

The image shows a library shelf with several rows of books. The top row features books with gold-tooled spines. Below the books is a dark brown wooden shelf with a gold floral pattern on the left and the number '10' embossed in the center. The background is a green mesh pattern. The title 'A EUROPA DO CONHECIMENTO' is written in large, white, serif capital letters across the middle. Below the title, the names of the authors and coordinators are listed in smaller, white, serif capital letters.

A EUROPA DO CONHECIMENTO

ALICE CUNHA
MARIA FERNANDA ROLLO
MARIA MANUELA TAVARES RIBEIRO
ISABEL MARIA FREITAS VALENTE
COORD.

**MOBILIDADE ACADÉMICA NO ÂMBITO DO PROCESSO DE
BOLONHA: RACIONALIDADE POLÍTICA, PADRÕES
DE DESENVOLVIMENTO E DE CONVERGÊNCIA**

**ACADEMIC MOBILITY WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE BOLOGNA
PROCESS: ABOUT POLICY RATIONALES, PATTERNS
OF DEVELOPMENT AND CONVERGENCE**

Eleonora Erritu

ORCID: 0000-0003-2992-4859

Resumo: Este capítulo tem como objetivo contribuir para um maior conhecimento sobre a implementação da mobilidade acadêmica na Europa no âmbito do Processo de Bolonha, e procura analisar se este foi um estímulo para a convergência política doméstica no âmbito das políticas relacionadas com a mobilidade acadêmica na Alemanha e na Itália, desde meados dos anos noventa em diante. O capítulo faz a ponte entre a literatura sobre convergência de políticas públicas e Estudos Europeus e as abordagens neo-institucionalistas da Ciência Política. Aborda o Processo de Bolonha sob o prisma da governança, utilizada aqui como uma ferramenta para compreender como o processo político é dirigido, e refere-se à convergência como o processo que leva ao aumento de similaridades

DOI | https://doi.org/10.14195/978-989-26-1634-6_2

nas políticas domésticas inter-relacionadas com a promoção da mobilidade acadêmica na direção do modelo do Processo de Bolonha, no caso da Alemanha e da Itália. Ambos os países foram promotores da Declaração de Bolonha desde o seu início, da Declaração da Sorbonne, e partilham uma longa tradição de mobilidade acadêmica que remonta a muito antes de Bolonha. Em 1998, à luz da sobreposição das prerrogativas políticas nacionais no setor do Ensino Superior na Europa, perceberam a necessidade e a urgência de reformar o sistema de Ensino Superior, e de aumentar a sua qualidade, desempenho e internacionalização, sendo que esta última se tornou, mais tarde, no núcleo do Processo de Bolonha. No entanto, quando se fala em mobilidade acadêmica, a Alemanha e a Itália apresentam um desempenho muito diferente. Considerando as diversas semelhanças entre os dois países mas também a escassez de contribuições de políticas públicas orientadas para a mobilidade acadêmica no âmbito do Processo de Bolonha, ambos os países foram selecionados como estudos de caso para esta análise, com um foco na promoção doméstica da mobilidade acadêmica estimulada pelo Processo de Bolonha, para avaliar a ocorrência de convergência nas políticas domésticas. Para tal, propomos um desenho de pesquisa qualitativa original, baseado em análise documental, para analisar este amplo pilar transversal.

Palavras-chave: Mobilidade acadêmica; Processo de Bolonha; Ensino Superior; convergência de políticas; políticas públicas

Abstract: This article aims to advance the available knowledge about the implementation of Academic Mobility (AM) at the domestic level in Europe under Bologna Process (BP), and it seeks to analyse whether its stimulus resulted in the occurrence

of domestic policy convergence in the realm of AM related policies in Germany and Italy, in the twenty years span of time since mid-nineties onward. The article bridges insights by scholar literature on policy convergence and European studies, as well as it draws on what enlightened by new-institutionalist strands of research in political sciences. It tackles BP under the lenses of governance, intended here as a tool to grasp how political process are steered, and it refers to convergence as the process leading to the increasing of similarities in domestic policies interrelated to the promotion of academic mobility toward the BP model in the case of Germany and Italy. Both countries have been promoters of the BP since its very beginning, the Sorbonne Declaration (SD), and share a long tradition of AM that goes back large before BP. In 1998, they funded it in light of overlapping national policy rationales on the Higher Education (HE) sector common in Europe at the end of the nineties – the perceived and urgent necessity of reforming HE system, and the one to increase its quality, performance and internationalization – that later became the core of BP. However, when it comes to AM, Germany and Italy currently perform very differently within the global landscape. In light of their several similarities and of the dearth of policy oriented contributions focusing on AM within BP realm, the two countries have been selected as case studies for this analysis focusing on the ‘domestic promotion of AM’ ‘under BP stimulus’ to assess the occurrence of convergence in domestic policies. It proposes an original qualitative research design to analyse this wide cross-cutting transversal pillar based on document analysis.

Keywords: Academic Mobility; Bologna Process; Higher Education; Policy Convergence; Public Policy

1. Introduction and Scope of the Article

Academic Mobility (AM) represents a tool and a policy instrument, as well as it constitutes the overarching aim of Bologna Process (BP)²¹. Also its perceived necessity across the continent lead to the establishment of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) in 2010.

In light of its growing expansion²² and increasing salience in political and policy-making discourse, as it applies to the BP experience, this analysis seeks to enlighten the potential for policy studies of approaching AM beyond confining it within the single policy field of Higher Education (HE), in line with what suggested by Sa and Sabzalieva²³. Coherently to BP's evidence on policy paper, the expression 'Academic Mobility' refers in the article to the mobility of students, interns, researchers, teachers and staff, as well as to its promotion at the institutional level by Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and HE system.

The article proceeds as follow. The second section presents BP, the transversal AM pillar, and sets the analytical lenses of this analysis. The third section focuses on the research design, while the fourth one on empirical evidence. The main findings are discussed in section five, and the sixth one wraps the article up presenting conclusive observations.

²¹ Vögtle (2014).

²² Murphy-Lejeune (2008) reports a 41% rate of growth of student mobility between 1991 and 2004. Forecasts suggest the number of mobile students are expected to reach 7.2 million students in 2025, a value about 1.2 million in the 2000 (Knight 2012).

²³ Sa and Sabzalieva (2017).

2. Framework

2.1. Bologna Process and Academic Mobility

Bologna Process is the way scholars refer to the process started in Bologna in 1999, where 29 European countries signed a common declaration stating the will to modernize and reform HE systems²⁴. It is an intergovernmental process that can be seen ‘as the product of a regular series of meeting of national ministers responsible for higher education²⁵. As widely known, it is characterized by a non-legally binding nature. Although it relies on voluntary engagement²⁶, shared frameworks of policy actions and common aims emerged along the way to the goal of launching the EHEA by 2010, perhaps the most impressive project in Europe beside the common currency²⁷.

AM is a feature present across Europe since centuries, other than a BP goal since its very early stage. As van der Hijden²⁸ suggests, ‘there cannot be an EHEA where students are not free to leave their place and study abroad, in particular for degree mobility²⁹’, reason why it constitutes a crucial pillar of the entire process. According to Teichler³⁰, it enlightens a timid tentative of cooperation between HE systems before BP, while Vögtle³¹ claims it constitutes the main BP goal that should create ‘a more complete and far reaching Europe³².

²⁴ UNESCO (2013).

²⁵ EURYDICE (2010).

²⁶ Heinze and Knill (2008).

²⁷ Capano and Piattoni (2011).

²⁸ van der Hijden (2012).

²⁹ Curay et al. (2012).

³⁰ Teichler (2011).

³¹ Vögtle (2014).

³² Bologna Declaration (1999), p. 1.

As Teichler³³ suggests, the BP could be read as a global-oriented shift in HE systems toward the internationalization of policies³⁴. It may also, in light of globalization, represent a systemic effort to tackle external pressure and respond to the necessity of the globalized knowledge economy³⁵ due to serious changes in the HE sector – i.e. the necessity of mass education and the one of excellence, the strong increase in competition and the societal need of research within the knowledge economy, as core political rationales of BP underline.

In light of Europeanization, instead, Papatsiba³⁶ argues that BP could be seen as a tentative, by the European Union (EU), ‘to establish the primary foundation for a European HE system’, beginning with the promotion of student mobility in the eighties. To this regard, Van Damme³⁷ notes that ‘a process of more structural convergence [...] [started with the Bologna Process in 1999, after a] series of pioneering and voluntary forms of cooperation’. They are the Erasmus, Socrates, Leonardo and Tempus programmes, and reveal the growing salience of AM within European policy making, as the EC flagship Erasmus program and the inclusion of BP by the European Commission (EC) within the Lisbon Agenda will later confirm. A number of scholars’ point indeed the EC interest in promoting AM in the context of BP as a means to ‘Europeanize’ HE in Europe³⁸.

2.2. Analytical approach

Convergence has been defined by Kerr ‘at root [...] as the tendency of societies to grow more alike’, to ‘develop similarities in struc-

³³ Teichler (2004).

³⁴ Green (1990).

³⁵ See Papatsiba (2006) and Veiga and Neave (2015).

³⁶ Papatsiba (2006).

³⁷ Van Damme (2009), p. 39.

³⁸ See Van Damme (2009) and Papatsiba (2006).

tures, process and performances³⁹. This would explain the tendency of advancing industrial societies to organize themselves in a sort of constant increasing similar away⁴⁰, mediating 'certain determinates process [...] set in motion which tend over time to shape social structures, political processes and public policies in the same mould⁴¹'.

Since within public policy this concept rises several concerns, three observations shall be addressed to begin. Firstly, it shall be highlighted that convergence is more about 'becoming' than 'being alike'⁴². As Kerr noted, it implies the decrease of differences in time of domestic policies or the increasing of their similarities. Secondly, policy convergence may occur in policy goals, as well as in policy content, instruments, outcomes and even in policy styles – 'a more diffuse notion signifying the process by which policy responses are formulated⁴³'. Third, movement in time represents its key dimension: to speak of policy convergence 'there must be movement over the time towards some identified common point⁴⁴'. In the words of Heinze and Knill⁴⁵ I am speaking of 'delta' rather than 'sigma' convergence, meaning two countries moving toward a third common identified point rather than towards each others.

I move beyond Bennet's framework of processes under which policy convergence may occur⁴⁶, and draw on Holzinger and Knill's classification⁴⁷. Mainly due to its non-binding nature, the assumption of this article relies in the fact that policy convergence within BP

³⁹ Bennet (1991), p. 215.

⁴⁰ Ibidem.

⁴¹ Ibidem, p. 216.

⁴² Ibidem.

⁴³ Ibidem, p. 218.

⁴⁴ Ibidem, p. 219.

⁴⁵ Heinze and Knill (2008).

⁴⁶ Bennet (1991) distinguished between emulation, penetration, harmonization/ elite working and policy community.

⁴⁷ Holzinger and Knill (2005a).

signatories' would occur through a process of 'transnational communication', rather than of 'imposition', 'international harmonization', 'regulatory competition' or 'independent problem solving'. In their understanding of convergence under 'transnational communication', they in fact refer to policy convergence as 'driven by the joint development of common perceptions and solutions to similar problems and their subsequent adoption at the domestic level', rather than 'the result of bilateral transfer'⁴⁸. In 'such constellation', 'common educational and normative backgrounds typically facilitate joint development of common policy models'⁴⁹.

They highlight *two families of factors* that may result of specific relevance in 'affecting the degree' of domestic policy convergence by mean of transnational communication, pointing out the caveat that *basic conditions* should already be in place – and specifically the existence of a 'corresponding communication network' where countries are 'actually represented', two aspects in line with BP intergovernmental platform.

Of interest to our discussion are the former, identified as the '*density of information exchange within transnational networks*' and the exchange occurring '*between countries with strong cultural links*'. Under such circumstances, two mechanisms should lead to convergence: *policy copying* (summarized as the synthesis of policy learning and emulation) and *benchmarking*. So doing, the authors shed light on the implications the emergence of a 'benchmark' country may have, mentioning this could 'hence induc[e] an upward shift of the mean'⁵⁰.

Knill groups factors that may favour the occurrence of policy convergence according to countries similarities (institutional and

⁴⁸ Ibidem, p. 784.

⁴⁹ Di Maggio and Powell (1991) in Holzinger and Knill (2005), p. 784.

⁵⁰ Holzinger and Knill (2005).

cultural, socio-economic structures), and the characteristics of their underlying policies (type of policy, policy characteristics in terms of paradigms, instruments and settings)⁵¹.

They then enlighten ‘transnational communication might potentially affect ‘constellations’ above described, while ‘this does not imply, however, [...] cross-national policy convergence in each constellation⁵². What may foster, or interfere, the occurrence of policy convergence toward this ‘third common identified point’ is grouped here according the number of countries already aligned to it, the extent of cultural linkages, the extent of institutional arrangement present between countries (regulation frameworks, administrative structure, policy legacy) and finally the extent of interlinkages in various transnational networks.

Drawing on Hall’s works on the ‘order of change’⁵³, Lenschow et al. also shed light on domestic structural factors that may ‘permit or constrains’ domestic adaptation⁵⁴. This implies a division between *cultural factors* – ideas and narrative of policy discourse, *institutional structures* – intended in a more strictly frame including ‘organizational structures, formal and informal rules and policy making process’ and ‘opportunities for and impediments to change⁵⁵, plus the *socio economic structure*.

These scholars point out the crucial role of domestic factors in the process leading to the occurrence of policy convergence, and indeed the relevance of cultural factors over institutional and socio-economic ones, building on Strang and Meyer⁵⁶ relation of the former

⁵¹ Knill (2005).

⁵² Holzinger and Knill (2005), p. 790.

⁵³ Hall (1989, 1993).

⁵⁴ Lenschow et al. (2005).

⁵⁵ Ibidem, p. 801.

⁵⁶ Strang and Meyer (1993).

to policy diffusion, and ‘by implication to convergence⁵⁷’. Regulatory settings are indeed between those factors that may strongly influence the setting of the instruments, and everything would be here reduced to a mere ‘can we afford this?’⁵⁸. They shed light, however, on the necessity of interplay beyond cultural factors over institutional and socio-economic ones, instead not capable of altering the process of policy convergence.

Radaelli focuses on the case of the Regular Impact Assessment to assess the impact of Lisbon Strategy in domestic policies and suggests the absence of policy convergence despite the presence of policy diffusion, adding insight on the debate about the extent to which ‘policy diffusion actually lead to policy convergence⁵⁹’. He shows how domestic *context matters* in altering the development of policy convergence, a ‘common argument of historical institutionalist literature’⁶⁰, and eventually concludes the supranational stimulus of the European Union (EU) resulted in feeling new bottles with ‘poor wine, or no wine at all’.

Borras and Radaelli’s effort for analyse ‘intervening variables’ which may alter domestic policy change shed indeed light on the role played by the level of ‘communication and co-ordination of the discourse at national level’, ‘the national traditions of political and administration organization’ and ‘the presence-absence of institutional opportunities for coupling and entrepreneurship’⁶¹. The authors conclude that Lisbon Strategy ‘end-point (the most competitive, sustainable, socially inclusive knowledge based society)’ is either perceived in different ways by key member states and remains in any case dif-

⁵⁷ Lenschow et al. (2005).

⁵⁸ Ibidem, p. 806.

⁵⁹ Vögtle (2014), p. 1.

⁶⁰ Radaelli (2005), p. 940.

⁶¹ Borras and Radaelli (2011).

difficult to achieve given the current performance of the European economies and societies⁶².

Veiga and Neave⁶³ underline how Bologna inputs are often incorporated within national policy designs and strategies, and provide ‘windows of opportunity’ in order to pursue national goals, while Witte argues each country ‘implemented its own Bologna’⁶⁴. Capano and Piattoni point out the Lisbon agenda may represent a ‘patchwork’ in Héritier words⁶⁵, but they opt for the concept of ‘script’ to ‘fully grasp the flexible, albeit constraining effects of Lisbon’⁶⁶ strategy. Papatsiba reminds how ‘many scholars contend that during the last two decades, converging HE policies have reinforced disparity among European systems instead of leading to more harmonized systems within Europe’⁶⁷.

2.3. Interplay: Convergence in Bologna Multilevel System

Higher education systems are multilevel governance systems by definition⁶⁸, due to the fact they imply several levels where the phase of policy implementation represents a phase for policy formulation. The BP added a new level of policy-making into the equation of European HE multi-level governance, moving beyond the time European HE system was ‘perceived as a policy field based on the principle of subsidiarity, with no direct interference in the more idiosyncratic features of national system [...] where Europeanization (weather convergence or simple harmonization) [...] was clearly per-

⁶² Ibidem, p. 480.

⁶³ Veiga and Neave (2015).

⁶⁴ Witte (2008).

⁶⁵ Héritier (1996).

⁶⁶ Capano and Piattoni (2011), p. 601.

⁶⁷ Musselin (2005) in Papatsiba (2006), p. 1.

⁶⁸ Capano et al. (2011).

ceived as something to be avoided⁶⁹. Huisman and van der Wende⁷⁰ magisterially made this point arguing that the ‘unthinkable have been implemented’ in the framework of BP.

The inherent tension between the supranational and national level of policy making – clearly emerged soon after BP aftermath – is of crucial importance in the investigation of the extent to which the multilevel governance of BP was eventually able to shape the domestic formulation of national implementation, therefore stimulating the occurrence of convergence between domestic policy of signatures’ countries. The drivers of domestic policy convergence within HE system are currently at the core of the academic debate, as Vögtle summarizes: ‘In the course of internationalization of higher education policies, researchers have increasingly begun to conduct more comparative studies, trying to identify causes for convergent developments, and issues related to “convergences versus divergence” are currently at the top of the research agenda⁷¹’.

‘Although not mentioned in the official declaration [...] convergence is the process leitmotiv⁷². The concept of ‘harmonization’ has been in fact soon abandoned within BP framework, leaving space to the softer sentence of converging toward ‘greater compatibility and comparability’ within European HE systems’. Harmonization was perceived as leading to standardization, while Bologna and following *communiqués* remark frameworks of actions and agreed goals should in any case undermine specificity and peculiarities of national systems, their languages, methods, and contents⁷³. The firm will of participants to keep their imprinting within their national HE system is visible in

⁶⁹ Capano and Piattoni (2011), p. 586.

⁷⁰ Huisman and van der Wende (2004).

⁷¹ Vögtle (2014), p. 224.

⁷² Witte (2008), p. 82.

⁷³ Witte (2006).

BP' pattern itself, built by non-binding agreements and voluntary leaving aside the EC⁷⁴.

Coherently to this panorama, any specific level of policy convergence to be achieved has been set in stone in BP framework. The perceived need of convergence due to external pressure – notably the spread necessity of the nineties of modernize and internationalize European HE systems and the one of increase their competitiveness globally – at the eve of the establishment of the so-called capitalist knowledge economy⁷⁵ have eventually been translated in a stimulus 'to make system similar⁷⁶'. The boundaries of convergence as 'increasing similarities', however, have not been clearly defined, and the measurement of convergence against an 'exemplary model' is complex due to their degree of vagueness⁷⁷. This is clearly showed by the first column of table I, reporting the ten measures emerged within BP discourse from the aftermath to its last development, Berger-2015, in the realm of AM. The second column shows related insights emerged during the analysis. The second column of the table II, moreover, enlighten how also policy rationales often results vague.

As Papatsiba argues, 'it is important to investigate the extent to which mobility outcomes [...] reflect the perceptions and fulfil the expectation of political actors', as well as 'to tackle the 'legitimizing ideas' or 'rationales' that accompanied the institutionalization of student mobility by political actors, since these are likely to mark future promotion of mobility⁷⁸'. However, as shown, we still don't know to what extent domestic policy is converging in the course of BP⁷⁹. Many BP dimensions have been analysed to shed light on the extent to

⁷⁴ Witte (2008).

⁷⁵ Heinze and Knill (2008).

⁷⁶ Van Damme (2009), p. 41.

⁷⁷ Witte (2008).

⁷⁸ Papatsiba (2005), p. 1.

⁷⁹ Heinze and Knill (2008).

which priorities, aims and goals shared on papers driven policy convergence within the EHEA, yet scholar literature offer instead few insights on this transversal pillar of AM.

The analysis of AM may instead enable a policy-privileged perspective due to its idiosyncratic wide nature that implies linkages with a relevant number of policy-making levels – at least seven, the international, supranational, national and regional ones, the institutional level, the sub-level of the single institution and finally the individual – and it has interlinkage in a plethora of policy fields, as shown by table III.

TABLE I: Bologna Process main goals/measures, from Bologna to Berger Declaration

| General Aim or Measure | Including indicators such as |
|---|---|
| Strengthening Bologna Measures Implementation | Introduction of BA and MA, proper use of ECTS and Diploma Supplement, European Quality Assurance, Attractiveness of EHEA and promotion of Academic Mobility |
| Promotion of EHEA Attractiveness | Inter-institutional cooperation, identification of partners regions, promoting quality education, increasing foreign students |
| Removal of the obstacles to recognition of Prior Learning | Recognition of Prior Learning and of Academic Work abroad, both for staff and students |
| Overcoming Obstacle to Mobility | Information Awareness Campaign, Law Motivation, Financial Support, Language Learning of in-coming and out-going students, employed staff and researchers; Space in Curricula, Quality of Mobility, Legal Barriers, Recognition of Academic Work |
| Inter-Institutional Cooperation | Promotion of Joint Degrees, awarding and recognition of the former. Promotion of Mobility |
| Curriculum Development | Integrated Mobility, English Taught Programs, Mobility Schemes and Windows, Double Degrees |
| Promotion of Mobility at PhD level | Reach quantitative targets, Double Degrees, Integrated Mobility, Co-supervised PhD thesis |
| Space in Curricula | Mobility Windows, Integrated Mobility, Flexible structure |
| Curriculum Development | Integrated Mobility, English Taught Program, Mobility Schemes and Windows |

Source: own research based on official Communiqués of Bologna Process Summits, from Bologna to Berger

TABLE II: Policy Rationales for the Development and Implementation of Academic Mobility Policies

| Rationales | Insights | Related Approach to Mobility |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Economical | Skilled Migration | Competitiveness, Country Development |
| | Market Revenue | Revenue Generation |
| | National Development | Capacity Building, Human Capacity Approach |
| Political | Foreign Policy | Cultural Diplomacy |
| | Regional Integration | Cultural Diplomacy |
| | National Development | Innovation, Competitiveness, Capacity Building, Revenue Generation |
| | HE Sector Internationalization | Innovation, Competitiveness, Capacity Building, Revenue Generation, Cultural Diplomacy |
| | International Prestige | Cultural Diplomacy, National Development |
| Institutional/ Educational | HE Sector Quality | Country Development, Capacity Building |
| | HE Sector Modernization | Country Development |
| | HE Sector Employability | Human Capacity Building |
| | Educational | Mutual Understanding, Employability |
| Socio-Cultural | Mobility as Rights | Mutual Understanding |
| | International Cooperation | National Capacity Building |
| | Educational | Pedagogic Approach, Mutual Understanding |

Source: elaboration of the author of DAAD and British Council (2014), Ferencz and Watcher (2012), OECD (2004)

TABLE III: Policy Areas Interlinked to Academic Mobility and sub-fields

| Economic and Financial | Labour Market and Industrial Policy | Immigration | Foreign Policy | Promotion/Marketing | HE Institutional | Educational | Social Protection |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Funds For Mobility | Recognition of previous Learning for Working Purposes | Visa Regulation for Admission | Country Competitiveness | Awareness Campaign | Recognition of Previous Learning and Degree Recognition | Joints/Double programmes | Health Care |
| Grants for Mobility | Research and Development | Visa Regulation for Studying | International Cooperation | Data Collection and Analysis | Admission Criteria and Comparability of Workloads | Non-native languages taught Program | Housing Services |
| Portability of Grants and Loans | Innovation Policies | Visa Regulation for Working while Studying | Soft Power-Cultural Influence | Creation of ad hoc Bodies | Quality Assurance Frameworks and Procedures | Space in Curricula / Mobility Windows | Tutoring - Orientation |
| State Incentives | International Ranks | Recognition of previous Learning for Working Purposes | Regional Integration | Off-line and Online Campaign | Creation of ad hoc Bodies | Off-Shore Curricula | Integration |
| State Benefits | | Visa Regulation for Prolonged or Permanent Residences | Selection and Recruitment | Recruitment | International Research and Cooperation | Stimulation of Student Participation | Protection of International Students |
| Tuition Fees | | | | | | Stimulation of International Network Domestically | Stimulation of Stakeholder participation |
| Exports | | | | | Selection and Recruitment | | |
| Taxation | | | | | Reforming / Modernization of the HE Sectors | Social and Cultural Spill over | |
| Public and Private Expenditure per Student | | | | | Internationalization of the HE Sector | | |

Source: elaboration of the author of evidence available in DAAD and British Council (2014), Ferencz and Watcher (2012), Guruz (2011), Knight (2012), OECD (2004, 2011), Sa and Sabzalleva (2017)

3. Research Design

3.1. Case Selection

AM has a long story within and across Europe that goes back to Greek ancient times⁸⁰ to reach the middle age, when academia was not yet under nations control. Germany and Italy share this tradition, as Guruz' outstanding reconstruction of scholar mobility remind us. Beyond their medieval experience, both countries appear between the 'top hosting' and 'sending' countries since the second World War until the eighties⁸¹, when Italy disappear while Germany seems to held his top position.

Throughout the nineties, both countries began to experience loss of efficiency and quality of their national HE system, especially when compared to the Anglo-Saxon university model⁸². Fears of brain drain

⁸⁰ Guruz (2011).

⁸¹ Guruz (2008), pp. 168-170.

⁸² Veiga and Neave (2015).

and overall necessity of reform their HE systems were present in the period immediately before the aftermath of BP, of which they are indeed the founders together with France and the UK with the Sorbonne Declaration. The BP was in Italy mainly linked to the domestic need of ‘pushing’ reform, as in the German case it was meant to tackle very high dropout rates and degree effective length⁸³. In the same years, a shift from a procedural oriented mode of governance toward a more steering-at-distance mode began in both countries.

The challenge their continental HE tradition implied, as the perceiving of HE as a public good and the presence of powerful ‘academic guilt’ within the domestic system drove them to agree for the establishment of a supranational platform that should have driven change, together with France and the UK, resulted in the BP. Italy and Germany also resulted early ‘implementers’ of its key features, such as the Bachelor (BA) and Master (MA) structure, the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and the Diploma Supplement (DS), basic BP ‘technology’ and pre-condition for the ‘promotion of AM at the domestic level’ shared aim, as presented by table IV.

Despite the very similar panorama at the time of Bologna aftermath, however, the Organization for Cooperation and Economic Development (OCED) report ‘Who studied abroad and where?’⁸⁴ reports Germany belong to the six states that receive more than the 50% of foreign students’, hosting the 6% of worldwide international students⁸⁵. Italy hosts the two 2% of them, and only belong, as Germany, to major sending OCED countries. Indeed, while Germany clearly distinguish by 6% share of international student within foreign students (10%) – as emerge comparing data with the one provided by Altbach et al. (2009) – the share for Italy always reports 2%,

⁸³ Capano and Piattoni (2011).

⁸⁴ OCED (2014).

⁸⁵ Data refers to the year 2012.

meaning the number of mobile students hosted could drastically drop down for the country if using these indicators. This analysis aims to enlighten how the supranational BP stimulus shaped the domestic promotion of mobility over the fifteen years of BP, and to investigate whether policy convergence eventually occurred in the case of Germany and Italy.

TABLE IV: BP Core Features Implementation

| | GER | ITA |
|---|--|------------------------------------|
| Degree structure | YES (supplementing the former and beside specific fields, 1998) | YES (beside specific fields, 1999) |
| Recognition of prior learning (Lisbon Convention) | Yes, but not a right, 2007 | Yes, but not a right, 2002 |
| ECTS | Yes, 2004 | Yes, 2002 |
| Diploma Supplement | Yes, 1999 | Yes, 2002 |

Source: German and Italian German National Report Consulted

3.2. *Research Puzzle*

Despite its strong growing salience, the AM poor European picture appears in line with the global one, characterized by the dearth of the necessary quantitative and qualitative exercises necessary to adequately describe mobility⁸⁶, especially in the realm of the monitoring, assessment and evaluation of related international, national or local policies and regulations.

⁸⁶ Teichler (2015).

A closer look to the Stocktaking exercise of the Bologna Follow Up Group (BFUG) on Internationalization, reveals how the development of AM began assessment relatively tardy. Objectives agreed are too often vague, diffused and difficult to be measured, as already introduced. Few solid efforts have been done⁸⁷, and despite the increase of AM since BP aftermath⁸⁸, it is not possible to draw a systematic picture in numbers neither at the global level, since the UNESCO, OECD, EUROSTAT (UEO) still rely on national collection often incomplete, partial and non-comparable, as showed by the Italian case.

Crosier and Parveva report that very little has been done concerning the analysis of national policies within the EHEA⁸⁹, but a first preliminary assessment on the development of the domestic promotion of mobility is available, as showed by appendix I⁹⁰. Despite this survey already revealed a very unsystematic domestic promotion of mobility across the EHEA, the report was in fact not assessing implementation of declared measures. First systematic qualitative evidence in this direction appears with the pioneering operationalization of a 'national policies/strategy on academic mobility' provided by Academic Cooperation Association (ACA) in 2012⁹¹, that identify how a 'fully-fledged' national policy/strategy on AM should look like, and notably:

- it should clearly identify targets and type of mobility, diploma and degree mobility, funding schemes;

⁸⁷ Teichler (2012).

⁸⁸ Teichler (2011, 2015).

⁸⁹ UNESCO (2013).

⁹⁰ EURYDICE (2010).

⁹¹ Ferentz and Wächter (2012).

- it should clearly identify levels of education and it should have regional targets;
- it should set quantitative and qualitative targets/policy aims, rationales, linkages to other policy areas or national development;
- it should name instruments and means to be employed to reach specific targets.

In contrast to official evidence reported by EURYDICE⁹², the authors themselves note that out of the 48 BP signature countries, only few appear to be equipped with such an effective policy, Denmark, Finland, Estonia, Lithuania and the Netherlands – with Germany standing in the ‘middle-category’.

Due to the current state of available quantitative and qualitative primary source data on academic mobility, I draw on the former definition of fully-fledged ‘national policy or strategy for academic mobility’ to control the occurrence of convergence under the stimulus of BP in the ‘national promotion of academic mobility’, as an ideal type framework of reference. This ideal-type framework enables to identify two crucial points to investigate how the dependent variable – the domestic promotion of student mobility – developed according to Bologna stimulus since time zero (*before* BP), where the path to policy convergence should have begun, and time one (about twenty years *since* BP).

The development of the dependent variable will be observed in several policy fields beyond HE. In fact, ‘for practical reasons, the comparative policy literature is cast mainly within the traditional, but atheoretical, set of sectoral policy categories (education, health, environmental, social, etc.). Yet, [...] it is necessary to break away from such artificial sectoral boundaries⁹³. The analysis of academic

⁹² EURYDICE (2010).

⁹³ Bennet (1991), p. 217.

mobility constitutes a privileged case study also in light of this reason, as largely shown above.

The research question playground of this article asks *'to what extent the supra-national multilevel governance of Bologna Process has been an effective stimulus capable to shape national policy rationales, policies and outcomes and resulted in the occurrence of policy convergence between German and Italian domestic policies interlinked to the national promotion of academic mobility, over the twenty years span of time considered'*.

I control how 'Bologna Process stimulus in the domestic promotion of academic mobility' shaped the 'domestic promotion of academic mobility' according to three dimensions. They are:

- The appearance/development/presence of policy rationales before and following Bologna Process aftermath and the development/presence of a declared/effective coherent national policy/strategy on AM over the time, as the presence/establishment of dedicated bodies to this end and measures taken to pursue agreed aims;
- The domestic establishment of mobility programs and the promotion of EHEA Attractiveness, core feature related to AM within BP, as reported by table I;
- Since the very vague character of BP's aim, I undertake an additional direct comparison to assess the occurrence of convergence, resulted in the operationalization of the 'removing obstacles to mobility' in 13 indicators that may be grouped as belonging to five different policy areas (HE and Research and Development (RD)/Labour Market/Economy/Immigration).

Table II, presented in the section 2.3, enlightens how the agreed aim 'overcoming obstacle to mobility' includes each but three aim/measures present within the other rows of the table. Of the three left out, the unique indicator excluded by the analysis would be the

promotion of mobility at the PhD level, which it included anyway in this article. In fact, ‘Promotion of the EHEA Attractiveness’ constitutes the second dimension according to which I am already controlling how the IV shapes the ‘domestic promotion of academic mobility’, while the implementation of the aim ‘Strengthening Bologna Measures Implementation’ has been addressed in the ‘case selection’ paragraph.

This article follows a qualitative and historical comparative approach. It has been drawn on academic scholarship, Bologna and national steering documents, and undertaken throughout document analysis. The unite of analysis is the national level of policy-making.

4. Empirical Evidence

4.1. Part I – Germany

Policy Rationales and Academic Policy

As aforementioned, Germany had many concern about the modernization of its HE system and its attractiveness among foreign students at the end of the eighties. Although internationalization was already seen as an important parameter of the quality of education in the country, fears of brain drain were behind the strong promotion of in-bound mobility instead of outgoing. Two documents related to Mobility and Internalization in Germany date back before BP, and reveals the economic and foreign policy functions underlying its promotion (*Studienstandort Deutschland Attraktiver Machen* and *Steigerung der Internationalen Wettbewerbsfähigkeit des Studienstandort Deutschland* of 1996⁹⁴).

⁹⁴ National Report Germany 2003.

Since the begin of Bologna, its orientation towards internationalization has been seen as one of the most important driver and priority⁹⁵. This is already visible during the establishment of the new degree structure, accompanied by the introduction of the pilot programme '*International oriented study course*' the programme '*Master Plus*' and the '*Binational integrated double-degree study programmes*'. Already in 2002, a statement linked internationalization of HE to other policy sectors, such as funding acquisition and flexibility of public services. Until 2005, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) supported approximately 10.000 of the 128.000 students from another EHEA nation, and Germany resulted strongly involved in the promotion of European schemes, participating in 13 out of the 19 Erasmus Mundus Master ongoing⁹⁶.

The release of the *International Marketing of Germany as an Education and Research Location* (Internationales Marketing für den Bildung – und Forschungsstandort Deutschland) is reported in steering documents, as the establishment of *Gate Germany Consortium*. The latter, funded by the Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF), DAAD and German Rectors Conference (HRK), involves 115 institutions and it has been established to promote international exchange in the field of higher education in over 20 countries, with 40 information points around the world under DAAD coordination. The stock-taking exercise undertaken for the period 2005-2007⁹⁷ reports growing number of mobility in the case of student, researcher, teaching and staff. The *German Mobility Centre* has been established at the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in 2006. Founded by the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research, it is part of the European Network of Mobility Centres (ERA – MORE).

⁹⁵ Ferencz and Wächter (2012).

⁹⁶ National report Germany (2004-2005).

⁹⁷ National Report Germany 2008.

The development of talks with the Fulbright commission, to achieve the recognition of bachelor degrees obtained in the USA appears also in agenda during these years.

Exactly ten years since BP, with the *Foreign Office's Research and Academic Relations Initiative* in 2009, the crucial role of international exchanges has been directly linked to the overall development of Germany in the globalized knowledge-based society: Germany aims to become a high level centre for global learning, and Internationalization is generally referred in terms of innovation (see *Bildung und Forschung weltweit* – Innovation Durch Internationalität⁹⁸). At this point, a Deloitte report⁹⁹ indicates nineteen programs providing and supporting mobility according to four areas: cross border grants, promotion of global carriers, supporting outbound mobility and inward mobility. The HRK-Audit Internationalisierung funded, until 2015, 42 different projects. Increasing international mobility of students is included in the nine action of the *Strategy of Internationalization of the HEIs*¹⁰⁰. The latter clears specific rationales and goals in supporting mobility, such as the expansion of international networking and campus oriented HEIs.

The main actors involved in mobility are the Federal Foreign Offices, the Federal Ministry for Education and Science, the Federal Ministry for Development and Cooperation, the Lander, the Standing Conference of the Ministries of Educations and Cultural Affairs, the Joint Science Conference (GWK), the WR, the Alexander Humboldt Foundation (AvH) and DAAD¹⁰¹. The former bodies provide policy orientation and funding, while DAAD has delegation to implement measures, mainly funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research. It

⁹⁸ Ferencz and Wächter (2012).

⁹⁹ Deloitte (2013).

¹⁰⁰ National Report Germany (2015).

¹⁰¹ Ibidem; Ferencz and Wächter (2012).

acts as a mediator between governmental bodies and HEIs to promote mobility especially within and beyond the Erasmus framework, for which it serves as national agency¹⁰². Most of the Lander, that have in Germany a key role in HE, have laws that include parts focused on mobility and internationalization¹⁰³. HEIs are also involved in the process of implementation of mobility and internationalization policies, the large majority of them have their own related strategy, and they receive incentives if they engage in internationalization activities¹⁰⁴. Germany follows a quantitative target for the development of promoting academic mobility, set at 50% of students for both credit and degree mobility, of which 30% gained abroad at least 15 ECTS¹⁰⁵, that make it one of the most ambitious target across the entire EHEA. It is worth mentioning, before concluding this preliminary overview, Germany still reports that the majority of all students finance their studies by private income, notably their earnings or family assistance¹⁰⁶.

Mobility and EHEA Attractiveness

The DAAD launched its first scheme on international attractiveness in 1996¹⁰⁷, and several initiatives, such as the Franco-German University, have been developed before BP¹⁰⁸. Evidence of the stock-taking exercise reports eleven projects in place to promote EHEA cooperation¹⁰⁹ and provides a large and detailed picture about the

¹⁰² National Report (2015).

¹⁰³ Ferencz and Wächter (2012).

¹⁰⁴ National Report (2015).

¹⁰⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰⁷ Ferencz and Wächter (2012).

¹⁰⁸ National Report Germany (2002-2003).

¹⁰⁹ *Ibidem*.

implementation of international activities naming over 100 programs on-going¹¹⁰ (i.e. funding reserved for mobility increased for initiatives already in place, to which it may added 50 international doctoral programmes at *German Research Foundation (DGF)*; 28 Lander programs implemented).

Germany is partner in the research partnership *Better Careers and More Mobility*, an BP initiative¹¹¹, and DAAD supported about 100 joint-degree programmes in 2007/2008¹¹². The rate of German participation in Erasmus mundus projects is reported to be stronger than others at this times, with Germany being involved in 50 out of 104 master programs promoted at the EU level, and with about 250 double/multiple or joint degrees in place.

The DAAD is also a key supporter of the European Higher Education Fairs, in collaboration with the British Council, Campus France and Nuffic. It also finances the *Integrated International Double Degree Programmes*, and it coordinates the ASEMUNDUS/Euro-Asia network. Indeed, it supports partnerships with developing countries, promoting activities with non-EHEA institutions¹¹³. As Ferencz and Wächter reports¹¹⁴, the centrality of establishing cooperation beyond Europe in the country was already visible in the 1996 DAAD initiative. As previously suggested¹¹⁵, beyond a large part of mobility ensured by EU lead programs, Germany effectively appears to concentrate in areas 'beyond Europe'. This explain the lack of a specific targeted zone around the globe in which to promote mobility, as the Italian case will instead point out.

¹¹⁰ Ibidem.

¹¹¹ National Program Germany (2007).

¹¹² National Program Germany (2009).

¹¹³ Ferencz and Wächter (2012).

¹¹⁴ Ibidem.

¹¹⁵ Kindel and Ruttgers 1996 (?).

Table V provides insights on the empirical evidence collected according to the first two dimension of the research design, enlightening the on-going dynamics between different actors and levels and how the macro to the micro level are connected within the mobility panorama. It also provides empirical evidence of the practical established measures on which this section has been built.

TABLE V: Germany

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy Rationales | The internationalization focus of BP appears strongly in line with national priorities before its own aftermath. The relevance of mobility increased over the time and AM appears currently strongly linked to the emerged German domestic rationales of becoming a highly competitive global key knowledge economy hub. Germany approaches mobility according to a skilled migration approach, as reported by the OCED (2012), and it is within the countries currently welcoming the highest number of international students worldwide. |
| Academic Mobility Policy /Strategy | The German national effort within the realm of academic mobility related policies appears coordinated and harmonized between providers, level of implementation and policy areas. The ministry of education steers the crosscutting theme of promoting academic mobility within the larger framework of innovating and internationalizing German HE system, a key sector for the fulfillment of German aim to become a key player in the global knowledge economy. It supports student mobility through a scheme of grants and loan, initially developed for domestic studies but currently portable in case of international mobility (annual pay-check/Bafog), and with the Free Mover Scholarship under the European Excellence Programme. Its funded ASSIST service acts as a reference point for foreign students and aims to simplify procedure leading to studying in Germany. |
| Actors and means | Germany has a central actor for the practical promotion of mobility, the DAAD, that allocates ministerial funds to support mobility directly to HEIs and to individuals (STIBET funds/PROFIS programmes). It also serves as the national agency for the Erasmus program, and it provides a series of additional schemes to promote mobility both for incoming and outgoing mobility, at the level of study, traineeship, research and teaching to overcome the 'demand' left aside by European mobility scheme. The lander, also equipped with independent internationalization strategies, allocate funds under their direct coordination to institutions and students. Higher education institution directly promotes mobility thanks to the establishment of more flexible curriculum, integrating mobility experiences within degrees and expanding the teaching supply in English, as establishing Joint and Double degrees at different level of study, transnational research cooperation, bi and multilateral exchanges. |
| Targets | The official stocktaking exercise indicates that the German effort under Bologna development has been coordinated in the promotion of a number of different declinations of academic mobility, and it targeted both in-coming and out-going flows, mobility at the level of studying – both at the BA, MA and PhD levels, of research – from early stage researchers to experienced once, and at the level of scholar and staff mobility. Germany has a quantitative targets set at 50% of students for both credit and degree mobility, of which 30% gained abroad at least 15 ECTS by 2025. |
| Measures initiative and established programs | The establishment of <i>East and South Partnership</i> , involving Japan and Korea, of the <i>UNIBRAL project</i> and the <i>EU-Asian Higher Education Platform</i> , run by the EUA, DAAD and NUFFIC highlights the country involvement in the promotion of the European higher education system beyond the continent. The DAAD program <i>Go East!</i> provides opportunities for domestic students to Easter Europe, while the GAIN initiative concentrates on scholars from/to North America. The DIES programmes focus on Eastern Africa and South-East Asia. Between the measures embraced to promote international exchange, a number of large regional trans-border collaborations should be mentioned: the Saar-Lor-Lux-Trier and Westfalz, cooperation between the Netherlands and lower Saxony, the European Confederation of Upper Rhine Universities EUCOR, the Unitec Project of the RWTH Aachen, the European Postgraduate Research Groups and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft DGF, cooperation in transport science (Dresden Technical University with 5 EU universities); ongoing cooperation with the Baltic Region, as the 'Nordische Bauakademie e. V.' and the Association of Baltic Academies of Music. In the realm of the international dimension of vocational training: the Bauhaus Universität Weimar with USA, NL and ITA, the cooperation centre in Bavaria with France, California, Usa, the Palucca Schule Dresden (Hochschule furt Tanz) and the Coimbra, Santander and Compostela Group. Internationalization at the level of the lander is also named with reference to the programs ISAP. Furthermore, between other initiative taken: International Max Planck Research School, the Franco German University and the German Italian University Centre; efforts in the practical implementation of binational doctoral programmes, the Germany Junior Professorship Scheme. Between the efforts undertaken by singles universities: the establishment of the Binational University (ENOTIS, later EMOTIS), the central scientific International School of Advanced Technology (ISAT) at Kaiserslautern University, and the Cologne University involvement in international network of PIM and CENS. |
| Source : German National Reports (2002-2005); Ferenz and Watcher (2012) | |

4.2. Part I – Italy

Policy Rationales and Academic Policy

In Italy, the lack of systematic policy rationales and of a national strategy related to mobility is evident before the aftermath of Bologna, when Italy appear as following the traditional ‘mutual understanding’ approach¹¹⁶. The latter implies countries seek to create international networks ‘of political and business elites between students and scholar¹¹⁷’, and it includes a variegated range of policy rationales ranging from the academic and cultural ones to geostrategic, political and broad economic ones¹¹⁸.

In the standardized questionnaire on ‘student and staff mobility’ included for the first time in the national report of 2012, the first national strategy to promote mobility within higher education has been suggested to be 1996, when support to quality bilateral cooperation has been granted by law. According to official document released by the Bologna monitoring exercise, however, a dearth of clear and systematic domestic policy rationales emerged for the promotion of student mobility, resulting in the lack of a strategic national approach also during the very last BP development.

According to the National Report of 2003, mobility has been at the centre of the implementation of BP since its early stage. In 2003 the *Found to Support Mobility of Students* has been established by law¹¹⁹, providing funds to enhance Erasmus mobility actions. Italian National Academic Recognition Information Centre (NARIC) has been established in the same year to collect data on joint/double degrees,

¹¹⁶ OECD (2004).

¹¹⁷ Ibidem, p. 221.

¹¹⁸ Ibidem, p. 232.

¹¹⁹ N. 170 of 11 July 2003.

and a National Register of Students and Graduates has been set up by the same law, to improve procedures of recognition of studies. Financial measures have been embraced to contribute to the harmonization of the EHEA, to the promotion of international mobility and inter-university cooperation¹²⁰. Four decrees focusing on internationalization and mobility have been released relatively soon after Bologna Declaration, allocating funds to enhance mobility, competition and inter-university cooperation within and beyond the EHEA as well as the recognition on previous study and work and, at least on policy papers, the improvement of immigration legislation¹²¹.

Declarations by key players suggesting the need for Italy to develop a 'country project' serving as a framework for the promotion of mobility emerge around 2008, when a book preface published by the Director General of the MIUR pointed out the need for Italy to <recover the noble traditions of the past and be once again considered as the selected venue for students and scholar from all over the world¹²²>, as well during the '*Strategies in support of the internationalisation of the Italian University System*' Conference of 2009, that highlight the role higher education system could play as a foreign policy instruments¹²³.

While Bologna National Reports suggest actions and measure to promote mobility increased, they also highlight how the promotion of mobility is neither coordinated nor monitored and evaluated. A national report (of 2012) states Italy as equipped with a national strategy for academic mobility, but the attached questionnaire highlights i) the dearth of policy rationales and goals at the very base of the promotion of international student mobility, ii) the country relying

¹²⁰ National Report Italy (2004-2005).

¹²¹ Ibidem.

¹²² European Migration Network (EMN) (2012), p. 17.

¹²³ Ibidem.

on Erasmus and the large unmapped panorama beyond it, and iii) the lack of clear policy instruments embraced to practically implement mobility in different policy areas.

The *Programmazione Triennale 2013-2015* (Ministerial Decree 827 of 2013 and Ministerial Decree 104 of 2014) targets the promotion of cooperation ‘in order to achieve better results at the international level’. The main lines of action follow the objectives of raising the number of visiting professors, increase participation in EU programmes for research and education, the promotion of foreign language taught programmes and finally to foster credit and balanced mobility¹²⁴. Italy does not yet have a quantitative targets set up for mobile students and follows the Bologna 20% benchmark by 2020. Other targets set are the <increase in the number of> students with foreign qualifications, international academic staff, joint degrees and teaching projects.

The last national report available, of 2015, states that clear objectives and aims rely behind the implementation of measures due to the internationalization of the Italian HE. It does not state them, but takes note on the dearth of a formal national strategy in this realm.

In 2017, finally, the *National Strategy for the Promotion of the Italian Higher Education System Abroad* explicitly reports policy rationales clear interlinked to foreign policy for the promotion of international mobility. It relates the development of strong linkages of the Italian HE abroad to the overall development of the country, and includes links with a number of policy field. Rationales emerge especially for what that concern in-bound mobility, and are listed to be interrelated with economic, social and diplomatic concerns¹²⁵. National policy goals are specifically mentioned for the mobility of staff, but only some measures to pursue goals reference the text. The

¹²⁴ National Report (2015).

¹²⁵ MAECI (2017).

strategy takes into account the lack of a key actor responsible for the promotion of AM for the first time, and the example of Britain and Germany with the British Council and DAAD are pointed out as best practices to be followed¹²⁶. The focus appears to be mostly linked to internationalization than of on AM.

The national actors involved in the promotion of mobility are the Ministry of Education, University and Research, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, and their competent departments. The Rector Conferences (CRUI) is the most relevant stakeholder¹²⁷. The ENIC/NARIC centre and Information Centre on Academic Mobility and Equivalence (CIMEA), plus the Interuniversity Consortium CINECA (Consorzio Interuniversitario per il Calcolo Automatico dell'Italia Nord Orientale), technical and operation body of the MIUR, are indeed key actors in the implementation of internationalization measures. A centre for the Academic Promotion and Orientation on Study has been established by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Rome, with three seats also in China, but the implementation of its tasks appear compromised by inadequate competences and lack of financial resources. The *Agenzia Nazionale per I Giovani* (ANG) is currently responsible for the implementation of EU programs.

Cooperation at the inter-university level played a relevant role in the promotion of mobility, as HEIs are crucial actors in the practical development of the international dimension of the Italian HE system¹²⁸.

¹²⁶ Ibidem.

¹²⁷ National Report Italy (2015).

¹²⁸ Ibidem.

Mobility and EHEA Attractiveness

As for the domestic implementation of schemes and mobility programs, the empirical evidence collected pin points few efforts beyond the implementation of basic measures within BP for mobility (establishment of BA/MA/PhD degree systems, ECTS, DS, QA) and the participation of European lead programmes.

The Italian effort appeared as strongly shaped by the establishment of binational universities and the efforts of joint degrees, as well as by structured cooperation by the ministries within larger framework of cooperation, and specifically of cultural, scientific and technological nature.

This effort suggests the reproduction of former exchanges networks; as at the level of universities, Spain, France, Germany, the UK and the United States were preferred partners in the establishment of joint degrees as for the establishment of binational universities¹²⁹. Currently, Usa, Cina, India and Japan ‘alone’ receive alone the 39% of available funding, as the Mediterranean and Balkans regions together, while 22% is reserved for Latin America¹³⁰. Middle East and generally North Africa appear between the ‘main region operating student mobility’, with Cina, Mongolia, Indonesia, Vietnam, Iran and Brazil as the geographic areas of ‘primary’ interest involved in the promotion of specific actions in secondary education¹³¹.

As table V did for Germany, table VI will summarize the empirical evidence on which these sections have been based.

¹²⁹ National Report Italy (2005).

¹³⁰ National Report Italy (2009).

¹³¹ MAECI (2017).

Academic Mobility within the framework of the Bologna Process:
About Policy Rationales, Patterns of Development and Convergence

TABLE VI: Italy

| | |
|--|--|
| Policy Rationales | <p>Clear and coherent policy rationales in the realm of student mobility are rather absent than not systematic. A wide range of reasons is mentioned as Bologna develops, while evidence of the emergence of clear and systematic policy rationales emerges only after 2015, when they appear to be interlinked with foreign policy consideration. Over BP development, the following emerges as motivation behind the domestic promotion of mobility: A) The contribution to the harmonization of the EHEA (2005); B) The promotion of international mobility and inter-university cooperation/competition (1996, 2005, 2013); C) The necessity to achieve better results at the international level (2013); D) The recovery of past noble Italian historical tradition in academic mobility (2008); E) The opportunity to use academic mobility as a foreign policy instrument (2009); F) General economic, social and diplomatic concerns (2009, 2015).</p> |
| Academic Mobility Policy /Strategy | <p>The national level of policy making is not central in the promotion of academic mobility, and relies on the reception of Bologna guidelines and on a 'diffuse' model emerging by the promotion of mobility at the sector level, notably by Italian higher education institutions. There is no evidence of a coordinated strategy at the national level. Indeed, empirical evidence and past scholarship point out the strong necessity of the latter.</p> |
| Actors and Means | <p>There is no central body dedicated to the promotion of international academic mobility in Italy. The number of actors involved in the promotion of mobility is huge. Each actor is engaged in different and often specialized aspect of this issue. According to the MIUR, over 800 different agencies operates 'in the field of international academic exchanges', some with very specific tasks, but with no coordination between them. Mobility is 'steered' by three key ministries, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and the Ministry of Education, University and Research. A number of annual scholarships are granted every year by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a mean to promote international cultural cooperation and to promote Italian language, culture and research, such as the annual scholarship for the College of Europe. They follow a system of public notice and a scheme of special projects, while other scholarships are granted according to agreements between foreign governments and Italian universities. They are structured and easy to be reactivated if temporary suspended, but they often report cooperation suspended. The promotion of mobility is ensured trough distribution output public system, with two additional channels providing funds: Fondo Giovani and the national funds to ensure institutional cooperation in teaching with compulsory modules; both of them can adopt and implement its own strategy. The coordination of ERASMUS and generally EU initiative is coordinated by the Agenzia Nazionale Giovani (ANG), that divides between youth, instruction (INDIRE) and traineeship (ISFOL). Institutional autonomy among institutions, on which the national level relies for the implementation of mobility schemes, has been granted enabling and promoting the establishment of more flexible degrees and mobility windows (National Report 2015). Over one-hundred universities are reported to provide English speaking courses and over 600 hundred double/Joints and multiples degrees have been reported as ongoing in February 2013. Evidence about them has not been retrieved.</p> |
| Targets | <p>The empirical evidence revealed the lack of both quantitative and qualitative targets for the promotion of academic mobility. The monitoring of mobility is generally under-developed and the complexity of retrieving information about flows, single initiative and programs undermine the reconstruction of a clear and whole picture of the state of promotion of academic mobility in Italy. The unique clear and measurable target Italy follows is the 20% BP benchmark by 2020, while domestic targets appear vague and as having a very general scope: 'raise the number of' visiting professors, participation in EU programs for research and studying, and 'increase in' the promotion of foreign taught programs or credit and balanced mobility, students with foreign qualifications, international academic staff, joint degrees and teaching projects (part of the multiannual planning 2013-2015).</p> |
| Measures, initiatives, programs schemes | <p>An effort to increase the European Dimension of the EHEA emerges with the establishment of the French-Italian University, the German-Italian University and UNIADRION in the first phase of the Bologna process. The latter has been established in 2000 and involves countries of the Adriatic/Ionian Basin with the aim of strengthening cultural cooperation. Thanks to the University of Foreigners Perugia, Italy is involved in the Mediterranean Universities Union (UniMed) and in the Euro-Mediterranean Universities (EMUn), as well as in the Italian University in Egypt. Outside, Europe, the Fulbright Programs appear as one of the most prestigious exchange programs in Italy. The Marco Polo Program has been established to ensure mobility with China within Universities (since 2006), while Turandot currently enable Chinese students aiming to access higher education in the fields of arts and music, and specifically Higher Education in Art and Music (AFAM). These programs have been promoted at the ministerial level. Two other programs ongoing in Asia are Fellowships for India and the establishment of the Italo-Chinese University. The ARCADE Project involves 20 foreign partner universities and it is managed by the Polytechnic University of Turin. The Italian University Consortium for Argentine (CUIA) has been developed and implemented under the internationalization plan of the Ministry of Education. Unibo has also a campus in Buenos Aires, and it is one of the two Italian universities with offset branches. The initiative Invest Your Talent in Italy is presented as means to achieve a better steering of the international education of Italian university beyond EHEA, and involves Colombia, South Africa, India, Turkey and Brazil. The Rita Levi Montalcini Program has been established to enhance mobility opportunities for research. An original project, One City One Dream, has also been developed at the level of Milan municipality, with the aim to increase Milan attractiveness as an excellence centre in several disciplines, such as design, fashion, tourism, film, economics and engineering. The European Migration Network report over 183 Italian languages schools operating abroad in 2012.</p> |
| <p>Source : Italian National Reports (2002-2015); EMN (2012)</p> | |

4.3. Part II – Direct Comparison

Coherently to previous emerged evidence, also the direct comparison enlightened a strongly less systematic effort and a partial implementation of shared measures to ‘overcome obstacles to mobility’ in Italy, while an advanced panorama emerged for Germany. Table VI shows this in detail.

A relevant number of individual scholarships and grants, managed by DAAD among a clear number of mobility providers are provided in Germany, while a standard procedure has been set up in Italy mainly to support Erasmus mobility, complemented by ‘diffuse’ effort at the HEIs level. In both countries, HEIs are incentivised to promote mobility thought financial means and mobility and is considered in QA procedures. In Germany there is almost full portability of grants, scholarship and loan, while only some grants are portable in Italy. Germany provides comprehensive and systematic information about mobility opportunities, through the DAAD. The lack of funds is listed as the main reason for the few programs in place in the case of Italy, where far less efforts have been taken and developed. Despite the effort to increase information, this feature is also perceived as one of the biggest obstacles to mobility.

TABLE VII: ‘Overcoming obstacles to Mobility’ Direct Comparison Overview

| Policy Area(s) | Bologna Measures | | GERMANY | ITALY |
|--|------------------------|---|--|--|
| Higher Education/ Research and Development | Curriculum development | Establishment of Joint & Double Degrees | German Higher Education legislation permits the establishment of Joint Degrees or Programs. Specifically, the section 18, sentence 5, of the Framework Act for Higher Education (HGR) and the corresponding regulations in the Lander: The Strategy of the Federal and Lander Ministers of Science for the Internationalization of Higher Education Institutions in Germany includes specific commitments to facilitate the inclusion of Joint Programs. The share of HEIs awarding and providing Joint Degrees is reported to be between 20 and 50%. The students enrolled in Joint Programmes is estimated to be below 2.5%. 45 and 55 are the percentage share of Joins Programs respectively in the first and second cycle. Joint Programs at the PhD level are reported to be zero. | Italian Higher Education legislation permits the establishment of Joint Degrees of Programs. Joint Degrees are named within the national regulation of degree structure (Ministerial Decree 509 of 1999, 240 of 2004 and 1059 of 2013). The legal base to establish joint degrees is the agreement between HEIs that organise the program. The share of HEIs awarding and participating in Joint Degrees is respectively between 11 and 25% and 76 and 99%. The Students enrolled in Joint Programmes is estimated to be below 2.5%. 30, 65 and 5% are the share of Joint Programs respectively in the first, second and third cycle of higher education. Although about 51-75% of HEIs in Italy have their own internationalization strategy in Italy, and the percentage of HEIs that engaged with international actions without having a formal policy or strategy is reported to be the 100%, participation in Erasmus seems to be the practical side of these data. |
| | | Non-native language taught programs | Programs taught in other than German languages follows the same legal regimes as programs held in the official language. | Programs taught in other than Italian languages follows different legal regimes as programs held in the official language, since they have been incentivised (Ministerial Decree 104 2014). |
| | | Recognition of previous studies | The recognition of foreign qualification is on behalf of HEIs, whom decisions are made basing on ENIC/NARIC centre advice. Recognition takes place according to the Lisbon Convention, and qualification are considered as the national ones if countries signed Lisbon Convention. Other way, qualification are valid if the grant access to HE within the home countries. The responsible body is the ZAB (German Central Office for Foreign Education), which published requirements and procedure to fulfil them, but recognition is granted by HEIs. The same apply to first, second and third cycle of higher education system. | The recognition of foreign qualification is on behalf of the central or regional governmental authority, which takes its decision basing on ENIC/NARIC centre advice. Foreign qualifications are considered in the same way as national ones, but the requirement of 12 global schooling years is required. If the qualification grants access to HE abroad, it is automatically recognised in Italy. The same apply for the first, second and third cycles of higher education system. |
| | | previous work | According to the professions, decision are taken at the Lander or Federal level and based on the advice of ENIC/NARIC centre. | The recognition of foreign qualification is on behalf of the central or regional governmental authority, which takes its decision basing on ENIC/NARIC centre advice. The regulation follows the law 148 of July 2002 (Lisbon Convention ratification). |

Academic Mobility within the framework of the Bologna Process:
About Policy Rationales, Patterns of Development and Convergence

TABLE VII (continued): 'Overcoming obstacles to Mobility' Direct Comparison Overview

| Policy Area | Bologna Measures | Indicator | GERMANY | ITALY |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------|---|---|
| Higher Education / Research and Development | Mobility of Staff | | Mobility of Staff is included within the (2013) Federal and Lander Ministers of Science for the Internationalization of the Higher Education Institutions in Germany. Specific mobility programs for staff are foreseen for researcher, teaching staff and PhD candidates and postdocs. DAAD, the Alexander von Humboldt, the German Research Foundations and Max-Plan-Gesellschaft offer funding for related activities. There are not quantitative targets related to staff mobility. Rates of participation collection exists and a website providing information about all mobility schemes for staff is available. | Mobility of Staff is included within the multiannual strategic planning of the Ministry (Ministerial Decree 827 of 2013), that foresees an increase in the number of visiting professors, participation in EU Programs and the recruitment of foreign scholars. Also short-term programs are available. There is not quantitative target set. 'Increase mobility' is mentioned in general. Rates of participation are considered as collected but empirical evidence is not available. There is not a website providing information about all the available programs for staff mobility. |
| | Quality Assurance Procedures | | Student Mobility and Internationalisation of curricula are considered in QA procedures. | Student Mobility and internationalisation of curricula are considered in QA procedures. Joint Degrees faces more flexible QA criteria. |
| Economy and Labour Market/ Research and Development | Funds for mobility | | DAAD acts as the key mediator between the governmental bodies and HEIs to promote mobility beyond Erasmus scheme, and is funded by the Federal Ministry of Higher Education and Research, that provides the funds allocated to other internationalization activities (National Report 2015). Funds: STIBET / PROFIS. A recent reform transformed one of the key scholarship, a sort of annual stipendium, 50% in grants and 50% loans. Lander may have additional funds, as this is true for higher education institutions. | A number of scholarships are granted to domestic and foreign students directly by different ministries according to different frameworks of bilateral cooperation. MIUR allocates 12 millions of euros per year to HEIs in order to integrate grants for mobility, study and placements abroad (DOCM of 9 April 2001). The 'Fond to Support Mobility of Students' has been established by the law 170 of 11 July 2003, and provided supplementary funds for Erasmus and additional mobility actions (NR 2003). Universities have established specific channels to finance mobility. Erasmus funding covers the large majority of exchanges. |
| | Grants for mobility | | Standard Individual scholarships for mobility purpose provided by the DAAD, such as the Bagot and the Free Mover Scholarship. Further grants are provided by the Begabtenförderungswerke and other following specific exchanges undertaken according the main national on-going framework (according to the DAAD network, the one of the other main stakeholders, HEIs, and EU initiatives within and across Europe). | Each student awarded by a grant within the country can keep it abroad, and the grant is in increased of € 500 per month, as foreseen by the DPCM of 9 April 2009. In some case, grants can cover travel expenses and language courses (NR 2015). Erasmus cover the most of exchanges. Beyond it, student may apply to ministerial, regional and HEIs scholarships, on which systematic evidence is not available. |
| | Portability of grants and loans | | All grants and loans are portable in Germany, according to some criteria (i.e. n. of grants, destination countries). | Only some grants are portable in Italy. Loans are instead not portable. |

TABLE VII (continued): 'Overcoming obstacles to Mobility' Direct Comparison Overview

| Policy Area | Bologna Measures | Indicator | GERMANY | ITALY |
|----------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Immigration Policies | Relation between BP and immigration policy | | A first revision of immigration law has been done in Germany before the aftermath of Bologna. The Aliens Act has been firstly revised in 1999, while in January 2005, the 'Immigration law' entered in force (Ferencz and Wächter 2012). Regulation resulted in 'easier access' to the German higher education system for study, research and employment. The entering in force of the Residence Act (Aufenthaltsgesetz) and of the Freedom of Movement Act (EU-Freizügigkeitsgesetz) provided more flexible option for studying and working. | The relationship interlinking immigration laws and the Italian higher education system is strongly shaped by the constitutional background of public and free education, as according to article 34 of Italian Constitution (ENS 2012). This report systematically presents how a number of main actors are strongly involved in the realm of immigration visa for educational reason, notably the Ministries of Foreign and Internal Affairs and the one of Labour and Social Affairs, with the Ministry of Education and University, as well as the Permanent Conference State-Region. It is the former who lead the process, publishing every year a decree with the number of established available places for non-nationals within the higher education system. The Directorate General of Immigration, within the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, is strongly involved and the actor that may supply the lack of annual quotas by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The ESN report released in 2012 provide a systematic overview of the development of immigration laws and the implication of Bologna Process until 2012. |
| | for studying and research | immigration laws for studying | Mobility of researchers and students was at the centre of a reform of the Aliens Act already in 1998 (NR 2002). The reform was meant to enable BAföG support also to foreign students. PhD students may enter Germany due to research activities, and the article 20 of the Residence Act also ensure unrestricted access to the German market for their spouses, as the latter national report declares. Mobility of researchers and students was at the centre of a reform of the Aliens Act already in 1998 (NR 2002). Non-EU students are also granted one-year residence permit that need to be renewed every year for security reasons, and may stay up to 90 days within the countries while they seek employment. | In principle, the Turco-Napolitano Law (40/1998) explicitly states for the first time that also extra-EU foreign student held the right to pursue public education in Italy, until the highest possible grade. Regulations on this realm have been revised a number of time, as in 1999, 2002 and later in 2004 (Presidential Decree no. 394/1999, Law no. 189/2002, Presidential decree no. 334/2004; Directive 2004/114/EC and 2005/771/EC, regarding the admission of third-nationals for the purposes of study and research implemented by Legislative decree no. 154/2007 and no. 17 of 9th January 2008 (EMN 2012)). With the Legislative Decree n. 104 of 13 September 2013, students are entitled to visas that have the same duration of their study programmes. Immigration and visa procedures are mentioned as improved. |
| | for work | immigration laws for working | As for PhD, Visa procedures have been improved also for researchers and scholars. Procedures have been simplified also for non-EU researchers. Differently from before, they are granted by the central administration of higher education institutions rather than by individual institutions. | The Legislative Decree n. 104 of 13 September 2013 simplified visa procedures also for international staff. |

TABLE VII (continued): ‘Overcoming obstacles to Mobility’ Direct Comparison Overview

| Policy Area | Bologna Measures | Indicator | GERMANY | ITALY |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| Immigration Policies | language tests | | The DaF Institute/Test has been developed in order to facilitate the acquiring of language requirement by foreign students who wish to apply for studying and researching in Germany. This certificate ensures, as according to residence and employment laws, easier regulation for non-EU students that holds a valid residence permits in another European country, that once receive the admission by a German Higher education institution will not have to provide again such certificates to national authorities as before. | Adequates knowledge of the Italian languages may be confirmed by Consular Representation, or by certificated released by the ‘Dante Alighieri’ Society (PULDA), the University of Roma Tre and University of Foreigners of Siena and Perugia. Also Italian Cultural Institutes abroad may certify the knowledge of Italian languages, fundamental requisite to apply for a visa in educational reasons. |
| Communication Policies | Information and Awareness Campaign | Provision for information | Comprehensive Information’s about all mobility programs is provided through a website by the DAAD. The country has a information website (set up by DAAD) about its education system and exchanges, related to outgoing and incoming mobility, for students and staff mobility. | A National Register of Students and Graduates has been set up in 2003, and together to CIMEA it should provide information about mobility. CINECA provides interactive platforms for the retrieval of agreements with foreign universities, but it lack updated informations. Information are collected also through the AlmaLauda database and surveys; Specific effort to collect information about mobility have been undertaken with the Survey of doctoral student in Italy coordinated by Fondazione De Benedetti, the Milan International Student Survey, emerged precious to increase information and awareness about the Italian landscape of mobility. The MAECI provides some information on scholarship for both domestic and foreign students in its website. |
| | | Institutional Campaigns | Germany developed the first systematic campaign focused internationalization and academic mobility about 2000, with the brands ‘Study in Germany’ and ‘Research in Germany’. ‘Gate Germany’ is a promotion alliance to which HEIs can subscribe set up by the DAAD, the national agency (ACA 2012). In June 2008, the German Rectors’ Conference (HRK), working under commission to the BMBF, held a seminar entitled ‘Penalized for Being Mobile’, which highlighted the action that needs to be taken in this area, especially in connection with financial preparation for retirement. Another relevant effort is ‘GATE Germany’, a consortium founded by the DAAD and the HRK, which uses BMBF funding to organise marketing for all study and research programmes in Germany. In 2007, nearly € 6 million were spent within the GATE-Germany framework on relevant measures. The project KISSWW.de is an online communication and information platform for young researchers. It cooperates with numerous partners from the education, consultancy and media sector and provide information and advice on career topics, funding opportunities and funding organisations. | The Study in Italy portal have been developed by the MIUR, CIMEA, and CINEMA, available in five languages, that provide information about Italian education supply. The new portal University4 has been developed to tackle the lack of information about mobility, jointly by CRUI, CINECA and all Italian universities (available in Italian and English). Lack of information and awareness about mobility are however perceived as one of the biggest obstacles to mobility. |

Sources: author research, German and Italian national reports 2002-2015; Ferenet and Watcher (2012); EMN (2012)

5. Discussion of the findings

Clear and strong policy rationales linked to the promotion of mobility emerge before BP and evolve strategically over the time in Germany. The international dimension and the promotion of mobility have been explicitly linked to the overall development of the country in 2004 and 2009, and the country is in a very advance level of developing a ‘fully fledged academic mobility policy’. Thanks to the DAAD, it is involved in pioneering activities for the EHEA with the British Council and Dutch Nuffic. The *established role of AM* appears as a primary difference in comparison to Italy, where the dearth of a strategic approach is evident. While the scholar mobility tradition the country inherited surely play an important role in the current landscape of international mobility in Italy, mobility seems to have (partially) gained the agenda of the national level of policy making only during the very last development.

Beyond the *dearth of a national strategy*, a second crucial difference between the countries lies in the *absence of a key national player*. While the co-ordinated role of DAAD emerge in Germany, measures implemented in Italy appear strongly fragmented among a plethora of different actors between promoters, providers and funders, and mostly to rely European schemes or Joint and Double Programs.

A '*lack of resource*' oriented discourse also strongly emerges within Italian documents, while in Germany emerged financial support of different kind, ranging from funds for structural mobility to ad hoc financial support for higher education institutions, passing by individual scholarships both for study, research and teaching, with related improvement of interlinked policy areas, such as immigration, communication and funding. In short, this evidence adds insights to the resulting Italian panorama marked by the dearth of clear rationales at the very core of the domestic promotion of AM in Italy, appeared as vanished soon after the implementation of basic BP shared measures and European driven schemes.

6. Conclusion

This article began asking whether the supra-national stimulus of BP resulted capable to shape the 'domestic promotion of academic mobility' and the extent to which this translated in the occurrence of policy convergence in domestic policies between signatories' countries in light of its complex multilevel governance and non-binding nature.

It investigated the transversal pillar of AM within BP, and it took two countries sharing a long tradition of scholar mobility, both of them founders of BP process itself in light of overlapping policy rationales at the national level of policy making, as well as due to their similarities.

The empirical evidence collected let emerge elements not suggesting the occurrence of (delta) policy convergence between the domestic policies interrelated to AM under BP stimulus in Germany and Italy in the span of time going from mid-nineties onwards. This is true, interesting, also at the level of policy discourse, as BP develops over the time. Therefore, this analysis suggests that BP may have presented an ‘window of opportunity’ for both countries to pursue domestic matching national rationales at time zero, the aftermath of BP, evolved soon after according to very different trajectories, in line with past research.

Despite the several similarities in place within the countries, the empirical evidence appears in line with previous evidence that focused on the extent to which domestic context matter. Between the domestic factors that may have – at the very least – shaped the occurrence of policy convergence in national policies interrelated to the promotion of academic mobility, appear of specific salience in this analysis the presence/absence of clear domestic policy goals, the country organizational and coordination capacity and the presence/absence of a clear implementer body – specifically emerged in Germany with the DAAD. Moreover, the availability of resources, as the Italian case points out.

This article sheds light on the additional value offered by the transversal pillar of AM when approached beyond the single HE field. Further research may advance its scope including a detailed analysis of the BP supranational level of policy making and its interplay with the domestic arena. Indeed, further research may test the occurrence of policy convergence according to this framework in different national contexts, so to advance the extent of empirical evidence available on the promotion of AM across the EHEA.

7. Bibliography

- ALTBACH, Philip, REISESBERG, Liz and RUMBLEY, Laura – *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution – Executive Summary*. A report prepared for the UNESCO. Paris: UNESCO, 2009.
- Bergen Communiqué – *The European Higher Education Area – Achieving the Goals – Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education*, 2005.
- BENNET, Collin J. – What is Policy Convergence and What Cause it?, *British Journal of Political Science*. Cambridge University Press. Vol. 21, n.º 2 (1991), pp. 215-233.
- Berlin Communiqué – *Realizing the European Higher Education Area – Communiqué to the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education*, 2003.
- Bologna Declaration – *The Bologna Declaration of 19 June 1999 – Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education*, 1999.
- Bologna Follow-Up Working Group – *Indicators on International Student Mobility for assessing the Bologna Process*, Eurostat, 2010.
- Bologna Follow-Up Working Group – *Report on 2012-2015 BFUG Group on Mobility and Internationalization*, 2015.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Germany – Present Situation and Follow-up until the Conference in Berlin*, 2003.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Germany*, 2004-2005.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Italy*, 2004-2005.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Germany*, 2004-2005.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Italy*, 2004-2005.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Germany*, 2007.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Italy*, 2007.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Italy*, 2009.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Germany*, 2009.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Germany*, 2012.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Italy*, 2012.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Regarding the Bologna Process Implementation 2012-2015*, Germany, 2015.
- Bologna Process – *National Report Regarding the Bologna Process Implementation 2012-2015*, Italy, 2015.
- BORRÁS, Susana and RADAELLI, Claudio M. – The politics of governance architectures: creation, change and effects of the EU Lisbon Strategy. *Journal of European Public Policy*. Vol. 18, n.º 4 (2011), pp. 463-484.
- British Council and German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) – *Going Global 2014*, 2014.
- CAPANO, Giliberto, HOWLETT, Michael and RAMESH, M. – *Varieties of Governance*. London: Palgrave, 2015.

- CAPANO, Giliberto – Government continues to do its job. A comparative study of governance shifts in the higher education sector. *Public Administration*. Vol. 89, n.º 4 (2011), pp. 1622-1642.
- CAPANO, Giliberto and PIATTONI, Simona – From Bologna to Lisbon: the political uses of the Lisbon 'script' in European higher education policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*. Vol. 18, n.º 4 (2011), pp. 584-606.
- CURAJ, Adrian et al. – *Mobility – Part IV in European Higher Education at the Cross Road: Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms*, Springer, 2012.
- EUROPEAN MIGRATION NETWORK – *Immigration of International Student in Italy*. Brussels: EMN, 2012.
- EURYDICE – *Focus on Higher Education in Europe 2010: The Impact of the Bologna Process*. Brussels: EURYDICE, 2010.
- FERENCZ Irina and WÄCHTER, Bernd – *European and National Policies for Academic Mobility: Linking Rhetoric, Practice and Mobility Trends*, ACA Papers on International Cooperation, Lemmens, 2012.
- KERR, Clark – *The Future of Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- DELOITTE – *Researchers' Report 2013 – Country Profile*, Germany, 2013.
- DIMAGGIO, Paul J. and POWELL, Walter W. – The iron cage revisited. Institutionalized isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. In POWELL, Walter W. and DIMAGGIO, Paul J. (eds.) – *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991, pp. 63-82.
- GREEN, Thomas – *Predicting the Behaviour of the Education System*. New York, Syracuse University Press, 1990.
- HALL, Peter A. – Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state. The case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics*. Vol. 25, n.º 3 (1993), pp. 275-296.
- HEINZE, Torben and KNILL, Christoph – Analysing the differential impact of the Bologna Process: Theoretical Considerations on National Conditions for International Policy Convergence. *Paper* presented at the ECPR Joint Session, Helsinki, 2007.
- HÉRITIER, Adrienne – The Accommodation of Diversity in European policymaking and Its Outcomes: Regulatory Policy as a Patchwork. *Journal of European Public Policy*. Vol. 3, n.º 2 (1996), pp. 149-176.
- HOLZINGER, Katharina and KNILL, Christoph – Causes and conditions of cross-national policy convergence. *Journal of European Public Policy*. Vol. 12, n.º 5 (2005), pp. 775-796.
- HOLZINGER, Katharina and KNILL, Christoph – Competition, Cooperation and Communication. A Theoretical Analysis of Different Sources of Environmental Policy Convergence and Their Interaction. Working paper. *IHS Political Science Series*. N.º 102 (2005).
- HUISMAN, Joroen and VAN DER WENDE, Marijk – The EU and Bologna: Are Supra and International Initiatives Threatening Domestic Agenda?. *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 39, n.º 3 (2004), pp. 349-357.
- ITALIAN MINISTRY FOR EDUCATION - UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH – *National Report on the Implementation of the Bologna Process*, July 2003.

- KNIGHT, Jane – Student Mobility and Internalization: trends and tribulations. *Research in Comparative & International Education*. Vol. 7, n.º 1 (2012), pp. 20-33.
- KNILL, Christoph – Introduction: Cross-national policy convergence: concepts, approaches and explanatory factors. *Journal of European Public Policy*. Vol. 12, n.º 5 (2005), pp. 764-774.
- LENSCHOW, Andrea, LIEFFERINK, Duncan and VEENMAN, Sietske – When the birds sing. A framework for analysing domestic factors behind policy convergence. *Journal of European Public Policy*. Vol. 12, n.º 5 (2005), 2005, 797-816.
- LOMBARDINO (n.d.) – *L'Università Italiana e la Sfida dell'Internazionalizzazione, Centro di Eccellenza Altiero Spinelli (CeAS)*, Università degli Studi Roma Tre MAECI and MIUR, *Strategia per la Promozione all'Estero della Formazione Superiore Italiana 2017-2020*, 2017.
- MAASSEN, Peter and STENSAKER, Bjørn – The knowledge triangle, European higher education policy logics and policy implications. *Higher Education*. Vol. 61, n.º 6 (2011), 2011, pp. 757-769.
- MUSSELIN, Christine – Is the Bologna Process a move towards a European Higher Education Area?, Paper presented at the Third Conference on Knowledge and Politics, University of Bergen, 2005, 18-20 May.
- MURPHY-LEJEUNE, Elizabeth – The Student Experience of Mobility, A Contrasting Score. In BRYAM, Mike and DEVIN, Fred – *Student, Staff and Academic Mobility in Higher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholarship Publishing, 2008.
- OECD – *Key Development and Policy Rationales in Cross-Border Post-Secondary Education*. Paris: Organization for Economic and Community Development, 2004.
- OECD – *Education at a Glance 2010*. Paris: Organization for Economic and Community Development, 2010.
- OECD – Indicator C4: Who studies abroad and where?. In *Education at a Glance 2014: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2014.
- PAPATSIBA, Vassiliki – Political and Individual Rationales of Student Mobility: A Case-Study of ERASMUS and French Regional Scheme for Studies Abroad. *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 40, n.º 2 (2005), pp. 173-188.
- PAPATSIBA, Vassiliki – Making Higher Education More European Trough Student Mobility? Revisiting the EU initiatives in the context of the Bologna Process. *Comparative Education*. Vol. 42, n.º 1 (2006), pp. 93-111.
- Prague Communiqué – *Towards the European Higher Education Area – Communiqué of the meeting of European Ministers in Charge of Higher Education*, 2001.
- RADAELLI, Claudio M. – Diffusion without convergence: how political context shapes the adoption of regulatory impact assessment. *Journal of European Public Policy*. Vol. 12, n.º 5 (2005), pp. 924-943.
- SÁ, Creso and SABZALIEVA, Emma – The Politics of the Great Brain Race: Public Policy and International Student Recruitment in Australia, Canada, England and the USA. *Higher Education*. Vol. 75, n.º 2 (2017), pp. 231-253.
- STRANG, David and MEYER, John W. – Institutional conditions for diffusion. *Theory and Society*. Vol. 22, n.º 4 (1993), pp. 487-511.
- TEICHLER, Ulrich – International Student Mobility in Europe in the Context of the Bologna Process. *Journal of International Education and Leadership*. Vol. 2, n.º 1 (2012).

- TEICHLER, Ulrich – Student Mobility in Europe: The Informational Values of Official Statistics and Graduate Surveys. In CURAJ, Adrian et al. – *European higher Education at the Crossroads; Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2012, pp. 485-509.
- VAN DAMME, Dirke – The search for Transparency: Convergence and Diversity in the Bologna Process. In VAN VUGHT, Frans – *Mapping the Higher Education Landscape*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2009.
- VAN DER HIJDEN, Peter – Mobility Key to the EHEA and ERA. In CURAJ, Adrian et al. – *European Higher Education at the Crossroads: Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2012.
- VEIGA, Amélia and NEAVE, Guy – Managing the Dynamics of the Bologna Reforms: How institutional Actors Re-Construct the Policy Framework. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. Vol. 23, n.º 59 (2015), pp. 1-40.
- VÖGTLE, Eva Maria – *Higher Education Policy Convergence and the Bologna Process: A Cross-National Study*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.
- UNESCO – *The Bologna Process: Its Impact in Europe and Beyond, Crosier and Parveva for UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning*, 2013.
- WITTE, Johanna – Aspired Convergence, Cherished Diversity: Dealing with the Contradiction of Bologna. *Tertiary Education and Management*. Vol. 14, n.º 2 (2008), pp. 81-93.
- WITTE, Johanna – *Change of Degrees and Degrees of Change: Comparing Adaption of European Higher Education System in the Context of the Bologna Process*. Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), 2006, PhD thesis.

ANNEX I

TABLE I: National Implementation of Academic-Mobility related measures/ schemes/policies under Bologna Measure according to the EURYDICE (2010) Report

| | | Status of Recognition of Prior Learning | ECTS Credit System | Diploma Supplement | National Mobility Benchmarks/ targets | | | Priority Regions for attracting Students |
|----|------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|
| | | | | | National Policy | Outbound target | Inbound target | |
| AD | Andorra | | * | * | | | | * |
| AL | Albania | | * | * | | | | |
| AM | Armenia | | * | * | | | | * |
| AT | Austria | * | * | * | | * | | * |
| AZ | Azerbaijan | * | * | * | * | * | | * |
| BA | Bosnia and Herzegovina | | * | * | | | | * |
| BE | Belgium G | | * | * | | | | |
| BE | Belgium F | * | * | * | | | | * |
| BE | Belgium Flem | * | * | * | | * | * | * |
| BG | Bulgaria | | * | * | | | | |
| CH | Switzerland | * | * | * | | * | | * |
| CY | Cyprus | | * | * | | | | * |
| CZ | Czech Republic | * | * | * | | * | * | * |
| DE | Germany | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| DK | Denmark | * | * | * | * | | | * |
| EE | Estonia | * | * | * | | * | * | * |
| EL | Greece | * | * | * | | | | * |

Academic Mobility within the framework of the Bologna Process:
About Policy Rationales, Patterns of Development and Convergence

TABLE I (continued): National Implementation of Academic-Mobility related measures/schemes/policies under Bologna Measure according to the EURYDICE (2010) Report

| | | Status of Recognition of Prior Learning | ECTS Credit System | Diploma Supplement | National Mobility Benchmarks/targets | | | Priority Regions for attracting Students |
|----|---------------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|
| | | | | | National Policy | Outbound target | Inbound target | |
| ES | Spain | * | * | * | * | | | * |
| FI | Finland | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| FR | France | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| GE | Georgia | * | * | * | | | | * |
| HR | Croatia | * | * | * | | * | | |
| HU | Hungary | * | * | * | | | | * |
| IE | Ireland | * | * | * | | | * | * |
| IS | Iceland | * | * | * | | | | |
| IT | Italy | * | * | * | * | | | |
| LI | Liechtenstein | * | * | * | | | | * |
| LT | Lithuania | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| LU | Luxembourg | * | * | * | | | | |
| LV | Latvia | * | * | * | | | | * |
| MD | Moldova | * | * | * | | | | * |
| ME | Montenegro | * | * | * | | | | * |
| MK | Former Rep. Of Montenegro | * | * | * | | | | * |
| MT | Malta | * | * | * | | * | | |
| NL | Netherlands | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| NO | Norway | * | * | * | | | | |

TABLE I (continued): National Implementation of Academic-Mobility related measures/schemes/policies under Bologna Measure according to the EURYDICE (2010) Report

| | | Status of Recognition of Prior Learning | ECTS Credit System | Diploma Supplement | National Mobility Benchmarks/targets | | | Priority Regions for attracting Students |
|----|--------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--|
| | | | | | National Policy | Outbound target | Inbound target | |
| PL | Poland | * | * | * | | | | |
| PT | Portugal | * | * | * | * | | * | * |
| RO | Romania | * | * | * | * | | | * |
| RS | Serbia | | * | * | | | | * |
| RU | Russia | * | * | * | | | | * |
| SE | Sweden | * | * | * | | | | * |
| SI | Slovenia | * | * | * | | | | * |
| TR | Turkey | | * | * | | | | * |
| UA | Ukraine | | * | | | | | |
| UK | UK - ENG, WLS, NIR | * | * | * | | * | * | * |
| UK | UK - SCOT | * | * | * | * | | | * |
| VA | Holy See | * | * | * | | | | * |

Source: Elaboration of the author of EURYDICE (2010), Focus on Higher Education in Europe 2010: The Impact of the Bologna Process