

New Trends and Current Development in Higher Education

Oya Tamtekin Aydın^{1,a*}, Halit Fatih Aydın^{2,b},

¹Okan University, Turkey

²Aydın University, Turkey

^aoyatamtekin@gmail.com, ^baydin@aydin.edu.tr

* Corresponding Author

Keywords: Current Development, Higher Education, New Trends

Abstract: Higher education has a major role in the social and economic development of all countries. Nowadays, it has been a transformation from traditional to modern with new trends and challenges. If a university wants to develop itself and catch new opportunities, it must be more responsive to students, government and business world. That is to say, universities are now not only responsible teaching and research but also responsible to operation, management, completion and innovation. The purpose of the article is to point out new trends and current developments in higher education. To redefined and reinterpreted higher education, understanding these trends is a very substantial instrument. Based on the literature, eleven items that are affected changing of higher education area are stressed in the study. In a time of transition, a university should be aware of and follow all developments in higher education to prepare its students for new world.

Introduction

For a long time, higher education is regarded as a luxury rather than necessity. Many people have considered higher education as an elitist activity not a necessity. It is proven that individual gains knowledge and credentials which in turn gets high income and more prestigious career thanks to higher education [1]. That is why; universities meet to a growing level of demand where resources are becoming scarcer with changing expectations from students and employers. Therefore, *expansion* is the first challenges. The result of this expansion, to create differences and to encounter diverse demands, the *diversity* is also another issue for higher education institutions. The inabilities of state universities to suck the increasing demand have cause establishment of private universities. Therefore, *privatization* of education is another important challenge. In such a changing context, universities cannot be seen only research and teaching center. They are regarded as engines for *economic productivity and competitiveness* [2]. They have to compete for funding, research and students. Universities have to strengthen and diversify their external relations with stakeholders to find sources of financing [3]. In parallel with the changes in higher education, it can be regarded as a commercial product, governed essentially by market forces and has brought in the concept of competitiveness [4]. As it can be concluded, universities now much more need to the *business approach*. Effects of *globalization*, internalization of higher education emerges a kind of process that is combined of integrating an international, intercultural and global perspective. Europeanization is the regionally oriented kind of either internationalization or globalization and frequently addressed with reference to cooperation and mobility in a certain area [5]. *Europeanization and internalization* are kind of strategies which are emerged the result of *globalization*. They encourage international mobility of students and academics; and promote sharing intercultural skills. They also aim at the compatibility of degrees, transferability of educational achievements and the internationalization of

the curriculum to ensure international competitiveness of either institutions or their graduates. In addition all of them, it must be also emphasized that higher education institutions should act as important nodes of *knowledge networks*. To disseminate of knowledge, higher education institutions cannot be considered without new information technologies. *Information technology* in its various forms is well placed to assist education institutions to become more competitive within international markets [6].

1. Expansion or Massification

These two term can be used each other in relevant literature. Higher education enrolment has expanded considerably over the past century. According to national statistical data by UNESCO and OECD, entry rates in higher education in the OECD member countries were only about 10% around in 1960; between 1995 and 2009, entry rates in tertiary programs increased by nearly 25 percentage points, on average across OECD countries. Based on current patterns of entry, it is estimated that an average of 59% of today's young adults in OECD countries will enter tertiary-type A (largely theory-based) programs and 19% will enter tertiary-type B (shorter, and largely vocational) programs over their lifetimes. Based on the literature, the growing rate of higher education demand is creating great pressure and some changing aspect on higher education systems and institutions. Some of them are *expanding number of places offered for university; to adapt programs and teaching methods to meet the changing needs of students; the increasing number of universities and academics need; encourage to private education; some debate about education quality and differentiate of the relation between labor market and society.*

2. Diversification

The expansion of higher education systems has often been associated with the need for increasing diversification, namely at the program level, based on the pressures to adapt more general programs to a more diverse student population and multiple regional, social, and economic needs [7]. Teichler [8] said that in the continuous process of expansion, higher education aims to respond to the growing diversity of students in terms of motives, talents and job perspectives. In the US, the term “diversity” is most often applied to concerns about the composition of the student body [9]. In many other parts of the world, the term “*diversity*” has been emphasized with regard to variety among the programs or services provided by academic institutions, and differences among the types of institutions themselves [10]. The entire world, the diversification requires a new set of demands on higher education institutions and systems. Such as new approaches into teaching and research, as well as new curricula and administrative structures that respond more appropriately and effectively to the unique identities of the new kinds of students pursuing higher education [11]. To meet the increasing demand of tertiary education and to deal with intensive competitive area, the higher education institutions must avoid “*institutional isomorphism*” [12]. In order to prevent institutional isomorphism each university must have own diversification politics. In other words, whilst avoiding the word ‘categorization’ stresses diversification and individualization, and calls for ‘functional differentiation’ of universities based on their own initiatives [13]. That is to say, higher education institutions are to respond to the differentiating demand for higher education by offering different dimensions with course programs, level of degrees, substantive profiles of institutions and programs of the same type, ranks of reputation and quality of the institutions and programs of the same type. Diversification concept is closed with expansion of higher education. Expansion tends to diversify of tertiary education. In other words, it seems that higher education will become even more diverse in the future through the establishment of new higher education providers and the creation of various consortia and partnerships between universities for research and/or teaching purposes [14].

3. New Management Approaches

The new challenges of management of higher education have an important impact on the success of higher education institutions. The competitive environment of education area, universities need

reengineering to respond this newly created requirements. Jongbloed [15] stated that competition where possible, regulation where necessary. Management of institutions is one of the major parts of this regulation process. Based on the literature *autonomy, transparency, accountability, visionary* is the most substantial tendencies for university managements. As one of the Magna Charta Observatory principles said “*to meet the needs of the world around it, its research and teaching must be morally and intellectually independent of all political and economic power*”. University organization and management in the future calls for devolution of decision-making powers from government institutions to increasingly autonomous universities [16]. This means that autonomy of higher education institutions in terms of both academic freedom and financial issues is the most crucial requirement for their success. Higher education institutions can be more innovative implementations and can increase their performances [17]. Reduced procedural controls by government both financially and academically and growing of mechanisms of evaluation of management system to ensure transparency and accountability. These are necessary for the visionary and strong management in university system.

4. Internationalizations

Internationalization strategies are designed to promote international mobility and convey intercultural skills and these strategies aim at the compatibility of degrees/certifications, transferability of educational achievements (ECTS), and the internationalization of the curriculum to ensure international competitiveness of both, institutions and graduates [18]. The Internationalization of universities activities greatly expanded over the two decades. Worldwide, there were about 3.3 million students in 2008 and by 2025; almost 8 million students are projected to be studying outside their home country [19]. Teichler [20] also explained the term of internationalization with these themes:

- a) *Physical mobility, notably of students, but also of academic staff and occasionally administrative staff as well, is obviously the most visible international activity, and it is in the forefront of programs aiming to promote internationalization.*
- b) *Recognition across borders of study achievements is a second major theme, which is clearly linked to the first one. As the results of learning in one country accepted as equivalent to that, which is expected to be learned in another country, if persons are mobile at the beginning of their study, during the course of study, upon graduation or in later stages of learning and work.*
- c) *Other modes of transfer of knowledge across borders have been less the focus of recent public debates, but certainly have altogether a stronger weight than physical mobility of students and scholars: e.g. international knowledge transfer through media.*
- d) *International orientations and attitudes, or, in contrast, national orientations and attitudes of the actors, the students and possibly the academics are a major issue of internationalization such as growing global understanding or a growing empathy with other cultures.*
- e) *The similarity or heterogeneity of national systems of higher education plays an ambivalent role in this respect. On the one hand, a variety of national higher education systems, for example, are considered beneficial in order to provide mobile students the opportunity to learn from contrasts and thus to develop a more reflective mind and a better understanding of diversity. Nevertheless, the Bologna Declaration called for a structural convergence of higher education systems in Europe, among other reasons, as a means of facilitating intra-European student mobility.*

Internationalization of higher education initiatives is certainly substantial almost all country. It has a significant effect on political, economic and cultural life of the countries. However, only developed countries, especially, English-speaking countries provide most of services. These countries earn the financial benefits and control the internal education industry. Political realities and national security, government policies and the cost of study, use of English, the internationalization of the curriculum,

e-learning, private higher education, quality assurance and control, support of European higher education space are major factors which affect the international student numbers [21].

5. Europeanization

Europeanization in the context of globalization will lead to a more market-g geared control and to growing intercontinental competition, including changes in the international division of labor, which all call for specific national and even regional responses [22]. Europeanization is the regional version of either internationalization or globalization; it is frequently addressed when reference is made to cooperation and mobility, but beyond that to integration, convergence of contexts, structures and substances as well as to segmentation between regions of the world [23].

6. Globalization

Recent years, globalization is a substantial term using many areas such as economic, social or cultural. New information technologies, communication tools, social networks result in important cultural and demographic changes in many area of the world. Higher education is certainly one of the region affecting global inclinations. Globalization means to the broad economic, technological, and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely inevitable in the contemporary world [24].

In addition, it should be mentioned that *internationalization*, *globalization*, *Europeanization* differs in some respects. Internationalization leans for increasing of cross-border activities and internationalization concept usually is interested in relation to physical mobility, academic collaboration and knowledge transfer; for globalization concept, borders and national systems get blurred or maybe disappear and it is often associated with competition and market-steering, trans-national education, and finally with commercial knowledge-transfer [25, 26]. Internationalization in higher education is the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of higher education [27]. With the emergence of the term “*globalization*” which was rejected at first and seen as a solely economic notion by higher education institutions, internationalization was interpreted as the reaction of higher education to phenomena of globalization [28]. Europeanization is the regionally oriented kind of either internationalization or globalization and frequently addressed with reference to cooperation and mobility in a certain area [29].

7. Privatization

New challenges like that neo-liberal politics, globalization, internationalization, Europeanization and massification/expansion cause the rising demand tendency of higher education come together the privatization concept in higher education area. Much of the this private higher education growth tendency for post-secondary education together with state financial insufficiencies, has forced universities to rely increasingly on tuition fees and to look for alternative sources of revenue to ensure economic survival [30]. This change involves powerful global tendencies that limit the financial role of the state: privatize and internationalize in overall development policy [30]. Because of privatization to the higher education: the students have financial burden but also they have more opportunities and the institutions have to seek alternative and different financial sources of funds with several entrepreneurial or commercial activities. The privatization of education has been a topic that provokes considerable debate in the field of higher education [32]. These debate as follows:

- a) **Academic capitalism:** Some people think that higher education is steered by only government. If education is leaded by private financial sources, it can be a part of capitalist system. It means that some people think that the privatization of higher education results the “*academic capitalism*” and this concept brings many *negative and threatening* elements. These elements are:
 - In the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, “higher education shall be *equally accessible*

to all on the basis of merit”. Moreover, in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, these words can be found “higher education shall be made equally accessible to all, on the basis of capacity, by every appropriate means, and in particular by the progressive introduction of free education.” That is to say, education is a main human right. Because of the privatization of higher education, if people have not enough money, they cannot access the higher education. This situation unfortunately causes “inequalities in accessing the higher education.” To prevent human rights to access equal opportunities for a quality higher education, public not the private sources should support it.

- These disparities of higher education bring also another problem that can be called “**social stratification**”. Social stratification is the inevitable consequence of unequal opportunities for higher education [33]. There is a widespread public debate over the social stratification created by the privatization of education. Public sector advocates have opposed the expansion of private sector in that they believe that it causes fractures in social cohesion. According to these advocates, the goal of privatization was an increase in the role of parents in the financing of education, which could increase inequalities in access to education and break social cohesion [34]. Private education also can cause irreparable socioeconomic inequities between the poor and rich [35].
- b) **Institutional isomorphism**: The private higher education sector is commonly looked upon as being flexible and responsive to the rapidly changing demands of students and the labor market, and thus as offering a diversity of educational programs and in a position to broaden social participation in higher education. However, a closer look at the types of educational programs being offered by private higher education institutions seems to show less diversity than expected. This is partly the result of “*institutional isomorphism*”. It means that the range of education programs offered in private institutions is quite similar to those offered in public institutions. In general, private higher education institutions tend to offer courses that do not require high capital cost such as business management, computer science, and electrical engineering. In some cases, significant differences exist between public and private higher education institutions that cater to differentiated demands.
- c) **The lack of quality education**: Another negative and threatening element is the quality of education. The people, who support the idea of the foundation universities is a part of academic capitalism, think that this kind of universities do not have the criteria of quality higher education. With neo-liberal education policies, the mission of universities as to raise individuals who have classical formation, social responsibility and ethical values has almost disappeared [36]. In private universities, the quality of education is depending on not only academics-teaching staff quality but also is about students’ quality of universities. To full the capacity of university, the students who have very low scores, can be accepted the foundation universities. In that case, the student quality also is an important reason of education quality problem in Foundation University. This image also affects the employability rate of foundation universities. The researches show that unemployment rate is higher in foundation university graduates.

In contrast to the idea of “**academic capitalism**”, some people think that private higher education brings many positive effects in society and it is a necessity of global world. These views are:

- The restructuring of higher education brings along with it a recurrent debate on the pros and cons of the private sector in comparison with the public sector. The arguments in favor of private higher education usually are based on three issues: efficiency, equity, and diversity and choice [37]. It is commonly argued that private higher education institutions are naturally more influential than publics because of *strong incentives*. The private sector is *more responsive to the changing demands of students and employers*. In addition, of course, competition brings *down costs* and *improves the quality* of education.
- Belfield and Levin [38] proposed that privatization in education eases the pressure on

governments to meet increasing demand and relieves them of excessive cost. Privatization can help to solve many educational problems if government regulates it in ways that make private schooling accessible to students at different income levels [39]. Education is a very expensive investment and government sources alone are not sufficient to provide all students with quality education. Privatization decreases some of these pressures and so it *reinforcements to government budget*.

- The defenders of privatization of higher education think that because the foundation universities have, *more and independent financial sources* and they can use these sources more freely than state universities. For these reason, they may offer more opportunities to their students. In addition, generally, number of academics of private universities has more than state universities. In this kind of universities, the number of students for per academic much less than the state universities and this factor facilitates and helps to improve the quality of education. Moreover, thanks to private university, there is a competitive environment and because of this *competitiveness*, each foundation university should develop new projects continually not only university management but also universities' academics also feel compelled to *produce new and quality resources* to cope with this competitive environment.

8. Lifelong Learning

In education area, the notion of lifelong learning is to enable and widen participation regardless of age, status, or gender. The concept of lifelong learning emerged as an educational strategy to provide adults with second chance education. It is a concept meaning to individual learning pathways. Anyway, higher education is one of the individual learning pathways. In sum, the Report published by Council of Higher Education in 2004, Towards the European Higher Education Area: The Bologna Process includes the following main point about lifelong learning: Regarding lifelong learning, almost all the universities have continuous education centers. These centers offer seminars, conferences, and refresher courses to those persons who wish to be kept up-to-date in their profession, or to those persons who would like to obtain additional skills and/or knowledge in a different field. In Europe's strategy for 2020 puts a major emphasis on high quality education and training as a means of ensuring greater innovation and productivity throughout the lifespan with the intent to increase individual citizen's income levels, health and wellbeing [40]. Innovative approaches to higher education need to be developed and renew implemented on a broader basis, to provide that every people can have access to high quality lifelong learning opportunities throughout the lifespan. It can be defined as a kind of efficient tool using by higher education institutions to access all people.

9. Knowledge Network with Information Technologies

In all societies and all business, enterprises need to use and update knowledge to perform well in their activities and functions. It is clear that knowledge is a necessity for all human activities. The higher education institutions are very significant to have and up-dated this necessary knowledge. At the present time and of course in the future, modern information technologies are the most substantial part of knowledge society. Portable computers and mobile phones with internet are main way to obtain knowledge. The increasing capabilities of internet offer unprecedented opportunity to wide and access to the quality educational resources in higher education. Prof. Dr. Jussi Välimaa [41] said, "*Higher education institutions may act as important nodes of knowledge networks because of their intellectual and material resources. The traditional hierarchical models of knowledge production have been replaced by network-based peer-production of knowledge. Open access is an example of this new form of knowledge production both in public and private sectors of societies.*" It is certain that our contemporary societies are called as networked knowledge societies. As an important part of society, higher education institutions cannot be considered without information technologies and they should support all development about information technologies. Moreover, it must be stressed that information technology in its various forms is well placed to assist education institutions to become

more competitive within international markets [42].

10. The business approach to higher education

The increasing demand of higher education causes rising number of higher education institutions and this causes the emergence of a higher education market. When higher education is considered as a business, it should be examined the concepts of the business definition which is defined as “*a business is an organization involved in the trade of goods, services, or both to consumers.*” Many studies agree with higher education is a kind of organization, there is no problem in this point but what about the good, service and consumer concepts in the business definition. According to classical view of higher education, it is a main human right, it must be charge free, and so higher education cannot be seen as a business. Alternative model emerged in contrast with the traditional model of higher education. It supports that higher education is a kind of business. Many higher education institutions started to adopt a more business-like approach in order to compete and survive in the changing education industry [43]. This “*strategic change*” in academia is now creating its own ambiguity to the institutions that are not accustomed thinking and acting strategically [44]. With the effect of global trends and strategic changes, the public higher education was changed such as educating the masses, advancing knowledge through research, contributing to economic development by employing workers and developing industrial applications [45]. The message for the academia was clear: ***academia is not allowed to lock themselves up in their ivory towers anymore*** [46]. Nevertheless, many academics are disturbed from the idea of managing higher education institutions in a market-oriented manner. In this situation, the reluctance of the academics on business approach is substantial impact on development of this idea. One of the substantial debates is the understanding of the *customer concept*. Although to tag the students as a customers is not normal and perhaps even a sin. According to some academics, the students are thought as customers, it can be contrast with the core of education. Customers are defined as the ones who receive the benefit of the product or service and they are the ones who can pay for it in marketing theory. When the definition apply to the higher education, it can be said that universities provide educational service and students benefit from these services and they are paying for the education they receive. Thus, students are perceived as customer of the higher education institutions. In addition, the students are as a customer they can share responsibilities of higher education institutions. Student-designed curricula, teaching guarantees and increased student opinions in determining education policy are only some examples of sharing responsibilities. As a result, higher education institutions adopt a student-customer model with an academic mission. Second important point is to make a comparison between *the responsibilities of a business entity and a higher education institution*. A business entity is a kind of institution that is formed to engage in business activities for selling a product or a service to make profit. However, the purpose of education institutions cannot be regarded such simplistic; it is a much more complex process than business. According to the *World Education Report 1991*, prepared by the *UNESCO*, the responsibility of the higher education institutions can be summarized as transferring the knowledge to the new generations by teaching, training and doing research; determining a balance between basic and applied research and between professional training and general education; meeting the priority needs of their respective societies. Also, higher education are expected to function as social institutions actively for the development of individual learning and human capital, the socialization and cultivation of citizens and political loyalties, the preservation of knowledge, and the fostering of other legitimate pursuits for the nation-state [47]. As can be seen in these statements, the goal of higher education cannot be thought as a simple way. It is very complicated process and different from business entity. Overall, in the light of new trends and challenges, higher education can be seen as a business approach but of course without neglecting quality of education.

11. University-government-industry collaborations

The roles of universities have changed due to intensifying technology development and increasing

competitive environment. In the past, universities had responsibility only research and teaching but now because of new challenges, they need government and industry collaborations. A global challenge for higher education institutions is to respond to an increasing variety of societal needs by using less public money and by becoming more efficient in their internal functions [48]. The different social needs and wants emerges effecting with global expectation and to meet the changing demands, the universities must behave as innovative and active. Industries also need universities because industrial companies have changed liked universities. They were dealing with only producing a new product but nowadays it is not enough. The universities and government support are necessary for them to struggle their rivals in an increasing competitive environment. The government supports to university and industry with financial contribution and policies, and the universities are part of industry with their faculty members and researchers to develop new project or new product. The partnership of these three main players as university, government and industry is very important for developing of a country. Gibbons et al. [49], Nowotny et al. [50] state that governments have promoted national prosperity by supporting new lucrative technologies together with the universities that become “engines” of their regions. Massay et al. [51] talk about an approach to industry-university quality partnerships for engineering education. According to Urry [52], higher education institutions had to be restructured in order to be productive and competitive, and should have organizational networks to fulfill the need for specialized labor and to provide linkages with industry. Carayannis et al. [53] indicate that the linkage between theory on knowledge management and strategic management provides a framework for understanding the imperative for collaborative research partnerships, particularly those involving government, university and industry actors. In this context, the “Triple Helix” can be mentioned. The thesis states that the university can play a major role on changing and improving in increasingly knowledge-based societies. Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff [54] defend that the previously isolated institutional social spheres of university, government and industry have become increasingly intertwined. Dinçer and Rosen [55] present that there is a strong need to concentrate the efforts in developing right policies and strategies to assess the impact of science and technology on national development; to develop mechanisms in bringing government, industry and university together for research and development and innovation; and to accelerate commercialization. Leydesdorf [56] mentions the triple helix dynamics. In the analysis, he introduced the relations between the institutions and government sectors, which could be measured as variables and probabilistic entropy while using dynamic fluxes basing on infrastructure support. Leydesdorff and Meyer [57] emphasize on three selection environments in the triple helix model namely wealth generation (industry), novelty production (academia), and public control (government). Worasinchai et al. [58] study the role of knowledge flow in the triple helix model. The triple helix model was a spiral model. It underlines the importance of contributing to the interactions between academic, industry, and government. Viale and Etzkowitz [59] introduce anti-cyclic triple helix. They propose a turning point of research and innovation policy in Western countries, with apparent contradictory effects. The result of study emerged that to support the academy-industry relationship was unavoidable. Perkmann et al. [60] state how universities’ research quality shapes their engagement with industry. Based on the literature, it is certain that the universities are not only teaching institutions, but also contribute to technological developments and sustainable economic growth of a country. It is expected that higher education institutions should be engaged with innovation and entrepreneurship activities through collaboration industry and government. In this collaboration, government must play a major role for supporting universities through incentives to create inventions in new technologies and industry provides funding to higher education institutions for research projects. Overall, universities should effort to the collaborations of government and industry that are regarded as a significant element to catch new trends of higher education.

Summary

Nowadays, higher education systems and institutions are facing a new paradigm, which are

transformed from traditional views to new ones. In this respect, there are some new trends and challenges in higher education. In the article, expansion or massification, diversification, different management style with autonomy and accountability, internationalization, Europeanization, globalization, privatization, life-long learning, knowledge network with information technologies, business approach to higher education and university-government-industry collaborations are especially underlined. The academic world needs understanding new approaches in such transformation process to reinterpret and redefine higher education.

References

- [1] Altbach, P. G., (2007). Higher education in the new century: Global challenges and innovative ideas. In, P. G. Altbach& P. M. Peterson (Eds.), Rotterdam: Sense Publisher.
- [2] Currie, J., (1998). *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- [3] Ginkel, H. V. (2003). What does globalization mean for higher education? *Universities and globalization: Private linkages, public trust*. (pp. 71-80). In, G. Breton& M. Lambert (Eds.), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.
- [4] Mohamedbhai, G., (2003). Globalization and its implications for universities in developing countries. *Universities and globalization: Private linkages, public trust*. (pp. 153-162). In, G. Breton& M. Lambert (Eds.), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.
- [5, 29] Race, J. (1997). *Regional Cooperation in Higher Education: A Background and Overview*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- [7] Teixeira, P. N., Rocha, V., Biscaia, R., & Cardoso, M. F. (2012). Competition and diversity in higher education: an empirical approach to specialization patterns of Portuguese institutions. *Higher Education*, 63(3), 337-352.
- [8, 23] Teichler, U. (2003). The future of higher education and the future of higher education research. *Tertiary Education & Management*, 9(3), 171-185.
- [9] Hurtado, S., & Dey, E. L. (1997). Achieving the goals of multiculturalism and diversity. *Planning and management for a changing environment: A handbook on redesigning postsecondary institutions*, 405-431.
- [10] Meek, V. L., Goedegebuure, L., Kivinen, O., & Rinne, R. (1996). *The Mockers and the Mocked: Comparative perspectives on differentiation, convergence, and diversity in higher education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- [11] Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education Philip G. Altbach Liz Reisberg Laura E. Rumbley
- [12] DiMaggio, Paul J. 1983 "State expansion and organizational fields." In Richard H Hall and Robert E. Quinn (eds.), *Organizational Theory and Public Policy*: 147-1 61. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- [13] Kitagawa, F., & Oba, J. (2010). Managing differentiation of higher education system in Japan: Connecting excellence and diversity. *Higher Education*, 59(4), 507-524.
- [14] Guri-Rosenblit, Sarah, Helena Šebková, and Ulrich Teichler. "Massification and diversity of higher education systems: Interplay of complex dimensions." *Higher Education Policy* 20.4 (2007): 373-389.
- [15] Jongbloed, B. (2004). Regulation and competition in higher education. In *Markets in Higher Education* (pp. 87-111). Springer Netherlands.
- [16, 18, 22] HoF Wittenberg Institute. (2006). Current and future trends in higher education.
- [17, 19] Prof. Dr. Yusuf Ziya Özcan, 22nd International Conference on Higher Education, Bilkent University, Ankara June 17-19, 2011.
- [20] Teichler, U. (2009). Internationalisation of higher education: European experiences. *Asia Pacific*

Education Review, 10(1), 93-106.

- [21] Altbach, P. and Knight, J. (2006), The internationalization of higher education: motivations and realities, in *The NEA Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- [24] Altbach, (2006). Globalization and the universities: And realities in an unequal world. In, F. James & G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 121-139). Springer
- [25] Middlehurst, R. (2000). *The Business of Borderless Education*. London: Committee of Vice Principals and Chancellors.
- [26] Sadlak, J. (2001). "Globalization in Higher Education", *International Educator*, 10 (4), 3-5.
- [27] Knight, J. (2004). „Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. In *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1).
- [28] Uluslararası Yükseköğretim Kongresi: Yeni Yönelişler ve Sorunlar (UYK-2011), 27-29 Mayıs 2011, İstanbul, Prof. Dr. Barbara M. Kehm International Centre for Higher Education Research (INCHER), University of Kassel, Kassel, Germany
- [30] Peters, M. A. (2007) *Knowledge economy, development and future of higher education: Higher education, development and the learning economy*. Location: Sense Publisher
- [31] Levy, D. C. (2002). Private higher education's surprise roles. In, P. G. Altbach & D.C Levy (Eds.), *Private higher education, a global revolution* (pp. 17-23). Rotterdam: Sense Publisher.
- [32, 34, 37] Altunay, E. (2010). "Profile of Students and the Reasons Why They Prefer Private Universities in Turkey" Boğaziçi University PhD thesis.
- [33] Apple, M. W., (2001). *Educating the right way: markets, standards, god, and inequality*. Newyork (NY), London: Routledge Falmer
- [35] Tilak, Jandhyala BG. "Financing higher education in India: principles, practice, and policy issues." *Higher Education* 26.1 (1993): 43-67.
- [36] İnal, K. (2001), Neo-liberal Eğitim Politikaları ve Üniversiteler [Neoliberal educational policies and universities] *Evrensel Kültür*, 114, Haziran
- [37] Woodhall, M., 1997. *Public versus private education: changing perceptions of boundaries and roles*. University of Wales, Department of Education, Aberyswyth (unpublished).
- [38] Belfield, C. R. and H. M. Levin (2002) *Education privatization: causes, consequences and planning implications*, Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved December 12, 2009 from <http://www.unesco.org/iiep>
- [39] Cinoglu, M. (2006). Private education as a policy tool in Turkey. *International Educational Journal*, 7(5), 676,687
- [40] *The Role of Higher Education in the Context of Lifelong Learning*, Barbara Kelly, Uluslararası Yükseköğretim Kongresi: Yeni Yöneliffler ve Sorunlar (UYK-2011), 27-29 Mayıs 2011, İstanbul; 1. Cilt / Bölüm V / Sayfa 283-291
- [41, 48] Välimaa, J. (2011) *The Roles of Higher Education Institutions in Networked Knowledge Societies*.
- [6, 42] Mazzarol, T., Hosie, P., & Jacobs, S. (1998). Information technology as a source of competitive advantage in international education. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, 7(1), 113-130.
- [43] Dahan, G. S., & Senol, I. (2012). Corporate Social Responsibility in Higher Education Institutions: Istanbul Bilgi University Case. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research Vol. 2 No. 3, March*, 95-103.
- [44] Gioia, D. A. and Thomas, J. B. (1996). Institutional Identity, Image, and Issue Interpretation: Sensemaking during Strategic Change in Academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41(3), 370-403.
- [45, 47] Gumport, P. J. (2000). Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives. *Higher Education* 39, 67-91.
- [46] Weymans, Wim. "Democracy, knowledge and critique: rethinking European universities beyond

- tradition and the market." *London Review of Education* 8.2 (2010): 117-126.
- [49] Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scot, P. and Trow, M. (1994) *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- [50] Nowotny, H., Scott, P. & Gibbons, M. (2001). *Re-thinking Science. Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [51] Massay, L.L., Udoka, S.J. & Ram, B. (1995). Industry-University Partnerships: A Model for Engineering Education in the 21st Century, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 29(1-4), 77-81.
- [52] Urry J, 1998, "Locating higher education in the global landscape", Online Papers, Sociology Department, Lancaster University, <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology/papers/urry-locating-he.pdf>
- [53] Carayannis, E.G., Alexander, J. & Ioannidis, A. (2000) Leveraging knowledge, learning, and innovation in forming strategic government–university–industry (GUI) R&D partnerships in the US, Germany, and France, *Technovation* 20, 477–488.
- [54] Etzkowitz, H, Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The Dynamics of Innovation: from National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of University-industry-government Relations. *Research Policy*, 29 (2), 109-123.
- [55] Dincer, I. & Rosen, M.A. (2001). The roles of science and technology in energy and environment research and development, *International Journal of Energy Research* 25(13), 1165-1187.
- [56] Leydesdorff, L. (2003). The mutual information of university-industry-government relations: An indicator of the Triple Helix dynamics. *Scientometrics*, 58(2), 445-467.
- [57] Leydesdorff, L., & Meyer, M. (2006). Triple Helix indicators of knowledge-based innovation systems: introduction to the special issue. *Research policy*, 35(10), 1441-1449.
- [58] L. Worasinchai, V. Riniere, A.A.A. Bechina, The role of knowledge flow in Thai GUIN version of the triple helix, *Electronic J. of Knowledge management*, Vol. 7, pp. 287-296, 2009.
- [59] R. Viale and H. Etzkowitz, *The capitalization of knowledge: a triple helix of university-industry-government*, Edited Book, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham, 2010.
- [60] Perkmann, M., King, Z. & Pavelin, S. (2011). Engaging excellence? Effects of faculty quality on university engagement with industry. *Research Policy* 40, 539–552.