

Original Paper

The Phases of International Education and Internationalization throughout History

Osman Gultekin, Ph.D.^{1*} (Note 1)

¹ President, Pertevniyal Alumni Association, Istanbul, Turkey

* Osman Gultekin, Ph.D., President, Pertevniyal Alumni Association, Istanbul, Turkey

Received: April 14, 2021

Accepted: April 28, 2021

Online Published: April 30, 2021

doi:10.22158/wjeh.v3n2p96

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/wjeh.v3n2p96>

Abstract

International education and internationalization have gone through distinct phases throughout world history and have become increasingly more complex and professional at each stage. Since Ancient Greece times, in different periods of history, international education included diverse student mobility patterns concentrating in particular regions of the world; and various stakeholders were involved in the international education processes with diversifying motivations. Currently, international education has become a very multi-faceted subject that falls into the fields of study of many disciplines such as educational sciences, economics, sociology, business administration, political science, public administration and international relations.

In this paper, firstly, conceptual background for international education and internationalization has been provided. Secondly, for the main purpose of the paper, the changes and the progress that international education has witnessed throughout history have been studied with a brief literature review. Findings and distinctive phases of international education are summarized within an informative and descriptive table. Remarks about the characteristics of the current situation and the prospects about the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on international education and internationalization have been added to the previous studies.

Keywords

international Education, international students, internationalization, international student mobility, history, the Covid-19 pandemic

1. Introduction

Although educational policy-making and teaching at the educational institutions happen at the national level; education, by its nature, is an international phenomenon. The international dimension of

education is very prevalent due to the existence of foreign nationals or refugees studying in other countries' national educational schemes or the reality that families or students move to other countries for better educational, social and economic conditions. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the international dimension of education has been hastened by globalization in the contemporary world.

Some claim higher education has always been an international affair because the cross-border exchange of ideas and scholars continued throughout history naturally for the academic knowledge to accumulate, diversify and develop without showing respect to national judicial boundaries. As knowledge is universal, universities remain as international entities all the time. The word "university" has a root in the word "universe" showing the universal and international dimension of education and academic research (Knight, 2006).

In early European universities, education was served in Latin, as an international language of its times (Lee et al., 2006). This situation enabled both students and professors, who came from different countries to foreign educational institutions, communicate in the same language for scientific and scholarly work purposes. Education in the Latin language helped universities continued to be international institutions (Altbach, 2014). Although with the Reformation, the universities started to teach in their national languages and this has lessened the aspect and idea of internationalism at the universities, science always remained international with international links among the academia all over the world at all times (Altbach & Teichler, 2001).

2. Conceptual Background

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (1974) defined international education as "*the standardized national education for mutual international understanding, cooperation and peace*", as the first official reference to the concept made by an international organization. UNESCO's this normative definition of international education was later altered by the "transnational" or "cross-bordering" character of education implying the educational exchanges and academic mobility among nations.

François (2016) claims that there are three perspectives used to analyze international education: philosophical, pedagogical and comparative. Vestal and Leestma (1994) assert the term "international education" refers to: "*a) study of the education of other peoples in other countries, b) educational exchanges and study abroad, c) technical assistance to educational development in other countries, d) international cooperation in educational development through international organizations, e) comparative and cross-cultural studies in a variety of subjects and disciplines, f) intercultural education*". Among those descriptions, items "b" and "f" are the most commonly used ones. Whereas "f" refers to international schools and internationalization processes, item "b" is in the heart of the international education activities. Most simplistically, international education refers to "*the activity of international students moving to another country to receive foreign education*". An international student is an individual who travels to another country for educational purposes. International student

mobility, the most commonly-cited indicator for the countries' involvement in international education, is defined as the movement of international students or scholars for academic or educational purposes between countries.

There are other terms used interchangeably frequently, or sometimes even mistakenly, to imply the concept of international education, such as cross-border education, transnational education, global education, borderless education, offshore education and comparative education. However, those terms have some slightly distinctive meanings. The most common ones used for international education are "cross-border education" and "transnational education". Whereas cross-border education refers to the movement of education or students across national jurisdictional or geographic borders (Knight, 2006), transnational education means the education activities, actions and practices that extend or go beyond national boundaries (François, 2016). While cross-border education recognizes the states' borders, on the other hand, transnational education assumes the extension of educational activities beyond borders. In the contemporary world, the concept of international education implies the educational exchange and mobility activities between at least two nation-states in a formal setting. International education is regulated by laws and often organized in the context of bilateral diplomatic and international relations of two countries. Educational exchanges occur within the context of immigration laws of the receiving countries and agreements between the countries. This feature of international education resembles the notion of "cross-border education". However, after the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, the "transnational" character of education is considered to be more prevalent as distance and online programs became more common.

Some scholars claim there is a notable two-way relationship between globalization and the international dimension of higher education. Elements of globalization such as the concept of a knowledge society, the presence of information and communication technologies, increasing market-based economies, trade liberalization and new governance structures have an impact on higher education in general (Knight, 2006). Moreover, globalization and trends related to globalization such as diversification, expansion and privatization had a profound effect on the international role of academic institutions (Altbach & Teichler, 2001). Hence, Knight (2006) claims that education is both the agent and response to globalization. Education is a response and a reactor to the fact that higher education needs to prepare students for living in a more connected, global and interdependent world. At the same time, education is an agent and a catalyst for globalization due to the trend of marketing higher education as a product to sell for profit through international student recruitment abroad and commercial delivery of education (Knight, 2006).

The total and dynamic effect of globalization on international education can be summarized as "internationalization". Instead of using the term "globalization of education", scholars prefer to use the term "internationalization of education" (Knight, 1999). Where globalization is evaluated as a general phenomenon that has an impact on economic and academic trends; internationalization involves the policies and practices implemented by academic systems and institutions (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Moreover, internationalization, as a process, is more steerable by governments than globalization (van der Wende, 2007). Internationalization also differs from globalization in the sense that the latter predicts that borders and national systems will eventually blur or even disappear; however, internationalization presumes the persistence of national systems of higher education and a cross-border character of student or program mobility (Teichler, 2004).

Knight (2014) defines the concept of internationalization as *“the process of integrating an international, intercultural and/or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education”*. It is a very careful, non-normative and neutral definition of the concept. *“Purpose”* refers to role, mission or objectives in a national education system or an institution; *“function”* refers to primary elements or tasks such as teaching, research and service to society through the education system, or in educational institutions; *“delivery”* refers to the offering of education courses and programs either domestically or in other countries.

According to Mok (2007), there are three types of internationalization in higher education. Firstly, the “internationalist” vein somewhat glorifies the old and archaic version of pure and genuine internationalization. Secondly, “translocalist”s support the nationalistic view of the concept by prioritizing national educational systems over the ones abroad. In the third place, “globalist”s subscribe to the idea that national education should encourage intercultural understanding and cooperation between international institutions. British universities typically, for centuries, represent an internationalist model as they are well-established and research-intensive institutions in an English-speaking and very multicultural environment. However, international universities in Hong Kong may represent a translocalist ideology, as they are more teaching-focused and have been established with nation-building concerns at the forefront. Finally, International Baccalaureate (IB) programs can be considered examples of a globalist approach (Chan & Dimmock, 2008).

3. Different Phases of International Education and Internationalization in World History

International education has passed different phases in world history, and in every stage, it became more sophisticated and professionalized. When looked at chronologically, initially, archaic internationalization has occurred in Ancient Greece with “itinerant teachers”. The knowledge was carried to other city-states by the traveling teacher philosophers. Gürüz (2011) informs Pythagoras has arguably been the first wandering international scholar in the world and the Sophists are the first group of international academic mobility in around the 4th and 5th centuries BC. During the same period, “Shihs” in China were traveling to teach warring rulers. Athens, Alexandria and Pergamum were the intellectual centers at their times and attracted many international scholars from the Hellenic and Roman world. Greek and later Latin were the common languages in teaching.

After the introduction of Christianity in the Roman Empire, many Greek philosophers’ teachings were ignored for many centuries. While Europe was living in a “Dark Age”, the Muslim world discovered and interacted with Hellenistic intellectual heritage and oriental knowledge from the East, especially

from China and India. In the 8th and 9th centuries, during the rule of Abbasids, Baghdad emerged as the intellectual center at its time and attracted many scholars from different parts of the world. The Abbasid rulers, *caliphs*, invited many scholars out of the region regardless of their faith. Arabic was the common language in this informal mobility scheme which was influential until the 13th and 14th centuries.

The first institutional internationalization was observed, in the medieval ages of the 13th and 14th centuries, with the inception of the very first universities in Europe. The universities were under the influence of the Church as a unifying symbol and Latin was the common language of instruction, as the *lingua franca* of those ages. Interestingly, in Medieval Europe, there had been times that foreign students constituted about 10 percent of all students in the whole European continent, which is remarkably higher than the average ratio of two percent in the 20th century. Foreign students were receiving “letters of safeguard” from the rulers of the host nations. It was very common for prominent scientists to study or teach in various disciplines in different universities in different countries throughout Europe.

Starting in the late 14th and 15th centuries, regionalization and nationalization of the universities occurred. The states started to use their own national language, as the language of education, in their higher education. The rulers of the states took protective measures for not letting their nationals study abroad and get exposed to different ideologies in other nations. In this way, they also aimed to protect capital flight abroad. Study abroad in universities turned to be an aristocratic endeavor that only sons of aristocratic or wealthy families could afford.

In the 16th century, with the spread of humanism in Europe, academic mobility has increased again. Erasmus (1466-1536), an itinerant scholar and intellectual founder of Reformation and inspirational figure for the name of the current European exchange framework of ERASMUS, was educated in a humanistic school and traveled to many countries in Western Europe for education and teaching. Desire to learn new languages and works of literature catalyzed educational mobility in this period.

In the 18th century, the secularization of higher education has completed. Towards to 19th century, more nation-states were established and they formed their own national education model. In the 19th century, the utilitarian approach was intact by especially French, German and British models. The programs and models spread to Eastern and Southeastern Europe, the Middle East, Africa, the Far East, Latin America and Oceania including colonial territories. With transportation enabled people to discover new lands overseas by long ship travel, European education was brought to other continents and universities were established in colonized lands. According to Kireççi et al. (2016), the export of educational systems and imposition upon colonized territories in the educational field lasted from the 18th century to World War II. For instance, higher education systems in Latin America were imported from the Iberian Peninsula. Former French colonies built their educational systems on the French model of higher education. India and other Asian, African, Caribbean and North American countries’ higher education models were bound to the British system.

During the global colonialization period, although low-key, education was used as an instrument to strengthen the influence on the exploitation of the people and land. Not only implementation of European education took place, but also the inflow of foreign students increased during European colonialization as a part of the process. It is not surprising the major countries that have the historical advantage and superior level of institutionalization in international education today have long-lasting colonial history previously.

During the same period in Europe, in parallel to the victories of France, the Napoleonic university model was imposed in many regions and got very popular. The Napoleonic model of practical knowledge for professions was challenged by Germany's Humboldtian model that encourages new scientific knowledge and academic excellence through in-depth research in addition to teaching at universities. With the international recognition of the research-based Humboldtian model, primarily Germany along with Britain and France were the center of internationalism in higher education in the 19th century until the First World War. The higher education system in the USA, as the leader in international higher education, was heavily influenced by the German system in the 19th century. Several American academics have studied in Germany, returned to the USA and brought in academic knowledge and know-how to American universities. In addition, many German academics migrated to the USA for teaching and research in the universities. They catalyzed the opening of many prominent universities in the USA. In the late 1800s, nation-states' interventions in international mobility in the rest of the world were overcome partially by the increasing interactions among scholars and universities through conferences, scientific organizations and publications. In 1910, 57 percent of the students studying in Swiss universities were foreign students.

After World War I, Britain and France continued to receive international students in large numbers. The traditional internationalization continued until World War II as unplanned, unorganized and unstructured. Individuals, in informal settings, moved to other countries for education, or they were forced to refuge or exile to other countries desperately, hence, they could get education in another country. The student mobility was at a very low level and concentrated in the renowned European and American universities. Although no significant travel restrictions were imposed among countries such as immigration and visa regulations at that time, the lack of availability of transportation overseas was the most limiting issue. During this period, due to severe political turbulence and wars in Europe, many scholars and academics were forced to emigrate to other countries such as the USA mainly, but also to Canada and Australia. That resulted in the USA being the center and the leader in the higher education field.

After World War II, the world entered a "development age", in which the winning countries established the global liberal governance institutions. Those international organizations were promoting global education for developmental purposes such as improving human capital, modernization and technological development. International organizations such as UNESCO, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), European Union (EU), World Bank and International

Monetary Fund (IMF) actively involved in restructuring the educational policies and infrastructure of developing countries. Besides, the countries' national educational and cultural promotion agencies such as the USA's Fulbright and Institute of International Education (IIE), UK's British Council, Germany's German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and France's Campus France were promoting their countries' culture and educational systems abroad worldwide and offering scholarships to attract the most talented brains from developing countries.

The international community of developed countries helped the underdeveloped or developing countries in different ways and education was at the top of the agenda in their development aid projects. With the international development aspects and evolutionary progress in international relations and diplomacy, student mobility was organized by the scholarships of donor countries and organizations, often, in the frameworks of bilateral arrangements. The use of international academic exchanges as foreign policy and diplomacy instruments has started in this period. Education for development was exploited to intervene in the domestic affairs of developing countries in many cases. This international aid period lasted until the neoliberal paradigm induced in the world society in the 1980s. Before then, the exchange of international students was on an individual basis and it was done in a more "genuine internationalization" framework.

With the neoliberal effect, international education has become more of an economic and corporate subject in the 1980s. In this period, most of the national governments couldn't respond sufficiently to the demographic needs of the societies, especially to the baby boomer generation. The neoliberal paradigm and changing demographics pushed the countries to privatize their educational system along with a massification process. This paved the way for increasing the trend of commercialization and commodification of education in the 1990s. Especially, after the collapse of the Soviet Republics, there were new states who were exposed to Western ways in many aspects including the educational systems and acceptance of English as the *lingua franca* in academic circles. Moreover, new states meant new markets for capitalist states to sell their educational products.

By the turning of the millennium, with the inclusion of education as a tradable commodity under the service sectors by the World Trade Organization (WTO) in the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) framework, cross-border education was formally recognized as a consumption abroad along with other educational mobilities. After this point, international education and international student mobility have been taken a further step and internationalization became a very important topic for all higher education institutions in the world. In this period, the student mobility numbers skyrocketed with intense internationalization efforts of higher education institutions within two main mechanisms. One of them was about the global rise of private universities and the expansion of cross-border private higher education in the world in a free-market framework. National private educational institutions, especially in the West, were looking for the recruitment of full fee-paying students overseas. Their international marketing efforts and outreach to other countries' nationals made international higher education more available to foreign students. Those students have been mainly children of the wealthy

or enlarging upper middle class in the Eastern countries who could afford to pay for study abroad. Nonetheless, under the new competitive international education market, “diploma mills” and “accreditation mills” have been a cause for concern about the quality of the education in the universities offering international education. Some countries and international bodies such as OECD and UNESCO published guidelines for the stakeholders in international education activities and some international quality associations started to check and certify the educational institutions for quality in their services.

The other mechanism to increase international student mobility was about the regional cooperative frameworks. The most significant example is the Bologna process in Europe. Institutionalization of internationalization of higher education institutions and student mobility were strongly encouraged within different programs in Europe, especially through ERASMUS programs. All those developments are accompanied by the Western countries’ well-defined and easing visa and immigration regulations for international students from other countries. Figure 1 shows the main countries hosting international students and sending them abroad in some selected years between 1968 and 2006.

1968		1980		1985		2002		2004		2006	
Host	Sender	Host	Sender	Host	Sender	Host	Sender	Host	Sender	Host	Sender
USA	China	USA	Iran	USA	China	USA	China	USA	China	USA	China
France	USA	France	Malaysia	France	Malaysia	UK	USA	UK	USA	UK	USA
Germany	Canada	USSR	Greece	Germany	Iran	Germany	India	Germany	India	Australia	India
Lebanon	Syria	Germany	China	UK	Greece	Australia	Korea	France	Korea	France	Korea
Canada	UK	UK	Nigeria	Italy	Morocco	France	Japan	Australia	Germany	Germany	Germany
UK	Germany	Lebanon	Morocco	Canada	Korea	Japan	Germany	Japan	Japan	China	Japan
USSR	Greece	Canada	USA	Lebanon	Jordan	China	Morocco	China	France	Canada	France
Egypt	Korea	Italy	Hong Kong	Belgium	Hong Kong	Russia	Greece	Russia	Turkey	Japan	Malaysia
Argentina	Italy	Egypt	Germany	Saudi Arabia	Germany	Canada	France	Canada	Morocco	Russia	Canada
Italy	Malaysia	Romania	Jordan	Australia	USA	Spain	Turkey	South Africa	Greece	Singapore	Russia

Figure 1. The Main Host and Sender Countries in Depicted Years between 1968 and 2006

Source: Gürüz (2011).

In the 2010s, there has been a new competitive and chaotic situation in regards to internationalization and international education in the world. At the domestic level, most of the national private educational institutions have gone through the financialization process as prominent businesses in their countries and started to affect the national governments and national educational systems by forming oligopolies within countries. On the other hand, especially the availability of collection and analysis of comparative data on internationalization and academic mobility enabled countries to compare, benchmark, conclude and compete with each other. The trends show that the number of international students has increased dramatically in the first decades of the 21st century. Whereas the number of international students traveled in the world for education purposes was around 250.000 students in 1965 and 800.000 students in 1975 (de Wit, 2012); the number of international students has reached 4.5 million in 2011 and it was anticipated that there would be 8 million international students traveling to

other countries to study abroad by 2025 according to the Institute of International Education (IIE, 2018). OECD (2018) informs that all international students make up six percent of all tertiary level international students in the world and it estimates that each international student spends approximately 40.000 USD per year for education abroad and education-related expenses such as housing, traveling and living. In 2019, the total market volume for international education was about 200 billion USD per year in the world and it was expected that it would exceed 300 billion USD by 2025. Of course, this estimation didn't take into account the Covid-19 pandemic that started in February 2020 and its negative effects on student mobility.

At the international level, the influence of rankings changed the landscape of international education completely. The competition among universities and countries over international student mobility has been affected to a great extent. In order to attract more international students, universities, and national governments also, started to work hard to be ranked as the highest possible on the ranking tables. Rankings on the tables are perceived as proves to claim that the national educational systems and universities offer quality and world-class university education. As a consequence, international and regional rankings of universities have become very popular and influential (Knight, 2014).

Proliferation and increasing influence of international ranking tables reinforced the higher education institutions and states to create policies for world-class universities which would possibly help them to build a reputation and be included in the higher positions of ranking lists. Many national governments invest heavily in their national universities and creating "educational hub" regions so that they can reach "world-class" status. They expect that would ultimately help them to attract more international students and gain more economic and political benefits.

At the institutional and state level, some private educational institutions form oligarchic structures and financialized completely. Those institutions compete aggressively in the international market for more students and profits. Nation-states joined this global competition through those oligarchic national institutions with other states in a mercantilist way for political and economic advantages. International education has been instrumentalized in a soft power race among countries. In this soft power competition with others, the states carry a very translocalist approach. In this framework, the national higher education institutions have to be in international character by default because of the inevitable necessity to be connected to the world and for profit-making purposes, however, at the same time, they have to have strict national characters due to national constraints, regulations and political and diplomatic priorities imposed by national governments. However, this has caused the universities to become any other national institutions of the nation-states rather than being more international and universal (Gürüz, 2011).

The emergence and inclusion of new countries, that invest heavily in public diplomacy channels including international education, in soft power competition resulted in very interesting repercussions in the international education sector. Currently, there has been a trend of South-South student mobility and regionalism with the emerging hub countries in the world; other than traditional South-North

mobility patterns towards Western destinations. Emerging nation-state actors in international higher education tend to prioritize their national interests above any other factors. Nationalistic or translocalist perspectives of national governments within the international education business have been significant for the emerging actors to compete with other nations over soft power influence. Political and ideological factors in global affairs have become influential in the regionalism trend in international student mobility.

Competition—if not war, over soft power influence, increasingly controlling roles of national governments and the importance of countries' jurisdictional borders in international higher education have already constituted a post-globalization situation in the world. Because the pillars of globalization such as interdependency, cooperation and disappearance of borders aren't evident in this new competitive environment among nations. Moreover, aggressive involvement of “sharp powers” (Walker, 2018) in international higher education suggests that education is weaponized in a global “hybrid war” with other countries rather than being used to enable international understanding and mutual benefits of the countries in a possible “knowledge diplomacy” framework (Knight, 2019).

Before the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, mainstream cross-border international student mobility has been happening at an increasing pace and many international education programs and institutions have been moving across borders. The institutions increasingly have been offering international campuses to attract both the national citizens in the internationalization-at-home scheme and the foreign students by claiming they offer internationally recognized world-class education. At the new competitive structure in international education, education's feature of being public good seems to be lost completely and it has been deduced to an element in the soft power race between countries. In that sense, national governments' involvement and their ambitious positions in international education business are representing a realm of power struggle in the world system. Hence, international education has become a very significant subject in the Political Science and International Relations field along with other disciplines such as educational sciences, public administration, economics, business administration and sociology. The phases related to international education and internationalization in history can be summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Different Phases of International Education and Internationalization in the World Presented Chronologically

Time Period	Overarching Theme	Characteristics
5th - 1st Century BC	Archaic internationalization	Itinerary teachers and scholars in Ancient Greece and Rome - Athens and Alexandria are centers
8th - 12th Century	Islamic world internationalization	Travelling scholars to the Islamic world – Baghdad is the center
13th - 14th	Medieval	Latin as the <i>lingua franca</i> , first Christian universities established

Century	internationalization	
15th - 17th Century	Nationalization of universities	Education in native languages, tolerant Christian universities, transition to positive and scientific education
18th - 19th Century	Colonialization period	Education used for exploitation in colonies, Napoleonic model vs Humboldtian model in Europe
20th Century - first half	Traditional internationalization	Individual, unorganized and low-level student mobility
1945 - 1960s (post-WW II)	International development education	Education for aid and development, human capital and modernization theories, recolonization through education
1970s	Foreign policy-making (North-South)	Intensification of developed countries' national agencies' works and scholarships overseas for the promotion of education, mobility from South to North
1980s	Neoliberal paradigm: from politics to economics	Economic imperatives with massification, privatization and corporatization; economization of education and structural adjustment plans by international organizations
1990s (Post-Cold War)	Commercialization	Commodification, marketization of education, new markets for international education, dominance of English - <i>lingua franca</i>
2000s	Intense internationalization	i) GATS' definition ii) global rise of private universities iii) Bologna Process iv) increased cross-border activity and student mobility v) immigration/visa reforms
2010s – first half	Complex competitive internationalization	i) financialization, oligopolies in providers ii) influence of rankings iii) quality assurance iv) organized education hubs v) governments' intensified involvements, mercantilism
2010s – second half	Post-globalization and regionalization	i) South-South or multi-directional mobility ii) new emergent regional hubs, regionalization iii) translocalist perspective iv) soft power competition v) knowledge diplomacy or involvement of sharp powers
2020s	Digitalization and virtual internationalization	i) effect of the global pandemic ii) mandatory/popular online programs iii) (re)discovery of distance transnational programs iv) virtual internationalization

Source: Gürüz (2011) and own elaboration.

After the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic in February 2020, there have been substantial changes in international education operations regarding the delivery, operations and policies. With the digitalization of teaching, educational institutions had to offer mandatory online programs to their students. While the debate on the efficiency of online teaching still goes on, the institutions have to

continue honoring degrees although some of the departments such as engineering and medicine require on-the-job training and close contact with other people. On the student side, during this digital education period, many students feel stress disorders, digital fatigue and mood instability which may cause further psychological problems in their life in the future (Gultekin, 2020).

As an interesting note, in the pre-pandemic period, online and distance transnational education programs have always been available for students to get a foreign degree, however, not all educational institutions and programs were offering those options. During the pandemic, online and distance education programs seem to be rediscovered. Currently, those programs are very common in all educational institutions and it looks like the situation will persist in the future as the institutions had to invest their online platforms immensely. The institutions will most likely to would like to see the return of their investment in digitalization by continuing to offer online programs. This situation will surely affect how the institutions will organize their internationalization activities. Whereas, the regular application of internationalization activities require person-to-person contact and develop the students' intercultural competence and communication skills; with the online and distance education programs, this interaction has to be limited and universities will be looking for ways to engage international students in intercultural activities in a kind of "virtual internationalization" framework. The virtual internationalization concept may well be one of the areas the institutions will focus on in near future.

4. Conclusion

The history of international education and internationalization dates back to Ancient Greece times in BC. Since then, the concept of international education has changed significantly in many formats in different periods regarding its role, features, mobility patterns and directions. With time, it became more complex, sophisticated and professional. International education's ever-evolving and multi-faceted character enabled a variety of academic disciplines to study it as a prominent subject.

This paper provides a brief academic literature review on the history of the evolution of the concept. It shows how genuine and pure internationalization has started with traveling teachers in Ancient Greece and how it has been transformed to today's oligarchic structures of chain educational groups and increasing financialization where education lost its feature of being a public good. The competition among nations over international education has taken to upper levels and different complex dimensions including the soft power race in diplomacy. At the state and system level, soft power considerations became the most important element in the international education and internationalization efforts of many countries. Internationalization policies are imposed for political reasons rather than addressing genuine pillars of an international university such as academic collaboration, the global diffusion of academic knowledge, global understanding and peace, intercultural competence and global citizenship. Hence, it is highly criticized that genuine internationalization processes in higher educational institutions have lost their original meaning and sacrificed to political and economic manipulations of the nation-states.

Especially, after the Covid-19 pandemic, it is still unsure what direction international education and internationalization will go and what will be the effect of politics and international affairs on the matter. Nonetheless, many scholars claim, regardless of world politics, what the stakeholders of international education need to focus on is what happens on the campuses and in the classrooms let it be physical or virtual, regarding the quality of instruction, learning, intercultural competence and engagement. All parties need to ensure the international students are having rewarding learning and cultural experiences during their international education programs.

References

- Altbach, P. G. (2014). The complexity of higher education: A career in academics and activism. In M. A. Maldonado, & R. M. Bassett (Eds.), *The Forefront of International Higher Education* (pp. 1-31). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7085-0_1
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542>
- Altbach, P. G., & Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(1), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/102831530151002>
- Asteris, M. (2006). British Universities: The “Coal Exporters” of the 21st Century, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 224-240. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306289785>
- Bhandari, R., & Blumenthal, P. (2011). *International Students and Global Mobility in Higher Education: National Trends and New Directions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- British Council. (2016). *The Shape of Global Higher Education: National Policies Framework for International Engagement: Emerging themes*. Retrieved September 12, 2019, from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/>
- Chan, W. W., & Dimmock, C. (2008). The internationalization of universities: Globalist, internationalist and translocalist models. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 7(2), 184-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240908091304>
- Cull, N. (2008). Public Diplomacy: Taxonomies and Histories. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, 31-54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716207311952>
- de Wit, H. (2012). Student mobility between Europe and the rest of the world: Trends, issues and challenges. In A. Curaj, P. Scott, L. Vlasceanu, & L. Wilson (Eds.), (2012). *European Higher Education at the Crossroads: Between the Bologna Process and National Reforms* (pp. 431-439). Springer Science & Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-3937-6_24
- François, E. J. (2016). What is transnational education? In E. J. François, M. B. M. Avoseh, & W. Grisworld (Eds.), *Perspectives in Transnational Higher Education* (pp. 1-22). Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-420-6_1

- François, E. J., Avoseh, M. B. M., & Griswold, W. (Eds.). (2016). *Perspectives in Transnational Higher Education*. Sense Publishers, Rotterdam. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-420-6>
- Froumin, I., & Lisutkin, M. (2015). Excellence-Driven Policies and Initiatives in the Context of Bologna Process: Rationale, Design, Implementation and Outcomes. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi, & P. Scott (Eds.), *The European Higher Education Area*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-20877-0_17
- Gultekin, O. (2020). Inquiry on the Role of International Education in Future Diplomacy after the Covid-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Perspectives in Higher Education*, 5(2), 146-154. Retrieved from <https://www.ojed.org/index.php/jimphe/article/view/2636>
- Gürüz, K. (2011). *Higher Education and International Student Mobility in the Global Knowledge Economy: Revised and Updated Second Edition*. State University of New York Press. <http://uis.unesco.org/en/uis-student-flow>
- IIE. (2018). *Open Doors: fast facts*. Retrieved From <https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Fact-Sheets-and-Infographics/Fast-Facts>
- Jules, T. D. (2016). "Gated Globalization", Regionalism and Regional Trading Agreements. In E. J. François, M. B. M. Avoseh, & W. Griswold (Eds.), *Perspectives in Transnational Higher Education*. Sense Publishers, Rotterdam. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-420-6_2
- Kawamura, H. (2016). International Education as Intercultural Communication. In J. Mock, H. Kawamura, & N. Naganuma (Eds.), *The Impact of Internationalization on Japanese Higher Education. Global Perspectives on Higher Education* (Vol. 22). SensePublishers, Rotterdam. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-169-4_1
- Kireççi, M. A., Bacanlı, H., Erişen, Y., Karadağ, E., Çeliköz, N., Dombaycı, M., Toprak, M., & Şahin, M. (2016). The internationalization of higher education in Turkey: Creating an index. *Education and Science*, 41(187), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2016.6223>
- Knight, J. (1999). *A Time of Turbulence and Transformation for Internationalization*. Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE).
- Knight, J. (2006). Crossborder education: An analytical framework for program and provider mobility. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (pp. 345-395). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4512-3_7
- Knight, J. (2014). Is internationalisation of higher education having an identity crisis? In A. M. Maldonado, & R. M. Bassett (Eds.), *The Forefront of International Higher Education* (pp. 75-87). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7085-0_5
- Knight, J. (2015). Internationalization: Unintended Consequences? *International Higher Education*, (54). <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2009.54.8412>
- Knight, J. (2017). Global: Moving From Soft Power to Knowledge Diplomacy. In *Understanding Higher Education Internationalization* (pp. 381-382). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6351-161-2_82

- Knight, J. (2019). *Knowledge Diplomacy in Action* (Rep.). British Council.
- Knight, J., & Wit, H. D. (2018). Internationalization of Higher Education: Past and Future. *International Higher Education*, (95), 2-4. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2018.95.10715>
- Kondakci, Y. (2011). Student Mobility Reviewed: Attraction and Satisfaction of International Students in Turkey. *Higher Education*, 62(5), 573-592. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-011-9406-2>
- Kondakci, Y., Bedenlier, S., & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2017). Social Network Analysis of International Student Mobility: Uncovering the Rise of Regional Hubs. *Higher Education*, 75(3), 517-535. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0154-9>
- Lee, J. J., Maldonado-Maldonado, A., & Rhoades, G. (2006). The political economy of international student flows: patterns, ideas, and propositions. In J. C. Smart (Eds.) *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 545-590). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4512-3_11
- Mok, K. H. (2007). Questing for internationalization of universities in Asia: Critical reflections. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 433-454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306291945>
- Monaghan, C. (2015), Changing the prism: New Theoretical Approaches for Education in Emergencies. In Z. Gross, & L. Davies (Eds.), *The Contested Role of Education in Conflict and Fragility*. Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-010-9_5
- Nye, J. S. (2018), How Sharp Power Threatens Soft Power. *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-01-24/how-sharp-power-threatens-soft-power>
- OECD & UNESCO. (2005). *Guidelines for quality provision in cross-border higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/education/innovation-education/35779480.pdf>
- OECD. (2001). *The Well-being of Nations: The Role of Human and Social Capital*. OECD Publications Centre. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264189515-en>
- OECD. (2018). *Education at a glance 2018: OECD indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2018-en>
- Portnoi, L. M. (2016). *Policy Borrowing and Reform in Education: Globalized Processes and Local Contexts*. Palgrave MacMillan US. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-53024-0>
- Soria, K. M., & Troisi, J. (2013). Internationalization at Home Alternatives to Study Abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18(3), 261-280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315313496572>
- Stetar, J., Coppla, C., Guo, L., Nabiyeve, N., & Ismailov, B. (2010). Soft Power Strategies: Competition and Cooperation in a Globalized System of Higher Education. In L. M. Portnoi, V. D. Rust, & S. S. Bagley (Eds.), *Higher Education, Policy, and the Global Competition Phenomenon. International and Development Education*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230106130_14
- Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, 48(1), 5-26. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:HIG.0000033771.69078.41>

- Trilokekar, R. D. (2009). International Education as Soft Power? The Contributions and Challenges of Canadian Foreign Policy to the Internationalization of Higher Education. *Higher Education*, 59(2), 131-147. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9240-y>
- UNESCO, *Global Flow of Tertiary-Level Students*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://uis.unesco.org/en/uis-student-flow>
- UNESCO. (1974). *Education for international understanding, Co-operation and peace and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms*. Report. UNESCO. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13088&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- UNICEF. (2011). *The Role of Education in Peace building: Literature Review*. New York: United Nations Children's Fund.
- van der Wende, M. (2007). Internationalization of higher education in the OECD countries: challenges and opportunities for the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 274-289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303543>
- Vestal, T. M., & Leestma, R. (1994). *International education: Its history and promise for today*. ABC-CLIO.
- Walker, C. (2016). The Hijacking of "Soft Power". *Journal of Democracy*, 27(1), 49-63. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2016.0007>
- Walker, C. (2018). What Is "Sharp Power"?, *Journal of Democracy*, 29(3), 9-23. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2018.0041>
- Walker, C., & Ludwig J. (2017). *Introduction: From Soft Power to Sharp Power: Rising Authoritarian Influence in the Democratic World*. National Endowment for Democracy
- Walker, P. (2013). International Student Policies in UK Higher Education from Colonialism to the Coalition. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18(4), 325-344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315312467355>
- World Bank. (2005). *Reshaping the Future: Education and Post-Conflict Reconstruction*. Washington DC, World Bank, 2005.
- Zajda, J. et al. (Ed.). (2005). *International Handbook on Globalisation, Education and Policy Research*. Springer, Dordrecht. <https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-2960-8>

Note

Note 1. OSMAN GULTEKIN, Ph.D., is the President of the Pertevniyal Alumni Association in Turkey and has completed his doctoral studies at Bahçeşehir University, Turkey in 2020. His dissertation title is "International Education and Soft Power: the Case of Turkey". He is the author of the book series "Education and Power" in Turkish. His major research interests lie in the area of International Relations theories, soft power, educational diplomacy, international higher education, internationalization and international student mobility. Email: osman.gultekin@gmail.com.