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Abstract: Purpose: To determine the main aspects of Ukrainian teaching staff mobility as integration process in the global society. Material: The survey involved female teachers (n=108) from H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University (Kharkiv, Ukraine) and Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskiy Hryhoriy Skovoroda State Pedagogical University (Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskiy, Ukraine). The survey contained mains aspects of teaching staff mobility, respondents chose the proposed variants of each issue and explain their choice. Results: It was determined that the most important aspects of Ukrainian teaching staff mobility were expansion of professional contacts, opportunity to gain experience in European universities, development in their professional area, gain the experience in a new professional area, international mobility, professional growth. The less attractive aspects of teaching staff mobility were increase in publication activity, the prospect of working abroad on a rolling basis, internal (regional) mobility, aspiration of permanent self-improvement. Conclusions: The level of professional mobility of Ukrainian teaching staff increase a lot last years due to the external politics of government and integration processes of modern society and it is considered to be the most effective way for professional development and competitive ability on the labor market.
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1. Introduction

The complex integration process of Ukraine’s into EU include all aspects of peoples social life, including education. The reform of higher education requires from teaching staff the new skills and aspiration to professional self-development. The universities support and promote these processes by advanced training of teaching staff and participation into different European programs of teaching staff exchange like Erasmus, Tempus etc.

There is a difference in understanding the content of labor and professional mobility of teaching staff. According to the conclusions of researchers (Krokhaleva, 2007; Dzvinchuk, 2018) labor mobility is a change of workplace, mainly with a change of profession in order to increase the income. The professional mobility, from the majority of scientists’ point of view (Brizhak, 2016; Familyarskaya, 2016; Kovalisko, 2002) means an ability of a person to adapt to the new professional activity or to the activity under the conditions which are the requirement of certain transformations of the field. Therefore, a dominant in the content of interpretation of personal mobility is the idea of adaptation, flexibility, and speed of reaction in changeable and unpredictable conditions of professional activity (Familyarskaya, 2016). The professional mobility is special property which characterizes internal readiness of the teaching staff to the high-quality changes.

The content of teaching staff competences is modernized enough, that’s why methods and forms of teachers’ advanced training deserve a lot of attention. The result has to be their readiness to work under conditions of the modern higher education system. It should be noted that labor stability of the modern teaching staff is also in a risk zone. The governmental politics to decrease the number of state universities caused by the reform of higher education make teaching staff to be ready to change the direction of professional activity or to extend own work skills in general. Therefore, the imperative of our time is teaching staff ability to find possibilities for acquisition the modern pedagogical competencies and to increase the professional communication network. The effective mean of these processes is the professional mobility.

The concept “professional mobility” in scientific discourse closely correlates with the concept “labor mobility” as the characteristic of labor market flexibility. The representative of teaching staff in the modern labor market has to be ready to compete for a workplace, to take an active part in
the correction of own life views, including the aspect of orientation on stability. The quality of professional mobility is the dynamical characteristic of modern life in general because the information society and social standards change fast and this stipulates person’s reaction on all these processes to self-changes, or to changes into the environmental. At the same time, mobility is the characteristic of all modern social processes, in particular, the professional sphere of the teaching staff.

It is defined in the scientific literature that labor mobility is a basic readiness of a person to change position, profession, workplace, residence, and lifestyle in general. According to V. Vasilchenko, the high level of labor mobility is a basis for ensuring the balance of labor market and high level of persons’ competitiveness in the labor market (Vasilchenko, 2005). The Ukrainian labor law considers the labor mobility as special option of social mobility that is the carried transitions of employees in the system of social organization of labor which are characterized by change of workplace, labor function, other conditions of labor contract, the legal nature of employment, separately or in different combinations and indirectly by conclusion of labor contract, changes of its conditions, and its termination (Krokhaleva, 2007). Legislators emphasize that labor mobility is determined by the economic law of demand. First of all, the professional mobility of teaching staff can be predetermined by the increase of a person’s need for work. Secondly, work on contract and salary is the only way of existence and satisfaction of needs for most of the members of society. The increase of their needs can lead to change of workplace by employees, labor function and so forth for the purpose of increasing income (Krokhaleva, 2007).

In general supporting such opinion of legal specialists, it should be noted that labor mobility of teachers also depends on their needs, but these needs are consequence of social transformations (needs of professional self-improvement – as result of teachers' reaction on education reform); or safety factor of maintaining the acquired stability (receiving additional profession for competitiveness under conditions of school network standardization).

Thus, in modern scientific literature labor mobility flexibility is determined as the possibility of the labor market to adapt to changeable conditions due to employees transition from one form of employment to another, wide range of employment’s terms, an organization of salary, additional payments, working hours, forms and methods of work. For example, Iucu R. et al. (Iucu, Pânișoară, & Pânișoară, 2011) determined the need for professional development, including the experience exchange within other teaching systems among the main reasons for Romanian teaching staff mobility. Russian researchers R. Valeeva & L. Amirova (2016)
revealed the following main structural components of professional staff mobility: personal excess activity, readiness to perform social roles, social adaptability and creativity. In West European legal literature scientists (Blanpain, 2004) appreciate flexibility’s potential for more freedom of participants of the labor relations and also great opportunities of employees’ self-realization.

According to psychologists’ point of view, aspects of teaching staff mobility which is defined as an objective, subjective and characterological are influenced by the person’s choice of professional activity changes. The objective aspect covers the sphere of social and economic changes which influence on profession change. At the same time stimulation factors of teaching staff mobility are factors of professional and practical training of competitive experts. The subjective aspect concerns the change of employee’s interests, change of workplace or profession. From the characterological point of view, teaching staff mobility is considered as the settled quality of personality which scientists call labor mobility (Dzvinchuk). Thus, professional mobility can be potential (orientation to profession change) or real (possibility of profession change or the status according to desire) (Kovalisko & Horunzhyi, 2002).

Understanding of fact that under the conditions of labor market competition the person psychologically aimed to keep but not to change work, the current problem is the acquisition of the ability to use professional knowledge and abilities in a new way. At the same time, the main point of professional mobility is the situation of choice predetermined by specific problems of life.

The interest of the state in this aspect is not to lose the most motivated representatives of teaching staff and to give them an opportunity to gain modern professional competences on different educational platforms.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the main aspects of Ukrainian teaching staff mobility as an integration process in the global labor market.

2. Materials and methods

Participants. The survey involved female teachers from two pedagogical universities located in different geographic regions of the country: H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University (Kharkiv, East Ukraine) and Pereiaslav-Khmelnitsky Hryhoryi Skovoroda State Pedagogical University (Pereiaslav-Khmelnitsky, West Ukraine). 108
teachers participated in the survey: 52 teachers from Kharkiv, control group (CG) and 56 teachers from Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi, experimental group (EG). The age of teachers was 35-42 years old, average age was 38.5. The study involved married women only. We obtained the informed consent from all respondents participated in the research.

**Design of research**

The survey was designed by authors in accordance with modern tendencies of professional mobility and contained the following issues:

1. Reasons for teaching staff mobility:
   - expansion of occupational contacts;
   - increase in publication activity;
   - opportunity to gain experience in European universities;
   - financial improvement;
   - the prospect of working abroad on a rolling basis;
   - wage and hour laws;

2. Main purposes of teaching staff mobility:
   - development in their professional area
   - gain experience in a new professional area

3. Geography of teaching staff mobility:
   - internal (regional) mobility
   - international mobility

4. Personal qualities which are developed by teaching staff mobility:
   - professional growth
   - flexibility to apply new teaching techniques
   - social activity
   - aspiration of permanent self-improvement

This survey was descriptive and quantitative. Respondents chosen variant of each issue and answerers were processed by MS Excel, the Student t-test was also applied. The hypothesis of the study was that motivation for teaching staff mobility as integration process in the global society is higher among representatives of the EG (teachers from the Western part of the country) in comparison with the control group (teachers from the Eastern part of the country).

**3. Results**

“Reasons for teaching staff mobility”. Respondents from Kharkiv chosen “expansion of professional contacts” as the main reason for teaching staff mobility (17 teachers of 52 or 32.69%). The majority of them think that it
could help them to promote themselves into scientific society. Respondents of EG prefer to gain experience in European universities (19 teachers of 56, 33,92%) because they consider Europe as the center of modern science and want to implement obtained European experience to improve own scientific researches.

The increase in publication activity was the less important reason for respondents of both CG (3 teachers of 52 or 5,76%) and EG (1 teacher of 56 or 1,78%). They prefer personal experience which helps them to make a career to the possibility of increasing the number of scientific work.

Results are presented in table 1 and diagrams 1a and 1b.

**Table 1. Reasons for teaching staff mobility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variants of answers</th>
<th>CG, number of answers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>EG, number of answers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>expansion of professional contacts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32,69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase in publication activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunity to gain experience in European universities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>financial improvement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17,30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the prospect of working abroad on a rolling basis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wage and hour laws</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11,53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram 1a. Reasons for teaching staff mobility (CG)**

**Diagram 1b. Reasons for teaching staff mobility (EG)**
The Student t-test was the following: $t_{emp} = 0.2$, $t_{cr} = 2.23$ ($p \leq 0.05$) and $t_{cr} = 3.17$ ($p \leq 0.01$). The obtained $t$-empirical (0.2) in the zone of insignificance ($p=0.05$).

"Main purposes of teaching staff mobility". The opposite results were obtained on this issue. Representatives of CG (31 teachers of 52 or 59,61 %) chosen to gain experience in a new professional area. They try to improve self-development and expand professional skills. Respondents from Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi chose variant “development in their professional area” (33 teachers of 56 or 58,92%) as the main purpose of teaching staff mobility. They want to become real experts in their work, so use all opportunities to reach this goal.

Results are presented in table 2 and diagrams 2a and 2b.

Table 2. Main purposes of teaching staff mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variants of answers</th>
<th>CG, number of answers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>EG, number of answers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>development in their professional area</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40,38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gain experience in a new professional area</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59,61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Diagram 2a. Main purposes of teaching staff mobility (CG)

Diagram 2a. Main purposes of teaching staff mobility (EG)

Table 2a. The Student t-test for the issue “Main purposes of teaching staff mobility”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Deviation from mean</th>
<th>Deviation square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CG = control group, EG = experimental group

The Student t-test was the following: \( t_{emp} = 0.3 \), \( t_{cr} = 4.3 \) (\( p \leq 0.05 \)) and \( t_{cr} = 9.92 \) (\( p \leq 0.01 \)). The obtained t-empirical (0.3) in the zone of insignificance (\( p = 0.05 \)).

“Geography of teaching staff mobility”. Respondents of both groups prefer international mobility to internal mobility (43 teachers of CG or 82.69% and 48 teachers of EG or 85.71%) as the way to gain new teaching experience and exchange knowledge and teaching techniques with foreign colleagues.

Results are presented in table 3 and diagrams 3a and 3b.
Table 3. Geography of teaching staff mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variants of answers</th>
<th>CG, number of answers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>EG, number of answers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>internal (regional) mobility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17,30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international mobility</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>82,69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>85,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 3a. Geography of teaching staff mobility (CG)

Diagram 3b. Geography of teaching staff mobility (EG)

Table 3a. The Student t-test for the issue “Geography of teaching staff mobility”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Deviation from mean</th>
<th>Deviation square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CG = control group, EG = experimental group

The Student t-test was the following: \( t_{emp} = 0.1 \), \( t_{cr} = 4.3 \) (\( p \leq 0.05 \)) and \( t_{cr} = 9.92 \) (\( p \leq 0.01 \)). The obtained t-empirical (0.1) in the zone of insignificance (\( p = 0.05 \)).

“Personal qualities which are developed by teaching staff mobility”. As personal qualities which are developed by teaching staff mobility, respondents of CG
chosen professional growth (27 teachers of 52 or 51.92%) and social activity (12 teachers of 56 or 23.07%). Thus, they prefer to improve professional skills to be competitive on a labor market and make social relations in the professional area to exchange working experience.

Respondents from Pereiaslav-Khmelnitsky chosen professional growth (24 teachers of 52 or 42.85%) and flexibility to apply new teaching techniques (16 teachers of 56 or 42.85%). Thus, they also want to be real professionals in their field and try to use modern teaching techniques and educational innovations in their everyday work.

Results are presented in table 4 and diagrams 4a and 4b.

**Table 4.** Personal qualities which are developed by teaching staff mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variants of answers</th>
<th>CG, number of answers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>EG, number of answers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>professional growth</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51.92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flexibility to apply new teaching techniques</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social activity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspiration of permanent self-improvement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram 4a.** Personal qualities which are developed by teaching staff mobility (CG)

**Diagram 4b.** Personal qualities which are developed by teaching staff mobility (EG)
The Student t-test for the issue “Personal qualities which are developed by teaching staff mobility”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Deviation from mean</th>
<th>Deviation square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CG = control group, EG = experimental group

The Student t-test was the following: $t_{emp} = 0.2$, $t_{cr} = 2.45$ ($p \leq 0.05$) and $t_{cr} = 3.71$ ($p \leq 0.01$). The obtained t-empirical (0.1) is in the zone of insignificance ($p=0.05$).

4. Discussion

During research, we also investigated aspects of teaching staff mobility in other countries. The majority of teachers of the European Union consider teaching staff mobility very important part of the educational process. However, a lot of representatives of teaching staff don’t exclude the possibility of professional mobility outside the educational field. More often, such choice of teachers is caused by professional problems with health. At the same time within the survey carried out by C. Duchesne (Duchesne, 2008), teachers defined the following risks of interdisciplinary professional mobility:

- change of professional environment can become the reason of social tension;
- change of profession contains certain risks connected with a realization in the labor market;
- perception of other kinds of activity can be stereotypic because of insufficiency of experience;
- teachers do not always understand how their competences can be used in other businesses;
- the state financial support to teachers who wish change profession is minimum.
We don’t discuss mobility risks with our respondents, but we suppose that part of them is relevant for modern Ukrainian educational system.

In the study of A. Zabalza (1978) was investigated that salary and promotion played the main role in inter-school mobility of English teachers at the end of the 70th of the XX century. Our survey, carried out nowadays defined that financial reason is less important for Ukrainian teachers as an aspect of teaching staff mobility.

The survey made among Turkish ELT academics done by Mede & Tuzun (2016) revealed that professional development is the main reason for participation in the ERASMUS Teaching Staff Mobility program. Our results confirm these conclusions.

Dušan Lesjak (2017) determined that improvement of foreign language skills is the main reason for Slovenian teaching staff mobility, especially for professors taught in foreign languages. In our survey wasn’t a question about the improvement of foreign language skills, but we suppose, that respondents who preferred international mobility to internal one improved language skills during their mobility.

5. Conclusions

The results of the survey showed, that the most important aspects of Ukrainian teaching staff mobility are the following: expansion of professional contacts, opportunity to gain experience in European universities, development in their professional area, gain the experience in a new professional area, international mobility, professional growth. The less attractive aspects of teaching staff mobility were increase in publication activity, the prospect of working abroad on a rolling basis, internal (regional) mobility, aspiration of permanent self-improvement. It is connected with higher education reform and general integration process of Ukraine nowadays.

It was also determined the essence of the concept "professional mobility" as the ability of person's adaptation to new professional activity or to activity under the new conditions which are the requirement of certain transformations of the field. It is proved that under the conditions of education reform the teacher has to demonstrate professional mobility for maintaining competitiveness according to the modernized requirements to professional competence.

It was revealed that $t_{emp}$ for all studied issues was lower than the value of the Student's t-test at $p = 0.05$. This means that the differences between
compared samples were statistically insignificant at p = 0.05 and the hypothesis of the study was not confirmed. The control and experimental groups had some differences according to the individual indicators, but on a national scale, the motivation for teaching staff mobility as integration process in the global society was demonstrated by all participants of the study irrespectively of the region.

The analysis of European teaching staff professional mobility has shown that there are a lot of common reasons for that process in Europe and in Ukraine, but it also has particular features like mobility risks, financial reasons and improvement of foreign language skills.

The level of professional mobility of Ukrainian teaching staff increase a lot last years due to the external politics of government and integration processes of modern society and it is considered to be the most effective way for professional development and competitive ability on the labor market.
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