-ordination.

This requires that practitioners have a thorough understanding of learning processes in learning mobility and can identify the factors – or conditions – that are necessary in order for the full potential to unfold. The key question here is: what is it that makes a stay abroad a particularly valuable pedagogical tool? A partial answer to this can be found in the learning theory developed by Piaget (2001). He operates with two different types of learning: assimilative learning, where we learn by adding new elements to already developed cognitive frameworks, and accommodative learning, where these frameworks are altered or replaced because we encounter new phenomena that do not fit into these already developed frameworks. Through accommodative learning, we "challenge our mindsets", "revise our attitudes" and "expand our horizon" – learning outcomes that are perceived by many as particularly valuable in a society that is characterised by globalisation and change. This type of learning has also been termed transformative learning (Mezirow et al. 2000). We can identify both assimilative and accommodative/transformative learning processes in transnational mobility projects, but it is particularly suited to the latter. Encountering a different culture represents a powerful platform where this kind of learning may develop, because our usual notions of normality are challenged by new concepts and practices – as has been expressed by another theoretician, we "learn through experiences of disjuncture" (Jarvis 1999). However, this type of learning is no foregone conclusion, because we may also react by rejecting what we see, discarding it as irrelevant to our situation, or simply by misinterpreting it. Therefore certain conditions need to be met and certain support structures and services – pedagogical interventions – must be available to the learner to ensure that such learning takes place. These form the building blocks of a quality management system for mobility.

A general model of learning processes in mobility projects (Kristensen 2004, 2015) posits four interconnected conditions:

▶ *Immersion*: that participants must be subjected to a real encounter with the culture and mentality of the host country, and not a superficial, sanitised version;

▶ *Responsibilisation*: that participants are actively involved in working out solutions to problems and challenges arising out of experiences of disjuncture encountered in the process, but that these are at a level which is not beyond what the target group can cope with;

▶ *Relativation*: that issues addressed and tasks undertaken are relevant and recognisable to the participants, so that culturally determined differences between ways of organising and doing things become visible and can be compared and discussed;

▶ *Perspectivation*: that participants are engaged in a constant process of reflection on experiences and that the necessary support for this process is available before, during and (especially) after the event.

This theoretical understanding of how learning outcomes in mobility projects are produced needs to be translated into an identification of what practical interventions are needed to underpin quality in learning mobility. Certain general principles can be inferred from the model, for example:

▶ that learning processes in mobility do not only comprise the time spent abroad, but also phases before and after;

▶ that pedagogical support geared to the needs of the target group must be available during all phases of the process;

▶ that a certain intensity and duration of the experience is necessary in order to ensure immersion.

These pedagogical reflections are, of course, especially important when we deal with a less resilient target group of young people with fewer opportunities. Inclusion in a context of learning mobility is not just a matter of a declaration of intent, but also of ensuring that the necessary support structures – in terms of preparation, accompaniment during the stay and debriefing – are in place, so that participation becomes a realistic possibility. If this is not considered, programmes and schemes that were originally intended for young people with fewer opportunities may over time become "colonised" by more resourceful groups, thus reinforcing rather than dispelling inequalities – as has arguably happened with the European Voluntary Service (see Chapter 13 in this volume by Şenyuva and Nicodemi).

Disadvantaged compared to whom? Critical notes on "social inclusion"

Magda Nico

One of this book's objectives is to look at learning mobility experiences as tools for social inclusion of young people. But in fact, defining "social inclusion" and identifying those to whom it should apply[2] are difficult issues that rely on specific theoretical, ideological and methodological approaches or views. Different approaches are used in the European youth sector in this regard. A common approach is the identification of groups of young people that share a specific vulnerability based on social, economic, educational, cultural, geographical, or health- or disability-related factors (see the Youth in Action Programme Guide, for instance[3]). The list of obstacles experienced within any one of these spheres is wide, but such an approach is useful in providing a relatively straightforward profile of the young people who should benefit from

_____

2. It has already been noted that the term "young people with fewer opportunities" is commonly used in mobility programmes, although some authors would choose other descriptions: "disadvantaged youth, youth-at-risk, vulnerable youth, disconnected youth or social excluded youth [sic] are preferred to describe social inequality among young people" (Bendit and Stokes 2003).

3. Available at www.salto-youth.net/tools/otlas-partner-finding/help/young-people-with-fewer-opportunities/.

given learning mobility experiences; it is an instrumental categorisation that serves a "target-oriented" operationalisation. A different approach has also been used (Markovic et al. 2015). In this approach, the emphasis on separate "groups" gives way to a concern about the interaction and cumulative effect of different factors of disadvantage (Nico 2016). In addition, the responsibility for addressing and resolving social inequalities is seen as lying with the social institutions and environments that cause them. It is this second approach that provides the basis for the discussion and critical notes that follow. This implies a critical questioning of aprioristic definitions of "fewer opportunities" and, to some extent, of "social inclusion" itself.

The continuum of social inclusion/exclusion

In the European youth sector, "social inclusion" is a popular and pervasive concept, presented both as an end (or goal) of youth policy and youth work programmes and as a means towards the "process of individual's self-realization within a society, acceptance and recognition of one's potential by social institutions, integration (through study, employment, volunteer work or other forms of participation) in the web of social relations in a community" (Kovacheva n.d.: 2). According to the Social Inclusion Monitor (see official site), social inclusion encompasses six dimensions: poverty prevention, equitable education, labour market access, health, social cohesion and non-discrimination, and intergenerational justice. Although these are collective and societally shared problems, it is clear that they have particular relevance for young people. This is true both because of young people's own crucial and vulnerable point in the life course (being in school, entering the labour market for the first time, etc.) and because of the positive effect they can have in achieving and advocating the values and practices of social inclusion for all (non-discrimination, intergenerational justice, for instance). In a sense, young people themselves are both a means to and an "end" of social inclusion.

> Social inclusion is a youth policy priority of the EU and CoE strategies for sustainable and inclusive growth and the promotion of human rights. Both institutions build their policies on the understanding of the complex and multi-dimensional character of young people's social integration and the grave risks that the economic crisis is still posing. Breaking down the barriers is made possible through development of evidence-based policy using the capacities of youth research, policy, practice, and young people's own agency (Kovacheva n.d.: 1).

But the six dimensions of social inclusion listed above[4] interact with each other, in different ways in different countries and at different times, in producing different levels (in quality and severity) of social exclusion or inclusion. Statistics institutions do not agree on a way to measure or rank this interaction of different factors of disadvantage. But two things are clear: the situation is not dichotomous and it is not fixed in time. At the very least, we are all at the very best borderline included. So it is not a matter simply of being included or excluded, but rather of:

▶ the degree to which one faces exclusion (in one or more dimensions);
▶ the severity of the dimensions from which one is excluded;

_____
4. Each of which has great inner heterogeneity and defies dichotomised understandings.

► the cumulative interactions between the dimensions from which one is excluded;

► the skills and confidence needed to prevent or overcome situations of social exclusions.

It is not about pursuing the "perfect – utopic – and at all times objective and subjective inclusion" but about recognising the domino effect that social exclusion might have (hence prevention and intervention in specific areas). Also, maybe more importantly, the domino effect that social inclusion, the feeling of being part of something, of going somewhere, of boosting skills and/or confidence may produce in one's life course, whatever the (temporary, apparent, circumstantial or fixed, structural, irreversible) starting point was. The positive effect of learning mobility experiences in social inclusion processes is, for instance, as valid for those from advantaged backgrounds as it is for the more disadvantaged. It is simply more urgent and decisive in the lives of "young people with fewer opportunities". "For them social inclusion involves breaking various barriers before acquiring their social rights as full members of society" (Kovacheva n.d.: 2). But can we separate the "groups" by urgency of intervention, by level of exclusion or risk of exclusion? Is that what social inclusion is all about?

Social inclusion – longitudinal and reversible

Social inclusion is a fluid and longitudinal process but not a one-way street. This means that, according to any specific definition of social inclusion, the same person can be "socially included" at certain moments of his/her life and be "socially excluded" in others. In this sense there is not a straight borderline or a clear dichotomy between the "before" and "after" of a learning mobility experience. Inclusion and exclusion are also not barricades or tracks that one has to choose at a specific point in one's life. Learning mobility experiences are thus not epiphanies that show the bright and right side of life to young people once and for all. Learning mobility experiences that have social inclusion in mind are about putting yourself in another person's shoes, to think outside your (social) box, to reposition yourself in the field of life possibilities. These experiences are not supposed to act as "support groups" where everyone shares and reinforces certain conditions, but arenas where the exposure to what and who is different, to diversity, is intended. So again, even if this is more urgent for "young people with fewer opportunities", may the process itself excuse the participation of young people with a few more opportunities than the ones with the fewest opportunities, the alleged "missing middle" in youth transition studies (Roberts 2011)? Even if we could find a dividing line, would we want to?

Research on the composition of the classes in formal and basic public education, for instance, has shown repeatedly that there are no benefits in putting together classes exclusively made up of with children with learning difficulties or simply with bad grades. This does not help these students to overcome their difficulties but usually contributes to self-labelling, over self-consciousness of the difficulties, stigmatisation and… exclusion. Even if for the students "with fewer difficulties" there is almost no specific benefit (in terms of formal learning processes) to being in a "mixed" class, the objective and subjective benefits for the students with more difficulties are crystal clear. Would it make sense to apply this diversity argument to the composition of

the groups that experience, together, learning mobility processes? Could we argue that some level of match has to exist between the composition of the groups and the type and aim of youth work practice (see Krzaklewska text, below). Some of the chapters of this book seem to advocate this, in the sense that the interaction between people or groups with different characteristics is especially beneficial to young people with fewer opportunities.

And finally, how would we find a dividing line between "most excluded" and "most included"? Although in contemporary society, one's social fate is not completely determined by social origin, it is well known that some disadvantages, alone or in interaction, contribute to the likelihood of being excluded. In fact, there is "a complex array of factors such as gender, health, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and sexual orientation [that] acts to enable or constrain social integration" (Kovacheva, n.d.: 2). But these "groups" or "labels" are not sufficient in defining this likelihood. They have to be put in their national context, and "comparing the distribution of … opportunities across countries is a challenging task" (OECD 2010: 30). In fact, not only is the average of the social-economic and cultural status much higher in some countries than others (compare Sweden or Finland to Portugal or Spain) but there are countries where the internal inequalities between the highest and lowest levels of social-economic and cultural status are much greater than others (for example, Portugal, Spain and Luxembourg). The social origin and background of children and young people and the national socio-economic context are the strongest and most holistic determinants of opportunities and access to opportunities in life. Therefore, we have to admit that labels like disabilities, health problems, educational problems, cultural differences, social obstacles (young people facing discrimination because of gender, age, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation; ex-offenders, drug and/or alcohol abusers, single parents, orphans; those with limited social skills, antisocial or high-risk behaviour) and geographical obstacles might sometimes be all it takes to be excluded, might just be the tip of the iceberg of exclusion (in poor and unequal countries, for instance).

So to sum up, we could state that social inclusion is an ongoing process in every-one's life and thus contributing to it (through learning mobility or other activities) is not a "one-time" thing. It can also be approached differently (for example through awareness, prevention, direct impact, etc.) for different people in the same group. A second conclusion would be that social inclusion and social diversity should be both an end or goal and simultaneously a means to the achievement of that end; that is, social inclusion must be the result of an interaction between diverse people, not a ghettoisation of experiences. "Nothing about us without us" is a common motto in the youth sector. One could also state that "nothing to promote social inclusion should be developed without social inclusion being reflected in its process". A third conclusion would be that finding the exact lines that separate young people with "fewer opportunities" and young people with "a little more than fewer" opportunities is a rather difficult endeavour. It frequently ends up being either the result of complex comparative statistical exercises or of well-intentioned guesses. Either way, our point is to make this "line" not a fixed one, a wall, a frontier, but rather a fluid one, a bridge, a springboard to a better life.

Youth work and non-formal learning

Ewa Krzaklewska

In the context of this book we concentrate on learning mobility for social inclusion in non-formal contexts – most of all in youth work practice. The chapters in the book embrace such settings as youth exchanges, youth services, youth camps, youth organisations and movements, non-formal educational programmes for young people and voluntary service.

In recent years youth work as a sector has increasingly consolidated, professionalised and invested a lot of energy in reflecting on its aims, scope of work, methods and quality assurance. Until recently "youth work" was a term and concept principally used in European policy documents, and it has been used to describe a range of very diverse practices directed towards young people. Nevertheless, even if the term is still not widely used in some countries, the identity of the sector is strengthening through various initiatives at European and national level. There continue to be diverse forms of youth work, different histories, organisational or funding structures, or different foci. However, what remains at the core of youth work is support for the development of young people, both as individuals and as a social group.

In the Council Resolution on a renewed framework for European co-operation in the youth field (2009), youth work has been defined as follows:

> Youth work is a broad term covering a large scope of activities of a social, cultural, educational or political nature both by, with and for young people. Increasingly, such activities also include sport and services for young people. Youth work belongs to the area of "out-of-school" education, as well as specific leisure time activities managed by professional or voluntary youth workers and youth leaders and is based on non-formal learning processes and on voluntary participation. (Council of the European Union 2009)

Similar elements are included in the report on the quality of youth work (European Commission 2015a: 12): youth work should support the personal and social development of young people; young people should take part voluntarily; and youth work is based on non-formal and informal learning processes. This vision for youth work was expressed in the Declaration of the 2nd European Youth Work Convention (2015: 4):

> Youth work is about cultivating the imagination, initiative, integration, involvement and aspiration of young people. Its principles are that it is educative, empowering, participative, expressive and inclusive. Through activities, playing and having fun, campaigning, the information exchange, mobility, volunteering, association and conversation, it fosters [young people's] understanding of their place within, and critical engagement with their communities and societies.

As stated above, in addition to its voluntary nature, non-formal learning processes are at the heart of youth work. We can even notice in the European documents that youth work and non-formal learning are almost used interchangeably (European Commission 2015a) – youth work is non-formal learning and non-formal learning opportunities for young people are (mostly) offered by youth work, in its diverse forms. A commonly used definition of non-formal learning was formulated by Lynne Chisholm (2005: 49):

> Non-formal learning is purposive but voluntary learning that takes place in a diverse range of environments and situations for which teaching/training and learning is not necessarily their sole or main activity. These environments and situations may be intermittent or transitory, and the activities or courses that take place may be staffed by professional learning facilitators (such as youth trainers) or by volunteers (such as youth leaders). The activities and courses are planned, but are seldom structured by conventional rhythms or curriculum subjects. They usually address specific target groups, but rarely document or assess learning outcomes or achievements in conventionally visible ways.

A noticeable current trend in the European context is a blurring of the boundaries between formal, non-formal and informal learning, a matter that arises in some of the contributions to this book (for example those by Petersen (Chapter 5) and Wordelmann (Chapter 11)).

Similar to the definition of youth work provided above, the definition of non-formal learning stresses the aspect of voluntary participation, but also – importantly from the point of view of this book – the fact that it is organised by youth workers or youth leaders. As the learning in both settings is guided, it requires a choice of approach and a methodology. This aspect links to the question of pedagogy, which is addressed in many of the chapters in this book: how can youth workers, through appropriate methods, support the development of young people using learning mobility as an additional tool? It also links to the tension between autonomy and dependency. A core principle of youth work (European Commission 2015b: 16) is that it should be based on young people's voluntary and active participation, engagement and responsibility; it should be designed, delivered and evaluated together with young people; it should enhance young people's rights, their personal and social development and autonomy, as well as engaging with young people as capable individuals and a resource in their own right. In the context of this book we can ask: to what extent does young people's participation in prepared mobility schemes actually allow for such autonomy and empowerment?

While we can name several spaces in which youth work takes place, two main types of practice – not mutually exclusive – have been identified within the youth work universe: those which are "forum oriented" and those that take the "transit-zone approach" (Taru et al. 2014: 128). This distinction is interesting as a way of reflecting on the approach that is taken to structuring learning mobility activities. The first approach – forum type – refers to "social educational practices that bring young people together to discuss their needs, reflect on their lives and prepare collective action to change social circumstances" (ibid.). It embraces diverse ways of participating in society, and through participation may lead to change. This perspective, if we take into account the international and intercultural aspect of mobility, could create almost a globalised, international forum concentrating on the young generation across borders. The second approach – transit zone – sees young people as needing to fit into the functioning social system. Through the development of skills and competences the young person should integrate into society. This approach links strongly to the recent emphasis on the role of youth work in integrating young people into the labour market or strengthening their employability, and the growing popularity of intervention-based youth work aimed

at dealing with issues faced by young people and targeting specific groups of young people (European Commission 2014: 6). The chapters in this book demonstrate both the approaches outlined above within mobility projects – for example the mobility programme described in the chapter by Wordelmann clearly fits into transit-zone approach, while those by Petersen or Teuma (Chapter 6) provide examples of the forum approach.

To what extent can youth work serve diverse aims? Filip Cousée (2016: 85) writes: "what makes youth work different from other actors in that social and pedagogical field is that its heart focuses on learning processes rather than on desired outcomes of knowledge and behaviour". Still, he points out that there exists a tension in youth work concerning product-orientation versus process-orientation and there appears a risk of instrumentalisation. In fact his opinion mirrors the concern by youth workers expressed in the Declaration of the 2nd European Youth Work Convention (2015: 5) that "youth work should continue to focus on the processes and the needs of young people, remaining outcomes informed and not outcomes led". While these opinions stress that youth work should not concentrate on outcome but rather accompany young people in their lives as they are lived and enable them to reflect on their role and position in society, most youth work activities nowadays are nonetheless focused on outcomes. Furthermore, not only are outcomes expected to be achieved, but they are also supposed to be measured and proved (this trend is shown by the work on indicators in diverse fields, including the youth work field and learning mobility). Many reflections in this book are concerned with demonstrating the actual outcomes (also as far as social inclusiveness is concerned) of the learning mobility experience.

Introducing European opportunities for mobility, first through the Youth for Europe programme from 1992, followed by Youth in Action and more recently Erasmus+, has definitely made a difference in the youth work sector. Some of the projects described in this book have been run thanks to funding from such European programmes; others take place within wider structures of work with young people (for example within youth organisations or established youth services), which use mobility as an "additional" event or opportunity. The internationalisation of youth work takes place on the one hand through the mobility of young people, but it also takes place through cross-border education of youth workers and the exchange of youth work/non-formal learning practices internationally. Interestingly, internationalisation is not listed as one of the significant current trends in youth work in the European Commission's transnational report (2014), although increasing collaboration is mentioned. Nevertheless, the funds directed to youth programmes have definitely brought new opportunities into the field, as well as promoted new ways of working with young people though non-formal educational programmes.

References

Bendit R. and Stokes D. (2003), "'Disadvantage': transition policies between social construction and the needs of vulnerable youth", in López Blasco A., McNeish W. and Walther A. (eds), *Young people and contradictions of inclusion: towards integrated transition policies in Europe* (pp. 261-83), Policy Press, Bristol.

Chisholm L. (2005), "Bridges for Recognition Cheat Sheet". Proceedings of the SALTO Bridges for Recognition: Promoting Recognition of Youth Work across Europe, Leuven-Louvain.

Council of the European Union (2009), Resolution of 27 November 2009 on a renewed framework for European cooperation in the youth field (2010-2018), (Official Journal C 311, 19 December 2009, pp. 1-11).

Council of the European Union (2011), Council Recommendation of 28 June 2011 "Youth on the move" – promoting the learning mobility of young people (Official Journal C 199/01, 7 July 2011).

Coussée F. (2016), "Introduction to Part IV 'Half boy and half man'" in Siurala L., Coussée F., Suurpaa L. and Williamson H. (eds) *The history of youth work in Europe*, Youth Knowledge Book 19, Vol. 5, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

European Commission (2014), *Working with young people: the value of youth work in the European Union*, Brussels.

European Commission (2015a), "Quality youth work: a common framework for the further development of youth work". Report from the Expert Group on Youth Work Quality Systems in the EU Member States, available at http://ec.europa.eu/youth/library/reports/quality-youth-work_en.pdf, accessed 24 July 2017.

European Commission (2015b), *Youth work and non-formal learning in Europe's education landscape: a quarter of a century of EU cooperation for youth policy and practice*, available at http://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1668225/youth-work-nonformal-learning_en.pdf/f0e0fafd-fe0b-4f4a-93d6-8970b335dc9a, accessed 24 July 2017.

European Youth Work Convention (2015), "Declaration of the 2nd European Youth Work Convention – Making a world of difference", Brussels, available at www.jugend-fuereuropa.de/downloads/4-20-3690/The%202nd%20European%20Youth%20Work%20Declaration_FINAL.pdf, accessed 24 July 2017.

Jarvis P. (1999), *The practitioner-researcher*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Kovacheva S. (n.d.) "Social inclusion", EU-CoE youth partnership policy sheet, available at http://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1668219/Social+inclusion+by+Siyka+Kovacheva/651cf755-ca79-486d-9648-5ae89542650b, accessed 24 July 2017.

Kristensen S. (2004), *Learning by leaving: placements abroad as a pedagogical tool in the context of vocational education and training in Europe*, University of Aarhus, Aarhus.

Kristensen S. (2015), "Measuring the un-measurable: evaluating youth mobility as a pedagogical tool for intercultural learning", in Küppers A. and Bozdag C. (eds), *Doing diversity in education through multilingualism, media and mobility*, Istanbul Policy Center, Istanbul.

Markovic J., Lopez M. and Dzigurski D. (2015), *Finding a place in modern Europe: mapping of barriers to social inclusion of young people in vulnerable situations*, Youth Partnership, available at http://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1668217/Finding.pdf/d5685c53-257e-4678-89f6-fcbf17469cff, accessed 24 July 2017.

Mezirow J. et al. (2000), *Learning as transformation*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Nico M. (2014), "Variability of the transitions to adulthood in Europe: a critical approach to de-standardization of the life course", *Journal of Youth Studies* Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 166-82.

Nico M. (2016), "Youth Inequalities: intersections, comparisons and accumulations", Analytical paper, Youth Partnership, available at http://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/9000853/AnalyticalPaper_YouthInequalities_MagdaNico.pdf/bf46962f-d2d2-4f03-85cd-22c1f02ffa8b.

OECD (2010), *PISA 2009 Results: overcoming social background – Equity in learning opportunities and outcomes* (Vol. II), available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264091504-en, accessed 24 July 2017.

Piaget J. (2001), *The psychology of intelligence*, Routledge, Abingdon.

Roberts S. (2011), "Beyond 'NEET' and 'tidy' pathways: considering the 'missing middle' of youth transition studies", *Journal of Youth Studies* Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 21-39.

Social inclusion monitor, available at www.social-inclusion-monitor.eu/.

Taru M., Cousée F. and Williamson H. (2014), "Youth work in connection to policies and politics", in Taru M., Cousée F. and Williamson H. (eds), *Relevance for today's youth work policy: the history of youth work in Europe* Vol. 5, Youth Knowledge Book 18, Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Part I

Access, reach and target

Chapter 1

Analytical paper: Learning mobility and social inclusion

David Cairns

The first contribution to this book is an analytical paper by David Cairns that was commissioned by the Youth Partnership of the European Commission and the Council of Europe in 2015. It provides a helpful overview of the key concepts relating to learning mobility and social inclusion and places them in the research and policy contexts. The paper argues that social inclusion is an issue that needs to be recognised as a major risk factor in the lives of many young people across Europe, encompassing not only difficulties resulting from a lack of labour-market integration but also issues relating to personal well-being and lack of integration into European society.

Introduction

The aim of this paper is to explore the relationship between learning mobility and social inclusion within the European context, assessing the present state of the art of research and identifying priorities for future developments. Through this discussion, we can move towards an understanding of how social inclusion can be addressed through learning mobility. The two main terms of reference of this paper, "learning mobility" and "social inclusion", are long-standing concerns of the European Platform on Learning Mobility (EPLM). Learning mobility is defined as "transnational mobility undertaken for a period of time, consciously organised for educational purposes or to acquire new competences … and can be implemented in formal or non-formal settings" (EPLM 2013: 1). In the context of this paper, social inclusion refers to "the process of [an] individual's self-realisation within a society, acceptance and recognition of one's potential by social institutions, integration (through study, employment, volunteer work or other forms of participation) in the web of social relations in a community (Kovacheva 2014: 2).

Putting these two issues together provides transnational mobility with a purpose, with time spent in another country associated with engaging in activities that foster personal and professional development. Learning mobility in this framework also aims to address key issues such as increasing participation, active citizenship, intercultural learning and dialogue, individual competency development and employability among young people, recognising the role of youth work and the need for effective policies and guidelines for mobility practice. The objective is therefore to make a connection with the need to improve the social situation of young people