Acknowledgements

We would like to express our deep gratitude to SRHE for the generous funding for this research and to Professor Miriam David for her invaluable advice as the official mentor of this project. We are also extremely grateful to all those who participated in the study.
Summary

This research explores the relationships between academic staff mobility, knowledge creation and internationalisation in higher education within a comparative framework, focusing on both space and time. It attempts to rethink the dichotomy of Mode 1 and 2 knowledge (Gibbons, et. al., 1994), through the two distinct periods of transnational academic mobility - here interpreted as two moments of the mobility of ‘persons’ within the world-system: first, the inter-war period (1918-1939) of the extreme politics of Nazism and the mobility of academics for liberty; and second, the contemporary period (the last two decades, 1992-2012) of the extreme politics of neo-liberalism and the mobility of academics for the pragmatics of ‘optimization’ in terms of marketability.

It is argued that: (1) Mode 1 and Mode 2 knowledge itself is changing in an epochal moment of extreme politics. (2) The evolution of knowledge production is not a linear process from Mode 1 to Mode 2; the dichotomy of Mode 1 and Mode 2 knowledge was blurred in the inter-war period of transnational academic mobility. Furthermore, the research attempts to theorise a new “Mode 3” knowledge production embodied in academic mobility and transnational identity capital – a concept initially sketched by Kim (2010). To test these arguments, and analyse the relationship between academic mobility and new types of knowledge creation (provisionally named “Mode 3” knowledge here), the research project involves empirical research.

Biographical accounts of academic mobility and knowledge creation in the inter-war period is offered through a literature review, including historical data, (and also audio visual archives, where available). However, the main focus of our research (the second and third parts of the study) is on the second moment of modern mobility. We are seeing the mass mobility of ‘academics’ but much else has changed. In other words, transnational academic mobility has been structured by political and economic forces determining the boundaries and direction of flows, and also involves personal choices and professional networks. The patterns of transnational academic mobility in history are discontinuous. Barriers of ethnicity, nationality, race, gender, religion and culture and the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion shift.

The project offers a critical analysis of (i) the contemporary redefinition of ‘knowledge’ - including the ways in which knowledge is governed and managed; (ii) the universalising demands of ‘knowledge creation’ and its shifting goals from emancipatory to entrepreneurial enlightenment; and accordingly, (iii) the globalisation of research industry as a force for academic mobility.
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Introduction

This research explored the relationships between academic staff mobility, knowledge creation and internationalisation in higher education within a comparative framework.

The purpose of this research project was two-fold: (i) to examine critically how the functioning – and ultimately the impact – of universities, in the production of knowledge, new knowledge creation and innovation may be affected by the increasing prevalence of international academic staff mobility; (ii) to offer an in-depth analysis of the internationalisation of British universities through international staffing.

This is an important and relatively unexamined area in higher education research - especially the intricate relations of the legal framework (immigration/employment law), the institutional contexts of policy implementation, and the internal sociology and cultural assumptions of daily practice inside academe.

The mobility of academic staff is an important and yet under-researched subject area. Despite a strong emphasis on mobility per se in both contemporary higher education policy and research, there has been no systematic analysis of trends in academic staff mobility (Teichler, 2010). Most research on mobility in higher education, in fact, has focused on: student mobility and experience (e.g. Gürüz, 2008; Schweisfurth & Gu, 2008; Brooks and Waters, 2010; Marginson, et. al., 2010); the globalisation of the knowledge economy (Brown, et. al., 2010); academic labour markets (Musselin, 2005; 2010); and the career paths of ‘researchers’ (EUI Max Weber Programme ‘ACO’; IDEA Consult ‘MORE’ study, June 2010).

The research findings will thus make a valuable contribution to filling a critical void in the higher education literature. It builds on Kim’s documentary research analysis on transnational academic mobility, which has employed a historical-sociological perspective (Kim, 2008, 2009a; 2009b; 2010; Kim and Locke, 2010) and Brooks’ work on the internationalization of higher education (Brooks and Waters, 2011). It also furthers the work of the 'Changing Academic Profession' project conducted by the Centre for Higher Education Research and Innovation (CHERI), which has emphasised the importance of a comparative understanding of UK university academics.

The proportion of foreign and migrant academic staff in UK universities has increased significantly in recent years: 27% of full-time academic staff appointed in 2007/08 came from outside the UK (Kim and Locke, 2009), but in some of the major research universities, the proportion is much higher: e.g. in the University of Oxford, over 60% of academic appointments in 2011 went to non-UK nationals (unpublished interview data, April 2011). The proportion seems also higher at the professoriate level: according to the unpublished survey data provided by INCHER-Kassel (Teichler, 2010), 41% of UK university professors have foreign citizenship. Within the UK, the highest numbers of new appointments from the EU are: Germany 4200, Ireland 2895, Italy 2695, France 2340, Greece 1905, and Spain 1570. From outside the EU, the highest numbers of appointees are US 2950 (2380 academic staff + 570 researchers), China 3730 (2280 academic staff + 1450 researchers), and India 1900 (1330 + 570). On the basis of current trends, it has been estimated by the Universities UK that the overall proportion of international academics employed in British universities will rise to 50% in 20
years (Source: Universities UK, Policy Brief Talent Wars, 2007: 10). Overall, this trend can be the indication that the British academic profession may well be in the process of de-nationalisation.

Research Methodology

Against this background, the research considered the intricate relations of academic mobility to, knowledge creation and internationalisation in higher education from a comparative perspective focusing on both space and time.

Our research on mobile academics is framed by international politics of migration and historical sociology of knowledge. Our analytic frame of reference draws on C. Wright Mills’ *Sociological Imagination* and Paul Ricoeur’s *Time and Narrative* and Narrative Identity to delineate the intricate connection between the patterns of individual lives and social structures and movements and the course of world history in an attempt to “understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and the external career of a variety of individuals.” (Mills, Sociological Imagination, 1959: 5). Thus historical time becomes human time “to the extent that it is articulated through a narrative mode, and narrative attains its full significance when it becomes a condition of temporal existence.” (Ricoeur, 1984: 52).

As a mobile academic, the project’s PI has been always interested in the relationship between academic mobility and knowledge, and thought the dichotomy of Mode 1 and 2 knowledge initially sketched by Gibbons, et. al. (1994) may be a useful frame of reference as a starting point. We have tried to re-think - via the two moments of the mobility of persons within the world-system:

First, the inter-war period of the extreme politics of Nazism and the mobility of academics for ‘liberty’ (1918-1939); and second, the period of extreme politics of neo-liberalism and the mobility of academics for the pragmatics of ‘optimization (1990-2011), which is how I defined the contemporary period of the last two decades.

A mode of knowledge creation by mobile academics

In our research on academic mobility and knowledge creation, we argued that the complex process of knowledge creation and innovation should be informed by the involvement of the personal, biographic dimensions of mobile academics’ engagement with knowledge and their terms with identity.

The typology below was made to explore a mode of knowledge creation by mobile academics, namely Mode 3 knowledge as sketched here. The work of Gibbons et. al. (1994) distinguished between Mode 1 and Mode 2 knowledge production. By and large, Mode 1 is judged to be discipline-based knowledge production, linked to cognitive communities, and characteristic of traditional university-based research; and Mode 2 is judged to be transdisciplinary, distributed knowledge production, linked to contextualised, problem-solving communities of professional practice, and characteristic of networked research.

However, on the basis of biographic narratives of mobile academics’ self account of knowledge creation, we took the analysis one step further to conceptualise what we temporarily call ‘Mode 3’ knowledge. We propose this concept of ‘Mode 3’ knowledge here as a consequence of this mixture of transnational academic mobility and identity transformation. This ‘knowledge’ was initially called ‘Transnational Identity Capital’ and was conceptualised in Kim (PI)’s article published in *Discourse* journal in 2010.
We have visualised a typology of three modes of knowledge creation as sketched here:

**A Typology of knowledge creation:**
evolving from Mode 1 and Mode 2 to Mode 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode 1</th>
<th>Mode 2</th>
<th>-----&gt;</th>
<th>Mode 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on Knowledge Capital (hierarchical)</td>
<td>Incorporating Social Capital (interactive, multiple nodes)</td>
<td>Using Identity Capital (entwined, circular movement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mode 1 is based on knowledge capital, and the direction of knowledge movements and modality of knowledge creation is hierarchical – as the arrow here represents, whereas Mode 2 knowledge incorporating social capital. The direction of knowledge movements is interactive and it has multiple nodes of knowledge creation.

And Mode 3 knowledge is using identity capital. It has entwined, circular movements of knowledge in the process of new knowledge creation. In the analysis of biographic narratives of transnational mobile academics, we argue that spatial transfer of knowledge (through academic mobility) is followed by knowledge transformation into ‘transnational identity capital’ (Kim, 2010).

We are interested in the ways in which new knowledge is produced and the relationship between positional knowledge and creative knowledge made visible especially through mobile academics biographies. Accordingly we have focused on embodied and travelled knowledge carried by mobile academics, which is not just *wissenschaft* (scientific knowledge) but *weltanschauung* (a view of the world).

Paying attention to the individual biographic narratives constructed by mobile academics, we have argued that academic mobility is not a simple zero-sum game of brain drain/brain gain; but mobility leads to brain transfer and brain transformation.

And the role of mobile academics can be found in the following three: knowledge broker/trader, and knowledge translator and knowledge creator – invoking Bauman’s (1987) distinction between interpreters and legislators.

In short, our initial proposition was that transnational identity capital as ‘embodied and travelled knowledge’ raises some fundamental issues around positional knowledge and creative knowledge generated by individual mobile academic intellectuals; and their relations in the contemporary (neoliberal) university contexts of mobility, interculturality and coloniality.¹

¹ The term *coloniality* used in this article, instead of ‘colonialism’, is to stress the experience of our engaging directly with the world we inhabit, and to avoid any overemphasis on the unilinearity and ‘imprinting’ nature of colonial relations.
Mobility and embodied travelled knowledge

*Spatial transfer of knowledge → Knowledge transformation into transnational identity capital*

Urry (2000, 2002) rightly asserts that mobility is an ontological condition and is expressed in processes of people, commodities, cultures and technologies all on the move. In our research, it is suggested that an important way to see the processes of mobility and the ways in which mobility is entwined with knowledge creation is through different types of knowledge, as ‘capital’.

We have refined the concept of Identity capital, which was initially defined by Cote and Levine (2008), to argue that there is transnational identity capital, which involves generic competences to engage with *otherness*. It is a mode of cosmopolitan positioning, which facilitate free movement among diverse groups and contexts, including ethno-national epistemic sub-cultures.

Transnational identity capital as a new transformation of knowledge is highly tacit and difficult to replicate as an authentic individual asset and thus not possible to purchase directly. Collins (1993; 1995) suggests that most of what we once thought of as the paradigm case of ‘unsocial’ knowledge – science and mathematics – has turned out to be *deeply social*; it rests on agreements to live our scientific and mathematical life a certain way (Kim, 2010: 584).

As such, Max Born, who was a major transnational physicist in the development of ‘quantum mechanics’ after leaving Germany in 1933, expressed his most important intellectual legacy as follows:

> I believe that ideas such as absolute certitude, absolute exactness, final truth etc. are figments of the imagination which should not be admissible in any field of science... The work for which I have had the honour to be awarded the Nobel prize in Physics for 1954, contains no discovery of a fresh natural phenomenon, but rather the basis for a *new mode of thought* in regard to natural phenomena.

(Max Born Nobel Laureate in Physics, 1954 In Seabrook, 2009: 44-5).

In his Nobel lecture in 1954, Born stated with his characteristic sense of humility towards his own achievement that his work contains no discovery of a fresh natural phenomenon but contains the basis for a *new mode of thought*. And his academic attestation reflects his own life experience as an uprooted academic émigré, which subsequently formed a new mode of thought and contributions to quantum physics.

Using biographical accounts of mobile academic intellectuals, our research has focused on how mobility has led to a new mode of knowledge creation in the process of becoming ‘strangers’ and being positioned as academic migrants.

**Becoming strangers**

The biographies of distinctive mobile academics whose knowledge have become trans-national tell us that the whole set of mobility-related experiences - the initial act of crossing territorial boundaries, settling in and adaptation to a new (academic) milieu are entwined with the process of epistemic transformation. ‘Displacement’ is a common experience of most migrants, but for some academics, if not many, such experience has led to a new breakthrough and paradigm shifting knowledge creation.

---

2 Identity capital as a concept is not context-specific or class-specific. Identity capital includes cultural capital as well as many other elements that are specific to membership in any type of social culture. Identity capital operates to gain a group membership validation or preserve a self-definition (Cote & Levine, 2008).
Zygmunt Bauman, a Polish academic émigré in Britain since 1971 and one of the most prominent academic intellectuals of our time, confirms his ontological position here:

Britain was the country of my choice and by which I was chosen through an offer of a teaching job once I could no longer stay in Poland, the country of my birth, because my right to teach was taken away. But there, in Britain, I was an immigrant, a newcomer – not so long ago a refugee from a foreign country, an alien. I have since become a naturalized British citizen, but once newcomer can you ever stop being a newcomer?

(Bauman 2004: 9)

There was a considerable difference in the way the host country was perceived between those enthusiastically welcomed in academic society and those who had to depend, initially, on their own resources.

Norbert Elias’s biography belongs to the latter case. Norbert Elias’s personal biography and his sociological theory came nowhere nearer convergence than in his propositions about established-outsiders relationships.

**Being Outsiders**

Elias’ writing reflects his powerful sympathy for outsiders of every kind, and in retrospect, Elias remarked that personal experiences and the events of his time, influenced his thinking at least as much as any book he read.

With his firsthand experience of the First World War as a soldier in the German army and the subsequent social disorder in the Weimar period and the murderous nature of the Nazi regime, Elias analysed *The Civilizing Process* (1969;1982) as a specific transformation of human behaviour. Even after he escaped the Nazi Germany, however, his career as an academic émigré was unusual and difficult.

Elias (1897-1990) initially studied both medicine and philosophy in Breslau and later sociology in Heidelberg where he learned from Karl Jaspers and did *Habilitation* under Alfred Weber (the brother of Max Weber). In 1930 Elias chose to follow Karl Mannheim to become his assistant in Frankfurt. After the Nazi take-over in 1933, Mannheim’s sociological institute was forced to close and Elias fled to Paris. In Paris, although he was soon able to move into French intellectual circles, there was no prospect of academic employment in France. After two years in poverty in Paris, he moved to London, accepting the invitation from Karl Mannheim who was already at LSE. Elias was thirty-eight years old then, had published very little, and did not speak English. Therefore, his career prospects in Britain were also very limited. Whilst working as Senior Research Assistant to Karl Manheim at LSE, he completed the two volumes of his *magnum opus*, *The Civilizing Process*. When the German invasion of Britain appeared imminent in 1940, Elias was detained at internment camps on account of his being German, even though he was a Jewish academic émigré. After his release in 1941, he taught evening classes in an adult learning organisation in Cambridge, and towards the end of the war, Elias also worked for British intelligence. It was only 1954 that Elias had the first secure academic post at the Univ. of Leicester, Sociology Department. He was then 57 years old. And it was only in his late seventies and his eighties that Elias came at last to be regarded by many social scientists as having ‘one of the world’s most original and penetrating sociological thinkers.’ (Mennell and Goudsblom, 1998).

Elias’s biography suggests that critical incidents in his lifetime and the experiences of crossing boundaries – epistemic, academic culture, and territorial boundaries have intimately interwoven and led to new knowledge creation.
The importance of marginality

Brigitte Bonisch-Brednich, Professor of Anthropology in New Zealand, who is originally from Germany, also offers a powerful analysis of her interstitial position as an academic migrant:

Having learnt to be ‘the Other’ means that I can never be Kiwi, nor do I aspire to be; after some years, however, I and other academic migrants like me may even become incapable of re-immersing ourselves in the academic world from which we came. We become the Other in both worlds and as a result will always be reflexive about our place in academic environments.

(Bönisch-Brednich, German Professor of Anthropology in NZ, 2011)

And this is possible by assuming the position of a stranger, invoking Simmel. In his essay ‘The Stranger’ in Soziologie (1908), Georg Simmel (1858-1918) argued:

To be a stranger is naturally a very positive relation; it is a specific form of interaction… He [the stranger] is not radically committed to the unique ingredients and peculiar tendencies of the group, and therefore approaches them with the specific attitude of “objectivity.” But objectivity does not simply involve passivity and detachment; it is a particular structure composed of distance and nearness, indifference and involvement.

(Wolff, trans. Ed. 1950, 402-408)

It is argued that becoming a transnational academic is like assuming the position of a stranger - as conceptualised by Georg Simmel: “His position within it, is fundamentally affected by the fact that, he does not belong in it initially, and that he brings qualities into it, that are not, and cannot be, indigenous to it.”(Simmel: Levine, D. trans. Ed. 1971: 143)

Prof. Anthony Leggett, the US-based British physicist & Nobel Laureate, comments on the significance of being a minority:

I definitely think that not just in science, but in any creative field of endeavour, it is an advantage to have been a ‘minority’…, be it through religion, ethnicity, or even left-handedness. How far the experience of maintaining and defending - sometimes in public and in the face of some ridicule - beliefs and attitudes not shared by the vast majority of my compatriots may have influenced my subsequent attitude to physics and indeed to life in general.


Boundaries making the position of a stranger

What then are the boundaries to make the position of a stranger? The concept of boundaries is partly drawn from work on collective identities - as explored by Barth (1969) and Jenkins (1996). According to Jenkins, “Boundaries are permeable, persisting despite the flow of personnel across them, and identity is constructed in transactions which occur at and across the boundary” (Jenkins, 1996: 24).
Transnational academic mobility is actually making boundaries hard and soft, explicit and implicit.

And visible and invisible, by legal-rational made by the State authority and cultural-reflexive by personal adaptation.

**Boundaries in the Neoliberal Market-framed University Context**

The boundaries of academic mobility overlap with, and are constructed by, the characteristics of contemporary neoliberal market-framed universities:

i) There is a new division of academic labour.

ii) There is ever more severe competition for external research funding and international recruitment of research staff.

iii) In the neoliberal market framed universities we have seen the end of tenure and casualisation of academic labour.

iv) Also there has been a new implementation of immigration policies favourable to highly skilled foreign knowledge workers. Both nation-states and corporations are in the worldwide market competition for brainpower.

v) Finally, neoliberal market framed universities need new leadership for corporatist governance and management. It requires the conversion from academic leadership which used to be *primus inter pares* to managerial skills and competencies (in line management).
The entrepreneurial management skills are now expected to be ‘transnational’ and ‘transferable’. Accordingly, some of the most prestigious universities in the UK have recruited Vice-Chancellors from abroad – for example, in Oxford, Cambridge, London School of Economics, St. Andrews, The Open University, the incumbent, or previous Vice Chancellors are all from abroad, notably from New Zealand, Australia, USA and South Africa. In short, manager-academics are emerging as a new type of mobile academics in the entrepreneurial research universities. This is especially visible in the English-speaking, neoliberal market-driven economies.\(^3\)

In the contemporary neoliberal market-framed university, there is a radical shift in the mode of knowledge production. The new paradigm, according to Shore and Wright (1999: 559) is ‘the re-invention of professionals themselves as units of resource whose performance and productivity must constantly be audited so that it can be enhanced’. Stephen Ball in his recent article on performativity and commodification admits that the neoliberal aspects of reform have required him to make himself calculable rather than memorable (Ball, 2012).

**Alienation in the contemporary neoliberal university context**

Brigitte Bonisch-Brednich, once again powerfully states that the corporatist performativity regime often creates another layer of culture shock to her as a German academic migrant. She says:

> It is experienced as a deep intrusion into my academic identity. It is an imposition of another learning process in the entrepreneurial system for producing and selling knowledge. Resisting this often means a slow or sudden professional death.

(Bönisch-Brednich, German Professor of Anthropology in NZ, 2011).

The following excerpt from our interview data also offers the experience of alienation among mobile academics working in the contemporary neoliberal university context:

**Q:** When do you feel foreign (i.e. as a non-UK national/European) in your academic and non-academic communities in the UK?

**A:** The only situation when I could possibly get a feel of foreignness is when I am in a management meeting, surrounded by people who take things all too seriously, without a sense of distance, sober reflection, or critical examination of the system and its dogmas. But this lack of critical distance could be found amongst people from different cultures, it is not a national trait; it is a specific mentality that seems to be proliferating in the new academic culture.”

(Excerpted from the interview with Professor Galin Tihanov -George Steiner Chair of Comparative Literature, Queen Mary, University of London, Dec. 2011)

Regardless of the contemporary changes to the university working condition, the ontological condition of being a stranger is more acutely expressed by some of major mobile academics with colonial backgrounds. This biographic account of Stuart Hall matches Simmel’s ‘position of a stranger’

\(^3\) The trend of recruiting transnational mobile manager academics is becoming a global phenomenon. For instance, the incumbent Dean of INSEAD, one of the world's most prestigious business schools, with campuses in France, Singapore and Abu Dhabi, is Dipak Jain, a transnational Indian manager-academic who used to be the Dean of Kellogg School of Management at North Western University in the USA.
Having been prepared by the colonial education, I knew England from the inside. But I’m not and never will be ‘English’. I know both places intimately, but I am not wholly of either place. And that’s exactly the diasporic experience, far away enough to experience the sense of exile and loss, close enough to understand the enigma of an always-postponed ‘arrival’. (Hall, 1996: 492).

Accordingly, it is suggested that mobile academics are positioned and positioning themselves as a stranger but that experience is often acute, given the existing boundaries of cultural non-inclusion.

And interculturality – we mean especially the condition of engaging with otherness - is bound to be intense when crossing and breaking the conventional boundaries of coloniality in the contemporary neoliberal universities, where ‘internationalisation’ is a motto everywhere, but the local practice of non-inclusion continues discursively.

For instance, a Professor of English Language Education working at one of major universities in Seoul, Korea for more than 10 years who is a Korean-American has responded to our interview question as follows:

Q: How significant are your nationality/ culture and identity to your academic work and new knowledge creation?

A: “Very significant in that as an expat, I do not feel a strong attachment to either one country or another. This allows a certain amount of academic and cultural freedom to create and explore third cultures--which carries with it the price of an inherent instability and lack of academic or social support. This increasing number of foreign academics is an inevitable result of the demand not only for courses other than language courses taught in English or other languages, but for alternative perspectives and expertise”.

(Korean-American, male Professor of English Language Education working at one of major universities in Seoul, Korea for more than 10 years, Interviewed in December 2011/January 2012)
However, what he has experienced is quite the opposite to the general expectation of internationalisation. According to his expression, foreign professors are to be "kept in their place":

“A general ethos that permeates the work culture in my school is that foreigners are not the experts. We are merely hired hands to do the work that locals are unable to do.”

In contrast, this excerpt from the interview with an English male professor in the University of Hong Kong put strong emphasis on his academic positional identity rooted in his national ethnic cultural heritage shaping his epistemic world.

…[my work] demonstrates how reliant I am on an essentially Anglo-Australian-American literature… I would not pretend to be as ‘international’ as some people like to lay claim to. In fact I think that sometimes being ‘international’ and having a ‘global’ perspective is over-emphasised, used as a bit of an empty boast and tends to devalue local knowledge and cognitive perspectives that cut across language/culture/nationality. That’s my thought anyway….. I guess I will always see myself as English and acknowledge that my cultural heritage is key in my work.

(Excerpted from the interview with an English male academic working in Hong Kong, July 2011)

In comparison, this excerpt from our interview with a French social scientist (who has mixed ethnic backgrounds) working as a postdoc in the USA, UK, and the Netherlands explains how she uses her identity capital in moving in and out of the multiple, multinational academic boundaries, which has also determined her choice of research subject.

In the US I was doing a postdoc and most of us were internationals, and worked really hard for a predominantly US faculty. This could be for a variety of reasons: postdocs tend to move like me or maybe that the scarcity of jobs had little prospects to move up it seemed. This two-tiered system was less visible to me in the UK (or maybe I did not notice it at the time). I am new to the Netherlands so I can't tell. They seemed to be pretty open despite recent changes in the law to make it harder for foreigners to work in the Netherlands…….Generally speaking I constantly feel aware of my mixed ethnic background and the culture that comes with it and how it impacts on the audience to know how I can be authoritative in front of a predominantly male, white and English speaking audience.

(Excerpted from the interview with a French female academic (with mixed ethnic backgrounds) working in the UK, USA and the Netherlands, Feb. 2012)

Likewise, this excerpt from the interview with a Greek female senior lecturer who was then working in an English university but has recently move to Sweden also reveals her reflexive positional identity as a stranger in the English academia and her negotiation in the process of moving and crossing boundaries leading to a new form of knowledge creation.

It is clear to me that I will always be an outsider when it comes to researching some aspects of the system. My choice of area of research the first time that I did make a conscious choice was that of the EU and that was precisely because of this feeling of coming from outside. … National identity is a bit more tricky because I cannot tell you where the boundaries of one ‘identity’ finish and the other begins (national, cultural, personal …). Early on in my career I found that many people responded to me as a Greek first rather than as an academic…. For instance, I gave two research seminars to present my work from the PhD in 1999 and 2000. In both of them, I had people at the end coming
to ask questions not of the PhD work but of things that, to me, were irrelevant. The comments I would get were ‘your English is so good’, ‘very brave of you to come to a foreign country to study’, etc. I did find this quite offensive, but not surprising. I had experienced it as well - as a PhD student with one of my supervisors [in Oxford] who would always comment about my language skills and almost never about the content of my work.

(Excerpted from the interview with a Greek female academic who worked in England, April 2012)

And Keita Takayama, Japanese Comparative Educationist working in Australia expresses his positional knowledge in relation to epistemic coloniality.

To be recognised ‘internationally’, I not only write in English but also formulate my findings in terms of relevant theoretical debates in the English speaking academic centres. As a Japanese national writing about Japanese education in English, I am otherised by the English-language scholarship with my argument defined as localised and nationally specific. The ironic benefit of being otherised, however, is that I gain authority as the ‘native’ whose voice often enjoys more legitimacy than non-Japanese scholars of Japanese education because of my national and racial ‘authenticity’, though my authority is strictly confined within the specialised field of Japanese education.

(Keita Takayama, Japanese academic in Australia; Excerpted from Takayama (2011) In Comparative Education, 47(4), 451)

However, Takayama does not move beyond this predicament to celebrate the structural connection between marginality and creativity that can overcome epistemic coloniality.

Conclusion

In short, a conclusion of this research is offered as follows:

First, the condition of transnational mobility and the position of mobile academics have been structured by political and economic forces determining the boundaries and direction of flows, and also involve personal choices and professional networks.

The transnational flows of academic mobility and migration are more often shaped by the intellectual centre/periphery relationships rather than merely directed by pure economic incentives.

We suggest that the position of a stranger enables mobile academics to explore the possibilities of a professionalization of ‘strangerhood’ in knowledge creation.

However, it is not yet clear to what extent the new forms and types of transnational academic mobility in the contemporary neoliberal period have impacted on the recognition and promotion of diverse academic cultures, leading to new knowledge creation and innovation.

Meanwhile, the global expansion of neoliberal market-framed university regimes may leave very little space for free floating mobile academic intellectuals, whose positions as an inside outsider, or outsider within.

There are unequal power relations in forming and shaping new knowledge and identity capital – which are made visible in the life history of mobile academics and also in the structure of knowledge
(re)production in higher education. Give the geometries of global-local power and knowledge, interculturality is enmeshed with de-coloniality and re-coloniality simultaneously.

Mobile academics and universities can no longer afford to ignore this. Whilst more and more academics are mobile, and becoming transnational, perhaps not many of them are aware of the considerable power and values of transnational identity capital, or even its own existence.

In the new cartography of shifting global power relations, the type of transnational knowledge and identity capital possessed and carried by academic intellectuals is a powerful force to be directed with careful consideration of the **longue durée** impact and consequences of academic mobility in the future of globalisation - beyond the boundaries of nation-states.

**References**
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4 Decoloniality insists on the liberating nature of the term and encourages a second decolonization—of an intellectual and cultural nature, in comparison with a first decolonization that is restricted to the legal-political level (Connell, 2007).


Appendix

Interviews with mobile academics
1. Professor (Comparative Literature, Bulgaria) Queen Mary College, London
2. Senior Lecturer (International Relations, Sweden) Cambridge
3. University Lecturer (Social Policy, Italy) Oxford
4. Deputy Director, Enterprise (International Relations, India) LSE
5. Researcher (Political Science & HE, France) LSE (UK) /Berkeley (USA) /Maastricht (The Netherlands)
6. Lecturer (Education, Greece) Keele (UK)/ Umeå (Sweden)
7. Senior Lecturer (Psychology, Canada) Regents College
8. Lecturer (Political Economy, Ecuador) Regents College
9. Professor (Higher Education Management, Netherlands) Bath
10. Researcher (Public Policy, Japan) UCL
11. Professor (Sociology, USA) Warwick
12. Lecturer (Management, Japan) Manchester
13. Reader (Political History & Philosophy, Australia) Brunel
14. Lecturer (Engineering & Design Studies, Korea) Brunel
15. Lecturer (Health Management, Nigeria) Westminster

Interviews with mobile academics in Europe and elsewhere for Comparative Analysis
15. Professor (Anthropology, USA), Kyoto, Japan
16. Professor (Linguistics & intercultural studies, UK/France), Helsinki, Finland
17. Lecturer (Linguistics, France), Malaysia
18. Lecturer (French studies, France), Australia
19. Senior Researcher (HE Management, Lithuania), Twente, the Netherlands
20. Senior Researcher (International Political Economy, specialist in global trade, TRIPS & GATS, Brazil and India), Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
21. Development Manager (Poland), Curriculum Resource Centre, Central European University, Hungary
22. Assistant Professor (Sociology, China), Syracuse University, USA
23. Professor (TESOL, Korean American), Seoul, Korea
24. Professor (Comparative Literature, UK) Hankook University, Seoul, Korea
25. Professor (Anthropology, Germany) Victoria, New Zealand
26. Professor (Anthropology, UK) Auckland, New Zealand
27. Associate Professor (Higher Education, UK) Hong Kong
28. Associate Professor (Media Studies, Korea) LSE & American University in Paris

Interviews with mobile consultant/CEO/self-employed academics
29. Honorary Professor/CEO (Design Studies & Psychology, USA/UK) City University London/ Loughborough/ Brunel
30. Former Dean/former OECD CERI Director/Consultant/Think Tank Director (Lifelong Learning, UK)

Interview with HE specialist/senior manager
31. Interview meeting with Dr. José Vásquez and Dr. Rosa Maltez at the College of the Americas [COLAM], IOHE in Montreal on 3rd May 2011. * Latin American academic managers working in Canada, IOHE devoted to inter-American university networks & academic mobility programmes.
32. Interview meeting with Prof. Sabine O’Hara (The Council for International Exchange of Scholars and Vice President of IIE in Washington DC & New York on 5th May 2011 * German academic CEO working in the USA.

33. Interview meeting with Prof. Peter Scott (Director, CHES, Institute of Education) and Aljona Sandgren (Research Academic, Moldova/Russia, Åbo Akademi University in Finland/University of Stockholm, Sweden) during the Academy of Europe-Wenner Gren Foundations Symposium in Stockholm, 26-28 May 2011.

34. David Palfreyman, Director of OXCHEPS and Bursar in New College Oxford on 20 January 2012.

35. Professor Roger Goodman, Head of Social Sciences Division, University of Oxford; Nissan Professor of Modern Japanese Studies, 15 June 2011.

Dissemination

Pl (Terri Kim)’s keynote & plenary talks by invitation:

(1) Invited as a keynote to give a talk on “Interface between Widening Participation and Internationalisation in UK Higher Education: a Clash or Concord between two cultures?” at the Learning Global International Conference, held at the University of Northampton, 11 May 2011.

(2) Invited to participate in the Academia Europaea Wenner-Gren Foundations International Symposium on The role of trust in higher education: ethical and quality standards in research and teaching, held in Stockholm, 26-28 May 2011. My role is a discussant of Dr. Stephanie Bird (of MIT)’s paper on Professional Responsibility and Institutions of Higher Learning in the Session on Media and HEI Trust chaired by Professor Sir Peter Scott.

(3) Invited to present a paper and participate in the first meeting of the International Advisory Board of iCOMpositor (inclusive Communities of Practice of Study, Education and Research) funded by DAAD, held at Institute for Intercultural Education and Development, Cologne University of Applied Sciences, Cologne, 9-10 September, 2011.

(4) Invited as a Panel Discussant to give a talk at the event on ‘University Futures: A Public Discussion’ organized by the group of ‘Support the Campaign for Social Science promoted by the Academy of Social Sciences, UEL, and THE (Times Higher Education), convened by Professor Corinne Squire, held at Friends’ House, Euston, London, 11 October 2011, 1.30-5 pm. (http://universityfutures.eventbrite.com).

(5) Invited to give a talk at Korea University, the Higher Education Policy Research Institute (HEPRI)/BK21 Colloquium, Seoul, 3 January 2012.


(8) Invited as a Plenary Speaker to the ICAMM 3 (International Conference on Academic Mobility and Migration), Universiti Putra Malaysia Serdang, Selangor, Malaysia, 4-5 July 2012: http://www.fbmk.upm.edu.my/ICAMM3/

(9) Invited to give a seminar presentation at Asan Institute for Policy Studies, Seoul, 23 August 2012, 3-5 pm.

(10) Invited to be the keynote Speaker at the 2012 EMN (European Migration Network) National Seminar in Finland (FI EMN NCP http://www.emn.fi/in_english) on the ‘Immigration of International Students to the EU, Eurooppasali, Malminkatu 16, Helsinki on 19 October 2012.
Invited to give a seminar presentation on ‘A biographic narrative approach to mobile academics crossing boundaries - rethinking the relationship between creative knowledge and positional knowledge’ at the UEL CNR (Centre for Narrative Research) on 4th December 2012.

Conference paper presentation:
(12) The CIES Conference in Montreal (May 2011).
(13) The ECER Conference Symposium, Berlin (September 2011);
(14) The SRHE Conference, Newport, Wales (Dec. 2011)
(15) The BAICE Conference, held in Cambridge (September 2012).

Media:
(3) QS AIM (Academic International Mobility) article ‘Has academic mobility reached its peak? The short answer is, 'no' (based on the interview - the quotations are based on her telephone interview made on 23rd January 2012: http://beta.aim.qs.dev.techsailor.com/articles/view/127
(4) PI (Terri Kim)’s work was on ‘Academic mobility’ reported in Monitori (http://www.intermin.fi/ajankohtaista/monitori-lehti/1/0/terri_kim_maahanmuuttopolitiikka_ja_tiedemaailma_valilla_ristiriidassa), an online magazine produced by the Ministry of the Interior of Finland. The article is based on her keynote speech at the European Migration Network (EMN) Seminar entitled ‘Immigration of international students’, which she made in Helsinki on 19 October 2012: http://www.emn.fi/ajankohtaista/programme_national_seminar_2012/; http://emn.fi/ajankohtaista/emn_kansallinen_seminaari_2012 _kooste/.