

Council for European Studies
18th International Conference of Europeanist
Barcelona, Spain
June 20-22, 2011

Mobility in the Bologna Process

Santiago Martínez-Dordella
Programa de Doctorado de Sociología
Universidad de Barcelona,
Despacho 4109, Avenida Diagonal 690
08034 Barcelona, España
E-mail: smdordella@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract: This paper analyses students' mobility in higher education throughout the Bologna process. The study summarises relevant information related to mobility in the different ministerial meetings and communiqués of the process: the Sorbonne Declaration (1998), Bologna Declaration (1999), Prague (2001), Berlin (2003), Bergen (2005), London (2007), Leuven and Louvain la Neuve (2009) and Budapest-Vienna (2010). Mobility is an "action line" gaining importance, practically defining the make-up and development of the Bologna process. Changes have occurred in order to promote mobility throughout the European Higher Education Area. This process might be the biggest transformation happening at Higher Education systems in the XXI century. Country Governments, private and public higher education institutions, students, researchers and academic staff are involved in the development of the process. Seeing that inequality is increasing in Europe (OCDE, 2008), the study includes concerns expressed in relation to the "social dimension". The research offers a comparative analysis of the 47 countries in the process, with recent data about mobility flows. Information is collected from two recognized higher education statistical sources: UNESCO and Eurostat database. The study is based on the number of students, in/outbound flows and mobility growth. Student flows are examined with both indicators: the number of higher education students and the mobility ratios. Data suggest that mobility objectives of the Bologna process might require implementing stronger actions or setting lower expectations. In addition to preparing international programs and financing scholarships for mobile students, mobility targets are also relevant to other sociological aspects. Mobility of students is closely linked with inequalities between European countries. Also significant are inequalities in the students' socio-economic backgrounds and the quality of their former education.

Key Words: Bologna Process, mobility, inbound and outbound ratios, students, university, European Higher Education Area, EU27.

The Bologna process is the result of a series of meetings held by the Ministers of higher education. Including the Sorbonne Joint Declaration in 1998, there have been eight meetings. The last one, the Budapest-Vienna Declaration in 2010, corresponded to the Bologna ten-year anniversary conference. The Leuven Communiqué, product of the conference of European Ministers in 2009, confirmed the continuation of the process until 2020. The process started with a small number of participants and “action lines”, but with time, it has expanded. The Bologna process has become part of the policy agenda in 47 countries (including Kazakhstan since March 2010). Its main goal is to establish a European Higher Education Area, EHEA, which is believed will ensure other underlying objectives like comparability, mobility, quality, innovation, and so on. The process also involves the European Commission as a member and other important stakeholders: the Council of Europe and UNESCO-CEPES. The consulting members of the process are the European University Association (EUA), European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE), the European Students' Union (ESU), European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), Education International Pan-European Structure (EI) and Business-Europe institution. There is no other European initiative that mobilizes so many people and institutions¹.

The construction of the European Higher Education Area involves a series of commitments and/or transformations. Countries are converging to harmonize their higher education systems. The goal is not to make universities equal, but to create a series of conditions that pushes the EHEA countries towards knowledge-based societies. A Europe of knowledge was recognized “as an irreplaceable factor for social and human growth and as an indispensable component to consolidate and enrich the European citizenship” (Bologna Declaration, 1999: pp. 1). The process actually involves many “action lines” but started in 1999 with six main priorities: 1) The adoption of a system of *easily readable and comparable degrees*; 2) A system essentially based on *two main cycles*, undergraduate and graduate; 3) The establishment of *a system of credits*, such as the European Credit Transfer System, ECTS; 4) The promotion of *mobility* by overcoming obstacles for free movement with particular attention to students and teachers; 5) The development of the criteria and methodologies for promoting the *European co-operation in quality assurance*; 6) The encouragement of the necessary

¹ I am specially grateful to Jesús M. de Miguel and Anne Corbett. They had been merciless with ideas and the making of this paper (Iglesias 2009; and Corbett 2005).

European dimensions in higher education. These objectives were undertaken within the framework of full respect for the diversity of cultures, languages, national education systems and University autonomy (pp. 4). From 1999 to 2010 the process has evolved from the original six action lines to ten higher education priorities for the following decade 2010 - 2020: 1) *The social dimension*: equitable access and completion; 2) Widening participation of education systems through *Life Long Learning*, LLL; 3) To equip students with the advance knowledge, skills and competences for *employability* in highly competitive labour markets; 4) *Student-centred learning* which empowers individual learners through new approaches to teaching, effective support and guidance in all three cycles; 5) To base higher education on the art of *research* and development of *innovation*; 6) To *further internationalise higher education* activities and global collaboration for sustainable development; 7) To encourage *mobility of the three cycles*; 8) To improve *data collection*; 9) To develop mechanisms for *multidisciplinary transparency tools*, in particular quality assurance and recognition; 10) To guarantee that higher education institutions have enough *funding*, by seeking new and diversified sources and methods (Leuven and Louvain la Neuve Communiqué, 2009: pp. 2-5).

Action lines and strategies for the construction of the EHEA have been modified and expanded. The focus of this study is mobility. An overview of the mobility in the Bologna process is shown in **Table 1**. Information is collected from the Bologna Declarations and Communiqués. Since the beginning, mobility in the Bologna process has been promoted in different aspects and for a variety of participants. At the Sorbonne Declaration, mobility was concentrated on students and teachers, facilitating them with opportunities for better integration into the European labour market. One year later, at the Bologna Declaration of 1999, mobility promotion was expanded to researchers and academic staff. Countries were called to overcome obstacles of free movement for students and teachers for studying and training opportunities. Other action lines were taken in order to facilitate mobility, i.e. the establishment of a system of credits like the ECTS. By 2001, the social dimension of mobility was put forward by students, as their awareness of and participation in the process increased. Mobility in the Prague Communiqué was considered as a way to enhance the attractiveness and competitiveness of higher education institutions in Europe. A serious commitment was made to pursue the removal of all obstacles to the free movement and to emphasise the social dimension of mobility.

Table 1
Mobility at the Bologna Process

1998 - Sorbonne Declaration	4 countries
<p>Promotion of mobility of students and teachers. Facilitating the mobility of students and teachers in the European area and their integration into the European labour market.</p>	
1999 - Bologna Declaration	29 countries
<p>Mobility of students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff. To overcome obstacles to the effective exercise of free movement for students and teacher to study and training opportunities. To establish a system of credits (such as ECTS).</p>	
2001 - Prague Communiqué	33 countries
<p>Enhancing the attractiveness and competitiveness of higher education institutions in Europe. Social dimension of mobility. Commitment to pursue the removal of all obstacles to the free movement of students, teachers, researchers and administrative staff and emphasized the social dimension of mobility. The need, recalled by students, to take account of the social dimension in the Bologna process.</p>	
2003 - Berlin Communiqué	40 countries
<p>To move towards more comparability and compatibility, to make higher education systems more transparent and to enhance the quality of European higher education at institutional and national levels. To improve the quality and coverage of statistical data on student mobility. To make every effort to remove all obstacles to mobility within the European Higher Education Area. Recognition of degrees and periods of studies, including the provision of the Diploma Supplement, automatically and free of charge for all graduates as of 2005. To enable the portability of national loans and grants. A call for increase mobility at the doctoral and postdoctoral levels. Encourage institutions to increase cooperation in doctoral studies and the training of young researchers.</p>	
2005 - Bergen Communiqué	45 countries
<p>To making quality higher education equally accessible to all. Attention to facilitating visa and work permits. Developing national frameworks of qualifications in compatibility with the adopted Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area. Reinforcing the social dimension and removing obstacles to mobility.</p>	

Continuation: Table 1

2007 - London Communiqué 46 countries

To build on a “rich and diverse European cultural heritage based on institutional autonomy, academic freedom, equal opportunities and democratic principles that will facilitate mobility, increase employability and strengthen Europe’s attractiveness and competitiveness”.

To overcome challenges of visa and work permits, pension systems and recognition.

The recognition of the Governments responsibility.

To implement fully the agreed recognition tools and procedures and consider ways of further incentivising mobility for both staff and students.

Committed to completing national frameworks of qualifications in compatibility with the adopted Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area by 2010.

Promised to report on national action taken to remove obstacles to the mobility of students and staff, including measures for future evaluation.

2009 - Leuven Communiqué 46 countries

Mobility of students enhances the quality of programmes and excellence in research, strengthens the academic and cultural internationalization of European higher education, is important for personal development and employability, fosters respect for diversity and a capacity to deal with other cultures, encourages linguistic pluralism, and it increases cooperation and competition.

By 2020 at least 20 % of those graduating in the EHEA should have had a study or training period abroad.

To create mobility opportunities for the three cycles.

To improved and enhanced data collection and monitor progress in the social dimension, employability and mobility agendas, as well as in other policy areas.

2010 - Budapest-Vienna Declaration 47 countries

Sources:

- Sorbonne Joint Declaration (1998) *Joint declaration on harmonization of the architecture of the European higher education system*. Paris: Ministers in charge for France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, 3 pp.
- Bologna Declaration (1999) *Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education*. Bologna: European Higher Education Area, 6 pp.
- Prague Communiqué (2001) *Towards the European Higher Education Area*. Czech Republic: European Higher Education Area, 4 pp.
- Berlin Communiqué (2003) *Realising the European Higher Education Area*. Germany: European Higher Education Area, 9 pp.
- Bergen Communiqué (2005) *The European Higher Education Area: Achieving the Goals*. Norway: European Higher Education Area, 6 pp.
- London Communiqué (2007) *Towards the European Higher Education Area: Responding to challenges in globalised world*. United Kingdom: European Higher Education Area, 7 pp.
- Leuven and Louvain la Neuve Communiqué (2009) *The European Higher Education Area in the new decade*. Belgium: European Higher Education Area, 6 pp.
- Budapest-Vienna Declaration (2010) *Budapest-Vienna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area*. Vienna: European Higher Education Area, 2 pp.

In 2003 the Berlin Communiqué started a move towards more comparable, compatible, and transparent higher education systems, which are believed to heighten quality in the EHEA. In Berlin, countries agree to improve the quality and coverage of statistical data, although at present there continue to be with some irregularities. In order to promote mobility countries acknowledged the need for recognition of (1) degrees and (2) periods of studies to be automatic and free of charge for all graduates. A target was set for the year 2005. At the same time attention was placed on to the portability of national loans and grants. For the first time, mobility at the doctoral and postdoctoral levels was taken into account. Countries committed to encouraging institutions to increase cooperation in doctoral studies and research. Again in the Berlin Communiqué the scope of mobility was expanded, moving from students and teachers in 1998 towards making everybody involved in tertiary education eligible and accountable, including researchers, academic staff, doctoral and postdoctoral students. An effort was made in 2005 during the Bergen Communiqué, to recognise the need to make quality higher education equally accessible to all, reinforcing the social dimension of higher education. Mobility improvements were prepared to facilitate visas and work permits. The objective is to remove all possible obstacles to mobility. At Bergen, other commitments were pursued in relation to mobility, like the increasing comparability between higher education systems. A Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area was adopted, providing new possibilities to develop comparable national frameworks of qualifications between countries, thus reducing recognition difficulties for mobile students. In 2005, the idea of an EHEA was a reality and a commitment signed by 45 European countries.

The London Communiqué presented a more consolidate and comprehensive discourse of mobility than in previous Communiqués. Mobility is included in the main objective presented by the Bologna process in 2007: “Building on our rich and diverse European cultural heritage, we are developing an EHEA based on institutional autonomy, academic freedom, equal opportunities and democratic principles that will facilitate mobility, increase employability and strengthen Europe’s attractiveness and competitiveness” (London Communiqué, 2007: pp. 1). The recognition of new obstacles for mobility was supported, including the portability of pension systems and the recognition of pension rights. Countries committed to fully implement the agreed recognition tools and procedures, and consider ways of further incentivising mobility

for both staff and students. A push to completing national frameworks of qualifications by 2010 was pursued in order to make higher education systems more comparable. Challenges related to visas and work permits remained. The London Communiqué recognizes the responsibility of individual Governments to facilitate visas and work permits. Countries promised to report on national action taken to remove obstacles for mobile students and staff, including measures for future evaluation (London Communiqué, 2007: pp. 6).

Mobility has been, and will continue to be, a key action line of the Bologna process since the beginning. The Leuven and Louvain la Neuve Communiqué of 2009 reinforced the idea that mobility of students and researchers enhances the quality of programmes and excellence in research. It also strengthens the academic and cultural internationalization of the EHEA. Mobility enhances the quality of programmes and excellence in research; strengthens academic and cultural internationalization; is significant for personal development and employability; it fosters respect for diversity and the capacity to deal with different cultures; it increases linguistic pluralism and cooperation and competition between higher education institutions. As it is expressed in the Communiqué “mobility shall be the hallmark of the European Higher Education Area. We call upon each country to increase mobility, to ensure its high quality and to diversify its types and scope. In 2020, *at least 20%* of those graduating in the European Higher Education Area should have had a study or training period abroad” (Leuven and Louvain la Neuve Communiqué, 2009: pp. 4). Countries of the process are convinced to increase opportunities for mobility within each of the three cycles. Mobility policies are to be based on a wider range of issues in order to facilitate funding, recognition, suitable infrastructure, visa and work permit regulations. Other important elements are the encouragement to generate flexible study paths, practical and useful information policies, recognition of study achievements, and the portability of grants and loans. There exists an increasing worrying about the unbalanced flow of incoming and outgoing students across the EHEA. The process aims to improve participation rates among diverse student groups (Leuven and Louvain la Neuve Communiqué, 2009: pp. 5). The mobility of teachers and researchers should be increased. It is recognized that attractive international working conditions and career paths are necessary to attract highly qualified staff to EHEA institutions. Career structures should be adapted to facilitate mobility of teachers and researchers, as well as the establishment of

appropriate access to social security and portability of pension and pension rights for mobile staff. Mobility should be increased by making the best use of existing legal frameworks (pp. 5).

Further development of the Bologna process is demanding countries to collaborate in two main areas related to mobility: *data collection* and *balanced mobility*. A Bologna follow up group (BFUG) was created to address these problems. To enable data collection, the BFUG requested countries to define indicators used for measuring and monitoring mobility in conjunction with its social dimension (Leuven and Louvain la Neuve Communiqué, 2009: pp. 6). Collecting consistent data for mobility is complicated for many reasons, i.e. citizenship as a criterion for considering mobile students will overestimate mobility in some countries due to migration flows. As it is noted in *Trends 2010*: “Despite the efforts to promote mobility, there are little sound data available on mobility flows and, thus, on the extent to which mobility has progressed over the years” (Sursock and Smidt 2010: pp. 75). Improvements have been proposed to correct some data irregularities, i.e. “considering as mobile a student enrolled in a country different from the one of previous level of education that is, ISCED 3 or 4 for students enrolled in ISCED 5 [...] However, few countries have so far collected this information” (pp. 39). Difficulties collecting data are one of the main problems for producing rigorous research, and thus implementing policies to correct unwanted mobility flow effects. The main idea is that “mobility is considered a key opportunity for learning and self-development; ensuring mobility for all students whatever their background is a priority from a social point of view” (pp. 106). Furthermore, as the European Commission emphasizes: “international mobility contributes to personal fulfilment and the development of competences, such as languages and intercultural understanding. Such skills are becoming more valued in an increasingly global labour market, and therefore can substantially enhance the employability of those students” (European Commission, 2009: pp. 13). Growing attention to the social dimension of the Bologna process calls for data. As it is noted in the *Bologna process independent assessment* some difficulties are to be overcome. In their research they found that “Higher education systems report under representation of certain groups in their student body. Most commonly underrepresented groups include those from lower socio-economic backgrounds, and people coming to higher education through non-traditional educational routes [...] From the few available data, we could

not conclude that these policies have been introduced with the aim of improving inclusion of underrepresented groups [...] we learned that successful social dimension policies need long, sustained effort” (Westerhijden, et. al., 2010: pp. 9). Producing reliable data about mobility related to its social dimension, as the BFUG is to achieve, is going to require a bigger push and more time. Two other circumstances related to data were found during the making of this research: small differences in the definition of “concepts” were found between sources of information i.e. mobile students, inbound or outbound students; and the problem of empty or missing data.

The BFUG tries to address how balanced mobility could be achieved within the EHEA. Action lines or strategies have yet to be proposed. Unbalanced mobility is increasingly relevant in two main circumstances: between social classes (described previously) and between countries. It’s known that “there is an east-to-west imbalance of student mobility within Europe” (Westerhijden, et. al., 2010: pp. 6). This imbalance might put the sustainability of mobility momentum into question. Eastern countries are becoming student exporters to Western Europe. This is not because of the Bologna process; there is an historical imbalance between east and west in Europe, i.e. countries like United Kingdom, Germany and France are well-known all-time student importers. This inbound flow might reflect the historical attractiveness of tertiary education in those countries. It also, reflects the enrolment capacity for foreign students and the efforts made in the past to attract international students. Whatever the case may be, the EHEA is to produce balanced flows between countries, and to generate the necessary attractiveness to the rest of the world.

Research has been carried out to identify the main problems concerning mobility. The Eurostudent survey indicates five obstacles for student’s mobility. The main barrier is financial. A second factor reported by students is the insufficient support in the home country, followed by the lack of language skills, lack of motivation, and insufficient support from their host country (Sursock and Smidt 2010: pp. 108). Other related issues are: legislation, proper communication, consultation procedures for students and staff, lack of financial and human resources, too optimistic/overloaded agenda, lack of support from academics and system-specific characteristics of each individual country that inhibit the reform project (Westerhijden, et. al., 2010: pp. 91). Furthermore obstacles for staff and student mobility are: partial understanding of the

Lisbon Recognition Convention, little support from academics for a central office that would process study abroad periods, a 'stay-at-home' culture of both students and academic staff, resistance to encouraging outgoing students as evidence shows concerns that they will not come back, competition within the sector that leads institutions to try to be unique or different thus creating further obstacles for recognition, different ways in which ECTS are calculated, part-time work or family obligations, and visa requirements for non-EU students (Sursock and Smidt 2010: pp. 80). Knowledge about those circumstances is increasing, as is countries' commitment to overcome them. From all of the above, financial support is the most frequently mentioned. It has to be noted that tuition and other fees paid by students can vary from 1 to 8 between EHEA countries (pp. 86). Disparities of income and education related costs might present different challenges for students between EHEA countries. Financial inequalities widen when considering social classes within countries. Aside from economic difficulties lower-income students also present lack of language skills and individual motivation (pp. 109).

International student flows can be properly defined through nationality or by previous studies. Countries use what they can to best calculate the number of students moving internationally. There are two dimensions to mobility: on the one hand, there are the students coming in and out, which are known as in/outbound mobility flows. On the other hand, distinction has to be made between students completing full degree studies and those doing a shorter period of study time. This is called vertical and horizontal mobility. Distinctions between vertical and horizontal mobility are relevant to understand student flows. Horizontal mobility might show larger student flows (including students in short courses). Vertical mobility is less usual but students having full programs outbound enhance the benefits of studying abroad. Currently there is only data available about the in/outbound flows. The *inbound* ratio "corresponds to the number of students from abroad studying in a given country, as a percentage of the total higher education enrollment in that country". The *outbound* ratio "corresponds to the number of students (or young people) from a given country studying abroad, as a percentage of the total higher education enrollment in that country" (UNESCO, 2009: pp. 256).

In order to analyse countries' mobility flows, recent data about mobility is collected. Data in **Table 2** attempts to distinguish to what extent mobility flows are different between countries. Information is available for the EU27 and non-EU countries of the EHEA. Some differences between west and east Europe could be associated to differences among EU and non-EU countries. The outbound and inbound flows are most relevant indicators for mobility. In/Outbound flows can be measured by number and/or ratios. In this study, to make international comparisons visible, both the number and the ratio are used. There is the case in which mobility could look deceivingly extremely high/low. This is the case particularly in small countries. To overcome these difficulties in the analysis between countries, both measures should be considered. The total number of students is included to facilitate a wider view of mobility flows. The in/outbound growth is measured for the period 2000-2006. Growth indicators for recent periods are not available. Growth in mobility flows would give useful insight into the possibility of meeting 2020 mobility targets of 20%. The data presented in the table was collected from Eurostat, UNESCO and the World Bank. Primarily from the *Global Education Digest 2009: Comparing Education Statistics Across the World*, published by UNESCO. Missing data for in/outbound flows was gathered from Eurostat. Concept definitions and data presented small differences between UNESCO and Eurostat. The problem of relying on two different sources is that statistical relationships, as well as the reliability of interpretations, are diminished. However for the purpose of this analysis, an effort was made to assemble a table of comparative information, due to the insufficient data availability at one source.

Statistics reveal that the world has more than 150 million students in higher education institutions. Considering the world population, over 6.5 billion inhabitants, students of tertiary education corresponds to as little as 2%. Higher education students normally stay in their home country. A small proportion (1.9%) of world students can be considered mobile. The world's average student mobility flow is greatly smaller than the EHEA mobility target of 20%. However, European tertiary enrollment, as well as many other demographic and socio-economic indicators, is developed in the EHEA. Therefore, Europe is better prepared to overcome challenges related to targeted mobility. The EU27 have nineteen million students, one of eight students in the world. A simple addition of non-EU students makes a total of 35 million students in the EHEA, representing 23% of global higher education students. Countries in the Bologna process

Table 2
Mobility in the Bologna Process

Countries ^a	Students (thousands)	Inbound ^b		Outbound ^b		Growth (2000-2006) ^d	
		Students from abroad	Ratio	Students abroad	Ratio	Inbound ^c	Outbound ^c
EU countries							
Luxembourg	2.7	1,137	42.2	7,201	269.2	na	0.39
Ireland	190	16,758	8.8	19,357	9.7	na	1.30
Denmark	232	12,695	5.5	5,035	2.1	1.14	0.60
Sweden	414	22,135	5.4	13,723	3.6	1.71	1.05
Netherlands	590	27,449	4.7	10,447	1.9	2.24	1.00
Finland	309	10,066	3.3	5,964	1.9	1.38	0.87
United Kingdom	2,363	351,470	14.9	24,115	1.1	1.37	0.67
Austria	261	43,572	16.7	10,458	4.3	1.34	1.26
Belgium	394	25,202	6.4	10,596	2.8	1.18	0.83
France	2,180	246,612	11.3	54,021	2.5	1.78	1.38
Germany	2,245 ^d	206,875	12.8 ^d	77,534	3.1 ^d	1.28	1.82
Italy	2,034	57,271	2.8	35,133	1.6	1.71	1.18
Spain	1,777	21,315	1.2	23,914	1.2	1.80	1.20
Greece	603	21,160	3.5	32,588	4.6	1.44 ^e	0.43
Cyprus	22	5,590	25.1	22,898	110.7	1.07	1.33
Slovenia	116	1,195	1.0	2,244	1.8	1.60	1.00
Portugal	367	17,950	4.9	11,200	2.8	1.53	1.68
Malta	9.4	na	7.7 ^d	1,033	8.6	1.38	1.15
Czech Republic	363	24,483	6.7	7,359	1.7	2.80	1.55
Estonia	69	na	3.2 ^d	3,245	5.0	1.78	2.19
Slovakia	218	1,901	0.9	24,206	10.3	0.75	4.52
Hungary	432	15,110	3.5	7,214	1.4	1.03 ^e	1.00
Latvia	131	1,677	1.3	3,858	2.9	0.17	1.83
Lithuania	200	1,901	1.0	6,762	3.7	1.33	1.89
Poland	2,147	13,021	0.6	32,888	1.5	1.25	1.75
Romania	928	9,383	1.0	22,852	2.2	0.50	1.50
Bulgaria	259	9,100	3.5	24,680	8.8	1.22	3.48
European Union (EU27)	19,040 ^d	na	7.5 ^d	na	2.5 ^d	1.42	1.25

Continuation: Table 2

Countries ^a	Students (thousands)	Inbound ^b		Outbound ^b		Growth (2000-2006) ^d	
		Students from abroad	Ratio	Students abroad	Ratio	Inbound ^c	Outbound ^c
Non EU countries							
Liechtenstein	0.7	na	90.1 ^d	884	132.6	na	0.63 ^e
Norway	215	15,618	7.3	11,873	5.8	1.72	0.98
Iceland	16	na	4.6 ^d	2,480	15.7	1.02	1.08
Switzerland	213	38,317	18	10,485	5.3	10.4 ^e	1.15 ^e
Andorra	0.4	na	41	997	91.1	0.87	0.62 ^e
Croatia	140	3,488	2.5	5,544	3.9	1.00 ^e	0.94 ^e
Russian Federation	9,370	60,288	0.6	42,881	0.5	1.00 ^e	1.33
Turkey	2,454	19,257	0.8	36,840	1.5	0.65	0.51
Kazakhstan	720	10,928	1.5	30,052	4.3	na	na
Montenegro	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Serbia	na	na	2.9 ^d	na	na	0.78	na
Bosnia-Herzegovina	99	na	na	8,634	8.7	na	na
Yugoslav R. of Macedonia	58	na	0.4 ^d	6,424	10.9	0.57	2.02
Azerbaijan	135	4,286	3.2	4,743	3.9	1.60	1.06
Albania	na	na	na	19,930	28.6 ^d	na	3.14
Ukraine	2,819	29,614	1.1	26,720	0.9	1.20	1.40
Armenia	107	4,239	3.9	3,910	3.9	1.59 ^e	2.00
Georgia	141	na	4.3 ^d	8,233	6.0	1.00	3.00
Moldova	148	1,882	1.3	10,073	7.1	0.68	1.03
Holy See	na	na	na	15	na	na	na
European Higher Education Area (Bologna Process)	na	na	3.5 ^d	na	3.2 ^d	1.21	1.39
World	150,656	2,800,470	na	2,800,470	na	na	na

Sources:

EUROSTAT (2010) *European Commission Database*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. For more detail visit: <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/eurostat/home>.

UNESCO (2009) *Global Education Digest 2009: Comparing Education Statistics Across the World*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 264 pp. For more information: www.uis.unesco.org.

The World Bank (2010) *World Bank Database*. Washington DC: World Bank Group. Permanent URL for World Development Indicators dataset: <http://go.worldbank.org/B53SONGPA0>.

Notes:

The main source for the collected mobility data is UNESCO (2009), otherwise specified. Data and definition of concepts between UNESCO and Eurostat have some differences.

a) Countries are ordered by geographic region and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita. Data for GDP per capita are collected for the year 2007 (The World Bank), data for 2008 is also available but some countries are missing. There is no GDP per capita for the Holy See.

b) The UNESCO's definition of the *inbound* index: "corresponds to the number of students from abroad studying in a given country, as a percentage of the total higher education enrollment in that country". And for the *outbound* index is: "corresponds to the number of students (or young people) from a given country studying abroad, as a percentage of the total higher education enrollment in that country".

c) The Eurostat's definition of the *inbound* index: "number of foreign students (world and Bologna Area) studying in a given country, as % of the total enrolment in that country, ISCED 5A and 6". And for the *outbound* index is: "students (ISCED 5A and 6) who are nationals of a given country, studying in another country (EU-27, EFTA and CC) as % of the total enrolment in that country".

d) Data are from Eurostat database.

e) Data corresponds to the growth between 2000 and 2003.

show large differences in the number of students. There are eight countries with more than two million students: Russian Federation, Ukraine, Turkey, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Poland and Italy respectively. The first three are non-EU countries. The EHEA have countries with small a population of students. There are four countries with less than ten thousand students: Liechtenstein, Andorra, Luxembourg and Malta correspondingly. Small countries can have significant mobility flows.

The intensity of student mobility flows varies between the EU27 countries and the non-EU countries of the EHEA. The EU27 has an inbound ratio of 7.5%. This suggests that one in every thirteen students of higher education is a student from abroad, studying in one of the 27 EU countries. The outbound ratio is 2.5%, which corresponds to the proportion of students from EU countries studying abroad. Mobility ratios change when adding non-EU countries of the EHEA. The inbound ratio decreases to 3.5%, while the outbound ratio increases to 3.2%. When considering students of the EHEA, the proportion of students from abroad is reduced by half, a reduction of four percentage points in the EU27 inbound ratio. Differences between EHEA and the EU are presented this way because there are no data available for the non-EU area. However, it might be important to consider that the EHEA includes 19 additional countries, with a slightly smaller number of students. Differences between mobility ratios, in this case the inbound ratio, might reflect the fact that non-EU countries have significant lower inbound mobility than the EU countries. Outbound differences are smaller; the EHEA outbound ratio is 0.7% higher than the EU27 ratio. Nevertheless, this increase reflects that non-EU countries have proportionally more students performing tertiary studies abroad. An explanation for in/outbound ratios differences between the EU27 and EHEA might be that non-EU students' travel to EU countries more frequently than EU students' travel to non-EU countries. In other words, this could be the east to west imbalance of mobile students that researchers and institutions warn of.

The mobility in/outbound flows differ greatly between countries, in both the number of students and the mobility ratios. The number of students from abroad fluctuates in the EHEA from 1,200 students (Slovenia) to 350,000 students (United Kingdom). The number of inbound students can differ between countries by as much as 300 times. The inbound ratios in the EHEA vary from small proportions (i.e. 0.4% in Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) to as high as 90% of the total student population

(Liechtenstein). Inbound ratios can't be higher than 100%. The outbound ratios have different variations. The number of students coming from abroad fluctuates in EHEA countries between 900 students (in Liechtenstein, although the Holy See has only 15 students abroad) to 78,000 students (Germany). The number of outbound students is at least four times smaller than the number of students coming from abroad. Mobility in EHEA is one of attracting students. The variation in the outbound ratio oscillates in a wider threshold, as one country can have more outbound students than the total number of students left in the country's higher education institutions, including those that come from abroad to study in the country. The outbound ratio in the EHEA fluctuates from 0.5% (Russian Federation) to 269% (Luxembourg). Countries like Luxembourg have more students abroad than the total number of students studying in the country. This is the reason for outbound ratios of over 100%. Ratios themselves are not good enough indicators. The case of the Russian Federation presents another circumstance. This country illustrates that even with 43,000 students abroad, the third largest number of students sent by a country to study abroad in the EHEA, the outbound ratio is as low as 0.5%. The Russian Federation is making an effort to facilitate or motivate students to go abroad, but the total number of students in that country is so large that the ratio appears to be insignificant. Individual comparisons between countries might also take into account the number of students. Countries with a large amount of students going in/outside the country could have very different ratios. Austria, Italia, and the Russian Federation are good examples. Their inbound number of students is high, but their inbound ratios illustrate different levels of mobility.

Mobility has no significant correlation to GDP per capita. Differing income between countries does not explain different levels of mobility. The number of students and the in/outbound ratios fluctuate independently of income. In the same way, no significant relationship was found between the total number of students and mobility flows. The number of students in one country does not necessarily reflect the mobility of students. However, the number of students in every country expresses the amount of the effort that countries must make. In countries with small student populations it will be easier to raise ratios, while countries with bigger student populations will need to push a greater number of students to increase their ratios. This is relevant as the Bologna process objectives are based on student proportions; 20% of students in the

EHEA have to have at least a period of study abroad. Depending on the student population size, some countries might be unable to push/attract that many students.

Growth in the mobility flows is calculated through ratios. An increase suggests that the proportion of mobile students in the country is enlarged. Growth can also be calculated with the number of students, indicating an expansion in the quantity of mobile students. Growth differences can be analysed for the EU27 and the EHEA. Countries in the Bologna process increased both their inbound and outbound ratios. The inbound ratio in the EU27 increased by 42% and the outbound ratio increased by 25%. The increase is stronger in the proportion of students coming to the EU area than the increase shown in the proportion of students going abroad. When considering mobility flows in the EHEA growth are different. The inbound ratio increased by 21%, and outbound ratio increased by 39%. The proportion of students going abroad is growing faster in the EHEA. This is a different balance from the growth shown by the EU27; the EHEA is experiencing a faster increase in the number of students going abroad than in the inflow of students. Indicators take into account only the period of study, not including the initial level of mobility. This is relevant as unbalanced flows between EU27 and non-EU countries could be increasing. Growth differences indicate that concerns of unbalanced mobility flows might be correct.

Current mobility flows and growth can be used together in order to calculate possible in/outbound levels in the year 2020. The EHEA average inbound ratio is 3.5% and the mobility inbound growth is 21%. Supposing that the inbound growth remains constant, the ratio in 2020 could surpass 5%. This is four times less than the desirable target. The outbound ratio could be over 6%. The EHEA needs to accelerate the in/outbound ratio growth in order to meet Bologna objectives. When analysing the EU27 area, in/outbound ratios have different proportions and growth. The EU27 might be capable of reaching an inbound ratio of over 15%. And the outbound ratio could reach 4%. Current growth in the mobility ratios in the EU27 countries is not enough to achieve the 20% targeted mobility flow.

Growth between countries does not follow any regular pattern. There is no relationship between inbound and outbound growth. Changes in mobility ratios do not necessarily correlate. Most commonly, in the EHEA, countries experienced an increase

in the in/outbound flows of students. However, mobility is not always expanding; countries reduce their mobility ratios too. This is the case in Andorra and Turkey, where both the inbound and outbound ratios decreased. Countries can experience inbound growth while reducing the outbound ratio. This is the case of Greece, where the proportion of students coming from abroad increased by 44%, while the proportion of students going abroad was reduced. Greece is becoming a country that attracts students, an importer, but it does not motivate students to go abroad. The opposite can be found in Slovakia, where the inbound ratio was reduced and the outbound ratio increased. Slovenia is becoming an exporter of students. The level or speed of growth changes between countries. It can be said that, in the period of analysis, countries can multiply their mobility by ten or can reduce it by half. But those are extreme cases.

Mobility is seen as an essential component of the EHEA. It is considered positive for countries and individual development. In this study some sociological hypotheses about mobility in the Bologna process stand out:

1) The increasing importance of mobility. As it is shown in the ministerial meetings and the resulting communiqués, mobility has changed from just an issue that has to be encouraged, to a desirable target, an objective itself, that would bring many other beneficial circumstances, like the increasingly popular knowledge based society, quality in university and research activities, the internationalization of the European higher education systems, cooperation and competition between countries of the EHEA and with other countries and geographic areas, linguistic pluralism and respect for diversity and capacity to deal with other cultures.

2) Mobility is expanding among both countries and participants. The number of countries that currently pursue mobility is increasing. The Sorbonne Joint Declaration was held by 4 countries. Today the number is 47 in the EHEA alone. However, expansion might continue because non-Bologna countries could include mobility targets in their national agendas. Mobility is not restricted to the Bologna area. More people are becoming involved in the mobility objectives, not only students and teachers. Now everybody in the university is eligible for mobility, doctors, researchers, and academic staff included.

3) Improving mobility is becoming progressively more complex and countries are trying to achieve it in two ways: eliminating barriers and increasing opportunities, both leading to an increase in the number of issues taken into account. Elimination of obstacles includes cooperation between countries for facilitating visas, work permits, transferability of pension funds and recognition of pension rights among many others. Countries are encouraged to improve data collection and monitoring. They should evaluate progress and eliminate specific country barriers. Opportunities are created mainly through funding. Scholarships and loans are increasing. Other opportunities are created by the recognition of ECTS credits, the increasing comparability and transferability in education programmes, and the application of quality assurance systems. All of the above are being applied in order to facilitate mobility.

4) Data about mobility is still being developed. Two main issues related to data are highlighted. Data is evolving in its core definitions and in the number of elements to be considered. There are some problems collecting data about mobility flows, and criteria are changing. This will produce statistical difficulties in the future, as historical data will represent different populations. Nevertheless, corrections should be made. There is the need to make clearer and standardized definitions of indicators for the correct follow up of the process. It is increasingly important to generate significant data. Data compilation requires more and better indicators. Countries should generate systems for collecting more frequent and up-to-date information. Further information must be collected about other issues related to mobility, like the social dimension. Little or no data are available about some of the most relevant sociological consequences and warnings of the Bologna mobility targets. Better and sufficiently available data will facilitate research, and making it possible to produce more suitable policies.

5) Mobility involves other sociological and economic aspects. Concerns about the social dimension of mobility have been expressed since 2001, at the Prague Communiqué. But no specific targets or objectives are found other than those that are discursive and vague. Countries and individual opportunities for mobility around the EHEA are increasingly unequal. Within the Bologna countries there exists different availabilities for financing, preparing international programmes, applying the developed tools, motivating students, teachers, researchers and academic staff, monitoring and producing information, among others. Difficulties for mobile students range from socio-economic

backgrounds to the quality of former education. The Bologna objectives should expand their involvement in other socio-economic aspects, not only targeting mobility as a percentage of the population.

Bibliography

- Bergen Communiqué (2005) *The European Higher Education Area: Achieving the Goals*. Norway: European Higher Education Area, 6 pp.
- Berlin Communiqué (2003) *Realising the European Higher Education Area*. Germany: European Higher Education Area, 9 pp.
- Bologna Declaration (1999) *Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education*. Bologna: European Higher Education Area, 6 pp.
- Budapest-Vienna Declaration (2010) *Budapest-Vienna Declaration on the European Higher Education Area*. Vienna: European Higher Education Area, 2 pp.
- Corbett, Anne (2005) *Universities and the Europe of Knowledge: Ideas, Institutions and Policy Entrepreneurship in the European Higher Education Policy 1955-2005*. Great Britain: Palgrave MacMillan, 268 pp.
- European Commission (2009) *The Bologna Process in Higher Education in Europe: Key Indicators on the social dimension and mobility*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Eurostat, and Eurostudent, 252 pp.
- Eurydice (2010) *Focus on Higher Education in the Europe 2010: The Impact of the Bologna Process*. Brussels: Eurydice, 158 pp.
- Iglesias, Julio, Jesús M. de Miguel, and Antonio Trinidad (2009) *Sistemas y políticas de educación superior*. Madrid: Consejo Económico y Social, 499 pp.
- Leuven and Louvain la Neuve Communiqué (2009) *The European Higher Education Area in the new decade*. Belgium: European Higher Education Area, 6 pp.
- London Communiqué (2007) *Towards the European Higher Education Area: Responding to challenges in globalised world*. United Kingdom: European Higher Education Area, 7 pp.
- OECD (2008) *Growing Unequal? Income Distribution and Poverty in OECD Countries*. Paris: OCDE, 309 pp. The report is available at www.oecd.org.
- Prague Communiqué (2001) *Towards the European Higher Education Area*. Czech Republic: European Higher Education Area, 4 pp.
- Sorbonne Joint Declaration (1998) *Joint declaration on harmonization of the architecture of the European higher education system*. Paris: Ministers in charge for France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, 3 pp.
- Sursock, Andrée, and Hanne Smidt (2010) *Trends 2010: A decade of change in European Higher Education*. Brussels: European University Association, 126 pp. An electronic version of the report is available on-line through www.eua.be.
- UNESCO (2009) *Global Education Digest 2009: Comparing Education Statistics Across the World*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 264 pp. For more information: www.uis.unesco.org.
- Westerheijden, Don F., et. al. (2010) *Bologna process independent assessment. The first decade of working on the European Higher Education Area: Volume 1 Detailed assessment report*. CHEPS, INCHER-Kassel and ECOTEC report for the Directorate General for Education and Culture of the European Commission, 114 pp.
- Westerheijden, Don F., et. al. (2010) *Bologna process independent assessment. The first decade of working on the European Higher Education Area: Volume 2 Case studies and appendices*. CHEPS, INCHER-Kassel and ECOTEC report for the Directorate General for Education and Culture of the European Commission, 221 pp.
- World Bank (2009) *World Bank Database*. Washington DC: World Bank Group. Permanent URL for World Development Indicators dataset: <http://go.worldbank.org/B53SONGPA0>.