

# HEI teaching mobility: looking for dynamics in a seven-year period

M. Pinheiro<sup>1</sup>, B. Barbosa<sup>2</sup>, C. Amaral Santos<sup>3</sup>, S. Filipe<sup>2</sup>, D. Simões<sup>4</sup>, G. Paiva Dias<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Aveiro Institute of Accounting and Administration, University of Aveiro (ISCA-UA) and CIDTFF Research Centre Didactics and Technology in Education of Trainers (PORTUGAL)

<sup>2</sup> Aveiro Institute of Accounting and Administration, University of Aveiro (ISCA-UA) and GOVCOPP Research Unit on Governance, Competitiveness and Public Policies (PORTUGAL)

<sup>3</sup> Aveiro Institute of Accounting and Administration, University of Aveiro (ISCA-UA) and CLLC Languages, Literatures and Cultures Research Centre (PORTUGAL)

<sup>4</sup> Aveiro Institute of Accounting and Administration, University of Aveiro (ISCA-UA) and CIC.DIGITAL/Digimedia - Digital Media and Interaction (PORTUGAL)

<sup>5</sup> Águeda School of Technology and Management, University of Aveiro (ESTGA-UA) and GOVCOPP Research Unit on Governance, Competitiveness and Public Policies (PORTUGAL)

---

## Abstract

Higher Education Institutions are currently embracing mobility as an imperative goal, particularly and most impressively in the European Union countries where programs such as Erasmus+ strongly encourage students and staff to participate. This exploratory research aims to characterize teaching mobility in one university, identify facilitators, determine outcomes of repeated mobility, and provide clues on mobility dynamics over time. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected from application forms and final reports submitted by 107 outgoing and 58 incoming teachers in one university between 2009 and 2016. It was observed that teaching mobility covers diversified profiles (e.g., gender, seniority, and fields of study). 23 out of 71 outgoing teachers participated in more than one mobility program during that period. A deeper analysis on the mobility champions reveals both individual and team initiatives. The results provide some interesting data on facilitators and consequences of teaching mobility.

*Keywords:* Teacher Mobility; Higher Education Institutions; Erasmus Mobility Program; Mobility Champions

---

## 1. Introduction

One of the most recognized words in Higher Education Institutions (HEI) today might be Erasmus. No wonder. It is widely accepted that internationalization encompasses clear benefits for HEI (Jones, 2013), which is reflected in the commitment of universities and government entities in motivating students, teachers and other staff to participate in internationalization programs. The motto has been the advancement of knowledge, the proliferation of academic best practices, and the promotion of overall mobility, cooperation and integration of European citizens. This European Union exchange program established in 1987 is the most successful mobility initiative in the world. Renamed as Erasmus+ for the period of 2014-2020, it comprises 6 other different programs with a forecast of 5 million beneficiaries and an increase in budget of 73%. Its relevance in the internationalization of HEI is highly significant. 90% of the European universities today are connected through the program, which broadened its scope to 33 countries and reached the impressive figure of more than 200,000 students annually. Indeed, more than 3 million individuals have benefited from this opportunity so far, which makes Erasmus+ the biggest mobility program ever. Although staff mobility only accounted for 7-10% of the budget in 2013-2014 (European Commission, 2015), it has evidenced a consistent increase, especially in teaching assignments, which received 38,108 grants in that period. According to the statistics factsheet provided by the European Commission (2016), Portugal registered 8,047 grants in HEI for staff and students in 2014 (when compared to Germany with 48,972 or with Spain with 36,375). From the almost 500,000 staff exchanges since its origin, teaching assignments absorbed 66.3%, with an average of 2,800 HEI sending staff abroad.

This paper aims to contribute to the understanding of HEI teachers' mobility. Sanderson (2008) emphasizes that teachers represent one of the essential dimensions of analysis in the perception of the internationalization process and its dynamics. Indeed, teaching mobility is indispensable to help students develop international skills (Enders & Teichler, 2005; Sanderson, 2008, 2011) and to enhance students'

academic experience (Jones, 2013), along with the benefits it provides to academia, research cooperation and overall teaching, where teachers' own initiative and choices are determinant for the success of mobility programs. The next section presents the main literature contributions on the topic, which supported an exploratory research encompassing qualitative and quantitative data that characterize teachers' mobility in one European HEI between 2009 and 2016. The results provide clues on mobility dynamics over time, which led us to recommend a set of management implications for HEI, as well as suggestions for future research.

## **2. Literature Review**

Knight (1997, p. 8) proposed a definition HEI internationalization as “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution”, that was later updated to “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). As Sanderson (2011) emphasizes, Knight's definition centers the process on the institution, viewing internationalization as a response of the HEI, whereas a more effective approach should be focused on the dynamics of the process, and thus on the interactive roles of students, teachers and institutions. More recently, Jones (2013, p. 162) defined the integration of internationalization as “developing the culture, attitudes and practices that enable international and cross-cultural perspectives and approaches to permeate all aspects of university life”. According to Sanderson (2008), the scope of internationalization includes two institutional levels - the individual and the faculty/department - that participate as key actors in its dynamics and outcomes.

### *2.1. Mobility teachers profile*

Despite the importance of this theme, research on HEI teachers' mobility is still scarce. One of the most relevant contributions is the study conducted by Enders and Teichler (2005), that concentrated on the experiences and views of 1666 teachers and Erasmus coordinators that had a mobility experience in 1998/99. Among the main conclusions of this study are some information about the mobility teachers' profile: they were employed at their HEI for 15 years on average, 46% were senior academics, 31% were women, 90% of non-native English speakers spoke English, and they came from various fields of study.

According to Sanderson (2011), the internationalized teaching practice encompasses a total of seven dimensions, namely knowledge of educational theory and other cultures, openness to other worldviews, critical appreciation of one's culture, use of internationalized content and universal teaching strategies, and understanding of the international labor market. Therefore, teachers' knowledge, skills and attitudes are required to effectively perform as an internationalization agent in class, and help develop global future professionals. This led us to consider two implications: on one hand, some teachers might lack the internationalization profile, and thus be less willing to participate in mobility experiences. On the other hand, it will be essential for teachers to acquire international knowledge and skills relevant to their students while on mobility, as well as an additional effort to incorporate these contributions in class after returning to their home institutions. Sanderson (2008) refers that HEI mobility teachers should accept cultural differences, have knowledge of other cultures and appreciate their own home culture. Most importantly, they should have a cosmopolite nature, which is built on attitudes such as openness, interconnectivity and reciprocity and not so much on intercultural knowledge.

In a general overview, internationalization does not seem to be widely embraced by academics, as an important segment has never been engaged in mobility activities. Still, other academics are actively participating in such programs. Jones (2013, p. 177) refers to a group of internationalization ‘champions’ that support the internationalization goals of their HEI, who are easily persuaded to participate, resulting in repeated mobility experiences. Kinsella, Bossers, and Ferreira (2008) refer that these champions have a passion for and commitment to mobility initiatives, becoming an important enabler of HEI's internationalization. Overall, champions can contribute to a perceived value of teachers' mobility and thus motivate other teachers to try it.

## *2.2. Teachers' mobility benefits*

Internationalization provides benefits to the HEI, to the teacher, and to the students. The outcomes of HEI internationalization include promoting excellence in research and teaching (Jones, 2013), as well as developing partnerships with similar universities (Jones, 2013). As for students, teachers' internationalization is expected to contribute to knowledge, skills and attitudes that are required to succeed in the globalized environment (Sanderson, 2011). In fact, teachers' mobility allows for greater internationalization of academic curricula, embedding an international view into teaching (Law, Muir, & Thompson, 2011) that benefits students. In this process, teachers perform as essential agents of students' international skills acquisition, especially for the ones that are unable to experience mobility during their academic life. In addition, there is evidence of mobile teachers recognizing a positive impact on their home students, especially by fostering and conveying international awareness to non-mobile students (Enders & Teichler, 2005).

Considering the teachers' point of view, mobility can contribute to both academic and personal development (Sanderson, 2011). It may help teachers develop language and inter-cultural skills (Jones, 2013), widen perspectives and understanding (Labriola & Mangione, 2013), improve their teaching methodologies (Smith, 2014) and might have an impact on teachers' professional recognition and reward (Jones, 2013; Smith, 2014), such as promotion and salary policies. Moreover, some teachers may consider the travelling opportunities as a benefit in itself (Jones, 2013; Smith, 2014), and may value adding variety to their academic routine (Smith, 2014). Enders and Teichler (2005) found that most mobile teachers recognized the positive impacts on themselves, including the improvement of their international and intercultural understanding, the contact with new teaching methods, and the improvement of their research contacts. At the same time, most teachers did not believe that the experience would have a positive impact on their career prospects. Labriola and Mangione (2013) emphasized the benefit of gaining a more open attitude, referring to the experience as "undertaking courageous itineraries abroad" (p. 6813). According to these authors, teachers' internationalization is better understood through the lens of a transformative learning process that does not happen overnight, being rather the outcome of repeated mobility experiences (Labriola & Mangione, 2013).

## *2.3. Facilitators and obstacles of teachers' mobility*

Among the accepted facilitators of teachers' mobility are past experience in cooperating internationally with other teachers (Welzer, Družovec, Hölbl, & Venuti, 2010), international professional experience (Law et al., 2011) and familiarity with other cultures (Law et al., 2011), reducing the sense of distance and differentness. Some of the obstacles include perceptions of their interest areas being less international in scope, lack of experience and lack of information on the mobility programs (Jones, 2013).

Welzer et al. (2010) stress that language limitations are one important obstacle to teachers' mobility in the case of teachers who are prepared to teach in their native language only. Enders and Teichler (2005) went through the problems faced during the mobility preparation, and they found four main problems: financial support, workload in preparing the classes for teaching abroad, interrupting teaching and research commitments and finding replacement staff. Smith (2014) presents evidence on overlapping of mobility experience and home university duties, with some mobility teachers having to cope with their home tasks and routines while on mobility, causing frustration. Law et al. (2011) found that some teachers were concerned with the fact that exchange activities would not be viewed as 'real work', and be pressured to keep up with their work at the home institution while being abroad. Additionally, mobility teachers may face physical impacts such as differences in climate and tiredness associated with using free time to meet with staff and students and managing their workloads at home university (Smith, 2014). Although there is evidence of mobile teachers considering the experience motivating and highly valued, there is also evidence of discomfort, loss of confidence, anxiety, role challenge and uncertainty before and during the mobility experience (Law et al., 2011). These problems can refrain mobility teachers from repeating the experience, and it may negatively influence other teachers who are considering that possibility and may be dissuaded by the difficulties faced by others during the process. The strategies for mobilizing teachers with no internationalization experience must encompass clear information on the value of such engagement (Jones, 2013).

### 3. Methodology

Considering the relevance of the topic and the scarce attention dedicated to teachers' mobility in extant literature, we adopted an exploratory approach, aiming to characterize teaching mobility in one university, identify facilitators, determine outcomes of repeated mobility, and provide clues on mobility dynamics over time. As part of the application procedures for Erasmus+ exchange programs, outgoing and incoming applicants are required to provide information that enables profiling of mobility teachers, as well as identification of relevant aspects that may help defining strategies to maximize the participation on the mobility program. Departing from the Erasmus mobility agreement form submitted to the International Office, a database was created comprising 107 outgoing and 58 incoming experiences in the Portuguese University of Aveiro between 2009 and 2016. As some of the teachers in the program participated in more than one mobility in that period, data returned only 121 teaching staff members. Each applicant filled a form that included information regarding personal data on the teaching staff member (name, seniority, sex, and email), identification of the sending and receiving institution (name, Erasmus+ code, address, contact person), and details on the proposed mobility program (main subject field, level, number of students at the receiving institution benefiting from the teaching program, number of teaching hours and language of instruction) (see Table 1).

Following the structure of the form, the study observed indicators that could be analyzed and that might characterize different teaching mobility profiles. The information obtained from the indicators showed some interesting results and shed light on teaching mobility applications by identifying facilitators, determining outcomes of repeated mobility, and providing clues on mobility dynamics over time. Although most of the data were easily coded (see Table 2), the number of Erasmus+' mobility programs that each teacher experienced during the period under analysis had to be constructed based on the application forms. Descriptive statistics were used to characterize teaching mobility.

Table 1. Dimensions and indicators

Dimensions from the application forms	Indicators
Teaching Staff Member	Academic year Name Seniority Gender Email
Sending Institution	Name Erasmus+ code Address Contact person
Receiving Institution	Name Erasmus+ code Address Contact person
Proposed Mobility Program	Main subject field Level of teaching Number of students at the receiving institution benefiting from the teaching program Number of teaching hours Language of instruction

Table 2. Variables and coding

Variables	Coding	Observations
Name	Name	
Mobility	Outgoing Incoming	
Academic Year	2009/2010 2010/2011 2011/2012 2012/2013 2013/2014 2014/2015 2015/2016	
Number of Erasmus+' experiences	Number of mobility experiences within the Erasmus+ context	
Gender	Female Male	Coded from the name of the applicant

Seniority	Junior Intermediate Senior	< 10 years of experience  >20 years of experience
Area of Study	Classification according to the International Standard Classification of Education: Fields of Education and Training 2013 (ISCED-F 2013)	
Level of Teaching	First cycle Second cycle Third cycle	
Partner Country	Country	
Duration of Instruction	Number of days in mobility	
Number of Hours Teaching	Number of hours in mobility	
Number of Students Benefiting	Number of students benefiting from the mobility	
Language	English Spanish French Other	

Additionally, qualitative data were collected from a selection of applications and final reports, in order to further explore the profiles of the participants, especially in the case of mobility champions. Content analysis was the technique adopted.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Mobility profile

Descriptive statistics regarding the mobility profile of the teachers can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics

Indicators	Coding	Frequency	%
Mobility	Outgoing	107	64,8
	Incoming	58	35,2
Academic Year	2009/2010	8	4,8
	2010/2011	9	5,5
	2011/2012	13	7,9
	2012/2013	15	9,1
	2013/2014	31	18,8
	2014/2015	50	30,3
	2015/2016	39	23,6
Number of Erasmus+ Experiences	1	93	76,9
	2	19	15,7
	3	4	3,3
	4	3	2,5
	5	2	1,7
	Gender	Female	86
Male		79	47,9
Seniority	Junior	16	15,8
	Intermediate	50	49,5
	Senior	35	34,7
Level of Teaching	First cycle	30	22,2
	Second cycle	52	38,5
	Third cycle	53	39,3
Language	English	151	91,5
	Spanish	10	6,1
	French	1	0,6
	Other	3	1,8

Outgoing teachers almost double incoming ones. Although in general terms mobility has increased steadily over the years, there was a small decrease in the current year with fewer teachers participating in mobility programs. Even if females are overrepresented in the mobility arena, the gender difference seems not to be significant. Globally, half of the teachers in mobility have more than one decade and less than two decades of teaching experience. The ones with more years of experience also seem to embrace mobility programs more willingly, while those with less practice are clearly the ones who participate just once. The majority of the teachers go abroad in order to give lessons to both second and third cycles and only about one out of five participate in mobility teaching programs for the first cycle. Finally, English is the very top language in the mobility experience. In the seven-year period under analysis, the dynamics shows a deeper

profile: nine teachers experienced mobility assignments more than three times, indicating more elaborate motivations beneath the application process.

The field of studies was another variable under analysis (see Table 4).

Table 4. Area of study

Subject area of study	Frequency	%
Education	9	6,0
Arts	13	8,7
Languages	11	7,3
Social and behavioral sciences	19	12,7
Business and administration	14	9,3
Biological and related sciences	3	2,0
Environment	4	2,7
Physical sciences	12	8,0
Mathematics and statistics	14	9,3
Information and communication technologies	18	12,0
Engineering and engineering trades	19	12,7
Manufacturing and processing	3	2,0
Architecture and construction	5	3,3
Health	2	1,3
Personal services	4	2,7

Although all areas are eligible, there are some that seem to be more popular among teachers. It is the case of social and behavioral sciences, engineering and engineering trades, and information and communication technologies, with more than 12% of attraction. Another relevant variable was the partner country for mobility at the University of Aveiro.

Table 5. Partner country

Partner country	Frequency	%
Spain	24	14,9
Poland	22	13,7
Lithuania	15	9,3
Bulgaria	14	8,7
Germany	13	8,1
Italy	13	8,1
Croatia	11	6,8
Turkey	6	3,7
Belgium	5	3,1
Finland	4	2,5
Greece	4	2,5
Netherlands	4	2,5
Romania	4	2,5
Slovakia	4	2,5
Slovenia	4	2,5
France	3	1,9
Czech Republic	2	1,2
Estonia	2	1,2
Sweden	2	1,2
United Kingdom	2	1,2
Denmark	1	,6
Hungary	1	,6
Latvia	1	,6

From Table 5 it can be seen that Spain and Poland are University of Aveiro's preeminent partners in the mobility process. The geographical and linguistic closeness between Portugal and Spain can be a good explanation for that academic movement, but regarding Poland files do not provide clarification on what motivates teachers to apply.

Three additional variables - duration of stay (in days), number of teaching hours and number of students benefiting from the program - can also help decoding how University of Aveiro perceives and implements the mobility dimension (see Table 6).

Table 6. Statistics

Statistics	Duration of stay	Number of teaching hours	Number of students benefiting from the program
Mean	5,7	7,6	37,7
Mode	5	8	20

Minimum	2	1	1
Maximum	15	24	114
Percentile 25	5	6	20
50	5	8	30
75	7	8	50

Generally, the majority of teaching staff members in the mobility process stays five days away from home, working with two dozens of students and providing eight teaching hours. However, and as it can be read in Table 6, these are mode values, and diversity occurs within the three variables.

#### 4.2. *Outgoing and incoming: two different profiles*

The next step was to understand the academic movement of outgoing and incoming teachers regarding the variables under analysis (see Table 7).

Table 7. Cross tables with mobility

		Mobility		
		Outgoing	Incoming	Total
<b>Academic Year</b>	2009/2010	8	0	8
	2010/2011	9	0	9
	2011/2012	11	2	13
	2012/2013	9	6	15
	2013/2014	11	20	31
	2014/2015	30	20	50
	2015/2016	29	10	39
Total		107	58	165
<b>Number of Erasmus+’ teaching mobility programs</b>	1	47	46	93
	2	15	4	19
	3	4	0	4
	4	2	1	3
	5	2	0	2
Total		70	51	121
<b>Gender</b>	Female	58	28	86
	Male	49	30	79
Total		107	58	165
<b>Seniority</b>	Junior	14	2	16
	Intermediate	33	17	50
	Senior	22	13	35
Total		69	32	101
<b>Level of Teaching</b>	First	17	13	30
	Second	34	18	52
	Third	37	16	53
Total		88	47	135
<b>Language</b>	English	94	57	151
	Spanish	9	1	10
	French	1	0	1
	Other	3	0	3
Total		107	58	165

The mobility dynamics over time seems to show that, in general, outgoing Portuguese teachers tend to embrace the mobility process more than their incoming peers. The exchange increased regularly across all academic years with the exception of 2015/2016. If, on the one hand, almost one third of the outgoings participate in more than one Erasmus+’ mobility program, on the other hand incomings tend to visit just once the University of Aveiro. More than male, Portuguese female teachers seem to enjoy going abroad (54% vs 46%) but there are not significant gender differences in incomings. Within the outgoings, almost 48% belong to an intermediate level (<10 and <20 years of experience) with 53% of incomings having the same level of experience. Almost 39% of the outgoings work with master students and 42% work with PhD students. Among incomings, 38% and 34% provided classes to second and third cycles’ students, respectively.

Table 8. Area of study and mobility

Subject area of study	Mobility		
	Outgoing	Incoming	Total
Education	6	3	9
Arts	10	3	13
Languages	7	4	11

Social and behavioural sciences	14	5	19
Business and administration	4	10	14
Biological and related sciences	2	1	3
Environment	1	3	4
Physical sciences	6	6	12
Mathematics and statistics	12	2	14
Information and communication technologies	16	2	18
Engineering and engineering trades	12	7	19
Manufacturing and processing	0	3	3
Architecture and construction	4	1	5
Health	2	0	2
Personal services	3	1	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>150</b>

Data from Table 8 shows that outgoing and incoming teachers are both attracted by different areas. In fact, if outgoings tend to work in information and communication technologies (16%), social and behavioral sciences (14%), mathematics and statistics (12%), and engineering and engineering trades (12%), those who came to Portugal preferred to work in business and administration (20%), engineering and engineering trades (14%), as well as in physical sciences (12%). Worth noticing is the fact that most of the mobility champions belong to engineering and engineering trades, precisely one of the areas of study with most mobility records in the period under analysis. Still, this area of study shows a tendency to concentrate mobility initiatives in fewer teachers, whereas other areas with high records of mobility have shown a greater dispersion involving a larger number of teachers, some of them with only one mobility experience in the seven-year period under analysis.

Table 9. Partner country and mobility

Partner country	Mobility		
	Outgoing	Incoming	Total
Spain	20	4	24
Italy	12	1	13
Poland	10	12	22
Bulgaria	9	5	14
Germany	9	4	13
Lithuania	9	6	15
Belgium	5	0	5
Turkey	5	1	6
Croatia	4	7	11
Greece	3	1	4
Finland	3	1	4
France	3	0	3
Estonia	2	0	2
Romania	2	2	4
Slovakia	2	2	4
United Kingdom	2	0	2
Denmark	1	0	1
Hungary	1	0	1
Latvia	1	0	1
Netherlands	1	3	4
Sweden	1	1	2
Czech Republic	0	2	2
Slovenia	0	4	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>161</b>

Italy and Spain are the most popular partner countries among outgoings (11% and 19%, respectively), whereas Poland, Croatia and Lithuania are the top ones for incomings (21%, 13% and 11%, respectively).

#### 4.3. Additional analysis on the mobility champions

A deeper look on the application forms and on the final reports submitted by mobility champions evidenced some interesting aspects on the dynamics, motivations and constraints of the experiences. For this matter we selected the four teachers that in the period under analysis registered four or more mobility assignments, three of them belonging to engineering and engineering trades. Among mobility champions, initiatives are either individual or done in a small team. This team pattern was especially notorious in engineering and engineering trades. Moreover, those teachers mentioned as objectives developing the participation in joint research projects and joint supervision of PhD students, emphasizing that the contacts



from the hosting universities had already been established. In their case, the recurrent mobility events resulted from long-term relationships with those partners. Furthermore, the outcomes reported focused mainly on future research projects, and partnerships between the two HEI and their teachers.

The outcomes to home students were never mentioned on the reports, neither the development of teaching methodologies. The focus seemed to be on research projects, and the mentions include knowing better the host university students, teachers and their research projects, in an attempt to foster future collaboration. Again, the focus seems to be on research opportunities.

Considering mobility facilitators, the more prominent referred by champions were the past experience with internationalization, and their international research networks. Also mentioned were the easiness of lecturing in the host universities, namely due to having the teaching materials in English and thus not having the need to create new materials for mobility classes. Thus, this evidence points to a readiness from teachers who use international teaching languages to embrace mobility. Markedly, the more frequent outgoing teachers in our sample have one common characteristic: all have international family backgrounds that may facilitate professional mobility, resulting in their predisposition and easiness to visit and interact with teachers from other countries. This aspect is beyond the scope of this research, and should therefore be further explored in the future.

As for the difficulties, the only reference in this selection of qualitative contributions was related to the insufficient funding provided by Erasmus+ programs, clearly inadequate to cope with all the expenses involved in mobility.

## **5. Conclusion**

Overall, this paper highlights the relevance and research opportunities regarding teachers' mobility that are still underexplored. As Sanderson (2011) stresses, it is evident that more research is needed in this area, in order not only to contribute to the improvement of the state of the art, but also to develop more effective strategies to maximize the outcomes of programs such Erasmus+ for all direct and indirect beneficiaries, particularly in the fulfillment of its final ambition in the education sector: to help develop effective global professionals, and hopefully better citizens. As stressed by Jones (2013), HEI internationalization is not an objective on its own, but ought to be seen as a vehicle for achieving wider goals. One major achievement would be to train globally competent graduates (Jones, 2013), considering students the ultimate beneficiaries of any internationalization practice associated to HEI. Looking at the results of our exploratory analysis, and particularly among mobility champions, the benefits for the HEI and for the research careers of the teachers do not quite match the set of benefits proposed by the literature. The objectives and outcomes registered in the application forms and final reports do not mention benefits for the students of the home institution, neither improvements on teaching methodologies or curricula. In fact, the main contribution seems to be confined to the participation in international research projects and knowledge development on peers' research. Still, we should remind that this research only analyzed the mobility reports, thus the absence of further outcomes might mean that they were neither top of mind, nor related to the main goals of the mobility. The importance and impact of teachers' mobility to home students must therefore be further explored in future research.

An analysis of mobility teachers' profile of the University of Aveiro between 2009 and 2016, seniority and cycle of study stand out. Mobility attracts more intermediate and senior teachers, which is in line with previous research (e.g., Enders & Teichler, 2005). Jones (2013) affirms that mobility managers are essential to encouraging international mobility of early career academics, who might have fewer connections in international networks. Accordingly, our results demonstrate the importance of long time relationships with international partners to foster the participation in mobility programs.

One final note on limitations and suggestions for future research. This paper analyzed qualitative and quantitative data retrieved from application forms and final reports of teachers' mobility initiatives. Thus, teachers' perceptions on mobility were disregarded, and should be considered in future research. Also worthy of further research is the success evaluation of mobility initiatives, namely in terms of the impact on students' learning outcomes, on learning methodologies, and on the HEI global prestige. Moreover, the perceptions of teachers that have never participated in a mobility program should also be object of deep analysis. The amount of application forms collected in this seven-year period indicates that the HEI has

been unable to mobilize most teachers, whose perceptions on the benefits and impacts of mobility deserve to be carefully explored.

## References

- Enders, J., & Teichler, U. (2005). Academics' view of teaching staff mobility: The ERASMUS experience revisited. In A. Welch (Ed.), *The Professoriate: Portrait of a Profession* (Vol. 7, pp. 97-112). Dordrecht: Springer.
- European Commission. (2015). *Erasmus – Facts, Figures & Trends*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission. (2016). EC Erasmus+ Annual Report 2014. Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education\\_culture/repository/education/library/statistics/2014/portugal\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/library/statistics/2014/portugal_en.pdf)
- Jones, E. (2013). The global reach of universities: Leading and engaging academic and support staff in the internationalization of higher education. In R. Sugden, M. Valania, & J. R. Wilson (Eds.), *Leadership and cooperation in academia: Reflecting on the roles and responsibilities of university faculty and management* (pp. 161-182). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Kinsella, E. A., Bossers, A., & Ferreira, D. (2008). Enablers and challenges to international practice education: A case study. *Learning in Health and Social Care*, 7(2), 79-92.
- Knight, J. (1997). A shared vision? Stakeholders' perspectives on the internationalization of higher education in Canada. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1(1), 27-44.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Labriola, A. G., & Mangione, D. (2013, 18th-20th November). *The transformational potential of staff Erasmus exchange: Reporting two experiences of teaching and learning in higher education*. Paper presented at the 6th ICERI International conference of Education, Research and Innovation, Seville, Spain.
- Law, K., Muir, N., & Thompson, K. (2011). An evaluation of a European teacher exchange programme. *Nurse education today*, 31(1), 76-81.
- Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalisation of the academic self. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 12(3), 276-307.
- Sanderson, G. (2011). Internationalisation and teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(5), 661-676.
- Smith, K. (2014). Exploring flying faculty teaching experiences: Motivations, challenges and opportunities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(1), 117-134.
- Welzer, T., Družovec, M., Hölbl, M., & Venuti, M. (2010). Experiences in International Cooperation in Teaching. *Elektronika ir Elektrotehnika*, 102(6), 19-22.