

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at:
<http://www.researchgate.net/publication/273092771>

Internationalization and the new academic generation

CHAPTER · JANUARY 2013

DOWNLOADS

11

VIEWS

5

1 AUTHOR:



Jisun Jung

The University of Hong Kong

16 PUBLICATIONS 19 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Chapter 10

Internationalization and the New Generation of Academics

Jisun Jung, René Kooij, and Ulrich Teichler

10.1 Introduction

As the widely used term, “internationalization,” suggests, education organizations have been experiencing a trend toward an increase in the international features of higher education in recent decades (see the analyses in Teekens and de Wit 2007; see also de Wit 2002; Knight 2008; Teichler 2007). In many respects, universities are already international (see Kerr 1990), but in recent years, the diminished influence of national regulations has aided in the enormous growth of visible international activities in higher education. In this context, one tends to refer – in the analysis of how the academic profession is embedded in the internationalization of higher education – to (a) a more rapid speed and a wider spread of knowledge transfer all over the world; (b) a stronger emphasis paid to global knowledge capital and the subsequent comparative analysis; (c) an increase in communication and collaboration across borders on the part of institutions, their subunits, and individuals; (d) growing student mobility; and (e) increasing mobility of the academics themselves (Musselin 2005; Teichler 2004, 2009, 2011).

The aim of this chapter is to establish the extent to which views on international issues of higher education and international activities vary across the generations of academics. This requires concrete definitions on a numerous concepts and measurements of what constitutes a “generation” as well as a choice of the international aspects to be addressed.

J. Jung (✉)

Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, SAR, China
e-mail: jisun@hku.hk

R. Kooij • U. Teichler

International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER-Kassel),
University of Kassel, Kassel, Germany

Further discussed below, two concepts of “generations” guide the subsequent analysis. *Biographical generations* are defined as less than 40 years old, 41–55 years old, and older than 55 years.¹ *Status generations* are defined as “senior academics,” or “professors,” and “junior staff” according to a classification generally employed in the CAP project.

The issues addressed regarding internationalization in the subsequent analysis are largely determined by themes covered in the questionnaires. Notably, four questions are raised:

- How much do young/old and junior/senior academics differ in terms of international mobility or migration for study or professional purposes throughout their lives that is in terms of the international aspect of their biographies?
- How much do young/old and junior/senior academics differ with respect to their international activities and to their foreign language use?
- Does the international aspect of the individual’s biography have an impact on the academics’ international activities and their foreign language use?
- Do international biographies as well as international activities and foreign language use effect the way the academics view the situation of the academic profession and act professionally in general?

As in other parts of the overall analysis of the academic profession within the CAP project, differences by country will be examined. Countries are categorized as advanced countries (Canada, USA, Finland, Germany, Italy, Norway, Portugal, UK, Australia, Japan, South Korea, Hong Kong) and emerging countries (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, South Africa, China, Malaysia).

Finally, it should be added here that the analysis of this chapter concentrates on academics active at “universities,” defined in this project as institutions more or less equally engaged in teaching and research. The available data show that academics at universities are more strongly active in the international arena than academics at other institutions of higher education. The latter are excluded here because national conditions for international activities vary more dramatically by countries in the latter case and a detailed review of these diverse contexts cannot be realized within the space limitation of the analysis.

10.2 Generation of Academics

A generation is a multidimensional concept that combines biographical, historical, sociological, and vocational perspectives. In discussing generations, one usually refers not only to age but also to different historical experiences, different lengths of professional experiences, as well as different positions in the hierarchical structure in the organization.

¹It has to be noted that biographical generations are concurrently historical generations, because the process of “internationalization” was at a different stage when they got to know the world of academia.

One could consider generations, first, merely in *biographical terms*. Many analyses in this domain lay out the typical stages of a human life cycle – youth, adulthood, old age, etc. – as forming a biography. As used in demographics, “cohort” stands for a set of individuals who pass some crucial stage at approximately the same time, like marriage, first employment, and especially birth (Carlsson and Karlsson 1970). Moreover, according to life cycle theories (Erikson 1959; Levinson et al. 1978), adults experience different levels of motivation and capability. For instance, early adulthood might be viewed as being characterized by high achievement motives, individual enthusiasm for one’s job, and possibly readiness for substantial changes in the life course. The academic profession is often named in this context as a profession where career decisions are made at a very late point in time. The age range of the academic profession in most countries stretches from about 25 years to about 65 years. However, both the typical entry age and the retirement age vary by country, and the overall time span of the academic career might be shorter in some countries and longer in others.

Second, generations can be defined *vocationally* in terms of career stages. Length of work in a specific organization, a specific occupational category, or specific economic sector would be in the spotlight. For example, individuals entering a specific organization at the same point in time or occupying the same position within an organization in the same period can be considered as a cohort, irrespective of their age. For instance, Bayer and Dutton (1977) divided academic generation groups, based on their length of experience, into fledglings (under 4 years), maturing (5–10 years), established (11–25 years), and patriarchs (over 25 years). In many international statistical analyses, researchers are described according to years of experience as “early-stage researchers” (less than 4 years), “experienced researchers,” and “senior researchers” (Teichler 2011). Similarly, one could define academic staff according to years of employment at institutions of higher education. Such a measure, however, is dubious in the case of a comparative study of the academic profession because of substantial differences in the career patterns of the academic profession. While, in some cases, academics are often employed after the award of a bachelor degree, in other cases they are employed only after some period of post-doctoral research work. Moreover, it would be difficult to put in perspective years of professional experience outside academia.

Third, any effort in analyzing generational differences of views and activities of academics with respect to international issues cannot succeed in measuring just effects of age and work experience per se. It is obvious that *biographic generational* effects cannot be isolated from *historic generational* effects. Therefore, it is necessary to determine in which historical moment or phase individuals entered a specific age group or stage of their life. Indeed, individual biographies are placed in specific historical contexts and are influenced and shaped by them. Some national studies point out that specific historical circumstances have shaped the values, attitudes, and behavior of academic generations. For instance, Evans (1995) classified academic generations based on major historical changes, such as the rapid expansion of the academic labor market in the 1960s and 1970s of the USA or the sudden decreasing moment of federal research funding. In an international comparative

study on the academic profession, historical developments salient across countries must be taken in account. For example, those who were about 30 years old at the time the survey was conducted experienced a more progressed stage of internationalization than those who were about 30 years in the 1980s. Further, with respect to a certain biographic stage, one has to bear in mind that some academics might have experienced the current internationalization trend during its infancy, while others might have experienced advanced internationalization from the outset of their career. As a consequence, in observing and interpreting differences between biographic generations, one has to take into consideration that the differences observed might be attributable to biographic age and/or to different experiences of the process of internationalization.

Fourth, many sociological studies point out that status and rank are important criteria to define generation in terms of socialization process and role expectations in organizational context. Generations in this respect are highly relevant in academia (see Katz 1973), because academic identity, scholarship, and interpersonal relationships can be changed according to length of service or position (see Enders and de Weert 2004, 2009). Academic careers have strong elements of seniority; the behavior and performance of academics can be explained from their networks, resources, and their power within the individual higher education institution and within the academic community at large. As a consequence, we might assume a strong *status generational* impact as regards international activities: that academics in senior positions can more easily make use of the opportunities of internationalization than academics in junior positions.

In the subsequent analysis, “generational” differences are addressed with the help of two measures: (a) *biographic generations*, which are, to a certain extent, *historic generations*, which are expressed in terms of age, and (b) *status generations*, which are expressed in terms of academic status or rank. Given these definitions, the analysis begins with two competing hypotheses. On the one hand, young academics might be more international in their activities because they are influenced by the progressing internationalization of higher education. On the other hand, the academics in senior positions might be more international because they have better means of undertaking international activities.

The respondents are classified, first, according to age group, those up to 40 years old, those 41–55 years old, and finally those 56 years and older. Those who are up to 40 years old got acquainted with the academic world as students beginning in the late 1980s, at a historical moment that we can consider as the breakthrough of the current internationalization discourse. This would include, for example, the start of massive activities in Western Europe and in Japan to strengthen international activities in higher education, the opening-up policy in China, and the end of the “Cold War” and of the political bloc of communist countries. Those who are 41–55 years old experienced higher education as students when paradigms of higher education expansion and modernization led the worldwide search for best models of higher education and reached the typical age of promotion to senior academic positions at the time of the above-named breakthrough of the current internationalization discourse. Finally, those older than 55 years began to study at a

time when higher education still was strongly shaped by a national emphasis on higher education policies.

Second, the respondents are classified according to status in the subsequent analysis. In this framework, we adopt the classification employed in the CAP project in general: “Senior academics” or “professors” on the one hand, i.e., those occupying a position equivalent to associate professors and full professors in the US higher education system, and junior academics or “junior staff” on the other hand, i.e., those on a lower position such as assistant professors, lecturers, research associates, and assistants.

Of course, “seniority” according to status and seniority according to age overlap. On average, the “professors” surveyed are about 50 years old, while the “junior staff” are about 40 years old. One has to keep in mind, though, that the age composition of the academic profession varies substantially according to the countries included in this comparative study.

10.3 Internationality of Career

For the initial steps of this analysis, we classify the internationality of academics’ careers into six categories based on citizenship, the distinction between immigrant and nonimmigrant mobile academics, the stage of their life when they moved to another country, and the purposes for crossing its borders:

- *Early immigrants*: persons having lived in a country different from that of their current work and also having had in most cases another citizenship who had come to the country of their current academic work sometimes between birth and study (up to the master’s level)
- *PhD immigrants*: persons having lived in a country different from that of their current work and also having had in most cases another citizenship who had come to the country of their current academic work at the beginning or during their doctoral work
- *Professional immigrants*: persons having lived in a country different from that of their current work and also having had in most cases another citizenship who had come to the country of their current academic work for the purpose of academic work at a later stage of their academic career, sometimes after the doctoral award or, if they are not PhD holders, sometimes after their highest degree
- *Study mobile academics*: (nonimmigrant) citizens of the country of current academic work who had been mobile during the course of study (including those who had been mobile both in the course of study and during doctoral work)
- *PhD mobile academics*: (nonimmigrant) citizens of the country of current academic work who had been mobile during the course of their doctoral work (excluding those who had been mobile both in the course of study and during doctoral work)
- *Non-mobile academics*: academics who are neither immigrants nor were mobile during the course of study or during doctoral work (we cannot exclude, however, the possibility that they have worked a while in another country)

It should be noted that information provided by respondents was not consistently complete. In the subsequent analysis, persons who did not state their citizenship were considered as persons having the nationality of the country of their current work.

Table 10.1 displays the international mobility of academics working at universities by status and age in advanced and emerging countries. In regard to academics' status, we note that the international character of the senior academics' career was higher than that of junior academics. As the left part of Table 10.1 shows, the proportion of immigrants and mobile persons among senior academics is slightly higher than among junior academics across all countries. There are substantial variations, however, by country. Clearly, these include higher proportions of young academics at Malaysian, Norwegian, and Dutch universities and also slightly higher proportions of some other countries.

The findings are similar with regard to age group, as the right part of Table 10.1 shows. The oldest group of respondents had been more internationally mobile in their life course and career course than the younger academics. The most striking difference according to age might indicate a *historical change*. The proportion of those from emerging countries who have studied abroad is clearly smaller among the young and middle-aged academics than among the older generation; obviously, it is less important for recent generations of academics in emerging countries to undertake their bachelor and master studies in an economically advanced country in order to embark on a successful academic career.

As the previous chapters have already shown, there are striking variations between countries in regard to migration and international mobility, which are more salient than generational variations across countries. It is clear that the proportion of immigrants in the countries of Australia, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and the Netherlands is higher than it is in other countries, which include Japan, Korea, and certain Latin American countries, across generations. However, high migration and high mobility do not necessarily coincide. Some countries show high student mobility and PhD mobility despite the fact that the proportion of immigrants is low; Korea is among them. Nearly 30 % of academics in Korea experienced PhD mobility; however, the proportion of immigrants is close to zero. This number indicates that it is rare to recruit immigrants as academics except for those who had experienced mobility during their course of study.

10.4 International Activities

Eight aspects of academics' international activities were addressed in the CAP questionnaire. Three refer to the teaching function:

- (a) Emphasizing international content in their teaching,
- (b) Teaching many international graduate students,
- (c) Having taught abroad recently.

Table 10.1 International mobility of academics in universities by status and age, by mean percent, 2007–2008

	Status						Age								
	Seniors			Juniors			56 and older			41–55 years			Up to 40 years		
	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All
Early immigrants	4	2	3	4	1	3	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	2	4
PhD immigrants	3	1	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	3	3	4	1	3
Professional migrants	8	2	6	8	2	6	10	3	8	6	9	8	9	2	7
Study mobile academics	10	18	13	8	14	11	10	18	13	11	9	10	9	11	9
PhD mobile academics	8	5	8	8	5	7	9	5	8	8	8	8	7	5	6
Non-mobile academics	66	70	68	68	78	71	64	68	65	68	66	67	66	80	71

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Five refer to the research function:

- (d) Research is international in scope or orientation,
- (e) Collaborating in research internationally,
- (f) Having raised research funds abroad or from international sources recently,
- (g) Publishing jointly with foreign colleagues,
- (h) Publishing abroad.

Table 10.2 suggests that about half of the respondents, on average, across countries, report emphasizing international content in their teaching (a), their research as international in scope (d), collaborating with international colleagues (e), and publishing abroad (h). Somewhat fewer academics publish jointly with authors located in other countries (g). Finally, only a few academics teach many international graduate students (b), have taught abroad recently (c), and have raised research funds abroad or from international sources recently (f).

On average across countries, 17 % stated that they do not undertake any of the eight international activities addressed in the survey and 12 % named only a single activity. In contrast, 1 % stated that they were internationally active in all eight areas, 2 % named seven areas, and a further 7 % named six areas. In order to get an aggregate picture, the three variables referring to teaching are merged in Table 10.2, creating an “International teaching index,” with the five variables referring to research being combined to create an “International research index.” Further, all eight variables were combined to create an “International activities index.”

The *status generational* impact obviously plays an important role in this respect. The left part of Table 10.2 indicates a clearly higher international activity index score for senior academics than for junior academics. Senior academics are more international than junior academics both with respect to teaching (1.0 vs. 0.8) and research (2.4 vs. 2.1). The finding can be viewed as surprising, as already discussed above. The CAP survey data as such do not provide any clear reason why more senior academics are internationally active than junior academics. We can assume that they are in a preferential situation to pursue international activities due to more power, better networks, and longer experience.

There is corresponding difference by *biographical generation*. As the right part of Table 10.2 shows, the international activity index is 3.3 each on average for academics at universities 56 years and older and 41–55 years and is slightly lower for those up to 40 years (3.0). This scores that the clout of an experienced academic is very important for the extent of international activities.

The only, and small, difference noted at all by age holds true only for teaching activities (index of 1.0 on the part of the older academics, 1.0 in the middle-age group, and 0.8 in the younger group). As far as the research index is concerned, there is not any noteworthy difference by age.

There are differences according to individual questions. As regards teaching activities, we note that:

- Members of the youngest group less often “emphasize international perspectives or content” in their class (59 % as compared to 66 % each).

Table 10.2 Percent of teaching and research activities and mean international index score for the international activities of academics in universities by status and age, 2007–2008

	Status						Age								
	Seniors			Juniors			56 and older			41–55 years			Up to 40 years		
	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All
Teaching															
International content/ perspectives infused teaching	70	68	69	61	49	59	69	69	69	66	66	66	59	60	59
Currently, most of your graduate students are international	14	8	13	12	6	10	14	5	11	14	7	12	12	6	10
Teaching abroad	18	10	19	8	6	7	19	9	16	15	9	13	8	5	7
Research															
International scope of research ¹	67	53	63	55	46	52	64	51	60	62	52	59	58	49	55
Do you collaborate with international colleagues? ²	65	40	58	50	31	43	59	38	53	62	38	55	56	35	49
International research funding ³	13	8	11	13	6	11	11	7	9	11	9	9	10	8	9
Coauthored with colleagues located in other (foreign) countries ²	51	28	45	38	21	33	43	24	37	48	22	39	46	27	40
Published in a foreign country ²	69	52	63	60	42	55	66	24	60	66	47	60	67	49	61
Internationalization index															
Int teaching index	1	1	1	0.8	0.8	0.8	1.1	1	1	1	0.9	1	0.8	0.8	0.8
Int research index	2.7	1.9	2.4	2.3	1.6	2.1	2.6	1.8	2.3	2.7	1.8	2.4	2.5	1.8	2.3
Int activity index	3.8	2.8	3.5	3	2.3	2.8	3.6	2.6	3.3	3.6	2.6	3.3	3.2	2.5	3

Source: CAP data, September 2011

¹Responses 1 and 2 on a scale from 1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Not at all agree²Affirmative responses³Means of adjusted percentages of all research external funds

- A larger proportion of the eldest academics has “teaching abroad” experience (16 % vs. 8 % and 7 %, respectively).

As regards research activities, we note that there are two survey items among five items in which a higher proportion of the older group is internationally active: emphasis of research as “international in scope or orientation” and “collaboration with international colleagues” in research. In the case of international collaboration, this result makes sense, because an older academic can be expected to have a broader network in the international academic community. However, there is no significant difference in terms of research funding from international sources across generations. Regarding international publications, we even find that the proportion of international joint publications and publishing abroad by the younger group are both higher than they are for the older group (joint publications: 37 % in the 56 and older group vs. 39 % in 41–55 years and 40 % in up to 40 years; publishing abroad: 60 % in the 56 and older group, 60 % in 41–55 years, and 61 % in up to 40 years).

There are a few countries where some international activities are more frequent among the younger academics. More frequent international publishing on the part of the younger academics is most pronounced in four countries, and the respective figures for international joint publications actively, in the three age groups, respectively, are 35, 43, and 51 % for Australia; 43, 44, and 45 % for Japan; 35, 41, and 57 % for Korea; and 35, 37, and 45 % for Mexico. These figures cannot be explained merely by a historic trend of internationalization, but, rather, by *policies* in these countries that place a stronger emphasis specifically on international publication activities.

Further, Table 10.2 shows that fewer academics in emerging countries are internationally active in the area of research than academics in advanced countries. Interestingly, such a difference does not exist in the area of teaching. As the international activity index covers both research and teaching, fewer academics in emerging countries are internationally active, overall, than the academics in advanced countries. But again, we note, both in advanced countries and in emerging countries, that senior academics are more internationally active in research overall than junior academics. We note that this senior-junior gap holds true – viewed on average across countries – for more or less all of the dimensions of international activities addressed in the CAP study. The only exception is research funding, which is reported as often by junior academics as by senior academics.

Finally, we note that the generational gap in academics’ international activities varies among countries. At universities, often, the difference is more striking among economically advanced countries of the West and is smaller in some emerging countries as well as some Asian countries, but there is not any consistent pattern. By and large, we can assume that academics at economically advanced countries were already on the move toward internationalization some while ago, while this is a more recent phenomenon in some of the emerging countries.

10.5 Foreign Language Use

The use of foreign language is often viewed as an indicator of internationalization. However, with contrasting views, a clear distinction has to be made between the use of a lingua franca and a foreign language not known, more or less, globally. Within the framework of this chapter, we define *foreign language use* according to three perspectives. First, a language is considered foreign if it is different from respondents' first language or mother tongue. This is the case for analyses addressing respondents' biographies. Second, a language is considered foreign if it is different from the dominant language used in the country where respondents work. Third, a language is considered foreign if it is different from the language being used at respondents' current institution.

First, academics participating in the CAP survey have been asked to state whether the prime language they use in teaching and research differs from their first language. The left part of Table 10.3 shows that the proportion of academics in both statuses employing another language is more or less identical across countries. Twenty-one percent each of senior and junior academics employ another language in teaching as well as 46 % vs. 45 % in research. The right part of Table 10.3, however, provides a different picture with regard to the respondents' age. A higher proportion of young academics use a language different from their first language both in research and teaching. Among young academics, the respective proportions are 21 % as compared to 15 and 17 % in regard to teaching and 45 % as compared to 40 and 41 % with regard to research.

Second, Table 10.4 shows the proportion of academics stating that they use a foreign language, according to our second definition, in teaching as well as in research. Slightly more senior academics than junior academics use a foreign language for purposes of teaching and research. As the first three lines in the left part of Table 10.4 indicate, the respective proportion varies slightly by the respondents' status (59 vs. 56 %). Looking at the individual countries, we note that foreign language use is most widely spread among academics in the Netherlands (mostly about 40–50 %). In contrast, the use of foreign language in teaching is rare in the Latin American countries surveyed.

Looking at the right part of Table 10.4, we also note that the youngest group of respondents uses a foreign language more than the two elder groups. For instance, in Japan and Korea, the younger generation at universities uses foreign languages to a higher proportion than that of the older generation. In both countries, efforts have been made to recruit junior academics who have demonstrated an international capacity in their research and teaching activities. As well, universities encourage academics to teach their classes in English while at the same time strive to recruit more foreign students.

In the two tables above, foreign language is defined as different from respondents' first language or as different from the predominant language used in a country.

Table 10.3 Percent of academics in universities using foreign language (different from first language) in teaching and research by status and age, 2007–2008

	Status						Age								
	Seniors			Juniors			56 and older			41–55 years			Up to 40 years		
	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All
In teaching	20	20	21	21	20	21	17	24	15	19	21	17	23	20	21
In research	48	42	46	47	41	45	43	39	40	46	41	41	53	46	45

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Question F11/12: Which languages do you primarily employ in teaching/research?

Table 10.4 Percent of academics in universities using foreign language (different from the dominant language being used at a current country) in teaching and research by status and age, 2007–2008

	Status						Age								
	Seniors			Juniors			56 and older			41–55 years			Up to 40 years		
	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All
Teaching and research	27	9	21	19	7	16	24	7	19	25	8	18	19	7	15
Teaching only	3	4	4	3	7	4	4	4	4	3	5	3	3	5	5
Research only	32	38	34	38	31	36	33	36	34	34	37	37	40	40	42
Neither	38	49	41	40	55	44	39	53	43	38	50	42	38	48	38

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Question F11/12: Which languages do you primarily employ in teaching/research?

However, these criteria don't consider the ordinary language being used in academics' working environment. Therefore, we used the third definition of foreign language as a language different from the one in use at their current institution. In the framework of the CAP survey, the respondents have also been asked whether they use a language different from the language of instruction at their current institution in their teaching and publication activities. We do not know whether the respondents use one or more foreign languages. We also do not know whether they use the foreign language only occasionally or regularly and whether they use it in part of their courses and publications or in all of their courses and publications. The academics have been asked just to state whether they use foreign languages with respect to the two named activities.

As the left part of Table 10.5 shows, compared to junior academics, a higher proportion of senior academics make predominant use of foreign languages (32 vs. 28 %). In contrast, as the right part of Table 10.5 indicates, we do not note any major differences in terms of the predominant use of a foreign language between age groups.

10.6 International Biography and International Activities: A Similar Link Across Generations?

In other chapters of this volume, evidence has been provided that academics who are migrants, and those who have been mobile in their careers, are more likely to undertake international academic activities and to use foreign languages in their academic activities. In the subsequent section of this chapter, we examined whether higher involvement in international academic work is more pronounced among senior or junior academics and among older or younger academics. Actually, this analysis is based on the hypothesis that differences in international engagement are greater among senior and elder academics than among junior and younger academics. While in the past, international academic activities might have been motivated primarily by individual factors, nowadays international academics' activities might be more often perceived as a "must" for all ambitious academics. In order to examine these similarities and differences across generations, we have simplified the outcome variable: the five categories of migrant and mobile academics were aggregated into a single category. Thus, we compare how international academic activities of "mobile" and "non-mobile" academics differ by status and age.

Table 10.6 shows the expected result that a higher proportion of internationally mobile academics are internationally active than those who had not been mobile. There are differences with respect to emphasizing international perspectives in teaching and in research, as well. The differences are large with respect to teaching abroad, collaboration with international colleagues, and publishing.

While we note that professors are more active internationally than junior staff overall, when we factor in as well differences according to international mobility, we note that these gaps in international activities between mobile vs. non-mobile

Table 10.5 Percent of academics in universities using predominant language other than current institution language(s) in teaching and publications by status and age, 2007–2008

	Status						Age								
	Seniors			Juniors			56 and older			41–55 years			Up to 40 years		
	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All	Advanced countries	Emerging countries	All
Teaching and publications	9	2	7	8	2	6	8	3	5	9	2	4	10	1	5
Teaching (only)	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Publications (only)	27	11	24	23	17	21	26	15	24	26	18	22	30	22	23
Neither	63	85	68	68	80	72	65	81	70	64	79	73	59	76	71

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Question C4: During the current (or previous) academic year, are you teaching any courses in a language different from the language of instruction at your current institution? Question D5: Have you ever published your research in a different language from your current institution in last 3 years?

Table 10.6 Percent and index scores of international biography and international activities of academics in universities by status, 2007–2008

Status	Seniors						Juniors					
	Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All	
	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile
Teaching												
International content/ perspectives infused teaching	73	62	76	68	75	65	68	57	61	56	65	57
Currently, most of your graduate students are international	19	12	6	7	13	10	16	9	12	8	14	9
Teaching abroad	21	17	17	6	19	12	11	7	10	3	11	5
Research												
International scope of research ¹	73	66	62	58	68	62	63	57	50	52	57	55
Do you collaborate with international colleagues? ²	72	63	58	25	65	44	60	52	37	21	49	37
International research funding ³	26	22	22	11	24	12	19	20	17	10	18	15
Coauthored with colleagues located in other (foreign) countries ²	53	46	39	14	46	30	47	37	34	14	41	26
Published in a foreign country ²	73	64	66	41	70	53	71	61	56	37	64	49
Internationalization index												
Int teaching index	1.2	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.2	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.8
Int research index	3.0	2.6	2.6	1.6	2.8	2.1	2.7	2.3	2.0	1.4	2.4	1.9
Int activity index	4.1	3.5	3.5	2.4	3.8	3.0	3.5	3.0	2.7	2.1	3.1	2.6

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Note: Mobile=Migrant+ Mobile academics; Non-mobile=Non-mobile academics

¹Responses 1 and 2 on a scale from 1=Strongly agree to 5=Not at all agree

²Affirmative responses

³Means of adjusted percentages of all research external funds

academics are greater among professors than among junior academics. A closer look reveals that the greater gaps in international activities between mobile vs. non-mobile academics at the senior ranks hold true only for academics in emerging countries. The gap is most striking with respect to joint publications with academics from other countries, acquisition of international research funds, and teaching abroad.

By contrast, these mobile vs. non-mobile gaps are more or less the same in the various age groups. However, these gaps are consistently greater among academics in emerging countries than among academics in advanced countries (Table 10.7).

Thus, our hypothesis suggesting greater gaps attributable to mobility among senior academics is called into question completely with respect to academics in advanced countries. It is also called into question with respect to the age of academics in emerging countries, while it is confirmed only with respect to rank in emerging countries. In sum, while mobility and international experience matter substantially for involvement in international activity of university professors in emerging countries, the gap in international activities between mobile vs. non-mobile academics is considerably smaller for junior academics in emerging countries. It might be noted here that international activities are especially rare among academics in China who had not been mobile in their career.

The use of foreign language, defined as a language different from that predominantly employed in the current working institution, is not consistently related to international mobility and experience. This might be explained by the fact that foreign language use in teaching and research predominantly means the use of English as a lingua franca and the use of English as a language is influenced by many factors. For example, it is more frequently used in smaller countries than in larger countries, more frequently in former British colonies and less frequently in Latin American countries, more frequently in science and engineering than in humanities and social sciences.

Table 10.8 shows, however, that mobile scholars at universities, both in advanced and emerging countries, more often employ a foreign language in teaching. In contrast, only mobile scholars in advanced countries employ a foreign language less frequently than non-mobile scholars. Altogether, Tables 10.8 and 10.9 do not indicate any major difference by status and age group of the respondents.

The findings are completely different as regards the *use of a language different from one's mother tongue*. In this respect, as Tables 10.10 and 10.11 show, mobility is associated with more frequent employment of a foreign language almost consistently among all status and age groups in both advanced and emerging countries. There is only one exception: elder non-mobile academics from advanced countries employ a language foreign to them in research as often as their mobile peers of the same age group.

Altogether, we note that a higher proportion of junior academic staff than of professors and a higher proportion of relatively young than of elder academics use a language foreign to them in teaching and research. But as far as the use of a foreign language is concerned, mobile and non-mobile academics do not differ substantially according to their status and age group.

Table 10.7 Percent and index scores of international biography and international activities of academics in universities by age, 2007–2008

	Over 56						41–55						Up to 40					
	Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All	
	Non-Mobile	mobile	Non-Mobile	mobile	Non-Mobile	mobile	Non-Mobile	mobile	Non-Mobile	mobile	Non-Mobile	mobile	Non-Mobile	mobile	Non-Mobile	mobile	Non-Mobile	mobile
Teaching																		
International content/ perspectives infused teaching	73	61	72	68	73	65	73	62	69	66	71	64	66	56	67	61	67	59
Currently, most of your graduate students are international	19	12	3	6	11	9	17	11	8	7	13	9	18	9	12	8	15	9
Teaching abroad	22	17	15	7	19	12	17	14	15	7	16	11	11	7	11	2	11	5
Research																		
International scope of research ¹	71	65	55	46	63	56	68	62	59	54	64	58	67	59	56	58	62	59
Do you collaborate with international colleagues? ²	65	54	59	30	62	42	68	62	51	28	60	45	66	56	41	18	54	37
International research funding ³	26	19	21	10	24	15	24	24	20	12	22	18	21	19	20	10	21	15
Coauthored with colleagues located in other (foreign) countries ²	41	39	38	18	40	29	52	44	35	15	44	30	54	42	42	12	48	27
Published in a foreign country ²	68	58	59	46	64	52	74	63	64	40	69	52	74	66	61	37	68	52
Internationalization index																		
Int teaching index	1.2	0.9	1	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.1	0.9	1.1	0.9	1	0.8	1	0.8	1	0.8
Int research index	2.7	2.3	2.4	1.5	2.6	1.9	2.9	2.6	2.4	1.5	2.7	2.1	2.9	2.5	2.3	1.5	2.6	2
Int activity index	3.8	3.2	3.2	2.3	3.5	2.8	3.9	3.4	3.3	2.3	3.6	2.9	3.8	3.1	3.1	2.2	3.5	2.7

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Note: Mobile = Migrant + Mobile academics; Non-mobile = Non-mobile academics

¹Responses 1 and 2 on a scale from 1 = Strongly agree to 5 = Not at all agree²Affirmative responses³Means of adjusted percentages of all research external funds

Table 10.8 Percent of academics using another language than that of the respondents' university in teaching and publications by international biography and status, 2007–2008

	Seniors						Juniors					
	Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All	
	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile
Teaching and research	23	25	14	6	19	16	17	17	10	6	14	12
Teaching only	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	8	6	6	5
Research only	26	37	44	43	35	40	35	45	29	32	32	39
Neither	48	35	38	48	43	42	44	34	52	55	48	45

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Note: Mobile = Migrant + Mobile academics; Non-mobile = Non-mobile academics

Question C4: During the current (or previous) academic year, are you teaching any courses in a language different from the language of instruction at your current institution? Question D5: Have you ever published your research in a different language from your current institution in last 3 years?

Table 10.9 Percent of academics using another language than that of the respondents' university in teaching and publications by international biography and age group, 2007–2008

	Over 56						41–55						Up to 40					
	Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All	
	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile
Teaching and Publication	21	22	10	4	16	13	22	22	14	6	18	14	19	20	11	6	15	13
Teaching only	4	4	2	3	3	4	3	3	7	3	5	3	4	3	6	8	5	6
Publications only	27	36	40	39	34	38	29	39	41	40	35	40	36	48	35	37	36	43
Neither	49	39	49	54	49	47	46	37	38	52	42	45	42	28	49	50	46	39

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Note: Mobile = Migrant + Mobile academics; Non-mobile = Non-mobile academics

Question C4: During the current (or previous) academic year, are you teaching any courses in a language different from the language of instruction at your current institution? Question D5: Have you ever published your research in a different language from your current institution in last 3 years?

Table 10.10 Percent of academics using a foreign language (different from mother tongue) in teaching and research by international biography and status, 2007–2008

	Seniors						Juniors					
	Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All	
	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile
Teaching	35	9	37	6	36	8	38	10	55	16	47	13
Research	52	44	62	20	57	32	57	48	67	29	62	39

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Note: Mobile = Migrant + Mobile academics; Non-mobile = Non-mobile academics

Question F11/12: Which languages do you primarily employ in teaching/research? (% reporting “other than native language”)

Table 10.11 Percent of academics using a foreign language (different from mother tongue) in teaching and research by international biography and age, 2007–2008

	Over 56						41–55						Up to 40					
	Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All	
	Non-Mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	
Teaching	27	8	33	8	30	8	36	8	41	8	39	8	43	13	58	14	51	14
Research	42	41	50	27	46	34	54	42	62	23	58	33	63	55	73	25	68	40

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Note: Mobile = Migrant + Mobile academics; Non-mobile = Non-mobile academics

Question F11/12: Which languages do you primarily employ in teaching/research? (% reporting “other than native language”)

10.7 Do International Biographies and International Activities Matter Similarly Across Generations?

As a final step in the analysis, we aim to establish whether international mobility and migration as well as international academics' activities – including the use of foreign languages – have a different impact on the general views and activities of the academic profession according to the academics' status and age. For this purpose, we selected a few important aspects of the general views and activities addressed in the survey on the changing academic profession. The findings are reported in Tables 10.12 and 10.13.

First, mobile academics state more often than non-mobile academics that they have a preference for research rather than for teaching. This gap, however, is smaller among junior academic staff and younger academic staff than among older and senior cohorts.

Second, a similar difference is not confirmed in the actual allocation of working time. On average, mobile and non-mobile academics hardly differed in the percentage of time allocated to research and to teaching respectively. There is an exception, however. Older and more senior academics that are mobile from emerging countries spend a somewhat smaller proportion of their time on teaching.

Third, we note that mobile academics state more frequently pronounced attitudes than non-mobile academics. Notably, they not only underscore more strongly the international aspects of their teaching, but they also point out more frequently the need for vigilance in preventing student cheating and a meritocratic approach, i.e., underscoring that their grading is totally achievement oriented. In this respect, we do not note any substantial difference between university professors and junior academic staff, but wider gaps between the mobile and the non-mobile academics according to age: the gap is widest within the youngest group and smallest within the eldest group.

Fourth, mobile academics emphasize original research more strongly, while non-mobile academics advocate the social relevance of research somewhat more strongly. The gap in the emphasis on original research is wider, the younger the academics are, whereas no corresponding difference can be observed between university professors and junior academic staff.

Fifth, we compared the number of articles published by mobile and non-mobile academics in the most recent 3 years. The data suggest that mobility does not affect academic productivity. In the senior group, productivity is the same for both mobile and non-mobile academics, and in the junior group, the productivity of the non-mobile group is even higher than that of the mobile group. Senior academics publish more than junior academics, but within the career ranks, no differences can be found between mobile and non-mobile academics.

Sixth, we note that mobile academics altogether show a slightly higher commitment to their academic discipline, department, and institution, but this difference is marginal in some institutions, and the reverse is true in some instances as well. For example, mobile junior academics in advanced countries consider themselves

Table 10.12 Academics' general views and activities, mean number of publications, and mean index score by international biography and status (percentages), 2007–2008

	Seniors						Juniors					
	Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All	
	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile	Mobile	Non-mobile
Academic preference												
Primarily teaching	3	5	5	10	4	8	6	9	7	11	7	10
In both, but leaning teaching	21	23	27	39	24	31	22	22	40	43	31	33
In both, but leaning research	59	57	58	44	59	51	46	45	47	41	47	43
Primarily in research	17	16	11	7	14	12	25	24	5	6	15	15
Time allocation												
Teaching	38	40	40	47	39	44	41	40	49	51	45	46
Research	32	32	33	30	33	31	36	38	25	28	31	33
Attitudes toward teaching												
Practice-oriented approach	58	55	75	81	67	68	67	64	68	76	68	70
International approach	73	62	76	68	75	65	68	57	61	59	65	58
Value-oriented approach	59	55	68	67	64	61	56	53	68	66	62	60

Honesty approach	72	57	75	75	74	66	70	57	77	70	74	64
Meritocratic approach	83	79	76	53	80	66	74	75	79	53	77	64
Attitudes toward research												
Original research	80	76	69	55	75	66	78	69	71	57	75	63
Application	68	67	79	81	74	74	69	72	79	81	74	77
Integration	63	62	68	71	66	67	62	61	65	72	64	67
Social relevance	57	61	60	68	59	65	55	60	66	67	61	64
Academics' affiliation												
Discipline	90	87	93	88	92	88	88	86	96	88	92	87
Department	66	64	77	77	72	71	65	65	84	79	75	72
Institution	56	56	83	75	70	66	52	55	84	76	68	66
Job satisfaction	69	70	71	66	70	68	59	60	59	58	59	59
Number of publications	10	10	7	7	9	9	5	5	3	4	4	5
Infrastructural support index	4.7	4.4	3.7	3.7	4.2	4.1	4.7	4.4	3.3	3.4	4	3.9

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Note: Attitudes toward teaching and research refer to the percentage of academics who strongly agree and agree

Table 10.13 Academics' general views and activities, mean number of publications, and mean index score by international biography and age (percentages), 2007–2008

	Over 56						41–55						Up to 40					
	Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All		Advanced		Emerging		All	
	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile	Non-Mobile	Non-mobile
Academic preference																		
Primarily teaching	9	9	5	15	7	12	5	8	6	10	6	9	2	4	5	10	4	7
In both, but leaning teaching	27	29	31	44	29	37	23	23	32	42	28	33	15	16	35	40	25	28
In both, but leaning research	51	50	54	35	53	43	53	52	54	43	54	48	52	51	52	45	52	48
Primarily in research	13	12	10	6	12	9	18	17	8	6	13	12	32	30	8	6	20	18
Time allocation																		
Teaching	40	41	40	47	40	44	40	41	43	47	42	44	37	36	48	52	43	44
Research	29	31	35	29	32	30	31	31	29	29	30	30	42	44	27	29	35	37
Attitudes toward teaching																		
Practice-oriented approach	59	56	75	85	67	71	63	61	72	81	68	71	64	59	70	76	67	68
International approach	73	61	72	68	73	65	73	62	69	66	71	64	66	56	67	61	67	59
Value-oriented approach	61	58	71	76	66	67	62	57	71	69	67	63	48	45	65	63	57	54

Honesty approach	72	55	76	75	74	65	73	59	75	75	74	67	67	53	77	71	72	62
Meritocratic approach	79	78	81	73	80	76	80	79	76	57	78	68	75	75	78	46	77	61
Attitudes toward research																		
Original research	77	74	68	53	73	64	78	72	69	55	74	64	81	72	70	56	76	64
Application	69	68	73	85	71	77	69	71	80	81	75	76	66	70	79	80	73	75
Integration	66	63	64	68	65	66	63	61	69	70	66	66	61	60	65	74	63	67
Social relevance	58	64	63	68	61	66	59	62	63	66	61	64	51	57	65	68	58	63
Academics' affiliation																		
Discipline	67	86	94	93	81	90	89	87	94	89	92	88	90	88	96	86	93	87
Department	60	65	77	80	69	73	64	63	79	79	72	71	67	66	84	77	76	72
Institution	73	56	84	81	79	69	53	56	83	76	68	66	51	54	85	75	68	65
Job satisfaction	73	70	76	71	75	71	61	63	65	65	63	64	62	63	63	58	63	61
Number of publications	8	8	7	6	8	7	9	9	6	6	8	8	6	5	5	6	6	6
Infrastructural support index	4.8	4.3	4	3.6	4.4	4	4.6	4.2	3	3.4	3.8	3.8	4.8	4.6	3.5	3.6	4.2	4.1

Source: CAP data, September 2011

Note: Mobile = Migrant + Mobile academics; Non-mobile = Non-mobile academics

Note: Attitudes toward teaching and research refer to the percentage of academics who strongly agree and agree

slightly less attached to their higher education institutions than non-mobile junior academics. The picture is even more mixed as regards age. While among the academics of the youngest age group mobility is linked to stronger affiliation in all three respects, the non-mobile elder academics have a stronger affiliation to the discipline and the department than do the mobile elder academics.

Seventh, mobility hardly has any influence on the job satisfaction of academics. Correspondingly, hardly any generational impact can be found in this respect. However, mobile academics of the eldest age group are slightly more often satisfied than non-mobile academics of the eldest age group.

An effect of mobility, i.e., a more positive rating of the infrastructure by those academics who are mobile, is visible to the same extent among senior and junior academics of advanced countries. Moreover, among the eldest academics, those having been mobile are more likely to rate the infrastructure positively, while such a difference cannot be observed regarding the younger academics.

10.8 Concluding Observations

Academic migration and mobility are widely appreciated as an opportunity for individuals to broaden their experience, to increase the international dimension of teaching and research in general, and even as factors contributing to the quality of academic work in general. Analyses in previous chapters have confirmed these assumptions to some extent but have also showed that academic migration and mobility are not consistently beneficial in all those respects.

In this chapter, the question has been raised whether differences between migrant and mobile academics, on the one hand, and non-mobile academics, on the other hand, are similar across generations or show varying patterns across generations. Within this context, we could expect two contrasting generational effects. On the one hand, we could expect *biographic generational* and *status generational* effects. Elder persons have had more opportunities in their life course to be mobile and thus contribute to possibly positive effects of mobility. Moreover, academics in senior positions might have more power, network links, and experience to be mobile and contribute to the beneficial effects of mobility. On the other hand, we could expect *historical generational* effects to overshadow the biographic generational effects and possibly the status effects as well: junior staff and young academics might have been socialized to academic work at a time when being international was more popular than at the time when the currently older academics and those in senior positions have been socialized to academic work. An analysis of the available data might show whether these contrasting factors neutralize each other or whether one might outweigh the other.

In looking at migration and mobility as outcome variables, generally speaking, senior academics' careers appear to be more international than those of junior academics. However, there are substantial variations by country. In addition, these differences exist according to types of mobility. For instance, more young

academics at Malaysian, Norwegian, and Dutch universities show high international mobility experience compared to those in other countries. Also, some countries, including Korea, show high student mobility and PhD mobility despite the fact that the number of immigrants is low.

In regard to international activities, we note a strong positive effect of academic status and a more moderate link between higher age and more frequent international activities. Such a link cannot be found as regards the use of a language other than the language of the country where the university is located. However, young academics are more likely to employ a language different from their native language.

The positive influence of migration and mobility on international activities and foreign language use hardly differs between generations. We note, as most striking, the findings that the gap between mobile vs. non-mobile academics differs more widely among young and junior academics than among elder and senior academics as regards the use of language that is not their native language.

In a minority of aspects examined, migration and mobility are associated with different general views and activities among academics. Indeed, in only a minority of those cases do these differences vary by generation. The most pronounced differences, in that respect, is that mobile academics who are senior and older differ more visibly from mobile academics who are junior and younger academics in terms of a stronger preference for research and less time spent on teaching, in comparison to non-mobile academics.

Thus, overall, generational factors do have an impact on international mobility, international activities, and on the links between mobility, international activities, and general academic activities. Although we need to consider different contexts such as advanced or emerging countries, clearly there are biographic and status generational differences in internationalization.

In the wake of the widespread debate about internationalization, which, for the most part, depicts it as an enormously dynamic trend, we might draw the conclusion that this trend is less dynamic than presumed. We might also conclude that both senior and junior academics as well as both older and younger academics can handle the implications of internationalization so successfully that no substantial status and biographical gaps arise in the majority of the countries addressed in this comparative study.

References

- Bayer, A. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1977). Career age and research-professional activities of academic scientists: Tests of alternative nonlinear models and some implications for higher education faculty policies. *Journal of Higher Education*, 48(3), 259–282.
- Carlsson, G., & Karlsson, K. (1970). Age, cohorts, and generation of generations. *American Sociological Review*, 35(4), 710–718.
- De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalisation of higher education in the United States and Europe*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Enders, J., & de Weert, E. (Eds.). (2004). *The international attractiveness of the academic workplace in Europe*. Frankfurt a.M.: Gerwerkschaft Erziehung und Wissenschaft.

- Enders, J., & de Weert, E. (Eds.). (2009). *The changing face of academic life*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Erikson, E. H. (1959). *Childhood and society*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Evans, C. H. (1995). Faculty development in a changing academic environment. *Academic Medicine*, 70(1), 14–20.
- Katz, D. A. (1973). Faculty salaries, promotion, and productivity at a large university. *American Economics Review*, 63, 469–477.
- Kerr, C. (1990). The Internationalisation of learning and the nationalisation of the purposes of higher education: Two 'Laws in Motion' in conflict? *European Journal of Education*, 25(1), 5–22.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalisation*. Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *Seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.
- Musselin, C. (2005). European academic labor markets in transition. *Higher Education*, 49(2), 135–154.
- Teekens, H., & de Wit, H. (2007). Special issue on the occasion of 10 years of the Journal of Studies in International Education: Challenges and opportunities for the internationalisation of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4).
- Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 48(1), 5–26.
- Teichler, U. (2007). *Die Internationalisierung der Hochschulen*. Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus.
- Teichler, U. (2009). Internationalisation of higher education: European experiences. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10(1), 93–106.
- Teichler, U. (2011). Academic staff mobility. In U. Teichler, I. Ferencz, & B. Wächter (Eds.), *Mapping mobility in European higher education: Volume 1: Overviews and trends* (pp. 115–149). Bonn: Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst.