

# International student recruitment in policy and practice: A research from Turkey

**DEVRIM VURAL YILMAZ\*** 

Suleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey

#### Abstract

**Aim:** This research aims to make projections about the efforts. Turkish universities are making to attract international students. Some nations like Turkey are actively trying to attract more foreign workers. Managers of international student offices are the focus of the research because they are both policymakers and practitioners and, as a result, have unique perspectives on international recruitment.

**Methodology:** Data were collected from the International Office Directors of Turkish universities via a survey conducted between December 2014 and February 2016. The online survey tool Survey Monkey was used to collect responses.

**Findings:** According to the research conducted, international student offices in Turkish universities are relatively new establishments that lack authority and personnel. In addition, the board members all agreed that universities do not provide enough funding for international outreach. Similarly, many higher education institutions do not systematically plan for international students.

**Implications/Novelty:** There are still significant obstacles that must be carefully addressed before Turkish universities can truly reap the benefits of their increased international student enrollment. Insights into how to solve these issues have been provided by this study, which has brought to light the issues that international students face.

Key Words: International Students, Internationalization in Higher Education, Internationalization Policy, Student Mobility, Turkish Higher Education

Received: 20 December 2016 / Accepted: 18 January 2017 / Published: 22 February 2017

## INTRODUCTION

As a result of their commitment to universality, universities have traditionally attracted a diverse international student body. Still, the profound changes of the 21st century have made the international dimension of higher education a phenomenon of increasing complexity and strategic importance. As a result, the focus of higher education has shifted from the "social, cultural, national" to the "economic, international" in many nations. Both national administrations and educational institutions have made internationalization a priority. Traveling students are a very old phenomenon, and certain regions of the world have a long experience with this form of internationalization. Many former colonies have sent students to their former masters in Europe. Likewise, many students from Latin America travel to the North to continue their education at the graduate level. Some countries in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union established international study programs during the Cold War to attract and educate students from other countries with similar political ideologies. During this time, the Atlantic community also grew through increased educational exchange between the United States and Western Europe (Van Damme 2001). Thus, political and academic factors have always favored global mobility. In recent years, however, there have been dramatic shifts in the scale and composition of international student mobility. Education abroad has grown in size, breadth, and complexity at an unprecedented rate as globalization has emerged as the dominant trend.

Since the early stages, the total number of international students has increased dramatically worldwide. Foreign students increased from 0.8 million in 1975 to 4.5 million in 2012. By 2025, there will likely be 7.2 million students participating annually in international or cross-border student mobility (OECD 2014). In 2012, 16.4 percent of international students studied in the United States, followed by Germany (6.4%), France (6%), and Australia (5.5%). For the countries that benefit from international education, it has also generated a substantial

© 2017 The Author(s). Published by JARSSH. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: Devrim Vural Yilmaz

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Email: devrimvural@sdu.edu.tr

financial resource. International students added an estimated \$10 billion to the UK's economy in 2015. Over 400 billion dollars in annual revenue is expected to be generated from the international student market worldwide. Again, it was estimated that international students brought in 21 billion USD in revenue to the United States each year, which was more than NASA's budget for the year (Turkish Ministry of Development 2015).

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

Traditionally universities in the North America and Europe have shared the biggest proportion of international students, yet in recent years countries like Singapore, China, Malaysia, Japan, Jordan and Korea have also expanded the number of international students. Knowing that people with higher levels of education are more likely to migrate and contribute to the economy of receiving country, governments around the world are introducing policies to attract "the most talented migrants". Internationalization, once seen simply as a marginal issue and a matter of cultural exchange, is now a necessary mechanism to increase the number of international students, especially graduate research students (Stensaker et al. 2008). Universities aim at recruiting more international students both as a means of generating income and of adding diversity to the student body.

Beside traditional receiving countries, universities in other countries have made various efforts to recruit more international students both as a means of generating income and as a means of adding diversity to the student body (Altbach and Knight 2007). Turkey is one of these countries attempting to increase international recruitment and to improve conditions of international students. As for the academic year 2014-2015, international students are more than 70.000 in Turkey, an increased but insufficient number when potential of the country is taken into account. Turkmenistan has the largest number of students in Turkey, followed by Azerbaijan and Iran, according to the data from Turkey's Council of Higher Education. Africa's share has also increased in the last years due to Turkey's policy toward the continent, which involves outreach and financial aid. 80 percent of international students in Turkey attend state universities, while 20 percent of them enrolled in foundation (private) universities in the 2013-2014 academic year (Turkish Ministry of Development 2015).

Despite the expansion of Turkish higher education and the country's steady path toward its enrolment targets, there are some challenges that need to be addressed. Studying abroad involves various processes from application to graduation, even after graduation. Application procedures, visa requirements, accommodation, language, study programs, staff and students in host institution, campus environment and city are among the factors that all shape study abroad experience. Thus, there is a growing need for the development of innovative and well-conceptualized programs for promotion, management, and guidance of international students. In this regard, there are many studies carried out with the international students to obtain feedback on their study abroad experiences in Turkey (Kondakci 2011; Mahmut 2012; Ozoglu, Gur, and Coskun 2012; Snoubar and Celik 2013; Turkish Ministry of Development 2015; UAK 2016; YOK 2014; Ozyurek and Uluturk 2016). Yet, there is a second group of people who also experience international student recruitment in practice, that is to say, the staff working in international student offices. International office staff play a three-dimensional role regarding international student recruitment. They put the national policies into practice, they shape institutional strategies and they deal with international students in many aspects. Thus, evaluations and recommendations of international office staff are important and should be taken into consideration in policy processes. This study aims at providing a contribution for both researchers and policy makers through a survey held with international student office managers in Turkish universities.

#### METHODOLOGY

Data for this study were collected between December 2014 and February 2016 from the International Office Directors of Turkish universities. At the time that survey was held, the number of universities was 176 and to ensure the quality of the research, 100% sampling was taken in questionnaire and the link to the questionnaire was sent to international office directors of all Turkish universities. Survey questions were formed in the light of literature, international student reports and the issues discussed in related national/ international meetings that the researcher participated in. In addition, survey was previewed by Suleyman Demirel University international student office managers. Questionnaires were administered using the Survey Monkey web-based software package. An information e-mail was sent to all directors in Turkish universities which contained information about researcher,



the goal and content of the survey. After a twoweek monitoring, a second reminder e-mail was sent to coordinators. At the end of two-month duration, 64 international office directors completed the survey. The limited participation of directors is one of the limitations of the study. Besides, survey was designed as a short one with limited number of questions for the sake of simplicity for respondents who have a heavy workload. This has limited the possibility of a deeper analysis and to decrease this limitation, open-ended questions were put at the end of the survey.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The survey questions could be divided into three general categories; institutional features, international student strategy and difficulties of study abroad. Accordingly, findings are presented in this order in the following sections.

#### **Institutional Features**

Among the directors who participated in the survey, 58% work in state universities, while the other 42% work in foundation universities. 19 participant universities were established before the year 2000, and remaining 45 universities after that year. Thus majority of the universities explored in the study were new universities. Nearly 65% of the universities have less than 10,000 students. As regards to international student offices, approximately 80% of them were established after the year 2010. Among the directors who participated in the study, 24 directors had more than 3-year experience in the Office and remaining ones had less. Thus, an overview of institutional features revealed that international student offices were relatively newly established and directors were also new at their posts. Next few questions focused on the statute and conditions of the offices. Results were given below:

	Table 1: I	nstitutional features			
Q. 1. What is the sta	tute of your Office?				
Type of Institution	A unit of International Office	A unit of Registrar's Office	An independent International Student Office		
State	51.43%	25.71%	22.86%		
	18	9	8		
Foundation	63.16%	15.79%	21.05%		
	12	3	4		
Q.2. What should be	the statute of your Office?				
Type of Institution	A unit of International Office	A unit of Registrar's Office	An independent International Student Office		
State	%33.33	%18.18	%51.52		
	11	6	17		
Foundation	%40.00	%4.00	%56.00		
	10	1	14		
Q.3. Do you think the	hat the number of staff in your Of	fice is adequate?			
Type of Institution	Yes	No			
State	%16.67	%83.33			
	6	30			
Foundation	%24.00	%76.00			
	6	19			
Q.4. Do you think the	at the infrastructure (building, co	omputers, other materials etc.) a	are adequate?		
Type of Institution	Yes	No			
State	%60.00	%40.00			
	21	14			
Foundation	%73.08	%26.92			
	19	7			

Both in state and in foundation universities, international student offices were established as a unit working under the international office. Yet, more than half of the directors agree that international student offices should be organized as autonomous offices. Approximately 70% of respondents recorded that the infrastructure of their



offices were adequate. On the other hand, the numbers of the staff were regarded as insufficient by both state and foundation universities. Directors at state universities were more dissatisfied with the infrastructure and human resources in the Office.

# **International Student Strategy**

Following questions were asked to explore international student strategy of participant universities. Findings are as following:

Q.1. Do you think that your university allocates sufficient resources for promotion abroad?         Type of Institution       Yes       No         State       % 86.49         5       32         Foundation       % 86.49         II       IG         Q.2. Are there any special international student recruitment policies in your university?         Type of Institution       Yes       No         State       % 51.35       % 48.65         IP       18         Foundation       % 50.26       % 40.74         I (B       III       III       III       III         Q.3. Which level of study takes the first place in your international student strategy?       Type of Institution       Associate       Bache-       Master's       Doctorate         I (PA       X3.51       % 78.38       % 40.54       % 13.51       %         YE       Z       29       1	Table 2: International student strategy								
Same tabular%13.51%86.49532Foundation%40.74%59.261116Q.2. Are there any special intermational student remained to the there and special intermation in the there and special intermation in the there and special intermation i	Q.1. Do you think the	hat your unive	ersity allocate	s sufficient res	sources for pro-	omotion abroad?			
532Foundation $\%40.74$ $\%59.26$ 1116Q.2. Are there any special intermativation basesType of InstitutionYesNoState $\%51.35$ $\%48.65$ 1918Foundation $659.26$ $640.74$ 1011Q.3. Which level of study takes the first place in your intermativation basesType of InstitutionAssociateBacheMaster'sDoctorateType of InstitutionAssociateBacheMaster'sDoctorateType of InstitutionAssociateBacheMaster'sDoctorateType of InstitutionAssociateBacheMaster'sDoctorateType of InstitutionAssociateBacheMaster'sDoctorateType of InstitutionAssociateBacheMiddleNTric Re-Foundation $\%11.11$ $\%51.351$	Type of Institution	Yes	No						
Foundation%40.74%59.261116Q.2. Are there any sectal internal students introduced internal students in your inversity?Type of InstitutionYesNetState%48.651018Foundation%59.26%48.65Foundation%59.26%40.741611Q.3. Which level of trutta takesBachenMaster'sState%13.51%78.38%40.54Yes%13.51%78.38%40.54State%13.51%78.33%3.73State%11.11%85.19%33.33611Yes%14.54%13.51State%13.51%13.53State%13.51%13.3370155Foundation%14.54%13.5371%14.54%14.5471%85.19%14.5472%14.54%14.5473%2%2.64%14.11%85.19%14.54%14.11%14.54%14.5474%14.54%14.5474%14.54%14.5474%14.54%14.5474%14.54%14.5474%14.54%14.5475%14.54%14.5475%15.38%15.3876%14.54%14.5475%15.38%15.3476%14.54%14.5476%14.54%14.5476%14.54%14.5476 <td>State</td> <td>%13.51</td> <td>%86.49</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	State	%13.51	%86.49						
Interpretation       16         Q.2. Are there any sectal interminational student recruitment policies in your university?       Type of Institution       Yes       No         Type of Institution       Yes       No       State $\%51.35$ $\%48.65$ State $\%59.26$ $\%48.65$ $548.65$ $548.65$ $548.65$ Foundation $\%59.26$ $\%40.74$ $-16$ $11$ Q.3. Which level of study takes the first place in your intermitoral student strategy? $548.65$ $568.668.668.668.668.668.668.668.668.668.$		5	32						
Q.2. Are there any special interview structure structur	Foundation	%40.74	%59.26						
Type of Institution StateYesNoState $\%51.35$ $\%48.65$ 1918Foundation $\%59.26$ $\%40.74$ 1611Q.3. Which level of study takes the first place in your interminational student strategy?Type of InstitutionAssociateBache-Master'slor'sState $\%13.51$ $\%13.51$ $\%78.38$ $\%40.54$ $\%13.51$ $5$ Foundation $\%11.11$ $\%85.19$ $\%33.33$ $\%23$ $9$ $7$ $23$ $9$ $1$ $7$ $23$ $9$ $1$ $7$ $7$ $7$ $7$ $8$ $9$ $8$ $9$ $7$ $9$ $8$ $9$ $8$ $9$ $9$ $1$ <		11	16						
Nome integration%51.35%48.65%48.651918Foundation%59.26%40.741611Q.3. Which level of study takes the first place 'n vinternation' integration' integr	Q.2. Are there any special international student recruitment policies in your university?								
1918Foundation19640.74 $3.50.26$ $640.74$ $16$ $1$ Q.3. Which level $5$ trust takes trust purce trust intermetation $1$ for $1$ Operating the end of	Type of Institution	Yes	No						
Foundation 16 $\%$ 99.26 $\%$ 40.74161Q.3. Which level $3$ tytakes $3$ trist place $3$ trist pla	State	%51.35	%48.65						
1611Q.3. Which level of Uy takes $+$ irst place $+$ vor interval student $+$ variable $+$ v		19	18						
Q.3. Which level of study takes the first place in your international student strategy?         Type of Institution       Associate       Bache- lor's       Master's       Doctorate         State $\%13.51$ $\%78.38$ $\%40.54$ $\%13.51$ $=$	Foundation	%59.26	%40.74						
Type of InstitutionAssociateBache- lor'sMaster's lor'sDoctorateState $\%13.51$ $\%78.38$ $\%40.54$ $\%13.51$ $5$ $29$ $15$ $5$ Foundation $\%11.11$ $\%85.19$ $\%33.33$ $\%3.70$ $3$ $23$ $9$ $1$ Q.4. What are the main countries $f$ origin of the international $mitorian internationalmitorian internationalType of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-AsiaThe USAAfricaLatinEuropeEastpublicstriesmitorian internationalmitorian internationalmitorian internationalmitorian internationalState\%54.29\%68.57\%85.71\%31.43\%22.86\%0.00\%37.14\%0.00Poundation1924301180130Foundation\%53.85\%76.92\%69.23\%42.31\%15.38\%11.54\%34.62\%0.00Q.5. Which regions take the first ranks in your transional strategy:TreeIIAIAType of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-AsiaThe USAAfricaLatinII0IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII$		16	11						
Ior'sState $\%13.51$ $\%78.38$ $\%40.54$ $\%13.51$ $5$ Foundation $\%11.11$ $\%85.19$ $\%33.33$ $\%3.70$ $3$ $23$ $9$ $1$ Q.4. What are the matrix countries of origin of the international students in your university?Type of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-AsiaAfricaLatinEuropeEastpublicstries $$	Q.3. Which level of	study takes t	he first place i	n your interna	tional student	strategy?			
State         %13.51         %78.38         %40.54         %13.51           5         29         15         5           Foundation         %11.11         %85.19         %33.33         %3.70           3         23         9         1           Q.4. What are the memory countries of rigin of the international students in vertices into the students in vertices into the students in vertices into the students in vertices in i	Type of Institution	Associate	Bache-	Master's	Doctorate				
529155Foundation $\%11.11$ $\%85.19$ $\%33.33$ $\%3.70$ 32391Q.4. What are the maximum countries or trigin of triginstridents in surface in the maximum contriginstridents in surface in the maximum contriginsType of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic ReEU coun-AsiaAfricaLatin AmericaState $\%54.29$ $\%68.57$ $\%85.71$ $\%31.43$ $\%22.86$ $\%0.00$ $\%37.14$ $\%0.00$ Foundation $19$ 24 $30$ 11 $8$ $0$ $13$ $0$ Foundation $\%53.85$ $\%76.92$ $\%69.23$ $\%42.31$ $\%15.38$ $\%11.54$ $\%34.62$ $\%0.00$ Q.5. Which regionstermstermstermstermstermstermsType of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-Asia $61.13$ $0$ Q.5. Which regionstermstermstermstermstermstermsType of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-AsiaAfricaLatinAmericafato $publics$ tirestermstermstermstermsState $\%56.25$ $\%50.00$ $\%90.63$ $\%75.00$ $\%15.63$ $\%3.13$ $\%12.50$ $\%3.13$ AfricaIa1629245141Foundation $\%58.33$ $\%70.83$ $\%66.67$ $\%62.50$ $\%16.67$ $\%8.33$ $\%16.67$			lor's						
Foundation $\%11.11$ $\%85.19$ $\%33.33$ $\%3.70$ 32391Q.4. What are the matrix countries of origin of the international students in your university?Type of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-AsiaThe USAAfricaLatin AmericaState $\%54.29$ $\%68.57$ $\%85.71$ $\%31.43$ $\%22.86$ $\%0.00$ $\%37.14$ $\%0.00$ 1924301180130Foundation $\%53.85$ $\%76.92$ $\%69.23$ $\%42.31$ $\%15.38$ $\%11.54$ $\%34.62$ $\%0.00$ 142018114390Q.5. Which regionsEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-AsiaThe USAAfricaLatin AmericaState $\%56.25$ $\%0.00$ $\%9.63$ $\%42.31$ $\%15.38$ $\%11.54$ $\%34.62$ $\%0.00$ Q.5. Which regionsEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-AsiaThe USAAfricaLatin AmericaState $\%56.25$ $\%50.00$ $\%90.63$ $\%75.00$ $\%15.63$ $\%3.13$ $\%12.50$ $\%3.13$ State $\%56.25$ $\%50.00$ $\%90.63$ $\%75.00$ $\%15.63$ $\%3.13$ $\%12.50$ $\%3.13$ I81629245141Foundation $\%58.33$ $\%70.83$ $\%66.67$ $\%62.50$ $\%16.67$ $\%8.33$ $\%16.67$ $\%0.00$	State	%13.51	%78.38	%40.54	%13.51				
32391Q.4. What are the $=$ countries $=$ origin of the transional statements is understand statements is understand statements in the transition of		5	29	15	5				
Q.4. What are the main countries of origin of the international students in your university?         Type of Institution       Eastern       Middle       Turkic Re-       EU coun-       Asia       The USA       Africa       Latin         Europe       East       publics       tries       The USA       Africa       Manerica         State       %54.29       %68.57       %85.71       %31.43       %22.86       %0.00       %37.14       %0.00         19       24       30       11       8       0       13       0         Foundation       %53.85       %76.92       %69.23       %42.31       %15.38       %11.54       %34.62       %0.00         Q.5. Which regions take the first ranks in your international student strategy?       Type of Institution       Eastern       Middle       Turkic Re-       EU coun-       Asia       The USA       Africa       Latin         Q.5. Which regions take the first ranks in your international student strategy?       Type of Institution       Eastern       Middle       Turkic Re-       EU coun-       Asia       Africa       Latin         Q.5. Which regions       Eastern       Middle       Turkic Re-       EU coun-       Asia       The USA       Africa       Latin         State	Foundation	%11.11	%85.19	%33.33	%3.70				
Type of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic Re- publicsEU coun- riesAsiaThe USAAfricaLatin AmericaState $\%54.29$ $\%68.57$ $\%85.71$ $\%31.43$ $\%22.86$ $\%0.00$ $\%37.14$ $\%0.00$ 1924301180130Foundation $\%53.85$ $\%76.92$ $\%69.23$ $\%42.31$ $\%15.38$ $\%11.54$ $\%34.62$ $\%0.00$ 142018114390Q.5. Which regions $ke$ the first $krist$ in your $krist$ remational $krist$ $krist$ The USAAfricaLatin AmericaType of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-AsiaThe USAAfricaLatin AmericaState $\%56.25$ $\%50.00$ $\%90.63$ $\%75.00$ $\%15.63$ $\%3.13$ $\%12.50$ $\%3.13$ State $\%56.25$ $\%50.00$ $\%90.63$ $\%75.00$ $\%15.63$ $\%3.13$ $\%12.50$ $\%3.13$ Foundation $\%58.33$ $\%70.83$ $\%66.67$ $\%62.50$ $\%16.67$ $\%8.33$ $\%16.67$ $\%0.00$		3	23	9	1				
America       Europe       East       publics       tries       America         State       %54.29       %68.57       %85.71       %31.43       %22.86       %0.00       %37.14       %0.00         19       24       30       11       8       0       13       0         Foundation       %53.85       %76.92       %69.23       %42.31       %15.38       %11.54       %34.62       %0.00         14       20       18       11       4       3       9       0         Q.5. Which regions take the first ranks in your international student strategy?       Type of Institution       Eastern       Middle       Turkic Re-       EU coun-       Asia       The USA       Africa       Latin         State       %56.25       %50.00       %90.63       %75.00       %15.63       %3.13       %12.50       %3.13         State       %56.25       %50.00       %90.63       %75.00       %15.63       %3.13       %12.50       %3.13         18       16       29       24       5       1       4       1         Foundation       %58.33       %70.83       %66.67       %62.50       %16.67       %8.33       %16.67       %0.00	Q.4. What are the m	nain countries	of origin of t	he internationa	al students in	your university?			
State         %54.29         %68.57         %85.71         %31.43         %22.86         %0.00         %37.14         %0.00           Poundation         19         24         30         11         8         0         13         0           Foundation         %53.85         %76.92         %69.23         %42.31         %15.38         %11.54         %34.62         %0.00           Q.5. Which regions         ike the first ranks in your international student strategy?         11         4         30         9         0           Q.5. Which regions         ike the first ranks in your international student strategy?         Type of Institution         Eastern         Middle         Turkic Re-         EU coun-         Asia         The USA         Africa         Latin           Europe         East         publics         tries         -         America           State         %56.25         %50.00         %90.63         %75.00         %15.63         %3.13         %12.50         %3.13           I8         16         29         24         5         1         4         1           Foundation         %58.33         %70.83         %66.67         %62.50         %16.67         %8.33         %16.67	Type of Institution	Eastern	Middle	Turkic Re-	EU coun-	Asia	The USA	Africa	Latin
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Europe	East	publics	tries				America
Foundation         %53.85         %76.92         %69.23         %42.31         %15.38         %11.54         %34.62         %0.00           14         20         18         11         4         3         9         0           Q.5. Which regions         take the first ranks in your international student strategy?         Type of Institution         Eastern         Middle         Turkic Re-         EU coun-         Asia         The USA         Africa         Latin           Europe         East         publics         tries	State	%54.29	%68.57	%85.71	%31.43	%22.86	%0.00	%37.14	%0.00
14       20       18       11       4       3       9       0         Q.5. Which regions       ke the first trust in your international structures trust structures.       5 </td <td></td> <td>19</td> <td>24</td> <td>30</td> <td>11</td> <td>8</td> <td>0</td> <td>13</td> <td>0</td>		19	24	30	11	8	0	13	0
Q.5. Which regions take the first ranks in your international student strategy?Type of InstitutionEasternMiddleTurkic Re-EU coun-AsiaThe USAAfricaLatinEuropeEastpublicstriesAfricaLatinAmericaState%56.25%50.00%90.63%75.00%15.63%3.13%12.50%3.13181629245141Foundation%58.33%70.83%66.67%62.50%16.67%8.33%16.67%0.00	Foundation	%53.85	%76.92	%69.23	%42.31	%15.38	%11.54	%34.62	%0.00
Type of Institution         Eastern         Middle         Turkic Re- East         EU coun- publics         Asia         The USA         Africa         Latin           State         %56.25         %50.00         %90.63         %75.00         %15.63         %3.13         %12.50         %3.13           18         16         29         24         5         1         4         1           Foundation         %58.33         %70.83         %66.67         %62.50         %16.67         %8.33         %16.67         %0.00		14	20	18	11	4	3	9	0
Europe         East         publics         tries         America           State         %56.25         %50.00         %90.63         %75.00         %15.63         %3.13         %12.50         %3.13           18         16         29         24         5         1         4         1           Foundation         %58.33         %70.83         %66.67         %62.50         %16.67         %8.33         %16.67         %0.00	Q.5. Which regions take the first ranks in your international student strategy?								
State         % 56.25         % 50.00         % 90.63         % 75.00         % 15.63         % 3.13         % 12.50         % 3.13           18         16         29         24         5         1         4         1           Foundation         % 58.33         % 70.83         % 66.67         % 62.50         % 16.67         % 8.33         % 16.67         % 0.00	Type of Institution	Eastern	Middle	Turkic Re-	EU coun-	Asia	The USA	Africa	Latin
18         16         29         24         5         1         4         1           Foundation         %58.33         %70.83         %66.67         %62.50         %16.67         %8.33         %16.67         %0.00		Europe	East	publics	tries				America
Foundation         %58.33         %70.83         %66.67         %62.50         %16.67         %8.33         %16.67         %0.00	State	%56.25	%50.00	%90.63	%75.00	%15.63	%3.13	%12.50	%3.13
		18	16	29	24	5	1	4	1
14 17 16 15 4 2 4 0	Foundation	%58.33	%70.83	%66.67	%62.50	%16.67	%8.33	%16.67	%0.00
		14	17	16	15	4	2	4	0

As for the international student strategy, more than 50% of the respondents recorded that there was no particular strategy for international students in their universities. Similarly, majority of the respondents believed that their institutions did not allocate sufficient resources for promotion abroad. This ratio was approximately 60% for foundation universities, whereas it increased to a very high degree (86%) for state universities. Thus, it could be said that both state and foundation universities lack a strong international student strategy supported by financial resources for promotion abroad. When the target regions for international student recruitment was explored, Middle East and Turkic Republics were recorded as the main target for universities and majority of international students came from those countries. As for the level of study, universities focused on bachelor's and master's degree students as their primary target. The next section of the survey focused on the difficulties regarding international student recruitment processes for both international offices and international students. Main findings have been analyzed in



the following section.

# Difficulties Confronted During Study Abroad Period

In this section, first three questions were asked for exploring difficulties confronted by international student offices.

Table 3: Difficulties confronted by the international student office							
Problems regarding application and admission							
Type of Institution	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Total		
State	%37.14	%48.57	%5.71	%8.57	%56.45		
	13	17	2	3	35		
Foundation	%48.15	%33.33	%14.81	%3.70	%43.55		
	13	9	4	1	27		
Problems regarding registration							
Type of Institution	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Total		
State	%42.86	%45.71	%5.71	%5.71	%56.45		
	15	16	2	2	35		
Foundation	%33.33	%37.04	%22.22	%7.41	%43.55		
	9	10	6	2	27		
Problems regarding academic issues							
Type of Institution	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Total		
State	%22.86	%25.71	%45.71	%5.71	%56.45		
	8	9	16	2	35		
Foundation	%22.22	%37.04	%37.04	%3.70	%43.55		
	6	10	10	1	27		

Table 4: Difficulties confronted by the international students							
Problems regarding application and registration							
Type of the University	Low	Medium	ledium High Very high				
State	%38.24	%50.00	%2.94	%8.82			
	13	17	1	3			
Foundation	%38.46	%34.62	%26.92	%0.00			
	10	9	7	0			
Financial problems							
	Low	Medium	High	Very high			
State	%8.57	%37.14	%48.57	%5.71			
	3	13	17	2			
Foundation	%12.00	%52.00	%24.00	%12.00			
	3	13	6	3			
Accomodation							
	Low	Medium	High	Very high			
State	%0.00	%45.71	%51.43	%2.86			
	0	16	18	1			
Foundation	%28.00	%32.00	%36.00	%4.00			
	7	8	9	1			



Language         Low         Medium         High         Very high           State         %5.71         %31.43         %37.14         %25.71           2         11         13         9           Foundation         %15.38         %34.62         %42.31         %7.69           4         9         11         2           Academic success         Low         Medium         High         Very high           State         %22.86         %28.57         %34.29         %14.29           State         %22.86         %28.57         %34.29         %14.29           Foundation         %28.00         %36.00         %0.00         %0.00           7         9         9         0            Adaptation to social life         Low         Medium         High         Very high           State         %22.86         %62.86         %11.43         %2.86           State         %22.86         %62.86         %11.43         %2.86           8         22         4         1	Table 4: Contii							
State       % 5.71       % 31.43       % 37.14       % 25.71         2       11       13       9         Foundation       % 15.38       % 34.62       % 42.31       % 7.69         4       9       11       2         Academic success         11       2         State       Low       Medium       High       Very high         State       % 22.86       % 28.57       % 34.29       % 14.29         8       10       12       5         Foundation       % 28.00       % 36.00       % 0.00         7       9       9       0         Adaptation to social life       Low       Medium       High       Very high         State       % 22.86       % 62.86       % 11.43       % 2.86         8       22       4       1	Language							
2       11       13       9         Foundation       %15.38       %34.62       %42.31       %7.69         4       9       11       2         Academic success       Low       Medium       High       Very high         State       %22.86       %28.57       %34.29       %14.29         State       %28.00       %36.00       %36.00       %0.00         Foundation       %28.00       %36.00       %0.00       %0.00         7       9       9       0       0         Adaptation to social life       Low       Medium       High       Very high         State       2       %22.86       %62.86       %11.43       %2.86         8       22       4       1       1       1       1       1		Low	Medium	High	Very high			
Foundation $\% 15.38$ $\% 34.62$ $\% 42.31$ $\% 7.69$ A9112Academic successLowMediumHighVery highState $\% 22.86$ $\% 28.57$ $\% 34.29$ $\% 14.29$ Academic success $\% 28.00$ $\% 36.00$ $\% 36.00$ $\% 0.00$ Augustation to social lifeLowMediumHighVery highStateLowMediumHighVery highState $\% 22.86$ $\% 62.86$ $\% 11.43$ $\% 2.86$ State $\% 22.86$ $\% 62.86$ $\% 11.43$ $\% 2.86$	State	%5.71	%31.43	%37.14	%25.71			
49112Academic successLowMediumMacturHighVery high%22.86%28.57%34.29%28.00%28.00%36.00%28.00%36.00%36.00%20%28.00%36.00%20%36.00%36.00%20%28.00%36.00%20%28.00%36.00%20%28.00%36.00%20%28.00%36.00%20%28.00%36.00%20%28.00%36.00%20%22.86%11.43%20%22.86%22.86%20%22.86%22.86%20%22.86%22.86%20%22.86%11.43%20%22.86%22.86%		2	11	13	9			
Academic success       Low       Medium       High       Very high         State       %22.86       %28.57       %34.29       %14.29         8       10       12       5         Foundation       %28.00       %36.00       %0.00         7       9       9       0         Adaptation to social life       Low       Medium       High       Very high         State       %22.86       %62.86       %11.43       %2.86         8       22       4       1	Foundation	%15.38	%34.62	%42.31	%7.69			
LowMediumHighVery highState $\%22.86$ $\%28.57$ $\%34.29$ $\%14.29$ 810125Foundation $\%28.00$ $\%36.00$ $\%36.00$ $\%0.00$ 7990Adaptation to social lifeLowMediumHighVery highState $\%22.86$ $\%62.86$ $\%11.43$ $\%2.86$ 82241		4	9	11	2			
State       %22.86       %28.57       %34.29       %14.29         8       10       12       5         Foundation       %28.00       %36.00       %36.00       %0.00         7       9       9       0         Adaptation to social life       Low       Medium       High       Very high         State       %22.86       %62.86       %11.43       %2.86         8       22       4       1	Academic success							
8         10         12         5           Foundation         %28.00         %36.00         %36.00         %0.00           7         9         9         0           Adaptation to social life              State         Medium         High         Very high           %22.86         %62.86         %11.43         %2.86           8         22         4         1		Low	Medium	High	Very high			
Foundation       %28.00       %36.00       %0.00         7       9       9       0         Adaptation to social life            State       Low       Medium       High       Very high         %22.86       %62.86       %11.43       %2.86         8       22       4       1	State	%22.86	%28.57	%34.29	%14.29			
7       9       9       0         Adaptation to social life            Low       Medium       High       Very high         State       %62.86       %11.43       %2.86         8       22       4       1		8	10	12	5			
Adaptation to social lifeLowMediumHighVery highState%22.86%62.86%11.43%2.8682241	Foundation	%28.00	%36.00	%36.00	%0.00			
Low         Medium         High         Very high           State         %22.86         %62.86         %11.43         %2.86           8         22         4         1		7	9	9	0			
State         %22.86         %62.86         %11.43         %2.86           8         22         4         1	Adaptation to social life							
8 22 4 1		Low	Medium	High	Very high			
	State	%22.86	%62.86	%11.43	%2.86			
Foundation %30.77 %57.69 %11.54 %0.00		8	22	4	1			
	Foundation	%30.77	%57.69	%11.54	%0.00			
8 15 3 0		8	15	3	0			
Negative attitudes of academic staff	Negative attitudes of academic staff							
Low Medium High Very high		Low	Medium	High	Very high			
State %74.29 %20.00 %5.71 %0.00	State	%74.29	%20.00	%5.71	%0.00			
26 7 2 0		26	7	2	0			
Foundation %88.00 %12.00 %0.00 %0.00	Foundation	%88.00	%12.00	%0.00	%0.00			
22 3 0 0		22	3	0	0			
Negative attitudes of students	Negative attitudes of students							
Low Medium High Very high		Low	Medium	High	Very high			
State %85.71 %14.29 %0.00 %0.00	State	%85.71	%14.29	%0.00	%0.00			
30 5 0 0		30	5	0	0			
Foundation %80.00 %16.00 %4.00 %0.00	Foundation	%80.00	%16.00	%4.00	%0.00			
20 4 1 0		20	4	1	0			
Negative attitudes of people in the city	Negative attitudes of people in the city							
Low Medium High Very high		Low	Medium	High	Very high			
State %64.71 %29.41 %2.94 %2.94	State	%64.71	%29.41	-				
22 10 1 1		22	10	1	1			
Foundation %79.17 %12.50 %8.33 %0.00	Foundation	%79.17	%12.50	%8.33	%0.00			
19 3 2 0		19	3	2	0			

T-1-1- 4. C ...

In general, directors agreed that the difficulties related to admission and registration processes were at lower levels. Yet, issues regarding academic success of students were more problematic according to the directors. 45% of state universitiy directors perceived academic issues as problematic. Thus, it could be inferred that international student offices are more convenient with the issues directly managed by them, yet they find difficult to deal with academic problems of international students which necessitate cooperation with other units of the university. Last questions were devoted to understand difficulties that international students face during their study period. Findings are given in Table 4.

In order to find out the most significant problems of international students, their answers on the level of difficulties were put in order by summing up the ratios for "high+very high" and the following results were found: The most challenging matter for international students is the language barrier. Approximately 63% of respondents rated language problem as high and very high. Second problematic area is financial problems which 55% of



respondents rated at high and very high degree. Another challenging issue arises from the accommodation problems. Accomodation was rated nearly as important as the financial problems and language barrier. International students have opportunity to stay in the dormitories, yet problems related to the capacity and conditions of state dormitories have been a concern for local students as well. On the other hand, in many Anatolian cities' apartment rents are very high and difficult to afford for particularly students coming from low income countries.

Academic success was depicted as another important problem by approximately 44% of respondents. This is in conformity with the findings recorded in the previous question which revealed that international student offices had difficulty in dealing with academic matters of the students. Inclusion of students in town and campus life is another important issue regarding international students. Participants did not report discrimination and negative attitudes toward international students. Yet, adaptation to social life was regarded as a medium-level problematic issue by 63% of the respondents.

## CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Main findings of the survey reveal that international student offices in Turkish universities are newly established units and suffer from lack of autonomy and insufficient human resources, at most. Besides, directors agreed that universities do not allocate sufficient resources for promotion abroad. Similarly, an important portion of universities has no international student strategy. Thus, it could be said that there is need for reviewing and reorganizing international student policy at both national and institutional level. International student offices should be organized as autonomous units and supported both by financial and human resources. It was also stated in open-ended questions that there is no clear definition regarding responsibilities of these offices which in turn results in overlapping duties with other units of the university. Thus, responsibilities and authorities of international student offices must be well-defined in order to develop a more institutionalized structure.

As for the problems of international students, the most important ones are language, finance, accommodation, academic success and inclusion in social life. Students who come from relatively low income countries perceive Turkey as an affordable alternative for studying abroad compared to traditional receiving countries, but they still suffer from lack of financial resources.

Financial problems mainly stem from insufficient financial resources, limited opportunities for scholarships and lack of part-time jobs. Accommodation is also another important problem, as rents are very high and dormitories are insufficient. Indeed financial matters and accommodation facilities are usually out of the reach of universities and necessitate more complex policies at governmental level. Yet, universities should develop cooperation with the NGOs and private sector to increase scholarships and job opportunities for international students in their region.

In this regard, scholarships from both state and private institutions should be increased for local and international students. Anatolian cities should become more attractive for international students. There should be cooperation mechanisms and planning among universities, local governments and NGOs to improve these cities as attraction centers for international students with their living standards and opportunities.

Findings reveal that international students have difficulties in integrating to academic life and major barrier for academic success is language. This is one of the most important reasons for academic failure and has to be taken seriously. Indeed, findings revealed that students assessed Turkish courses as inadequate. Thus, for contributing to academic success of incoming students, Turkish language training has to be improved and designed in line with the academic needs of international students.

Above mentioned findings reveal that although Turkish universities have recorded an important success in attracting more international students, there are still some challenges that need to be carefully addressed. There is a growing need for the development of innovative and well-conceptualized programs for promotion, management, and guidance of international students and for creating a multicultural campus environment. For Turkey to better use its potential in the region, research on international students should be increased and regulations should be adjusted accordingly.



## REFERENCES

- Altbach, P. G., and Knight, J. 2007. "The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities." *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11(3): 290-305.
- Kondakci, Y. 2011. "Student Mobility Reviewed: Attraction and Satisfaction of International Students in Turkey." *Higher Education* 62(5), 573-592.
- Mahmut, O. 2012. "International Students in Turkey." Journal of Higher Education and Science 2(1): 10-13.
- OECD. 2014. Education at a Glance, 2014: OECD Indicators. Paris, France: OECD.
- Ozoglu, M., Gur, B. S., and Coskun, I. 2012. *International Students in Turkey: In the Light of Global Trends.* Ankara: SETA.
- Ozyurek, H., and Uluturk, Y. 2016. "Flexible Budgeting Under Time-Driven Activity Based Cost as a Tool in Management Accounting: Application in Educational Institution." *Journal of Administrative and Business Studies* 2(2): 64-70.
- Snoubar, Y., and Celik, G. 2013. "Cultural Differences of International Students in Turkey and Problems They Experience." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 106, 759-766.
- Stensaker, B., Frolich, N., Gornitzka, A., and Maassen, P. 2008. "Internationalisation of Higher Education: The Gap between National Policy-Making and Institutional Needs." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 6(1): 1-11.
- Turkish Ministry of Development. 2015. Turkish Universities in the Framework of the Internationalization of Higher Education Project for the Establishment of Gravity Center for International Students. Ankara, Turkey: T.C Ministry of Development, Development Research Center.
- UAK. 2016. Higher Education and Internationalization in Turkey. Ankara, Turkey: University Council.
- Van Damme, D. 2001. "Quality Issues in the Internationalisation of Higher Education." *Higher Education* 41(4): 415-441.
- YOK. 2014. "Growth, Quality and Internationalization: A Roadmap for Figher Education in Turkey." YOK Publication No: 2014/2, Ankara, Turkey: Council of Higher Education.

