

Research Article

Fieldwork Studies Encourage Graduates to Revisit Studied Regions: Lifestyles of Young People in the Age of Mobilities

Shiro Horiuchi¹

1. Hannan University, Japan

Field Work Studies (FWS), a form of off-campus learning integrated into university education programs, can foster high mobility among students. Graduates with high mobility are more likely to revisit the regions where they undertook their FWS, potentially generating benefits for those host communities. This study investigates how FWS experiences influence graduates' revisits. A web-based survey was conducted with 1,000 individuals residing in Japan who graduated from universities between 2018 and 2023. The research examines the types of satisfaction that encourage students to revisit FWS locations, the mindsets of graduates with a high propensity to revisit, and the regional characteristics that facilitate such revisits. The analysis indicates that graduates who expressed overall satisfaction with their FWS experiences—particularly those enriched by cross-cultural interactions—were more inclined to revisit the regions. These graduates tended to prioritize personal fulfillment and professional growth over family-related matters. Additionally, those who participated in FWS in bedroom communities exhibited a greater likelihood of revisiting and displayed higher levels of trust in others. The findings suggest that fostering graduates' mobility and strengthening regional connections require the design of FWS programs that go beyond merely developing students' communication skills. Instead, these programs should emphasize opportunities for meaningful encounters with unfamiliar individuals. Regions that successfully engage with such graduates are likely to attract a continuous flow of mobile individuals, evolving into hubs for diverse human interactions.

1. Introduction

Many universities today go beyond campus-based education, engaging students in off-campus programs. These initiatives, known by various terms such as Service Learning (SL), Community-Based Learning (CBL), Project-Based Learning (PBL), and Field-Work Studies (FWS), offer diverse educational benefits. These benefits include the enhancement of intellectual abilities, specialized knowledge, civic awareness, a sense of justice, empathy, smoother career transitions, professional consciousness, and increased post-graduation income^{[1][2][3][4][5][6][7][8]}. For the purposes of this study, we use the term Field-Work Studies (FWS), as we are particularly interested in how these programs impact the regions where they are implemented.

The regions hosting FWS participants can derive multiple benefits from the collaboration. These include opportunities for future research partnerships between universities and local communities^[9] and the potential for ongoing technological and financial support through long-term university relationships^[10]. Additionally, residents may gain a sense of pride by acting as community teachers and passing on traditional knowledge to students^[11]. It is also hoped that students will develop an affinity for the region, possibly motivating them to return or even settle there after graduation. The attraction and retention of highly skilled human capital are critical for economic development, particularly in the post-industrial era^[12], and even more so for regions experiencing severe population decline^[13].

However, graduates are unlikely to permanently settle in the regions where they completed FWS based solely on their participation in these programs. Individuals with high levels of human capital tend to move freely across multiple regions, seeking locations where they can maximize their personal and professional benefits, such as higher incomes or improved amenities^{[14][15][16][17][18]}. Thus, while FWS alone may not promote permanent settlement, it holds potential for fostering a different kind of regional engagement—namely, mobility.

In today's era of heightened mobility, individuals are less likely to remain rooted in one place and instead move fluidly across regional boundaries^[19]. This growing mobility has led to the rise of multiple sites dwelling, where individuals repeatedly visit a second location apart from their primary residence^[20]. Such lifestyles have the potential to revitalize local economies while simultaneously enhancing the well-being of the individuals themselves. Through FWS, students gain exposure to diverse natural environments, technological advancements, and social or community challenges

beyond the university campus. These experiences can cultivate a strong desire among students to revisit these regions after graduation, either for further study or professional development. Moreover, students may develop personal connections with residents during their time in FWS, fostering relationships that continue beyond graduation. Even if graduates do not permanently relocate, their periodic visits from their primary residence or workplace could facilitate inter-regional cooperation and exchange.

This study focuses on the possibility that graduates who participated in FWS will repeatedly revisit the regions they engaged with during the program. The key research questions are: What factors motivate these graduates to revisit? What mindsets characterize graduates with high mobility? And which regional characteristics encourage revisits by graduates after FWS?

2. Theoretical background

Tourism research has long explored the factors driving individuals to repeatedly visit specific locations. Studies consistently show that higher levels of satisfaction with a destination correlate with a stronger tendency to revisit^{[21][22][23]}. Tourists are particularly inclined to return to places where they had positive experiences^[24]. In this context, FWS can also be regarded as a form of tourism, where students' satisfaction with their experiences may foster a desire to return. For instance, Chua et al.^[25] demonstrated that individuals who participated in international volunteer programs and embraced a global lifestyle exhibited a higher willingness to revisit those regions as volunteers. Based on these findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

- Hypothesis 1: The higher the satisfaction with FWS experiences, the more likely graduates are to revisit the region.

By leveraging their high mobility, young people revisiting FWS regions may also develop a stronger sense of career consciousness. In today's age of mobility, an autonomous and entrepreneurial mindset is essential^[19]. Young people with high mobility tend to exhibit distinct mindsets that set them apart from their less mobile peers. For example, Yoon^[26] conducted interviews with South Korean youth participating in working holiday programs in Toronto, Canada. These experiences facilitated self-discovery and provided the skills necessary to thrive in a global society. Similarly, Lee^[27] found that international students who studied in the UK continued to move between different regions post-graduation rather than returning to their home countries. These graduates, having acquired high

human capital through UK higher education, developed a form of mobility that enabled them to navigate global opportunities freely. Horiuchi^[28] further demonstrated that graduates who formed friendships with local residents during FWS became motivated to use their careers to revitalize depopulated areas, drawing on the effects of globalization. Based on these studies, the following hypothesis is proposed:

- Hypothesis 2: Graduates who repeatedly revisit their FWS regions tend to possess distinct mindsets associated with mobility.

FWS programs encourage students to engage actively, advancing their learning through interactions with peers and residents^[29]. The content and nature of students' learning can vary depending on the region where the FWS takes place. For instance, students in urban settings may confront issues such as poverty, discrimination, and diversity^[30], while those in rural areas might gain insights into the harshness of nature and the complexities of community management^[31]. Through these diverse experiences, students can develop a broad perspective that transcends regional boundaries. It is important to note that urban and rural areas are not isolated from one another; rather, they exist in a mutually influential relationship^{[32][33]}. Based on these insights, the following hypothesis is proposed:

- Hypothesis 3: The characteristics of the FWS region significantly influence graduates' revisits and the mindsets they develop.

3. Methods

To test the hypotheses, the author conducted an online survey targeting residents of Japan, commissioned through Rakuten Insight. The participants were individuals who had graduated from university between 2018 and 2023 and had participated in FWS during their studies. The survey was conducted in December 2023, collecting responses from 1,000 individuals.

The survey began by asking participants to identify the most significant FWS activity they engaged in during their university years and to indicate how frequently they currently visit those locations after graduation. The frequency of visits was measured on a four-point scale: 1. Never visit; 2. Visit approximately once every few years; 3. Visit about once a year; 4. Visit several times a year or more

Hypothesis 1 suggests that graduates with higher satisfaction in their FWS experiences are more likely to revisit the region. To test this, the survey assessed participants' satisfaction with both their interpersonal interactions and overall experiences during FWS. Interactions were evaluated across seven categories: interactions with 'professionals', 'other students', 'LGBTQ communities', 'foreigners', 'people with disabilities', 'children', and 'residents'. Experiences were evaluated using 12 dimensions, including exposure to 'future work opportunities', 'cooperation', 'life planning', 'challenges faced', 'utilizing abilities', 'job-related experiences', 'responsibility', 'academic studies', 'science and technology', 'nature', 'planning and organizing', and 'overcoming setbacks'. A total of 19 items were rated on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Does not apply) to 5 (Very satisfied).

Hypothesis 2 examines whether graduates who repeatedly revisit FWS regions possess distinct mindsets, particularly regarding autonomy and entrepreneurial attitudes. To evaluate this, the survey included 10 items reflecting participants' work-related attitudes: "I want to achieve success and social recognition", "Changing jobs is an effective means of career advancement", "I want to excel in my work and feel a sense of growth", "I prioritize my private life even if it means earning a lower income", "I am willing to devote time and effort to my family", "I prefer to be a specialist rather than a manager or executive", "I actively gather information on job opportunities at other organizations", "Work is merely a means to support my lifestyle", "Work is my passion", "I prioritize family over work". These items were rated on a four-point Likert scale, from 1 (Does not apply at all) to 4 (Applies very much).

Participants were also asked to evaluate their current life satisfaction on a 10-point scale, with 1 indicating 'dissatisfied' and 10 indicating 'satisfied'. Additionally, they rated their general trust in others on a 10-point scale, where 1 indicated 'should be cautious' and 10 indicated 'trustworthy'. Participants also assessed their outlook on the future of the world, with 1 meaning 'getting worse' and 10 meaning 'getting better'. These metrics provided insights into the respondents' values and ethics.

Hypothesis 3 investigates how the type of location where participants undertook FWS influences their revisitation tendencies and mindsets. Participants were asked to categorize their FWS locations as one of the following: 'A major city', 'A bedroom community', 'A small or medium-sized city', 'A town or village', 'Overseas'. The goal was to explore how different regional characteristics affect participants' revisitation behavior and attitudes.

In addition to the attitudinal variables mentioned above, the study controlled for demographic factors such as gender, age, and household size. All statistical analyses were performed using R, version 4.3.

4. Results

Table 1 summarizes the survey. The gender ratio was approximately 1:3 (male to female). The older the year of graduation of the respondents, the larger the number. The regions where FWS were conducted were, in descending order of number, ‘a small or medium sized city’, ‘a major city’, ‘a town or village’, ‘a bedroom community’, and ‘overseas’. The frequencies of revisits were, in descending order of number, ‘Never’, ‘About once a year’, ‘Several times a year or more’ and ‘Once every few years’.

	Never	Once every few years	Once a year	Several times a year
Gender				
Male	92 (0.36)	39 (0.15)	69 (0.27)	59 (0.23)
Female	379 (0.51)	107 (0.14)	144 (0.19)	111 (0.15)
Graduation				
2018	104 (0.51)	29 (0.14)	40 (0.20)	32 (0.16)
2019	99 (0.52)	28 (0.15)	34 (0.18)	30 (0.16)
2020	89 (0.39)	32 (0.14)	59 (0.26)	46 (0.20)
2021	95 (0.50)	28 (0.15)	35 (0.19)	31 (0.16)
2022	54 (0.45)	22 (0.18)	20 (0.17)	23 (0.19)
2023	30 (0.43)	7 (0.10)	25 (0.36)	8 (0.11)
Revisit region				
Major city	138 (0.47)	30 (0.10)	61 (0.21)	67 (0.23)
Bedroom	40 (0.27)	27 (0.18)	53 (0.36)	28 (0.19)
Small medium city	169 (0.49)	59 (0.17)	66 (0.19)	49 (0.14)
Town or village	104 (0.58)	20 (0.11)	30 (0.17)	24 (0.13)
Oversea	20 (0.57)	10 (0.29)	3 (0.09)	2 (0.06)

Table 1. Respondents’ tendencies to revisit the FWS region, depending on gender, graduation year, and region. Number (ratio).

4.1. Hypothesis 1: Satisfaction and Revisits

Hypothesis 1 posits that higher satisfaction with FWS activities increases the frequency of revisits to the region. To test this hypothesis, principal component analysis (PCA) was conducted on the 19 satisfaction items. Table 2 presents the results. The PCA identified two principal components (PCs) with eigenvalues greater than 1. PC1: Represents overall satisfaction with FWS activities, as all items exhibit positive loadings. PC2: Reflects satisfaction with cross-cultural experiences, with positive loadings for items such as interactions with foreigners, people with disabilities, and LGBTQ communities, as well as experiences related to science, technology, and nature. However, PC2 shows negative loadings for items like interactions with other students and professionals, as well as experiences tied to 'future work', 'cooperation', and 'future living'.

item	PC 1	PC 2
interaction with professionals	0.22	-0.19
interaction with other students	0.21	-0.12
interaction with minorities such as the LGBTQ community	0.23	0.40
interaction with foreigners	0.21	0.34
interaction with people with disabilities	0.22	0.32
interaction with children	0.24	0.14
interaction with residents	0.24	0.06
experiences that connect to future work	0.23	-0.26
experiences of cooperation	0.22	-0.26
experiences that connect to future living	0.24	-0.25
experiences of new challenges	0.24	-0.23
experiences of utilizing owns' abilities	0.25	-0.22
experiences that connect to jobs	0.22	-0.15
experiences of responsibility	0.25	-0.14
experiences that complement academic studies	0.23	-0.06
experiences in science and technology	0.21	0.34
experiences in nature	0.21	0.28
experiences in planning and organizing	0.24	0.07
experiences of overcoming setbacks	0.25	0.04
eigenvalue	7.57	1.88

Table 2. Principal component analysis of 19 items with regard to satisfactions in FWS.

A multiple regression analysis was conducted, with the dependent variable being the frequency of visits. The visit frequency was treated as an ordinal variable (1–4), where higher values indicate more

frequent revisits. Model 1 included gender, year of graduation, marital status, and household size as independent variables. Model 2 added PC1 (overall satisfaction) and PC2 (cross-cultural satisfaction) as additional predictors.

Table 3 presents the results. The analysis shows that men tend to revisit FWS regions more frequently than women, while household size, marital status, and graduation year did not exhibit statistically significant effects. Both PC1 and PC2 had positive associations with revisit frequency, suggesting that graduates who were satisfied with their FWS experiences—particularly in terms of cross-cultural engagement—were more likely to revisit. The Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) improved in Model 2, indicating that adding the satisfaction variables (PC1 and PC2) enhanced the model’s explanatory power. These results support Hypothesis 1, confirming that satisfaction with FWS activities increases the likelihood of revisiting the region.

variables	Model 1	Model 2
female	-0.374 (0.084)***	-0.274 (0.083)**
household size	-0.033 (0.029)	-0.039 (0.028)
year of graduation	0.025 (0.025)	0.016 (0.024)
marital status : married	-0.032 (0.095)	-0.077 (0.091)
marital status : others	0.024 (0.388)	-0.080 (0.372)
PC1		0.107 (0.013)***
PC2		0.123 (0.026)***
AIC	3133.5	3048.9

Table 3. Multiple regression analysis: Model 1 and Model 2.

* $P < 0.05$, ** $P < 0.01$, *** $P < 0.001$

4.2. Hypothesis 2: Revisits and Career Mindset

To explore Hypothesis 2, which examines the relationship between revisit frequency and career-related mindsets, a factor analysis was conducted on the 10 questions related to autonomy and

entrepreneurial attitudes. After reviewing the scree plot and comparing AIC values for models with one to five factors, a three-factor solution was determined to be optimal. The factors are summarized as follows: Factor 1, Active engagement in work (e.g., career ambition and growth); Factor 2, Prioritization of family over work; Factor 3, Valuing private life and work-life balance. Table 4 shows the result.

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
I want to achieve success and social recognition	0.70	0.12	-0.12
I want to excel in my work and feel a sense of growth	0.68	-0.04	-0.07
Work is my passion	0.60	-0.29	0.16
I actively gather information on job opportunities	0.43	-0.02	0.26
I am willing to devote time and effort for my family	0.42	0.36	0.05
I prefer to be a specialist	0.39	-0.04	0.25
Changing job is effective for career advancement	0.34	0.37	0.00
I prioritize family over work	0.03	0.70	0.06
Work is merely a means to support my lifestyle	-0.18	0.56	0.09
I prioritize my private life even if with lower income	-0.08	0.22	0.54
SS loadings	1.99	1.26	0.53
Cumulative variance	0.20	0.32	0.38
Cumulative proportion	0.53	0.86	1.00

Table 4. Factor analysis of 10 items with regard to mindset in jobs and lifestyles.

The three factors, along with respondents' life satisfaction, trust in others, and outlook on the future, were compared across different revisit frequency groups using one-way ANOVA (Table 5). The frequency groups were: 1. Never, 2. Once every few years, 3: Once a year, 4: Several times a year or more.

Revisit frequency	1	2	3	4		
N	471	146	213	170	F	P
Factor 1	-0.16 (0.90)	0.07 (0.93)	0.21 (0.77)	0.11 (0.84)	10.5	P<0.001
Factor 2	0.14 (0.81)	-0.10 (0.88)	-0.20 (0.78)	-0.06 (0.82)	10.0	P<0.001
Factor 3	-0.08 (0.65)	-0.03 (0.65)	0.16 (0.65)	0.05 (0.74)	6.8	P<0.001
Life satisfactions	6.20 (1.91)	6.10 (1.85)	6.40 (1.87)	6.33 (1.98)	0.9	N.S.
Trust others	5.01 (2.04)	5.75 (1.85)	5.95 (2.08)	5.63 (2.16)	12.9	P<0.001
Outlook for future	4.97 (1.90)	5.14 (1.67)	5.24 (1.98)	5.38 (1.96)	2.4	N.S.

Table 5. One-way Analysis of Variances based on revisit frequencies for respondents' mindsets.

1: Never, 2: Once every few years, 3: Once a year, 4: Several times a year or more

The results indicate that participants who revisit their FWS regions more frequently tend to:

Place higher importance on work engagement (Factor 1); View work as a meaningful pursuit rather than a mere necessity (lower values on Factor 2); Value private life and personal fulfillment (Factor 3); Exhibit higher levels of trust in others. However, there were no significant differences between groups in terms of life satisfaction or outlook on the future. These findings suggest that frequent revisitors tend to have a more positive mindset toward both work and interpersonal trust, supporting Hypothesis 2.

4.3. Hypothesis 3: The Effects of Region

Hypothesis 3 proposes that the nature of the FWS region influences revisit frequency. To test this, a one-way ANOVA was conducted with the type of FWS region (1: major city, 2: bedroom community, 3: small or medium-sized city, 4: town or village, 5: overseas) as the independent variable and revisit frequency as the dependent variable.

The results, presented in Table 6, indicate that graduates who conducted their FWS in bedroom communities revisit those regions more frequently than participants in other locations. To further investigate the role of regional context, a subset analysis was conducted on participants who revisit

their FWS region several times a year or more (N = 170). Table 7 presents the results of one-way ANOVAs comparing the effects of different regional types on participants' mindsets, satisfaction, and trust. The dependent variables included: PC1 (overall satisfaction), PC2 (cross-cultural satisfaction), Factor 1, 2, and 3 (mindset-related values), Life satisfaction, trust in others, and outlook on the future.

region	1	2	3	4	5		
N	296	148	343	178	35	F	
Frequency	2.19 (1.24)	2.47 (1.08)	1.99 (1.12)	1.85 (1.13)	1.63 (0.88)	8.55	P < 0.001

Table 6. One-way Analysis of Variances based on revisit regions for revisit frequencies of respondents.

1: a major city, 2: a bedroom community, 3: a small or medium-sized city, 4: a town or villager, 5: Overseas

region	1	2	3	4	5		
N	67	28	49	24	2	F	P
PC 1	0.46 (2.72)	1.53 (1.98)	0.38 (2.27)	-0.09 (2.85)	0.93 (4.72)	1.53	n.s.
PC 2	0.15 (1.52)	-0.58 (1.02)	0.23 (1.38)	0.15 (1.47)	-1.45 (0.09)	2.31	n.s.
Factor 1	0.15 (0.83)	0.34 (0.80)	-0.08 (0.85)	0.10(0.76)	0.26 (2.25)	1.20	n.s.
Factor 2	0.11 (0.82)	-0.29 (0.70)	-0.08 (0.83)	-0.18 (0.83)	-0.82 (2.22)	1.78	n.s.
Factor 3	0.02 (0.77)	0.22 (0.74)	0.05 (0.73)	-0.08 (0.55)	0.23 (1.91)	0.61	n.s.
Life satisfactions	6.16 (2.14)	7.07 (1.80)	6.22 (1.95)	6.13 (1.75)	7.00 (1.41)	2.65	n.s.
Trust others	5.32 (2.20)	6.75 (2.05)	5.63 (2.05)	5.13 (2.07)	6.00 (2.83)	1.12	P < 0.05
Outlook future	5.51 (2.07)	4.79 (1.85)	5.47 (1.82)	5.67 (1.97)	4.00 (2.83)	1.12	n.s.

Table 7. One-way Analysis of Variances based on revisit regions for respondents' mindsets.

1: a major city, 2: a bedroom community, 3: a small or medium-sized city, 4: a town or villager, 5: Overseas

The analysis revealed that participants in bedroom communities exhibit higher levels of trust in others compared to participants from other regions. This suggests that the nature of the FWS region can shape participants' mindsets, particularly regarding interpersonal trust, supporting Hypothesis 3.

5. Discussion

This study analyzed data from a web survey to explore: (1) how FWS promotes revisits by graduates, (2) the mindsets of graduates who revisit, and (3) the regional characteristics that encourage revisits and influence graduates' perspectives.

The results reveal that graduates with higher satisfaction in FWS activities—particularly with cross-cultural interactions—are more likely to revisit the region. However, interactions with other students and professionals showed little effect in encouraging revisits. Second, those with a strong tendency to revisit tend to place high value on both their work and private lives while assigning less importance to family matters. They also exhibit higher trust in others. Graduates who completed FWS in bedroom communities revisit those regions more frequently than those who participated in other areas. Additionally, individuals from bedroom communities demonstrate higher levels of trust compared to visitors from other regions.

The findings suggest that FWS leverages young people's high mobility, encouraging them to revisit regions they engaged with during the program. However, this motivation is closely linked to satisfaction at the time of participation. Educational institutions and communities often design FWS programs to develop basic professional skills through interaction with residents^[34]. Yet, the experiences that truly encourage revisits are not related to such basic skills. Instead, they stem from new discoveries, such as engaging with minorities or exploring topics like science, technology, and nature. In this sense, graduates who revisit the same region repeatedly resemble “veteran tourists”—individuals seeking authenticity beyond surface-level experiences^{[35][36]}. FWS fosters this search for authenticity by encouraging students to discover the deeper aspects of a region.

Graduates with a strong tendency to revisit are highly motivated not only to excel in their work but also to enrich their personal lives. At the same time, they place less importance on family bonds, a characteristic often observed in digital nomads^{[37][38]}. It is worth noting that all survey respondents were in their 20s at the time of the study. As they age, marry, raise children, or take care of parents, their responses may change. However, it is also possible that these individuals will maintain their

nomadic lifestyles even as they grow older. Future research should investigate how these mindsets evolve over time and how they influence long-term career development.

This study highlights the impact of regional characteristics on graduates' revisitation patterns. Although the survey left the definition of "region" to the respondents, the findings suggest that graduates revisit bedroom communities more frequently than other areas. Traditionally, FWS programs focus on urban areas to address issues like poverty and discrimination, or on rural areas to provide agricultural or nature-based experiences^{[30][31]}. In contrast, bedroom communities, primarily residential areas, are less common choices for FWS programs. However, the findings demonstrate the potential benefits of conducting FWS in such communities. For example, students may learn about isolation in apartment complexes or explore disaster response efforts. This study offers new insights into the value of selecting bedroom communities as FWS locations.

The results suggest several important implications. It is essential for FWS programs to select regions that encourage graduates to revisit, fostering reflection on their careers in the context of high mobility. Programs should aim to provide opportunities for students to discover unique aspects of regions and their lifestyles. Graduates with a digital nomad mindset—who prioritize work and personal life over family—may revisit regions but are also likely to move on eventually. Bedroom communities, with their relatively casual and less restrictive social environments, may offer the flexibility needed to accommodate these transient lifestyles. However, the study could not determine which specific FWS experiences or regional activities influenced revisits and career awareness. Future research should explore what kinds of experiences graduates had, who they engaged with, and why they revisit regions both during and after graduation.

The findings also raise concerns about mobility disparities between those who are mobile and those who are not. Recent discussions have highlighted disparities in motivation and skills for navigating a neoliberal society^[39]. Individuals who do not learn how to adapt to such environments risk facing growing disadvantages. Similarly, students who did not express satisfaction with their FWS experiences were less likely to revisit the regions. Furthermore, university students who did not participate in FWS or young people without access to higher education are unlikely to develop the mobility required to revisit regions. As Sheller^[40] pointed out, mobility disparities also stem from differences in access to public institutions and professional opportunities. This study adds a new dimension to the concept of mobility disparities by highlighting the significance of experience-based

mobility—the ability to revisit meaningful places, which is largely shaped by educational opportunities like FWS.

6. Conclusion

It is advantageous for companies and communities to welcome young people who have participated in FWS and developed a strong work ethic. Even if these graduates do not immediately find jobs or settle in the region, they may establish new businesses by maintaining relationships with the companies and communities. Over time, the region could evolve into a travel destination, and eventually, it may attract these graduates as future residents. Hosting FWS participants holds significant potential: if graduates rich in human capital succeed in enhancing the productivity and social capital of the area, the long-term benefits to the region will be substantial.

Highly mobile young people can also act as intermediaries, connecting the region with other parts of the country. Florida^[12] highlights that cities that welcome mobile individuals tend to experience economic growth and innovation. Similarly, Horiuchi and Morishige^[41] suggest that mobile individuals are more likely to form affiliative relationships with local residents if both parties share a common vision.

In the current age of mobilities, residents increasingly encounter different types of mobile individuals. To minimize potential conflicts between mobile people and long-term residents, FWS can serve as an entry point. By fostering repeated visits to specific regions, FWS not only strengthens participants' career-oriented mindsets but also nurtures their trust in others—laying the groundwork for positive and meaningful connections between mobile individuals and local communities.

References

1. [△]Astin AW, Sax LJ, Avalos J. (1999). "Long-Term Effects of Volunteerism During the Undergraduate Year s." *The Review of Higher Education* 22(2): 187–202.
2. [△]Einfeld A, Collins D. (2008). "The Relationships Between Service-Learning, Social Justice, Multicultural Competence, and Civic Engagement." *Journal of College Student Development* 49(2): 95–109.
3. [△]Matthews PH, Dorfman JH, Wu X. (2015). "The Impacts of Undergraduate Service-Learning on Post-Graduation Employment Outcomes." *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement* 3(1): 1–16.

4. [△]Leonard P, Halford S, Bruce K. The new degree? Constructing internships in the third sector. *Sociol.* 2016;50(2):383–99. doi: 10.1177/0038038515574456.
5. [△]Bowman NA, Wolniak GC, Seifert TA, Wise K, Blach C. (2023). “The Long-Term Role of Undergraduate Experiences: Predicting Intellectual and Civic Outcomes.” *Research in Higher Education* 64: 379–401. doi:10.1007/s11162-022-09708-5
6. [△]Raath S, Golightly A (2017). “Geography Education Students’ Experiences with a Problem-Based Learning Fieldwork Activity.” *Journal of Geography* 116(5): 217–225. doi:10.1080/00221341.2016.1264059.
7. [△]Kudo S, Mursaleen H, Ness B, Nagao M. (2018). “Exercise on Transdisciplinarity: Lessons from a Field-Based Course on Rural Sustainability in an Aging Society.” *Sustainability* 10(4): 1155. doi:10.3390/su10041155
8. [△]Zhang L, Ma Y (2023). “A study of the impact of project-based learning on student learning effects: a meta-analysis study.” *Frontiers in Psychology* 14: 1202728. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1202728.
9. [△]Ankrah S, Al-Tabbaa O. (2015). “Universities industry collaboration: A systematic review.” *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 31: 387–408. doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2015.02.003
10. [△]Reynolds NP (2014). “What Counts as Outcomes?: Community Perspectives of an Engineering Partnership.” *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 21(1): 79–90.
11. [△]Collins L. (2019). “Letting the village be the teacher: a look at community-based learning in Northern Thailand.” *Teaching in Higher Education* 24(5): 694–708.
12. [△]^bFlorida R. (2008). *Who Is Your City?* Basic Books.
13. [△]Ciriaci D. (2014). “Does University Quality Influence the Interregional Mobility of Students and Graduates? The Case of Italy.” *Regional Studies* 48(10): 1592–1608. doi:10.1080/00343404.2013.821569
14. [△]Faggian A, McCann P, Sheppard S. (2007). “Human Capital, Higher Education and Graduate Migration: An Analysis of Scottish and Welsh Students.” *Urban Studies* 44(13): 2511–2528. doi:10.1080/00420980701667177
15. [△]Whisler RL, Waldorf BS, Mulligan GF, Plane DA (2008). “Quality of Life and the Migration of the College-Educated: A Life-Course Approach.” *Growth and Change* 39(1): 58–94.
16. [△]Horiuchi S, Takahashi T. Globalization and regional revitalization in a local university of Japan. In: Gonzalez B, editor. *Globalization: economic, political and social issues*. Nova Publisher; 2016. p. 149–59.
17. [△]Cui C, Wang Y, Wang Q. (2022). “The Interregional Migration of Human Capital: The Case of “First-Class” University Graduates in China.” *Applied Spatial Analysis and Policy* 15: 397–419. doi:10.1007/s12061-021-09401-7

18. [^]Blanco-Moreno AC. (2024). "Inter-regional graduate migration, subjective expectations, and human capital mobility." *Regional Science Policy & Practice* 16: 100110. doi:10.1016/j.rspp.2024.100110
19. [^]^bUrry J. *Mobilities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2007.
20. [^]McIntyre N, Williams D, McHugh K. (Eds.) (2006). *Multiple Dwelling and Tourism: Negotiating Place, Home and Identity*. Cabi.
21. [^]Kozak M. (2001). "Repeaters' behavior at two distinct destinations." *Annals of Tourism Research* 28 (3): 784–807.
22. [^]Gatewood JB, Cameron CM. (2004). "Battlefield pilgrims at Gettysburg national military parks." *Ethnology* 43: 193–216.
23. [^]Horiuchi S. (2008). "Affiliative segregation of outsiders from a community: bonding and bridging social capital in Hachimori-cho, Japan." *International Journal of Japanese Sociology* 17: 91–100. doi:10.1111/1/j.1475-6781.2008.00111.x
24. [^]Khazami N, Lakner Z. (2021). "Influence of Experiential Consumption and Social Environment of Local Tourists on the Intention to Revisit Tunisian Guesthouses: Mediating Role of Involvement in the Experience." *Sustainability* 13: 6584. doi:10.3390/su13126584
25. [^]Chua B, Meng B, Ryu HB, Han H. (2021). "Participate in volunteer tourism again? Effect of volunteering value on temporal re-participation intention." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 46: 193–204. doi:10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.12.003
26. [^]Yoon L (2014). "Transnational youth mobility in the neoliberal economy of experience." *Journal of Youth Studies* 17(8): 1014–1028. doi:10.1080/13676261.2013.878791.
27. [^]Lee J. When the world is your oyster: international students in the UK and their aspirations for onward mobility after graduation. *Globalisation Soc Educ.* 2022;20(3):277–90. doi: 10.1080/14767724.2021.1904209.
28. [^]Horiuchi S. (2022). "Fieldwork Studies in Rural Areas: Growth of Students in an Urban University in Japan." *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences* 18(4): 117–128. doi:10.9734/arjass/2022/v18i4409
29. [^]Freire P. (1970). *Pedagogia do Oprimido*. Paz e Terra.
30. [^]^bCausey VE, Thomas CD, Armento BJ. (2000). "Cultural diversity is basically a foreign term to me: the challenges of diversity for preservice teacher education." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 16: 33–45.
31. [^]^bPreradović NM, Čalić M, van Overbeeke PSM (2022). "Rural 3.0: A Case Study of University? Community Engagement Through Rural Service-Learning in Croatia." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach a*

nd Engagement 26(1): 117–128.

32. [△]Van Leeuwen E. (2015). “Urban–Rural Synergies: An Explorative Study at the NUTS3 Level.” *Applied Spatial Analysis and Policy* 8: 273–289. doi:10.1007/s12061-015-9167-x
33. [△]Manzenreiter W, Lutzeler R, Polak–Rottmann S (eds.) (2020). *Japan’s New Ruralities: Coping with Decline in the Periphery*. Routledge.
34. [△]Nakayama K, Matsumura N (2018). “Ability Development Measured by the Fundamental Competencies for Working Persons and Effectiveness of Forest Volunteer Activities: Case Study of Forest Volunteer Activities of University Students in Niimi City, Okayama Prefecture.” *Journal of Forest Planning* 22(2): 63–75.
35. [△]MacCannell D. (1976). *The Tourist: A new theory of leisure class*. University of California Press.
36. [△]Cohen E. (1988). “Authenticity and commoditization in tourism.” *Annals of Tourism Research* 15: 371–386.
37. [△]Hannonen O. (2020). “In search of a digital nomad: defining the phenomenon.” *Information Technology & Tourism* 22: 335–353. doi:10.1007/s40558-020-00177-z
38. [△]Wibowo TO (2024). “Dynamic of Migration lifestyle and settlement of nomad in Bali, Indonesia.” *Indonesian Journal of Geography* 56(2): 292–299. doi:10.22146/ijg.90856.
39. [△]Dean J. (2016). “Class Diversity and Youth Volunteering in the United Kingdom: Applying Bourdieu’s Habitus and Cultural Capital.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 45(1S): 95S–113S. doi:10.1177/0899764015597781
40. [△]Sheller M (2018). *Mobility Justice: The Politics of Movement in an Age of Extremes*. Verso
41. [△]Horiuchi S, Morishige M. (2024). “Affiliative nomads in Japan: Potential sustainable tourism stakeholders in depopulated rural areas.” *Frontiers in Sustainable Tourism* 3: 1329856. doi:10.3389/frsut.2024.1329856

Declarations

Funding: JSPS KAKENHI 21K12469

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.