#### Annex A

#### What the literature tells us about international student mobility

- 1. There is a scattered literature on student migration and mobility, and very few in-depth studies. What does this literature tell us about the eight questions which frame this study (listed in section 1.2)?
- 2. First, ISM has been only partially conceptualised. A first perspective sees students as a subset of skilled migration (Findlay 2002). More precisely, students can be seen as a potential flow of qualified workers, following the hypothesis that mobility as a student will increase the propensity for subsequent mobility. Second, increased student mobility has been seen as a product of globalisation, both generally (increased global flows of goods, capital, people, ideas) and of higher education (Altbach and Teichler 2001; Kwiek 2001). A subset of this approach relates to 'Europeanisation' and the role of mobile, multilingual students/graduates as agents of European integration the new Euro-professionals or, as Favell calls them, 'Eurostars' (Favell 2004; King 2003). A third interpretative strand places ISM within 'youth mobility cultures'. Here, 'going abroad' (to study, travel, do voluntary work, and so on) is motivated less by traditional economic migration factors (to find a job, better income) and more by experiential goals. At a higher conceptual level this fits with the notion of the 'do-it-yourself' biography of the young, post-modern individual (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002).
- 3. Second, global ISM trends are inexorably upward. In an often-quoted figure, UNESCO (1998) estimated that globally there were 1.6 million tertiary-level students studying abroad in 1996. By 2000 this had risen to 1.8 million. It was forecast to grow to 2.8 million in 2010 and 1.5 million in 2025 (Bruch and Barty 1998). A more recent survey (Böhm *et al* 2002) suggests global demand will reach 7.2 million international students in 2025. The four biggest receiving countries (the US, UK, France and Germany, in that order) currently account for 61 per cent of global student mobility. The statistics and published analyses tell us that the UK is a major global player in ISM, but more as a host rather than a sending country. UK trends in outward mobility are upward, but they are increasing more slowly than in most other advanced countries.
- 4. Third, the literature speculates on several determining factors for ISM. In addition to important structural factors such as globalisation and the institutionalisation of student exchanges, other filters have been suggested. In one of the few in-depth anthropological investigations of European students abroad, Murphy-Lejeune characterises them as a 'migratory elite' ready and willing to move, 'open to changes in their environment: language, personal entourage, lifestyle, working style' (2002: 5). Whether mobile students represent an elite among the general population of HEI students is more open to question. Indeed the evidence is contradictory. While the European Commission study on the socioeconomic background of Erasmus students found little support for selectivity (Commission of the European Communities 2000; Teichler and Maiworm 1997: 39-40), the *Euro Student* report concluded the opposite: 'students from low-income families make substantially less use of the opportunities for studying abroad than those from families with higher income' (Schnitzer and Zempel-Gino 2002: 115). This is a question that needs to be resolved.
- 5. At the individual level, choosing to study abroad is found to reflect a range of decision-making influences. One study of student mobility in the EU identified the wish to enhance foreign language skills, career prospects, cultural experience and personal development as the main factors behind student choices; moreover, many students stated that it had 'always' been their wish to study abroad (West *et al* 2001). Such findings are reinforced by several smaller-scale studies on students of varying European nationalities.

- 6. The relevance of prior mobility is also confirmed in the literature. Murphy-Lejeune (2002) advances the concept of 'mobility capital'; her evidence strongly suggests those who go abroad on exchanges and as language assistants have previous experiences of overseas mobility and, often, personal and family histories involving an international dimension. Teichler and Jahr (2001) found students who had already been mobile prior to HE were more likely to be mobile during HE and to be professionally mobile after graduation.
- 7. With regard to Question 5, there is abundant evidence of the benefits of mobility for students. Several longitudinal studies of Erasmus mobility undertaken by Teichler and his colleagues conclude that students see their time abroad as overwhelmingly valuable. Specific benefits tend to mirror the motivations mentioned above: cultural awareness, foreign language proficiency, personal development (Maiworm and Teichler 1996; Maiworm *et al* 1991; Teichler and Maiworm 1994, 1997). A large-scale study on American students abroad reached similar conclusions: students returned intellectually enhanced, with better work habits, and with more empathy for other cultures (Carlson *et al* 1990).
- 8. The specific relationship between ISM and employment has been analysed by Teichler and Jahr (2001) within the framework of the Socrates 2000 Evaluation Study. They found that formerly mobile students are more likely than non-mobile students to be employed abroad and to reach a somewhat higher status in their careers. Analogous findings emerged from questionnaire surveys of matched mobile and non-mobile student samples from a UK university (King and Ruiz-Gelices 2003).
- 9. Barriers to UK student mobility have been identified in the literature, although the evidence base is somewhat speculative. Nevertheless some key studies enable provisional answers for Questions 6, 7 and 8 of our study. In an early study Adia *et al* (1994) highlighted language problems, financial obstacles, entry restrictions and academic recognition issues. The same four barriers were identified in the ADMIT study of five EU countries, including the UK (West *et al* 2001). This study also picked out a range of other obstacles, many of which referred to the institutional domain. Concerns were expressed about academic standards in other EU countries. There were different attitudes to mobility according to the prestige of institutions. Also within the institutional context, lack of support and resources, and lack of information, were seen as important obstacles. The ADMIT study also points to cultural/attitudinal barriers, and notes that study abroad is seen by some as more akin to a 'tourist activity'. Two other problems were highlighted: the lack of opportunities for prospective students to hear about the advantages and positive experiences of studying or working abroad from returning students; and anxieties about the negative impact of grades/degree results (West *et al* 2001: 9).

#### Annex B Research methods

Secti	on	Page
B1	Overview of research instruments	51
B2	Comments on the representativeness of the HEI questionnaire	54
В3	Questionnaire survey methodology	58
B4	Interview questions for students who have spent a period abroad	68
B5	Interview questions for students who have not spent a period abroad	69
B6	Interview survey methodology	70
B7	Questions for staff interviews	71
B8	List of staff interviewees	73

#### Section B1: Overview of research instruments

1. The primary research conducted by the consultants involved a multi-method approach: review of data and literature, statistical analysis of secondary datasets, site visits to selected HEIs, questionnaire surveys to HEIs and students, interviews with students and staff, and focus groups. Employing these different methods enabled us to cross-check findings. In this annex we begin by summarising the different research instruments that were deployed. We then give extra methodological details about each research instrument.

#### Review of existing data

2. An early task in research of this kind is to review and evaluate critically existing data on ISM. This helps us to understand the nature and diversity of ISM, and sets the UK position in an international context. Existing data sources are analysed in Chapter 2. Comparison of one dataset with another is problematic since different definitions exist of 'student', 'higher education' and 'international mobility'. These problems are illustrated in some of the tables in Annex C; they show just how difficult it is for organisations such as the OECD to collate comparative statistics for different countries. Partly as a result of these problems, and partly because of a lack of secondary information on a wide range of ISM issues, the authors, in consultation with the steering group, placed great emphasis on primary research.

#### Questionnaire survey of HEIs

- 3. In September 2003 a short questionnaire was sent to all UK HEIs via the Academic Registrars' Council and by post from HEFCE to heads of all UK HEIs. The survey was designed to gather information on the management and evolution of mobility in each institution. Specific questions asked for a listing of mobility initiatives and trend data by destination country for the years 1994-95, 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03. Data were only requested for mobility initiatives outside Erasmus and British Council schemes, whose data we were able to access by other means.
- 4. By March 2004, 80 HEIs had replied, a return rate of 48 per cent. Annex Table B1 shows that the pattern of return was fairly consistent across the HE sector (pre-1992 universities, post-1992 universities, other HEIs) and across the constituent parts of the UK. Further comments on the representativeness of the survey are in Annex B2.

5. In addition to the questionnaire survey, HEI web-sites were visited to collect non-quantitative data about institutions' mobility links (for examples, see Annex G).

#### Selection of HEIs for site visits

- 6. We undertook site visits to 10 HEIs, selected to reflect the diversity within the UK HE sector. The visits took place during autumn term 2003. Three survey techniques were used: a large-scale student questionnaire survey, face-to-face interviews and focus groups with students, and face-to-face interviews with academics and mobility scheme managers. These three survey instruments are described in the next three subsections.
- 7. Four main criteria guided the choice of HEIs:
- geography: distribution across the UK, including the regions of England
- type of institution: proportionate representation across pre-1992, post-1992 and other (non-university) HEIs, reflecting the fact that pre-1992 universities account for about two-thirds of all student out-mobility
- physical location: a proportionate balance between major city, smaller city and green field campus
   HEI locations
- mobility trends: on the basis mainly of Erasmus data, a mix of large and small outflows, and growing and declining numbers over recent years.
- 8. Since we wish to preserve the anonymity of the HEIs, we refer to them by letter codes from A-K. Out of the 10 HEIs selected, six are in England, two in Scotland and one each in Wales and Northern Ireland. The six English institutions comprise two in the London area, one in the south of England, one in the Midlands and two in the north of England. Seven of the HEIs are pre-1992 universities, two are post-1992 universities and one is a non-university HEI.

#### Questionnaire survey of students

- 9. Two student questionnaires for first and final years were the means of generating quantitative data on student mobility experiences and attitudes. The questionnaires are included in section B3 of this Annex.
- 10. The questionnaires were distributed in lectures and seminars at the 10 HEIs with the collaboration of on-site tutors. They took 8-10 minutes to complete. They were piloted in the authors' own universities before the main survey was undertaken.
- 11. The survey targeted students in three disciplines/departments:
- languages, because of their high engagement with study and work abroad schemes
- geography, because this subject often involves shorter-term trips abroad and because geographers tend to have a broad world-view
- maths as a science subject likely to be present in most institutions.
- 12. The quota was 120 questionnaires per HEI visited: 20 per discipline per year (first and final years only); the total was 1,200 for the 10 HEIs.

13. The method of administering the questionnaires often enabled much larger numbers to be collected, but in order to maintain a balanced sample across years and disciplines we randomly selected 20 per cohort for coding. However, we coded all questionnaires for final-year non-language students who had been mobile. Further details on the survey methodology are provided in section B3.

#### Interviews with students

- 14. Students were interviewed singly or in small focus groups. The aim was to generate complementary, qualitative insights into more or less the same topics covered by the questionnaire, and hence to reinforce the evidence to answer Questions 3-7.
- 15. A total of 140 individual interviews were taken. Focus groups enlarged the total sample of 'student voices' to 180. Interviews and focus groups were taped for subsequent transcription and analysis.
- 16. Interviewees were nearly all final-year students, drawn mainly but not exclusively from the three departments/disciplines in which the questionnaire survey was administered. The interviews were evenly balanced between those who had spent a period abroad during their degree (n=67) and those who had not (n=73). The focus groups, on the other hand, comprised mainly students who had been abroad. One of the purposes of these groups was to learn of the experiences of students who had been on a variety of study or work abroad schemes.
- 17. Two slightly different interview sets of interview questions were used, depending on whether the interviewee had been abroad as a student or not. The schedules are provided in sections B4 and B5 and methodological notes are at section B6.

#### Interviews with academics and 'mobility managers'

- 18. The third survey technique employed during site visits was face-to-face interviews with academic, managerial and administrative personnel. The objective was to find out how mobility is perceived, organised and promoted at the institutional level, taking account of devolved responsibilities for mobility management to departments or schools. We wanted to hear institutions' and key informants' diagnoses of the reasons for the decline of (certain types of) mobility. We also wanted to document examples of good practice in supporting student participation in mobility schemes, especially in HEIs with increased mobility in recent years.
- 19. Four categories of interviewee were targeted:
- the most senior individual in the institution responsible for outward student mobility
- a dean or head of school/department
- a mobility scheme manager within a school or department usually an academic
- an administrative officer responsible for organising student mobility.
- 20. A total of 46 interviews were made across the 10 HEIs. All were taped and transcribed. The interview questions are included in section B7. A list of the persons interviewed is at section B8; we do not give their names, only an indication of their position and function within the institution. Where we quote an interviewee their code (A1, C5 and so on) is given at the end.

#### Section B2: Comments on the representativeness of the HEI questionnaire

- 21. The questionnaire was distributed electronically to registrars in late September 2003. At the same time a letter was sent by HEFCE to all vice-chancellors and principals informing them of the survey and inviting them to participate together with a copy of the questionnaire. A supplementary sheet to the questionnaire provided brief guidance and clarification notes.
- 22. We did not expect a high return rate, especially since we were asking for data that had in many cases never been compiled before. Given this difficulty, many respondents asked for more time to collect the data from different units in their institution. This was readily granted. While the final survey fraction 48 per cent is not very high, the data collected are fairly unique. To the best of our knowledge no such compilation has been achieved before.
- 23. The table shows that the survey fraction was reasonably constant across the three main HEI categories, and by geographical area although in the latter case the pattern is somewhat obscured by the varying sizes of the constituent parts.

#### **Questionnaire return rates**

Type/location of HEI	Total no. of HEIs	No. of returns	Rate of return %
Pre-1992	63	31	49.2
Post-1992	41	21	51.2
Other HEIs	64	28	43.7
Institutional location:			
England	131	65	49.6
Wales	13	5	38.5
Scotland	20	9	45.0
Northern Ireland	4	1	25.0
Total	168	80	47.6

- 24. Some under-representation of Welsh and Northern Irish HEIs is noted, but these account for a small proportion of the UK HE sector in any case. The slight under-representation of 'other HEIs' is unlikely to be a problem since these institutions tend to be smaller than universities and have much less aggregate mobility than the other two categories of HEI.
- 25. We checked whether responding institutions were broadly representative of the size distribution of institutions, in terms of numbers of HE students. This was to counter concerns that responses were biased towards small institutions (which may have easier data accessibility), and away from larger institutions (which would tend to have complex mobility statistics which could be a barrier to filling out the questionnaire). No such bias was revealed. The 47.6 per cent response rate by institution closely matches the share of the aggregate student numbers in the returning institutions compared to the total student population of the HEIs. If the very large Open University (which has very little mobility and which did not return a questionnaire) is included, the student fraction is 44.5 per cent; if it is excluded the figure rises to 48.1 per cent.
- 26. There remains the possibility that the sample of returnees is biased towards institutions with centralised administration of student mobility and away from institutions with decentralised

management (and therefore statistics) of student mobility programmes, regardless of size of institution. We acknowledge that we therefore might be missing some interesting types and destinations of mobility. We think this effect, if it exists, is relatively minor. We say this because many responding institutions, especially the larger ones, do have decentralised records for non-EU mobility schemes. This was apparent from comments accompanying the returned questionnaires and from our site visits.

27. The HEI questionnaire is reproduced here.

2. Management of mobility in your institution:

a) Please state your name and position

1. Name of HEI

## **UK HEIs non-Socrates Student Mobility**

b <sub>i</sub>	ls there a key at	O Yes	O No										
	responsibility for outward student mobility?  If yes, please state name and position												
		1:4.,	O their sole	respo	nsibility	? Or							
C	) Is student mobi	iity				description?							
ď	) Are there separa	ate persons	responsible	for:									
Euro	ppe	O Yes	O No		Othe	r parts of th	e world	O Yes	O No				
Nort	h America	O Yes	O No		If yes	s, please sta	ite where						
	oes your instituti minimum period of		O Yes	O No									
yc	4. Please list the student mobility arrangements/initiatives for study/work abroad (over one month) that your institution is involved in (excluding Socrates/Erasmus exchanges, and the British Council Language Assistant and IAESTE schemes. for which institution-level data is available in the public domain)  a) title of the mobility initiative  b) discipline(s) / course(s) of study involved												
1	1												
2													
3													
4													
5													
6													
7													
8													
(please	(please continue in a separate sheet if necessary)												
re	5. For each of the mobility arrangements listed in Q.4, please supply data on number of students over recent years.  (please state country code stated on the next page)												
	Location (destination	country)	1995/9	6		2000/01	2001	1/02	2002/03				
									55				

1												
0												
2												
3												
Ŭ.												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
		he mobility arrang	ements lis	sted in	Q. 4	t, pleas	se prov	ide infor	mation	on the	follow	ing
	i) At what level does the scheme operate (e.g. Year 2 undergraduate, MA etc)?	ii) What is the normal duration of the period abroad (e.g. 3 months, one year etc)?	iii) Is mobilit or optional f following the degree programme, study?	or students	r r	academi	mobility ir c study at k experier of both?	a foreign	v) Is the credit-be		vi) Is for language learning intrinsic the mob arranger	e an part of ility
1			0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2			0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3			0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4			0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5 6			0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7			0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8			0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0

7.	Does your institution have a strategic plan for student mobility?	O Yes	O No	O Don't Know
	If yes, what, briefly, is it?			
	(please note that by this we do not mean plans for enrolment of overse	as students, bu	ıt a policy for d	overall
	student mobility, especially the outmovement of your own institution's st	tudents)		
_				
8.	Please comment on your institution's views and experiences of st			
	(any comments you make will be used for aggregate analysis only and	wiii not be attri	outea to you o	your
	institution)			
9.	Please use this space to provide any additional information you m	ay consider r	elevant.	
	Please return the completed questionnaire to Professor Russell King, Sussex C	_	ion Research, l	Iniversity of
	Sussex, Brighton BN1 9SH, or by email to Enric Ruiz-Gelices at: e.ruiz-gelices	@sussex.ac.uk		
	We would be most grateful if you could enclose or send us further information r	_	ty schemes at y	our
	institution (brochures, statistical digests, guides for students studying abroad er	tc.)		
	Thank you very much for your help!			

#### Section B3: Questionnaire survey methodology

- 28. The sampling of students in the 10 institutions was stratified in two ways:
- a. The first stratification surveyed first- and final-year undergraduate students. Final-year students were usually third years, but in Scottish universities and on language and other programmes that involved a year spent abroad, they would be fourth years.
- b. The second stratification, designed to ensure spread across the arts and science spectrum while maintaining some subject-area consistency, involved targeting three subject groups, found in many UK HEIs. These were languages, geography and mathematics. Languages were chosen because of their obvious link with study and work abroad schemes. Geography was selected because this subject often involves shorter-term trips abroad and because this discipline is widely represented across social science and arts faculties. Maths was identified as a science subject likely to be present in most institutions.
- 29. Engineering had been the original science choice but at the pilot phase it became apparent that a large share of Engineering students were overseas students rather than of UK origin. While we did not want to ignore the presence of overseas students in UK HEIs, nor overlook their potential participation in further mobility, we wanted to avoid biasing the overall sample towards foreign students.
- 30. In HEIs where degrees in geography or maths were not offered (this applied mainly in the three institutions surveyed that were not pre-1992 universities), we substituted other cognate programmes drawn respectively from the humanities/social sciences and the physical sciences/technology areas. In institutions where single-honours language degrees were not offered, the substitutes were degree programmes involving some compulsory language study, such as international business studies.
- 31. The questionnaire target numbers were 20 per subject per year, hence 1,200 overall, 120 per HEI, 600 first years, 600 final years, and 400 per discipline. We experimented with e-mail circulation during the pilot phase, but rates of return were very low compared to in-class distribution. The latter method was chosen for the main survey.
- 32. Once the fieldwork phase of the survey was completed, the 1,200 questionnaires were coded and analysed using SPSS 10.0. The coding phase revealed a number of issues that could affect interpretation of the results. The most important of these was that some language students went to two host countries during their period abroad. For practical reasons, and because the questions were not adapted for two host countries, we only considered the first country mentioned. Therefore, we have to keep in mind that some students who appear to have gone abroad for one term or semester, spent in reality the whole year abroad.
- 33. Below are the two questionnaires, for first-year and final-year undergraduate students respectively.

Sussex Centre for Migration Research

### STUDENT MOBILITY STUDY 2003 (1st year undergraduate)

1 Life at Present											
1.1 Where do you stay during term-time?											
Parental home	0	Γ	University hall of residence				Flat shari students	ng with friends o	or other	0	
On my own	0		With my partner		0		Other			0	
1.2 How are you financing (Please tick all that apply)	your st	udi	ies?								
O Self-financing		0 1	Parental support	0.0	Grant			0 L	can		
O Other (Please specify)											
1.3 Do you agree with the following statements concerning your socialisation and interaction?  (Please fick one box only in each row)											
Agree Neutral Disagree											
I prefer to socialise with people from my own country											
When I'm with people from other	countrie	sle	ealise how similar we are	•			0	0	0		
1.4 How do you see yours (Rank the 2 most important				- дохез)							
Regional/National			British	European		Wor	rld citizen		Other		
English N. Iri	sh				T		П	Please	apecify below	w)	
Scottish Web	h [										
1.5 How often have you tr	avelled	out	side the UK?								
O Never			O Once	O 2	-5 tim	es		O Mon	e aften		
1.6 Did you take a gap year	r betwe	en	school and universit	ty?		С	) Yes		O No		
1.7 If yes, did you spend r	nore tha	n 3	months of it abroad	1?		C	Yes		O No		
1.8 Which were the main countries visited (for more than three months) during your Gap Year?											
1.9 Has taking a Gap Year influenced your attitude towards spending a period abroad during your university studies?											
O No											
O. Yes, it increased my desire to	O Yes, it increased my desire to undertake study and/or work abroad										
O. Yes, it decreased the likelihoo	d that I v	rouli	d want to study/work abr	oad during my de	gree						

2 Languages											
2.1 Did you participate in a school exchange to another country?  O Yes  All yes, please specify country and approximate length of stay)											
Co	untry				Length of stay eks, months or y	years)					
2.2 Do you speak/write any languag	rate level of command)										
Language (list below)		Speak			Write						
	Excellent Good Basic Excellent Good Basic										
	0	0	- 0	-	0	-					
	0	0	-	0	0	0					
				11 0							
2.3 Do you think universities should give more importance to language teaching?  O Yes definitely O Maybe O No O Don't know											
C residentially	O Yes definitely O Maybe O No O Don't know										
2.4 Do you think schools should give more importance to language teaching?											
O Yes definitely	O Maybe		O No		O Don't	knew					
2.5 Are you learning a language at											
O No O Yes Please specify which on	mt(x)		ls it a new l	anguage?	O No	O Yes					
3 Studying and/or Working	Abroad										
3.1 Have you heard from university abroad during your degree?	staff of the po	ssibility of stu	idying and/o	r working	O Yes	O No					
3.2 Have you heard of the Erasmus	scheme?				O Yes	O No					
3.3 Have you heard of other study a	ind/or work ab	road schemes	:7								
O No O Yes (Please specify v											
3.4 Do you know which countries you (If yes, please state with which countries)		department h	as study and	l/or work agree	ments with?						
O No O Not sure	O No O Not sure O Yes Countries										
3.5 Would you like to spend some time abroad during the remainder of your degree? (If your answer is "No", please skip to question 3.10)											
O Definitely	O Perhaps		O No		○ Don't	know					
3.6. If your answer is "Yes" would t	vou prefer to:										

O Work abroad

O Study abroad

O Mixture of both

3.7 Please state the main reason(s) would like to study and/or work										
3.8 Which country would you like to	o go to?									
3.9 For how long?										
O Less than three months	O One	e semester	(3 to 6 months)	01	Full academic year					
3.10 What are the reasons that would (Tick one box in each row)	d deter you f	rom spen	iding a period abro	ad during your	degree?					
	Very import	tant	Slightly important	Not importa	nt N/A					
Not confident enough with the language	0		0	0	0					
Difficult to leave parental family	0		0	0	0					
Wary of living in another country/culture	0		0	0	0					
I have a boyfriend/girlfriend	0		0	0	0					
Commitment to partner and/or children	0		0	0	0					
Not enough financial means	0		0	0	0					
Studies not recognised	0		0	0	0					
I would have to leave my flat	0		0	0	0					
I would have to leave my job	0		0	0	0					
I would have to prolong my degree	0		0	0	0					
3.11 If you decided to go abroad, do	you think yo	our family	y would support yo	our decision?						
O Yes, including financial help O Yes	es, but not finar	ncially	O No		O Don't know					
3.12 After graduation, could you im	agine living i	n anothe	r country for a yea	r or more?						
O Yes		O No			O Don't know					
3.13 If yes, where would you like to	live (a) and t	for what r	reasons (b)?							
a)			(0).							
b)										
~,										
4 General Information										
4.1 Gender O Female	O Ma	le le								
Tanana Tanana										
4.2 Age										
4.3 What discipline/subjects are yo	.3 What discipline/subjects are you studying?									
4.4 From the point of view of fee st	atus, are you	Home student	O EU student	O Overseas student						
4.5 Do you have a temporary job?										
÷ ::	an 8 hours a w	eek C	8 to 18 hours a w	reek O	More than 18 hours a week					
4.6 What is your mother tongue? (If you're bilingual, please specify in w	hich languages	)								
4.7 What is your nationality? (If you have dual nationality, please if	of Boffi)									

4.8 What is your ethnic origin/herit	tage? (Please lick ONE	ONEY)							
O White – UK/Irish	O Indian		0.0	Other Asian					
O White European	O Pakistani		0.0	Black – Carib	bean				
O White Other	O Bangladeshi		0.6	Black – Africa	en				
O Mixed Race	O Chinese		0.6	Slack Other					
If you belong to another ethnic group, pleas	e specify								
4.9 Do you have a disability?	O Yes	0	No	]					
4.10 Please list any countries you h	ave lived in for a peri	od longer t	than 6 mo	nths, with	approxin	nate dates:			
4.11 What is your parents' nationali	ty?	Mother			Father				
4.12 What is your parents' postcode sector? (e.g. DD15 or BN7) (If your parents live abroad, leave blank)									
4.13 Do your parents have Universit	ty-level education?								
O Yes, my mother	Yes, my father		O Both			O None of them			
4.14 Which of the following categor (in the relevant box, please write M (			occupati	on?					
Skilled Manual	Profession	al/Teacher			Retired				
Non-skilled Manual	☐ Housewife	/Househusba	and		Student				
Sales Person/Representative	Director/Pr	artner			Unemplo	yed			
Clerical/Admin	Manager			Othe (Please se					
4.15 Can your parents communicate in any language other than their mother tongue?  (Please specify the languages they can communicate in)									
Mother	O Don't know	Father				O Don't know			

Your answers to this questionnaire will be used for aggregate analysis only: full confidentiality and anonymity are thus assured. The research is sponsored by HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for England) which retains copyright over the aggregate data you have kindly contributed to by filling out this questionnaire.

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire. If you would like to comment on any of the issues raised in this questionnaire, please contact Enric Ruiz-Gelices on: e.ruiz-gelices@sussex.ac.uk

Sussex Centre for Migration Research

# STUDENT MOBILITY STUDY 2003 (3rd / Final year undergraduate)

1	Life at Prese	ent										
1.1	1.1 Where do you stay during term-time?											
	Parental home O University hall of residence O Flat sharing with friends or other students											
	On my own		0	With my partr		Other			0			
1.2	1.2 How are you financing your studies? (Please tick all that apply)											
	O Self-financing O Parental support O Grant O Loan											
	O Other		(Please sp	ecify)								
1.3	Do you agree w (Please tick one bo			statements concern	ing your s	ociali	isati	ion and into	eraction	n?		
								Agree	Ne	eutral	Disag	ree
I pre	fer to socialise with p	people from	m my own	country				0		0	0	
Whe	n I'm with people fro	om other co	ountries I :	realise how similar we a	re			0		0	0	
1.4				s of your identity? 1 and 2 in the appropria	te boxes)							
	Regional/Na	ational		British	Europe	an	Т	World citi	zen		Other	
Eng	glish 🔲 r	N. Irish		п	П		T	П		(Please	specify be	iow)
Sco	ttish 🔲	Welsh					$\perp$					
1.5	How often have	you trav	relled ou	tside the UK?								
	O Never			O Once	٥	2-5	time	s		O More	often	
1.6	Did you take a g	gap year	betweer	school and univers	ity?			O Yes	nq		O No wered Wo 21, next a	
1.7	If yes, did you s	spend mo	ore than	3 months of it abroa	id?			O Yes		0	No	
1.8 Which were the main countries visited (for more than one month) during your Gap Year?												
1.9 Did taking a Gap Year influence your attitude towards spending a period abroad during your university studies?												
O No												
0 Y	es, it increased my	desire to u	indertake	study and/or work abros	ıd							
0.1		Discouling a set	#h -4 1	Advanced to advantage or de-								

2	Languages									
2.1	Did you participate in a s country?	chool exchange to a	nother		count	O Ye es, please ry and app ength of s	specify proximat		0 N	0
		Country					0		ngth of stay , months or y	years)
2.2	command)									
	Language (list below) Speak Write									
			Excell	ent	Good	Basic	Ex	cellent	Good	Basic
				+	0	0	+	0	0	0
			<u> </u>	-	0	0	-	0	0	0
			<u> </u>	+	0	0	+	0	0	0
					0	0		0	0	0
2.3	Do you think universities	should give more i	mportance	to lang	guage t	eaching	?			
	O Yes definitely	O Maybe			0.1	lo			O Don't kn	w
2.4	Do you think schools sh	ould give more impo	ortance to I	languag	ge teac	hing?				
	O Yes definitely	O Maybe			0 N	io	$\neg$		O Don't kno	3W
2.5	Have you learnt a langua	ge at university?								
		y which one(s)			ls it a	new lang	guage?		O No	O Yes
3	Studying and/or Wo	orking Abroad								
3.1	Have you heard from univ	versity staff of the po	ossibility o	f study	ing and	l/or work	king ab	road d	uring your	degree?
	O Yes	O No	T							
3.2	Have you heard of the Er	asmus scheme?				) Yes			O No	
3.3	Have you heard of other	study and/or work a	broad scho	emes?						
_	No O Yes (Please									
3.4	Has your university depa	rtment promoted str	udy and/or	work a	broad?	,				
	,	but not enough	0 N							
3.5	Do you know which coun	tries your university	departme	nt has	agreem	ents wit	h?			
0	No O Not sure O Ye	1								
3.6	3.6 Has your department organised any short study visits abroad of less than a term of duration?  (e.g. a fieldtrip, reading party etc.)									
	O No O Yes (please		ce.							
	O No O Yes (please specify): Type of study Location									
3.7	3.7 Have you studied or done a work placement abroad during your degree for a term or longer?									
		Yes					O No			

3.8 Do you regret not having spent time abroad during your university studies?											
O Yes			(if you an	swered "N	O Ni lo" to this	o : question, move	to 9.11)				
3.9 If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, would you have preferred to:											
O Study abroad	O Study abroad O Work abroad O Mixture of both										
3.10 How long would you have liked to study and/or work abroad?											
O Less than three months O One semester (3 to 6 months) O Full academic year											
3.11 What are the reasons that have deterred you from spending a period abroad during your degree?  (Tick one box in each row)											
Very important Slightly important Not important N/A											
Not confident enough with the language	0		0			0	0				
Difficult to leave parental family	0		0			0	0				
Wary of living in another country/culture	0		0			0	0				
I have a boyfriend/girffriend	0		0			0	0				
Commitment to partner and/or children	0		0			0	0				
Not enough financial means	0		0			0	0				
Studies not recognised	0		0			0	0				
I would have to leave my flat	0		٥			0	0				
I would have to leave my job	0		0			0	0				
I would have to prolong my degree	0		٥			0	0				
Insufficient information on possibilities to go abroad	0		0			0	0				
3.12 If you had decided to go abroad, do you	ı think your fa	amily v	would hav	e suppor	ted you	ur decision?					
O Yes, including financial help O Yes, but no	t financially		0 1	lo		O Don	't know				
3.13 How do you think a period of study and	Vor work abro	oad mi	ght benefi	t you in 1	the follo	owing terms:					
				Y	05	Not certain	No				
I feel my foreign language skills would develop cons	iderably			(	)	0	0				
It would be good from the viewpoint of my personal	growth			-	)	0	0				
It would be interesting to immerse myself in a differe	nt culture				)	0	0				
It would enhance my general career prospects				(	)	0	0				
3.14 Do you intend to take a gap year abroa	d after gradua	ating?		O Ye	s	O No	O Don't know				
3.15 After graduation, could you imagine liv	ing in anothe	r coun	try for a ye	ear or me	ore?						
O Yes	0	No				O Don't kno	w				
3.16 If yes, where would you like to live (a) and for what reasons (b)?											
a)											
bj											

If you answered Questions 3.8 – 3.16, please ignore section 4 and move to section 5

4 Mobility Experience (only)	for completion by t	hose who	have s	tudied o	r worked	abroad for	a ter	m or longer)
4.1 Please name the host country and the	he duration of you	ur period	of stu	dy/work	abroad			
Host country	Duration (e.g. 0	Oct. 2002 -	- June 2	003				
4.2 What kind of experience was it?								
O Erasmus exchange O Other	(Please specify)							
4.3 Please state your two main reasons to study and/or work abroad								
4.5 Flease state your two main reasons	to study androi v	OIN MUIT	POM					
4.4 Can you briefly explain why you went to this country?								
4.5 Do you agree with the following stat	tements concerni	ng social	aspec	ts of yo	ur perio	d abroad?		
I mainly socialised with people from the host co	ountry		0.	Yes			01	No.
Most of my friends there were from my home of	ountry		0.	Yes			01	No
I tended to socialise mainly with other foreign s	tudents		0,	Yes			01	No
4.6 From your point of view now, to wh regard to the following? (Tick one both		consider	your p	eriod o	f study/v	vork abroad	d wo	rthwhile with
		Extrer		Wort	hwhile	Slightly worthwhil	e	Not at all worthwhile
Enhancement of my academic and professiona	l knowledge	0			0	0		0
Relevance to my general career prospects		0		0		0		0
Relevance to my potential for developing an int	lemational career	0			0	0		0
Foreign language proficiency		0			0	0		0
Knowledge and understanding of another cour	ntry	0			0	0		0
Maturity and personal development		0			0	0		0
New ways of thinking about my home country		0		0		0		0
4.7 How problematic were the following	issues in decidir	g to stu	dy and/	or work	abroad	?		
	Very problematic	Sligh	tly probl	lematic	Not Pr	oblematic		N/A
Not confident enough with the language	0		0			0		0
Difficult to leave parental family	0		0			0		0
Wary of living in another country/culture	0	+	0			0		٥
I have (had) a boyfriend/girlfriend	0		0			0		0
Commitment to partner and/or children	0	+	0			0		0
Not enough financial means	0	+	0			0		0
Studies not recognised	0	+	0			0		0
I had to leave my flat	0	+	_ 0			0		
I had to leave my job	0	+-	0			0		0
I had to prolong my degree	0		0			0		0
4.8 In retrospect, and all things conside	red, how satisfied	d are you	with y	our per	iod abro	ad?		
O Very satisfied O Satisfied O Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied O Dissatisfied O Very dissatisfied								
4.9 Do you have any other comments ye	ou wish to make?							

5	General Information										
5.1	Gender		0	Female	0	Male	]				
5.2	Age						]				
5.3	What discipline/subjects are yo	u studying?									
5.4	From the point of view of your	fee status, ar	e you:	0	Home s	tudent		EU stu	dent	00	verseas student
5.5	5.5 Do you have a temporary job?										
0	None O Less than 8 ho	ours a week		0	8 to 18	hours a	week	O M	ore than	18 ho	urs a week
5.6	What is your mother tongue? (	f you're bilingu	il, pleas	se specit	y in wh	ich langs	(ages)				
5.7	What is your nationality? (# you	have dual nati	oneity,	piease l	ist both)						
5.8	What is your ethnic origin/herit	age? (Please	tick ON	E OWLY	)						
o w	hite – UK/Irish	O Indian					0.0	ther Asia	en .		
o w	hte European	O Pakistani					OB	lack – Ca	aribbean		
OW	hite Other	O Banglade	shi				ОВ	lack – Af	rican		
OM	ixed Race	O Chinese					ОВ	lack Oth	er		
If you	u belong to another ethnic group, pleas	e specify									
5.9	5.9 Do you have a disability? O Yes O No										
5.10	Please list any countries you h	ave lived in f	or a pe	eriod lo	nger ti	han 6 n	nonths	, with a	pproxin	nate d	lates
5.11	What is your parents' nationali	ty? Moth	er				Fat	her			
5.12	What is your parents' postcode (if your parents live abroad, leave bit		. DD15	or BN	7)						O N/A
5.13	Do your parents have Universit	y-level educ	ation?								
0	Yes, my mother O Yes	s, my father		0	Both				Neith	er of th	nem
5.14	Which of the following categori (In the relevant box, please write M (				rents'	occup	ation?				
	Skilled Manual	Profes	sional/T	eacher				Retired			
	Non-skilled Manual	☐ House	wife/Ho	usehusb	and			Student			
	Sales Person/Representative	Directo	r/Partn	er				Unemple	oyed		
	Clerical/Admin Manager Other (Please specify)										
5.15	Can your parents communicate (Please specify the languages they co			ther th	an thei	ir moth	er tong	jue?			
Moth		O Don't k	_	Fathe	-					T	O Don't know
_		-			_					_	

Your answers to this questionnaire will be used for aggregate analysis only: full confidentiality and anonymity are thus assured. The research is sponsored by HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for England) which retains copyright over the aggregate data you have kindly contributed to by filling out this questionnaire.

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire. If you would like to comment on any of the issues raised in this questionnaire, please contact Enric Ruiz-Gelices on: e.ruiz-gelices@sussex.ac.uk

#### Section B4: Interview questions for students who have spent a period abroad

#### 1. Pre-university international experience

- Have you had any experience of living, studying or working abroad before coming to university?
   If so, to what extent was this an influential factor in your decision to go abroad as part of your degree? Were you there as part of an organised programme?
- Were you encouraged to study abroad by your school teachers? How about your family?
- Were you encouraged to learn a foreign language by your school teachers? How about your family?
- Did you take a Gap Year abroad between school and university? If so, where did you go? How long were you abroad? Did you organise it yourself? Did you seek assistance from any particular organisation? How did you finance it? Did you work while abroad?

#### 2. Studying/working abroad

- Did you sign up for a degree with a mandatory period of study/work abroad?
- What made you decide to spend some time abroad as part of your degree?
- Did you decide so before coming to university?
- How did you first hear about the possibility to study/work abroad?
- What were the main factors that triggered your decision to spend part of your studies abroad?
- How did you finance your period abroad?
- Have the courses you took been recognised and credited as part of your degree?
- If you were abroad on a work placement, has this been recognised and credited as part of your degree?
- What were the main problems, if any, you encountered in planning you period abroad?; and once there? How do you think these could be ameliorated?
- How would you evaluate the assistance you received from your home institution?; and from your host institution?
- What do you perceive to have been the main benefits of spending time abroad?
- What were your main expectations when you planned going abroad? Have these been fulfilled so far?
- If you had had the possibility, would you have stayed there longer?

#### 3. Life at university

- Do you often socialise with students from other countries?
- Do you keep in touch with friends made during your period of study/work abroad?
- Do you live with any international students?

#### 4. Foreign languages

- Did you study any foreign languages prior to university? (at school? private lessons?)
- Have you studied a foreign language as part of your degree?
- Had you studied the language of your host country before you went there?
- To what extent was improving your foreign language skills important in your decision to go abroad?

#### 5. Post-graduation plans

- What are you planning to do when you graduate?
- Do you intend to take a Gap Year after graduating?
- Have you considered studying/working abroad after graduating?
- Are you aware of any schemes to spend time studying/working abroad at post-graduation level?
- How do you think the period abroad will reflect in your future career moves?
- · Would you consider moving abroad to live and work? Where? Why?
- How do you think your career might compare with students who have not been abroad?

#### 6. General questions

- There is some concern about the declining numbers of students participating in study/work abroad initiatives – why do you think most students decide not to take advantage of the opportunities available?
- What do you think should be done so that more students would spend time abroad as part of your studies?
- Would you recommend to a fellow-student that he/she take a period of work/study abroad?

#### Section B5: Interview questions for students who have not spent a period abroad

#### 1. Pre-university international experience

- Have you had any experience of living, studying or working abroad before coming to university?
   If so, to what extent was this an influential factor in your decision to go abroad as part of your degree? Were you there as part of an organised programme?
- Were you encouraged to study abroad by your school teachers? How about your family?
- Were you encouraged to learn a foreign language by your school teachers? How about your family?
- Did you take a Gap Year abroad between school and university? If so, where did you go? How long were you abroad? Did you organise it yourself? Did you seek assistance from any particular organisation? How did you finance it? Did you work while abroad?

#### 2. Studying/working abroad

- Have you heard of the possibility to go abroad during your degree?
- How would you assess the extent to which your university/department has promoted study/work abroad opportunities?
- Do you regret not having spent a period of study/work abroad? If so, why? How long would you have liked to spend a period of study/work abroad?
- What have been the main deterrents to you not spending time abroad?
- If you had opted to spend or had had the possibility of spending part of your degree abroad would you have preferred to do a work placement, study ... ?
- If you had the possibility, would you still consider studying/working abroad perhaps as a post-graduate students or within a post-graduate training scheme?

#### 3. Life at university

- Do you often socialise with students from other countries?
- Do you live with any international students?

 Do you have any friends at university who have been abroad?; If so, what have you heard about their experiences abroad?

#### 4. Foreign languages

- Did you study any foreign languages prior to university? (at school? private lessons?)
- Have you studied a foreign language as part of your degree?
- How do you think foreign language knowledge (or lack of it) might influence your career?

#### 5. Post-graduation plans

- Do you intend to take a Gap Year after graduating?
- What are you planning to do when you graduate?
- Have you considered studying/working abroad after graduating?
- Are you aware of any schemes to spend time studying/working abroad at post-graduation level?
- How do you think the period abroad will reflect in your future career moves?
- · Would you consider moving abroad to live and work? Where? Why?
- How do you think your career might compare with students who have been abroad?

#### 6. General questions

- There is some concern about the declining numbers of students participating in study/work abroad initiatives – why do you think most students decide not to take advantage of the opportunities available?
- What do you think should be done so that more students would spend time abroad as part of your studies?

#### Section B6: Interview survey methodology

- 34. The most common method of selecting and accessing students for interviewing was to ask for volunteers at the end of classes, for instance where questionnaires had just been distributed; and then to arrange mutually convenient times and places. Sometimes the department concerned arranged rooms for the interviews and focus groups to take place in; on other occasions the interviews took place in common rooms and coffee bars. Departmental faculty and administrators also identified suitable and willing students, and helped to set up the focus groups.
- 35. We were also keen to broaden our survey of students' views of mobility beyond the three departments targeted in each institution, so some interviews and focus groups were set up via other strategies. We got in touch with other departments where there were interesting experiences of mobility and set up interviews and discussion groups there and talked to departmental staff. Some students were interviewed 'randomly' in concourse areas, coffee bars and so on.
- 36. We cannot claim that the sample of students interviewed is representative of the student population as a whole. This is above all because the research is especially interested in learning about diverse experiences of mobility. So the in-depth interviews and focus groups were biased towards the students who had had a mobility experience, and these students constitute only a small minority of the total student body. However, more than half the individual interviews were with final-year non-mobile students.

- 37. It also has to be acknowledged that the students who participated in the interviews and discussion groups did so as volunteers and as such might not be a representative cross-section. Students with more negative views and experiences of mobility may well have 'opted out' of the opportunity to be interviewed.
- 38. All students interviewed were assured of the anonymity of the information provided, and all gave permission for the researchers to quote their statements.

#### Section B7: Questions for staff interviews

#### 1. Institutional management of mobility

- Is there a central office or individual responsible for overseeing student mobility in your institution? Follow-up questions on level of post, relationship to rest of institution, other duties etc.
- To what extent is managing student mobility a centralised function in your institution, or is it highly decentralised to individual departments (schools, faculties etc.)?
- Is there an office or an individual responsible for collating all statistics on mobility in your institution?

#### 2. Mobility trends in the institution, and nationally

- What are the broad mobility trends incoming and outgoing, and to various destinations in your institution?
- How do you explain the evolution of mobility in your institution?
- Is there a shifting balance in the pattern of mobility for instance between academic study and work placements, or between undergraduate and postgraduate mobility?
- Are you concerned about the low and/or declining level of mobility of UK students compared to other EU countries?
- Do you feel these trends put UK graduates at a disadvantage in the international business and employment market?

#### 3. Profile of the internationally mobile student

- To what extent do the overall characteristics of the student population at your institution influence the make-up of the outward flow of students going abroad?
- Does the mobile student reflect the characteristics of your institution's student body as a whole; and if not, why not?
- To what extent do you see international student mobility in your institution as typical of that from UK HEIs as a whole?
- To what extent do you think your institutional engagement with this issue is different from elsewhere?

#### 4. Promotion of mobility

- What efforts have been made to promote mobility within your institution (or department, school, faculty etc.)?
- Is there a specific mobility strategy within the institution (department, etc.)? Follow-up questions on the nature of this strategy, its main catalysts, and evaluation of its success.

- Are there institution-led activities (including departmental initiatives) which have evolved independently of international and national schemes such as Socrates/Erasmus and the Language Assistants programme?
- Are there other kinds of shorter-term mobility abroad (fieldtrips, study tours etc.) which your institution/department promotes?

#### 5. Reasons that deter students from going abroad

- In general, how do you explain the non-mobility of most students?
- What are the main factors that deter students from your institution from going abroad? Can you
  give an idea of their relative importance?
- How about the relevance of the Gap Year? Does it act as a substitute for within-programme mobility (or maybe a stimulus)?

#### 6. Language skills

- What is the importance given to language teaching within your institution? Are students from departments other than languages encouraged to learn languages? Do you, for instance, have an 'open language' or 'languages for all' policy whereby all students can have access to language learning?
- What are the trends for applications and enrolment in degrees including languages (other than English) in your institution over the past 5-10 years?
- For those students who enrol on degrees involving languages, do you feel that their language competence has been increasing or decreasing over recent years?
- What is the relationship between languages and mobility in your institution? For instance, do all students doing a language degree have to spend a period abroad? How about language minors? For students on non-language degrees who wish to spend a period abroad in a non-English language environment, what language conditions, and what language training, are offered?
- Is your institution/department exploring study/work abroad schemes that do not involve a foreign language?

#### 7. Benefits of mobility

- What do you perceive to be the main benefits of international student mobility for your institution/department?
- Why should students be encouraged to study/work abroad during their degree programme?
- What do you, personally, think should be done to encourage more students to take a period of work/study abroad?

#### 8. Problems of mobility, and future changes

- What are the main problems that have arisen with mobility (e.g. transfer of credit)?
- What policy changes could counter these problems?
- What major changes over the next few years might affect future mobility (e.g. the Bologna process, top up fees, semesterisation ...?

#### Section B8: List of staff interviewees

#### Interviewee

code	Position and function within the institution
A1	Head of Department of French
A2	Year Abroad Coordinator for Languages and European Studies (Academic)
B1	Deputy Registrar and Head of European Office
B2	Exchange Coordinator for a Medical department (Academic)
	·
B3	Coordinator of Exchanges with Latin America (Academic)
B4 C1	Student Exchange Coordinator (Administrator) Vice-Principal
	•
C2 C3	Erasmus Coordinator of the Faculty of Media and Arts (Academic)
C3	Student Placement Coordinator, International Business Studies (Academic)
C4 C5	Field Trip Coordinator, Geography Department (Academic)
	Erasmus Coordinator, Department of Law (Academic)
C6	International Links Manager (Administrator)
D1	Dean of Humanities
D2	Head of Department of Geography
D3	Head of Centre for International Exchanges and Languages
D4	Study Abroad Advisor (Administrator)
E1	Study Abroad Tutor (US Exchanges), School of Mathematics (Academic)
E2	Socrates/Erasmus Coordinator, Department of Statistics (Academic)
E3	Year Abroad Tutor, Department of Geography (Academic)
E4	Study Abroad Advisor (Administrator)
E5	Socrates/Erasmus Coordinator, Student Admissions (Administrator)
F1	Head, School of Environmental Sciences
F2 F3	Head of the International Office (Administrator)
	Educational Advisor, North American and Australian Exchanges (Administrator)
F4 G1	Coordinator, Leonardo placements (Administrator)
	Head of European Studies
G2 G3	Erasmus Coordinator for Department of Economics and Management Studies (Academic)
G3 G4	Director, International Office (Administrator)  Director, Careers Service (Administrator)
G5	International Exchanges Administrator, Registry
H1	Deputy Principal
H2	Head of Department of Mathematics
п2 Н3	Erasmus Coordinator, Department of Mathematics (Academic)
J1	Director of the Language Departments
J2	Erasmus Coordinator, Department of German (Academic)
J3	Director, International Office (Administrator)
J4	University Exchange Coordinator (Administrator)
л <del>4</del> К1	Head of Department of Geography
K2	Socrates/Erasmus Coordinator, Department of Geography (Academic)
K3	Lecturer, Department of Geography
K4	Careers Advisor and Work Placement Coordinator, School of Computer Science (Academic)
K5	Placements Coordinator, Department of Business and Finance (Academic)
K6	Director, International Office (Administrator)
K7	Socrates International Coordinator, International Office (Administrator)
K8	General Secretary of IAESTE
K9	Head, Business Enterprise Initiative
113	rieau, Dusiness Enterprise initiative

## Annex C Supplementary tables for international student mobility

Table C1: Criteria for identification of foreign students in OECD countries

Australia Foreign citizenship excluding

- permanent residents

New Zealand citizens and residentsstudents sponsored by AUSAID

Only concerns tertiary type A students (ISCED)

Austria Foreign nationality, thus including permanent residents Belgium (Flemish) Foreign nationality, thus including permanent residents

Canada Foreign nationality, excluding

- former Canadian residents

- students declaring themselves as immigrants Only concerns tertiary type A students (ISCED)

Czech Republic Foreign citizenship, thus including permanent residents

(a register of students should allow to distinguish residents in the future)

Only concerns full-time students

Denmark Foreign citizenship, thus including permanent residents
Finland Foreign nationality, thus including permanent residents
France Foreign citizenship, thus including permanent residents

Germany Foreign citizenship, disaggregation between permanent residents and non-

residents exists, but is incomplete (disaggregation by level of study only)

Hungary Foreign citizenship, thus including permanent residents, but excluding members

of neighbouring countries' Hungarian minorities

(a specific questionnaire should allow to distinguish residents in the future)

Iceland Foreign citizenship, thus including permanent residents

Ireland Foreign domiciliary address, thus excluding permanent residents

Italy Foreign nationality, thus including permanent residents

Japan Foreign citizenship, disaggregation between permanent residents and non-

residents exists, but is incomplete (64% coverage for ISCED 5-6)

Korea Foreign nationality, thus including permanent residents

Luxembourg Foreign citizenship, thus including permanent residents (who make up the

majority of foreign students, 100% for ISCED levels 1 to 4)

New Zealand Foreign nationality (excluding Australian students), thus including permanent

residents

Norway Foreign country of birth

Poland Foreign citizenship, thus including permanent residents
Spain Foreign nationality, thus including permanent residents
Sweden Foreign citizenship, thus including permanent residents

However, only students registered on the Swedish population register are considered foreign, which is not the case of all students originating from other

Nordic countries

Switzerland Foreign citizenship, disaggregation between permanent residents and non-

residents exists, but is incomplete (70% coverage for ISCED 5-6)

Turkey Foreigners entering Turkey on the sole purpose of study

United Kingdom Foreign home address

United States Foreign citizenship, excluding

- permanent residents

- refugees

Source: OECD, 2001

74

Table C2: Exchange of students in tertiary education (OECD countries, 2000)

	Foreign	E	change of student	s <sup>1</sup>		Foreign
	students as a percentage of				enrol	ment by gender
	all students	Students from	Students	Net intake of	%	%
	(foreign and	other countries	studying abroad	foreign students	male	female
	domestic	relative to total	relative to total			
	students)	tertiary enrolment	tertiary enrolment			
Australia	12.5	6.1 <sup>2</sup> 7.6 <sup>2</sup>	0.6 <sup>2</sup> 4.4 <sup>2</sup>	5.5 <sup>2</sup> 3.2 <sup>2</sup>	52.9	47.1
Austria	11.6				49.9	50.1
Belgium	10.9	5.8 <sub>2</sub>	2.8 <sub>2</sub>	3.1 <sub>2</sub>	52.4	47.6
Canada	3.3	1.5	2.4	-0.9	55.8	44.2
Czech Republic	2.2	1.0	1.2	-0.2	58.8	41.2
Denmark	6.8	2.6	3.5	-0.9	44.5	55.5
Finland	2.1	0.7	3.6	-2.9	57.5	42.5
France	6.8	1.9	2.6	-0.6	m	m
Germany	9.1	4.5	2.6	1.9	53.1	46.9
Greece	m	m	13.1	m	m	m
Hungary	3.2	m	2.2	m	46.7	53.3
Iceland	4.2	3.5	25.4	-21.9	35.5	64.5
Ireland	4.6	3.9	11.0	-7.2	47.8	52.2
Italy	1.4	0.2	2.3	-2.1	48.8	51.2
Japan	1.5	0.6	1.5	-0.9	55.6	44.4
Korea	0.1	n	2.3	-2.3	57.6	42.4
Luxembourg	m	m	225.6	m	m	m
Mexico	0.1	m	0.7	m	m	m
Netherlands	2.9	1.7	2.6	-0.8	52.9	47.1
New Zealand	4.8	2.4	3.5	-1.0	49.3	50.7
Norway	3.7	2.2	7.0	-4.8	44.7	55.3
Poland	0.4	0.1	1.1	-1.0	47.2	51.2
Portugal	3.0	0.8	2.8	-2.0	49.7	50.3
Slovak Republic	1.2	0.3	2.9	-2.6	62.8	37.2
Spain	2.2	1.4	1.5	-0.1	49.3	50.7
Sweden	6.0	4.3	4.4	-0.1	44.1	55.9
Switzerland	16.6	11.8	5.3	6.5	56.0	44.0
Turkey	1.7	0.1	4.3	-4.3	73.7	26.3
United Kingdom	11.0	6.0	1.4	4.6	52.8	47.2
United States	3.6	1.8	0.3	1.5	58.1	41.9
Country mean <sup>3</sup>	4.9	2.9	4.1	-1.2	52.2	47.7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Only those OECD and non-OECD countries which report the inflow into their system are included in the sum

Source: OECD, 2002

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Tertiary-type A and advanced research programmes only.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Country mean excludes Luxembourg.

n = Missing data of which the magnitude is either negligible or zero.

m = Data is not available.

Table C3: Exchange of students in tertiary education (non-OECD countries, 2000)

	Foreign students as a	E	Exchange of students <sup>1</sup>					
	percentage of	Ottordanta francia	Ct. do oto	Not intoles of	by ge			
	all students	Students from	Students	Net intake of	%	% •••••••••		
	(foreign and	other countries	= =	foreign students	maie	female		
	domestic	relative to total	relative to total	relative to total				
	students)	tertiary enrolment	tertiary enrolment	tertiary enrolment				
Argentina <sup>2</sup>	0.2	n	0.4	-0.4	m	m		
Brazil	m	m	0.6	m	m	m		
Chile <sup>2</sup>	0.4	0.1	1.1	-1.0	m	m		
China	m	m	1.5	m	m	m		
Egypt	m	m	2.2	m	m	m		
Indonesia 3	n	n	1.1	-1.0	m	m		
Jamaica	2.2	6.3	12.0	-5.7	m	m		
Jordan	8.5	1.1	3.6	-2.5	m	m		
Malaysia 2	0.7	0.3	8.0	-7.7	m	m		
Paraguay	m	m	0.8	m	m	m		
Peru	m	m	0.6	m	m	m		
Philippines <sup>2</sup>	0.2	0.1	0.2	-0.1	m	m		
Russian Federation <sup>3</sup>	0.9	2.4	0.3	2.1	m	m		
Thailand	m	m	0.9	m	m	m		
Tunisia	1.5	4.4	1.5	2.8	m	m		
Uruguay <sup>2</sup>	0.9	2.8	1.5	1.4	m	m		
Zimbabwe	m	m	7.0	m	m	m		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Only those OECD and non-OECD countries which report the inflow into their system are included in the sum.

m = Data is not available.

Source: OECD, 2002

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Year of reference 1999.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Year of reference 2001.

n = Missing data of which the magnitude is either negligible or zero.

Table C4: Proportion of citizens in tertiary education studying abroad (2000)

Countries of origin									
	EU <sup>1</sup>	Other	Korea +	G-B +	North	Australia +	Total		
		European	Japan	Ireland	America	N-Zealand			
OECD countries									
Australia	0.09	0.01	0.04	0.16	0.33	0.00	0.63		
Austria	3.16	0.30	0.01	0.49	0.40	0.04	4.41		
Belgium	1.69	0.08	0.01	0.69	0.27	0.02	2.77		
Canada	0.19	0.03	0.02	0.27	1.78	0.09	2.38		
Czech Republic	0.43	0.28	0.01	0.11	0.36	0.02	1.21		
Denmark	1.26	0.49	0.01	1.02	0.60	0.10	3.47		
Finland	2.10	0.13	0.01	0.99	0.35	0.03	3.61		
France	1.20	0.15	0.01	0.65	0.54	0.01	2.55		
Germany	1.06	0.30	0.01	0.68	0.48	0.07	2.60		
Greece	4.89	0.58	0.00	6.95	0.64	0.03	13.09		
Hungary	1.59	0.09	0.02	0.13	0.36	0.01	2.21		
Iceland	14.77	2.62	0.06	2.34	5.54	0.05	25.38		
Ireland	1.13	0.05	0.01	8.93	0.72	0.21	11.04		
Italy	1.55	0.23	0.00	0.35	0.18	0.01	2.33		
Japan	0.11	0.01	0.02	0.16	1.12	0.07	1.48		
Korea	0.24	0.00	0.61	0.07	1.30	0.09	2.32		
Luxembourg	188.51	7.76	0.16	25.36	3.48	0.21	225.47		
Mexico	0.11	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.54	0.00	0.72		
Netherlands	1.48	0.08	0.01	0.54	0.37	0.08	2.55		
New Zealand	0.09	0.01	0.05	0.28	0.57	2.48	3.49		
Norway	2.34	0.26	0.01	2.19	1.20	0.94	6.94		
Poland	0.85	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.14	0.01	1.08		
Portugal	1.77	0.12	0.01	0.61	0.24	0.02	2.77		
Slovak Republic	0.95	1.42	0.01	0.11	0.35	0.02	2.86		
Spain	0.71	0.09	0.00	0.42	0.23	0.00	1.46		
Sweden	1.13	0.37	0.02	1.17	1.41	0.29	4.40		
Switzerland	2.94	0.04	0.02	0.92	1.28	0.12	5.32		
Turkey	3.15	0.06	0.01	0.17	0.93	0.02	4.34		
United Kingdom	0.54	0.05	0.02	0.09	0.42	0.22	1.35		
United States	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.25		
Non OECD countries									
Argentina	0.17	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.18	0.01	0.39		
Brazil	0.23	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.34	0.01	0.65		
Chile	0.49	0.04	0.01	0.06	0.34	0.05	0.98		
China	0.16	0.01	0.40	0.08	0.74	0.08	1.47		
Egypt	0.86	0.07	0.07	0.39	0.80	0.02	2.21		
Indonesia	0.11	0.00	0.05	0.04	0.42	0.40	1.01		
Jamaica	0.09	0.01	0.01	1.65	10.23	0.01	12.01		
Jordan	1.10	0.28	0.01	0.58	1.48	0.04	3.49		
Malaysia	0.06	0.01	0.42	2.32	1.92	2.97	7.69		
Paraguay	0.20	0.02	0.09	0.03	0.44	0.00	0.79		
Peru	0.26	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.26	0.00	0.56		
Philippines	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.14	0.03	0.22		
Russian Federation	0.14	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.09	0.00	0.28		
Thailand	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.13	0.54	0.16	0.94		
Tunisia	0.93	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.53	0.00	1.52		
Uruguay	0.39	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.42	0.02	0.92		
Zimbabwe	0.26	0.09	0.01	3.79	2.37	0.49	7.01		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Does not include Great Britain and Ireland.

Source: OECD, 2002

Table C5: Distribution of outgoing students by language of the destination country (%, 1998)

	Des	stination (OECD excluding Mexic	co, the Netherlands and Portugal	
Country of origin	Different language	of which French-speaking	of which German-speaking	of which English-speaking
Australia	21.7	9.4	7.0	
Austria	31.3	10.4		62.4
Belgium	70.2		19.9	60.2
Canada	4.9		2.7	
Czech Republic	100.0	22.6	7.9	73.0
Denmark	100.0	8.5	14.7	50.8
Finland	100.0	5.5	17.4	43.6
France	82.9		27.3	72.2
Germany	76.7	24.4		65.7
Greece	100.0	5.7	37.4	51.4
Hungary	100.0	9.3	56.2	29.9
Iceland	100.0	3.9	12.8	31.8
Ireland	9.1	3.6	3.8	
Italy	88.4	23.2	52.6	29.0
Japan	100.0	4.7	4.2	92.2
Korea	100.0	3.3	7.9	63.1
Luxembourg	18.1			93.1
Mexico	92.7	10.6	3.8	88.7
Netherlands	76.7	7.9	22.5	51.3
New Zealand	3.6	2.6	1.3	
Norway	100.0	5.6	12.1	58.2
Poland	100.0	14.2	60.5	19.6
Portugal	100.0	42.2	23.3	30.5
Spain	100.0	22.5	32.3	50.4
Sweden	100.0	10.3	13.2	63.2
Switzerland	52.0			91.1
Turkey	100.0	6.5	68.1	24.9
United Kingdom	43.1	18.2	13.5	
United States	40.8	21.9	18.4	

Source: OECD, 2001

Note: For multilingual countries (Canada, Switzerland, Belgium), we assumed that students were fluent in all official languages. Hence studying in a French or English-speaking country (Canada) / Italian, German or French-speaking country (Switzerland) did not involve adjusting to a different language environment. For these countries, mobility towards countries with a different language may thus be underestimated.

Table C6: English language assistants abroad, 1995-96 to 2002-03

England	1995-	1996-	1997-	1998-	1999-	2000-	2001-	2002-
	96	97	98	99	2000	01	02	03
French speaking	1,334	1,358	965	1,216	1,026	896	796	769
German speaking	558	552	563	508	464	365	351	372
Spanish speaking	212	215	219	216	193	197	204	231
Portuguese speaking	3	9	10	10	4	1	1	0
Italy	14	15	13	12	10	10	13	14
Dutch speaking	3	3	2	0	0	0	8	2
Scandinavian languages	1	2	2	0	1	0	8	2
Central and Eastern Europe	30	41	39	34	34	5	8	2
Chinese	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Total England*	2,155	2,195	1,812	1,996	1,732	1,474	1,373	1,466
Wales					122	116	80	92
Scotland	349	281	250	279	240	277	277	232
Northern Ireland	120	109	103	98	99	75	71	79
Total UK	2,624	2,585	2,165	2,373	2,193	1,942	1,801	1,869

Notes: 'England' includes assistants from Wales until 1998-99; assistants from Wales are recorded separately for the first time in 1999-2000. The above figures represent the number of assistants in post on 30 November. Source: British Council

Table C7: Student mobility relative to the population of 18-21 years of age

Country	Student mobility (per 1,000)
Belgium	9
Denmark	7
Germany	5
Greece	3
Spain	6
France	6
Ireland	6
Italy	4
Luxembourg	5
Netherlands	6
Austria	8
Portugal	4
Finland	13
Sweden	8
United Kingdom	4
EU	5

Source: calculated from OECD data

Table C8: UK institutional involvement in outgoing Erasmus students: number of students departing from UK institutions

	Number of students departing:	1-10	11-50	51-100	101+
1994-95		35	43	39	42
2001-02		34	54	30	30
2002-03		38	55	29	27

Source: UK Socrates-Erasmus Council

Note: the numbers in the table are the number of institutions from which students departed

Table C9: Location of work for graduated students by Erasmus exchange and type of studies (2000-01), percentage data

	Language stu	ıdents	Non-language students			
Location of work	<b>Erasmus</b>	Non-Erasmus	<b>Erasmus</b>	Non-Erasmus		
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)		
UK	79	82	88	97		
Other EU	15	12	8	1		
Rest of world	5	6	4	2		

Source: HESA-Erasmus matched data set

Table C10: Administrative aspects of outward student mobility by type of HEI

Type of HEI	With a key with	pers	There are separate persons responsible for:				Have a strategic plan for student	
	responsibility for outward student mobility		Euro	ppe	North America		mobility	
	V	%	$\sqrt{}$	%	√	%	$\sqrt{}$	%
Pre-1992 universities (n=31)	18	58.1	18	58.0	12	38.7	6	19.3
Post-1992 universities (n=21)	11	52.4	9	42.9	7	33.3	10	47.6
Other HEIs (n=28)	16	57.1	8	28.6	8	29.6	11	39.3
Total (n=80)	45	56.3	35	43.8	27	33.8	27	33.8

Source: Authors' survey

Table C11: Numbers of students on the Northern Irish Business Education Initiative (USA)

Year	Number of students		
1999-2000	65		
2000-01	73		
2001-02	70		
2002-03	62		
2003-04	45		

Source: British Council

Table C12: Correlation of explanatory variables with the institutional migration rates for the 2002 Erasmus outgoing student flow

Independent variable	Pearson's R	Statistical significance
% Full-time first degrees in languages (00/01)	0.265	0.002
% Full-time first degrees in law (00/01)	0.054	0.536
% Full-time first degrees in social science (00/01)	0.080	0.358
% Full-time first degrees in business studies (00/01)	-0.248	0.004
% Staff entered as research active in the 2001 RAE	0.486	0.000
% Staff in RAE rated 5 or 5* departments (2001)	0.360	0.000

Very significant' differences were those evident at the 0.01 level

Table C13: Regression models on 'change in number of Erasmus outgoing students'

Model	R	Statistical
		Significance
Constant, % staff in RAE grade 5 and 5* departments <sup>1</sup>	0.621	0.000
Constant, % staff in RAE grade 5 and 5* departments, %	0.667	0.000
change in language students		0.000

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The percentage change in the number of Erasmus students has been calculated on the basis of 1994 and 2002 figures supplied by the UK Socrates-Erasmus office, whereas the percentage change in language students is based on 1994 and 2001 values supplied by HESA. Staff in RAE grade 5 and 5\* departments concerns the year 2001.