Youth Partnership

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

Desk research
The value of learning mobility and its impact on communities

Justina Garbauskaitė-Jakimovska

December 2018

Content

Abstract

The impact of learning mobility on the participants of the projects is well known, broadly researched and published. However, while the impact on communities is known by practitioners or experts of the youth field and often referred to as "added impact", it is rarely in the centre of studies or measured. Yet, recent developments in European youth policies and programmes show that more emphasis is put on understanding the impact not only on the individual level, but also on the local community or wider society. The aim of this study is to provide an overview of the existing publications on learning mobility and impact on communities and society and to map the gaps in research on these themes. The scope of this study is learning mobility in the youth field and its contribution to citizenship education, civic participation and intercultural dialogue and learning, European citizenship, peace building and conflict transformation at community level.

There are several **different approaches** to analysing how the learning mobility projects reach the community and have an impact on it:

- the impact that is achieved by involving community members in the activities of learning mobility and direct interaction between the participants in learning mobility and community members;
- the impact that is achieved by the participants taking action in their home communities, which means that the participants improve their competences and acquire certain values during mobility and, later on, either get actively involved in various activities targeted at creating a more active, responsible and cohesive society or simply share their knowledge and newly gained points of view with their families, friends and other peers. This impact is achieved through a so-called "multiplier effect";
- the impact on communities might embody itself in visibility measures or in the dissemination of results targeting the local communities and, as a result, these communities would be engaged in and informed on the issues that the organisers of the project intended to address.

In researching the value of learning mobility for the communities, the distinction between short-term and long-term programmes is significant. For the **short-term** actions, impact on communities is usually not specifically targeted, but it appears in studies considering the general

impact of mobility programmes and is mostly presented in an abstract way, most of the time formulated as “there is (positive) impact”. The impact on communities varies depending on the learning mobility activities that are implemented and, for the most part, on the main aim of the activity. **Short-term** programmes are usually focused on personal development of the participants in the mobility activity; therefore the research on impact on the broader society or communities is more often directed to the home (sending) communities and relies on a multiplier effect. In contrast, in **long-term** international volunteering (including work camps), which is usually directed at working with local communities, the general impact is more visible and appears more often.

The impact of long-term learning mobility programmes such as volunteering or short-term programmes that are specifically directed to work with communities (work camps, or short-term volunteering, or the European Solidarity Corps actions), is targeted and analysed in detail more often. Even though the general impact studies are not focused on the development of one concrete competence, they indicate that **most of the gain by the community comes from long-term volunteering activities when foreigners are immersed in local communities**. The impact on local communities is often not measured, but implied and tightly connected with communication, direct actions of volunteers in order to benefit the communities or, in the case of closed small communities, living together, being present among other members. **The impact of learning mobility on the community level is stronger and more positive in the case of communities that have not had many prior interactions with foreigners.** It is important to note that usually the impact on the communities or wider society is interpreted through the impact on young people and their readiness to become more active members of their communities after the learning mobility activities. This aspect is very strong in the case of inclusion of young people with fewer opportunities into learning mobility which, according to researchers, results in them becoming more active members of their societies and therefore the societies becoming more cohesive.

It is also important to note that **most of the research does not involve the community members** themselves, but is researched through the participants of learning mobility or the organisers of projects (initiatives) asking for their opinion on how their learning mobility project affected the local community or the broader society. The impact of learning mobility on communities is to the most extent implied, but rarely supported by data, evidence or actual research with the members of local communities. Reports of studies mainly say there was a positive impact, or that the members of communities improved their intercultural skills or are participating more actively in local community events. There is a need for further research directly

tackling the impact on communities as the data that is currently available is rather manipulative and the impact on communities is most often formulated with “might have”, “can have”, “potentially”, “intuitive”. What would be interesting to know is the details, the exact experiences that the members of communities had while interacting with the participants of learning mobility and how it affected their lives or the actual initiatives that are undertaken by the former learning mobility participants after they return home and how the members of communities perceive them.

We would suggest some research ideas:

- to use a 360 degree feedback model in order to assess the impact from different perspectives, use self-assessment tools and cross-assessment frameworks (peer evaluation);
- to gather real experiences from host communities that were impacted by learning mobility, conduct interviews, focus groups or surveys with the family members or friends of those directly involved in the learning mobility activities;
- to re-balance focus on short-term mobility and its impact on the communities and not only on mid- and long-term mobility;
- to co-operate with the participants of learning mobility activities and include them into societal impact assessment as researchers in their home communities;
- to undergo a longitudinal study that would start with surveying the representatives of host communities of volunteers before and after learning mobility activities. In order to implement this strategy on research a very close co-operation with the national agencies and the co-ordinating and hosting organisations would be crucial.

Context

Learning mobility of individuals in the field of youth is an important part of the implementation of youth work (especially in the countries that lack financial support for youth work and youth organisations) and providing both non-formal and informal learning opportunities for young people and the ones working with them. Tony Geudens (2010), in the publication on the impact of youth projects "Making waves: creating more impact with your youth projects", points out that there are three types of impact that can be achieved through youth projects:[1] "micro-level impact focuses on the project itself – the participants of the project, young people in the youth organisations, the local community and partner organisations directly linked to the project. Meso-level impact targets the youth sector more widely – as opposed to the individual project; youth workers, multipliers, other organisations active in the youth sector. Macro-level impact is about feeding policy developments – at national or European level, or at the level of the European programme, rather than at individual projects" (Geudens 2010: 29). Many organisations are focusing on the micro level, most of the time exclusively on the participants of the project while the communities and meso and macro levels are left on the side. The impact on the participants of the projects is also well known, broadly published and researched. The impact on the communities is often referred to as "added impact", therefore it is not surprising that it is not at the centre of studies. However, recent movement in the European youth policies and programmes shows that more emphasis is being put on the impact not only on the individual level, but also on the local community or wider society.

The European Union youth strategy "Engaging, connecting and empowering young people: a new EU youth strategy" points out the importance of "encourag[ing] young people to become active citizens, agents of solidarity and positive change for communities across Europe, inspired by EU values and a European identity" (European Commission 2018). The new EU mobility programme European Solidarity Corps is another turn towards more attention to the communities as one of the main characteristics of the programme is that it "creates opportunities for young people to volunteer or work in projects in their own country or abroad that benefit communities and people around Europe" (European Solidarity Corps 2018). Communities and broader society are getting more attention in the discussions on the quality of learning mobility. The upcoming conference of European Platform for Learning Mobility, named "The Power of Learning Mobility:

1. Learning mobility is often implemented in the form of a youth project (Erasmus+ Youth in Action programme); the model can be transferred to explaining learning mobilities.

changing lives, changing society", is one more indication that it is time to acknowledge that learning mobility impacts on many more players than the individual participants and their personal or professional development. The description of the conference notes the importance of more attention to "more cohesive society, the altruism that comes with making a community a better place, impact of volunteering on host communities, internationalisation at home, providing opportunities for all, increased contribution and gain through the interchange that learning can bring" (European platform on learning mobility in the youth field 2018). The Charter on quality for learning mobility in the youth field also underlines that local communities (or the hosting environment) are equally important in the preparation and implementation of the learning mobility and this is one of the quality principles. The charter points out that in order for the learning mobility to be of good quality, "the programme of the activity [must] fit to what the hosting environment can offer. All actors share expectations and agree well in advance how they will implement the project" (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership 2017: 6). As the emphasis on the role of the community in learning mobility is growing, we often need proof that the value of learning mobility for community and impact on it is there. Therefore it is becoming more important to take a look into the research that is done regarding these topics. The aim of this study is to overview the existing publications on learning mobility and impact on communities and society in general and to map the gaps in the research. The scope of this study is learning mobility in the youth field and its contribution to citizenship education, civic participation and intercultural dialogue and learning, European citizenship, peace building and conflict transformation at community level.

Different types of studies made it to the review as the topic of learning mobility and impact on community has different layers that are rarely covered in one study. The main question of the review was: what is already researched and how it was done. The review is done within the frame of learning mobility in the youth field. The links with the community, topics of intercultural learning, active participation and peace building are covered. Not to forget the concept of impact as such and how it is used in the context of learning mobility. This made the review of the literature rather broad, first of all because of the lack of studies that directly tackle learning mobility and its value for communities (society). The following types of studies were reviewed: impact studies of different programmes, initiatives and projects that support learning mobility (Youth in Action, Erasmus+ Youth in Action, programmes, initiatives and long-term projects of the Council of Europe), publications by organisations that focus on working with communities,

independent or general studies on the impact of volunteering, general publications on social impact, diverse articles published in Youth Knowledge Books, manuals on the topics of intercultural learning, human rights education, European citizenship, conflict transformation, scientific articles in academic journals.

Before getting into reading the overview, a few remarks need to be made:

- the terms “society”, “community” and “local environment” are used interchangeably;
- among the researchers who publish their work in academic journals, the term “learning mobility” is not broadly used. Learning mobility is often implied in the terms “non-formal education/learning” and “(international) youth work”, or is specified according to the programme that the researchers are investigating, which for the most part is volunteering.

What is out there?

There are several different approaches to how learning mobility projects reach the community and have an impact on it. The first is the impact that is achieved by involving community members in the activities of learning mobility. The Handbook for quality of learning mobility (2019)[2] encourages ensuring "maximum interaction with the hosting environment". The authors of the Principles for quality in learning mobility in the youth field (2017) suggest that "a programme of activities rooted in the hosting environment and local community gives an added value to the mobility project increasing the social impact and the possibilities for the integration of your participants. At the same time, it helps local people to benefit from the intercultural learning experience improving a positive communication with different people backgrounds and mentalities and increases the commitment from all the parts involved." The second is the impact that is achieved by the participants taking action in their home communities, which means that the participants improve their competences and/or acquire certain values during mobility and later on either get actively involved in various activities targeted at creating a more active, responsible and cohesive society or simply share their knowledge and newly gained points of view with their families, friends and other peers. This impact is achieved through the multiplier effect. The third way that the impact on communities might be achieved is the visibility measures or the dissemination of results that would target the local communities. This is a long shot, as this type of impact would be difficult to see or measure, so as an impact it remains implicit.

The focus on learning mobility and its impact on local (both sending or host) communities is not too popular among researchers or developers of papers, articles or other publications, although its importance often appears in the manuals as a general aim of youth work, of learning mobility, of activities by youth NGOs and others. There could be several reasons for the lack of evidence or research on the impact of learning mobility on communities:

- Learning mobility in the youth field can be seen as one of the forms of youth work or one of the forms of competence development. Therefore in the studies on the impact of youth work on communities the connection to learning mobility is not presented as a separate case. Also in short-term learning mobility most of the work or interaction with community happens after the mobility, so the improved competences (of young people, youth leaders or youth workers) might not be connected to the actual mobility

2. Forthcoming.

and could be attached to the general impact of youth work. For example: “The 2015 European Youth Work Convention Final Declaration presents multiple dimensions of the role and impact of youth work contributing to the development of young people and society. Among those dimensions one can find advancing democracy, human rights, citizenship, European values, participation, equal opportunities and voice, the promotion of peace-building, tolerance and intercultural learning, combating radicalisation, preventing extremism, strengthening positive identities and belonging, agency and autonomy, cementing social inclusion and cohesion, upholding civil society, and engaging in collaborative practice, partnership and cross-sectoral co-operation” (Georgescu 2017: 4). We can see here that most of the benefits for society are presented as a general impact of youth work even though it is also mentioned that we have European youth work in mind, which is often implemented through learning mobility.

- The direct beneficiaries of the learning mobility activities or whole programmes are the young people or youth workers (in the case of youth worker mobility) who take part in the activities. The “second” beneficiaries are sending or hosting organisations (which are also sometimes referred to as communities), and the third beneficiaries are local communities or society in general. This means that the impact on the communities or society in general is less direct, more difficult to grasp and requires a complex research methodology which, especially in short-term projects, is not the main aim.

In the research on the value of learning mobility for communities, the distinction between short-term and long-term programmes is significant. For the short-term actions the impact on communities is usually not specifically targeted; it appears in general impact studies of mobility programmes and is mostly presented in an abstract way, most of the time formulated as “there is a (positive) impact”. The impact on communities varies depending on the learning mobility activities that are implemented and, for the most part, the main aim of the activity. While in international volunteering (including work camps), which is usually directed at working with local communities, the impact is more visible, the short-term programmes are usually focused on the development of the participants of the mobility, therefore the research of impact on the broader society or communities is more often directed to the home (sending) communities and relies on the multiplier effect for the impact.

It is also important to note that most of the research does not involve the community

members themselves, but is researched through the participants of learning mobility or the organisers of projects or initiatives asking for their opinion on how their learning mobility project affected the local community or broader society. Nevertheless, the impact of the long-term learning mobility programmes such as volunteering or short-term programmes that are specifically directed to work with communities (work camps, or short-term volunteering, or the upcoming European Solidarity Corps actions), is targeted more often and is looked into in more detail.

General impact

The less scientific approaches to impact on the local communities propose what kind of impact is possible and how it could be achieved. For example, the publication on quality of youth exchanges "Cherry on the cake – Advice for quality planning of youth exchanges" pays some attention to the communities, claiming that youth exchanges can support "new responses to challenges being faced in that community and at the same time raise the awareness and recognition of youth work in that community … a youth exchange can also serve as an opportunity to integrate the activities of a youth group within the broader framework of its local community … A youth exchange always leaves a mark on the local environment. Part of the results can be planned (e.g. restoring a walking path, painting walls, preparing a local festival), while part of them come casually through the interaction of people. These results are often neglected in project documents, but they still leave a deep mark with the people … Organisations can also learn from youth exchanges … These experiences can be adapted to their own practices and so change the culture within their organisation" (Oblak et al. 2015: 3-78). These are very important observations about the impact of youth exchanges on the community level, though it is also important to acknowledge that these statements are either drawn on experience or wishful thinking, but not supported with evidence. This is a fairly common feature in publications on the topic of impact on communities – it is known to experts, participants of the learning mobility projects, and might even be obvious to the communities, but the lack of actual empirical research, numbers or real stories does not allow to prove that learning mobility has an impact not only on the participants' personal and professional development, but is also valuable to society.

There has been some research done mainly on international volunteering, which shows that the communities that benefit most from learning mobility are those that have no prior interactions with foreigners or have a youth work tradition that ensures more encounters between participants of learning mobility and members of communities. A transnational report on "The impact of European Voluntary Service on local communities", prepared by Mateusz Wit

Jeżowski, Sandra Zaidova (Navickaitė) and Krisztina Zsiday (2016), is one of the rare studies that directly focuses on the impact on local communities. The aim of the research was to find out what happens in the organisations and the communities that host the European Voluntary Service volunteers. The main findings involve different aspects of impact on communities. In general the communication between the members of communities and volunteers plays a crucial role in any sort of impact on communities. "In communication with the volunteers, the communities start to share their own views and impressions about their life as a community. This self-reflection process leads to noticing their strengths and weaknesses" (Navickaitė 2016: 4). The study also noted that in order to grasp the impact of learning mobility on communities (bearing in mind EVS exclusively), the communities that did not have prior interaction with foreign volunteers benefited the most. This is in line with what Reet Kost notes about international volunteering and communities in Estonia: "on the other hand there was this new opportunity for young people to volunteer without specialisation or experience that benefited not only society in general but individuals, organisations and communities. So it was something new to understand and to adapt to for those receiving foreign volunteers for the first time as it was for those local communities where EVS programmes took place" (Kost 2012: 60). The great impact on the local communities that are not always exposed to foreigners in EECA is also underlined in the article by Marzena Ples, "European Voluntary Service with the Eastern Europe and Caucasus region" (2018). The author bases her input on qualitative research (interviews with EVS co-ordinators): "co-ordinators from programme countries underlined that, despite all the challenges, they are greatly motivated to co-operate with this region, as projects with EECA very often have a much bigger impact on the volunteers and local community" (Ples 2018: 177). Fennes et al. refer to the RAY analysis, which also proves that the country where the learning mobility is implemented is a factor in assessing the impact on communities: "a differentiation by the project venue countries shows considerable differences of effects on the local communities for the different countries – up to 20%. In some countries (e.g. Sweden) relatively large effects were observed by the project leaders for the majority of items; in contrast to other countries (e.g. the Czech Republic), where relatively low effects were observed for the majority of items. Partly this might be for reasons which are linked to country-specific socio-political conditions or traditions of youth work, but partly it is likely to be linked to the way in which YiA projects are implemented in the different countries – in particular if and how the local environment was involved in a project" (Fennes et al. 2011: 90).

Many studies that consider learning mobility and the impact on communities focus on international volunteering and the general impact that is achieved, although most of them also

remind the reader that the impact of volunteering on communities is not nearly well enough researched and/or is in many cases implied. In an extensive study which was supported by voluntary service organisations and conducted by Steve Powel and Esad Bratovic, "The impact of long-term youth volunteering service in Europe: a review of published and unpublished research studies," the authors note: "there is little direct evidence of impact on others or on communities or societies as a whole. However, there are some encouraging indications that voluntary service can positively impact understanding between regions and has the potential to contribute towards the integration of less advantaged young people" (Powel and Bratovic 2007: 7). Powel and Bratovic note that crossing borders is "contributing to the intercultural development of volunteers and of communities" (2007: 8). The study overviews the impact of volunteering on communities with regard to intercultural learning, economic capital, and development of basic European identity. Judith Dubiski, in the article "What do we know? A systematic literature review on youth learning mobility in European contexts" (2013), claims that "several Finnish studies cover the impacts of voluntary service not only on the volunteers' side, but on the side of the hosting organisations, the youth workers and the local communities (Jyrkka 2012; Tikkakoski 2012)" (Dubinski 2013: 121). Another study that also takes into consideration the impact of international volunteering, developed by Joanna Machin, is "The impact on returned international volunteers on the UK: a scoping review". The author conducts a literature review and bases the insights on the research that was done by other scientists. As for the impact on the communities, the publication takes into consideration two aspects: 1) raising development awareness and promoting social cohesion; 2) increasing civic participation. Machin claims that "it might … be argued that international volunteering can help to facilitate a better understanding of different cultures within … communities" (Machin 2008: 13). The author herself draws attention to the need for further research directly tackling the impact on communities as the data that is available currently is rather manipulative and the impact on communities is most often formulated with "might have", "can have", "potentially", or "intuitive".

As was mentioned previously, numerous studies connect the impact on local sending communities with the activities that are done by volunteers after the learning mobility. The Alliance of European Voluntary Service Organisations carried out a survey on the impact of work camps and investigated the impact on both the participants and the communities. The main findings show that "the impact on local communities is also remarkable: 98% of interviewed representatives registered a positive impact on cultural/intercultural competence in their communities, and 79% in the participation of local people in the daily life of the community"

(Alliance of European Voluntary Service Organisations 2016). Gillian Thomas's research suggests that international volunteering and the experiences and perspectives that volunteers bring back … can potentially make a contribution to developing global perspectives and raise development awareness in the wider community. As argued by Thomas, returned volunteers "possess a massive ability to shape attitudes, change mindsets, and give global perspectives to domestic situations" (Thomas 2001: 25). Another aspect is brought up by Kate Stanley, who makes a connection between participation in mobility and development of society: "targets for the number of volunteers (i.e. outputs) might be supplemented by measures of change in quality of life or community impact, such as trust, young people's political involvement, youth crime or safety on streets (i.e. outcomes, see Ellis 2000)" (Stanley 2005: 114).

Regarding the short-term programmes, activities or learning mobility in general, as mentioned before, the findings on impact on communities are not that explicit. Yaryna Borenko shares insights from a study on recognition of learning mobility in Ukraine and refers to the impact on the community briefly: "non-formal education and the Youth in Action Programme, as primary tools for learning mobility, offer a more real possibility to be involved in another kind of learning for diverse groups of young people. The impact of the Youth in Action Programme in communities is more visible, despite the fact that the number of participants in Youth in Action is also low" (Borenko 2013: 106). Fennes et al. explain that "training and networking projects seem to have the least effect on the local environments/communities, which indicates that they are more focused on their strategic purpose – developing the quality of support systems of YiA – and only in a more indirect way are aimed at the political objectives of the YiA Programme" (Fennes et al. 2011: 90). Here it is important to note and understand that in the short-term projects the impact of learning mobility is less obvious and tangible immediately after the learning mobility, but can have significant impact on the long-term perspective and contribute a great deal to the development of local or national youth work practices and policies – although it can be difficult to prove.

The impact on the local communities cannot be separated from the impact on the organisations that are participating in learning mobility, especially in the cases of long-term volunteering. According to Jezowski et al. (2017), the organisation can also be understood as a community. The European Youth Forum presents a study which says that youth organisations help to increase social capital while "increases in social capital can also be considered both a personal (and individual) and societal benefit given, for example, the contributions that social capital makes

to economic growth and social cohesion (Temple, 2001; Putnam, 1993, 2001)" (Holtom et al. 2016: 27). The authors of the National report on the implementation and impact of the Erasmus+ programme – Croatia claim that "there is no evidence as to YiA's impact at the institutional level, although according to the results of the RAY Standard Survey (national report), in Erasmus+, YOU project leaders recognised a positive impact from the projects on an organisational level in terms of cultural diversity acceptance, international projects and networking at an international level. However, project leaders recognised no impact on co-operation with the local community, the use of open educational resources or the frequency of European topic-related work after project participation (Gregurović 2017)" (Ančić and Brajdić Vuković (eds) 2017: 107-8).

Even though the general impact studies are not focused on development of one concrete competence, they indicate that most of the gain by the community comes from long-term volunteering activities when foreigners are immersed in the local communities. The impact on the local communities is often not measured, but implied and tightly connected with communication, direct actions of volunteers in order to benefit the communities or, in the case of closed, small communities, living together, being present among other members. It is important to note that usually the impact on the communities or wider society is interpreted through the impact on young people and their readiness to become more active members of their communities after the learning mobility activities.

Citizenship education, active citizenship, civic participation, and European citizenship and learning mobility

Citizenship education, active citizenship, civic participation and European citizenship as topics find their place in many programmes that support learning mobility. These are the topics that are also covered in the manuals for youth workers or youth leaders, which often have a chapter about active citizenship, call for action, ideas for action, etc. with the main idea in the long run to create a more active, responsible society that would understand and live by the principles of European citizenship. There is evidence that learning mobility contributes to more active and cohesive societies by including young people with fewer opportunities.[3] Also that through the learning mobility the community learns about the concept of European citizenship. Of course we cannot expect that the communities will start living according to its values, but awareness is raised.

3. Again, the impact is assessed on the individual level, but the question is asked whether project participants after the project participate more actively in societal and/or political life, which means that the society has more active members, which makes it more active as well.

Regarding the topics of citizenship education, active citizenship, civic participation and European citizenship, it makes sense to distinguish the impact on hosting communities and sending communities. The hosting communities are for the most part affected by interaction with participants of learning mobility and/or participating in the events organised by the participants. As a result of this participation, communities gain a better understanding or are better informed about active participation, European citizenship and so on. Jezowski et al. also found that: "EVS helps to unite members of community for common activities. In this way the social capital of communities is growing. Locals have become more active, taking part in various activities, organised around EVS volunteers (for example foreign language classes or cultural events). Community members take care of the volunteers and volunteers have become the tool of gathering the members of community together. EVS volunteers have encouraged communities to start co-operation with local organisations" (Jezowski et al. 2017: 16).

Another way to achieve the impact on communities is closely linked with the impact of learning mobility on individuals and their personal and professional development. Two aspects are important to cover here. First, the natural multiplier effect when the participants share what has happened to them with their closest circles – friends, family, etc. – since a massive number of young people and professionals who work with young people take part in the learning mobility projects. Giselle Evrard Markovic and Darko Markovic made calculations that "for more than 40 years, the Council of Europe has organised and supported activities to train a large number of youth workers in the management of international youth projects as well as issues such as human rights, cultural diversity, youth participation and social cohesion with their youth groups. It is estimated that about 5 000 young people pass through the European Youth Centres of the Council of Europe every year, and that the European Youth Foundation has, to date, supported projects involving about 370 000 young people" (Evrard Markovic and Markovic 2017: 347). The plan for Erasmus+ Youth in Action was that "more than 500 000 young people will participate in youth exchanges and volunteering (Erasmus+ Key figures). "A longitudinal study (Roker and Eden 2003) of 22 youth action groups found evidence of the ability of such programmes to influence levels of civic engagement and sense of civic responsibility. It found that as a result of their participation young people felt they could try and bring about change in society and their participation had impacted on their sense of who they were and their understanding of political and social issues" (Stanley, 2005: 109). It is important to mention here that the article by Kate Stanley is focusing on volunteering in general and not exclusively on international volunteering (learning mobility) actions. Similar observations are made by other authors in the European youth work field:

Kateryna Shalayeva notes that “volunteering allows people to gain competences valuable for the labour market and enhances societal cohesion; it promotes active citizenship and facilitates participation in society; it safeguards the democratic foundations of European societies, and is deeply rooted in their nature” (Shalayeva, 2012: 35). Garrahy states that “mobility experiences give young people the vital skills they need, not only for future employment, but also to be citizens and active participants in society” (Garrahy 2013: 37); while Friesenhahn makes a complementary observation about international youth work: “as a cross-sectional area, international youth work affects ... all areas of children and youth welfare with the responsibility of promoting adolescents and young adults in their own personal development as well as fostering intercultural experience and, thus, encouraging a constructive impact on community development (Friesenhahn and Thimmel 2005; Friesenhahn 2006, Thimmel 2011)” (Friesenhahn 2013: 85). The type of impact that goes through the direct participants of the learning mobility into societies could be big, but is rarely proven with evidence, except for the “following the logic” approach.

Special attention is given to the inclusion of people with fewer opportunities to learning mobility and links to the development of communities and social cohesion. First it is the result of the programmes that promote inclusion of young people with fewer opportunities: “the different possibilities for youth mobility offered by the Youth in Action programme of the European Commission – particularly targeting young people with fewer opportunities – are an important tool for the promotion of such cohesion” (Ohana (ed.) 2012: 11). Abed and van Raalten also point out that “the main lesson is that mobility programmes strongly contribute to the local participation and integration of marginalised young people. Giving those young people a place among their peers helps to break down stereotypes, gives peers the opportunity to educate each other and can lead to unexpected positive results once they are back in their communities” (Abed and van Raalten 2012: 136). Bello proposes that participating in a learning mobility programme leads to more active participation in the local (home) communities: “ultimately, by engaging themselves in this program, second-generation migrants with different backgrounds have the chance to have a say in Italian society, to contribute to the making of bottom-up youth policies and to improve their enjoyment of their European citizenship” (Bello 2011: 352).

Quite many publications are based on the insights of experts and are drawn on the logic that if individuals participate in the learning mobility, it benefits the community. However research done by the RAY network provides more data and evidence based insights to the impact of one of the learning mobility programmes – Erasmus+. An impact study of the Erasmus+ Programme was done

in Croatia, where “learners were asked whether, after having taken part in mobility, they intended to participate more actively in the social and political life of their community. A majority of … EVS volunteers (75.5%) declared that they did intend to participate more actively after their periods of time abroad. In the youth field, the RAY Standard Survey (national report) effect of ERASMUS+ Youth projects on the involvement of participants in active citizenship and social participation has been assessed on a frequency scale with three response options. Respondents were asked about their behaviour before and after the project. The results show that a significant share of participants recognised no change in pre- versus post-project behaviour in this respect. There are only two areas: a) appreciation of cultural diversity (64%); and b) interest in involvement in and development of youth policy (50%) in which half of the participants recognised a change after returning from a mobility period abroad” (Ančić and Brajdić Vuković (eds) 2017: 15). The RAY network research implemented with former participants in learning mobility suggests that participants in learning mobility are more active in political and/or community life although the involvement decreases over time after the actual mobility (Bárta et al. 2018). This means that the impact on the communities also fades with time.

The publication by the European Youth Forum “Inspiring! Youth organisations’ contribution to citizenship education” provides an overview on different programmes that support citizenship education. Based on the survey that was conducted with representatives of youth organisations, “92% of the respondents to the survey state that they (or their members) provide some type of citizenship education (including related education fields as mentioned above), either through a specific programme/project or as mainstreamed in the overall educational work of the organisation” (Päll (ed.) 2016: 39). Among the programmes that are presented, we also find mobility events: volunteering, international exchanges and events, global/international projects, training workshops, conferences, study/field visits and sessions. The question still stands, though, where are the local communities positioned in these activities? “Youth organisations serve as laboratories for active citizenship. They provide both a space for awareness-raising and discussion on a wide range of topics concerning the individual and society, as well as the necessary structures and opportunities to translate their views and ideas into practice, either within the organisation or outside (in their schools, local communities and associations, through civic and political participation, international programmes, volunteering, etc.).” This means that local communities are seen as a third beneficiary of the activities of youth organisations including mobility.

Intercultural dialogue and learning

The connection between learning mobility and promotion of intercultural dialogue in the youth field is made clear in many publications developed by the Council of Europe, the European Commission and other organisations active in the international youth field. The Charter on the quality of learning mobility indicates that in a project/activity that is considered quality mobility, "participants interact with the diverse cultures involved in the project, and in the hosting environments. The programme gives enough opportunity for authentic encounters with the cultures involved in the project and of the host communities. The project stimulates the intercultural learning process and allows participants to challenge stereotypes and prejudices. The duration and intensity of interaction is adapted to the target group" (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership 2017: 7). Even though the publication does not say it, intercultural learning is not a one-sided process, so if interaction is ensured, the above-mentioned hosting environments would benefit as well and gain more intercultural awareness through dialogue. Beatrix Niemeyer reminds us that "hosting international young guests is a huge learning opportunity as well, so there can be good reasons for staying at home. And even those who stay at home may experience learning mobility, albeit from a different perspective. Hosting foreigners and organising international exchange also yields intercultural learning. It requires openness and readiness to engage with unknown and unpredictable encounters, to invite and live with new persons and engage in the challenging business of cross-cultural communication and nonverbal understanding, probably in a more radical way than the decision to live and learn elsewhere for a limited time" (Niemeyer 2018: 49). A 2010-2011 transnational analysis of the Youth in Action Programme by the RAY network points out that "Youth Exchanges are specifically appreciated for bringing an intercultural dimension to the local project environment (which indicates that a core characteristic of Youth Exchanges becomes visible in the local community), but at the same time they rank low for involving the local community in the project – a challenge for short-term projects with multilingual/multicultural groups" (Fennes et al. 2011: 90). In the YFJ Reaction to the Green Paper on Learning Mobility of Young People, Social Erasmus ESN is presented as a good practice of a programme that introduces foreign students to local communities, helps to make more interactions with local people, etc. (European Youth Forum). These activities are presented as ones that should benefit the direct participant of the learning mobility and even though the document mentions events that the ESN members are organising in local communities, the impact on the communities is not taken into consideration.

Jezowski et al. (2017), who conducted focus groups and observation of local communities where the volunteers were located, state that: "at the beginning of the research communities

were sharing many stereotypical attitudes towards foreigners. Communities which first time hosted EVS volunteer from abroad, had the very first, real and authentic experience working with foreigners that broke the stereotypes. Locals started to be interested in other cultures, tried not to judge, but to understand … The research showed that in communication with the EVS volunteers, people become more open towards a "different" person, "different" perspective. The mistrust and fear towards foreigners decreases and instead trust, willingness to understand and empathy increases" (Jezowski et al. 2017: 16). The 2001 evaluation of EVS (Alecci 2000: 21) also points to the fact that "the volunteer brought new ideas, practices and inspiration to the local host community and through his/her presence the intercultural awareness and the awareness of the European Union was increased" (Powel and Bratovic 2007). The general impact study on the Youth in Action Programme, implemented by the RAY network, also indicates that general awareness of the local communities is improved because of the learning mobility that is hosted in their countries: "with respect to YiA objectives and priorities, a large majority of project leaders expressed that the local community appreciated the intercultural and European dimension of the project and that the local community became more aware of the concerns and interests of young people" (Fennes et al. 2011: 89). These examples show that the local host communities do actually benefit from interaction with the participants of learning mobility and it helps the communities to become more open to differences in people, perspectives or needs.

As mentioned previously, after the learning mobility changes the individual, the individual goes home to change their society: "youth exposure to cultural diversity does not only benefit the individuals directly involved but also the communities concerned, as well as families and peers. It helps spread a culture of openness, solidarity and tolerance which has an impact beyond the individual participants directly involved" (Lejeune 2013: 27). "As different as the forms of youth exchange may be, they are all based on one and the same elementary aspect: contact with people from other cultures, countries and/or languages. This contact across existing boundaries, in whatever form it may take place, has the potential to contribute to a more open and tolerant society, because it can lead to remarkable attitudinal changes" (Brunner 2016: 15). A publication of the European Youth Forum, "Study on the social value of youth organisations", points out that "annually, European Educational Exchanges – Youth for Understanding arranges for about 4 000 15 to 18 year olds to have the opportunity to live in a foreign country with a volunteer host family and attend school. This [is reported to have] ... a positive impact on the individual exchange participant, the host family and the local community where they live. This form of youth work

develops intercultural competences, linguistic skills and promotes intercultural dialogue" (Holtom 2016: 19).

Peace building and conflict transformation and learning mobility

The concept of peace building and conflict transformation is closely linked to human rights education and intercultural learning. "The Partnership between the Council of Europe and the European Commission in the field of youth has … strongly focused on and contributed to the development of tools to deal with conflict through its Euro-Mediterranean Youth programme … For the Partnership programme, the promotion of peace, co-operation and human rights in Europe cannot be disconnected from realities around Europe, in particular those of the Mediterranean region, one of Europe's closest neighbours" (Ohana 2012:11). Gelabert and Neisse also write about peace building and it being rooted deeply in the European programmes for youth: "the basis for common values in the Decision (article 2 – where the objectives of the Youth programme are presented) includes the objective 'to promote an active contribution by young people to the building of Europe through their participation in transnational exchanges within the Community or with third countries so as to develop understanding of the cultural diversity of Europe and its fundamental common values, thus helping to promote respect for human rights and to combat racism, anti-Semitism and xenophobia'" (Gelabert and Neisse 2004: 144). The impact on the communities within the topics of peace building and conflict transformation is the least tackled in the existing literature. Even though the Council of Europe supports many initiatives that foster peace building and conflict transformation in the communities – such as Youth Peace Ambassadors, No Hate speech movement, Youth Peace camp, Roma youth action plan and Compass – Manual for Human Rights Education with Young People as a tool to promote human rights culture through capacity building, Living Library as a tool to challenge prejudice and discrimination, to contribute to creating a more understanding and tolerant society – only a few of these programmes have impact assessment initiatives or publications. For example the project report of Youth Peace Ambassadors (2014) says that the participants took part in a residential training seminar (learning mobility), and afterwards organised various activities in the local communities. The results indicate the numbers of the community projects that were implemented; the impact is focused mainly on the knowledge and the fact that more local people (participants of the community projects) were informed about a certain issue. This could be called a community impact, although we do lack information on what were the actual changes in the

perspectives, values or competences of the members of communities after the local actions were implemented.

What is used in research, and what are the gaps and possible improvements?

Most of the research and publications on the impact of learning mobility and its value for communities is developed by the organisations that are financing the learning mobility activities. These publications usually take the form of a general impact study with a few lines dedicated to the community level or sets of articles on a chosen topic. The publications developed by the supporting organisations and their researchers often involve expert opinions on learning mobility and multiply the beliefs and values that most of the practitioners and experts share. Unfortunately there is a lack of studies that would provide evidence and proof on how learning mobility actually affects communities or what transformations they undergo. National reports on the implementation of the Erasmus+ Programme vary in regard to the information on the impact of the programme on local communities or broader society. Those that take into consideration the research that was conducted by the RAY network draw insights on programmes' impact (Croatia (Ančić and Brajdić Vuković (eds) 2017), Norway (Nordhagen and Dahle 2017)); the others are usually limited to the general insights that can be drawn on the programme guide and do not provide empirical data. The work of the RAY network is significant in collecting data about the impact of Erasmus+ Youth in Action projects. Many publications use the data provided by RAY. In the RAY network the research impact on local communities is also referred to as "impact on local environment". The methodology of the studies varies, and includes surveys and qualitative interviews. Regarding the impact on local environment, in the surveys the project leaders are asked the following questions:

- if the local environment/community was actively involved in the project;
- if the project was perceived as enrichment by the local environment/community;
- if the local environment/community became more aware of the concerns and interests of young people;
- if the intercultural dimension was appreciated by the local environment/community;
- if the local environment/community became more committed to the inclusion of young people with fewer opportunities;
- if the European dimension was received with interest by the local environment/community;
- if the local environment/community showed interest in similar projects in the future;
- if the local environment/community expressed readiness to support similar activities in the future.

The interesting aspect here is that the impact on the communities is assessed according to the opinions of the project leaders and whether they have noticed any societal changes that are connected with their project. There can be several problems here. First, the objectivity of the project leaders who want to believe that their project had an impact. Second, the capacity of the project leaders to assess impact. Measurement of the impact on a broader level requires a complex methodology that most of the time is not implemented, especially in short-term learning mobility. Therefore the impact on communities can often be of the presumed nature.

Publications developed by NGOs during learning mobility projects usually focus on general remarks about intercultural learning, active participation, peace building and its importance for communities. The publications and manuals also suggest descriptions of activities that can be implemented in order to work with communities. Even though the publications and manuals are prepared as part of international (learning mobility) projects, the role or impact of mobility is not taken into consideration and links are not made.

In the scientific articles the topic of learning mobility and impact on communities is not too popular, although there are several studies published in international journals that present studies on international volunteering and its impact on local communities. There are different types of article: some are more concerned with acknowledging that there is an impact on local communities, not specifying what kind of impact it is; while others focus more on the possibilities of assessing the impact beyond the direct participants of the mobilities. A group of Romanian researchers published an article, “Volunteering as international mobility: Recent evidence from a post-socialist country”, where they claim that “recognition of the good work performed by the voluntary sector increased, contributing to a real impact on local communities” (Roman et al. 2018). The authors investigate the reasons for involvement in international volunteering service and dedicate a few sentences to the contribution to local communities as one of the reasons. Sherraden et al. (2008) propose a conceptual model for impact research of international volunteering based on existing research evidence. The model also takes into consideration the impact on communities. The proposed model for measuring the impact on communities involves: “social, economic, environmental, or political conditions; intercultural knowledge and skills; International knowledge and understanding; global engagement; paternalism and dependency; host organisation capacity” as well as on the sending community: “human capital; intercultural competence; international knowledge and understanding; social, economic, political, and environmental conditions; global engagement; sending organisation capacity” (Sherraden et al.

2008). What is interesting here is that the outcomes on host communities and sending communities, according to the model, are supposed to be similar. The author claims that the host communities are coming from less developed countries, so there is impact on economic development, health, etc., while the sending communities, according to Sherraden et al., are benefiting from returned international volunteers as they "could contribute to aggregate increases in human capital, and lower levels of risk behavior and social exclusion … could improve cross-cultural relations or resolve social conflicts at home … could help to dispel myths about foreigners, spark dialogue about disadvantaged populations, explain the importance of local and global interdependence … could enhance capacity to solve local, domestic, and international conflicts" (Sherraden et al. 2008: 411). It is implied in the article by Sherraden et al. that the sending communities are in Western countries while the hosting communities are in developing countries, which also leads to the question whether the proposed model of impact assessment is suitable for the learning mobility programmes in the countries that do not experience such a big difference in the levels of development according to the Western standard.

What could be used to assess the impact on communities and society?

There are different approaches to measuring social impact, which, according to literature, also includes the impact on the community. In the scope of this study, it is important to note that usually learning mobility is implemented on a project basis (happens for a limited amount of time, is implemented with limited resources). Therefore in order to evaluate what research is already done and what kind of research could be conducted in the future to explore and/or prove the societal impact of learning mobility in the youth field, the proposed models of project impact assessment are beneficial.

The GECES Sub-group on Impact Measurement overviews a model for social impact measurement and proposes the following steps:

1) A social enterprise, or a project within it, has a supply of resources, known as inputs. These may be financial, intellectual, human, premises, or others;
2) With these it undertakes activities. Developed to a balanced and appropriately funded financial model, these are primarily focused on creating improvements – changes – in the lives of beneficiaries;
3) These activities have points of contact with those beneficiaries, known as outputs. These may be the attendance of a service-user on a course or programme, ... the development of a social interaction – a community – to support them ... In each case the output is the means to achieving the outcome and the impact, not the outcome itself.

4) Through the activities and outputs, changes are achieved in the lives of beneficiaries (both the direct service-users, and other stakeholders such as their families, communities, employers, and State and other service providers). These changes are the outcomes, and are stated as the difference in situation between what would have happened but for the service or product concerned, and what was actually achieved with it. Those outcomes may be short- or long-term, to match the need being met, and the service or product being delivered. Customarily outcomes are usually described as primary (in the lives of the direct service-user, and as a reasonably direct consequence of the service or product) or secondary (a consequential effect in the life of the service-user – "… and so they were able to…", or in the lives of others)
5) The outcomes may then be evaluated in terms of the impacts on that person's life in terms of the value achieved for a given stakeholder (person) by reason of the service or product supplied. This is net of the gain contributed by the intervention of others, and takes into account both positive and negative effects (known as displacement), as well as:
    - attribution: the extent to which the social enterprise is responsible for the outcome, as opposed to its being due to the intervention of others;
    - deadweight: outcomes that would have arisen anyway, regardless of the intervention;
    - drop-off: the tendency of the effects of an intervention at a particular time to become less over time.

The logical flow that links the five is known as **theory of change**. This is fundamental. It shows and explains the causative link between the activities being undertaken and their targeted outcomes and impact. The rationale behind this must always be understood and explained. It must always be underpinned with proportionate evidence as to why it is believed that those outcomes arise from that activity" (European Commission 2014: 30-31).

Drawing on the theory of change, we can follow the suggestion made by Kristensen, claiming that in order to measure the unmeasurable, assessing the educational impact (intercultural learning) on the participants would be time-consuming and require a complex research methodology which is not feasible in small projects. Therefore, according to Kristensen (2015), "what we can measure, however, is the design and the execution of the pedagogical interventions ... which are conducive (indeed essential) to the learning process. If these are satisfactory and the necessary aspects covered, then it is a good project, and participants are likely to have improved their intercultural understanding" (Kristensen 2015: 33). The idea of Kristensen can be transferred to the learning mobility and its impact on society or communities that are involved in the learning mobility in any kind of form. In this case it would be useful to follow the Indicators for Quality in Learning Mobility (2018), choose the aspects of the quality that the expected impact is the closest to, and assess them.

Another approach is proposed by the Americans for the Arts organisation, which developed the model of measuring the impact of arts projects on society. The proposed model of the Continuum of Impact comprises six categories of outcomes that can be observed in order to assess the impact that the programme had. The categories are the following: knowledge (what people know: awareness, understanding), discourse (how people communicate: deliberation, dialogue, media), attitudes (how people think and feel: values, motivation, vision), capacity (know-how and resources: social capital, leadership, creative skills, civic engagement), action (what people do: mobilisation, participation), and conditions (change that is lasting: systems, physical conditions, access, equity) (Americans for the Arts 2017). The publication by Americans for the Arts also involves proposed indicators for measuring or observing the desired category of impact. If adjusted according to the specifics of a learning mobility and the topic that will be investigated (intercultural learning/dialogue, active citizenship, etc.), it could be a useful model for developing criteria and assessing the impact of learning mobility.

Methodological insights on assessing impact are done by Matthew Cantele, who emphasises the need for researchers and practitioners to work out the indicators and not to fixate on the quantitative research methodology, but to use a mixed-method approach (Cantele 2015). Kateryna Shalayeva proposes "using qualitative research methods for analysing the volunteers' experience" (2005). The proposed approach, according to the author, also "can provide the source for verification and estimation of the impact of voluntary service on a volunteer, and the hosting and home community" (Shalayeva 2005: 165). Shalayeva explores "methods of case study, personal development reporting, biography, and qualitative research of documents. Our description of the case study is oriented towards the exploration of the community impact of voluntary activities" (Shalayeva 2005: 166).

An interesting aspect of the assessment of impact on the local communities or wider society is who to include in the study. In many studies the impact on the communities is judged by the input from the participants or representatives of organisations that were involved in the learning mobility projects. Jezowski et al. point out that it is important to choose the right research participants for the inquiry as "EVS volunteers have ... a lower perception of their influence on local communities in which they worked than the representatives of hosting organisations. This may be due to the fact that EVS volunteers are present in the local community "only" for a limited period of time and hence are unable to recognise the changes in the local environment" (Jezowski et al. 2017: 17). On the other hand it is also important to note that the

organisations and their representatives might be overly optimistic while presenting the impact on the local community bearing in mind that the researchers are sent by the National Agency for Erasmus+ Programme and impact on community level is one of the criteria that the project is evaluated by. The article by Olberding and Olberding criticises the practice of doing impact assessment only with the direct participants of the learning mobility and propose to use a 360 degree feedback model, which means "gathering data not only from the exchange students but also from chaperones, host families, and students and teachers in the host school. ANOVA analyses finds that the program had positive impacts on the exchange students and, in many cases, even greater ripple effects on indirect participants" (Olberding and Olberding 2010: 75).

There are also models of societal and general impact of the projects (including learning mobility) that are proposed by different organisations and could be helpful for the organisers of the projects to actually assess what is the realistic and not presumed impact of their activities. The publications and models propose to follow steps, answer questions, agree on the criteria, set goals, foresee results and then work out the impact (including community or societal) from that.

- Don Bosco Youth-Net ivzw proposes a tool for measuring the societal impact of learning mobility (Buliy 2016);
- TSF "IOOI Workbook: The 1-0-1 on Impact Measurement" tool is proposed to the organisers of the projects in order to measure what kind of impact their project has in general. The workbook is based on the workbook developed by Astrid Schrader (TSF). This tool also can be used for assessing the impact of learning mobility on communities.

Drawing on the fact that youth work in Europe (and the development of it in the non-Western countries) is still very closely connected to learning mobility, it would be worth looking into the societal impact studies of youth work in order to develop the indicators that would be more helpful for assessing the impact that learning mobility has on the community or society levels.

Conclusions and insights

What is not being measured that could be? What are the main gaps? Need for further research

The impact of learning mobility on communities is to the most extent implied, but rarely supported by data, evidence or actual research with the members of local communities. Reports of studies mainly say there was a positive impact, or that the members of communities improved their intercultural skills or are participating more actively in local community events. What would be interesting to know is the details, the exact experiences that members of communities had while interacting with the participants of learning mobility and how it affected their lives, or the actual initiatives that are undertaken by former learning mobility participants after they return home and how members of communities perceive them.

Kristian Brakel says that "one point that became clear during the research process is that the YiA lacks a regular mechanism to document the impact on the research fields i.e. youth policies, youth work and local communities" (Brakel 2012: 11). However, compared with other programmes or initiatives that support learning mobility, Erasmus+ Youth in Action receives the most attention among researchers and the contribution from the RAY network is significant. There is a lack of research on short-term learning mobilities and closer direct links between development of organisations or the impact of organisations on societies and learning mobility, which is implied but will not necessarily be understood by every reader.

An important question is how to measure the societal impact. As Geudens et al. point out, "participants in international mobility projects clearly report a positive impact on their competences, their behaviour and their values as a result of their participation" (Geudens et al. 2018: 145). Then, following the logic, we could say that by sharing the values and an altered behaviour the multiplier effect works and the communities or broader society are affected as well. Many papers follow this logic, but there is very little proof that this actually works the way it should or we would like it to. Also, taking a critical view of the situation, even if the surveys or interviews with members of communities are carried out, how can we prove that the changed attitudes or improved intercultural or active participation competences are a result of a concrete interaction with participants or organisations that took part in learning mobility? As impact is a long-term phenomenon, societal changes can be a result of many factors. One of these can be learning mobility, but there is no way of knowing if it was learning mobility or a combination of different factors.

Machin (2008) points out that “the aspirational nature of much of the commentary on these issues points to the need for further research to demonstrate the impact of returned international volunteers on promoting cross-cultural understanding and awareness within home communities.”

Research ideas:

- to use a 360 degree feedback model in order to assess the impact from different perspectives, use self-assessment tools and cross-assessment frameworks (peer evaluation);
- gather real experiences from communities that were impacted by learning mobility, conduct interviews, focus groups or surveys with the family members or friends of those directly involved in the learning mobility activities;
- re-balance focus on short-term mobility and its impact on the communities, and not only mid- and long-term;
- co-operate with learning mobility participants and include them into societal impact assessment as researchers in their home communities;
- longitudinal study that would start with a survey on the period before learning mobility and would be continued after the learning mobility activitywith the representatives of host communities of EVS volunteers. In order to implement this research strategy a very close co-operation with the national agencies and the co-ordinating/hosting organisations would be crucial;
- the ways in which communities get involved in the activities of learning mobility and the sense that they are making of this participation;
- the ways in which learning mobility participants transfer their understanding and awareness to home communities and how communities perceive them;
- “research with local communities to explore the extent to which returned international volunteers encourage participation in volunteering and community action at home;
- the long-term impact of international volunteering experiences on returned volunteers in terms of civic engagement and involvement in volunteering” (Machin 2008).

References

Abed N. and van Raalten J. (2012), "European youth mobility and inclusion among those with fewer opportunities" in Friesenhahn G. J. (ed.) (2013), *Learning mobility and non-formal learning in European contexts: Policies, approaches and examples*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/YKB17_Text.pdf/84ae531b-fbc8-440e-95bf-082d585420bf, accessed 1 December 2018.

Alliance of European Voluntary Service Organisations (2016), What is the impact of workcamps?, available at www.alliance-network.eu/what-is-the-impact-of-workcamps/2016/3108/ , accessed 8 December 2018.

Americans for the Arts (2017), How do arts & culture make a difference? Continuum of Impact: A guide to defining social & civic outcomes & indicators, available at http://animatingdemocracy.org/sites/default/files/pictures/continuum/Continuum%20Final_09.05.17.pdf, accessed 7 December 2018.

Ančić B. and Brajdić Vuković M. (eds) (2017), National Report on the Implementation and Impact of the Erasmus+ Programme – Croatia, available at http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/sites/erasmusplus2/files/el_national_report/HR_National%20Report.pdf, accessed 10 December 2018.

Barta O. et al. (2018), Ray LTE: Long-Term Effects Of Erasmus+: Youth In Action On Participation And Citizenship. Draft Interim Transnational Analysis 2018. Main Findings From Interviews And Surveys Between 2015 And 2018, available at www.researchyouth.eu/results-erasmus-youth-in-action, accessed 9 December 2018.

Bello B. G. (2011), "Empowerment of young migrants in Italy through nonformal education: putting equality into practice", *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 16(3), 348-59.

Borenko Y. (2013), "Challenges for recognition of non-formal learning and learning mobility in Ukraine: education, labour market and society" in Friesenhahn G. J. (ed.) (2013), *Learning mobility and non-formal learning in European contexts: Policies, approaches and examples*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/YKB17_Text.pdf/84ae531b-fbc8-440e-95bf-082d585420bf, accessed 1 December 2018.

Brakel K. (2012), Local impact of the Youth in Action programme Action 3 in Euro Mediterranean co-operation, available at www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17-3189/Youth%20in%20Action%20EuroMed%20Impact%20Study.pdf, accessed 10 December 2018.

Brunner S. (2016), Impact compendium on youth exchange: An overview of scientific research results on the impact of intercultural exchanges, available at www.intermundo.ch/Wirkungskompendium-Englisch.pdf, accessed 2 December 2018.

Buliy M. (2016), Social impact measurement: Case study "All alien! Step 1 Training Course and its social return on investment", available at https://issuu.com/donboscoyouthnet/docs/20141218_rep_allaline8_sroi_v2, accessed 12 December 2018.

Cantele M. (2015), Identification of broadly supported and harmonized concepts of intercultural competence, available at www.fondazioneintercultura.org/_files/uploads/trimestrale_intercultura_n76_2015_1.pdf, accessed 7 December 2018.

Council of Europe (2016), Competences for democratic culture: Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies, available at https://rm.coe.int/16806ccc07, accessed 18 December 2018.

Council of Europe, "Compass – manual for human rights education with young people", available at www.coe.int/web/compass/citizenship-and-participation#Citizenship,%20participation%20and, accessed 18 December 2018.

Council of Europe, "The concept of intercultural dialogue", available at www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/concept_EN.asp, accessed 8 December 2018.

Cunha T. and Gomes R. (2009), "Against the waste of experiences in intercultural learning" in *Intercultural Learning in European Youth Work: Which Ways Forward?* Seminar Report by Ingrid Ramberg, Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, pp. 86-101.

Doyle G. M. (2011), Making a Difference: Study of the Impact of Learning Mobility: Lifelong Learning Programme in Ireland 2007-09, available at http://biblioteka-krk.ibe.edu.pl/opac_css/doc_num.php?explnum_id=204, accessed 7 December 2018.

Dubinski J. (2013), "What do we know? A systematic literature review on youth learning mobility in European contexts" in Friesenhahn G. J. (ed.) (2013), *Learning mobility and non-formal learning in European contexts: Policies, approaches and examples*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/YKB17_Text.pdf/84ae531b-fbc8-440e-95bf-082d585420bf, accessed 14 December 2018.

European Commission (2014), Proposed Approaches to Social Impact Measurement in European Commission legislation and in practice relating to EuSEFs and the EaSI, available at https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/0c0b5d38-4ac8-43d1-a7af-32f7b6fcf1cc, accessed 4 December 2018.

European Commission (2017), EU Citizenship report 2017: Strengthening Citizens' Rights in a Union of Democratic Change.

European Commission (2018), Engaging, Connecting and Empowering young people: a new EU Youth Strategy. Brussels, available at https://ec.europa.eu/youth/sites/youth/files/youth_com_269_1_en_act_part1_v9.pdf, accessed 13 December 2018.

European Commission, Erasmus+ Key figures, (2014), available at https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/about/key-figures_en, accessed 6 December 2018.

European Platform on Learning Mobility, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/en/web/youth-partnership/european-platform-on-learning-mobility, accessed on 4 December 2018.

European Platform on Learning Mobility in the Youth Field (2018), The POWER of Learning Mobility: Changing lives, changing society, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/11338644/POWER+of+Learning+Mobility+concept+v4.pdf/76891281-7735-b201-9cda-de3607a25173, accessed 4 December 2018.

European Solidarity Corps (2018), available at https://europa.eu/youth/solidarity_en, accessed 4 December 2018.

European Youth Forum, YFJ Reaction to the Green Paper on Learning Mobility of Young People, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1663184/0773-09_YFJ_reaction_greenpaper_mobility.pdf/b558f1e0-e6b5-44b3-99d7-251b9fd63a0b, accessed 19 November 2018.

EU-Council of Europe youth partnership (2017), Charter on quality in Learning Mobility in the Youth Field, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/7110668/Brochure+EPLM/7edf348a-e204-02a4-c502-686a494fea99, accessed 4 December 2018.

EU-Council of Europe youth partnership (2017), Principles for Quality in Learning Mobility in the Youth Field, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/7110668/Brochure+EPLM/7edf348a-e204-02a4-c502-686a494fea99, accessed 3 December 2018.

EU-Council of Europe youth partnership, Glossary of terms, available at www.coe.int/en/web/enter/glossary#{"15781926":[0]}, accessed 13 December 2018.

Evrard Markovic G. and Markovic D. (2017), "The present and the future of youth worker training in Europe" in Schild H. et al. (eds), *Thinking Seriously about youth work: And how to prepare people to do it*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/Thinking+seriously+about+YW.pdf/6b620a71-f7be-cf80-7da9-17408a3960ba, accessed 6 December 2018.

Fennes et al. (2011), Research-based Analysis of Youth in Action. Results from the first series of surveys with project participants and project leaders between October 2009 and June 2010: Transnational Analysis, available at www.researchyouth.eu/download?id=28, accessed 14 December 2018.

Friesenhahn G. J. (2013), "A comparative framework for youth mobility" in Friesenhahn G. J. (ed.) (2013), *Learning mobility and non-formal learning in European contexts: Policies, approaches and examples*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/YKB17_Text.pdf/84ae531b-fbc8-440e-95bf-082d585420bf, accessed 5 December 2018.

Garrahy D. (2013), "Advocating for youth: the European Youth Forum helping to increase recognition of mobility and non-formal learning" in Friesenhahn G. J. (ed.) (2013), *Learning mobility and non-formal learning in European contexts Policies, approaches and examples*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/YKB17_Text.pdf/84ae531b-fbc8-440e-95bf-082d585420bf, accessed 5 December 2018.

Gelabert E. and Neisse J. (2004), Mid-Term Evaluation: The Euro-Mediterranean Youth Programme, 2001-2003, available at https://ec.europa.eu/youth/sites/youth/files/euromed-mid-term-evaluation-2004_en.pdf, accessed 20 November 2018.

Georgescu M. (ed.) (2017), T-kit 7: European citizenship and youth work. Revised edition, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667923/T-Kit+on+European+Citizenship.pdf/7beade8c-aa21-9855-8fc6-6b53481ece2b, accessed 16 December 2018.

Geudens T. (2010), Making waves: creating more impact with your youth projects, available at www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17-1408/MakingWaves.pdf, accessed 15 December 2018.

Geudens T. et al. (2018), "Do international inclusion projects work? Yes." in Devlin M. (ed.) (2018), *Learning mobility, social inclusion and non-formal education: Access, processes and outcomes*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/Learning-Mobility-2018+WEB.pdf/313c137e-d76c-241c-411c-7b3b7e9a4646, accessed 27 November 2018.

Gregurović M. (2017), ERASMUS+: MLADI NA DJELU Rezultati istraživanja RAY Research-based Analysis and Monitoring of Erasmus+: Youth in Action u Hrvatskoj 2015. Agencija za mobilnost i programe EU [unpublished report].

Holtom D. et al. (2016), Study on the Social Value of Youth Organisations, available at www.youthforum.org/sites/default/files/publication-pdfs/YFJ_StudyOnTheSocialValueOfYouthOrganisations_1P1.pdf, accessed 30 November 2018.

Jezowski et al. (2016), The impact of European Voluntary Service on local communities, available at http://czytelnia.frse.org.pl/media/The-impact-of-EVS-on-local-communities.pdf, accessed 21 November 2018.

Jyrkk H. (2012), EVS-vapaaehtoinen kotikansainv.lisyyden edist.j.n.: Kokemuksiayhdeks.n kunnan [EVS volunteers promoting home internationalism – Experiences from nine municipalities], Humank University of Applied Sciences, Helsinki, available at http://publications.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/44527/Jyrkka_Heidi.pdf?sequence=1, accessed 18 December 2018.

Kost R. (2012), Learning mobility in the youth field: the Estonian experience with a European imprint, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/YKB17_Text.pdf/84ae531b-fbc8-440e-95bf-082d585420bf, accessed 21 November 2018.

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.

Lejeune P. (2013), "European Union support to learning mobility: rationale of a success" in Friesenhahn G. J. (ed.) (2013), *Learning mobility and non-formal learning in European contexts: Policies, approaches and examples*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/YKB17_Text.pdf/84ae531b-fbc8-440e-95bf-082d585420bf, accessed 5 December 2018.

Machin J. (2008), The impact on returned international volunteers on the UK: a scoping review, available at http://build-online.org.uk/documents/Impact%20of%20International%20Volunteering%20on%20the%20UK%20VSO%20Machin%202008-1.pdf, accessed 21 November 2018.

Navickaitė S. (2016), How European Voluntary Service Impacts Communities: Research Summary, available at https://jtba.lt/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Fin3_A4_tyrimo-maketas_EN_naudojimui.pdf, accessed 16 November 2018.

Niemeyer B. (2018), "Ambivalences and ambiguities of learning mobility and social inclusion in nonformal youth work" in Devlin M. (ed.) (2018), *Learning mobility, social inclusion and non-formal education: Access, processes and outcomes*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/Learning-Mobility-2018+WEB.pdf/313c137e-d76c-241c-411c-7b3b7e9a4646, accessed 27 November 2018.

Nordhagen I. C. and Dahle M. (2017), national report on the implementation and impact of Erasmus+ in Norway, available at www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/92e16a1e04104a35a669377ffa04754d/national-report-on-the-implementation-and-impact-of-erasmus-in-norway.pdf, accessed 9 December 2018.

Oblak A. et al. (2015), "Cherry on the cake" – Advice for Quality Planning of Youth Exchanges, Ljubljana, Motiv, available at www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17-3198/Cherry%20on%20the%20cake%20%20publication.pdf, accessed 16 December 2018.

Ohana Y. (ed.) (2012), T-kit 12: Youth transforming conflict, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/7110680/T-Kit12_EN.pdf/9791dece-4a27-45e5-b2f1-b7443cb2125b, accessed 11 December 2018.

Olberding J. C. and Olberding D. J. (2010), "Ripple Effects" in Youth Peacebuilding and Exchange Programs: Measuring Impacts Beyond Direct Participants, *International Studies Perspectives* 11, 75-91.

Päll A. (ed.) 2016, *Inspiring! Youth organisations contribution to citizenship education*, available at www.youthforum.org/sites/default/files/publication-pdfs/Youth-organisations-contribution-to-citizenship-education.pdf, accessed 3 December 2018.

Ples M. (2018), "European Voluntary Service with the Eastern Europe and Caucasus region as a tool for social inclusion of young people" in Devlin M. (ed.) (2018), *Learning mobility, social inclusion and non-formal education: Access, processes and outcomes*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/Learning-Mobility-2018+WEB.pdf/313c137e-d76c-241c-411c-7b3b7e9a4646, accessed 27 November 2018.

Powel S. and Bratovic E. (2007), *The impact of long-term youth volunteering service in Europe: a review of published and unpublished research studies*, AVSO, Brussels.

Roman M. et al. (2018), "Volunteering as international mobility: Recent evidence from a post-socialist country", *Transnational Social Review*, DOI: 10.1080/21931674.2018.1509926.

Shalayeva K. (2005), "Using qualitative research methods for analysing the volunteers' experience" in Williamson H. et al. (2005), *Charting the landscape of European youth voluntary activities,* available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1668255/2005_charting_landscape_voluntary_coepub.pdf/3d5d399e-9d61-4bf6-a5a1-14fe3e8ab109, accessed 8 December 2018.

Shalayeva K. (2012), "Volunteering by young people in Europe" in Boetzelen P. (2012), *EKCYP insights*, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1667851/YNB15_EkcypInsights.pdf/91b15f12-1568-47ae-9cfb-e4f4bc70711b, accessed 1 December 2018.

Sherraden M. S. et al. (2008), "Effects of international volunteering and service: Individual and Institutional Predictors", *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations*, DOI: 10.1007/s11266-008-9072-x.

Stanley K. (2005), More than a numbers game: a UK perspective on youth volunteering and active citizenship, available at https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1668255/2005_charting_landscape_voluntary_coepub.pdf/3d5d399e-9d61-4bf6-a5a1-14fe3e8ab109, accessed 25 November 2018.

Thomas G. (2001), *Human Traffic: Skills, Employers and International Volunteering*, London, Demos.

Tikkakoski T. (2012), The impact of the EVS-volunteer to the culture identity of the members of their work community, Humak University of Applied Sciences, Helsinki, available at http://publications.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/42651/OpinnaytetyoTyttiTikkakoski.pdf?sequence=1, accessed 18 December 2018.

TSF, "IOOI Workbook: The 1-0-1 on Impact Measurement", available at https://padlet-uploads.storage.googleapis.com/290619752/b862357ea5d761f74fd78e7ec292adb0/Impact_measurement_workbook.pdf, accessed 14 December 2018.

UNESCO, “Citizenship education for the 21st century”, available at www.unesco.org/education/tlsf/mods/theme_b/interact/mod07task03/appendix.htm, accessed 11 December 2018.

Vaclay F. (2003), International Principles For Social Impact Assessment, *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal,* 5-12, DOI: 10.3152/147154603781766491.

Youth peace ambassadors (2014), Human dignity and peace building by young people in Europe: Project report, available at https://rm.coe.int/1680460487, accessed 10 December 2018.

Glossary

Active citizenship "The capacity for thoughtful and responsible participation in political, economic, social and cultural life. Young people learn about active citizenship through an introduction to the concepts and values underpinning citizenship in a democracy (usually through some form of education, formal or non-formal), by being active and responsible members of their community (through the activities of civil society) and, once they have reached the relevant age, by practising the rights and responsibilities of citizens in a democracy (joining a political party or group, voting, standing for elected office, etc.). Active citizenship is both a human right, but, also, a responsibility. Young people experiencing barriers to accessing social rights are also more likely to experience barriers to exercising active citizenship and participating responsibly in society" (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership).

Citizenship education has three main objectives: educating people in citizenship and human rights through an understanding of the principles and institutions [which govern a state or nation]; learning to exercise one's judgement and critical faculty; and acquiring a sense of individual and community responsibilities. Citizenship education can be regarded as an ethical (or moral) education as well as education in citizenship (UNESCO).

Community "The term 'community' is used here to denote a social or cultural group that is larger than one's immediate circle of family and friends and to which one feels a sense of belonging. There are numerous types of group that might be relevant here, for example, the people who live within a particular geographical area (such as a neighbourhood, a town or city, a country, a group of countries such as Europe or Africa, or indeed the world in the case of the 'global community'), a more geographically diffused group (such as an ethnic group, faith group, leisure group, sexual orientation group, etc.), or any other kind of social or cultural group to which an individual feels a sense of belonging" (Council of Europe 2016: 41).

Democratic citizenship "is a closely related concept, which emphasizes the belief that citizenship should be based on democratic principles and values such as pluralism, respect for human dignity and the rule of law" (Council of Europe, Compass).

Democratic society "is a society in which all citizens have meaningful and effective ways to participate in the decision-making processes of every organisation that makes decisions or takes actions that affect them and to hold other individuals, and those who are responsible for making decisions and taking actions, fully accountable if their decisions or actions violate fundamental human rights, or are dishonest, unethical, unfair, secretive, inefficient, unrepresentative,

unresponsive or irresponsible, so that all organisations in society are citizen-owned, citizen-controlled, and citizen-driven, and all individuals and organisations are held accountable for wrongdoing" (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership).

European citizenship "As a citizenship shared by all Europeans, complementing and not replacing national citizenships, EU citizenship embodies shared rights and values as well as the rich diversity of a Union of different nationalities and languages" (European Commission 2017).

Hate speech Recommendation No R (97) 20 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on Hate Speech, defines the term "hate speech" as "all forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance, including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin" (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership).

Impact "There is a tendency to confuse outputs and impact. Outputs are results which have been intended and achieved by a project. **Impact** is the effects which those results have on individuals, organisations, systems or policies. For example, an output of a training course is what a person learns while on the course, while the impact is what the person does subsequently with that new learning … The numbers involved and the visits made are outputs but the impact is to be found in the increased intercultural awareness of the students or in their collective awareness of the heritage and culture of Europe" (Doyle 2011: 15).

Indicators "are specific measurable changes that can be easily observed (within reason), heard, or read to demonstrate that an outcome is being met" (Americans for the Arts 2017).

Informal education/learning "is the lifelong process whereby every individual acquires attitudes, values, skills, knowledge and insights from daily exposure to the environment, such as at home, at work, during leisure; from travel, reading, through different media sources. In contrast to formal and non-formal education, informal education is typically unorganised and unsystematic. It is virtually never certified, but it constitutes the majority of a person's lifetime learning" (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership).

Intercultural dialogue is an open and respectful exchange of views between individuals and groups belonging to different cultures that leads to a deeper understanding of the other's global perception (Council of Europe, Concept of intercultural learning).

Intercultural learning The main purpose of intercultural learning – to reduce ethnocentric perspectives, fight prejudices and promote solidarity actions that support equality in human dignity and respect for the plurality of cultural identities – remains fully valid and more relevant than ever in European societies whose futures are ever more intertwined with and interdependent on the rest of the world (Cunha and Gomes 2009).

International youth work "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" (Declaration of the 2nd European youth work convention 2015: 4).

Learning mobility "Transnational mobility undertaken for a period of time, consciously organised for educational purposes or to acquire new competences or knowledge. It covers a wide variety of projects and activities and can be implemented in formal or non-formal settings" (European Platform on Learning Mobility).

Local community as a term usually appears in the publications about long-term volunteering. "Local community – the hosting organisation, the target groups of the hosting organisation as well as all other inhabitants of the city/village where the organisation is located" (Jezowski et al. 2017).

Mobility "Youth mobility is the capacity of young people to move between different places in their home country and outside of it, with the purpose of achieving personal development goals, autonomy, for the purposes of volunteering and youth work, of education systems and programmes, of expert training, of employment and career goals, of housing opportunities and free time activities" (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership).

Non-formal education/learning is an extensively used and intensely debated notion in the youth field. Non-formal learning is any planned programme of education designed to improve a range of skills and competences, outside the formal educational setting. It stands for a range of core learning principles, methodologies and approaches in the youth sector, commonly emphasising the learner's intrinsic motivation, voluntary participation, critical thinking and democratic agency. The glossary of the European Knowledge Centre for Youth Policy describes non-formal learning as "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" (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership).

Peace building can be described as activities that are intended to "[build] a culture of human rights [as] a pre-condition to achieving a state of peace" (Council of Europe, Compass). Peace building usually means "working with and in conflict affected communities through training, their initiatives to and projects in local communities and their organisations or institutions" (Youth peace ambassadors).

Social cohesion is the capacity of a society to ensure the welfare of all its members, minimising disparities and avoiding polarisation. A cohesive society is a mutually supportive community of free individuals pursuing these common goals by democratic means. Social cohesion is not only a matter of combating social exclusion and poverty, it is also about creating solidarity in society such that exclusion will be minimised (See Revised Strategy for Social Cohesion Council of Europe (2004)) (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership).

Social impact "A convenient way of conceptualizing social impacts is as changes to one or more of the following: people's way of life – that is, how they live, work, play and interact with one another on a day-to-day basis; their culture – that is, their shared beliefs, customs, values and language or dialect; their community – its cohesion, stability, character, services and facilities; their political systems – the extent to which people are able to participate in decisions that affect their lives, the level of democratisation that is taking place, and the resources provided for this purpose; their environment – the quality of the air and water people use; the availability and quality of the food they eat; the level of hazard or risk, dust and noise they are exposed to; the adequacy of sanitation, their physical safety, and their access to and control over resources; their health and wellbeing – health is a state of complete physical, mental, social and spiritual wellbeing and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity; their personal and property rights – particularly whether people are economically affected, or experience personal disadvantage which may include a violation of their civil liberties; their fears and aspirations – their perceptions about their safety, their fears about the future of their community, and their aspirations for their future and the future of their children" (Vaclay 2003: 8).

Society “A large group of people who live together in an organised way, making decisions about how to do things and sharing the work that needs to be done. All the people in a country, or in several similar countries, can be referred to as a society” (Cambridge dictionary online).

Youth work “encompasses a broad range of activities (e.g. social, cultural, educational, sports-related and political) carried out with, by and for young people through non-formal and informal learning. Youth work has three essential features: (i) young people choose to participate; (ii) the work takes place where the young people are; (iii) it recognises that the young person and the youth worker are partners in a learning process. Its value is recognised in the Council conclusions on youth work and highlighted in a study released in 2014” (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership).

Youth workers People involved in work or activities with and for young people, either on a voluntary basis or professionally and in several contexts, including youth organisations, youth services, youth centres, youth/social work training institutions, or any other structure operating in the area of non-formal education with young people (EU-Council of Europe youth partnership).