Faculty Experiences, Views, and Challenges on Internationalization in Higher Education from a Cross-Cultural Perspective

Hanife AKAR [a*] (ORCID ID - 0000-0001-7819-5758)

Rahime ÇOBANOĞLU[b] (ORCID ID - 0000-0003-4662-8920)

Patrick PLUNKETT[c] (ORCID ID - 0000-0003-2584-2370)

[a]Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Ankara/Türkiye
[b]Sinop Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Sinop/Türkiye
[c]Northeastern Üniversitesi, Boston/Amerika Birleşik Devletleri

Article Info

Abstract

This paper explores faculty experiences, visions and their perceived challenges of internationalization in higher education in two different cultural contexts through a causal-comparative research. The participating faculty (N = 216) were affiliated with a university in the Northeast of the USA and a university in Mid-Anatolia in Turkey. Data were collected through Status of Internationalization Scale and the Challenges of International Education Scale and analyzed employing descriptive statistics and one-way between-groups multivariate analyses. The study findings indicate that faculty are challenged differently by the internationalization process in the two cultural contexts. The sample in the west tends to internationalize less abroad as receivers of international students and are especially challenged to teach diverse student populations and dealing with cross-cultural communication. The faculty in non-west internationalize more abroad and view their curriculum as international due to adopting an Anglophone education and utilizing international curriculum instruments. The study overall reveals that universities become increasingly complex and should establish policies not only to address international student needs, but also promote policies for collaborative research in a global context.

Kültürlerarası Bir Bakış Açısından Yükseköğretimde Uluslararasılaşmaya Yönelik Öğretim Elemanlarının Deneyimleri, Görüşleri ve Karşılaştıkları Zorluklar

Makale Bilgisi

Öz

Bu makale, nedensel-karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma ile iki farklı kültürel bağlamda öğretim elemanlarının yükseköğretimde uluslararasılaşmaya ilişkin deneyim, görüş ve algıladıkları zorlukları incelemektedir. Çalışmaya katılan öğretim elemanları (N = 216) ABD'nin kuzeydoğusundaki bir üniversite ile Türkiye'de Orta Anadolu'da bir üniversitede görev yapmaktadırlar. Veriler, Uluslararasılaşmanın Durumu Ölçeği ve Uluslararası Eğitimin Zorlukları Ölçeği kullanılarak elektronik ortamda toplanmıştır. Verilerin analizi betimsel istatistikler ve tek yönlü çok değişkenli varyans analizi ile yapılmıştır. Çalışma bulguları, iki farklı kültürel bağlamı temsil eden kurumlardaki öğretim elemanlarının uluslararasılaşma süreçlerinde farklı zorluklarla karşılaştıklarını göstermektedir. Uluslararası öğrenci alıcısı olarak Batılı bağlamı temsil eden örneklemin yurtdışında daha az uluslararasılaşma eğiliminde olduğu ve özellikle farklı öğrenci gruplarına yönelik öğretim süreçleri ile kültürlerarası iletişim konularında zorlandığı anlaşılmaktadır. Batılı bağlamda olmayan örneklemin ise yurtdışında daha çok uluslararasılaştıkları ve kendi programlarını İngilizce eğitimi benimsemeleri ve uluslararası eğitim programı araçlarını kullanmaları nedeniyle daha uluslararasılaşmış olarak gördükleri bulunmuştur. Bu araştırma genel olarak üniversitelerin giderek daha

* Author: hanif@metu.edu.tr

karmaşık bir hale geldiğini ve üniversitelerde sadece uluslararası öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarını karşılamaya yönelik değil, aynı zamanda küresel bağlamda işbirliğine dayalı araştırmalara yönelik politikaların geliştirilmesi gerektiğini ortaya koymaktadır.

Introduction

The structure of internationalization of higher education has changed dramatically over the last two decades, especially, in the forms of connecting students and staff in western or non-Western higher education institutions located in a wide spectrum of international contexts. Connections may evolve through mobility policies, mutual recognition agreements, efforts to attract advanced international students, increasing numbers of branch campuses, the European Credit Transfer System, social dimensions, quality assurance, diploma supplements, and facilitating short study periods within institutions and across countries (European Commission, 2006; van Damme, 2001). The changing nature of knowledge that is non-constant with research and development activities, instructional process and resources and the influence of globalization on internationalization of higher education (abbreviated as IHE) has been very influential and it has been no surprise that over the past two decades the discourses of IHE have become widely practiced beyond the borders of the USA (van der Wende, 2007). Anderson (2014) points out that there is a need to reconsider teaching and learning needs at higher education due to the fact that higher education platforms have become complex with students meeting from different geographies and identities, it is also essential to understand the practices that faculty adopt in different cultures that are identified as western, non-western or in the transition countries.

As Marginson (2010) puts it, there exists a changing global landscape of higher education referring to countries in the Asia-Pacific region, and nations and institutions are competing in two ways: capacity building and meta-strategy, in which the former includes policy interventions including the inherited educational traditions and culture; capacity in English language for mobility, research and communication, research capacity and cross-border activity, and the latter about policies related to nation-state or sense of identity in the global context. Ultimately, this vast development triggers nations located in the non-Anglophone space to transform themselves to pace and cope with the new demands that emerge to retain or improve their quality and become part of the world-class universities, which makes the study worthwhile to understand the effects of internationalization based on faculty experiences (Bedenlier & Zawacki-Richter, 2015). Doubtless, the USA has become a major attraction for higher education students and faculty (Gürüz, 2011; Marginson, 2010), especially, in the way it has taken the leadership role in the world by shifting from an industrial society towards a knowledge-based economy as its strengths in higher education and research and development transformed English into the Lingua Franca of international communication and the global medium of instruction and both the USA and UK universities being English-speaking nations have become major attractions for staff and students.

Although there have been traces of internationalization of higher education since the early periods of the young republic in 1923, the internationalization process in Turkey has mainly accelerated with the Bologna Process as part of the European Commission in early 2000s. From the 2000s onwards she has released national policies to establish world-class universities through promoting innovative activities that include internationalization. Formerly, the role of the European Commission was merely a complementary one that entailed developing activities such as the Erasmus Program for mobility, European Credit Transfer System, social dimensions, quality assurance, diploma supplements, and facilitating short study periods within institutions and across countries (European Commission, 2006), which participated in three main reform initiatives: curricular, governance, and funding reform (Turner & Robson, 2008).

As a part of the Bologna Process, Turkey is located as a transition country between the western and non-western world, and is trying to strengthen its higher education through establishing national policies for internationalizing its higher education, and through establishing academic partnerships and build capacity to have her universities become recognized at the international arena and keep pace with the developed world and compete equally (YÖK, 2012); therefore, the current study research is hoped

to shed light on the IHE from multiple perspectives and raise new questions for nations both in the western and non-western world.

Internationalization of Higher Education

Internationalization in higher education is approached differently in time and context. In terms of contexts, de Wit (2002) identifies four major differences between the internationalization of higher education in the USA and in Europe. He states that the activities are grounded in foreign policy and national security, especially the European Commission is largely interested in integrating nations for political and economic reasons through IHE. Secondly, in the USA curriculum puts emphasis on global and intercultural awareness, while in Europe it is on the diversification and extension of academic specialization. Third, while the USA tends to more globalize curricula and incorporate study-abroad programs for undergraduates, European higher education puts emphasis on institutional networking and exchanges, especially, at the graduate level. Finally, he describes the United States IHE as fragmented and not being strategic, while perceives the activities in Europe integrated with programs through well-developed policies.

de Haan (2014) defines internationalization as a fuzzy word and based on interviews with key actors in the field that internationalization, the author found that conceptions were likely to be differently perceived in research universities and universities of applied sciences in the Dutch context and suggests to explore further how internationalization is perceived in different political and social contexts. For instance, Childress (2009) explains that the internationalization plan typology is available universities' plans based on meeting institutional needs and categorizes them as means to serving a roadmap in the IHE process, tool to develop buy-in, mechanisms to explain meaning and goals of IHE, a means to collaborate interdisciplinary, and a tool for fund-raising tool (Childress, 2009).

Through a brief review of the literature Zha (2003) and Ma and Yue (2015) classify four main approaches to describe the concept of internationalization in education. Of these, the most widely used is the activity approach, which deals with issues such as curriculum, student/faculty exchanges, and international students; however, Zha (2003) argues that this approach is likely to lead to a fragmented, uncoordinated approach to internationalization since it ignores interactions and relationships among the mentioned activities. The competency approach emphasizes skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values to promote internationally knowledgeable and skilled students, faculty and staff; in this approach, the development of an international curriculum is not an end, but a means to develop essential competencies. The ethos (Zha, 2003) or rationale approach (Ma & Yue, 2015) describes internationalization by its goals and outcomes (Ma & Yue, 2015), and it is based on organizational development theories and defines internationalization mostly as creating a culture or climate that value international and intercultural perspectives and initiatives in higher education institutions (Zha, 2003). Finally, the process approach considers the sustainability of the internationalization and puts emphasis on program aspects as well as organizational matters like policies and procedures (Zha, 2003), which concerns teaching, research and service the instructional process (Ma & Yue, 2015).

Some define internationalization in the form of league tables that pushes research and knowledge production for the globe (Akar, 2010), and is described as an outcome of the global knowledge economy competition. The economic activities, on the other hand, are described to be the instruments of neoliberal policies, and are criticized to weaken or pull down monetary public investments into universities and urge them to invest in privatization processes (Şimsek, 2015). Others may identify it as enhancing improvement in the quality of curriculum and instruction (Tamtik & Kirss, 2016) which includes infusion of content such as global citizenship (Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws, Van Gyn, & Preece, 2007), developing a global mindset (Crosling, Edwards, & Schroder, 2008). While IHE may include definitions related to discourses of engaging with the neglected issue of diversity and multicultural teaching environments or linguistic pluralism (Crose, 2011; Extra & Yagmur, 2012; Fabricius, Mortensen, & Haberland, 2017), it underscores that intercultural competence development is one of the core components in the curriculum for internationalized education (Deardorff & Jones, 2012). Bovill, Jordan, and Waters (2015) examined the range of challenges that could emerge in a context of support and

implement learning and teaching initiatives. Their study revealed that faculty of different cultures may hold different views of student learning and teaching. In another study, Seeber, Cattaneo, Huisman, and Palereari (2016) conducted a large-scale survey including more than 400 European higher education institutions and concluded that environmental, organizational and intra-organizational levels had an impact on the indicators for conceptual understanding.

Faculty Experience with Internationalization

Faculty are explained to experience internationalization in higher education through different means and experiences. IHE requires a deep understanding and appreciation of the institutional context requiring a shared understanding and vision of its stakeholders (Coryell, Durodoye, Wright, Pate, & Nguyen, 2012), and raises the question of how faculty themselves internationalize (Stohl, 2007). Considering the activities mentioned earlier related to IHE, the issue of faculty and student mobility that is accepted to foster respect for diversity and world peace is regarded as a significant component of IHE (Bologna beyond 2010, 2009). In IHE in China, quality has been the main focus to enhance elite education and innovative research for education, which are to be enhanced through student and academic staff mobility, internationalizing the curriculum and the program, and research collaboration and partnership (Ma & Yue, 2015). Kim (2009) claims that for instance, in British universities the goal of IHE is directly related to neoliberal competition for being a part of the global market share and indirectly being with students and research markets. To put forth, the literature around internationalization in higher education gather alongside the western practices in Anglophone countries and definitions in divergent ways.

Research policies are quite challenging for institutions due to shrinking budgets that is a result of the neoliberal economy and decreased government funding (Coryell et al., 2012; Young, 2013). Universities push themselves to be more engaged in collateral research funding activities. Funding of research and development activities are aimed to be realized through Framework Programmes created and numbered consecutively in the European context. For instance, the 7th Framework Programme is claimed to be launched in an optimistic climate of post-millennial globalization that focused on the challenges and opportunities of growing inequalities in economies, i.a. the supremacy of the United States and the emerging economies in Asia (Young, 2013) and worked well for research funding as the European Union was almost at an equal with that of the USA, and bigger than the value of the funding at a global level (Rus, 2014). While Horizon 2020 was launched in 2014, the language of opportunities switched into the language of focus on the economically oriented ones indicating that Europe is not well adapting to the external challenges (Young, 2013). Consequently, researchers, especially for the Social Sciences and Humanities had always had difficulties in securing EU-funding (Schindler-Daniels, 2014) and current higher education governance in the Turkish context has put more pressure on faculty for increased research outputs to become a benchmark through global league tables (Akar, 2010).

Language for Non-Anglophones as a Challenge

Countries, such as in the Nordic countries universities change their language policies to compete with the vast developments and become a part of world-class universities (Hellekjær & Fairway, 2015), and the 'Englishisation of education' (Cots, Llurda, & Garrett, 2014) became the element of instructional delivery. In a recent study, Airey et al. (2017) examined the English language policies in higher education in four Nordic countries, and found that although English medium instruction was a desirable tool, it was fraught with challenges both for the faculty and the students, and suggested policies to be replaced for selective disciplines to avoid service learning of the discipline rather than adopting a unified language policy for all disciplines on campus.

A challenge was also revealed from the perspectives of students' experiences based on English language use in the class by local non-native speakers of English faculty compared with international faculty in the case of Chang, Bai, and Wang's (2014) study, who found that students experience may not only rely on the faculty member but also the cultural context and the type of university, private or public, as a means to create the differences in the class support systems. Consequently, being

Anglophone, or non-Anglophone, and teaching in English as the medium in a non-Anglophone context may raise challenges for both faculty and students when trying to implement IHE strategies.

The medium of instruction, or the English language used in a non-Anglophone country itself may appear as a challenge in the internationalization process and de Wit (2011) argues that this may result in poor quality of the education offered because both the faculty and the students are non-native speakers of English, which yields a crucial question towards finding answers regarding the experiences of the faculty with mixed groups of native and non-native student populations in an non-Anglophone context.

International Curriculum

Higher education institutions aiming to institutionalize are accountable to prepare their students for the global world alongside knowledge production within the knowledge economy and learning society. According to Knight (2004), taking into account the international dimension when designing curriculum can help universities work towards a more inclusive climate and suggest that internationalization of curricula may be accomplished through diverse elements and activities. As Schuerholz-Lehr et al. (2007) put it, infusion of content from various cultures into the design and addressing training in cross-cultural and intercultural skills may be one strategy. According to Turner and Robson (2008), the institutionalized curriculum requires reviewing content regarding contexts, values, and understandings; the processes of teaching, learning and assessment; and the skills required for life and work in a diverse world. Bologna Beyond 2010 report (2009) especially highlights the content and teaching for diverse populations and developing learning environments for multicultural or multilingual student populations, yet the internationalized curriculum is accepted to be one of the most important elements in institutionalization internationalizing (Knight, 2004). In relation to the process of institutionalizing international policy into university agendas, the implementation of an internationalized curriculum also calls for closer scrutiny (Leask & Bridge, 2013; YÖK, 2012).

Dewey and Duff (2009) state their astonishment toward the scarcity of studies that addresses the roles and responsibilities of faculty on an operational level. Through an in-depth study with faculty in the School of Architecture and Allied Sciences, they examined faculty views and found that the school's strengths were related to its academic programs, research and scholarly collaboration, external relations, and its extra-curricular activities. However, weaknesses are described from the perspectives of governance, operations and human resources, and highlighted that lack of explicit expectations for faculty engagement in internationalization. Korhonen and Weil (2015) claim that different variations in understanding and implementation that lack coherence, and a vague view of teaching at an international level may be observed, and faculty may be unclear about their definitions of internationalization, and therefore, Friesen (2012) underscores that the meaning of the term needs to be clearly communicated. While Dulce de Castilho (2015) associates that the research between the west and the underdeveloped nations as the internationalization between the developed countries and the non-hegemonic countries and the internationalization of higher education as a unilateral transference rather than solidary cooperation. Rather than pinpointing such comparative measures of criticism, we wanted to shed light on how the internationalization process is perceived and practiced from the perspectives of faculty in both cultures.

In this study, our purpose was to examine how faculty vision and experience internationalization in higher education (abbreviated as IHE) through comparing two higher education institutions located in two different contexts; a sample in the United States of America that illustrates a western perspective and a sample from Turkey as an non-western or even a transition country perspective to explore if the process of internationalization changes in visions and practices from the perspectives of faculty in an Anglophone and non-Anglophone culture. In addition, we also tried to tried to contribute to an area of gap in the literature as faculty are the most exposed stakeholders in IHE discourse yet it is claimed that their views are asked the least (Bedenlier & Zawacki-Richter, 2015; Dewey & Duff, 2009). Eventually, we attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the international experiences of faculty at two cultural contexts?

2. How do faculty vision internationalization of higher education at two cultural contexts?

3. What are the challenges of teaching in a class with domestic and international students at two cultural contexts as reported by faculty?

4. Do the perceptions of faculty at two cultural contexts differ regarding how they vision internationalization in their departments and view the challenges of teaching in a class including international students?

Method

In this study, we specifically explore the internationalization of higher education from the perspectives of faculty in a university located in the western context and a university located in the non-western context.

Research Design

The study is designed as a causal-comparative research study. Causal-comparative research is a strand of associational research that aims at explaining the differences that already exist between or among groups of subjects (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2015).

Contexts

The sample was derived from faculty at a research state university in Mid-Anatolia in Turkey (i.e. pseudonym TRUNI) and a research private university in the Northeast of the United States (i.e. pseudonym USUNI). These institutions were purposefully selected for the study considering their high reputation for engaging in internationalization in their national contexts. Both universities offer a monolingual approach which is English-medium instruction. While English is the local language for the western institution, Turkish is the local language for the other institution. The universities have at least one campus university abroad and recruit students and faculty reflecting multi-national identities. The strategic plans of both universities have set high goals for research and development and internationalization including attracting international students and academic staff. Although one feature that distinguishes these two universities is being a private or state organization, our concern did not evolve around university type for the comparison, rather it was rooted in how both universities shared a similar internationalization culture.

Study Group

The sample included overall 216 respondents. In this sample, 54% of the respondents are affiliated with USUNI, whereas 46% of them are from TRUNI. The faculty on average have more than ten years of experience at the current university they are affiliated with. In both universities, the study group represents a variety of departments available in both contexts. The respondents hold at least a doctoral degree and have academic titles that vary from full professorship to academic specialist. Table 1 displays key demographic and professional characteristics of the sample involved in the current study.

Table 1.

Demographic and Professional Characteristics of the Faculty at USUNI AND TRUNI

Variable	USUNI (n = 116, 54%)		TRUNI (n = 100, 46%)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Years of experience	19.35	12.36	15.64	10.08
Years of experience at the current university	11.58	10.95	12.34	9.85
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*
Gender				
Male	63	54	60	60
Female	53	46	40	40
Department				
Economic and administrative sciences	28	24	16	16
Engineering and engineering sciences	22	19	32	32

Arts, humanities and social sciences	18	16	8	8
Modern Languages	15	13	2	2
Education	12	10	12	12
Natural sciences	7	6	16	16
Interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary studies	7	6	2	2
Computer and technology	3	3	8	8
Architecture and urban planning	3	3	1	1
Title				
Full Professor	21	18	26	26
Associate Professor	31	27	32	32
Assistant Professor	8	7	32	32
Lecturer/Instructor	5	4	8	8
Academic Specialist	19	16	-	-

Note. Missing values were not demonstrated on the table.

Reliability and Validity

Data were collected via the Status of Internationalization Scale and the Challenges of International Education Scale. These scales were developed for the present study based on an intensive review of literature on IHE and the results of semi-structured interviews with faculty and administrative faculty in multiple universities (Akar, 2015) in both contexts. The instrument was piloted with nine faculty for its content validity and face validity. Five US-born, one visiting Turkish scholar, and three Turkish-born American faculty were also consulted for language comprehensibility to avoid any misinterpretations or ambiguity in the instrument for both cultures.

For the construct validity of the instrument common factor analyses with principal axis factoring and direct oblimin were performed to explore the latent structure of the scales. The number of factors was determined based on Kaiser's eigenvalue rule and Cattell's scree test along with reasoned reflection. The factor loadings of .40 and above were interpreted as significant to ensure practical significance with the current sample size (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 2010). Data were screened for the practical issues of factor analysis including outliers, normality, linearity, and multicollinearity (Hair et al., 2010) and met the statistical requirements for conducting factor analysis. We applied list-wise deletion method to deal with missing values in the data set based on the assumption that the missing data were characterized as missing completely at random.

Status of Internationalization Scale (SIS)

The SIS attempts to gather the perceptions of faculty regarding the status of internationalization in their departments on a 6-point scale ranging from not internationalized at all (1) to completely internationalized (6). Having higher scores from this scale indicates a higher degree of internationalization in the departments as reported by faculty. The SIS were subjected to exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with a sample of 198 faculty members. As expected, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value (.86) was above the critical value of .60 and Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p =. 00$) was statistically significant (Hair et al., 2010).

The EFA results suggested a two-factor model for the SIS with 12 items, explaining 47.31% and 12.35% of the variance respectively. In this model, all items have factor loadings above the value of .40, between .42 and .84. The first factor involves eight items and named as the internationalization of faculty and student at home and abroad (e.g., receive international students pursuing various degrees, welcome visiting scholar/lecturers in the department). The second factor addresses the internationalization of curriculum with four items (e.g., infusion of international values in the course design, infusion of international content in the curriculum). Cronbach alpha values as a measure of reliability was .85 for the first factor, .87 for the second factor, and 89 for the whole scale. The correlations between the factors and between the factor and the total score were all positive and

statistically significant (.62 between the first and the second factor; .92 between the first factor and the total score; .83 between the second factor and the total score).

Challenges of International Educational Scale (CIES)

The CIES explores the perceptions of faculty regarding the challenging aspects of teaching in a classroom including both domestic and international students on a 6-point scale ranging from not challenging at all (1) to very challenging (6). The respondents with higher scores from this scale are considered perceiving teaching in a class including international college students being more challenging compared to those with lower scores on this scale.

The EFA was conducted to explore the factor structure of the CIES with a sample of 182 faculty members. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .91 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant. The EFA results revealed that three factors best explained the latent structure of CIES with 19 items. In this interpretable model, all items have a factor loading greater than the critical value of .40 except for item 13, i.e., managing cultural differences in student behavior. Yet we decided to include it in our analysis because its factor loading (.39) was remarkably close to the critical value we set in this study (.40). The three factors explained 45.72%, 8.92%, and 5.65% of the variance in the sample respectively.

In the three-factor structure of the CIES, the first factor with nine items mainly addresses the challenges of international education concerning curricular issues (e.g., aligning course goals with international standards and practices in the discipline, incorporating different points of view into the course content). The second factor with seven items pertains to the challenges of international education regarding instructional issues (e.g., teaching students with different levels of prior knowledge, applying a variety of assignments to accommodate learning differences). The third factor with three items is about the challenges of dealing with diversity in classrooms (e.g., planning instruction to serve all students, assessing students with diverse backgrounds objectively). The Cronbach alpha values were .90 for the first factor, .85 for the second factor, .78 for the third factor and .93 for the whole scale. The correlations between the factors and between the factor and total score were all positive and statistically significant (.64 between the first and second factor; .63 between the first and the third factor; .72 between the second and the third factor; .90 between the first factor and the total score; .88 between the second factor and the total score; .87 between the third factor and the total score) indicating that both scales are statistically valid and reliable.

Data Collection

Only the faculty at the departments available and who volunteered to participate in both institutions were reached in the data collection process to attain comparable samples. The online instrument was mailed to 969 faculty in USUNI and 726 faculty in TRUNI in 2014 July for the former and 2015 March for the latter upon receiving the Ethical Human Subject Research Approvals from both institutions, respectively. In both cases, the instrument was administered twice to improve the response rate. Overall, 295 surveys were returned; however, 79 of them were not usable because of excessive incomplete data. After deleting these cases, we identified a response rate of 11.97% for USUNI and 13.77% for TRUNI.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the faculty's international experiences and perceptions about the status and challenges of internationalization at two cultural contexts. One-way between-groups multivariate analyses were performed to identify if there was any difference in faculty perceptions concerning the status and challenges of internationalization at TRUNI and USUNI. We reported Wilks' Lambda to evaluate the multivariate significance because the Box's M test results indicated that the data met the assumption of homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The Levene's test values at $p > .05$ revealed that the assumption of equality of variance was met in the data. We applied Bonferroni adjustment to reduce Type 1 error while

evaluating the statistical significance of univariate test results (.025 for the status of internationalization; .017 for the challenges of internationalization).

Findings

Findings regarding international experiences of faculty, status of the internationalization, challenges of the international education, and differences in the perceptions of faculty at TRUNI and USUNI are reported respectively.

International Experiences of the Faculty

A higher number of faculty at TRUNI (70%) reported having their undergraduate, graduate and/or post-doctoral education abroad than the faculty at USUNI (30%). Yet the issue of inbreeding for faculty who received their doctoral degrees in the same institution was higher at TRUNI (14%) compared to USUNI (7%). The number of faculty with no form of international experience such as undergraduate, graduate education or post-doctoral research, teaching experience or short-term exchange was higher in the case of the western institution USUNI (27%) than in the case of the non-western institution TRUNI (13%). Table 2 summarizes the international experiences of faculty at TRUNI and USUNI.

Table 2.
International Experiences of the Faculty at TRUNI and USUNI

Variable	TRUNI (n = 100, 46%)		USUNI (n = 116, 54%)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Number of international students in their classrooms	10.38	13.29	19.51	20.38
	f	*%*	*f*	*%*
Educational experience abroad				
Yes	70	70	35	30
No	30	30	81	70
Teaching experience abroad				
Yes	38	38	39	34
No	62	62	77	66
International experience via education, teaching or exchange programs				
Yes	13	13	31	27
No	87	87	85	73
Collaboration with international faculty on research				
Yes	71	71	67	58
No	12	12	42	36
Will be within a year	1	1	2	2
Involvement in international research projects				
Yes	53	53	37	32
No	27	27	71	61
Will be within a year	4	4	1	1
International collaborative publication				
Yes	72	72	55	47
No	28	28	61	53

Note. Missing values were not demonstrated on the table.

As Table 2 displays, a higher percent of the faculty at TRUNI (71%) reported that they had collaborated on research with international faculty in another country compared to the faculty at USUNI (58%). Similarly, faculty involvement in international research projects occurred at a higher rate at TRUNI (53%) than it was at USUNI (32%). This trend was also observed in collaborative publications (TRUNI, 72%; USUNI, 47%). While about one third of the faculty at USUNI (34%) and more than one third of the faculty at TRUNI (38%) reported that they had a teaching experience abroad, the figures showed

that at USUNI, the faculty taught nearly twice more international students at their undergraduate, master and doctoral classes (M = 19.51, SD = 20.38) compared to their colleagues at TRUNI (M = 10.38, SD = 13.29).

Status of the Internationalization

Table 3 displays the descriptive results for the status of the internationalization at TRUNI and USUNI. The results highlight that the faculty at TRUNI perceive their departments to be internationalized to a higher extent regarding the internationalization of the faculty and students abroad (M = 3.87, SD = 1.12), and the internationalization of the curriculum (M = 4.47, SD = 1.18) compared to their colleagues at USUNI (M = 3.51, SD = 1.07 for the internationalization of the faculty and students at home and abroad; M = 3.05, SD = 1.27 for the internationalization of the curriculum). The faculty at TRUNI rate the status of internationalization in their departments more positively than the faculty at USUNI on each item except for "receiving international students pursuing various degrees." Both at TRUNI and USUNI, the faculty view that their departments reveal the lowest degree of the internationalization regarding encouraging faculty for an international teaching experience (M = 3.22, SD = 1.67 for TRUNI; M = 2.73, SD = 1.53 for USUNI).

As Table 3 shows, the faculty at TRUNI report that their departments are internationalized most regarding using international educational resources (M = 5.22, SD = 1.06). Yet the faculty at USUNI report that the departments are internationalized most concerning receiving international students pursuing various degrees (M = 4.32, SD = 1.65). The faculty at USUNI overall characterize the internationalization of curriculum at their departments with a lower status (M = 3.05, SD = 1.27) compared to the internationalization of faculty and students (M = 3.51, SD = 1.07). This is the opposite in the case of TRUNI, where the faculty report that their curriculum is internationalized to a higher extent (M = 4.47, SD = 1.18) compared to the internationalization of faculty and students (M = 3.87, SD = 1.12).

Table 3.
Status of the Internationalization at TRUNI and USUNI

Items	TRUNI		USUNI	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Internationalization of the faculty and students at home and abroad	3.87	1.12	3.51	1.07
Engaging students in an international experience through exchange programs	3.69	1.54	3.21	1.58
Receiving international students pursuing various degrees	3.90	1.56	4.32	1.65
Encouraging faculty for an international teaching experience	3.22	1.67	2.73	1.53
Encouraging the engagement of faculty in international Research	3.95	1.68	3.27	1.65
Recruiting faculty with diverse backgrounds regarding international experience	4.05	1.49	3.54	1.56
Welcoming visiting scholars/lecturers in the department	3.96	1.51	3.48	1.69
Educating students for a global competence as future leaders	3.77	1.53	3.46	1.48
Remaining academically relevant in a world that is becoming more global	4.39	1.31	3.96	1.42
Internationalization of the curriculum	4.47	1.18	3.05	1.27
Infusing international content in the curriculum	4.38	1.54	3.42	1.39
Using international educational resources	5.22	1.06	2.96	1.51
Having a curriculum with an international focus	4.15	1.61	2.85	1.59
Infusing international values in the course design	4.10	1.50	2.89	1.47

Challenges of the International Education

Table 4 displays the descriptive results for TRUNI and USUNI regarding the challenges of teaching in a class including both domestic and international students. The faculty at USUNI overall perceive

international education more challenging than their colleagues at TRUNI in all domains including challenges regarding curriculum issues (M = 3.21, SD = 1.00 for USUNI; M = 3.14, SD = 1.16 for TRUNI), instructional issues (M = 3.83, SD = 0.96 for USUNI; M = 3.42, SD = 1.09 for TRUNI), and dealing with diversity (M = 3.57, SD = 1.17 for USUNI; M = 3.09, SD = 1.30 for TRUNI). The three issues that the faculty at TRUNI perceive more challenging than the faculty at USUNI include incorporating different points of view into the course content (M = 2.83, SD = 1.47 for TRUNI; M = 2.69, SD = 1.27 for USUNI), engaging students in global citizenship development (M = 3.43, SD = 1.51 for TRUNI; M = 3.20, SD = 1.42 for USUNI), and preparing students for a global mindset (M = 3.43, SD = 1.54 for TRUNI; M = 3.36, SD = 1.37 for USUNI).

As it can be seen in Table 4, the least challenging aspect of international education is the infusion of global content in courses (M = 2.75, SD = 1.30) at TRUNI, while incorporating different points of view into the course content is perceived as the easiest task in international education at USUNI (M = 2.69, SD = 1.27). On the other hand, the most challenging aspect of the international education for both group is teaching students with different levels of prior knowledge (M = 4.03, SD = 1.45 for TRUNI; M = 4.62, SD = 1.24 for USUNI).

Table 4.
Challenges of the International Education at TRUNI and USUNI

Items	TRUNI		USUNI	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Curricular issues	3.14	1.16	3.21	1.00
Aligning curriculum with evolving needs of the global economy/market	3.17	1.41	3.23	1.35
Infusing global content in the courses	2.75	1.30	3.28	1.40
Helping students develop global perspectives/values along with knowledge construction	3.20	1.39	3.41	1.27
Incorporating different points of view into the course content	2.83	1.47	2.69	1.27
Aligning course goals with international standards and practices	3.08	1.46	3.12	1.47
Engaging students in activities to enhance global citizenship Development	3.43	1.51	3.20	1.42
Building a multicultural learning environment	3.18	1.57	3.22	1.30
Building opportunities for effective cross-cultural communication	3.19	1.48	3.44	1.34
Preparing students for developing a global mindset	3.43	1.54	3.36	1.37
Instructional issues	3.42	1.09	3.83	0.96
Teaching students with different levels of prior knowledge	4.03	1.45	4.62	1.24
Teaching lifelong learning skills such as critical thinking or problem solving	3.42	1.54	3.76	1.45
Teaching considering different learning styles	3.18	1.36	3.58	1.39
Managing cultural differences in student behavior	2.95	1.39	3.60	1.29
Engaging students in critical thinking tasks	3.36	1.58	3.59	1.41
Applying a variety of assignments to accommodate learning differences	3.15	1.44	3.16	1.23
Coping with weak academic language skills	3.90	1.44	4.51	1.57
Dealing with diversity	3.09	1.30	3.57	1.17
Planning for instruction to serve all students	2.80	1.56	3.78	1.38
Building group efficacy when putting students with different nations in a team	3.34	1.52	3.47	1.44
Assessing students with diverse backgrounds objectively	3.14	1.61	3.49	1.44

Note. The mean values are on a 6-point scale.

Difference in the Faculty Perceptions about the Status of Internationalization and its Challenges

The first one-way MANOVA was conducted to examine if the faculty perceptions regarding the status of the internationalization differ in the two universities studied. The results indicate that the combined dependent variables (i.e., the status of the internationalization of students and faculty at home and abroad and the status of the internationalization of curriculum) is significantly affected by the university, F (2, 211) = 42.26, p = .00; Wilks' Lambda = .71; partial eta squared = .27. The univariate test results show that the perceptions of faculty from two universities are statistically different regarding both the status of the internationalization of students and faculty at home and abroad, F (1, 212) = 5.70, p = 02, and the status of the internationalization of curriculum, F (1, 212) = 71.06, p = .00. The mean scores indicate that the faculty at TRUNI rate the status of internationalization both for faculty and students and curriculum more positively than the faculty at USUNI. Table 5 illustrates the multivariate and univariate analyses of variance for the status of the internationalization as a function of the university.

Table 5.
Status of the Internationalization as a Function of the University

Variable	MANOVA F(2, 211)	ANOVA F(1, 212)	
		Status of the internationalization of students and faculty at home and abroad	Status of the internationalization of curriculum
University	42.26*	5.70**	71.06**

Note. F ratios are Wilks' approximations of F. *p < .05. **p < .025

The second one-way MANOVA was performed to explore if faculty perceptions differ regarding the challenges of teaching in classrooms including international students in the two universities studied. The results reveal that there is a statistically significant difference between the faculty perceptions at TRUNI and USUNI on the linear combination of the dependent variables (i.e., curricular issues, instructional issues, dealing with diversity in classrooms), F (3, 191) = 4.66, p = 00, Wilks' Lambda = .93, partial eta squared = .07. Given the results for each dependent variable separately, faculty perceptions at TRUNI and USUNI are statistically different with respect to the challenges that pertain to instructional issues, F (1, 193) = 7.69, p = .01, partial eta squared = .04, and dealing with diversity in the classrooms, F (1, 193) = 10.94, p = .01, partial eta squared = .04. Yet their perceptions are not significantly different in the domain of the challenges with respect to the curricular issues of international education, F (1, 193) = 0.22, p = .64. The mean scores specifically indicate that the faculty at USUNI perceive instruction and dealing with diversity in classrooms with domestic and international students more challenging than their colleagues at TRUNI. Table 6 illustrates the multivariate and univariate analyses of variance for the challenges of teaching in classrooms including international students as a function of the university.

Table 6.
Challenges of the International Education as a Function of the University

Variable	MANOVA F(3,191)	ANOVA F(1, 193)		
		Curricular issues	Instructional issues	Dealing with diversity in classrooms
University	4.66*	0.22	7.38**	7.18**

Note. F ratios are Wilks' approximations of F. *p < .05. **p < .017

Discussion & Conclusion

Faculty experiences and challenges for western and non-western internationalization of higher education may vary based on context, national policies, and institutional policies (Friesen, 2012) and in our study we attempted to shed light on what internationalization means at those different levels for faculty at both cultures through capturing their views on internationalization. The study overall reveals

that universities become increasingly complex with human movements, and the increasing demands provide suggestions for higher education institutions that already included or want to consider internationalization into their curricular agendas. They are urged to establish policies not only to address international student needs at home, but also internationalization abroad. The findings show that faculty, especially in the case of the Turkish institution, view internationalization not as a ground for solely education rather they view this process as a common ground for promoting collaborative research and knowledge development. More specifically, our findings reveal the following conclusions:

In the current study via purposively selecting two institutions, one from the western world in an Anglophone context, USUNI and one from a non-Anglophone non-western context, TRUNI, we found that both universities are subjected to different modes of internationalization although sharing many common activities, For instance, both define their views of internationalization mainly from a competency and ethos approach of internationalization of higher education (IHE) which values to adopt a culture for IHE's organizational structure and develop competencies to become internationalized at all levels of the organization (Ma & Yue, 2015; Zha, 2003). On the other hand, differences are found in how they adopt a process approach. For instance, faculty in the transition or non-western country, in Turkey, are more involved in collaborating in research at international level and publishing with international faculty than do faculty in USUNI, indicating that less mobile academics publish less in international venues (Horta, 2013). This seems to be related to the fact that the faculty in the Turkish university are more mobile and receive their doctoral or post-doctoral degrees at international level and remain academically in touch with their colleagues in the international Anglophone context, ultimately geographic mobility becomes the key element in developing knowledge (Horta, 2013), which complements with the literature that reveals mobility is more from the non-western nations to Anglophone western nations (Mak, 2010; Ma & Yue, 2015).

The above argument is also in line with the goals of the policy put by the Higher Education Council in Turkey as well. One example is that of the fast track faculty development program, acronym for ÖYP Model, was founded in 2002 (Higher Education Law Article 2547) and although it enables prospective faculty to receive their doctoral degrees in a reputable university at national level, it contracts them with incentives to learn the English Language as the Lingua Franca both domestically and abroad, and enables opportunities for an integrated doctoral degree through financially supported research at international level.

Findings reveal that the faculty in the samples of the Turkish university perceived themselves more internationalized both at home and abroad compared to the faculty in the samples of the USA university, which supports the idea that the transfer is to the west and to the Anglophone country (Kim, 2009; Ma & Yue, 2015). This finding is contradictory to our initial assumption indicating that experiences of faculty from one institution in an Anglophone nation, in the USA that is claimed to be the hub of internationalization (Gürüz, 2011) is more internationalized in the way they attract international students mainly rather than experience it.

We found that the faculty in the USA and the Turkish institutions are equally challenged to teach mixed ability groups. Especially, due to variations in students' prior knowledge, and that the challenge increases as the international student sizes increase. In other words, increase in international student size yields more complexity in the classroom, ultimately faculty are challenged to teach and deal with more culturally diverse groups with different language backgrounds and pre-knowledge. Such contexts call for a need for effective intercultural or multicultural pedagogy development (Mak, 2010; Mak & Kennedy, 2012). Consequently, institutions that are willing to increase their international student populations should initially put strategies to become more culturally aware (Crose, 2011) and establish policies to fill the gap for pre-knowledge differences among different groups.

According to Deardorff and Jones (2012) intercultural competence development is a core matter in the internationalized universities' missions and goals to become prepared for the 21st century, and suggest that including strategic policies onto their institutional agendas may help them overcome foreseen challenges. We found that the increase of international student population has a negative

impact on faculty's teaching practices. We wonder if this outcome may also affect how faculty view internationalization, especially, in terms homogenously grouped student populations in further research. Turkish national statistics indicate most of the international students (*N* = 72.178) to Turkey by the academic year 2014-2015 were from Azerbaijan (N = 10638), and other neighboring countries (YÖK, 2016). Given the countries, it may be claimed that the host students reveal more or less similar cultural or language backgrounds with the domestic students and therefore, the faculty in the Turkish sample may have perceived that the internationally mixed groups are less challenging, while in the US sample the figures indicate growing student numbers from East Asia, where students language backgrounds are different from the English language itself with a total of 274,439 (31%) enrolment among all other international students in the years 2013-2014 and currently increased to 328,547 (31.5%) in 2016-2017 (Project Atlas, n.d.). As a result, the faculty in Turkey identify internationalization in education as part of attracting more international students and academic staff. Therefore, the institution seems to put stringent policies for academic recruitment, and collaborative research.

In addition, we found that the faculty in the Turkish institution links the English language policy with holding an international curriculum as they include English printed textbooks and other curricular instruments reflecting a western dominance onto their education agenda. However, this yields new questions to be answered such as how to attract advanced students and academic staff from a wider spectrum of nations, especially if the Anglophone language policy may have a distorting effect on learning outcomes (Cots et al., 2014; de Wit, 2011; Hellekjær & Fairway, 2015). In addition, in case the same curriculum instruments are used in both cultural contexts: Anglophone versus non-Anglophone, how do we identify the former one: internationalized or not? This finding urges us to do more in-depth research from the visions of faculty in the western Anglophone universities through examining to what extent they actually desire to include an international or multicultural dimension into their courses (Fabricius et al., 2017).

If higher education curriculum is a global issue, incorporating different points of view into the course content, engaging students in global citizenship development and preparing students with a global mindset seem essential components to be included into their higher education curriculum policy for nations who want to invest in IHE. Haigh's (2014) call for inclusion of such components as education for the planetary, whole-earth consciousness, or merging internationalization components into the curriculum content through objectives related to intercultural knowledge may be an effective means. We want to depict on Robertson's (1992) term "glocalization" and suggest a "glocally sensitive curriculum policy" to indicate an international curriculum policy that serves for the good of all students' interests and facilitates the praxis of faculty confronting diverse student groups at the international and local level given the curricular instruments to be used. Also, we found that faculty in diverse classrooms are struggling with basic academic skills of their student groups (Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010). Given the common struggle evidenced in the western or non-western institutional contexts, we recommend instructional policy that dominates students' academic skills development in formal k-12 education prior to higher education seems to be a crucial dimension to be considered for nations that want to invest in higher education internationalization.

In a comparative study, Korhonen and Weil (2015) wanted to explore the self-concepts of university teachers through collecting narrative data based on story writing assignments. The authors found that that lack of coherence led to different steering criteria, inconsistent quality approaches, and having a vague view of teaching at an international level. The optimistic view was related to the richness and new insights that international students introduced into the content and increasing intercultural sensitivity. While pessimistic orientation seemed to come from the old behavior patterns or available resources among the university teachers such as lack of experience in teaching in another language than the local language.

The status of internationalization for teaching abroad is found to be higher in the Turkish university as there is more faculty with international graduate and post-graduate education or teaching abroad experience than in that of the sample of faculty from the United States. This finding aligns with stringent

staff recruitment policies mentioned earlier to overcome inbreeding through recruiting doctoral candidates from the west. Although some critics may associate the findings as a natural outcome of the study since the movement is drawn towards the west, the study is worthwhile as it provides pathways to consider internationalization into universities' curricular agendas for both cultures and what policies to be set into their institutional strategic plans with respect to recruitment of staff and student recruitment policy, funding for knowledge production, and focus on needs for international curricular practices.

Inbreeding is regarded as a local challenge but a global issue may have deleterious effects on higher education (Altbach, Yudkevich, & Rumbley, 2015), and less mobile academics may have more inward oriented information exchange dynamics (Horta, 2013). Alternatively, we found that internationalization requirement policy for faculty in the Turkish study group helps to overcome inbreeding issues and enables a different spectrum to faculty as it may impact on their intercultural communication competences and alleviated the inbred pandemic of Turkish universities. In addition, however advantageous mobility of staff or students may be, those seem not suffice for faculty in the current Turkish research university. Faculty in the Anglophone university in the non-western context want to engage more in internationally funded research and development in the internationalization of higher education process such as in the case of Anglophone western nations where academic staff mobility is not prioritized over teaching to internationalize, rather, they are rather more engaged with funded research projects (Kim, 2009).

To conclude, we found that both the universities in the western and the non-western contexts implement policies to internationalize their institutions from a different approach. In the case of the university, in the USA the faculty are less mobile and less internationalized in education and teaching abroad, but they are not inbred and the university has twice as much faculty in a different citizenship than faculty in the Turkish university does. On the other hand, although the faculty are more inbred in number in the latter, they try to overcome this process through more incentives and provisions of faculty exchanges or mobility, and these activities create opportunities for having more international teaching or research experience, and hold more different educational and postdoctoral degrees at international level.

The study findings suggest that the faculty in the university in the non-western context are advantaged compared with the faculty in the western university in that she utilizes curricular instruments into its agenda due to its stringent English language policy and most of its faculty own doctorates from Anglophone speaking countries, where the university in the west becomes the provider for those services In addition, while faculty in the west are more challenged with larger intercultural student group sizes, mobility policies provide opportunities to experience and adopt a multicultural pedagogy, develop intercultural communication competences and retain a network for research with international faculty. However, given the instruments of internationalization are mostly Anglophone, how universities in the non-western context using their native language as medium of instruction tackle with the challenges of internationalization in their teaching experiences yields to be answered.

While this study provides us invaluable implications that illustrate internationalization at home to provide students with experiences to live in a more interconnected word (Knight, 2012), it urges researchers to further examine what happens at cross-border or off-campuses or different forms of education such as at branch campuses to understand the impact of internationalization beyond national borders. Therefore, we suggest to do more comparative research, especially in different cultural context that identify internationalization in western, or non-western, in which the latter can be identified as in the Asia-Pacific nations or nations located in the transitions are between those the West and Asia-Pacific for three reasons. First, provision of implications for faculty and policy-makers to improve the quality of education for all student populations from a multicultural perspective including curriculum and instructional policies in an era of complexities; second, addressing multiple student needs to fit in the national and international context, and to compete with the global context, and finally, to overview collaborative research needs for further development of an internationalized higher education.

The current study includes some minor limitations that stem from the sample size that is not generalizable to its population, the type of institution, private or/ state, and the language context where English is the local language in the USA, it is not in the Turkey. Given the conclusions of the current study, there remain other aspects to be considered for further research. Despite some promising findings in relation to realizing the instruments of internationalizing higher education has been evidenced in the Turkish institution, the discourses in the higher education context reveal much criticism and are regarded as the neoliberal instruments of internationalization put forth by the Higher Education Council (Acronym YÖK) policies towards pushing universities to implement those as part of commercialization (Kaya, 2015; Simsek, 2015) and as standardization of higher education driven by the transformation of the European higher education area (Kaya, 2015).

Eventually, we suggest that further critical in-depth research to evaluate the implementation of internationalization instruments. In addition to the limitation above, in our study, due to the sociological demography of the USA, migrant or non-migrant, and due to confidentiality concerns asking the languages spoken, it was not possible to identify if the faculty in the USA were non-USA nationals or USA nationals born abroad. Such data would have made the internationalization component with faculty in the USA institution more relevant and we suggest future research to shed light on the issue. Eventually, our research findings provide invaluable implications regarding doing further cross-cultural comparative research for universities who both have or are working towards setting an international higher education policy into their agendas to exemplify experiences of IHE from in an Anglophone university located in the west and an Anglophone university located in a transition between the west and non-western.

Acknowledgement

References

Akar, H. (2010). Globalization and its challenges for developing countries: The case of Turkish Higher Education. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *11*, 447-457.

Akar, H. (April, 2015). Internationalization of higher education: Experiences and challenges addressed by faculty. AERA, Chicago.

Airey, J., Lauridsen, K. M., Räsänen, A., & Salö, A. (2017). The expansion of English-medium instruction in the Nordic countries: can top-down university language policies encourage bottom-up disciplinary literacy goals? *Higher Education*, *73*(4), 561-576.

Altbach, P. G., Yudkevich, M., & Rumbley, L. E. (2015). Academic inbreeding: local challenge, global problem. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *16*(3), 317-330.

Anderson, V. (2014). 'World-travelling': a framework for re-thinking teaching and learning in internationalised higher education. *Higher Education, 68*(5), 637-652.

Bedenlier, S., & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2015). Internationalization of higher education and the impacts on academic faculty members. *Research in Comparative & International Education*, *10*(2), 185-201.

Bologna beyond 2010 (2009). *Report on the development of the European higher education. Area background paper for the Bologna Follow-up Benelux Bologna Secretariat*. Retrieved January 10, 2017 from http://media.ehea.info/file/2009_Leuven_Louvain-laNeuve/91/8/Beyond_2010_report_ FINAL_594918.pdf.

Bovill, C., Jordan, L., & Watters, N. (2015). Transnational approaches to teaching and learning in higher education: challenges and possible guiding principles. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 12-23.

Chang, T. S., Bai, Y., & Wang, T.W. (2014). Students' classroom experience in foreign-faculty and local-faculty classes in public and private universities in Taiwan. *Higher Education*, *68*(2), 207-226.

Childress, L. K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(3), 289-309.

Coryell, J. E., Durodoye, B. A., Wright, R. R., Pate, P. E., & Nguyen, S. (2012). Case studies of internationalization in adult and higher education: Inside the processes of four universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *16*(1), 75-98.

Cots, J. M., Llurda, E., & Garrett, P. (2014). Language policies and practices in the internationalization of higher education on the European margins: An introduction. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *35*(4), 311-317.

Crose, B. (2011). Internationalization of the higher education classroom: strategies to facilitate ıntercultural learning and academic success. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 23*(3), 388-395.

Crosling, G., Edwards, R., & Schroder B. (2008). Internationalizing the curriculum: the implementation experience in a faculty of business and economics. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *30*(2), 107-121.

de Haan, H. (2014). Internationalization: Interpretations among Dutch practitioners. *Journal of Studies in International Higher Education, 18*(3), 241-260.

Deardorff, D. K., & Jones, E. (2012). Intercultural competence: an emerging focus in international higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds)*, The Sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 283-303*).* Los Angeles: Sage.

Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before Passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education*, *58*(4), 491-504.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: a historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

de Wit, H. (2011). *Internationalization of higher education: Nine misconceptions.* Retrieved January 15, 2017 from https://ejournals.bc.edu/ojs/index.php/ihe/article/viewFile/8556/8321.

Dulce de Castilho, S. (2015). Internationalization of the graduate curriculum: Questions for debates. *RBPG, Brasília*, *12*(27), 121-143.

European Commission. (2006). *Delivering on the modernization agenda for universities: Education, research, and innovation*. Retrieved January 15, 2017 from http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0208:FIN:en:PDF

Extra, G., & Yagmur, K. (2012). *Language rich Europe. Trends in policies and practices for multilingualism in Europe*. Retrieved January 30, 2017 from http://www.language-rich.eu/fileadmin/content/pdf/LRE_English_version_final_01.pdf.

Fabricius, A. H., Mortensen, J., & Haberland, H. (2017). The lure of internationalization: paradoxical discourses of transnational student mobility, linguistic diversity and cross-cultural exchange. *Higher Education, 73*(4), 577-595.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2015). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Friesen, R. (2012). Faculty member engagement in Canadian university internationalization: a consideration of understanding, motivations and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *17*(3), 209-227.

Gürüz, K. (2011). *Higher education and international student mobility in the global knowledge economy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Haigh, M. (2014). From internationalization to education for global citizenship: a multilayered history. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *68*(1), 6-27.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, W.C. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hellekjær, G. O., & Fairway, T. (2015). The mismatch between the unmet need for a supply of occupational English skills: an investigation of higher educated government staff in Norway. *Higher Education, 70*(6), 1033-1050.

Horta, H. (2013). Deepening our understanding of academic inbreeding effects on research information exchange and scientific output: new insights for academic based research. *Higher Education*, *65*(4), 487-510.

Kaya, A. (2015). Critical voices against the Bologna Process in Turkey: Neo-liberal governance in higher education. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, *50*, 105-133.

Kim, T. (2009). Transnational academic mobility, internationalization and interculturality in higher education. *Intercultural Education, 20*(5), 395-405.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*(1), 5-31.

Knight, J. (2012). Concepts, rationales, and interpretive frameworks in the internationalization of higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds), *The Sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 27-42). Los Angeles: Sage.

Korhonen, V., & Weil, M. (2015). The internationalisation of higher education: perspectives on self-conceptions in teaching. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *14*(3), 198-212.

Leask, B., & Bridge, C. (2013). Comparing internationalization of the curriculum in action across disciplines: theoretical and practical perspectives. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *43*(1), 79-101.

Ma, W., & Yue, Y. (2015). Internationalization for quality in Chinese research universities: student perspectives. *Higher Education*, *70*(2), 217-234.

Mak, A. (2010). Enhancing academics' capability to engage multicultural classes and internationalize at home. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *22*(3), 365-373.

Mak, A. S., & Kennedy, M. (2012). Internationalising the student experience: preparing instructors to embed intercultural skills in the curriculum. *Innovative Higher Education*, *37*(4), 323-334.

Marginson, S. (2010). Higher education in the global knowledge economy. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*, 6962-6980.

Project Atlas. (n.d.) *International students in the United States.* Retrieved January 10, 2017 from http://www.iie.org/Services/Project-Atlas/United-States/International-Students-InUS#.WHKyk_l97IU.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. London: Sage.

Rus, M. I. (2014). *Funding the research activity through the seventh framework program*. Retrieved January 15, 2017 from http://www.humanistica.ro/anuare/2014/Continut/06_07_Rus_MI_2014.pdf.

Schindler-Daniels, A. (2014). Shaping the Horizon: social sciences and humanities in the EU framework programme Horizon 2020. *Z Erziehungswiss*, *17*(6), 179-194.

Schuerholz-Lehr, S., Caws, C., Van Gyn, G., & Preece, A. (2007). Internationalizing the higher education curriculum: an emerging model for transforming faculty perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 37*(1), 67-94.

Seeber, M.,. Cattaneo, M., Huisman, J., & Palereari, S. (2016). Why do higher education institutions internationalize? An investigation of the multilevel determinants of internationalization rationales. *Higher Education, 72*(5), 685-702.

Simsek, H. (2015). *Yeni toplumculuk ve yeni toplumcu eğitim* [Neoliberalism and neoliberal education]. Ankara: İmge Kitapevi.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: the role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3/4), 359-372.

Svensson, L., & Wihlborg, M. (2010). Internationalising the content of higher education: the need for a curriculum perspective. *Higher Education, 60*(6), 595-613.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Pearson.

Tamtik, M., & Kirss, L. (2016). Building a norm of internationalization the case of Estonia's higher education system. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *20*(2), 164-183.

Turner, Y., & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university: continuum studies in education*. New York: Continuum International Publishing.

van Damme, D. (2001). Quality Issues in the Internationalization of Higher Education. *Higher Education, 41*(4), 415-441.

van der Wende, M. (2007). Internationalization of Higher Education in the OECD Countries: Challenges and Opportunities for the Coming Decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 274-289.

Young, M. (2013). *Shifting policy discourses in FP 7 and Horizon 2020.* Retrieved January 15, 2017 from http://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/7da0ac1c-0ce7-4574-9714-09977538c8d1.pdf.

YÖK. (2012). *Bologna süreci* [The Bologna process]. Retrieved January 15, 2017 from http://bologna.yok.gov.tr/?page=yazi&i=136.

YÖK. (2016). *Higher education information management system*. Retrieved January 15, 2017 from https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/.

Zha, Q. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, *1*(2), 248-270.