

Internationalisation (at Home) of the Non-Mobile Youth in Europe outside formal Education

Birte Nienaber

Celia Díaz-Catalán

Emilia Kmiotek-Meier

Laura Diaz-Chorne

Volha Vysotskaya

Javier Lorenzo-Rodriguez

MIS-Working Paper 16

Luxembourg 2021

Authors

Prof. Birte Nienaber (corresponding author), University of Luxembourg, Campus Belval, Maison des Sciences Humaines, Department of Geography and Spatial Planning, 11, Porte des Sciences, L-4366 Esch-Belval, Luxembourg, birte.nienaber@uni.lu

Prof. Celia Díaz-Catalán, Complutense University of Madrid, Somosaguas Campus, 28223 Pozuelo de Alarcón, Madrid, Spain, celdiaz@ucm.es

Dr. Emilia Kmiotek-Meier, University of Luxembourg, Campus Belval, Maison des Sciences Humaines, Department of Geography and Spatial Planning, 11, Porte des Sciences, L-4366 Esch-Belval, Luxembourg

Present address: University of Cologne, ProfessionalCenter, Albertus-Magnus-Platz, 50923 Köln, Germany, emilia.kmiotek-meier@uni-koeln.de

Laura Diaz-Chorne, Professional Association of Political Scientist and Sociologists, C/ Ferraz, 100 - 28008 – Madrid; Spain, laura.diaz@colpolsoc.org

Dr. Volha Vysotskaya, University of Luxembourg, Campus Belval, Maison des Sciences Humaines, Department of Geography and Spatial Planning, 11, Porte des Sciences, L-4366 Esch-Belval, Luxembourg, volha.vysotskaya@uni.lu

Prof. Javier Lorenzo-Rodriguez, Carlos III University of Madrid, 28903, Getafe, Madrid, Spain, javier.lorenzo@uc3m.es

Contact MIS

University of Luxembourg
Belval Campus – Maison des Sciences Humaines
Key Research Area MIS – Migration and Inclusive Societies
11, porte des Sciences
L-4366 Esch-sur-Alzette
mis@uni.lu | www.mis.lu

Internationalisation (at Home) of the Non-Mobile Youth in Europe outside formal Education

Keywords

mobility, non-mobility, youth, internationalisation, Europe

Acknowledgement:

The research from the MOVE project leading to these results has received funding from Horizon 2020 under Grant Agreement N° 649263.

Abstract

Mobility is often mentioned as one main aspect of “internationalisation”. However, little is known about the internationalisation at home of non-mobile young people outside formal higher education. In the post- COVID19- era, mobility might remain limited and immobility becomes the rule. Therefore, internationalisation at home plays an important role in times of restricted mobility. To what extent are non-mobile people internationalised? Which factors favour this internationalisation amongst the non-mobiles?

We develop a comprehensive index which empirically tests whether and to what extent non-mobiles, become internationalised at home. The answers of 3431 non-mobiles respondents between 18 and 29 years old from six EU countries are analysed.

First, we review the concept “internationalisation at home”. We present an empirical measure of internationalisation at home consisting of three dimensions 1) foreign language skills i.e. English; 2) multicultural way of living; 3) information about foreign countries. Linear regression models are used to empirically explain which factors influence the internationalisation at home of the non-mobiles on the individual level, using their socio-demographic and social embeddedness, as well as controlling for the country level.

1. Introduction

Internationalisation is increasingly seen as a part of everyday life and an important advantage for today's labour markets. For instance, education is becoming more and more internationalised (i.e. Van Mol 2017; King and Raghuram 2013) since national labour markets seek people with an international outlook (e.g. Jones, Coelen, Beelen and de Wit 2016) who possess rich cultural capital (Cairns 2017) and various soft skills (Yoon 2004; Heath 2007; Roman, Muresan, Manafi and Marinescu 2018). Mobility is often mentioned as one main aspect of internationalisation and a formal and informal added value for future employability of young people (Kelly 2013; Wiers-Jenssen 2011; Fernández-Araiz 2017). Yet, "The 'normality' of this phenomenon lies only partly in the increased number of people actually going abroad" (Weichbrodt 2014, 9) as "immobility is still the rule" (Van der Velde and Van Naerssen 2011, 219).

During the 1980s and 1990s the term internationalisation – especially in higher education and in the European context – referred mainly to geographical mobility (Nilsson 2003; Wächter 2003). Wächter (2003, 7) states that from 1995 on "[m]obility was still a central concern, but it was no longer the be-all and end-all of the internationalisation project." This can be seen as the first starting point of "internationalisation at home". This concept stems from the field of higher education and refers to "...the purposeful integration of international and intercultural dimensions into the formal and informal curriculum for all students within domestic learning environments" (Beelen & Jones, 2015, 69). "Internationalisation at home" thus integrates people, organization and curriculum by internationalizing all different parts of higher education without geographical mobility (Nilsson 2003; Wächter 2003). "Internationalisation at home" has in fact become so important that it is one of the goals of the EU 2020 Growth Strategy (de Wit, Deca and Hunter 2015), which acknowledges that not all people can be geographically mobile due to financial, social, health, and family constraints, etc.

The European Commission states three key priorities on "internationalisation at home" in higher education institutions (HEI): to "capitalize on international experiences of the staff of HEIs, aiming to develop international curricula for the benefit of both non-mobile and mobile learners; to increase the opportunities offered to students, researchers and staff to develop their language skills, particularly local language tuition for individuals following courses in English, to maximize the benefits of European linguistic diversity; develop opportunities for international collaboration via online learning" (European Commission 2013).

Young people are thus "expected to incorporate mobility options into their life plans" (Robertson, Harris and Baldassar 2018, 203) Indeed, today 90% of young Europeans (15-30 years) consider it important to have some experience abroad while in fact only about 25% actually manage to organise a study or work exchange abroad (Eurobarometer 2018). Can it be deduced that job prospects are comparatively better for this small group of young Europeans? What would that mean for the 75% of non-mobile young Europeans? Those who have not the opportunity or the wish – be it due to financial, language or other personal reasons – to be geographically mobile? Are they able to incorporate international aspects in their CV – actively or passively through their internationalised surroundings?

Increasing significance of "internationalisation at home"

In the (immediate post-) COVID19- era, spatial mobility remains limited. Therefore, “internationalisation at home” plays an important role in times of restricted mobility as it can provide particularly youth with effective tools to improve their prospects for work and education. Nonetheless, while “internationalisation at home” of non-mobile populations has not been given wide attention in the literature, scientific research on “internationalisation at home” outside higher education is even scarcer. Particularly in the European context it is important to understand how and to what extent cultural, social, political, information channels or even financial aspects produce an international environment for non-mobiles. The rising relevance of “internationalisation at home” poses new questions. Can internationalisation be detected for the non-mobile European youth? Do mobility experiences of ancestors (e.g. parents) support the internationalisation of non-mobiles? Could non-mobiles be “internationalised at home” if they do not pursue higher education? Which leads to our main research question: To what extent are non-mobile people internationalised? And which factors favour internationalisation amongst the non-mobiles?

This paper aims to shed some light in this regard by providing an empirical approach to measure “internationalisation at home” with an analysis of the factors that influence “internationalisation at home” of non-mobile young people. We have developed a comprehensive index, which empirically tests whether and to what extent non-mobiles become internationalised at home. This index is based on data from the H2020-Project MOVE, which conducted a survey of 5499 respondents between 18 and 29 years old from six countries (Germany, Hungary, Luxembourg, Norway, Romania and Spain). We selected the 3431 non-mobile participants, meaning those who have never been abroad more than two weeks for reasons other than tourism or visiting relatives. This criterion has been applied, as two weeks is a common time frame for many mobility programs (pupil’s exchange, vocational training, voluntary work) in the countries studied.

As a first step, we review the concept of “internationalisation at home”. Then, following theoretical approaches of Beelen and Jones (2015) and Nilsson (2003), we present an empirical measure of “internationalisation at home” consisting of three dimensions. Afterwards, four linear regression models are used to empirically explain which factors influence internationalisation at home of non-mobiles at the individual level by using their socio-demographic characteristics and their social embeddedness, as well as controlling for the country level.

2. “Internationalisation at home” outside formal (higher) education – a conceptual framework of internationalisation of non-mobiles

The use of “Internationalisation at home” as instrument to stimulate internationalisation and international experiences of non-mobiles has significantly grown. However, despite its popularity, the term is quite heterogeneous and mostly focused on higher educational research (Teichler 2017). Knight (2004) distinguishes between three different definitions: (1) international and intercultural concepts in curricula and teaching, (2) inclusion of international development and trade into curricula and (3) the globalization in education. She also clusters the rationales of the importance of internationalisation (at home or abroad) in four groups: “social/cultural, political, academic, and economic” (Knight 2004: 21). Yemini (2015) proposes that internationalisation should be viewed as “the process of encouraging integration of multi-cultural, multilingual, and global dimensions within the education system, with the aim of instilling in learners a sense of global citizenship” (p. 21). Beelen and Jones (2015) argue that

internationalisation should not be seen as a didactic concept in itself, but as a toolbox to develop international and intercultural competencies (s. also Thomas 2008).

Exploring “internationalisation at home” beyond formal higher education

Most of the “internationalisation at home” -research has been conducted with respect to higher formal education (e.g. Wächter 2003; Nilsson 2003; Robson, Almeida and Schartner 2017; Hoffman 2003; Watkins and Smith 2018; Prieto-Flores, Feu and Casademont 2016). This research however, holds the view that there are more layers to internationalisation and particularly to “internationalisation at home”, which need to be explored.

Departing from “internationalisation at home” through education, Nilsson (2003, 31) for instance, argues that “internationalisation at home is any internationally related activity with the exception of outbound student mobility”. Internationalisation brings together international (language skills, particularly English, knowledge of international political, economic, social situation and developments) and intercultural competencies (understanding, respect for people with a different cultural, social, ethnical, etc. background) (Nilsson 2003, 36). In addition, others emphasise individual socio-cultural characteristics, ranging from ethnic, religious to social class aspects (Harrison 2015) as well as technological enhancement facilitating and speeding up the internationalisation process (Joris, van den Berg and van Ryssen 2003) – including non-formal education activities. Wächter (2003) emphasises processes, which also include international experiences and contacts (such as e.g. foreign languages, interculturality) outside university campuses or schools and which need to be bundled with informal parts of learning and education (e.g. intercultural encounters). Together, these add to the rich array of “internationalisation at home” as exemplified by vocational education and training (Tran, 2012) or entrepreneurship (Jaklič and Karageorgu 2015; Turunen and Nummela 2017).

Jaklič and Karageorgu (2015) highlight the fact that expatriates and non-nationals support internationalisation in enterprises as one aspect of “internationalisation at home” in non-formal learning environments. This shows that internationalisation has also a demographic aspect. Allport’s (1954) contact hypothesis deals with the contacts different cultural groups have within a society and how this affects interculturality and intercultural competencies (see also Jon 2013; Otten 2000; Thomas 2008). Local diversity, for example enhanced by getting in contact or meeting with ethnic groups at the local level, can lead to internationalisation at home, argues Knight (2003).

Murphy-Lejeune (2002) argues, on the contrary, that the difference between spatially mobile and non-mobile people lies in the “mobility capital” as a sub-component of human capital, which can only be achieved by one’s own mobility experience. Kaufmann, Bergman and Joye (2004) also refer to the connectedness of social and spatial mobility and view it as a form of capital. Regardless, people who remain in their countries of origin do not necessarily suffer from a lack of international contacts. In a globalized world, where international mobility incorporates economy, social behaviour (e.g. migration or tourism) but also information and communication technologies, non-mobiles are often part of international networks (Hannam, Sheller and Urry 2006, 2-3; Herz, Díaz-Chorne, Díaz-Catalán, Alice and Samuk 2019).

3. An empirical approach to measure factors favouring internationalisation at home

Since the literature on internationalisation of non-mobiles is scarce, we will resort to literature on mobile populations as a starting point to track down factors relevant for mobility and explore their transferability to processes of “internationalisation at home”. We will begin by formulating and explaining the hypotheses around “internationalisation at home”.

Hypothesis 1: Higher education facilitates internationalisation among non-mobiles

Hypothesis 2: Socio-economic background impacts internationalisation among non-mobiles

Previous research confirms that a family’s socio-economic background is relevant for any kind of mobility as well as lack of it. The higher the educational level of the parents, the higher the probability for the children of becoming mobile students (Jahr and Teichler 2007; Lörz and Krawietz 2011). Particularly a mother’s occupational status and level of education show significant influences (Findlay, King, Stam and Ruiz-Gelices 2006). Students, whose parents earn less, also have a smaller probability to participate in student exchanges (King and Ruiz 2003), as scholarships do not cover all expenses (Van Mol and Timmerman 2014). Additionally, many students from very disadvantaged backgrounds may not be attracted by an international educational experience as they might be unaware of its added value (DiPietro 2013). Based on the relation of social and spatial mobility (Kaufmann, Bergman and Joye 2004), we deduce that socio-economic factors play a role for non-mobiles as well and especially in their “internationalisation at home”.

Hypothesis 3: Internationalisation at home is often facilitated and supported through social networks: friendship with people who have mobility experience strongly encourages internationalisation at home for non-mobile young people.

The link between social networks and cultural capital is crucial for understanding mobility processes (Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, Pellegrino and Taylor 1993) –including impacts on those who leave and those who stay. Strong ties with partners, children, other relatives, and close friends influence the decision to become mobile in the first place (Moskal 2014; Ryan, Sales, Tilki and Siara 2009). Friends, (virtual) peers, members of shared social networks, etc. provide “key information central to final decision-making process[es]” (Beech 2015, 336) on mobility. Therefore, mobility in itself is seen as a part of a peer-effect among young people (Brooks and Waters 2010). Mobilities realised by others often inspire their close environment to do the same. We hypothesise that a family’s migratory background as well as peer connections with mobiles (face-to-face and virtual contacts) might lead to more “internationalisation at home”.

Hypothesis 4: Migration links to parents’ and other relatives’ home country support internationalisation at home.

Parents’ earlier migration experiences increase the likelihood of children’s own migration in the future (Donato and Sisk 2015) and may be used as strategies later in life as well as behavioural repertoires (Massey, Arango, Hugo, Kouaouci, Pellegrino and Taylor 1993; Van MolSnel, Hemmerechts and Timmerman 2018). Thus, migratory background and mobility experience of family members directly impact the decision of young people to move (Brooks and Waters 2015; Ryan 2011). Attachment and connection to parents’ and grandparents’ roots becomes possible through materialisation of their shared migration

history. Sometimes visits to their relatives' home country (Haikkola 2011), summer vacations in the family house (King, Christou and Ahrens 2011), or learning the parents' native language (re)connect children with their parents' country of origin (Wang 2016). To others, the connection exists even without visiting their parents' home country as the bond in the destination country can also be established through various transnational practices, ranging from composing songs about the homeland (Glick Schiller 2004) to the reproduction of traditions and ceremonies of rites of passage (i.e. weddings, food) (Wise and Velayutham 2008). A migration background of the parents and grandparents has also been related to greater cosmopolitanism (Cuenca and Araiz 2017). Hence, by codifying the traditions of their parents and their communities, younger generations will have more exposure to international affairs through TV, radio, or digital media while maintaining more contact with additional and different cultures, traditions, foods, etc.

Hypothesis 5: A stronger cosmopolitan identity increases the probability of being internationalised at home.

Cosmopolitanism conception in this article is based on: "an identity as a 'citizen of the world' or to challenge existing conceptions of national identity (Myers, Szerszynski and Urry, 1999). In that sense we found few 'global citizens'. On the other hand, we also take the conception of cosmopolitanism as a practice (Szerszynski and Urry 2002), understanding the disposition to:

- "extensive mobility in which people have the right to 'travel' corporeally, imaginatively and virtually and for significant numbers they also have the means to so travel
- the capacity to consume many places and environments en route,
- a curiosity about many places, peoples and cultures and at least a rudimentary ability to locate such places and cultures historically, geographically and anthropologically
- a willingness to take risks by virtue of encountering the 'other' "

Hypothesis 6: More travels abroad increase the likelihood of being internationalised at home.

Muxel (2009) showed that European identity is based more on emotion (a feeling of solidarity, shared cultural heritage, etc.). It is especially generated by the use of information and communication technology and transnational networks (not strictly linked to mobility) among young people and less by "civic elements" (institutions, European passport, etc.) (Muxel 2009, 154). This identity is tied to a cosmopolitan vision of the public sphere that transcends the limits of the nation-state. In this respect, some authors speak of the formation of a "new" transnational identity or European cosmopolitanism (Thiel 2016, 174). We believe that this transnational European identity closely linked to a cosmopolitan vision, which is characterised by understanding the world as a whole, by universal ethics and an openness to people of different places and countries. Related to that, travel abroad experiences may increase the likelihood of being internationalised at home.

Hypothesis 7: The country of origin impacts the process of internationalisation at home for non-mobiles.

Standards of living, welfare regimes, political situation as well as mobility, emigration and immigration contexts impact mobility as well as “internationalisation at home”. We argue that the economic situation has an impact on youth mobility, as it was the case in Spain during the financial crisis (high mobility) and in other countries, such as Luxembourg where long-term mobility is less common due to a strong economy (Hemming, Tillmann and Reißig 2016). A low ratio of student outgoing mobility, as for instance, in Hungary (Rodrigues 2013, 8) might hinder internationalisation at home, while domestic policies as well as several official languages may also contribute to multilingualism in a country as these factors create openness towards other countries, cultures and the world. Furthermore, countries with a high percentage of working migrants, cross border workers, or seasonal temporary workers often favour the internationalisation of residents in the receiving countries (Ardic, Christen, Helsthalm, Pavlova, Skrobanek and Vysotskaya 2017).

4. Data and Methods

In order to understand how non-mobile young people (can) become internationalised at home, we created an “internationalisation at home” index, based on the conceptualization framework of non-mobiles we have introduced in the previous section. The index is used as a dependent variable in a set of linear regressions models against a set of explanatory factors with the aim of testing the aforementioned hypotheses. We test each of the dimensions that compose the index against the same set of explanatory factors to see how they are contributing to “internationalisation at home” for non-mobile young people.

Both, the index and the independent variables, are taken from the data and the questionnaire developed within the H2020-Project MOVE 1. A cross-sectional online panel survey (n=5,499) was carried out with the aim of studying mobility perceptions of young people from 18 to 29 years living in 6 European countries: Germany, Hungary, Luxembourg, Norway, Romania and Spain. Focusing on “internationalisation at home”, we selected non-mobile respondents who have never been abroad more than two weeks for a reason other than tourism or visiting relatives, which account for 62.4% of the sample (n=3,431), with strong variance among countries (see table A1 in appendix).

4.1 Operationalisation

4.1.1 Index Internationalisation at Home

As “internationalisation at home” of non-mobiles takes place on different levels, we created an “internationalisation at home” index (IHI) with three sub-dimensions following the definitions by Beelen and Jones (2015) and Nilsson (2003). Hence, the IHI consists of

- a) an international cultural approach (‘INTCULT’),

¹ The data can be found online as of 1st April 2019 in the GESIS datarium. Please consult this page for any further methodological details.

- b) awareness and information about international issues ('INTINFO') and
- c) participants' English level ('INTLANG').

These three dimensions or levels in turn consist of manifest variables (see Table 1).

The resulting index ranges from 0 to 1 accounting each sub-index for 0.33. All items that compose these sub-dimensions are measured in a dichotomous way: 0= no participation and 1= participation. To score high in the “internationalisation at home” Index, respondents need to check several activities, thus, the index appreciates diversity rather than frequency/regularity. The final scores are ranged in similar ways, grading by .33, trying to avoid any measurement bias. The performance of the IHI scores at national level shows that low and medium internationalisation are the regular while only a few respondents score high. However, several differences could be identified among those countries with high level of English proficiency levels such as Luxembourg or Norway, which score significantly higher than the rest.

The index is used as a dependent variable in a set of linear regressions models against explanatory factors. We test each of the dimensions that compose the index against the same set of explanatory factors to see which ones are contributing (most) to the internationalisation at home for non-mobile young people.

Table 1: Internationalisation at home index: components

INDEX	Dimensions	sub-index value	sub-index Coding	Questionnaire Coding
a) Foreign language skills i.e. English (INTLANG)	English language proficiency	0-.33	0-4	0 (do not speak), 1(low level), 2 (intermediate), 3 (high), 4(very high), 5 (native)
b) Cultural aspects (INTCULT)	Have you ever taken part in any of the cultural/leisure activities during the last year?			
	To go to the cinema, watch movies, TV series from other countries	0-.33	0-5	0 (no) -1 (yes)
	To buy food or go to restaurants from other countries			0-1
	To celebrate traditional celebrations/festivities of other countries			0-1
	To play a sport with people from other countries			0-1
To go to parties or get-together with people from other countries	0-1			
c) Information	Do you stay informed of international events? Mark only those you have used at least once a week:			
	you follow the news on TV or radio;	0-.33	0-4	0-1

about outside world (i.e. media) (INTINFO)	you read the newspapers (printed or digital);		0-1
	stay informed through websites or blogs;		0-1
	stay informed through social networks (Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.)		0-1

The performance of the IHI scores at national levels shows that low and medium internationalisation are the norm as only a few respondents score high (Table 2). However, several differences could be identified between the countries with high English proficiency levels, such as Luxembourg or Norway.

Table 2: Distribution of internationalisation at home index by country

	Germany	Hungary	Luxembourg	Norway	Romania	Spain	Total
Low (0-0.33)	46.3%	60.5%	19.6%	25.0%	46.9%	54.3%	1523
Medium (0.34-0.66)	44.8%	37.1%	58.5%	51.4%	44.8%	37.9%	1527
High (0.66-1)	8.9%	2.4%	21.9%	23.7%	8.3%	7.8%	381
Total	594	708	301	625	654	549	3431

4.1.2 Potential Influences

Departing from our conceptualisation framework on becoming internationalised, we cluster explanatory variables in four dimensions, that potentially influence the “internationalisation at home” of non-mobiles and match them with the hypotheses (from section 3):

(1) *socio-economic dimension (hypotheses 1-3)*

- Gender: female or male
- Age: divided in two groups, one from 18-24 and the other from 25-29
- Level of education: tertiary education level finalised or not
- Mother’s level of education: tertiary education level finalised or not
- Multiple nationality: yes or no

(2) *social networks of young people and migration background (hypothesis 4)*

- Mobile family background, i.e. if any parent or grandparent has lived abroad: yes or no
- Siblings studied abroad, i.e. any siblings, if applicable, have studied abroad: yes or no
- Friends studied abroad, i.e. if any friends completed their entire course of study abroad: yes or no
- Friends participated in study exchange, i.e. if any friends participated in a student exchange (e.g. Erasmus): yes or no

(3) *cosmopolitanism and international contacts/identification with the world (hypotheses 5-6)*

- Identification with the world, i.e. dummy variable from the five-point-scale question “Do you identify yourself with the world”: identification (4-5) and no-identification (1-3)
- Travelled abroad more than 5 times: yes or no

(4) country of origin (hypothesis 7)

This group includes only one variable, the country of origin, as a control for structural constraints as potential predictors of young people experience, with Germany as the reference category.

4.2 Sample and Methods

A cross-sectional online panel survey (n=5,499) was carried out with the aim of studying mobility perceptions of young people from 18 to 29 years living in six European countries: Germany, Hungary, Luxembourg, Norway, Romania and Spain. Focusing on internationalisation at home, we selected non-mobile respondents which account for 62.4% of the sample (n=3,431), with strong variance among countries.

Females make up 54% of the non-mobile respondents. 35% of the non-mobiles have already gained tertiary education and 25% come from families where the mother also holds this educational level. Less than 5% of non-mobiles have a double nationality but 25% have a migratory background. 36% identify themselves with the world and 25% have been more than 5 times abroad. Around half of the respondents have friends with mobility experiences (see Table A1 in appendix).

To test the hypotheses, we carried out linear regression analysis. It occurred step by step in four models, where each model introduced one (additional) group of explanatory variables.

4.3 Results

Table 3 OLS: Factors influencing internationalisation at home of non-mobile

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Beta	S.E	Sig	Beta	S.E	Sig	Beta	S.E	Sig	Beta	S.E	Sig
Female	-0.045	0.008	0.015	-0.055	0.008	0.002	-0.060	0.008	0.000	-0.066	0.007	0.000
Age: From 18 to 24	0.076	0.009	0.000	0.062	0.008	0.001	0.073	0.008	0.000	0.073	0.008	0.000
Tertiary Education	0.080	0.009	0.000	0.040	0.009	0.029	0.042	0.009	0.021	0.069	0.008	0.000
Mother with Tertiary Education	0.172	0.010	0.000	0.130	0.009	0.000	0.101	0.009	0.000	0.072	0.009	0.000
Multiple Nationality	0.109	0.020	0.000	0.061	0.019	0.001	0.044	0.019	0.011	0.022	0.018	0.195
Siblings studied abroad				0.089	0.013	0.000	0.052	0.013	0.003	0.041	0.012	0.017
Friends studied abroad				0.184	0.008	0.000	0.162	0.008	0.000	0.130	0.008	0.000
Friends did exchange study				0.196	0.008	0.000	0.162	0.008	0.000	0.186	0.008	0.000
Mobile family background				0.100	0.009	0.000	0.088	0.009	0.000	0.093	0.009	0.000
Identified with the World							0.051	0.008	0.002	0.061	0.008	0.000
More than 5 times abroad							0.237	0.009	0.000	0.135	0.010	0.000
Hungary										-0.180	0.012	0.000
Luxembourg										0.050	0.017	0.016
Norway										0.129	0.013	0.000
Romania										-0.019	0.014	0.381

Spain										-0.123	0.013	0.000
Constant		.009	.000	.009	.000	.010	.000				.012	.000
R2	.056			.172		.224				.285		

Regarding the set of variables introduced in the first model, the influence of a mother’s education is the strongest predictor and outweighs even the influence of young people’s education level. This may be due to the fact that many participants were still in the formal education system when answering the questionnaire. However, the R squared of this model is too small to extract relevant conclusions. The fact of being a woman minimizes (though on a modest level) the extent of “internationalisation at home”. This effect significantly controls all variables. It is remarkable that its effect (and significance) grows even bigger in the course of adding new variables (see Model 4). The effect of gender is further interesting as it has been shown, for example, that females in the UK are keener on taking part in student exchanges (King, Findlay and Ahrens 2010). This could mean that young women are more polarized in their behaviour between those opting for a full international experience and thus becoming mobile and those not interested in internationalisation at all.

The introduction of variables linked to the (mobile) social embeddedness of young people changes not much with respect to the significance of socio-economic factors with the exception of young people’s educational level (but it stays significant). However, the influence of a mother’s educational level and the participant’s own education level diminish, as well as the positive influence of having multiple nationalities. With the second group of variables, a strong predictor for “internationalisation at home” is introduced: friends studying abroad, both short (e.g. Erasmus) and long term (entire study course abroad). Interestingly, previous study-related mobility of friends has more explanatory power than the student mobility history of siblings and the family’s migratory background throughout all models. From this finding, we deduct a relevance of peers in the internationalisation process.

The third model adds two variables linked to the international outlook of young people. The variable capturing cosmopolitan values of young people expressed as identification with the world has a positive influence but a moderate explanation power for the “internationalisation at home” index. However, the second variable aiming rather at actions than at values, takes over the role of the strongest predictor in Model 3: young people travelling abroad frequently have significantly higher scores on their “internationalisation at home” index than their peers who (in)voluntarily travel less. Actually, travelling abroad explains, ceteris paribus, 22% of the model by itself. Looking at the coefficients across models, we can also observe how individual experience of travelling abroad outperform peers’ mobility background and family background. However, the fourth model – under the control of the national setting – changes some of the outcomes from previous models. The first big change regards the variable “multiple nationality”, which was insignificant in the last model. Also, the power of the frequency of travelling (the strongest predictor in Model 3) diminishes almost by half. Similarly, tertiary education of mothers, while still a significant influence, has smaller effect. This means that some effects caused by variables in Model 1-3 are actually caused by a country’s characteristics. Those effects also show that the relevance of national preconditions might influence the individual behaviour of young people and their degree of internationalisation. E.g. Luxemburg, being a small country with permeable borders, facilitates the frequency of travelling – both from and to the country. Compared to Germany (reference category), young people from Hungary and Spain have smaller “internationalisation at home scores”; the negative effect for Romania is insignificant. For those from Luxemburg and Norway, scores on “internationalisation at home” are

significantly higher. This last model demonstrates that the “internationalisation at home” index is a generalizable powerful tool to explain this phenomenon at the European level.

When analysing “internationalisation at home” with the help of its three sub-indices, new insights became apparent (Table 4). The cultural and informational sub-indices are affected by different sociodemographic variables. This could be explained by the fact that the items building this cultural sub-index are intercultural skills and competence-oriented rather than highbrow cultural capital. The items with a stronger explanatory impact for “internationalisation at home” for all three sub-indices are those related to social networks and mobility experience, especially when that experience comes from their peers.

Table 4: OLS Factors influencing internationalisation at home

	Cultural Internationalisation subindex			Information Internationalisation subindex			Foreign language skills (English language proficiency) Internationalisation subindex		
	Beta	SE	Sig.	Beta	SE	Sig.	Beta	SE	Sig.
Female	-0.022	0.003	0.210	-0.061	0.004	0.001	-0.052	0.004	0.002
Age: From 18 to 24	0.013	0.003	0.473	0.046	0.005	0.017	0.091	0.004	0.000
Tertiary Education	-0.004	0.004	0.841	0.037	0.005	0.062	0.106	0.004	0.000
Mother with Tertiary Education	0.044	0.004	0.019	0.023	0.005	0.222	0.091	0.004	0.000
Multiple Nationality	0.041	0.008	0.023	0.004	0.011	0.825	0.007	0.009	0.675
Siblings studied abroad	0.076	0.005	0.000	0.015	0.007	0.426	0.007	0.006	0.680
Friends studied abroad	0.085	0.003	0.000	0.113	0.005	0.000	0.077	0.004	0.000
Friends did exchange study	0.136	0.003	0.000	0.144	0.005	0.000	0.119	0.004	0.000
Mobile family background	0.073	0.004	0.000	0.076	0.005	0.000	0.052	0.004	0.003
Identified with the World	0.029	0.003	0.109	0.057	0.005	0.002	0.040	0.004	0.015
More than 5 times abroad	0.119	0.004	0.000	0.069	0.006	0.001	0.110	0.005	0.000
Hungary	-0.167	0.005	0.000	-0.077	0.007	0.002	-0.157	0.006	0.000
Luxembourg	0.004	0.007	0.857	0.074	0.010	0.002	0.020	0.008	0.357
Norway	0.023	0.005	0.355	0.039	0.008	0.126	0.208	0.006	0.000
Romania	-0.115	0.006	0.000	-0.035	0.008	0.155	0.093	0.007	0.000
Spain	-0.065	0.006	0.007	-0.034	0.008	0.171	-0.169	0.006	0.000
Constant		0.005	0.000		0.007	0.000		0.006	0.000
R2	0.151			0.111			0.256		

For the variation in the news and information based sub-index, being female is significant and has a negative influence, while cosmopolitan identity has a positive influence on the scores. On the country level, results go in opposite directions for Hungary and Luxembourg as respondents from the former country have less probability to obtain international information and news than the latter. This most likely stems from the fact that a large share of Luxembourg’s residents is multilingual and is able to read news and information from its larger neighbours, Germany, France and Belgium in their respective languages.

The foreign language skills sub-index is explained mostly by the independent variables (Rsquared=.256). As expected, family and respondent’s higher education have a large effect on this sub-index, along with mobility among social networks. Cosmopolitan values also have a significant effect in this regard. Confirming this pattern, countries, where English is not fully

developed as a *lingua franca* in their educational systems, show a negative effect, while those with established use of English significantly increase the effect of being “internationalised at home”.

In sum, the following hypotheses are supported (the parameters from the Model 4 are mentioned in brackets):

H 1: Higher education facilitates internationalisation among non-mobiles ($\beta=0.069$; $p=.000$)

H 2: The social background influences the internationalisation among non-mobiles: Mother with Tertiary Education ($\beta=0.072$; $p=.000$)

H 3: “Internationalisation at home” will be facilitated and supported through social networks: friendship with people who possess mobility experience strongly encourages internationalisation for non-mobile young people at home: Friends did exchange study ($\beta=0.186$; $p=.000$); Friends studied abroad ($\beta=0.130$; $p=.000$); Mobile family background ($\beta=0.093$; $p=.000$); Siblings studied abroad ($\beta=0.041$; $p=.017$).

H 4: Migration links to the home country of parents and other members of the family support internationalisation at home: Mobile family background ($\beta=0.093$; $p=.000$)

H 5: A higher cosmopolitan identity increase the probability of being internationalised at home ($\beta=0.061$; $p=.000$)

H 6: More travels abroad increase the likelihood of being internationalised at home ($\beta=0.135$; $p=.000$).

The last hypothesis is supported only partially by the data.

H 7: The country of origin impacts the process of internationalisation at home for non-mobiles: Being from Romania does not present a significantly different influence in comparison with German origin. Hungary ($\beta=-0.180$; $p=.000$); Luxembourg ($\beta=0.050$; $p=.016$); Norway ($\beta=0.129$; $p=.000$); Spain ($\beta=-0.123$; $p=.000$).

Looking across models (Table 3 and 4), we conclude that having mobile social networks, especially mobile peers, as well as having personal experiences travelling abroad enhances “internationalisation at home”. Furthermore, constraints at home country level affect the “internationalisation at home”. Foreign language skills, in our case English skills, seem to facilitate the reception of international information or to help making more content available (e.g. in the Internet). Hungarian youth has a low foreign language index and hence faces more difficulties in that respect. Romanians are less likely to score high on the interculturality sub-index but they score high on the foreign languages sub-index. Spanish youth follows similar patterns; English is not a *lingua franca* in the educational system or in everyday life as in Luxembourg, which diminishes the scores on the interculturality sub-index.

5. Discussion and Outlook

“Internationalisation at home” has for a long time been limited to the realm of higher education. The aim of this paper was to analyse the level of “internationalisation at home” among young people in Europe regardless of their educational status. For this purpose, we first created an index of “internationalisation at home” and then analysed (OLS) the potential influences contributing to its variance between young people.

The full model (Model 4) explains almost 30% of the variance in the data, which can be described as a result between moderate and good. However, there is still a considerable amount of variance linked to factors external to the model, which should be addressed in further research, including qualitative research. Our results can serve as a first step in researching this topic. Comparing all groups of factors, we can sum up that one’s own willingness (or ability) to travel, country of residence context and social embeddedness in networks with people that have some previous mobility experience are significant predictors of an individual’s degree of “internationalisation at home”.

Thus, the mixture of micro-, meso-, and macro-influences decides on the extent of an individual’s “internationalisation at home”. However, those explanatory variables should not be seen as causal influences, rather as characteristics under mutual influence. The three dimensions do not exist in a vacuum as they are linked with one another. A person’s frequent travels can be related to family habits (e.g. spending the summer holiday abroad) or to family migratory background (visiting the family abroad). It is also probable that a person fond of travelling will have friends (peers) with similar interests. Indeed, in statistical terms the fact that somebody travels a lot correlates significantly with mother’s tertiary education ($r=.146$), siblings’ study abroad ($r=.205$), friends’ study abroad ($r=.166$), friends’ exchanges ($r=.194$) as well as with country contexts (all correlations are significant at a 5% level).

Additionally, our analysis shows that the significance of *country context* should not be neglected in studies of mobility and consequently of “internationalisation at home” as the availability of opportunities appears to be very country-dependent:

- Traditions and regulations regarding outgoing and inward mobility: The fewer people go abroad, the less internationalisation impact they might have when coming back home.
- Some countries enjoy certain advantages, which give them a head start. For instance, their official language is widely spoken, or they are located in a favourable geographical position and other countries are still to be discovered e.g. as holiday destination. In both cases, the poor outflow and inflow of people affects the non-mobiles who stay at home as they have fewer opportunities to contact “the internationalised”.

These recognisable differences between countries reflect an uneven geography in the EU, where internationalisation is not equally accessible to all. Among the “internationalised” countries, which are visible in Table 2, Luxembourg stands out as a very mobile country (almost 60% of respondents). This high number results largely from a tradition to study abroad and shows the relevance of country’s history as well as geography in shaping (a favourable) domestic discourse on internationalisation (Kmiotek-Meier, Karl and Powell 2020).

The social networks and national contacts variables are in line with the contact hypothesis (H3) described in the theoretical part. More openness and possibilities to meet “the other” in a certain context (in this case at home) lead to stronger internationalisation of an at-home person. Furthermore, our results also confirm the importance of peers in the life of young people. This finding concurs with the literature on adolescence, which discusses peers as an important reference for young people at the edge of the adulthood (Hurrelmann 1990). As young people are becoming more and more detached from the parents and their nuclear family, they search for other forms of belonging (Kmiotek-Meier 2019). They spend more and more time with people of the same age group and thus peers act as orientation for different behaviours (Grob 2009). Clibborn (2018) even speaks about a ‘peer frame of reference’ while describing the information flow among international students.

The low internationality index – with only 11.1 % of all young people scoring high (see Table 1) – shows a need for action in this area. These low scores may not directly result from intentional ignorance of “the international” but from the lack of knowledge, that internationality could be more accessible than originally thought and on how to access internationality. Higher readiness to embrace “the international” at home would have a double positive effect. On the one hand, those staying at home could benefit from other cultures and widen their horizons without needing to leave their home for an extended period of time. On the other hand, increasing “internationalisation at home” could contribute to a welcoming culture towards mobile people. Higher openness from locals could for example assist with better immersing international students in the peer cultures of their hosting country (Suspitsyna 2013).

The pandemic has left most (young) people immobile. With most (if not all) youth forced to resort to internationalisation at home, the significance of this aspect of internationalisation, which has been underresearched up to now, is currently growing dramatically. These results serve as initial exploration of new developments in the “international at home”- discussion in the (post-)COVID-19 era.

6. Bibliography

- Allport, G-W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- Ardic, T, Christen, M., Helsthalm, R. Pavlova, I., Skrobaneck, J. and Vysotskaya, V. (2017). Employment (Luxembourg-Norway). In: Move consortium : Six internal reports from the countries with the focus on two types of mobility. In: Altissimo, Alice; Bartels, Agnetha; Herz, Andreas and Schröer, Wolfgang (Eds.): *Mapping Mobility – Pathways, Institutions and Structural Effects of Youth Mobility: Deliverable N° D3.5 – Patterns of youth mobility: results from the qualitative case studies -- integrated public report*. 23-25. (http://move-project.eu/fileadmin/move/downloads/MOVE_D3_5.pdf)
- Beech, S-E. (2015). International student mobility: The role of social networks. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 16(3), 332-350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2014.983961>
- Beelen, J. & Jones, E. (2015). Redefining Internationalisation at Home. In Curaj, Adrian; Matei, Livia; Pricopie, Remus; Salmi, Jamil and Scott, Peter (Eds.), *The European Higher Education Area*. (pp. 59-72.) Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_5

- Brooks, R. & Waters, J. (2010). Social networks and educational mobility: the experiences of UK students. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 8(1), 143-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767720903574132>
- Buckner, E. & Stein, S. (2019). What Counts as Internationalisation? Deconstructing the Internationalisation Imperative. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315319829878>
- Cairns, D. (2017). Exploring student mobility and graduate migration: undergraduate mobility propensities in two economic crisis contexts. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 18(3), 336-353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2016.1180425>
- Christie, H. (2007). Higher education and spatial (im)mobility: nontraditional students and living at home. *Environment and Planning A*, 39, 2445-2463. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a38361>
- Clibborn, S. (2018). Multiple Frames of Reference: Why International Student Workers in Australia Tolerate Underpayment. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X18765247>
- Cuenca, Cristina and Araiz, Victor (2017). The formation of identity by mobile young people compared to non-mobiles. In: Navarrete Moreno, Lorenzo; Lorenzo-Rodríguez, Javier; Díaz Chorne, Laura; Díaz Catalán, Celia; Sanz Suárez-Lledó, Victor; Fernández Araiz, Víctor; García Cuenca, Cristina; Pallarés I Cardona, Elisabet; Zúñiga, Ricardo; de Luxán, Adolfo; Skrobanek, Jan; Kmiotek-Meier, Emilia; Hemming, Karen; Tillman, Frank; Manafi, Ioana and Marinescu Daniela (Eds.): *Mapping Mobility – Pathways, Institutions and Structural Effects of Youth Mobility: Deliverable D.4.7 -Public Workpackage 4 Report*. 82-95. (http://move-project.eu/fileadmin/move/downloads/MOVE_D4_7.pdf)
- Cuzzocrea, V., & Mandich, G. (2016). Students narratives of the future: imagined mobilities as forms of youth agency? *Journal of Youth Studies*, 19(4), 552-567.
- de Wit, H., Deca, L., & Hunter, F. (2015). Internationalisation of higher education—What can research add to the policy debate?. In Curaj, Adrian; Matei, Livia; Pricopie, Remus; Salmi, Jamil and Scott, Peter (Eds.), *The European Higher Education Area*. (pp. 3-12). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_1
- Di Pietro, G. (2013). Do Study Abroad Programs Enhance the Employability of Graduate? IZA *Discussion Paper*, Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Diaz-Chorne, L., Suárez-Lledó, V., & Lorenzo, V. (2019). It's the taking part that counts: Inequalities and simultaneous youth transnational engagement from six European countries. *Migration Letters*, 16(1), 73-91.
- Donato, K-M., & Sisk, B. (2015). Children's Migration to the United States from Mexico and Central America: Evidence from Mexican and Latino American Migration Projects. *Journal of Migration and Human Security*, 3(1), 58-79. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v3i1.43>
- Eurobarometer (2018). Flash Eurobarometer 466: The European education area. <http://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/ResultDoc/download/DocumentKy/82898> Accessed 13 March 2020.
- European Commission (2013). *European higher education in the world*. https://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/international-cooperation/european-higher-education-world_en Accessed 14 February 2019.
- Fernández-Araiz, V. (2017). The career plans of young people. In: Navarrete Moreno, Lorenzo; Lorenzo-Rodríguez, Javier ; Díaz Chorne, Laura; Díaz Catalán, Celia; Sanz Suárez-Lledó, Victor; Fernández Araiz, Víctor; García Cuenca, Cristina; Pallarés I Cardona,

- Elisabet; Zúñiga, Ricardo; de Luxán, Adolfo; Skrobaneck, Jan; Kmiotek-Meier, Emilia; Hemming, Karen; Tillman, Frank; Manafi, Ioana and Marinescu Daniela (Eds.): *Mapping mobility – pathways, institutions and structural effects of youth mobility: Deliverable D.4.7 – Public Workpackage 4 Report*. 74-81. (http://move-project.eu/fileadmin/move/downloads/MOVE_D4_7.pdf)
- Findlay, A., King, R., Stam, A., & Ruiz-Gelices, E. (2006). Ever Reluctant Europeans: The Changing Geographies of UK Students Studying and Working Abroad. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 13(4), 291–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776406065429>
- Glick Schiller, N. (2004). Transnationality. In Nugent, David. and Vincent, Joan (Eds.) *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics*. Malden. (pp. 448-467). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Grob, U. (2009). Die Entwicklung Politischer Orientierungen Vom Jugend- Ins Erwachsenenalter – Ist Die Jugend Eine Spezifisch Sensible Phase in der politischen Sozialisation? In Helmut Fend, Fred Berger, and Urs Grob (Eds) *Lebensverläufe, Lebensbewältigung, Lebensglück: Ergebnisse Der Life-Studie*, (pp. 329–372) Heidelberg: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Haikkola, L. (2011). Making connections: Second-generation children and the transnational field of relations. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(8), 1201-1217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2011.590925>
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450100500489189>
- Hemming, K., Tillmann, F., & Reißig, B (2016). Mapping mobility – pathways, institutions and structural effects of youth mobility: D.2.4 Final work package report. http://move-project.eu/fileadmin/move/downloads/MOVE_D2_4.pdf Accessed 13 March 2020.
- Herz, A., Díaz-Chorne, L., Díaz-Catalán, C., Alice, A., and Samuk, Ş. (2019): Are you mobile, too? The role played by social networks in the intention to move abroad among youth in Europe. *Migration Letters*, 16(1), 93-104.
- Harrison. N. (2015). Practice, problems and power in ‘internationalisation at home’: critical reflections on recent research evidence, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(4), 412-430, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1022147>
- Heath, S. (2007). Widening the gap: Pre-university gap years and the economy of experience. *British journal of sociology of education*, 28(1), 89-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690600996717>
- Hoffman, D-M. (2003). Internationalisation at Home From the Inside: Non-Native Faculty and Transformation. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 7(1), 77-93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690600996717>
- Hurrelmann, K. (1990). Parents, Peers, Teachers and Other Significant Partners in Adolescence, *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 2(3), 211-236, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.1990.9747679>
- Jahr, V., & Teichler, U. (2007). ‘Graduates’ International Experience and Mobility’. In Ulrich Teichler (Eds.) *Careers of University Graduates. Views and Experiences in Comparative Perspectives*, (pp. 211–224) Dordrecht: Springer.
- Jaklič, A., & Paraskevi, K. (2015). Internationalisation at Home: Exploiting the Potential of the Non-nationals’ and Expatriates’ Community. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 3(4), 49-72. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2015.030404>

- Jon, J-E. (2013). Realizing Internationalisation at Home in Korean Higher Education: Promoting Domestic Students' Interaction with International Students and Intercultural competence. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(4), 455-470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312468329>
- Jones, E., Coelen, R., Beelen, J., & de Wit, H. (2016). *Global and Local Internationalisation*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers
- Joris, M., van den Berg, C., & van Ryssen, S. (2003). Home, but not Alone: Information and Communication Technology and Internationalisation at Home. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 94–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315302250191>
- Kaufmann, V., Bergman, M. M., & Joye, D. (2004). Motility: mobility as capital. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(4), 745-756. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00549.x>
- Kelly, M. (2013). “Interventions: Language competences for employability, mobility and growth”, *European Journal of Language Policy*, 5 (2), 257-286.
- King, R., & Raghuram, P. (2013). International student migration. Special issue. *Population, Space and Place*, 19(2), 127-222.
- King, R., Findlay, A., & Ahrens, J. (2010). ‘*International Student Mobility Literature Review Report to HEFCE*, and Co-Funded by the British Council, UK National Agency for Erasmus’. HEFCE: HEFCE
- King, R., Christou, A., & Ahrens, J. (2011). ‘Diverse Mobilities’: Second-Generation Greek-Germans Engage with the Homeland as Children and as Adults. *Mobilities*, 6(4), 483-501. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2011.603943>
- King, R., & Ruiz-Gelices, E. (2003). ‘International Student Migration and the European “Year Abroad”’: Effects on European Identity and Subsequent Migration Behaviour’. *International Journal of Population Geography*, 9, 229–252.
- Kmiotek-Meier, E. (2019). *Auslandsstudium an der Schwelle zum Erwachsenwerden. Ausgestaltung und Bedeutung des Auslandsaufenthaltes unter Credit- und Degree-Studierenden aus Luxemburg*. PhD diss., University of Luxembourg.
- Kmiotek-Meier, E., Karl, U., & Powell, J. J. W. (2020). ‘Designing the (most) mobile university: The centrality of international student mobility in Luxembourg’s higher education policy discourse’. *Higher Education Policy*, 33(1), 21–44. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-018-0118-4>
- Knight, J. (2003). *Internationalisation: Developing an institutional self-portrait*. Readings for EOTU Project.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalisation remodelled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>
- Lörz, M., & Krawietz, M. (2011). ‘Internationale Mobilität und soziale Selektivität: Ausmaß, Mechanismen und Entwicklung herkunftsspezifischer Unterschiede zwischen 1990 und 2005’, *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 63(2), 185-205.
- Massey, D.S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A., & Taylor, J-E. (1993). ‘Theories of international migration: A review and appraisal’. *Population and Development Review*, 19(3), 431-466.
- Moskal, M. (2014). Polish migrant youth in Scottish schools: Conflicted identity and family capital. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(2), 279-291.
- Murphy-Lejeune, E. (2002). *Student Mobility and Narrative in Europe*. London: Routledge.

- Muxel, A. (2009). EU movers and politics: towards a fully-fledged European citizenship? In Recchi, E. and Favell, A. (Eds.), *Pioneers of European integration: Citizenship and mobility in the EU*. (pp. 156-178) Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Myers, G., Szerszynski, B., & Urry, J. (1999). *Cosmopolitanism and Care in Everyday Lives*, Working Paper, CSEC, Linguistics, Sociology Depts, Lancaster University.
- Nilsson, B. (2003). Internationalisation at Home from a Swedish Perspective: The case of Malmö. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315302250178>
- Oinonen, E. (2018). Under pressure to become—from a student to entrepreneurial self. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 21(10), 1-17.
- Otten, M. (2000). Impacts of cultural diversity at home. P. Crowther et al. Internationalisation at Home: A Position Paper. European Association for International Education/Academic Cooperation Association, IAK, IESEG, Nuffic, Katholieke Hogeschool Limburg and Malmo University, 15-20.
- Prieto-Flores, Ó., Feu, J., & Casademont, X. (2016). Assessing Intercultural Competence as a Result of Internationalisation at Home Efforts: A Case Study From the Nightingale Mentoring Program. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 20(5), 437–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315316662977>
- Robertson, S., Harris, A., & Baldassar, L. (2018). Mobile transitions: A conceptual framework for researching a generation on the move. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 21(2), 203-217.
- Robson, S., Almeida, J., & Schartner, A. (2017). Internationalisation at home: Time for review and development? *European Journal of Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2017.1376697>
- Roman, M., Muresan, L. M., Manafi, I., & Marinescu, D. (2018). Volunteering as international mobility: Recent evidence from a post-socialist country. *Transnational Social Review*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21931674.2018.1509926>
- Ryan, L. (2011): Migrants' social networks and weak ties: Accessing resources and constructing relationships post-migration. *The Sociological Review*, 59(4), 707-724.
- Ryan, L., Sales, R., Tilki, M., & Siara, B. (2009). Family strategies and transnational migration: Recent polish migrants in London. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 35(1), 61-77.
- Suspitsyna, T. (2013). Socialization as sensemaking: A semiotic analysis of international graduate students' narratives in the USA. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(9), 1351-1364. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2011.629343>
- Szerszynskiand, B., & Urry, J. (2002). Cultures of Cosmopolitanism. *The Sociological Review*, 50(4), 455–481. doi:10.1177/003802610205000401
- Teichler, U. (2017). Internationalisation Trends in Higher Education and the Changing Role of International Student Mobility. *Journal of international Mobility*, 5(1), 177-216. <https://doi.org/10.3917/jim.005.0179>
- Tran, L. (2012). Internationalisation of Vocational Education and Training: An Adaptive Curve for Teachers and Learners. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 17(4), 455-470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312469987>
- Thiel, M. (2016). *European identity and culture: Narratives of transnational belonging*. London: Routledge.
- Thomas, A. (2008). *Kulturvergleichende Psychologie*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Turunen, H. & Nummela, N. (2017). Internationalisation at home: The internationalisation of location-bound service SMEs. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 15, 36-54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10843-016-0179-7>

- Van der Velde, M., & Van Naerssen, T. (2011). People. Border, trajectories: An approach to cross-border mobility and immobility in and to the European Union. *Area*, 43(2), 218-224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2010.00974.x>
- Van Mol, C., & Timmerman, C. (2014). Should I Stay or Should I Go? An Analysis of the Determinants of Intra-European Student Mobility. *Population, Space and Place*, 20, 465-479. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.1833>
- Van Mol, C. (2017). Do employers value international study and internships? A comparative analysis of 31 countries. *Geoforum*, 78, 52-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.11.014>
- Van Mol, C., Snel, E., Hemmerechts, K., & Timmerman, C. (2018). Migration aspirations and migration cultures: A case study of Ukrainian migration towards the European Union. *Population, space and place*, 24(5), e2131.
- Wächter, B. (2003). An introduction: Internationalisation at Home in Context. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(1), 5-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315302250176>
- Wang, L. K. (2016). The Benefits of in-betweenness: return migration of second-generation Chinese American professionals to China, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(12), 1941-1958. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2016.1139447>
- Waters, J., & Leung, M. (2013). Immobile transnationalisms? Young people and their in situ experiences of 'international' education in Hong Kong. *Urban Studies*, 50(3), 606-620. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098012468902>
- Watkins, H., & Smith, R. (2018). Thinking Globally, Working Locally: Employability and Internationalisation at Home. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(3), 210-224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315317751686>
- Weichbrodt, M. (2014). Learning mobility: High-school exchange programs as a part of transnational mobility. *Children's Geographies*, 12(1), 9-24.
- Wiers-Jenssen, J. (2011). Background and Employability of Mobile vs. Non-Mobile Students. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 17(2), 79-100.
- Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2008). Second-Generation Tamils and Cross-Cultural Marriage: Managing the Translocal Village in a Moment of Cultural Rupture, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34(1), 113-131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691830701708718>
- Yemini, M. (2015). Internationalisation discourse hits the tipping point. Perspectives: *Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 19, 19-22.
- Yoon, K. (2014). Transnational youth mobility in the neoliberal economy of experience. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(8), 1014-1028. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2013.878791>

7. Appendix

Table A1

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Female	3431	0.54	0.50
Age: From 18 to 24	3431	0.60	0.49
Tertiary Education	3431	0.35	0.48
Mother with Tertiary Education	3431	0.25	0.44
Multiple Nationality	3429	0.05	0.21
Siblings studied abroad	2990	0.12	0.32
Friends studied abroad	3251	0.45	0.50
Friends did exchange study	3238	0.50	0.50
Mobile family background	3270	0.25	0.43
Identified with the World	3431	0.37	0.48
More than 5 times abroad	3431	0.25	0.43
Hungary	3431	0.21	0.41
Luxembourg	3431	0.09	0.28
Norway	3431	0.18	0.37
Romania	3431	0.19	0.39
Spain	3431	0.16	0.37
Germany	3431	xx	xx

Variables (n)	Category	% per category
Gender (n=3431)	Female	54 %
	Male	46 %
Age (n=3431)	18 to 24	60 %
	25 to 29	40 %
Tertiary education (n=3431)	yes	35 %
	no	65 %
Mother with Tertiary Education (n=3431)	yes	25 %
	no	75 %
Multiple Nationality (n=3429)	yes	5 %
	no	95 %
Siblings studied abroad (n=2990)	yes	12 %
	no	88 %
Friends studied abroad (n=3251)	yes	45 %
	no	55 %
Friends did exchange study (n=3238)	yes	50 %
	no	50 %
Mobile family background (n=3270)	yes	25 %
	no	75 %
Identified with the World (n=3431)	yes	37 %
	no	63 %
More than 5 times abroad (n=3431)	yes	25 %
	no	75 %
Country of origin (n=3431)	Hungary	21 %
	Luxembourg	9 %
	Norway	18 %
	Romania	19 %
	Spain	16 %
	Germany	17 %



mis
Migration
and
Inclusive
Societies

University of Luxembourg
Belval Campus – Maison des Sciences Humaines
Key Research Area MIS – Migration and Inclusive Societies (MIS)
11, porte des Sciences
L-4366 Esch-sur-Alzette
mis@uni.lu | www.mis.lu