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ABSTRACT
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Europe has been leading the world’s largest university student exchange program, ERASMUS (EuRopean Community Action Scheme for or the Mobility of University Students), since 1987. The program has proven its success with participation of 3 million students in 25 years. Turkey has been part of this program since 2003. Then, internationalization has moved beyond being a dream for the Turkish higher education system becoming a reality. Participation in ERASMUS has brought many adjustments to the Turkish universities such as the implementation of the European Credit Transfer System, offering courses in English, internationalizing the curricula and establishment of international relations offices on campuses. In addition, a common ERASMUS experience started spreading not only among the university students but also among the faculty and university administrative personnel.

The purpose of this study was to examine how the ERASMUS Programme has influenced the internationalization of Turkish higher education and explore the perceptions of the university communities in Turkey. The objective was to analyze how the impact of a strong European international education program directs educational globalization of a developing country.

An e-mail was sent to the university students, faculty and administrative personnel through convenience sampling with a link to an online survey to participate in the study. There were three different surveys composed of 20 questions. The last eight questions were shared by all surveys in addition to two questions shared by the faculty and the administrator surveys. Survey questions consisted of multiple-choice, rating scale, dichotomous and open-ended questions. In total, 254 respondents participated in the study.
The responses show the perceived value of the ERASMUS Programme by the university communities in Turkey. All the results show that, without ERASMUS, it would have been very difficult for the Turkish higher education to reach its current internationally active level yet it still needs further improvements. However, it is clear to that higher education in Turkey is internationalizing from a European dimension and the ERASMUS Programme and related EU programs have played a significant role in that. Despite the slowly increasing interest in the world outside of Europe, both by the university communities and the government, due to the monetary power of the EU, the need for a European dimension makes up a big portion of educational globalization of Turkish higher education.
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CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

I implemented this study to explore the extent to which the ERASMUS Programme has a role in the internationalization of Turkish higher education. My hypothesis was that higher education in Turkey is internationalizing from a European dimension and the implementation of the ERASMUS Programme along with other EU programs has a significant role in that. I therefore surveyed faculty, university administrators and students to find support for my hypothesis from all around the country.

This study is especially important because it also aims at finding a pattern in the course of educational globalization in Turkey under the struggle of meeting the EU criteria in many aspects of life as a necessity to fit into Europe better. The purpose of this study is therefore to explore the extent to which the Erasmus Program has influenced the internationalization of higher education in terms of aims and activities. The research questions were: “What are the perceptions of Turkish faculty members, administrative staff and students of the internationalization of Turkish higher education?” “What are the different types of ERASMUS programs the Turkish universities are involved in?” “What are the opportunities other than the ERASMUS Programme that the Turkish universities offer to promote their internationalization?”

Education, especially higher education, is a very important element in this process because the European influence currently constitutes a big portion of it. This study therefore helps us understand the role of Europe in globalization and some of its influences from a higher educational perspective and how these influences take place.

I delved into how the ERASMUS Programme has influenced the internationalization of Turkish higher education in terms of its aims and activities. I aimed to find out about the different types of the ERASMUS programs that the Turkish universities are involved in, different
internationalization opportunities that the Turkish universities offer and the perceptions of the Turkish faculty members, administrators and students on internationalization of Turkish higher education. I used cross-sectional electronic surveys to gather data from the participants from different universities all around the country. The study starts with information from the existing literature about the international trends in education in Europe and Turkey and how globalization can be situated in this process. This is followed by chapters concerning methodology, findings, analysis of findings, and conclusion. I analyzed my data by using descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVA, t-test, and chi-square for the quantitative part depending on the question and used qualitative analysis for the last two open-ended questions.

**Higher Education, Turkey, ERASMUS and Europe**

Regarding the term “internationalization”, Bostrom (2010) asserts that it is “a term associated with specific international programs and student exchanges historically, today, internationalization has a broader meaning related to strategic initiatives for global effectiveness” (p.143). This does not only mean that the universities will benefit from it, but also the countries will benefit from the outcomes of it. Nowadays the internationalization of universities is implemented via different research projects under different frameworks such as European Union (EU), joint curriculums, short-term student and academic exchanges with foreign universities, and increasing the recruitment of international personnel and students for long-term studies, which has been related to the development of the countries’ academy, cross-cultural awareness, employment opportunities by causing creation of new jobs, and a multi-lingual environment at the world level. However, in order for the universities to be able to engage in international corporation in all areas where exchange of knowledge and practice of skills occur, they have needed to do adjustments in their budgets which definitely requires additional public funding.
The governments have therefore been expected to form new policies to create new funding opportunities as well as to increase their funding. Especially, public universities have had to face with some issues because it is still unclear how much the governments have prioritized their budgets for the internationalization goals of the state universities.

Turkey was first involved in the program in 2003, starting with 15 pilot universities’ participation. In 2004, the Turkish government extended the participation to all universities within the country as long as they received an Erasmus University Charter from the European Union Education Commission. This participation brought innovations to Turkish universities that were to be adapted. The EU framework has been more intensely integrated into educational policies, strategies and aims of Turkey as Turkey has taken considerable steps in moving forward in collaboration with the EU (Özmuşul, 2012, p. 358).

By participating in the European Union Higher Education Programs, the concept of internationalization has become a reality rather than a dream in Turkey. Being part of such a large mobility has empowered Turkish students’ and scholars’ academic success, creating an intercultural awareness among youth and adding different dimensions and perspectives to the Turkish universities. In addition to that, the Turkish government and the universities decided not to limit themselves with Europe and so took steps to extend their international vision. Despite efforts for international participation in the wider geography, the majority of the programs are still limited to ERASMUS and other EU-run programs.
CHAPTER II - LITERATURE REVIEW

The following section presents an overview of the recent research findings within the field of higher education, Europeanization, and internationalization as they occur under globalization. This review of the literature has been categorized into sub sections to provide the reader with an inclusive comprehension of the European Higher Education Area, Turkish Higher Education, the ERASMUS Programme, and the geopolitical, economic, political and educational interests of Turkey in its internationalization process and development.

Internationalizing Higher Education

Higher education has been at a crossroad all around the world recently with important quantitative and qualitative changes that impact both the economy and the larger society (Sanyal & Johnstone, 2011) of developing countries. The most prominent changes, according to Sanyal and Johnstone (2011), are developments in information and communication technology (this factor can potentially both increase and decrease the costs); globalization (as a process of building up connections between the individuals, groups, companies, and countries); the emergence of knowledge-based societies and economies; the spread of globalization (leading countries to open access to higher education); the spread of liberal and market-friendly economies; and an increased concern for sustainable and ecologically friendly development. All of these challenges have brought additional issues to the governments to deal with the need to internationalize so as to compete in a globalizing world.

The internationalization of countries includes various activities such as considerable changes in government policies, assessment of government programs, international agreements, and collaborations (Harman, 2005). Francis (1993a) argues that internationalization as a course
of action re-forms a society in an inter-dependent world and to stimulate a global understanding, it needs to impact all phases of education (as cited in Andrews, 2005).

Higher education has expanded from serving the elite to the mass populations, and this is not only because of growing populations, but also due to the changing national goals related to social justice and the desire to reach global standards (Yang & McCall, 2014). The concerns of higher education are definitely having a turning point from domestic issues to international issues (Knerr, 1990). In relation to the current geopolitical changes in the world, universities are becoming more interested in bringing together local, national and global relations (Singh, 2005).

Internationalization is now accepted as a criterion of success for universities (Tekin & Gencer, 2013). It is now a significant aspect of universities both at the institutional and national level to provide its students and staff with international mobility opportunities so as to manage the challenges of globalization (Gürüz, 2011). Defining internationalization of higher education with its various aspects is very important here. The old term ‘cross-border education’ refers to a trend in higher education indicating a dramatic increase in cross-border movement among higher education institutions (HEIs from now on) (Sanyal & Johnstone, 2011). As Bostrom (2010) states, internationalization “has a broader meaning related to strategic initiatives for global effectiveness” (p.143) while Knight (2003) defines internationalization at the national, sectorial and institutional levels as a development of bringing together international, cross-cultural and global aspects of postsecondary education into its aims and activities (as cited in Yang, 2005). The institutional level of internationalization is considered to be mostly about having the appropriate circumstances for recruiting new international students (Otter, 2007). As Leggott and Stapleford (2007) note, those unable to go abroad should be able to benefit from internationalization at home through their home institution’s internationalization strategy,
curricula, multicultural atmosphere, and global vision. While advancing education helps for a sustainable development, it is also important to recognize and accept the issues with the curriculum, irrelevance and the limited knowledge and experience of the staff, and limited institutional dedication or pushing factors (Otter, 2007).

As defined by many authors, internationalization of higher education has various aspects such as improving the knowledge and skills of academic and administrative staff, and how this new knowledge and skills can be implemented to support the student academic and social experience at universities, which will also increase the prestige that the universities have.

**Internationalization Actions**

An important question that crosses the mind is how the internationalization of higher education institutions (HEI from now on) can be processed. Until the 1980s, internationalization was referred to as student and academic exchanges, teaching of foreign languages, and including courses about different countries and cultures in international affairs area studies while curricula of the hard science studies had already been internationalized in a way that they were taught in English and their textbooks came from English-speaking countries (Gürüz, 2011) but now it is beyond studying foreign languages and/or cultures (Gürüz, 2011). Becoming international needs to go beyond sole student and academic exchange to recognition of international developments, international research projects, an active involvement in the international arena, and using technology to market both within the local and the global context as this will shape how HEIs will be perceived by the outside world (Jones & Brown, 2007). A study by Bartell (2003) found that adjustments in internationalization of HEIs require revisions in the curriculum for inclusion of international perspectives, increased numbers of students from both developed and developing
countries, increased numbers of international mobility opportunities and their enriching implementation by the university communities.

In this respect, different types of internationalization actions can be listed as foreign student enrollment, hiring foreign academic staff, internationally collaborative study programs, fund-raisings (Knerr, 1990), curricula development, student, faculty and scholar exchange (Yang, 2005) distance-learning programs, founding campuses in other countries, multi-national cooperation through a variety of international organizations (Harman, 2005); foreign language teaching programs, work abroad opportunities, visiting scholar programs, joint and dual-degree programs, administrative staff mobility, cross-cultural trainings (Gürüz, 2011), and addition of intercultural programs in a variety of disciplines (Andrews, 2005).

**International Mobility**

The history of international academic mobility includes movement of people, institutions, and programs beyond national borders (Gürüz, 2011). Exchange programs are core elements of internationalization strategies because they involve direct experience, known as a strong and influential method in developing international skills (Andrews, 2005).

In evaluating the international mobility of students, it is important to know where the students mostly go to, for how long, among which programs the most the mobility occurs, how their earned credits are accredited back home, their foreign language competence, and what kind of qualifications students earn after studying abroad.

Academic mobility on the other hand has different aspects. Academics are usually expected to show a lot of effort and make commitment from their time when they teach abroad. For example, when an academic travels abroad for an international educational activity, his duties are not limited to teaching in an international arena, but vary from marketing and
representing their universities at educational fairs, improving their foreign language skills to recruiting new foreign students for the upcoming years (Schapper & Mayson, 2005). Even when faculty members stay at their home institution, as long as they have a diverse body of students, they are required to show characteristics of an international teacher. Those skills include determining and integrating the international context into their teaching, being open to various feedback from different students, and having flexible teaching methods based on the student needs (Leask, 2007).

**Internationalizing the Curricula**

A most important goal of internationalizing the curricula should be meeting the needs of both domestic and international students. Internationalizing the curricula goes beyond updating the course material and teaching methods to adding extended curriculum activities to it, which will recognize the diversity and global perspectives (Jones & Killick, 2007). According to Schoorman, it should be continuing, all-inclusive, integrated, and have many aspects (as cited in Schapper & Mayson, 2005). Indeed, a lower diversity of information impacts the quality of knowledge being produced as well as the nature of its production (Loomis et al, 2011). An internationalized curriculum also brings foreign language requirements, chances to study abroad, interdisciplinary studies, and comparative international perspectives to the conventional subject areas (De Vita, 2007). The curriculum needs to internationalize irrespective of discipline, subject area and age level of students (Andrews, 2005). Such a curriculum will provide teachers and students with skills required for constantly changing local and global contexts in a diverse educational surrounding (Hall & White, 2005).
ERASMUS Programme

Europe has been leading the world’s largest university student exchange program; ERASMUS (EuRopean Community Action Scheme for or the Mobility of University Students), since 1987. The program has proven its success with participation of 3 million students in 26 years. Currently the ERASMUS International Mobility Programme is run under the framework program of ERASMUS+. 28 European Union countries, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway and Turkey (since 2003) are the member states of the ERASMUS Programme (ERASMUS+ Programme Guide, 2014). HEIs in those countries have bilateral agreements to provide their students with one or two semesters study abroad opportunities at partner institutions with grants from the European Union Education Commission. National Agencies in each participating country have been founded to organize the program from the distribution of grants, to trainings in cooperation with ERASMUS Institutional Coordinators from participating institutions. The teams under the management of these coordinators at universities are in charge of signing bilateral agreements with other institutions, administering the student selection process, and dealing with other related miscellaneous tasks. Implementation of this funded mobility program reinforced the modernization, quality-wise development and internationalization of European Higher Education System (ERASMUS: Facts, figures & trends, 2010).

Academic collaboration in Europe was mostly at the institutional level between 1955 and 1975 (Barblan, n.d.). Then with the actions of the Institute of Education of the European Cultural Foundation in Paris, academic mobility started through joint study programs and this eventually led to the ERASMUS Programme (Gürüz, 2011). Since its implementation in 1987, the ERASMUS Programme has become the flagship program of the EU (Teichler, 2001). Different
than the other international mobility programs, ERASMUS not only includes the mobility of university students and the faculty, but also the mobility of university administrative personnel.

The above indicates the importance of further advancement because, as Skardeus (2010) argues, such a “brain circulation” is required to continue for the flow of knowledge between higher education institutions. ERASMUS started as a learning mobility program and then became a part of the larger framed programs that were named Socrates I (1994-98) & II (2000-06), Lifelong Learning Programme (2007-13) and ERASMUS+ (2014-20) respectively. Previous programs included a variety of projects and sub fields for mobility; however, at the Brussels European Commission meeting of 2011, it was decided to simplify the framework of the Programme and unite all of them under one title with the aim of better links between the European institutions and the world, an increased quality, and recognition of the skills (Supporting growth and jobs: An Agenda for the modernization of Europe’s higher education systems, 2011). Currently, the goals of ERASMUS are in harmony with Europe’s immediate need for more efficient education (Zhelyazkova, 2013).

ERASMUS Programme Antecedents

As the perception of higher education in Europe after WWII changed from an elitist and undemocratic professorship to a democratic and egalitarian system, a fast development and spread of mass higher education happened (Trow, 1973). In 1950s, the idea of internationalized and enhanced education with a European dimension came into existence. It then took the European Union (the European Economic Community in the 1950s), Council of Europe, and European Commission decades to improve the policies regarding the field of higher education and training.
The initial decision was when six member states of the European Economic Community (Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembug, Netherlands and West Germany) laid the foundations of the current educational mobility policy by signing the Treaty of Rome in 1957 (Corbett, 2003). The first goal was to found a higher education institution as a European university. Corbett (2003) argues that the European University Institution of Florence is the result of this first goal followed by a series of summits and action plans such as The 1973 Enlargement, the Action Programme of Resolution of the Council and the Ministers of Education of 1976 developing the initial idea of a European university into collaboration among European HEIs for recognition of academic studies Europe-wide, international student mobility and improved foreign language teaching opportunities. The Joint Study Programmes (JSP) founded in 1976 progressed into 1986 by providing institutional support for student exchanges for up to one-year study periods (Teichler, 1996). Several programs such as Comett, ERASMUS, Petra, Lingua, Force and Tempus came into existence (Pepin, 2007) following the Decision of the Council in 1987 adopting the European Community action scheme for the mobility of university students for the period between January 1986 and June 1987 (Corbett, 2003).

With the start of the JSPs, many European countries have promoted temporary foreign study experiences so that their citizens can have a better sense of international understanding, increase their foreign language proficiencies, and be prepared for their careers (Teichler & Janson, 2007). The ERASMUS Programme has gained more importance with the launch of the Lisbon Strategy in 2000 because with that education was regarded as an important component of the social and economic objectives of EU set for 2010 (Pepin, 2007). By 2014, the ERASMUS Programme reached up to 3 million participants, making it the largest international education program in the world.
**European Higher Education Area (EHEA)**

The European Higher Education Area “driven by the Bologna Process” aims at laying down higher education at the center of the European Union for progress in the social and cultural aspects of European countries (Rahona & Pérez-Esparrells, 2011). The basis for founding it is the promotion of student and university staff mobility (Birtwistle, 2007). However, unlike other Western countries, in the EU the main objective of this international higher education mobility is beyond exporting education to less developed countries for “Western dominance or as a form of neo-colonialism” to promoting mobility within European countries only, and therefore it has received special attention (Harman, 2005, p.122).

The ideological goals of this educational mobility have phased out to internationalize European higher education as well as to create a concept of Europeanization for the betterment of the EU. In the European context, this betterment happens through the significant addition that comes from the HEI staff and students with increased qualifications (Rahona & Pérez-Esparrells, 2011). European dimension of internationalization is specifically significant here (Knight & de Wit, n/i) as it refers to creating a prestige for the European universities at the world level and Europeanizing its citizens by creating a European identity and European integration.

The Bologna Process and the Lisbon Strategy both involve actions from students, administrators, teachers, policy-makers, and researchers most of which mainly come from the HEIs due to their inclusive role in financial and social development of a country (Rahona & Pérez-Esparrells, 2011). In this respect, they both can be considered as the initiators of the EEHA. Thanks to the Bologna Process, higher education, which was funded mainly by the states in Europe until the 1970s, went through a reform and a change happened providing the European higher education with the cooperation needed to deal with the challenges of globalization.
(Gürüz, 2011). It is within the Lisbon Agenda where European Union’s dedication to become a knowledge-based economy for economic growth exists (Birtwistle, 2007). What is different in the Lisbon strategy is that it moved the focus on higher education cooperation to global competition. So there became international student mobility at two levels; the worldwide recruitment of students, and the “reciprocal” mobility occurring in Europe (Teichler, 2009).

Some of the goals of the Bologna Process stated by Gürüz (2011) are adaptation of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS from now on), encouragement of mobility for members of university communities within a European context and advancement of required European aspects in higher education. ECTS, as a very common application of the Bologna Process, refers to a standardized system for easily transfer of course credits among collaborating European universities.

The Bologna Process as a demonstration of the active role of the EU Commission in education, is an initiative which aims at bringing transparency and a standard measurement to the complexity of higher education practices and grow student mobility within Europe (Gürüz, 2011). Teichler (2009) claims that with the contribution of the Bologna Process, intra-European mobility and attractiveness of European higher education to the world has increased.

In addition to the Lisbon Strategy impact, globalization and technological changes now require continuous updates and knowledge and skills, making lifelong learning one of the key goals as influenced by the Amsterdam Treaty of 1997 (Pepin, 2007) and as expressed in it the significance of providing the people of the EU with broad access to updated knowledge (Pepin, 2011). EHEA now constitutes the main framework in which the ERASMUS program runs and the European higher education system is re-formed.
Internationalization of Turkish Higher Education

There are a variety of things, which directly affect the internationalization of higher education within a country such as its national policies on foreign affairs, its financial, social, and technological development level, its history, cultural heritage, migration, and its economy (Gürüz, 2011). The geographical location of the countries becomes especially very important in analyzing the actors and the scope of the internationalization movements. It is therefore important to consider interaction of HEIs with the wider world to see whether that interaction remains at the regional level. EU educational programs have had an important impact on international mobility programs (Birtwistle, 2007). In the case of Turkey, considering its geopolitical location and its long-term struggle to be an EU member, European influence has made a big impact on the internationalizing process of its HEIs. Since its founding, Turkey has been trying to be a member of all Western institutions not only for political but also for economic development (LaGro & Jørgensen, 2007). In the early years of the Turkish Republic, a capacity-building approach was implemented; government scholarships were provided for students to study abroad in return for mandatory service in the public sector in Turkey after graduation (Gürüz, 2011). This is also known as the “know-how and technology transfer” method in which the participants are trained, especially in technical developments and in return do obligatory service at home by sharing that knowledge (Gürüz, 2011). This type of funding is still implemented by the Turkish government as the Ministry of Education Scholarship to obtain full degrees at the graduate level in return for service at the Turkish universities as academics by serving twice more than the amount of duration spent abroad.

Some of the other currently funded programs promoting the internationalization of higher education are ERASMUS+ (previously known as Lifelong Learning Programme of the European
Union); the Mawlana Program (a scholarship program for the students to study abroad for short-term studies at the accredited institutions all around the world); International Education Fair Participation Funding; the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) Scholarships for academic research abroad; Turkish Educational Foundation Scholarship; and many other scholarship and funding opportunities provided by the Turkish universities and companies to study abroad for long-term studies, mostly in return for working for the funding provider institution. On the other hand Mawlana funding only funds public universities for international mobility and the International Education Fair Participation Funding only pays 50% of the private universities’ expenses.

**Turkey in EHEA**

An important outcome of the Lisbon Strategy is that as the EU extended its relations with Turkey and with the Copenhagen Criteria era, a new phase of development started for Turkey (LaGro & Jørgensen, 2007). In this new era, it is important for countries to meet the EU requirements as a long and a hard internal transition period, which involves institutional and policy adaptations (Dyson, 2005).

There were policies in the development plan covering the term between 2007 and 2013 which aimed at leading to a Turkey that would have completed its European Union adaptation criteria with goals in developing the higher education system (9th Development Plan, 2006). Educational development was stressed under a variety of topics in this document such as international developments and its major inclinations, increased competitiveness, enabling agricultural structure, increased deployment goals, education in harmony with labor force needs, human development and empowering social solidarity and last but not least improving the higher education system as a whole. But the only place where steps towards the internationalization of
higher education were mentioned was in relation to Bologna Process and adaptation of European Credit Transfer System. On the other hand, in the 10th development plan (2013) covering the years between 2014 and 2018; the focus of international education activities emphasizes support for cooperation with the least developed countries instead of industrialized ones and neither Bologna Process nor EHEA are mentioned in this document.

**ERASMUS in Turkey**

Before participating in the ERASMUS Programme, Turkish universities did not have much multicultural and diverse experience on their campuses except a couple of top universities in a limited way. Besides, internationalization was a goal totally out of mind previously. However, as required by the Bologna Process, the main core of the internationalization of European universities and the ERASMUS Programme, a goal was to “ensure that the European higher education system acquires a worldwide degree of attractiveness equal to (Europe’s) extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions” (The Bologna Declaration on the European space for education, 1999, p. 4). This integration policy to EU in education has constituted a significant opportunity for Turkey to adapt to the globalized world and to the EU as well (Özmuşul, 2012). Hence, as Klasek, Garavalia, Kellerman and Marx (1992) have argued, universities in Turkey have realized that international interdependence is a reality and not an abstract theory (as cited in Bostrom, 2010).

This mobility strengthened the students’ academic success as well as worldviews, creating an ERASMUS culture among university youth that would lead to more positive views on Turkey by gaining the country the prestige it needed. Also, Turkey became more familiar with the idea of broadening its university education borders. Considering Turkey’s initial date of participation ERASMUS is still a quite new process for Turkish higher education institutions.
Plus, according to the European Commission progress report, Turkey is still well below the average in terms of EU benchmarks (Özmuşul, 2012).

Turkish universities have had to go drastic changes since its initial participation in the ERASMUS Programme such as establishing internationalization related institutional goals, more emphasis in English as a foreign language, curricula adjustments and adaptation of ECTS. With the application of the ECTS, Turkish universities transferred their credit system from local units to European Credit Transfer System universities so that the Turkish university courses could be accredited and recognized within Europe and they could also recognize the period studied abroad. With more emphasis on English as a foreign language, English has recently been used as the medium of language in instruction in some programs at some higher education institutions in Turkey. While the number of courses/programs taught in English was very limited before, it is now possible to find a variety of courses/programs taught in English or both in English and Turkish. English became necessary not only for the academics but also for the administrative staff, as they also have to interact with foreign ERASMUS students.

Considering all these procedures, the effect of the ERASMUS Programme cannot be dismissed, as it is the main initiative for Turkish universities to notice the need to make changes and join in the internationalization process. The program outcomes did not limit themselves to academia but also to the universities’ administrative policies, life on campuses, and even to the future lives of those ERASMUS exchange students. As Dunkel and Teichler (2006) and Corbett (2005) emphasize, today it is possible to talk about a common ERASMUS experience, which extends beyond the students’ experience of the lifestyle and student culture of the country in which they study; bonding with students from other countries and the sharing of everyday life is also a part of the ERASMUS experience (as cited in Tekin & Gencer, 2013).
Globalization as Theoretical Framework

The following section provides an overview of globalization theory, highlighting some other important terms that happen in accordance with it so that the unique roles of the EU and higher education can be better understood. Globalization impacts the international relations of countries through international participants across borders (Clark, 1999). Knight (1999) argues that globalization, as a movement of technology, people, ideas, and educational activities across borders, impacts each state in a different way due to the differences in their historical, cultural, political, economic and national development levels (as cited in Harman, 2005). On the other hand, globalization impacts each country in a similar way because the outcomes of globalization are universally applicable (Loomis et al, 2011).

We cannot avoid globalization because it is in every aspect of life. It brings lots of ethical issues to consider as part of the changes it leads to in a variety of fields (Robinson & Lee, 2007). The leading force of globalization for some scholars is the strong relationships between capitals, markets, and technologies while for some others it is the relations of the local and the global, (Singh et. al, 2005). Important questions to ask in globalization theory are how it correlates with the impacts of interdependence, what its role is in the country’s activities and anticipated international cooperation, and if it necessitates a rethinking of international anarchy (Clark, 1999). It also has conflicting aspects; in one aspect it demonstrates the incapability of a country to manage its own affairs as its object, while in another aspect it is a process already run and sustained by the countries as the subject (Clark, 1999). Whether it has either positive or negative implications, scholars consider globalization as a causal dynamism reforming a country’s actions as an outsider (Clark, 1999).
Globalization does not involve a linear process; it evolves under the impact of neo-liberal and political policies (Clark, 1999). There are many actor nations leading to these changes. For example, Europe’s role in globalization cannot be dismissed because after the United States, it comes as the second most dynamic actor in globalization and it is a combination of nations (Adams, 2007). As the course of globalization changes the relationships between different ethnic and cultural groups, educational cooperation becomes very important along with its international and intercultural dimensions (Golz, 2005). Ball et al. (2010) evaluates it as a significant instrument of world economy quickly affected by the globalization flows. It is the key set of structures and procedures through which the connection between the global and the local can be understood (Singh et. al, 2005) and educational policies, and politics have valued reactions to the mobility of any globalization agenda (Singh et al, 2005). Higher education is very special in this case because it is the level of education at which international mobility occurs the most and the internationalization goals are embedded the most.

**Europeanization – Internationalization – Globalization**

The “global” world we live in today is determined by interdependence from various aspects such as political, economic, social, cultural, and technological, of which origin goes back to exploration of the world by the Europeans (Nester, 2010). Western European colonialism can therefore be considered as an earlier stage of globalization; yet since there are new power blocs increasing in the world, they are also impacting educational policies and politics in the world (Singh et. al, 2005). European integration is important in this case because it is considered as an advanced form of closer internationalization processes (Wilson, 2011) and higher education plays a vital role here.
There are certain terms used in European higher education such as “international, European and global”, to refer to the transmission of knowledge to longer distances as well as the changes that occur within education (Teichler, 2009). That way, it is expected that the transmission of new cultural values, language, and knowledge will move between the sending and the receiving ERASMUS country.

If we want to define these terms we come across a variety of perceptions for each. For Harman (2005), it is significant to differentiate between internationalization and globalization because globalization refers to cultural, technological, political, along with educational relations of different countries, which go beyond the local and national level to a continental and/or regional level within the entire world through flows of goods, money, ideas, people, and services. Teichler (2009) describes internationalization as the growing number of cross-border activities occurring in recognition of borders, globalization as similar activities happening with the elimination of borders, and Europeanization as the regional version of internationalization and globalization. Scott argues that internationalization refers to the notion of nation-states in the world, while globalization refers to competition and cooperation among those nations (as cited in Gürüz, 2011). It can be difficult to separate Europeanization from globalization because both of them have a very similar transformation of institutions, and cultural forms but Europeanization has an extra social and cultural facet (Dyson, 2005) as it is happening faster and at a regional level.

Internationalizing education as a necessity for globalization has brought changes to the framework and content of academia as a consequence of technological advancement, changes in the government policies and spread of mass education (Schapper & Mayson, 2005). With the spread of the term globalization starting in the 1990s within Europe, the operational area of
European higher education gained a new dimension to the wider world (Teichler, 2009). Now we need to define those terms within education. In this case, internationalization within international education refers to the international mobility of students and academic staff as well as academic cooperation; Europeanization refers to “cooperation and mobility” within the concepts of “European culture, European dimension and European higher education” (Teichler, 2009, p.4); and globalization refers to “trans-national education, market, knowledge transmission” (Middlehurst, 2000; Sadlak 2001 as cited in Teichler, 2009, p. 4). In this new era, education and being educated is also gaining a new meaning and is linked to economic competence and lifelong learning (Ball et al., 2010). It is seen as part of the higher education experience to study abroad for students, to have international experience for academics and to have an understanding of the outside world and improve foreign language skills for the university administrative staff and the first two.

**Situating the Present Study within the Literature**

As presented in the review of the current body of literature, the internationalization of higher education is an all-inclusive and a complex process for HEIs. Administrative strategies are important but HEI internationalization is beyond sole managerial activities, as it requires changes in academia as well. It is important to consider both the incoming foreign and domestic students and staff. Globalization is definitely the trigger of the current stage of this complex and comprehensive process of international higher education mobility in the world. In the case of Turkey, this mobility is mostly happening via ERASMUS and the national educational strategies that are prioritizing European criteria. For less developed countries partnering with the EU, globalization may actually mean Europeanization. In this respect, it is important to analyze what Europeanization really means and how it is related to globalization. This will also help us
understand how the EU is gaining power through higher education for achieving its knowledge-based economy goal in the global world.
CHAPTER III - METHODS & PROCEDURES

The following chapter provides information about the sampling method, the research instrumentation, and the procedure I used to analyze the results of this study. I aim at finding the extent to which the ERASMUS Programme has influenced the internationalization of Turkish higher education in terms of its aims and activities. I start with identifying the research questions I used in this study and give brief information about what types of methods I later used to analyze the instrument questions. Then I talk about the details of my sample and sampling method, instrumentation and why I chose to use the specific tools mentioned, quantitative and qualitative process in which I analyzed my data and limitations of the study.

The purpose of this study is to explore into “To what extent has the Erasmus Program influenced the internationalization of higher education in terms of aims and activities?” Sub-questions were: “What are the perceptions of Turkish faculty members, administrative staff and students of the internationalization of Turkish higher education?” “What are the different types of ERASMUS programs the Turkish universities are involved in?” “What are the opportunities other than the ERASMUS Programme that the Turkish universities offer to promote their internationalization?”

I used cross-sectional surveys as the research design in this study. As the study gathered opinions of a large pool of people from another country, I used web-based surveys in my research design through convenience sampling. There were three different surveys for each cluster all of which shared the last eight items and the faculty and the administrator surveys had two more items in common which the student surveys did not have. I analyzed the results by using descriptive statistics, chi-square, one-way ANOVA, independent sample t-test and qualitative analysis. I implemented descriptive statistics to interpret the answers for the items
which were different in each survey; chi-square, one-way ANOVA and the independent sample t-test to reach statistical inference for the larger population; qualitative analysis to interpret the answers to the last two questions of my instrumentation. The three population clusters I studied were university academic staff, university administrative staff, and university students. I specifically created those groups as the Erasmus program encourages the international mobility of individuals from all of these groups and provides funding for all of them.

**Sampling & Sampling Method**

I used convenience sampling to gather participants. Academics, university administrative staff and university students living in Turkey could take the survey. Academic personnel (“academics”) in this study referred to the instructors who are in charge of teaching and/or researching at universities with titles such as assistant professor, associate professor, professor, and researcher. Administrative staff referred to individuals with a variety of administrative tasks and titles, drawn mostly from the university international relations offices (also known as study abroad offices), students’ affairs, management and department secretaries. Students were university students from undergraduate, graduate and doctorate level studies. Participants were domestic or internationals either working or studying at Turkish universities. Having participated in the ERASMUS Programme was not a requirement to take the surveys.

In Turkey, in order to be able to generalize the results of a study to the whole country, some surveys were implemented with participants from seven different geographical regions of the country. I used the same criteria with the purpose of making my results and interpretation of my results valid. These regions included the Marmara Region, Aegean Region, Mediterranean Region, Black Sea Region, Central Anatolian Region, Eastern Anatolian Region, and the Southeast Anatolian Region. There can be distinct differences among them.
Starting with my own network, I sent survey recruitment e-mails to the university academic and administrative personnel and students. Based on the initial demographic data of the universities from which participants took the surveys, I sent e-mails to other academic and administrative staff from those universities. My intention of doing that was to reach as many participants from the same universities as possible so that more valid data could be obtained.

I obtained e-mails of the participants from the university websites, and approximately 5300 people were e-mailed to participate in the study. I had 254 participants making the response rate 5% from 36 different universities from seven different geographic regions of Turkey. In total, 152 of the participants with a response rate of 4% were academics, 39 with a response rate of 3% were administrative staff and 63 with a response rate of 63% were students. There were participants from all clusters from 13 different universities. Among them 138 academics, 36 administrative personnel, and 50 students took the surveys in Turkish, while 13 academics, three administrative personnel, and 13 students took the surveys in English. Upon investigation, I found that only four participants (one academic, one administrative and two students) were internationals with a long-term affiliation to a Turkish university. Other participants were Turkish citizens.

The only demographic information I obtained from the participants was the name of their institution. I used this information to indicate which geographical region the participants were from. Higher Education Institution (HEI) names were kept confidential. I identified participant clusters by type based on the survey they took since there was a different survey for each cluster. There were three surveys, which shared eight common and 12 different questions so that I could gather information specific to each participating group. The geographic distribution of the universities which the study participants attended were; Marmara Region, six universities with
35 participants (26 faculty, four administrators and five students); Aegean Region, eight universities with 48 participants (28 faculty, nine administrators and 11 students); Mediterranean Region, three universities with 21 participants (14 faculty, two administrators and five students); Black Sea Region, four universities with 29 participants (16 faculty, seven administrators and six students); Central Anatolia Region, eight universities with 47 participants (26 faculty, five administrators and 16 students); Southeast Anatolia Region, three universities with 38 participants (23 faculty, five administrators and ten students); and Eastern Anatolia Region, four universities with 43 participants (19 faculty, 14 administrators and ten students).

**Instrumentation**

A cross-sectional survey research design was used and web-based surveys were implemented. The amount of time I spent on collecting data was two months. I sent the surveys electronically to the participants and provided them both in English and Turkish. I wanted to have international participants affiliated with Turkish universities and used English as the second language in this study. After gathering data for two months I closed the surveys.

The survey questions were self-prepared based on my previous professional and academic experience within the ERASMUS Programme. For each cluster, I provided a different survey however some survey questions remained the same for all clusters (see Analyzing the Data below). Each survey consisted of 20 questions. The surveys started with asking the participants to type the name of the university they were from for demographics so that participants from each region could be reached. Survey questions for each cluster had different numbers of multiple-choice, rating scale, dichotomous (yes/no answer choices) and two open-ended questions. The open-ended questions were the last two questions in all surveys. Last eight questions were shared by all surveys. The themes of these questions were international
awareness and advancement of higher education. Academic and administrative staff surveys had two other multiple-choice questions, which were the same and their themes were also international awareness and advancement of higher education. Those questions were placed just before the last eight questions in the faculty and the administrator surveys. The remaining questions in the surveys were different than each other, asking specific information based on the role of their cluster about the internationalization of their higher education institution and the impact of the ERASMUS Programme on this process.

Table 1.

*Distribution of Survey Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Types</th>
<th>ACADEMICS</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichotomous Questions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Ended</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analyzing the Data**

I implemented descriptive statistics, chi-square, one-way ANOVA and the independent sample t-test for statistical inference, and thematic qualitative analysis to interpret the last two survey questions. Descriptive statistics were helpful in summarizing and making the numeric results understandable. That way, I was able to calculate the measures of central tendency for questions different in each survey to explain the answer percentages of each of those items for the study sample. I used Chi-square, one-way ANOVA and the independent sample t-test to find
out the group differences. Qualitative statistics helped with categorizing and then coming up with the sub-themes for the last two questions under the main study themes, which were Europeanization, international awareness and advancement of higher education. The two variables in the study were the internationalization of Turkish higher education as the dependent variable and the ERASMUS Programme as the independent variable.

I applied descriptive analysis for survey questions different in each survey to answer the sub-research questions and to find the themes of the study by exploring into the types of international mobility programs either through ERASMUS or other opportunities in the current internationalization process. For the multiple choice and dichotomous questions in all three surveys, I calculated the percentages and the frequencies of the answer rates by using excel. For rating scale question seven in the faculty survey, I used SPSS to find the mean and the standard deviation of each answer choice. The data I obtained through descriptive analysis helped me point out how common the ERASMUS Programme is and its significance.

My primary hypothesis was that there would not be a significant difference in perceptions on the role of the ERASMUS Programme in internationalization of Turkish higher education among faculty, administrators and students. I ran chi-square for questions 11 (in the faculty and the administrator surveys), 13, 14, 15, and 17 existent in all surveys for group analysis by using the $\chi^2$ value to assess significant differences across groups where $\chi^2$ is equal to the sum of squared difference between the observed frequency and the expected frequency divided by the expected frequency ($\chi^2 = \sum (f_o - f_e)^2 / f_e$). I ran one-way ANOVA for question 11 (in faculty and administrator surveys) and question 16 existent in all three surveys for group analysis using $F$ ratio to assess significant differences across groups where $F$-ratio is equal to between group

---

1 Please refer to Appendices A, B, & C for a complete list of survey questions.
variability divided by within group variability \((F = MS_{between}/MS_{within})\). I ran independent sample t-test for question 12 existent in the faculty and the administrator surveys to examine the two population means by using the \(t\)-value to assess the differences between groups where the \(t\)-value is equal to the difference between sample means divided by standard error of the two samples which is the square root of the difference between variance of group one divided by sample size for group one and variance of group two divided by sample size for group two

\[
(t = \frac{\bar{y}_{faculty} - \bar{y}_{admin}}{se_{faculty} - admin} \text{ where } se_{faculty - admin} = \sqrt{\frac{s^2_{faculty}}{n_{faculty}} - \frac{s^2_{admin}}{n_{admin}}}).
\]

Group one referred to the faculty and group two referred to the administrators in this calculation. In order to determine significance of my findings, I determined the alpha level as \((0.05)\) and found the critical values accordingly from the related tables for all of these items. I used SPSS for all of the group comparison data analysis.

For the qualitative analysis, I analyzing the common themes found in the answers for the last two questions since they were open-ended. Those two questions explored into perceptions of the participants about the current stage of the internationalization of Turkish higher education and the impact of the ERASMUS Programme on it. I first divided question 19 into two questions in my analysis since it consisted of two questions together. Those were “What do you think internationalization of higher education should look like?” and “What does it look like now?” Question 20 was “What do you think internationalization of Turkish higher education could look like without the ERASMUS Programme?” I created tables for each question and organized the answers for each cluster separately. After that I found the common answers among different clusters. My next step was to categorize those answers to find their themes. I then articulated those themes with quotes from the participants into my findings.
Limitations of the Study

More than 6,000 people were e-mailed to participate. I obtained the e-mail addresses from the universities’ websites. Around 750 of those e-mails were not delivered to the recipients. I received mail delivery failure notifications for those e-mails. Still, there was a low participation with only 39 administrative personnel and 63 students took the survey compared to 151 academics that took it.

There was a different survey for each cluster to prevent coverage error, which happens when the target population does not match with the sample population, however; some of the university personnel working, especially in the international relations offices of the universities held both academic and administrative duties. In this case they were provided with both types of surveys. The decision was left to them to take the survey they felt most comfortable with. Although their feedback on the administrative part of the program would be more appreciated, most of them preferred taking the academic survey.

As the university name was very important for demographics, the participants were required to type the name of their institutions to continue the survey. Yet despite having typed the university name, some participants did not take the rest of the survey. In these cases, their responses were recorded as incomplete surveys. Those records were removed from the data to prevent nonresponse error, which occurs when a survey fails to get response to some or all questions so as to prevent increase in the variance in the analysis.

In this study use of convenience sampling and including representative participants from different clusters in a university community from universities in different parts of Turkey made external validity plausible. The results come from both educationally more and less developed parts of the country. This way I could have results pertinent to the students, faculty and
administrative personnel from seven geographical regions in Turkey. I don’t only have students and faculty who are mostly the beneficiaries of ERASMUS but also administrators who are both beneficiaries and implementers of ERASMUS and I could reach perspectives of all.

Threats to internal validity in this study would be the subject characteristics and the location. ERASMUS Programme is open to students, faculty and administrative personnel of universities. I didn’t choose one particular cluster for this study because approaching perspectives of just one group would lead to biased results by ignoring the perspectives of the other two. Therefore, I didn’t only include all three groups as the subjects of this study but I also included questions unique to each cluster along with some shared questions in the surveys in order to explore the differences in the perspectives and experience each cluster has within ERASMUS. Turkey is divided into seven geographical regions and educational development of each region is different from each other. The differences are also seen in the implementation of European Union adjustment criteria. There is also more interest in certain parts of the country such as the western part compared to the other parts such as eastern or central Anatolia from outside world for international mobility. Therefore, availability and implementation of any type of international education programs can differ from one region to the other. Choosing participants from one region could prevent learning about international education activities of and the perspectives of participants from universities from different regions. In order to prevent the location threat, I made sure that I had participants from all around in Turkey by sending out e-mails to universities in seven different geographical regions. The participants had to type in their university names when they took the surveys as demographics so that I could make sure that I had participants from each region.
As presented in this chapter, I used convenience sampling as my sampling method, cross-sectional surveys as my instrumentation and descriptive statistics, chi-square, one-way ANOVA, independent sample t-test and qualitative analysis as my analysis methods. Especially by using three different techniques in the data analysis process, I aimed at reaching data as consistent and valid as possible.
CHAPTER IV - FINDINGS

This chapter presents the descriptive, Chi-Square, ANOVA, t-test, and qualitative findings of the study. It is organized into the themes of this study, which are Europeanization, international awareness, and advancement of higher education. It first illustrates the descriptive findings for each cluster separately, followed by the ANOVA, chi-square and/or t-test findings for the survey-questions related. Qualitative findings are located after quantitative findings. The qualitative survey questions were the same in all three surveys. Each qualitative question is under the survey question as the sub-title. The answers are organized into the sub-themes that are found in the qualitative answers.

The quantitative findings are categorized according to the themes of the study. Although some questions fit into more than one theme at the same time, they are placed under the theme to which they fit the most.

Quantitative Analysis

Europeanization

The theme Europeanization here refers to the internationalization of Turkish Higher Education at the regional level, which is Europe as well as preference of European programs and Europe over non-European international programs and regions. The questions under this theme aim to find out whether European programs are the most popular international mobility activities at Turkish universities.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 reflect the questions, which were only asked to the administrators.
Table 2

*Official Name of the International Relations Office of Their Institution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Name</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Relations Office</td>
<td>15 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS &amp; International Relations Office</td>
<td>59 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Project Coordination Office</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center of EU and ERASMUS Office</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The responses show that the majority of the participants responded ERASMUS is in the official title of their office’s name. Other answers mostly included “ERASMUS and Foreign Affairs Office” or “EU Project/Affairs Office”.*

Table 3

*Title of the Coordinator in the Office in Charge of International Affairs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Name</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Institutional Coordinator</td>
<td>59 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations Office Coordinator</td>
<td>49 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N* 39
As a result of the variety of international education activities that the international affairs offices are in charge of, the coordinators might have more than one title separate for each program so the participants could choose all that applied to their coordinator’s duties. A majority of the coordinators from the participating universities have the word “ERASMUS” in their title. The other responses given were Mawlana Coordinator and Foreign Affairs Office Coordinator.

Table 4

*Are the Internationalization Goals ERASMUS-related?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>YES % (f)</th>
<th>NO % (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS-related Internationalization Goals</td>
<td>74 (26)</td>
<td>26 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( N = 35 \)

According to the majority of the administrative personnel participants, internationalization goals are also mostly ERASMUS related.
Table 5

_programs that the academics benefit the most both to teach abroad and to recruit international academics_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Teaching Abroad</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Academic Mobility</td>
<td>86 (127)</td>
<td>80 (113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlana Program</td>
<td>33 (49)</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS EU Programs</td>
<td>17 (25)</td>
<td>32 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European International Programs</td>
<td>15 (26)</td>
<td>30 (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (8)</td>
<td>18 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questions above were specific to the faculty members only. Faculty members could choose all that applied to their institution in this question. ERASMUS is the most common international mobility program among faculty both for to teach abroad and to recruit internationals. Other programs chosen were TUBITAK, Fulbright and Mawlana (for recruitment).

Tables 6 and 7 reflect the questions, which were only asked to the students.
Table 6

Programs that are available and the students can benefit and incoming internationals come the most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Student Mobility</td>
<td>92 (58)</td>
<td>92 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERAMUS Internship Mobility</td>
<td>70 (44)</td>
<td>43 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouthInAction Programs</td>
<td>44 (28)</td>
<td>13 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Volunteer Service</td>
<td>35 (22)</td>
<td>13 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EU International Projects</td>
<td>22 (14)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlana Student Mobility</td>
<td>49 (31)</td>
<td>14 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS European Agreements</td>
<td>21 (13)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European Bilateral Agreements</td>
<td>22 (14)</td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

*International Internship Opportunities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Student Mobility</td>
<td>91 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University’s non-ERASMUS Network</td>
<td>41 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For incoming, outgoing and internship student mobility opportunities, ERASMUS related programs take the first place. The only valid answer given to the other answer choice was Comenius Programme, which is another EU funded program for student teachers.

**International Awareness**

International awareness refers to the interest in other international education programs, and the scope of international activities from the West to the East and the interest in different regions of the world.
Table 8

*The most common international mobility program to go abroad*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Mobility Programme</td>
<td>100 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlana Program</td>
<td>26 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other EU Programs</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = 38

The question above was only asked to the administrators to find out about the most common international mobility program for the university community and they could choose all that applied to their institution. The entire administrator participants agreed on the ERASMUS.
Table 9

*The most convenient program to study abroad for them and its effectiveness both academically and professionally*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Convenience % (f)</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>ACADEMIC % (f)</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL % (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Student Mobility</td>
<td>91 (57)</td>
<td></td>
<td>78 (49)</td>
<td>51 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlana Student Mobility</td>
<td>18 (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>51 (32)</td>
<td>21 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS EU Programs</td>
<td>21 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 (25)</td>
<td>37 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European International Programs</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 (21)</td>
<td>35 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (4)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[N = 63\]
The table above shows two questions, which were only asked to the students and they could choose all that applied to them. The results show that ERASMUS is not only the most convenient program to study abroad for the students, but it is also the most effective program both academically and professionally.
Table 10

*International Programs at their Institution's International Affairs Office*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Student Mobility</td>
<td>94 (142)</td>
<td>87 (34)</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Faculty Mobility</td>
<td>91 (138)</td>
<td>85 (33)</td>
<td>.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Administrator Mobility</td>
<td>47 (71)</td>
<td>69 (27)</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Internship Mobility</td>
<td>58 (88)</td>
<td>56 (22)</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth In Action</td>
<td>39 (59)</td>
<td>36 (14)</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Volunteer Service</td>
<td>12 (18)</td>
<td>15 (6)</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EU International Projects</td>
<td>21 (31)</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlama Program</td>
<td>60 (91)</td>
<td>54 (21)</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS European Mobility</td>
<td>35 (53)</td>
<td>38 (15)</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European Mobility</td>
<td>34 (52)</td>
<td>33 (13)</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>10 (4)</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTES. No differences were found*
Both the faculty and the administrator responses could choose all that applied to their institution. Both cluster responses show that ERASMUS programs are the most common ones. Mawlana program comes after ERASMUS. The least common programs are European Volunteer Service and Non-EU international projects. No valid answers were given for the “other” answer choice. No significant differences were observed between the clusters for the question above.

Table 11

*Participation in an International Mobility Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>FACULTY % (n)</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS % (n)</th>
<th>STUDENTS % (n)</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>36 (53)</td>
<td>37 (14)</td>
<td>37 (23)</td>
<td>.991*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>64 (95)</td>
<td>63 (24)</td>
<td>63 (40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTES. None of them are significantly important.*

Majority of them have not participated in any international mobility program. Names given for the programs they participated in are ERASMUS (the most common answer), YouthInAction. Other EU funded programs, Fulbright and IREX-TEA. No significant differences for observed between the clusters.
Table 12

*Location of the Universities with non-ERASMUS Agreement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>37 (56)</td>
<td>38 (15)</td>
<td>57 (36)</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>36 (55)</td>
<td>31 (12)</td>
<td>32 (20)</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td>10 (6)</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkans</td>
<td>34 (52)</td>
<td>41 (16)</td>
<td>25 (16)</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>21 (31)</td>
<td>28 (11)</td>
<td>25 (10)</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>15 (22)</td>
<td>18 (7)</td>
<td>8 (5)</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>29 (44)</td>
<td>31 (12)</td>
<td>17 (11)</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia</td>
<td>23 (35)</td>
<td>23 (9)</td>
<td>17 (11)</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (8)</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td>11 (7)</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTES. None of them are significantly important.*
The most popular regions for non-ERASMUS international mobility are European Union, the Balkans, North America, which are followed by Central Asia and the MENA countries. South America is the least popular part of the world for international mobility among the study participants. No significant differences were observed between the clusters for the question above.

**Advancement Of Higher Education**

Advancement of higher education in this study refers to the implementation of various international activities, institutional goals for internationalization and the university community perspectives.
Table 13

*Administrative Personnel Responses to the Dichotomous Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Management in Charge Of the International Relations Office</td>
<td>92 (34)</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization as Agenda At the Management Conferences</td>
<td>67 (22)</td>
<td>33 (11)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS as Agenda At the Management Conferences</td>
<td>62 (21)</td>
<td>38 (13)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS International Programs As Agenda at the Management Conferences</td>
<td>61 (20)</td>
<td>39 (13)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS Mobility Programs At Their Institution</td>
<td>77 (26)</td>
<td>23 (8)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrators most agreed with the existence of a person from the university management in charge of their institution’s international relations office. They least agreed with the inclusion of non-ERASMUS international programs at their management conferences.

Table 14

*Non-ERASMUS funding from their institution (Administrative responses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Equal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%(f)</td>
<td>%(f)</td>
<td>%(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS Funding Portion</td>
<td>22 (3)</td>
<td>68 (21)</td>
<td>10 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the administrators agreed that the amount of non-ERASMUS funding which their university receives for other international mobility programs is lower than the ERASMUS funding.
Table 15

*Faculty Responses to the Dichotomous Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS University Funding</td>
<td>49 (70)</td>
<td>51 (72)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization as Agenda at the Departmental Meetings</td>
<td>47 (66)</td>
<td>53 (76)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS as Agenda at the Departmental Meetings</td>
<td>43 (61)</td>
<td>57 (81)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricula Adjustments for International Students</td>
<td>59 (84)</td>
<td>41 (58)</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECTS Implementation</td>
<td>94 (138)</td>
<td>5 (7)</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments after ERASMUS</td>
<td>57 (60)</td>
<td>43 (46)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty agreed most with their institution’s implementation of the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) and they least agreed with the inclusion of ERASMUS in the departmental meetings.
Table 16

Effectiveness of the international activities in internationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Activity</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the ERASMUS Programme</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the International Projects</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the Mawlana Program</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures in another language</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of ECTS</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTES. M=Mean. SD=Standard Deviation. Minimum Value=1. Maximum Value=5*
The question above was only asked to the faculty and their responses show that participation in the ERSMUS program is accepted as the most effective strategy for internationalization of their institution. The least effective strategy was chosen to be the Mawlana Program followed by the other option. The specified responses for other were implementation of the “Diploma Supplement” participation in other scientific international conferences and international publications.
Table 17

*Student Responses to the Dichotomous Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td>% (f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the ERASMUS</td>
<td>45 (28)</td>
<td>55 (34)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types of funding</td>
<td>42 (25)</td>
<td>58 (35)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Student</td>
<td>84 (53)</td>
<td>16 (10)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other International Student</td>
<td>47 (29)</td>
<td>53 (32)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network/Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students most agreed with the existence of an ERASMUS student network/organization at their institution and they least agreed with the availability of other types of funding from their university for international activities.

Table 18

*How they learnt about the ERASMUS Programme*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>65 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Website</td>
<td>44 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>35 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Student Network</td>
<td>24 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Coordinators</td>
<td>25 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Meetings for Study Abroad Programs</td>
<td>21 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>N</em></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common way learning about the ERASMUS Programme is through friends and the least common one is introductory meetings organized at the universities for study abroad programs. No valid response for other was specified.
Table 19

*Contribution to Multiculturalism on Campus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributors</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming ERASMUS Students</td>
<td>57 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term International Students</td>
<td>62 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS Exchange Student</td>
<td>20 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question above was asked to the students only and the majority of the student participants agreed that long-term international student contribute the most to the multicultural atmosphere on their campuses. No valid answers were specified for the other answer choice.
Table 20

*Contribution of various international education programs to internationalization of Turkish Higher Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Student</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Faculty</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Administrator</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS Internship</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth In Action</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Volunteer Service</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EU International</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawlan Program</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ERASMUS</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-European Mobility</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTES. None of them are significantly important.*

*Notes. M=Mean. SD=Standard Deviation. Minimum Value=1. Maximum Value=2*
However, the mean scores show that ERASMUS Student Mobility is considered to be the biggest contributor. For faculty, the least effective contributor is the European Volunteer Service while for the administrators it is the non-EU international projects. TUBITAK was the only specified valid response by the faculty for the “other” answer choice. No significant differences were observed between the clusters for the question above.
Table 21

*Biggest Benefit of the ERASMUS Programme*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>( x^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Atmosphere</td>
<td>68 (102)</td>
<td>62 (24)</td>
<td>59 (37)</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional experience abroad</td>
<td>68 (102)</td>
<td>67 (26)</td>
<td>73 (46)</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of English</td>
<td>36 (54)</td>
<td>41 (16)</td>
<td>52 (33)</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy international mobility</td>
<td>55 (83)</td>
<td>51 (20)</td>
<td>33 (21)</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External funding</td>
<td>36 (54)</td>
<td>21 (8)</td>
<td>37 (23)</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to EU</td>
<td>23 (34)</td>
<td>21 (8)</td>
<td>25 (16)</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International reputation in the EU</td>
<td>46 (69)</td>
<td>56 (22)</td>
<td>49 (31)</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International reputation worldwide</td>
<td>25 (38)</td>
<td>18 (7)</td>
<td>40 (25)</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTES. None of them are significantly important.*
Overall, all of the clusters agree that the greatest benefits are the multicultural atmosphere on campus and that it provides professional experience abroad. The least reported benefits are that it provides access to the EU and international reputation worldwide. No significant differences were observed between the three clusters for the benefits of the ERASMUS Programme.


Table 22

*Main Objectives/Goals of Internationalization of Turkish Higher Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives/Goals</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To expand international mobility in Europe</td>
<td>75 (113)</td>
<td>67 (26)</td>
<td>83 (52)</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To expand international mobility beyond Europe</td>
<td>65 (98)</td>
<td>62 (24)</td>
<td>51 (32)</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attract students from the West</td>
<td>64 (96)</td>
<td>62 (24)</td>
<td>49 (31)</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attract students from less developed countries</td>
<td>25 (38)</td>
<td>31 (12)</td>
<td>21 (13)</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote international mobility for short-term periods</td>
<td>48 (73)</td>
<td>56 (22)</td>
<td>46 (29)</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To hire international personnel for long-term periods</td>
<td>59 (89)</td>
<td>59 (23)</td>
<td>52 (33)</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To accept long-term international students</td>
<td>70 (106)</td>
<td>59 (23)</td>
<td>68 (43)</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>P-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To initiate joint-study programs worldwide</td>
<td>68 (103)</td>
<td>64 (25)</td>
<td>59 (37)</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support international joint-research projects</td>
<td>26 (40)</td>
<td>33 (13)</td>
<td>30 (19)</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build campuses worldwide</td>
<td>38 (58)</td>
<td>31 (12)</td>
<td>30 (19)</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To popularize Turkish Higher Education beyond</td>
<td>49 (74)</td>
<td>54 (21)</td>
<td>51 (32)</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N:** 151

**NOTES.** None of them are significantly important.
Overall, all of the clusters agree that the goals of internationalization of Turkish higher education should be to expand international mobility in Europe. The least reported goals are building campuses in other countries and supporting international joint-research projects. No significant differences were observed between the three clusters for the benefits of the ERASMUS Programme.

Table 23

*The Importance of the ERASMUS Programme in Internationalization of Turkish Higher Education (5=extremely important & 1=unimportant)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>FACULTY M (SD)</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS M (SD)</th>
<th>STUDENTS M (SD)</th>
<th>F – Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>4.04 (.99)</td>
<td>3.97 (1.18)</td>
<td>4.26 (.11)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES.** None of them are significantly important.

*Notes.* M=Mean. SD=Standard Deviation. Minimum Value=1. Maximum Value=5

Overall results show that the faculty and the student responses are closer to extremely important followed by administrator responses. No significant differences were observed between the clusters.
Table 24

ERASMUS’ Contribution to Spreading Their Universities’ Popularity

Beyond Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATORS</th>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>( x^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>66 (95)</td>
<td>66 (23)</td>
<td>74 (45)</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>34 (48)</td>
<td>34 (12)</td>
<td>26 (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES. None of them are significantly important.

Responses show that all of the clusters agreed on the fact that ERASMUS was helpful in spreading their institution’s reputation beyond Europe. No significant differences were observed between the clusters.

Qualitative Findings

Question 19 was “What do you think internationalization of higher education should look like? What does it look like now?”

Since this question consists of two questions, I divided them into two categories and divided the answers accordingly. The response count to this question was 127; 22 (17%) of which were administrative personnel, 71 (56%) were faculty and 34 (27%) were student responses.

The themes that I found among the answers for the first part of Question 19 (What do you think internationalization of higher education should look like?) are below.

My first theme was “more accessible” and I found it in 17 (13%) responses. Administrative personnel indicated that it should be accessible for everyone as well as being a
requirement for students and faculty. Faculty reinforced this idea by saying that it needs to be transparent, less complicated, and information about international opportunities should be better distributed to the masses. In order for that programs similar to ERASMUS needed to be advertised so that they will also develop and accessibility to more international opportunities would then occur. Administrative personnel agreed on programs being more informative.

Student responses included the need for more student-oriented activities to which both faculty and the administrative personnel agreed by emphasizing the importance of participant-group-oriented programs and activities. Students added to that the need for more reliability.

My second theme was “geographically more inclusive” and I found it in 14 (11%) responses. This includes both in and outside Turkey. Administrative personnel reported that international mobility should not only spread to a wider geography outside Turkey but it should also spread within the local communities in Turkey. Faculty expressed that faculty mobility needs to spread more at the international level and needs to be continuous. ERASMUS shouldn’t be the only means of internationalization and it shouldn’t be limited to Europe. A faculty member made the point that the internationalization process needs to spread more within Anatolian universities.² Students responded that there should be more bilateral agreements with all around the world. One student responded that bilateral agreements needed mostly to be done with North American and European countries instead of less developed countries.

My third theme was “reciprocal” and I found it in 3 (2%) responses. Faculty responded that more respondents (especially students) should be recruited both from Europe and abroad in general. Also they responded, “Internationalization should be a process in which not only the

---
² Anatolia refers to part of Turkey, which is in Asia. Since some part of Marmara region is in Europe, its European part and Istanbul are not always considered Anatolia.
Turkish academics desire to go to Western world but also academics from the Western world desire to come to Turkey for quality of research, education, conferences, etc.”

My fourth theme was “more inclusive” and I divided it into two categories: academic work and variety of international mobility programs. First category is “academic work” which I found in 23 (18%) responses. Administrative personnel argued that internationalization of Turkish higher education should be research oriented. Faculty responded that it should include joint-studies, conferences, projects, and learning about different systems with long-term multi-national projects which would include students as well. According to them, there is currently a need for qualified larger numbers in scientific production. That way academic recognition of the higher education institutions will increase without the need for variety of international mobility programs. Basically, it needs to move beyond student and faculty exchange to international conferences and scientific seminars. This also necessitates emphasis on cross-cultural studies.

Faculty mentioned the need for an action plan by the academics for better effectiveness because the current process needs more academic emphasis, which needs to go beyond the Bologna Process. It needs to move beyond adaptation to the Bologna Process and application of ECTS on paper for their better utilization so that the content of the courses are updated along with their credits (ECTS). Students responded that there should be greater focus on technical programs. In addition, course content should be updated in accordance with internationalization. Similar to faculty, students also expressed the need for more joint-research projects and moving beyond ERASMUS. Although all of the clusters requested more funding provided either by universities or external resources for further international actions in general, students specifically requested grants for student research. The second category is “variety of international mobility programs” which I found in 15 (12%) responses. According to what faculty responded, “ERASMUS and
Mawlana programs seem to be effective but participation of students and academics are still limited.” This can be due to the fact that Mawlana only funds public universities. Therefore it needs to develop more. If programs like Mawlana get stronger, non-ERASMUS based internationalization would develop. Interaction with universities in other countries could happen through projects, etc. other than ERASMUS. Students expressed the need for greater inclusion of international standards, and more opportunities for better integration with foreign students.

My fifth theme was “larger” and similar to the previous themes I divided it into two categories. First category was “increased programs and bilateral agreements” which I found in 17 (13%) responses. Administrative personnel responded that a balance between agreements in different departments and programs should be provided. Faculty argued that participation in a variety of international mobility programs should increase as well as the bilateral agreements. One faculty member responded that the current internationalization process is already effective with ERASMUS and non-ERASMUS bilateral agreements while another one considered the current stage insufficient but developing very fast. The second category was “increased participation” and I found it in 12 (9%) responses. Faculty specified recruitment of more graduate students from abroad. There was also consensus on more respondents participating in the programs. Both faculty and administrative personnel responded that there should be focus on increasing quality along with quantity in internationalization.

My last theme for this question was “more English” and I found it in 9 (7%) responses. All of the clusters agreed that there needs to be more focus on the use of English as a foreign language.

The themes that I found among the answers for the second part of Question 19 (What does it look like now?) are below.
First theme that I had among the answers was “limitedness” which had two categories, in terms of participation and in terms of geographical distribution. I found limited participation in 8 (6%) responses. Administrative personnel made a statement that the current emphasis of internationalization is on the students and the faculty. Faculty on the other hand emphasized the imbalance between the numbers of incoming and outgoing participants. I found limited geographical distribution in 5 (4%) responses. Administrative personnel indicated that universities in Anatolia are not able to advance at the same level with the universities in bigger cities because universities in bigger cities and in the western part of the country are more successful at recruiting foreign ERASMUS students. This might create an image of Turkey for international education as a touristic activity. There was an expression about full-time students’ being from relatively less developed countries.

Second theme was “not understood” which I found in 4 (3%) responses. Faculty responded that it is inefficient and some still perceive international mobility programs as a sole international activity. Students brought up the same issue as well since participating students only seem to be able to exhibit the program as a travelling opportunity and a way to make international friends.

My third theme was “developing with ERASMUS” which I found in 8 (6%) responses. Faculty responded that it is better now than what it used to be like before ERASMUS because ERASMUS has had a positive impact both at the social and cultural level. Students responded that education programs are globalizing and socializing and this is part of development in Turkey. It is good enough because it provides them with internationals with whom to practice English in their home country. Some students on the other hand responded that it is still not good enough for them without further explanations.
Question 20 was “What do you think internationalization of Turkish higher education could look like without the ERASMUS Programme?”

The response count to this question was 123; 21 (17%) of which were administrative personnel, 70 (57%) were faculty and 32 (26%) were student responses.

The first theme that I found is “less known outside Turkey” which I found in 19 (15%) responses. There was a consensus by all clusters that Turkish higher education would be less known outside Turkey without ERASMUS. Faculty also responded that it would be isolated and more limited. European universities wouldn’t know Turkish higher education Turkish higher education wouldn’t benefit from the western higher education. Students expressed a similar idea by saying that Turkish students would be unaware of the European education system and its opportunities while the European students would be unaware of the Turkish education system. ERASMUS helped with the introduction of a better image of Turkey and Turkish higher education into Europe.

The second theme that I found was “less developed” and I found it in 71 (58%) responses. All administrative personnel, faculty and students agreed that it would be slower, difficult to develop, not as important and at its current developmental level since it would be missing a very important element without ERASMUS. Faculty also responded that it would lack the facility to build a bridge between Turkey and Europe and have not expanded as quickly and be ineffective. Some faculty members responded that ERASMUS was the first step of internationalization; they would still be trying to overcome the first step as it is the driver of this process, otherwise they would still be trying to take the first step. In addition to that they responded most of the universities would have limited international opportunities without it as supported in the sentence, “It wouldn’t happen without ERASMUS because the program
provided both a lot of students and personnel with international experience even through recruitment of internationals.” It has become a must for higher education institutions in Turkey. Faculty also agreed that without ERASMUS it would be happening at the institutional level and/or through individual efforts and network. One faculty member responded, “It would be at the regional level without a globalized perspective” while another one responded, “Internationalization through projects and international academic mobility could still occur through their own academic work and connections but not the international student mobility.” Students supported that last idea by saying that there wouldn’t be adequate forms of international student mobility since ERASMUS is the only one. Besides they responded, “There would also be less awareness of international education and other cultures, lives, ideas” and “Without ERASMUS, Turkish higher education would lack the current multicultural environment, which makes universities different than other levels of education.” Students thought that Turkey would be less developed.

The third theme that I found is “lacking financial support” and I found it in 8 (7%) responses. Administrative personnel responded that it is being funded by an external agency helped its development because other programs such as Mawlana are not as effective. Faculty responded that it would lack external financial support so there wouldn’t be enough budget to support short-term international mobility. Students argued that public universities would suffer from not being able to be part of international mobility while private universities could still have some means of doing it.

Despite having the “other” option to find out more about what the participants thought in most of the quantitative questions, the majority of the participants did not choose it. Therefore having the qualitative questions helped with exploring into the participants’ opinions. These
responses added an explanation to what the quantitative results meant and reinforced the hypothesis of this study, which was “ERASMUS Programme has a significant role in the internationalization of higher education and students, faculty and the administrators have similar opinions in recognition of its role in this process.”
CHAPTER V - ANALYSIS CHAPTER

This chapter analyzes the study findings. In the analysis there are specific details regarding the commonalities and differences found among all participating clusters; faculty, university administrators, and university students. Under the framework of globalization, I specifically used the concepts of internationalization and Europeanization to delve into the international development of higher education in Turkey. This helped me with identifying the themes of educational globalization and the variables, which make the ERASMUS Programme as the most widespread international mobility program in Turkey.

As I indicated in the literature review, globalization can be interpreted as a movement of technological, political, educational, and cross-cultural activities across borders (Knight 1999, as cited in Harman, 2005). However, its process and impacts differ from country to country because of each country’s historical, cultural, political, educational, and economic development level and location in the world. The location and educational goals of a country are especially important here. The internationalization of higher education is both a product of and a reaction to globalization at the same time. Turkey’s educational globalization seems to have taken the form of Europeanization since it started with EU educational programs.

In this study, in order to answer the main research question (“To what extent has the Erasmus Program influenced the internationalization of higher education in terms of its aims and activities?”) I ran a quantitative analysis along with a small qualitative part at the end. The themes that I have in my theoretical framework in connection to my findings are Europeanization, international awareness, and higher education advancement.

By “Europeanization”, I mean the European integration of Turkey, which includes the internationalization of Turkish higher education at the regional level mostly, and the possible
reasons for the European education programs being so prevalent in Turkey. By “international awareness”, I specifically mean the scope of the international activities from the West to the East that the Turkish universities are involved in. By “higher education advancement”, I refer to the internationalization of the curricula, use of English as a medium of instruction, application of European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), advancement in international research and projects, and managerial actions for internationalization.

Analysis of Findings

With two sub-research questions at the same time, I wanted to find out about the different types of ERASMUS Programme opportunities along with the non-ERASMUS opportunities that the Turkish universities offer to promote their internationalization. They both helped me understand whether there was a strong European influence or not in the higher education development. I asked certain questions to faculty, administrative personnel and students from a variety of universities to explore those opportunities. Some questions differed for each cluster since each group is associated with international mobility programs from a different aspect.

Europeanization

An important question to be asked regarding globalization concerns its role in a country’s activities and anticipated international cooperation (Clark, 1999). In this respect, starting with the faculty, as a response to the type of programs they can benefit the most from, a majority of them (86 %) responded ERASMUS Academic Personnel mobility. The Mawllana program, a program with a more international scope, only received one third of the responses and non-ERASMUS EU programs came third in the response list. When I asked them about the location of the universities with which the participating universities had bilateral agreements, the responses for all clusters showed that the majority of the non-ERASMUS bilateral agreements are still with the
European countries (Faculty responses; 37 % EU & 34 % Balkans, administrator response; 38 % EU & 41 % Balkans, Student responses; 57 % EU & 25 % Balkans). The regions, which came after the EU and the Balkans together, were North America, Middle East and North Africa (MENA) and Central Asia. Various things affecting the internationalization of higher education are a country’s national policies on foreign affairs, cultural heritage, and its history (Gürüz, 2011). The Turkish universities’ preference of North America, MENA, and Central Asia after EU can be related to that. Yet international mobility with these regions does not offer as many opportunities as the EU programs do. The EU, unlike other Western countries, prioritizes educational mobility within European countries rather than exporting education to less developed countries (Harmon, 2005) because it encourages vertical international mobility within the region. Unlike the U.S., the EU is not one country but a combination of countries and nations (Adams, 2007) so there is the notion of coalition by unification. This is where the term “Europeanization” comes into existence, and ERASMUS Programme becomes a very practical tool to impose on the European citizens.

A little bit more than half of the participant faculty members in this study (51 %) and more than half of the students (58 %) are still not provided with funding other than the ERASMUS funding by their universities for other mobility/research initiatives. The majority of the administrative personnel (68 %) responded the funding they receive for international mobility other than ERASMUS is lower than the Erasmus grant. ERASMUS funding comes from the European Education Commission and the Turkish universities still seem to depend mostly on this external funding to run their international mobility programs. The Turkish government only supports public universities with Mawlana funding (“Mawlana Exchange Program FAQs”, n.d.) and different funding types are either through the Turkish government or the external
governments and are rather competitive to get. When I asked the participants if they were involved in any international mobility programs, I couldn’t observe any significant responses between the groups as the majority of each cluster have still not participated in an international mobility program. I also asked them to give me the names of different programs they participated in if the programs were not ERASMUS, and only a few different program names were given. Those were Youth in Action (YiA), Grundtvig, and Comenius, which were other EU education programs in addition to the Teaching Excellence Program sponsored by the US Department of State. Despite a smaller participation in the international education programs among the study participants, the other programs given by a few respondents as examples are nonetheless mostly EU programs. Similar to ERASMUS, other EU programs are also externally funded. These responses indeed help understanding why ERASMUS is the most common and the most convenient international mobility program to participate. First of all, it is externally funded, and the funding is open to all universities regardless of them being public or private. As well, the selection process happens within the universities and not nation-wise so it is less competitive. Also, it presents the opportunity to travel into other European countries while on the program. Implementation of the Schengen Visa is part of it. Teichler (2009) describes globalization as a movement of cross-border activities with the elimination of borders. In this respect, the participants benefit from an international activity in accordance with globalization. It is still at the regional level but it fits into Scott’s (as cited in Gürüz, 2011) partial definition of globalization as cooperation among nations.

So far, all of the study responses above show that ERASMUS is the leading, and the most common international mobility program that the Turkish universities are part of (%100 of the administrative personnel responses and 92 % of the student responses). It is also the most
common international internship opportunity for the student participants of this study (91%). Students also consider it the most convenient (91% of the student responses), the most effective study abroad program both academically (78% of the student responses) and professionally (51% of the student responses). It has brought a great opportunity to Turkey to integrate itself into the EU from an educational dimension by providing funded opportunities and has created an international awareness about the outside world other than Turkey. However, it doesn’t seem to be enough to move the internationalization of Turkish universities beyond Europe. Even for non-ERASMUS agreements, EU or Balkan countries are still the first preference for international cooperation. This limited interest and/or fewness of international activities in different regions of the world also reinforces exposure to Europeanization of the international mobility participants, aim and activities.

**International Awareness**

As internationalization is now taken as a necessity for success for universities (Tekin & Gencer, 2013), I delved into the managerial aspect of it. More than half of the administrative personnel (67%) responded that internationalization is an agenda in the management conferences, while almost half of the faculty (47%) responded internationalization has become an agenda in departmental meetings. Then I wanted to know whether ERASMUS specifically has become a regular agenda item in the departmental/managerial meetings. Almost half of the faculty responses (43%) and more than half of the administrators (62%) responded YES. The majority of the administrators (74%) also responded that the internationalization goals are mostly ERASMUS related. In order to find out about student-oriented structures for educational internationalization, I asked the students if there were any ERASMUS student networks or other international education networks at their universities. 84% of the students responded there was
an ERASMUS student network, while only 47% responded there was an international education network at their universities. As a significant aspect of internationalization at the institutional level (Gürüz, 2011) internationalization has seemingly taken its place according to the majority of the participant responses. However, my most important finding here is that ERASMUS has become an inseparable part of higher education in Turkey within the last 12 years (since its start in Turkey). Birtwistle (2007) argues that EU educational programs have a significant influence on international programs. Therefore it is important to evaluate the interaction of higher education institutions with the outside world so as to determine whether it is mostly happening at the regional level. ERASMUS has a distinct role in such a strong way that it is indirectly shaping the course of internationalization of higher education by leading to more exposure to Europeanization and more EU shaped development, as seen in the previous explanations regarding the ECTS and the Bologna Process. Moreover, both the faculty and the administrators in this study agreed that ERASMUS related international mobility activities make up the biggest portion of the international mobility activities of international relations of their institution (Faculty Responses; Student Mobility 94%, Academic Staff Mobility 91%, Internship Mobility 58% and Administrative Personnel Mobility 47% vs. Administrator Responses; Student Mobility 87%, Academic Staff Mobility 85%, Internship Mobility 56% and Administrative Personnel Mobility 69%). The majority of the faculty (80%) chose ERASMUS as the most common international education program through which they can recruit international visiting scholars, and so did the majority of the students (77%) for foreign students who come to study at their institutions. ERASMUS has a reciprocal effect in international mobility. The other common programs that the participants specified in the “other” answer choice they have as examples were Fulbright and Mawlana (for only public universities) both of which are also fully funded.
**Advancement of Higher Education**

Next come the changes in the curricula as an inevitable part of the internationalization of higher education. An internationalized curriculum is beyond updating the course material and teaching methods (Jones & Killick, 2007). It introduces foreign language requirements and international perspectives to the traditional subject areas (De Vita, 2007) irrespective of discipline (Andrews, 2005) to provide teachers and students with skills needed for their immediate diverse background and changing local and global contexts (Hall & White, 2005). In my study, more than half of the faculty (59%) responded there were changes in the curricula and teaching for international students, and more than half (57%) responded those adjustments began with ERASMUS. Majority (94%) of the faculty also responded that they implemented the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) to comply with the Bologna Process, which has so far seemingly been the main adjustment in the curricula in Turkey. This is related to the EU integration policy of the country (9th Development Plan, 2006). In this respect, the changes are likely to align with the Bologna process because in order for the recognition of studies, there needs to be an application of the European Credit Transfer System. This means not only that the Turkish universities will accept the period studied abroad without causing the student to lose a semester or a year, but also the European universities will recognize the term studied in Turkey. This therefore brings international acknowledgement of the studies in Turkey. Nevertheless, Özmusul (2012) argues that Turkey is still below the average in EU benchmarks according to the 2011 European Commission progress report. In other words, despite the widespread credit recognition, the advancement of Turkish higher education is still not advanced enough to be able to catch up with the European criteria.
With my third sub-question, I wanted to learn about the perceptions of the faculty members, administrative staff and students from the Turkish universities about the internationalization of Turkish higher education.

I first asked the faculty about the effectiveness of different international mobility programs in the internationalization of their institution. The mean of the responses for the ERASMUS Student Mobility by the faculty (M=4.31) and the administrators (M=4.41) shows that they agreed on the ERASMUS program as the most effective contributor, followed by other types of ERASMUS mobility programs and a few EU-funded international education programs. Then I specifically asked the participants if they thought that ERASMUS had been helpful in spreading their institution’s popularity beyond Europe despite being a European program, and 66% of faculty responses, 66% of the administrative personnel and 74% of the students responded YES. Again, there were no significant responses observed between groups. I followed these two questions by asking the importance of the ERASMUS Programme in the internationalization of Turkish higher education. The responses and the values for each response were extremely important (5), very important (4), important (3), somewhat important (2) and unimportant (1). The mean of the responses were 4.04 by the faculty, 3.97 by the administrators and 4.26 by the students. According to these responses, there is confidence in the ERASMUS Programme to help the Turkish higher education institutions reach out Europe. The European dimension of internationalization (Knight & Wit, n/i) and the popularity of Europe come as important signifiers here, creating a prestige for the universities at the world level and moves higher education cooperation to global recognition. Similar to the US, we can’t deny the fact that Europe attracts people around the world for education, tourism, business, migration, etc. as a result of its rich history, current economic and political power and diversity. In this respect,
ERASMUS provides Turkish higher education with recognition of its higher education system in Europe through ECTS, increases its educational popularity internationally, constitutes a bridge to go to Europe to study abroad for non-European international students studying in Turkey (the program does not require a European citizenship for participation), and moves Turkey to a more European level in the globally competent world. These are especially important qualities affecting university preference for students. The high number of responses from the students selecting ERASMUS as the most effective study abroad program in their both academic and professional career also supports its significance for them.

I also asked all of the clusters about what they thought to be the biggest benefit of the ERASMUS Programme. They mostly agreed on professional experience abroad followed by multicultural atmosphere on campus and international reputation in the EU. I also asked them what they thought should be the main objectives and/or goals of internationalization of Turkish higher education. The first item all of the clusters mostly agreed on was expanding international mobility in Europe. Faculty and the administrators together mostly agreed on expanding international mobility beyond European countries, attracting students from the West, and initiating joint-study programs worldwide. Faculty and the students also mostly agreed on accepting long-term international students. Indeed, when asked, the students responded long-term international students contributed the most to the multiculturalism on campus followed by incoming ERASMUS students. I observed no significant differences among the answers for the first two questions. However, it is also important to understand what the participants perceive as multiculturalism on their campuses since it is still quite a new concept for most of the Turkish universities and as result not all of them may have enough sources to promote its occurrence yet. Benefits of international education activities just like the activities themselves are various. Gürüz
(2011) illustrates internationalization as moving beyond studying foreign languages and Jones 
and Brown (2007) argue it as moving beyond sole student and academic exchange. Despite 
Europe and the Western world being the most effective actors, the participating university 
members have started having a need for a broader vision of the scope of international activities. 
It is important but not enough just to collaborate with Europe for student and staff exchange. In 
addition, reaching internationalization at home necessitates multiculturalism for which according 
to the faculty and the students, long-term international students become very important.

I also had two open-ended questions. My first open-ended question consisted of two 
questions together and I divided them into two parts. Starting with the first part (“What do you 
think internationalization of higher education should look like?”), responses showed that there is 
a general agreement on the internationalization of higher education being more accessible, 
geographically more inclusive, reciprocal, more inclusive in terms of its content, larger in terms 
of participation and agreements, and more focus on English as a second language. The need for 
geographical inclusiveness shows that there is interest among all participating clusters in 
educational internationalization outside Europe. For reciprocity, the idea was that Turkey needed 
to be a desired educational location by the Western countries. This also matches with one of 
Leeds Met’s (year) criteria of effective recruitment of international students in his 
internationalization strategy (as cited in Joens, 2007). The responses also suggested inclusion of 
different opportunities for mobility programs and moving beyond mobility programs to joint- 
research projects (Knerr, 1990, & Yang, 2005), at the international level.

According to the second part of Question 19 (“What does it look like now?”), the 
internationalization of Turkish higher education is currently limited, not being understood, and 
still developing. It is limited in terms of unequal numbers of participants from among all clusters
and not having a balance between incoming and outgoing students. This goes back to the need for reciprocity I mentioned above. It is still not understood because as expressed both by the faculty and the students, mobility participants still do not perceive the academic purpose of the program. This lack of perception also prevents its productiveness. On the other hand, the participants responded it is developing thanks to ERASMUS. As Tekin and Gencer (2013) argue, the ERASMUS Programme expanded the study abroad opportunities that the Turkish universities offered. The following open-ended question (“What do you think the internationalization of the Turkish higher education would look like without ERASMUS?”) helps with delving into this last answer. Frist of all, the responses from all clusters show that the internationalization of Turkish higher education without ERASMUS would be less known outside Turkey, less developed, and lack financial support. It would be less known because not only the Turks would know less about European higher education, but also the Europeans would know less about Turkish higher education. These answers also came up in previous quantitative responses. It would be less developed because it would be slower, inefficient, not as important, limited, and based on institutional and/or individual networking. It would also lack financial support because the ERASMUS budget comes from an external source.

**Overall Analysis**

As Clark (1999) argues, globalization can be considered as a process evolving around neo-liberal policies, and in the case of the internationalization of universities, each institution becomes responsible for their own adjustment to catch up with this process. The financial resources become very important here. The Turkish government is still lacking the ability to provide all of the higher education institutions with an adequate budget for a wide international mobility. The universities also are not able to have enough funding for other types of
international mobility. However, the European Union is able to support the Turkish universities with funding coming from outside Turkey and that eases the implementation of the ERASMUS Programme. Universities apply to be part of the program independent from the Turkish government and act independently upon receiving the approval and the funding. It becomes their own responsibility to successfully implement the ERASMUS Programme.

It is also important to differentiate between internationalization and globalization here as Teichler (2009) explains ‘internationalization’ as recognizing the existence of borders while ‘globalization’ conveys eliminating the borders for international mobility. In this respect movement in Europe can be considered a smaller version of globalization since that is how the movement happens there under the Schengen framework. There is international awareness, education advancement and definitely Europeanization. “Europeanization” is repeated many times in this study because according to Teichler (2009), it refers to collaboration and mobility and stands for the notions of “European culture, European dimension and European higher education” (p.96). It is part of globalization and has the potential to help any country’s adjustment to the globalizing world. Dyson (2005) states that Europeanization has an extra social and cultural facet. In the case of Turkey, this is definitely a strong influence over the country, and important in shaping the country’s future advancement at the higher education level. Turkey is adjusting to the globalized world, but it is mostly happening at the regional level. What we see in this work is that despite having the notion of catching up with the global mobility among the participants, their means of doing this mostly allows them to do it only in a European context. Combining the EU’s fiscal power and Turkey’s long-term desire to be part of Europe, it can be claimed that being European already has its own significance in Turkish higher education before
being global as the perception among the participants shows that a European dimension is needed to be recognized in the global world.
CHAPTER VI - CONCLUSION

In this study I find that higher education in Turkey is internationalizing from a European dimension, and the implementation of the ERASMUS Programme along with other EU programs has a significant role in this process. ERASMUS related international mobility programs still make up the highest portion of the internationalization of higher education in Turkey and Western World is the most preferred region of the world for international cooperation. There is interest among the participants in implementing various research-based academic work and spread to the world from outside Europe. The Turkish government has similar interest however; lack of financial support from the universities and the government-sponsored programs limits internationalization activities mostly to mobility actions and slows down both the further advancement of international activities and the process of reaching out the Western World.

As supported by the data gathered, the international development of Turkish higher education is developing but still seems to be at the regional level within Europe. With this study, I found that the ERASMUS Programme still holds the biggest portion of the international higher education activities in Turkey, and without it the internationalization of Turkish higher education would be extremely limited. Turkey’s long-term Westernization and EU integration policy have an important role in this case. Özmusul (2012) argues that in the international development of education in Turkey, the EU is profoundly integrated into the country’s policies, strategies and aims. Such efforts constitute the biggest portion of international education projects of Turkey. ERASMUS also impacts other areas of internationalization in education. Tekin and Gencer (2013) argue that the ERASMUS Programme plays a significant role in the formation of transnational structures. Therefore the role of ERASMUS and its extensions such the Bologna Process and the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) are not to be ignored.
External funding comes with ERASMUS, and Turkey’s geographical location eases the Europeanization of Turkish higher education. International awareness has been aroused on the need for expanding international education activities both inside and outside the country. This expansion not only requires more various activities but also a wider geography. However, especially according to some student responses in this study, the Western world still is the main attraction for international mobility. The general responses show that increased numbers in international mobility both for incoming and outgoing participants are the core actions for international development of Turkish higher education. In the advancement of higher education, one of the biggest benefits of the ERASMUS program in the academia seems to be use of English and application of European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), which provides international recognition of Turkish credits. Yet, ECTS only provides this international recognition within Europe. The study results also show that development of higher education is not only a matter for higher education management, but also for the academic side of the universities, and the students are increasingly becoming more active in international participation.

The Mawlana Program, as the second most common international mobility program within Turkish universities sponsored by the Turkish government, aims at providing international mobility with the wider world. However, since private universities are not funded under this program, Turkish participation in Mawalna remains limited despite being a great opportunity to interact with countries from all around the world. This automatically makes ERASMUS the most widespread program in Turkey. Also, currently higher education strategy in Turkey is based on the Bologna Process (Özmusul, 2012), which is almost a requirement for a smooth application of the ERAMUS Programme for recognition of the semesters studied abroad and to be aligned with
the European higher education standards. As a result, Turkey is also in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) so the educational development goals at the higher education levels have to be in compliance with EHEA goals. This means that international education mostly runs according to the EU standards.

There is a great effort in Turkey in terms of educational development internationally. Yet, these endeavors are still limited mostly to ERASMUS and to other EU programs. Turkey is not only trying to catch up with the wider world in globalization, but also trying to adjust the country profile to the EU standards in many aspects. Plus, in order for a bilateral agreement to be signed between two institutions, one of them is required to be an EU member, thus reinforcing exposure to the European Union more. Integration to the EU through higher education has created a significant opportunity for Turkey not only to integrate into the EU, but also to the globalizing world (Özmuşul, 2012). In this respect, globalizing mostly from a European dimension might impact the country’s further interaction and the integration with the larger world at a slower speed as it is seen in the survey responses showing less interest and participation in other international programs. As a country in the middle of three continents; Europe, Asia and Africa, Turkey needs to benefit from this geographical richness to globalize from a variety of perspectives. In order for that, the government needs to provide funding equally open to both public and private universities, and a system for accreditation of the periods studied in other countries. The monetary power that the European Union has shows that how the fiscal power of globalized institutions can influence a country’s educational development level and policy-making. Accordingly, the European Union external funding should not be the only resource to rely on for international mobility for the Turkish universities because this limits international
cooperation to Europe. There should also be funding provided to the universities by the government for a variety of international education activities.

Moreover, the results show that there is already awareness for the need for Turkey to reach out to the wider world beyond Europe. Especially the administrator responses show that more steps need to be taken, but in order for that to happen the universities need more support. This is also expressed as a government interest to reach the least developed countries in the 10th development plan. In order for that to happen, the Turkish government and Turkish universities should work in harmony with each other. Everybody’s contribution in the university including the faculty, administrators and the students are very important here. Their voice needs to be heard as they do have valuable ideas. This will provide the government with an understanding of universities’ priorities for internationalization from the perspective of its actors for a better and more independent internationalization strategy.

How the Turkish universities benefit from the existence of incoming international students other than language benefits, and the further details of internationalizing the curricula are still not clearly identified. These should be explored further. Also, as a follow-up study, a longitudinal survey with at least a five-year interval and larger participation would be very useful so as to measure how internationalization takes shape in Turkish universities. It would also be important to obtain demographic information about whether participating universities are public or private, in addition to the geographical location of the universities. Also international education related government policies both in the 9th and the 10th development plans of Turkey should be analyzed. In the former plan the interest of the government seems to be catching up with the European style of horizontal mobility while in the latter one, it is more in the form of catching up with the Westernized style vertical mobility which refers to exporting education
from “the developed” home country to “the less” or as it is stated in the 10th development plan, “the least” developed countries. Such a policy analysis along with a follow-up research will help understanding how the course of internationalization of Turkish higher education and the perceptions of the university members develop throughout time.

**Recommendations & Practical Implications**

The data of this study could be stronger with more participants from all of the clusters. Also some of the different survey questions about other university financial sources for international education activities and management/departmental meetings could have been formed as the same questions throughout all of the surveys. Some survey questions had quite a lot answer choices. Those could have separated into multiple questions instead of one. Also, it would have been valuable data if ideas of the personnel from the Turkish National Agency which is in charge of EU programs had been included.

The results of this study can be used for a wider analysis of the current international education activities of Turkish universities. Also, EU programs occur at various levels of education such as secondary and vocational, and informal education through short-term projects. This can serve as a guide in exploring the role of Europeanization in various forms of education.
REFERENCES


Grand National Assembly of Turkey. (2013). Tenth Development Plan (No. 28699).

Ankara: Turkey. Resmi Gazete. Retrieved from
http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/sirasayi/donem24/yil01/ss476.pdf


education: Critical explorations of pedagogy and policy (pp. 9-36). Springer: Hong Kong.


APPENDIX A

ELECTRONIC SURVEY QUESTIONS IN ENGLISH FOR FACULTY

Please write the name of your university: ..............................................................

1- Which programs can you benefit from the most as an academic?
   a. Erasmus Academic Personnel Mobility Program
   b. Mawlana Program
   c. Non-Erasmus EU programs
   d. Non-European international programs
   e. Other:

2- Are you provided with funding other than Erasmus by the University for international cooperation and research projects?
   (Y/N)

3- Is internationalization regularly an agenda item in the departmental meetings?
   (Y/N)

4- Is Erasmus program regularly an agenda item in the departmental meetings?
   (Y/N)

5- Through which international programs are you able to recruit visiting scholars from other countries the most? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Academic Staff Mobility
   b. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with European universities for international staff mobility
   c. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international staff mobility
   d. Other: ...........................................

6- Does your institution implement the ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) to comply with the Bologna Process?
   (Y/N)

7- Using a scale where 5= most and 1=least, how do rate the effectiveness of the activities below from the most to the least as a contribution to the internationalization of your institution? (Write N.A. if activity does not apply to your institution)
   a. Participation in the Erasmus Mobility Program Rating........
   b. Participation in the International Projects Rating ....
   c. Participation in Mawlana Program Rating......
   d. Having lectures in a foreign language Rating......
   e. Implementation of ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) Rating.....
   f. Other: ............................................ Rating.....

3 After the surveys were closed, I lost access to the electronic versions of the surveys. Therefore I am only able to present the survey questions in the current format.
8- Are there any adjustments in the curricula and teaching that you apply in your program for the incoming international students? (Please answer question 12 if you answer this questions YES) (Y/N)

9- Did those adjustments start with Erasmus? (Y/N)

10- What is the international network you use the most for your international academic research and projects? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus network
   b. Mawlana network
   c. University’s non-Erasmus international network
   d. My own personal international network
   e. I don’t do international academic research or projects
   f. Other: ...........................................

11- What is the scope of the international education programs of the international relations/Erasmus office of your institution? (please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Student Mobility
   b. Erasmus Academic Staff Mobility
   c. Erasmus Administrative Personnel Mobility
   d. Erasmus Internship Mobility
   e. YouthInAction Projects
   f. European Volunteer Service Projects
   g. Non-EU International Projects
   h. Mawlana Student Mobility
   i. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with European universities for international student and staff mobility
   j. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international student and staff mobility
   k. Other: ...........................................

12- Using a scale where 5= most and 1=least, how do you think each international program contributes to the internationalization of your institution? (Please check all that apply) (Write N.A. if activity does not apply to your institution)
   a. Erasmus Student Mobility Rating........
   b. Erasmus Academic Staff Mobility Rating........
   c. Erasmus Administrative Personnel Mobility Rating........
   d. Erasmus Internship Mobility Rating........
   e. YouthInAction Projects Rating........
   f. European Volunteer Service Projects Rating........
   g. Non-EU International Projects Rating........
   h. Mawlana Program Rating........
i. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with other European Universities Rating........
j. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international student and staff mobility. Rating........
k. Other: …………………………… Rating........

13- Have you participated in any of the international mobility programs as an academic? If so, through which program?
(Y/N) ……………………………

14- What do you think is the biggest benefit of the Erasmus Program for your institution?
(Please check all that apply)
a. Multicultural atmosphere on campus
b. Provides academic experience for our staff in another country
c. Increased use of English in the curriculum
d. Easy international student & personnel mobility
e. It is funded by an external agency
f. Provides access to European Union
g. Creates an international reputation for our institution within Europe
h. Creates an international reputation for our institution worldwide
i. Other………………………………………………

15- What should be the main objectives or goals for internationalization of Turkish higher education? (Please check all that apply)
a. To expand international student and staff mobility in Europe
b. To expand international student and staff mobility beyond European countries
c. To attract students from the Western World
d. To attract students from the less developed countries
e. To promote student & staff exchange for short-term periods
f. To hire international personnel for long-term periods
g. To accept international students for full-time study periods
h. To initiate joint-study programs with other international universities
i. To support international joint-research projects worldwide
j. To build campuses in other countries worldwide
k. To popularize Turkish higher education beyond Erasmus
l. Other………………………………………………………………

16- How do you rate the role of the Erasmus Mobility Programs in internationalization of Turkish higher education?
a. Extremely important ……………
b. Very Important ……………
c. Important …………………
d. Somewhat important ………
e. Unimportant ………
17- What countries are the other institutions with which your institution has non-Erasmus international education agreements located in?
   a. European Union (non-Erasmus agreements)
   b. North America (Canada, USA, Mexico)
   c. South America
   d. Balkans
   e. Middle East & North Africa
   f. Africa
   g. Central Asia
   h. East Asia
   i. Other ..................................

18- Do you think that Erasmus has been helpful in spreading your institution’s popularity beyond European countries?
   (Yes / No )

19- What do you think internationalization of higher education should look like? What does it look like now?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

20- What do you think Turkish higher education internationalization could look like without the Erasmus Program?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
APPENDIX B

ELECTRONIC SURVEY QUESTIONS IN ENGLISH FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Please write the name of your university: .................................................................

1. What is the official name of the office, which is in charge of international student and staff exchange and international projects?
   a. International Relations Office
   b. Erasmus & International Relations Office
   c. EU Project Coordination Office
   d. Center of European Union & Erasmus Office
   e. Other: ........................................

2. What is the general title of the coordinator in charge of your office? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Institutional Coordinator
   b. International Relations Office Coordinator
   c. Other: ........................................

3. Through which program do the staff/students at your institution go abroad the most?
   a. Erasmus Mobility Programs
   b. Mawlama Program
   c. Other EU programs
   d. Other:

4. Is there a member of the university management responsible of international relations of your institution? If yes, what is the position of that person in the management?
   (Yes/No) .................................................................

5. Is internationalization regularly an agenda item in the management conferences?
   (Yes/No)

6. Is Erasmus program regularly an agenda item in the management conferences?
   (Yes/No)

7. Are the internationalization goals usually Erasmus-related (adaptation of European Credit Transfer System (ECTS), student and staff mobility with EU universities, joining the European Higher Education area, etc)? If no, what are the other goals? (Please list them if there are different internationalization goals)
   (Yes/No) ........................................

8. Are there any other non-Erasmus but still international programs agenda items in the management conferences?
   (Yes/No)

9. Are there any non-Erasmus international mobility programs your institution provides its staff and students with?
   (Yes/No)
10. What is the usual proportion of the funding you receive for non-Erasmus Programs compared to the funding you receive for Erasmus program?
   a. Higher
   b. Lower
   c. Equal

11. What is the scope of the international education programs of the international relations/Erasmus office of your institution? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Student Mobility
   b. Erasmus Academic Staff Mobility
   c. Erasmus Administrative Personnel Mobility
   d. Erasmus Internship Mobility
   e. YouthInAction Projects
   f. European Volunteer Service Projects
   g. Non-EU International Projects
   h. Mawlana Student Mobility
   i. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with European universities for international student and staff mobility
   j. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international student and staff mobility
   k. Other: ........................................

12. Using a scale where 5= most and 1=least, how do you think each international program contributes to the internationalization of your institution? (Please check all that apply) (Write N.A. if activity does not apply to your institution)
   a. Erasmus Student Mobility Rating........
   b. Erasmus Academic Staff Mobility Rating........
   c. Erasmus Administrative Personnel Mobility Rating........
   d. Erasmus Internship Mobility Rating........
   e. YouthInAction Projects Rating........
   f. European Volunteer Service Projects Rating........
   g. Non-EU International Projects Rating........
   h. Mawlana Program Rating........
   i. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with other European Universities Rating........
   j. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international student and staff mobility. Rating........
   k. Other: ........................................ Rating........

13. Have you participated in any of the international mobility programs? If so, through which program? (Yes/No) ........................................

14. What do you think is the biggest benefit of the Erasmus Program for your institution? (Please check all that apply)
a. Multicultural atmosphere on campus
b. Provides professional experience for our staff in another country
c. Increased use of English in the curriculum
d. Easy international student & personnel mobility
e. It is funded by an external agency
f. Provides access to European Union
g. Creates an international reputation for institution within Europe
h. Creates an international reputation for our institution worldwide
i. Other

15. What should be the main objectives or goals for internationalization of Turkish higher education? (Please check all that apply)
a. To expand international student and staff mobility in Europe
b. To expand international student and staff mobility beyond European countries
c. To attract students from the Western World
d. To attract students from the less developed countries
e. To promote student & staff exchange for short-term periods
f. To hire international personnel for long-term periods
g. To accept international students for full-time study periods
h. To initiate joint-study programs with other international universities
i. To support international joint-research projects worldwide
j. To build campuses in other countries worldwide
k. To popularize Turkish higher education beyond Erasmus
l. Other

16. How do you rate the role of the Erasmus Mobility Programs in internationalization of Turkish higher education?
a. Extremely important
b. Very Important
c. Important
d. Somewhat important
e. Unimportant

17. What countries are the other institutions with which your institution has non-Erasmus international education agreements located in?
a. European Union (non-Erasmus agreements)
b. North America (Canada, USA, Mexico)
c. South America
d. Balkans
e. Middle East & North Africa
f. Africa
g. Central Asia
h. East Asia
i. Other ........................................

18. Do you think that Erasmus has been helpful in spreading your institution’s popularity beyond European countries?
   (Yes / No )

19. What do you think internationalization of higher education should look like? What does it look like now?
   ........................................................................................................................................

20. What do you think Turkish higher education internationalization could look like without the Erasmus Program?
   ........................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX C

ELECTRONIC SURVEY QUESTIONS IN ENGLISH FOR STUDENTS

1) What are the international education programs that you can participate as a student at your university? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Student Mobility
   b. Erasmus Internship Mobility
   c. YouthInAction Projects
   d. European Volunteer Service Projects
   e. Non-EU International Projects
   f. Mawlana Student Mobility
   g. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with European universities for international student mobility
   h. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international student mobility
   i. Other: ........................................

2) What are the international internship opportunities you can benefit from at your university? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Internship Mobility
   b. University’s non-Erasmus network
   c. Other: ........................................

3) How did you learn about the Erasmus Program?
   a. From friends
   b. University Website
   c. Media
   d. Erasmus Student Network
   e. Erasmus Coordinators
   f. International Student Exchange Programs Introduction Meetings

4) Was there an introduction to other international education programs other than Erasmus at your university? (Y/N)

5) What is the most common international student mobility program at your university that the students can go abroad with? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Student Mobility
   b. Erasmus Internship Mobility
   c. YouthInAction Projects
   d. European Volunteer Service Projects
   e. Non-EU International Projects
   f. Mawlana Student Mobility
g. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with European universities for international student mobility
h. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international student mobility
i. Other: ........................................

6) What is the most common international student mobility program through which the international exchange students come to study at your university? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Student Mobility
   b. Erasmus Internship Mobility
c. YouthInAction Projects
d. European Volunteer Service Projects
e. Non-EU International Projects
f. Mawlana Student Mobility
g. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with European universities for international student mobility
h. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international student mobility
i. Other: ........................................

7) Are you provided with funding other than Erasmus by the university for international mobility?
   (Y/N) .................................

8) What program is the easiest and most convenient way to study abroad for you? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Student Mobility
   b. Mawlana Student Mobility
c. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with European universities for international student mobility
d. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international student mobility
e. Other: ........................................

9) What program do you think is the most effective study abroad program for your academic and professional success? (Please mark all that apply)
   a. Erasmus Student Mobility   Academic ...... Professional .......
b. Mawlana Student Mobility   Academic ...... Professional .......
c. Non-Erasmus bilateral agreements with European universities for international student mobility   Academic ...... Professional .......
d. Bilateral agreements with non-European universities around the world for international student mobility   Academic ...... Professional .......
e. Other: ........................................   Academic ..... Professional .......
10) Is there an Erasmus student network/organization at your university? (Y/N)

11) Are there other student networks/organizations for international education at your university? (Y/N)

12) What do you think contributes the most to multicultural student atmosphere of your university?
   a. Incoming Erasmus Students
   b. Long-term international students
   c. Non-Erasmus international exchange students
   d. Other: …………………………………………

13) Have you participated in any of the international mobility programs? If so, through which program? (Y/N) ……………………………..

14) What do you think is the biggest benefit of the Erasmus Program for your institution? (Please check all that apply)
   a. Multicultural atmosphere on campus
   b. Provides a different type of education for us in another country
   c. Increased use of English in the curriculum
   d. Easy international student & personnel mobility
   e. It is funded
   f. Provides access to European Union
   g. Creates an international awareness within Europe
   h. Creates an international awareness worldwide
   i. Other…………………………………………………

15) What should be the main objectives or goals for internationalization of Turkish higher education? (Please check all that apply)
   a. To expand international student and staff mobility in Europe
   b. To expand international student and staff mobility beyond European countries
   c. To attract students from the Western World
   d. To attract students from the less developed countries
   e. To promote student & staff exchange for short-term periods
   f. To hire international personnel for long-term periods
   g. To accept international students for full-time study periods
   h. To initiate joint-study programs with other international universities
   i. To support international joint-research projects worldwide
   j. To build campuses in other countries worldwide
   k. To popularize Turkish higher education beyond Erasmus
   l. Other………………………………………………………………
16) How do you rate the role of the Erasmus Mobility Programs in internationalization of Turkish higher education?
   a. Extremely important ..................
   b. Very Important ....................
   c. Important ...........................
   d. Somewhat important ............
   e. Unimportant ....................

17) What countries are the other institutions with which your institution has non-Erasmus international education agreements located in?
   a. European Union (non-Erasmus agreements)
   b. North America (Canada, USA, Mexico)
   c. South America
   d. Balkans
   e. Middle East & North Africa
   f. Africa
   g. Central Asia
   h. East Asia
   i. Other .................................

18) Do you think that Erasmus has been helpful in spreading your institution’s international education activities beyond European Union?
   (Yes / No)

19) What do you think internationalization of higher education should look like? What does it look like now?
   ........................................................................................................................................

20) What do you think Turkish higher education internationalization could look like without the Erasmus Program?
   ........................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX D

ELECTRONIC SURVEY QUESTIONS IN TURKISH FOR FACULTY

Lütfen yandaki boşluga üniversitenizin adını yazınız ………………………………………
1. Bir akademisyen olarak hangi programdan en fazla faydalanabilirsiniz?
   a. Erasmus Personel Hareketliliği
   b. Mevlana Programı
   c. Erasmus dışı AB programları
   d. Avrupa harici diğer uluslararası programlar
   e. Diğer: ……………………………………………………….
2. Üniversite tarafından Erasmus dışı uluslararası işbirliği ve/veya araştırma projeleri için fon alabiliyor musunuz?
   (Evet / Hayır)
3. Uluslararasılaşma fakülte toplantılarında düzenlenen olarak dile getirilen bir gündem konusu mu?
   (Evet / Hayır)
4. Erasmus fakülte toplantılarında düzenlenen olarak dile getirilen bir gündem konusu mu?
   (Evet / Hayır)
5. Hangi uluslararası program ile diğer ülkelerden misafir öğretim üyesi getirtebiliyorsunuz? (Lütfen uyandıran tüm şekilleri işaretleyiniz)
   a. Erasmus Akademik Personel Hareketliliği
   b. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle uluslararası personel hareketliliği sağlayan Erasmus dışı ikili anlaşmalar
   c. Avrupa harici dünya üniversiteleriyle uluslararası personel hareketliliği sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
   d. Diğer: ……………………………………………………….
6. Kurumunuz Bologna Sürecine uyum için AKTS (Avrupa Kredi Transfer Sistemi) uyguluyor mu?
   (Evet / Hayır)
7. 5=en çok, 1=en ölçünesine kullanarak aşağıdaki aktivitelerin kurumunuzun uluslararasılaşmamasına katkı açısından etkililiğini nasıl değerlendirirsiniz? (Eğer kurumunuzda uygulanmamış bir program varsa N.A. yazınız)
   a. Erasmus Hareketlilik Programına katılım Değerlendirme...........
   b. Uluslararası projelere katılım Değerlendirme...........
   c. Mevlana Programına katılım Değerlendirme............
   d. Yabancı dille eğitim sunma Değerlendirme............
   e. AKTS’phin uygulanması (Avrupa Kredi Transfer Sistemi) Değerlendirme............
   f. Diğer ………………………………………………………. Değerlendirme............
(Evet / Hayır)  

9. Bu düzenlemeler Erasmus ile mi başladı?  
(Evet / Hayır)  

10. Uluslararası akademik araştırmalarınızı ve projelerinizi için en çok hangi bağlantılardan faydalanıyorsunuz? (Lütfen uyan tüm şikleri işaretleyiniz)  
a. Erasmus Bağlantıları  
b. Mevlana Programı Bağlantıları  
c. Üniversitenin Erasmus dışı uluslararası bağlantıları  
d. Benim kendi uluslararası bağlantılarını  
e. Uluslararası araştırmalar ve projeler yapmıyorum  
f. Diğer: .................................................................  

11. Kurumunuzun uluslararası ilişkiler/Erasmus ofisinin ilgilendiği uluslararası eğitim programlarının faaliyet alanı nelerdir? (Lütfen uyan tüm şikleri işaretleyiniz)  
a. Erasmus Öğrenci Hareketliliği  
b. Erasmus Akademik Personel Hareketliliği  
c. Erasmus İdari Personel Hareketliliği  
d. Erasmus Staj Hareketliliği  
e. AB Gençlik Projeleri  
f. Avrupa Gönüllü Hizmeti Projeleri  
g. AB dışı projeler  
h. Mevlana Öğrenci Hareketliliği  
i. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle Erasmus dışı uluslararası öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar  
j. Avrupa harici dünyada üniversitelerle uluslararası öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar  
k. Diğer: .................................................................  

12. 5=en çok, 1=en ölcüğünü kullanarak hangi uluslararası programın kurumunuzun uluslararasılaşmasına ne derece katkı sağladığını düşünüyorsunuz? (Lütfen uyan tüm şikları işaretleyiniz) (Eğer kurumunuzda uygulanmayan bir program varsa N.A. yazınız)  
a. Erasmus Öğrenci Hareketliliği Değerlendirme...........  
b. Erasmus Akademik Personel Hareketliliği Değerlendirme.........  
c. Erasmus İdari Personel Hareketliliği Değerlendirme.........  
d. Erasmus Staj Hareketliliği Değerlendirme.........  
e. AB Gençlik Projeleri Değerlendirme...........  
f. Avrupa Gönüllü Hizmeti Projesi Değerlendirme.........  
g. AB dışı uluslararası projeler Değerlendirme.........  
h. Mevlana Programı Değerlendirme.........
i. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle Erasmus dişii ikili anlaşmalar Değerlendirme..............

e. Diğer: ................................................................. Değerlendirme..............

13. Herhangi bir uluslararası hareketlilik programına akademisyen olarak katıldınız mı? Eğer katıldıysanız, hangisi?
(Evet / Hayır) ........................................................................................................

14. Kurumunuza Erasmus programının en büyük katkısı size ne olmuştur? (Lütfen uyan tüm
şıkları işaretleyiniz)
 a. Kampüste oluşan çok kültürlü atmosfer
 b. Personelimizle başka bir ülkede akademik deneyim kazandırması
c. Eğitim müfredatında artan İngilizce kullanımı
d. Kolay öğrenci ve personel hareketliliği
e. Dış bir birim tarafından fon sağlanması
 f. Avrupa Birliği’ne giriş sağlaması
g. Kurumumuz için Avrupa genelinde uluslararası bir ön kazandırması
 h. Kurumumuz için dünya genelinde uluslararası bir ön kazandırması
 i. Diğer: ........................................................................................................

15. Türk Yükseköğretiminin uluslararasılaşma temel hedef ve amaçları neler olmalı? (Lütfen
uyan tüm şıkları işaretleyiniz)
 a. Öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini Avrupa‘da yaygınlaştırınmk
 b. Öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini Avrupa ülkeleri dışına yavmak
c. Batı dünyasından öğrenci çekmek
d. Daha az gelişmiş ülkelerden öğrenci çekmek
e. Kısa dönem öğrenci ve personel değişikliği hareketliliğini teşvik etmek
 f. Uzun dönemler için uluslararası personel işe almak
g. Uzun dönemli eğitim (lisans, vb.) için uluslararası öğrenci kabul etmek
 h. Diğer uluslararası üniversitelerle ortak programlar başlatmak
 i. Dünya genelinde uluslararası ortak proje çalışmalarını desteklemek
 j. Dünyadaki diğer ülkelerde kampüsler açmak
k. Türk yükseköğretimini Erasmus’un da ötesine ünlündirmek
 l. Diğer: ........................................................................................................

16. Erasmus Programlarının Türk yükseköğretiminin uluslararasılaşmasındaki rolünü nasıl
değerlendirdirirsiniz?
 a. Son derece önemli .............
 b. Oldukça önemli .............
c. Önemli ..................
d. Biraz önemli .............
e. Önemsiz .............
17. Kurumunuzun Erasmus dışında uluslararası eğitim anlaşımları olan diğer kurumlar nerelerdedir?
   a. Avrupa Birliği (Erasmus dışı)
   b. Kuzey Amerika (Meksika, ABD, Kanada)
   c. Güney Amerika
   d. Balkanlar
   e. Ortadoğu ve Kuzey Afrika
   f. Afrika
   g. Orta Asya
   h. Uzak doğu
   i. Diğer ........................................... 

18. Erasmus’ın kurumunuzun popülaritesini Avrupa dışında da yaymaya etkisi olduğunu düşünüyör musunuz?
    (Evet / Hayır)

19. Yükseköğretimin uluslararasılaşması sizce nasıl olmalı? Şu anda nasıl?
       .............................................................................................................................................. 

20. Türk yükseköğretiminin uluslararasılaşması Erasmus olmadan sizce nasıl görüürdü?
       ..............................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX E

ELECTRONIC SURVEY QUESTIONS IN TURKISH FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Lütfen yandaki boşluğa üniversitenizin adını yazınız ........................................

1. Uluslararası öğrenci ve personel değişimi ile uluslararası projelerden sorumlu ofisiniz resmi adı nedir?
   a. Uluslararası İlişkiler Ofisi
   b. Erasmus & Uluslararası İlişkiler Ofisi
   c. AB Proje Koordinasyon Ofisi
   d. Avrupa Birliği Merkezi ve Erasmus Ofisi
   e. Diğer .................................................................

2. Yukarıda belirtilen ofisten sorumlu koordinatörün görevi nedir? (Lütfen uyan tüm shriları işaretleyiniz)
   a. Erasmus Kurum Koordinatörü
   b. Uluslararası İlişkiler Ofisi Koordinatörü
   c. Diğer .................................................................

3. Hangi programlar aracılığıyla kurumunuzdaki personel ve öğrenciler en çok yurt dışına gidiyor?
   a. Erasmus Hareketlilik Programı
   b. Mevalla Programı
   c. Diğer AB Programları
   d. Diğer .................................................................

4. Üniversite yönetiminden kurumunuzun uluslararası ilişkilerinden sorumlu bir yetkili var mı? Eğer varsa, bu kişinin yönetimdeki görevi nedir?
   (Evet / Hayır) ........................................................................................................

5. Uluslararasılaşma yönetim toplantlarında düzenli olarak dile getirilen bir gündem konusu mu?
   (Evet / Hayır)

6. Erasmus yönetim toplantlarında düzenli olarak dile getirilen bir gündem konusu mu?
   (Evet / Hayır)

7. Uluslararasılaşma hedefleri genellikle Erasmus ile mi bağlantılı (Avrupa Kredi Transfer Sisteminin (AKTS) uygulanması, AB üniversiteleriyle öğrenci ve personel hareketliliği, Avrupa Yüksek Öğretim Alanna katılma, vb.) ? Eğer değilse, diğer hedefler nelerdir?
   (Lütfen farklı uluslararasılaşma hedefleri varsa belirtiniz)
   (Evet / Hayır) ........................................................................................................

8. Yönetim toplantlarında Erasmus dışı uluslararası programlar gündem konusu mu?
   (Evet / Hayır)

9. Kurumunuzun öğrencilerine ve personeline sağladığı Erasmus dışı uluslararası hareketlilik programları var mı?
   (Evet / Hayır)
10. Erasmus dışı programlar için aldığınız fonların Erasmus fonuna genel oranı nedir?
   a. Daha fazla
   b. Daha az
   c. Eşit

11. Kurumunuzun uluslararası ilişkiler/Erasmus ofisinin ilgilendiği uluslararası eğitim programlarının faaliyet alanı nelerdir? (Lütfen uyan tüm şkleri işaretleyiniz)
   a. Erasmus Öğrenci Hareketliliği
   b. Erasmus Akademik Personel Hareketliliği
   c. Erasmus İdari Personel Hareketliliği
   d. Erasmus Staj Hareketliliği
   e. AB Gençlik Projeleri
   f. Avrupa Gönlü Hizmeti Projeleri
   g. AB dışı projeler
   h. Mevlana Öğrenci Hareketliliği
   i. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle Erasmus dışı uluslararası öğrencii ve personel hareketliliğini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
   j. Avrupa harici dünya üniversitelerle uluslararası öğrencii ve personel hareketliliğini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
   k. Diğer: .................................................................

12. 5=en çok, 1=en ölçüne kullanarak hangi uluslararası programın kurumunuzun uluslararasılaşmasına ne derece katkı sağladığını düşündüyorsunuz? (Lütfen uyan tüm şkleri işaretleyiniz) (Eğer kurumuzda uygulamanmayan bir program varsa N.A. yazınız)
   a. Erasmus Öğrenci Hareketliliği Değerlendirme........
   b. Erasmus Akademik Personel Hareketliliği Değerlendirme........
   c. Erasmus İdari Personel Hareketliliği Değerlendirme........
   d. Erasmus Staj Hareketliliği Değerlendirme........
   e. AB Gençlik Projeleri Değerlendirme........
   f. Avrupa Gönlü Hizmeti Projesi Değerlendirme........
   g. AB dışı uluslararası projeler Değerlendirme........
   h. Mevlana Programı Değerlendirme........
   i. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle Erasmus dışı ikili anlaşmalar Değerlendirme........
   j. Avrupa harici dünya üniversiteleriyle uluslararası öğrencii ve personel değişimi sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar Değerlendirme........
   k. Diğer: ................................................................. Değerlendirme........

13. Siz herhangi bir uluslararası hareketlilik programına katıldınız mı? Eğer katıldysanız, hangisi?
   (Evet / Hayır) ........................................................................................................

14. Kurumunuzda Erasmus programının en büyük katkısı sizce ne olmuştur? (Lütfen uyan tüm şkleri işaretleyiniz)
   a. Kampüste oluşan çok kültürlü atmosfer
b. Personelimize başka bir ülkede profesyonel deneyim kazandırması

c. Eğitim müfredatında artan İngilizce kullanımı

d. Kolay öğrenci ve personel hareketliliği

e. Dış bir birim tarafından fon sağlanması

f. Avrupa Birliği’ne giriş sağlaması

g. Kurumumuz için Avrupa genelinde uluslararası bir ün kazandırması

h. Kurumumuz için dünya genelinde uluslararası bir ün kazandırması

i. Diğer

15. Türk Yükseköğretiminin uluslararasılaşma temel hedef ve amaçları neler olmalı? (Lütfen uyandıkları şıkları işaretleyiniz)

a. Öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini Avrupa’da yaygınlaştırılmak

b. Öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini Avrupa ülkeleri dışına yaymak

b. Batı dünyasından öğrenci çekmek

d. Daha az gelişmiş ülkelerden öğrenci çekmek

e. Kısa dönem öğrenci ve personel değişikliği hareketliliğini teşvik etmek

f. Uzun dönemler için uluslararası personel işe almak

g. Uzun dönemli eğitim (lisans, vb.) için uluslararası öğrenci kabul etmek

h. Diğer uluslararası üniversitelerle ortak programlar başlatmak

i. Dünya genelinde uluslararası öğretim projelerini desteklemek

j. Dünyadaki diğer ülkelerde kampüsler açmak

k. Türk yükseköğretimini Erasmus’un da ötesine ünlülemek

l. Diğer

16. Erasmus Programlarının Türk yükseköğretiminin uluslararasılaşmasındaki rolünü nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

a. Son derece önemli ……………

b. Oldukça önemli ……………

c. Önemli ………………….

d. Biraz önemli …………

e. Önemsiz …………

17. Kurumunuzun Erasmus dışı uluslararası eğitim anlaşmaları olan diğer kurumlar nerelerdedir?

a. Avrupa Birliği (Erasmus dışı)

b. Kuzey Amerika (Meksika, ABD, Kanada)

c. Güney Amerika

d. Balkanlar

e. Ortadoğu ve Kuzey Afrika

f. Afrika

g. Orta Asya

h. Uzak doğu

i. Diğer ……………………..
18. Erasmus’un kurumunuzun popülaritesini Avrupa dışında da yaymaya etkisi olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?
   (Evet / Hayır)
19. Yükseköğretimin uluslararasılaşması sizce nasıl olmalı? Şu anda nasıl?
   ........................................................................................................................................
20. Türk yükseköğretiminin uluslararasılaşması Erasmus olmadan sizce nasıl görünürdü?
   ........................................................................................................................................
APPENDIX F

ELECTRONIC SURVEY QUESTIONS IN TURKISH FOR STUDENTS

Lütfen yandaki boşluğu üniversitenizin adını yazınız ……………………………

1. Üniversitenizde öğrenci olarak katılabileceğiniz uluslararası eğitim programları nelerdir? (Lütfen uyan tüm şıkları işaretleyiniz)
   a. Erasmus Öğrenci Hareketliliği
   b. Erasmus Staj Hareketliliği
   c. AB Gençlik Projeleri
   d. Avrupa Gönüllü Hizmeti Projeleri
   e. AB dışı projeler
   f. Mevlana Öğrenci Hareketliliği
   g. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle Erasmus dışı uluslararası öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
   h. Avrupa harici dünya üniversitelerle uluslararası öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
   i. Diğer: ………………………………………………………

2. Üniversiteniz aracılığıyla faydalanabileceğiniz uluslararası staj imkanları nelerdir?
   a. Erasmus Staj Hareketliliği
   b. Üniversitenin Erasmus dışı bağlantıları
   c. Diğer: ………………………………………………………

3. Erasmus programını nasıl öğrendiniz?
   a. Arkadaşlardan
   b. Üniversitenin web sayfasından
   c. Medya
   d. Erasmus Öğrenci bağından
   e. Erasmus Koordinatörlerinden
   f. Uluslararası Öğrenci değişim programı tanıtımda toplantılarında

4. Üniversitenizde Erasmus dışı diğer uluslararası eğitim programlarının tanıtımı oldu mu? (Evet / Hayır)

5. Üniversitenizde öğrencilerin yurtdışına gittikleri en yaygın uluslararası öğrenci hareketliliği programı nedir? (Lütfen uyan tüm maddeleri işaretleyiniz)
   a. Erasmus Öğrenci Hareketliliği
   b. Erasmus Staj Hareketliliği
   c. Gençlik Projeleri
   d. Avrupa Gönüllü Hizmeti Projeleri
   e. AB dışı uluslararası projeler
   f. Mevlana Öğrenci Hareketliliği
   g. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle Erasmus dışı uluslararası öğrenci değişimini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
h. Avrupa harici dünya üniversiteleriyle uluslararası öğrenci değişimi sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
i. Diğer: .................................................................

6. Üniversitenize yurt dışından öğrencilerin geldiği en yaygın uluslararası öğrenci hareketliliği programı nedir? (Lütfen uyan tüm maddeleri işaretleyiniz)
a. Erasmus Öğrenci Hareketliliği
b. Erasmus Staj Hareketliliği
c. Gençlik Projeleri
d. Avrupa Gönüllü Hizmeti Projeleri
e. AB dişı uluslararası projeler
f. Mevlana Öğrenci Hareketliliği
g. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle Erasmus dışı uluslararası öğrenci değişimini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
h. Avrupa harici dünya üniversiteleriyle uluslararası öğrenci değişimini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
i. Diğer: .................................................................

7. Üniversite tarafından Erasmus dışı uluslararası hareketlilik için fon alabiliyor musunuz? (Evet / Hayır)

8. Sizin yurt dışında okumanızı sağlayan en kolay ve güvenilir program sizen hangisidir? (Lütfen uyan tüm şklları işaretleyiniz)
a. Erasmus Öğrenci Hareketliliği
b. Mevlana Öğrenci Hareketliliği
c. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle Erasmus dışı uluslararası öğrenci değişimini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
d. Avrupa harici dünya üniversiteleriyle uluslararası öğrenci değişimini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar
e. Diğer: .................................................................

9. Akademik ve Profesyonel kariyeriniz için hangi program sizen en etkili yurt dışında eğitim programdır? (Lütfen uyan tüm şklları işaretleyiniz)
a. Erasmus Öğrenci Hareketliliği Akademik ...... Profesyonel ......
b. Mevlana Öğrenci Hareketliliği Akademik ...... Profesyonel ......
c. Avrupa üniversiteleriyle Erasmus dışı uluslararası öğrenci değişimini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar Akademik ...... Profesyonel ......
d. Avrupa harici dünya üniversiteleriyle uluslararası öğrenci değişimini sağlayan ikili anlaşmalar Akademik ...... Profesyonel ......
e. Diğer: .................................................................

10. Üniversitenizde bir Erasmus ağı veya topluluğu var mı? (Evet / Hayır)

11. Üniversitenizde uluslararası eğitimle ilgili başka ağlar veya topluluklar var mı? (Evet / Hayır)
12. Üniversitenizdeki çok kültürlü ortama sizen en çok aşağıdakilerden hangisinin katkısı vardır?
   a. Gelen Erasmus Öğrencileri
   b. Uzun-dönemli uluslararası öğrenciler
   c. Erasmus harici değişim öğrencileri
   d. Diğer: ………………………………………………………..

13. Herhangi bir uluslararası hareketlilik programına üniversite öğrencisi olarak katıldınız mı? Eğer katıldığınızı, hangisi?
   (Evet / Hayır) …………………………………………………………………….

14. Kurumunuzda Erasmus programının en büyük katkısı sizen ne olmuştur? (Lütfen uyandıran tüm şıkları işaretleyiniz)
   a. Kampüste oluşan çok kültürlü atmosfer
   b. Bize başka bir ülkede farklı bir eğitim deneyimi kazandırması
   c. Eğitim müfredatında artan İngilizce kullanımı
   d. Kolay öğrenci ve personel hareketliliği
   e. Fon sağlanması
   f. Avrupa Birliği’ne giriş sağlaması
   g. Avrupa genelinde uluslararası bir farkındalık kazandırması
   h. Dünya genelinde uluslararası bir farkındalık kazandırması
   i. Diğer: ………………………………………………………..

15. Türk Yükseköğretiminin uluslararasılaşma temel hedef ve amaçları neler olmalı? (Lütfen uyandıran tüm şıkları işaretleyiniz)
   a. Öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini Avrupa’da yaygınlaştırılmak
   b. Öğrenci ve personel hareketliliğini Avrupa ülkeleri dışına yaymak
   c. Batı dünyasından öğrenci çekmek
   d. Daha az gelişmiş ülkelerden öğrenci çekmek
   e. Kısa dönem öğrenci ve personel değişikliği hareketliliğini teşvik etmek
   f. Uzun dönemler için uluslararası personel işe almak
   g. Uzun dönemli eğitim (lisans, vb.) için uluslararası öğrenci kabul etmek
   h. Diğer uluslararası üniversitelerle ortak programlar başlatmak
   i. Dünya genelinde uluslararası ortak proje çalışmalarını desteklemek
   j. Dünyadaki diğer ülkelerde kampüsler açmak
   k. Türk yükseköğretimini Erasmus’un da ötesine ünlülemek
   l. Diğer: ………………………………………………………..

16. Erasmus Programlarının Türk yükseköğretiminin uluslararasılaşmasıındaki rolünü nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?
   a. Son derece önemli ……………
   b. Oldukça önemli ……………
   c. Önemli ……………
   d. Biraz önemlidir ……………
e. Önemsiz ............
17. Kurumunuzun Erasmus dışı uluslararası eğitim anlaşmaları olan diğer kurumlar nerelerdedir?
   a. Avrupa Birliği (Erasmus dışı)
   b. Kuzey Amerika (Meksika, ABD, Kanada)
   c. Güney Amerika
   d. Balkanlar
   e. Ortadoğu ve Kuzey Afrika
   f. Afrika
   g. Orta Asya
   h. Uzak doğu
   i. Diğer ........................................
18. Erasmus’un kurumunuzun uluslararası eğitim aktivitelerini Avrupa dışında da yaymaya etkisi olduğunu düşünüyor musunuz?
   (Evet / Hayır)
19. Yükseköğretimin uluslararasılaşması sizce nasıl olmalı? Şu anda nasıl?
   ...........................................................................................................................................
20. Türk yükseköğretiminin uluslararasılaşması Erasmus olmadan sizce nasıl görünürdü?
   ...........................................................................................................................................
Dear Sir/Madam,
I am Derya Dogan, an MA candidate in Cross-Cultural and International Education at Bowling Green State University. I am in my second year of my program and currently working on gathering data for my thesis. My thesis is about the perceptions of university academic and administrative staff and the students on internationalization of Turkish higher education along with the extent to which Erasmus program has so far had an impact on and role in this process. As I mentioned above, I am gathering data from academics, university administrative staff and students at Turkish universities.
I would kindly want to ask your participation in this study as your contribution will be priceless. Participation is totally voluntary and it will take maximum 30 minutes to finish the survey. The survey questions are about your experience and opinions pertinent to this internationalization process. It is totally anonymous to participate in this survey. Only the university names and your position will be required since it will make sure that I have enough data from each cluster and different universities. The name of the universities will never be mentioned in the results. You can reach more detailed information about how the results will be generalized in the consent form once you click one of the links below. After reading the consent form, you may still not participate if you do not wish so. Your contribution to this study will help analyzing the course of the internationalization of Turkish higher education with possible suggestions for further development.
You may contact me at deryadil.7@gmail.com for further questions or to see the proposal of the study.
If you are willing to participate, you may click on the correct link which identifies your position below; academics, administrative staff, students. There are three different links for each of those different groups. Please make sure that you click on the right link.
Regards,
Derya Dogan

Academic Staff https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Academic_Staff_English
Administrative Staff https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Administrative_Staff_English
Students https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Students_English
Sayın Yetkili,

Eğer katılma istiyorsanız, size uygun pozisyonu belirten linke tıklayabilirsiniz; akademisyen, idari kadro, öğrenci. Bu üç grup için üç farklı link bulunmaktadır. Lütfen doğru linke tıklamaya özen gösteriniz.

Saygılarımla,
Derya Doğan

Akademik Personel Anket Linki
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Akademik_Personel_Turkce
İdari Personel Anket Linki
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Idari_Personel_Turkce
Öğrenci Anket Linki
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Ogrenci_Turkce
APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT FORM IN ENGLISH

Letter of Informed Consent: Participant

Title of the project: Internationalization of Turkish Higher Education and the Impact of the Erasmus Programme on it

Persons responsible:
- Derya Dogan, MA Candidate in Cross-Cultural and International Education, School of Educational Leadership, Foundations and Policy, Bowling Green State University, Email: dergad@bgsu.edu, Office Phone: +1 (419) 372-3351
- Dr. Bruce Colles, Ph.D. (Thesis Advisor) Associate Professor, School of Educational Leadership, Foundations and Policy, Bowling Green State University, Email: colleba@bgsu.edu, Office Phone: +1 (419) 372-7354

About the study: The purpose of the study is to understand how the internationalization of Turkish higher education started, how it has been implemented and the impact and the role of the Erasmus program in this process. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to participate in a survey concerning your observations, what you have benefited from this process and future recommendations. The survey will take place electronically and will start after you electronically sign it by clicking on the next button at the end of this form.

Benefits: If you agree to participate in this research, you will provide important information concerning internationalization agenda of the Turkish higher education in general and research for the relation between this process and the Erasmus program in particular. The results of this study are likely to include some recommendations for the betterment of this process and may be used to provide literature for further academic studies. As a participant, you will have a clearer idea of the importance of the Erasmus Program in the development of Turkish higher education and will have contributed to its improvement with your feedback on your experience.

Risks: The risk of participation is no greater than that experienced in daily life.

Confidentiality: The information you provide us will be stored electronically on password protected computers of the principal investigator (myself). It will be anonymous (no name will be connected to the data). No one else will have any access to the information. Only the name of the university you are part of and the cluster you belong to in this study will be asked for demographics. The name of the university will not be stated at all in the results of this study however, since there will be other universities from different geographic regions, the results may be revealed based on the region, and the cluster you belong to in the overall results. The results of the surveys will be kept in an electronic file and those files will be destroyed in 5 years after the study is done.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You need to be at least 18 years old to participate. You may withdraw from the survey at any time, and you may choose not to answer any questions. Whether or not you choose to participate will not influence your future relations with the researcher, Bowling Green State University, or your home university. Participation or withdrawal will not affect any rights to which you are entitled. Taking the survey will take maximum 30 minutes to answer. Please clear your internet browser and page history after taking the survey.
APPENDIX J

INFORMED CONSENT FORM IN TURKISH

Katılımcı İzin Formu

Proje Başlığı: Türk Yüksek Öğretiminin uluslararasılaştırılması ve Erasmus Programı'nın etkileri

Yerelki Kişiler:
- Derya Doğan, Kültürlerarası ve Uluslararası Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Bölümü, Eğitimde Liderlik, Temeller ve Politika Programı, Bowling Green State Üniversitesi, Email: deryaadogan@gmail.com, Ofis numarası: +1 (419) 372-3351
- Dr. Bruce Collet, Ph.D. (Tez démarche) Dağıntı, Eğitimde Liderlik, Temeller ve Politika Programı, Bowling Green State Üniversitesi, Email: colletb@bgsm.edu, Ofis numarası: +1 (419) 372-7354


RISKLER: Bu çalışmada yer alan riski gürültü hatası karsılama risklerinden öte değildir.
