

## Article

# Youth-Centred Research-Based Model—An Innovative Tool in Youth Work

Andu Rämmer , Anne Kivimäe , Kaur Kõtsi and Maria Žuravljova

Division of Social Studies, University of Tartu Narva College, 20307 Narva, Estonia; anne.kivimae@ut.ee (A.K.); kaur.kotsi@ut.ee (K.K.); maria.zuravljova@ut.ee (M.Ž.)

\* Correspondence: andu.rammer@ut.ee; Tel.: +372-740-1916

**Abstract:** Terms like youth-friendly, youth-focused, youth-centred, youth-responsive, etc., have been used to describe the opportunities and services offered to young people. Such concepts often refer to essential and suitable forms of activity and their quality for young people. However, the term “youth-centred” or “youth-centred approach” is not unambiguously understandable in youth work or in other services or activities for young people. Furthermore, more instruments are needed to help a youth worker or a specialist working with young people in every field to work in a more youth-centred way. The team of the Youth Work programme of Narva College of the University of Tartu launched a project to conceptualise the meaning and content of the youth-centred approach and to develop an instrument—a model—that could help implement a more youth-centred practice in youth work. In-depth interviews with Estonian youth field experts and focus group interviews in open youth work confirmed the relevance of the theoretical concept. The empirically tested model is valuable for planning and developing youth-centred activities in youth work.

**Keywords:** youth centred; youth work; tool



**Citation:** Rämmer, A.; Kivimäe, A.; Kõtsi, K.; Žuravljova, M. Youth-Centred Research-Based Model—An Innovative Tool in Youth Work. *Youth* **2023**, *3*, 1004–1012. <https://doi.org/10.3390/youth3030064>

Academic Editor: Diego Gomez-Baya

Received: 30 May 2023

Revised: 10 August 2023

Accepted: 17 August 2023

Published: 21 August 2023



**Copyright:** © 2023 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

This article aims to illustrate the importance of finding knowledge-based ways to refresh often-used concepts with meaning relevant to the values of youth work nowadays and applicable in practice. The practical model described below proposes a new form for use in youth work to support a youth worker to empower young people’s values and rights in everyday practice through an objective youth-centred approach.

In 2013, the Government of Estonia approved the Youth Field Development Plan for the years 2014–2020. In the opening statement, the youth field, i.e., youth policy and youth work in Estonia, was described as a field that has the most varied relationship with young people [1] (p. 7). This echoes an understanding that youth workers have a close or closer connection to young people (in this article, a young person is defined as somebody between 7 and 26 years of age) than professionals in any other field, and this has its roots in the concept of youth work being a practice, where the needs and interests of young people are in the centre of attention. This approach is based on the real-life circumstances, real needs, and interests of young people (also defined in similar wording in the Youth Work Act of Estonia as one of the principles of youth work provision) [2]. One of the areas of work thought to be instrumental in putting these principles into practice in Estonia has been youth research for many years. However, having a better knowledge of youth is not enough if it lacks the capabilities and instruments to apply this knowledge in everyday practices in youth work. The other concept or principle referred to in different (Estonian) contexts as a method and/or a goal in youth work practice that is based on the actual “needs and interests of young people” has been the participation of young people [2]. Considering that the need for more opportunities and new forms of youth participation has been a recurrent theme in youth work and youth policy planning in Estonia for decades (relevant policy

goals have been present in all national policy documents since 2006), it is evident that the application of this principle continuously needs new and practical tools that support authentic and meaningful engagement and the participation of young people [1] (p. 13), [3] (p. 27), [4] (p. 16).

This Estonian policy context has prompted the research project this article is based on. The first research question aimed to find out how the term “youth-centred” is conceptualised in the scientific literature, what are the main elements of a “youth-centred approach” and how relevant these elements are in the youth work context in Estonia. The second research question focused on the evaluation and the application of a theoretical understanding of the youth-centred approach through developing a model for practical application and the analysis of its usability in youth work. In this article, we draw on the 3-year research conducted within this project, describe the process and evidence gathered, and discuss the findings in the Estonian youth work and broader context.

## 2. The Development of Theoretical Basis for Defining the Youth-Centred Approach

To construct a theoretical background for the possible definition and meaning of a youth-centred approach, the academic literature was reviewed, and a theoretical concept consisting of principal components and their key elements was formulated.

Reviewing the literature in several fields, including youth work [5,6], social work [7–9], education [10], and medicine [11], we highlighted several components that could be defined as the core of a youth-centred approach. First, the young person’s right to be respected as a personality of their own and an agent of change in their life forms the starting point of a youth-centred approach. The literature [12] also points out that conditions such as poverty, poor health, and political oppression make it difficult for young people to exercise personal agency. Considering that this research is based on an Estonian context, it is, therefore, essential to bear in mind that Estonia is a transitional society. Helve and Leccardi [13] pointed out that young people in previous socialist societies were pictured in the role of the leading constructors of communism, and Taru and Pilve [14] specified that the Soviet ideology treated youth as objects to be exploited for a political goal, with the intention implemented starting from early childhood. This view almost totally ignored the free youth agency—the view of young people as essential creators, developers, and change agents in their own and society’s lives [15]. After the communist ideology lost its influence, the new goal was to mould young people into active members of society, capable of making informed and rational decisions [14]. Second aspect recurring in several sources as a critical element of a youth-centred approach is the consistent, meaningful, and actual participation of young people [5,16–22]. In addition, the values of young people as the cornerstone of their identity creation and a part of youth life that needs to be better understood, both by young people themselves and by the people working with young people, play a significant role in the conceptualisation of this approach (see for example Tajfel [23] and Marcia [24] in connection with the formation of youth identity). LeBlanc [19] and McLaughlin [20] stress that focusing on young people’s strengths and valuing their differences is significant in the youth-centred approach. Finally, the importance of positive relations between young people participating in activities, services, programmes, and the staff is also highlighted [17,25].

Based on this review of the literature, we concluded that the consistent and systematic youth-centred approach in organising activities, programmes, and services results in greater effectiveness, especially for young people in complex, challenging situations. It also results in more consistent and meaningful participation and influences the community, including young people who do not participate in activities directly. This youth-centred approach supports an increase in young people’s self-confidence, thus supporting their perception as agents of change in their own life.

Based on this review, the following definition was formulated: the youth-centred approach is an approach placing the development of young people’s personalities and well-being at the centre of the content, organisation, and development of activities, services, and programmes to achieve the best outcomes for young people. The components of

the approach with their key elements include: (1) ensuring youth rights: acknowledging and implementing these rights; encouraging the following of these rights; (2) real participation: encouraging cooperation; valuing the differences and taking into account dominant influences; (3) respect: focusing on the strengths and professionalism of the staff; (4) acknowledging values: analysing values and attitudes; (5) providing an empowering environment: opportunities for having control and supporting aspirations.

### 3. Methodology and Empirical Research

The empirical background for this article builds on the research project that entailed several stages: a review of the literature to construct the theoretical concept; two rounds of studies to validate the relevance of the theoretical concept; theoretical modelling to create a practical model; a study to evaluate the feasibility of the model, a simulation; and a study on the pilot phase of the model. We used the potential of qualitative research [26] in our research and describe the empirical research below. The results of these stages are presented in the next chapter. Our data were collected, stored, and analysed according to the requirements of the Estonian Code of Conduct for Research Integrity [27].

First, in-depth interviews with Estonian national-level youth field experts were conducted to test the validity of components in the youth-centred approach and its essential elements. In March 2021, semi-structured interviews were conducted with seven experts (employees of Estonian youth work state institutions and umbrella organisations that have vast experience in planning and offering services to young people) in five socio-economically different municipalities. Thematic analysis [28] was employed to compare the interviewees' perceptions with the theoretical conception of the youth-centred approach.

The relevance of the theoretical concept of the youth-centred approach for youth work also found confirmation in a second study with a much larger sample, conducted in May–June 2021 in the field of open youth work. We selected this specific field of youth work practice for this study based on the criteria that the focus area has a significant versatility of activities: the activities and services offered to different young people, numerous staff, extensive geographical availability, and tight connections with local governments. Eight focus group interviews were conducted with different stakeholders—young people, youth workers, and youth work providers (altogether 27 persons). Again, thematic analysis was employed to reveal recurring patterns of the focal themes in the content. The accordance of interpretation of representatives of different groups to the theoretical conception of the youth-centred approach was compared.

During the modelling stage, we used the deductive approach to combine the theoretical concept of the youth-centred approach developed based on the review of the literature and validated by studies, with theories concerned with the processes of making choices. This decision was based on the analyses of the validation studies of the concept of the youth-centred approach that stressed the importance of the choices of individual youth workers in everyday practical youth work situations. The model and its theoretical linkages are presented in the results chapter.

In November 2021, a feasibility study was conducted to test the usability of a model developed for the practical application of the youth-centred approach, developed based on the theoretical concept. The study was conducted using a simulation exercise with 34 participants of different gender, ethnic, and geographical origins. During this process, a situation imitating a youth work environment to the greatest extent possible was designed. The groups presented the discussion results to all participants and analysed the strengths and weaknesses of implementing the youth-centred approach using the model.

The simulation was followed by the piloting stage. The model was tested in practice using six different local-level youth work organisations in five municipalities in geographically different regions of Estonia in the summer of 2022. All the participating organisations were engaged on a voluntary basis. First, the concept and the model were introduced. The organisations were given full freedom to choose the level of activity for testing the model. The consultancy of the research team was available during the whole period. In the end, a

written overview was submitted by each participating organisation about their experience, and an evaluation group meeting was conducted afterward.

During the whole research process, the research team analysed the need for adjustments in the planned stages based on the experience and data. Most notably, we used the validation studies to enhance the theoretical framework for the modelling stage; we decided that greater flexibility should be employed for the piloting stage based on the simulation study.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. *The Validity of the Theoretical Concept*

The analyses of the results of in-depth interviews with Estonian national-level youth field experts confirmed that despite the absence of a legal or other universally recognised definition, the “youth-centred approach” has a shared meaning in Estonia. It is rooted in the understanding that youth work practice should be based on a young person’s actual needs and circumstances, the principle of youth work, and the need to act together with young people in youth work.

The analysis of the results from the focus group interviews with young people, youth workers, and youth work providers revealed that all five components of the theoretical framework were considered relevant in youth policy and youth work, and no major missing components were identified. In our previous work [29], we analysed the importance of the component of acknowledging youth values: a component that we consider to not yet have received sufficient attention in youth work practice in more detail. These studies also revealed the importance of the individual youth worker in all the components of the approach, and several risks were highlighted, such as the dominant influence, lack of professional training for different situations, the ability to ensure a suitable environment, etc. This result paved the way for the model that was developed in the next stage to be focused on the individual youth worker.

### 4.2. *The Model for Practical Application of the Youth-Centred Approach*

The concept of the youth-centred approach led to the elaboration of the model that could help put the developed theory into practice. The model is a tool designed to help set up the process for analysing one’s work and creates an opportunity to take on board the components of the youth-centred approach at a larger scale while planning and implementing youth work or other services for young people. This focus on the individual youth worker—the specialist working with young people—stems from our findings from the validation studies. However, it has been widely acknowledged that methodologically well-equipped and competent youth workers are the basis of high-quality youth work and practical support (including high-quality education and training) is one of the prerequisites for the competencies of youth workers in the EU member states [30]. The model is a tool for a youth worker and designed for a practitioner. However, its usage should be supported at the organisational level to provide space and time for the youth worker to implement the steps of the model. The organisation could also support the process by developing (in cooperation with youth workers) a prepared list of possible solutions (“a menu of choice”) to nudge toward the expected changes.

The starting point for the model is an understanding that youth work can be looked at as a string of decisions that a youth worker makes. Creating opportunities for young people in youth work means that youth workers must think through, analyse, and make decisions on a variety of issues, from the aims to the small practicalities of every activity. As all these decisions need an analysis of pros and cons or pluses and minuses: we call them weighted decisions. Kahneman and Sibony [31], who have researched judgement calls in making the necessary decisions and evaluations, point out that almost every repeated decision is accompanied by noise. They have defined such noise as undesired dissimilarities in evaluating the same problem [31] (p. 36), which can result in mistakes in the choices one makes. Therefore, it is necessary to decrease the so-called noise to ensure balanced decisions

and raise evaluation quality. This theoretical concept of reducing noise in decision-making processes in the everyday practice of youth work forms the model's spine. If we look at youth work as a string of decisions by a youth worker, a youth-centred approach can only be implemented if these decisions are made so that the components of the approach are taken into account. All these weighted decisions that youth workers must make (often alone) to create youth work settings and opportunities for young people can be analysed to evaluate how they are made and how much unnecessary noise is present in order to understand if there is a way to increase a youth-centred approach, i.e., ensuring youth rights, real participation and mutual respect, taking on board youth values and creating an empowering environment.

Another theoretical approach used in developing the model is the nudge theory. Thaler and Sunstein [32] considered nudging as influencing people's choices through so-called nudges to direct a person toward making a consciously predictable choice, i.e., through the architecture of choice. This model suggests a process that, in addition to supporting minimising noise in decision-making, helps the youth worker to make changes in his/her practice. This help comes in the form of prepared choices (we use the term a "menu of choice") that are easier and quicker to use and implement. By these choices, we mean practical solutions to identified shortcomings that prevent a fully youth-centred approach from being applied in practice. This echoes the architecture of the choice to nudge toward the choices that could help the youth-worker and not demand too much time for planning and implementing.

To sum up: the core of this model is creating an overview of the decisions made in the process of practical youth work. It enables analyses as to what extent components of the youth-centred approach are present in decision making and how much noise is present and thus impacting the reasoning, content, and quality of the judgments that serve as the basis for decision making. A profound understanding of how decisions are made allows one to think through the steps that help to decrease unwanted noise. It also provides one with a better understanding of what changes should be implemented to increase the use of the youth-centred approach (see Figure 1).



**Figure 1.** Overall view of the model toward a more youth-centred approach.

The model was designed as a reference model, considering that youth work is part of public services. Numerous models that focus on the organisation and/or management of the public sector have either a descriptive nature (the model describes what should be) and/or the nature of measuring and assessing quality (the model sets the required quality level). Such models can generally be described as outcome-based: they try to describe the solution or circumstances that should be achieved, and thus, they become useless once the result is achieved. Models aimed at providing reference points for achieving and supporting the sustainable functioning of certain practices and solutions—or so-called reference models—can be seen as alternatives to outcome-based models, as Lee and Kim [33] concluded, researching the models for e-governance. Reference models look at the problems that can be solved at a societal level, are considerate of values, are flexible, and create more possibilities to cope with complex problems through adaptability. The model is limited by the choices of the authors and our viewpoints and experience, which means that it does not carry the label of being the best or the only process that could lead to a more youth-centred practice. It is also furnished by various concepts—such as participation, values, and empowerment—that carry a broader content by themselves, the understanding of which has a significant influence on the model.

### 4.3. Testing the Model

The simulation exercise and piloting results confirm that this model is applicable in practice at different levels and in different youth work organisations. Thus, using the model demonstrated that it helps to analyse practical work and finds opportunities that could enable the development of a more youth-centred approach. The participants noted that it is a complex process that takes time and needs more planning; however, it proved the usefulness of this tool for engaging in in-depth analyses of the practices of youth work and its youth-centred approach. It made starting the process of identifying areas that could be changed to achieve a more youth-centred practice possible. Additionally, the flexibility of the model was pointed out as a positive element. Though it was tested in youth work settings, it was also considered applicable in any setting where the goal was to improve the quality of services through a more youth-centred approach.

## 5. Discussion

This research departs from the views shared by the authors and is derived from their experience that youth workers are often in situations where they need to find practical ways to put theoretical knowledge and concepts into daily practice. It echoes the situation with political goals and rhetoric on the policy level: statements are declared and agreed upon, but everyday practical applications remain to be sorted out by youth work organisations or, often, youth workers alone. Results and indicators are also generally defined on the policy level and tend to have little value in informing the daily practice of individual youth workers. This happens in the context where one could still find that there is a lack of academic research on youth work and youth services both on the level of concepts and theories and practical models, instruments, and their usability; this is undoubtedly the case in Estonia, according to our understanding.

In this situation, the theoretical conceptualisation of the often-used term “youth-centred” and the development of a model that helps to apply the youth-centred approach in practice can be viewed as an exercise to connect academic knowledge and youth work practices. It is achieved by not evaluating what is already happening in everyday work with young people and its impacts but also by constructing a vision of a process—a model—based on several theories and hypotheses. This model can also be viewed as an attempt to embed systematised theoretical knowledge deep into practical work, which is sometimes naturally reactive and intuitive (which is, by our understanding, a very valuable feature of youth work). However, our practical experiences hint that intuitive decision making can be scary and confusing. Therefore, an analytical tool that includes intuition and knowledge built on past experiences and moves beyond them to structured and more informed and deliberative evaluations could enrich this practice.

This research project aimed to illustrate the importance of finding knowledge-based ways to refresh often-used concepts with a meaning that is both relevant in terms of the values of youth work nowadays and applicable in practice. The need to engage in this work comes not only from the practical need for more tools but also from the European youth work and youth policy agenda, where one could notice some concepts such as participation, social inclusion, policy mainstreaming, etc., repeating for decades, for example, the revised EU Youth Strategy Work Plan 2022–2024 sets a plan to hold in 2023 an informal meeting of ministers for youth, universities, and education to exchange best practices and “develop a European agenda that places youth at the centre” [34] (p. 18). Considering the changes that have been present in youth life in the last decade, or even the last three years, a new discussion of old concepts and their applicability in practice is in high demand.

## 6. Conclusions

To understand better the youth-centred approach and its relevance in practice, the youth work research group of Narva College of the University of Tartu initiated a research project in 2020. The following research questions were formulated: (1) what content is given to the term “youth-centred”, what are the main elements of a “youth-centred approach”,

and how relevant are these elements in the youth work context in Estonia; (2) are the theoretical understandings of the youth-centred approach applicable in practice in the form of a developed model?

In the academic literature, the forms of activities and their quality that are necessary and suitable for young people are often described using terms such as youth-friendly, youth-focused, youth-centred, and youth-responsive. At the same time, the “youth-centred” or “youth-centred approach” concept has not been conceptualised unambiguously in the context of the services or activities offered to young people.

Based on a review of the literature, the research group defined a concept that the youth-centred approach consists of five main components—ensuring youth rights, achieving real participation, developing practice with mutual respect, acknowledging, and taking the values of young people on board, and creating empowering environments. The relevance of the theoretical concept in Estonian conditions was confirmed in individual in-depth interviews with experts in the field of youth. In addition, focus group interviews were conducted with youth policy makers, youth workers, and young people participating in open youth work. The study revealed the significant relevance of the theoretical concept of a youth-centred approach in the open youth work of Estonia. The interviewees of all groups could relate the five main components of the youth-centred approach to their own youth work experience.

Based on this concept, the research group developed a model for its practical application. The reference-type model is a tool for a youth worker or any other specialist working with young people in other fields and aims to help analyses to find shortcomings in practice that prevent the implementation of a more youth-centred approach. This model builds on an understanding that youth work is a string of decisions that a youth worker has to make. Mapping these decisions and analysing the noise in the process—i.e., unwanted differences in repeating decisions, opens an opportunity to understand how the choices that build up daily youth work practice are made and enables analyses as to what extent the components of the youth-centred approach are taken into account when making these decisions. Identifying the shortcomings is the starting point for making changes that can be made less difficult by providing the youth worker with a list of possible suitable solutions (the menu of choice), thus nudging towards more a youth-centred practice.

The model outlines a decision analysis process that consists of a set of activities or measures: decision audit, evaluation of noise, analysis of youth-centred approach, making choices, and implementing changes. Applying the model in practice means that the specialist providing services to young people, its organisation, and the organiser of the service can achieve a more youth-centred approach in practice. Based on the review of the literature, it can be concluded that a systematic youth-centred approach leads to the greater effectiveness of services, especially for young people in more difficult circumstances, the more consistent and meaningful participation of young people in services, and impact on the community, including on young people who do not directly participate in these services. An essential effect of the youth-centred approach on young people is increased self-confidence and a higher appreciation of their lives. This practice significantly supports young people’s agency—their ability to act and their perception as a conscious guide of their lives, well-being, and mental health.

The results from the simulation exercise study and piloting study confirmed that this model is applicable in practice at different levels and in different youth work organisations. Though it was tested in youth work settings, it was also considered applicable in any setting where the goal is to improve the quality of services through a more youth-centred approach.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, A.K.; methodology, A.R.; data analysis, A.K., A.R., K.K. and M.Ž.; writing—original draft preparation, A.K., A.R., K.K. and M.Ž.; writing—review and editing, A.K., A.R., K.K. and M.Ž.; supervision, A.K., A.R. and K.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** The research project is funded from the resources of the program “Engaging young people at risk of exclusion and improving youth employment readiness”, approved by the Estonian Minister of Education and Research and co-financed by the European Social Fund, implemented by the Education and Youth Board of Estonia (2014–2020.2.07.001.01.15–0002).

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Our data was collected, stored, and analysed according to the requirements of Estonian Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. Parents’ permission to interview minors was asked as well.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. Youth Field Development Plan 2014–2020. 2013. Available online: [https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/documents/2022-10/nak\\_eng.pdf](https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/documents/2022-10/nak_eng.pdf) (accessed on 26 June 2023).
2. Youth Work Act §4 Section 2. 2010. Available online: <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/517072020007/consolide> (accessed on 26 June 2023).
3. Estonian Youth Work Strategy 2006–2013. 2006. Available online: [https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/documents/2022-10/noorsootoo\\_strateegia\\_eng.pdf](https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/documents/2022-10/noorsootoo_strateegia_eng.pdf) (accessed on 26 June 2023).
4. Youth Sector Development Plan 2021–2035. 2022. Available online: <https://www.hm.ee/en/media/1600/download> (accessed on 26 June 2023).
5. Bamber, J.; O’Brien-Olinger, S.; O’Brien, M. *Ideas in Action in Youth Work*; Centre for Effective Services: Dublin, Ireland, 2014. Available online: [https://file.notion.so/f/s/7885f336-88bf-441f-9f5a-ae2d490087c1/CES-theory-final\\_v3\\_28.05.14.pdf?id=6fba4676-7321-49e1-a818-9bd0b05dd43f&table=block&spaceId=aa2d115a-20c6-4d51-a558-36dc44f7c821&expirationTimestamp=1686335163660&signature=9KK97aXokGBHWlh5i0BFcRtmYUHIOFXpB\\_FZCGsnDDk&downloadName=CES-theory-final\\_v3\\_28.05.14.pdf](https://file.notion.so/f/s/7885f336-88bf-441f-9f5a-ae2d490087c1/CES-theory-final_v3_28.05.14.pdf?id=6fba4676-7321-49e1-a818-9bd0b05dd43f&table=block&spaceId=aa2d115a-20c6-4d51-a558-36dc44f7c821&expirationTimestamp=1686335163660&signature=9KK97aXokGBHWlh5i0BFcRtmYUHIOFXpB_FZCGsnDDk&downloadName=CES-theory-final_v3_28.05.14.pdf) (accessed on 30 May 2023).
6. Ord, J.; Carletti, M.; Morciano, D.; Siurala, L.; Dansac, C.; Cooper, S.; Fyfe, I.; Kötsi, K.; Sinisalo-Juha, E.; Taru, M.; et al. European Youth Work Policy and Young People’s Experience of Open Access Youth Work. *J. Soc. Policy* **2021**, *51*, 303–323. [CrossRef]
7. Davidson-Arad, B.; Kaznelson, H. Comparison of parents’ and social workers’ assessments of the quality of life of children at risk. *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.* **2010**, *32*, 711–719. [CrossRef]
8. D’Cruz, H.; Stagnitti, K. Reconstructing child welfare through participatory and child centred professional practice: A conceptual approach. *Child Fam. Soc. Work* **2008**, *13*, 156–165. [CrossRef]
9. Toros, K.; Tiko, A.; Saia, K. Child-centered approach in the context of the assessment of children in need: Reflections of child protection workers’ in Estonia. *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.* **2013**, *35*, 1015–1022. [CrossRef]
10. O’Neill, G.; McMahon, T. Student-centred learning: What does it mean for students and lecturers? In *Emerging Issues in the Practice of University Learning and Teaching*; O’Neill, G., Moore, S., McMullin, B., Eds.; AISHE: Dublin, Ireland, 2005.
11. Karazivan, P.; Dumez, V.; Flora, L.; Pomey, M.-P.; Del Grande, C.; Ghadiri, D.P.; Fernandez, N.; Jouet, E.; Las Vergnas, O.; Lebel, P. The Patient-as-Partner Approach in Health Care: A Conceptual Framework for a Necessary Transition. *Acad. Med.* **2015**, *90*, 437–441. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
12. Williamson, H.; Côté, J.E. *Advanced Introduction to Youth Studies*; Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK, 2022.
13. Helve, H.; Leccardi, C.; Kovacheva, S. Youth research in Europe. In *Contemporary Youth Research: Local Expressions and Global Connections*; Helve, H., Holm, G., Eds.; Original Volume Published 2005; Routledge: London, UK, 2020; pp. 15–32.
14. Taru, M.; Pilve, E.; Kaasik, P. The history of youth work in Estonia. In *The History of Youth Work in Europe. Relevance for Today’s Youth Work Policy*, 4; Taru, M., Coussée, F., Williamson, H., Eds.; Council of Europe Publishers: Strasbourg, France, 2014; pp. 15–33.
15. Corney, T. The human rights of young people: A catalyst for the professionalisation of youth work through the development of codes of practice. In *Professional Youth Work: An Australian Perspective*; Corney, T., Ed.; University of Tasmania: Hobart, Australia, 2014; pp. 13–34.
16. Erulkar, A.; Onoka, C.; Phiri, A. What Is Youth-Friendly? Adolescents’ Preferences for Reproductive Health Services in Kenya and Zimbabwe. *Afr. J. Reprod. Health/La Rev. Afr. De La St. Reprod.* **2005**, *9*, 51–58. [CrossRef]
17. Heinze, H.J.; Jozefowicz, D.; Toro, P.A. Taking the youth perspective: Assessment of program characteristics that promote positive development in homeless and at-risk youth. *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.* **2010**, *32*, 1365–1372. [CrossRef]
18. Larson, R.; Walker, K. Dilemmas of practice: Challenges to program quality encountered by youth program leaders. *Am. J. Community Psychol.* **2010**, *45*, 338–349. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
19. Leblanc, M.B. *On Being Youth Centred: A Guideline for Individuals and Organizations*; Government of Nova Scotia: Halifax, NS, Canada, 2009. Available online: <https://novascotia.ca/dhw/healthy-development/documents/On-Being-youth-Centred-A-Guideline-for-Individuals-and-Organizations.pdf> (accessed on 13 July 2021).

20. McLaughlin, M.W. *Community Counts: How Youth Organizations Matter for Youth Development*; Public Education Network: Washington, DC, USA, 2000. Available online: <https://publiceducation.issuelab.org/resources/14432/14432.pdf> (accessed on 30 May 2023).
21. Walker, K.C.; Larson, R.W. Youth worker reasoning about dilemmas encountered in practice: Expert-novice differences. *J. Youth Dev.* **2012**, *7*, 5–23. [[CrossRef](#)]
22. Walz, L. *Toward a Youth-Centered Approach: Creating a (New) Standard Operating Procedure through Shared Values*; University of Minnesota Extension: Saint Paul, MN, USA, 2012. Available online: <http://www.extension.umn.edu/youth/Training-Events/docs/Toward-a-Youth-Centered-Approach.pdf> (accessed on 21 July 2021).
23. Tajfel, H. Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* **1982**, *33*, 1–39. [[CrossRef](#)]
24. Marcia, J.E. Development and validation of ego-identity status. *J. Personal. Soc. Psychol.* **1966**, *3*, 551–558. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
25. Sanders, J.; Munford, R. Youth-centred practice: Positive youth development practices and pathways to better outcomes for vulnerable youth. *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.* **2014**, *46*, 160–167. [[CrossRef](#)]
26. Flick, U. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*; Sage: London, UK, 2018.
27. *Estonian Code of Conduct for Research Integrity*; Centre for Ethics, University of Tartu: Tartu, Estonia, 2017. Available online: [https://www.eetika.ee/sites/default/files/www\\_ut/hea\\_teadustava\\_eng\\_trukis.pdf](https://www.eetika.ee/sites/default/files/www_ut/hea_teadustava_eng_trukis.pdf) (accessed on 21 May 2022).
28. Ezzy, D. *Qualitative Analysis: Practice and Innovation*; Routledge: London, UK, 2002.
29. Rämmer, A.; Kivimäe, A.; Kötsi, K.; Žuravljova, M. Raising awareness of young people’s values in the youth work practice and studies. *Youth Voice J.* **2022**, *1*, 20–31.
30. Rannala, I.-E.; Stojanovic, J.; Kovacic, M. *European Youth Work Policy Goals Analysed: The Role of the EU-CoE Youth Partnership in the Interplay between the European Union and the Council of Europe*; Partnership between the European Commission and the Council of Europe in the Field of Youth: Strasbourg, France, 2021. Available online: <https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/42128013/101043895/European+youth+work+policy+goals+analysed-July2021.pdf/9db78437-5858-b35c-1523-ec41b083d837> (accessed on 26 July 2023).
31. Kahneman, D.; Sibony, O.; Sunstein, C.R. *Noise. A Flaw in Human Judgment*; William Collins: London, UK, 2021.
32. Thaler, R.H.; Sunstein, C.R. *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*; Penguin Books: London, UK, 2009.
33. Lee, J.; Kim, B.J.; Park, S.; Park, S.; Oh, K. Proposing a Value-Based Digital Government Model: Toward Broadening Sustainability and Public Participation. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 3078. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. Council of the European Union; Representatives of the Governments of the Member States. Resolution of the Council of the European Union and the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States Meeting within the Council on the Revision of the EU Youth Strategy Work Plan 2022–2024. *Off. J. Eur. Union* **2023**, *66*, 14–20. Available online: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2023:185:TOC> (accessed on 31 July 2023).

**Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.